U.S. Congress

Appendix

World Health: A New Dimension to the American Revolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LISTER HILL
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 1, 1959

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, on April 17, 1959, I had the privilege of speaking at the symposium held on the occasion of the opening of new laboratory facilities at the Wistar Institute in Philadelphia, Pa. I spoke on "World Health: A New Dimension to the American Revolution," and I ask unanimous consent to have my remarks printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY U.S. SENATOR LISTER HILL AT THE OPENING OF NEW LABORATORY FACILITIES AT THE WISTAR INSTITUTE, PHILADELPHIA, PA., APRIL 17, 1959

It is indeed a privilege for me to speak today at the dedication of the magnificent new Wistar Institute—an institute so deeply rooted in the history of American medicine, located here in Philadelphia in the very cradle of American medicine.

The founding of the Pennsylvania Hospital in 1751, the establishment at that hospital in 1763 of the first public medical library in the Colonies, and 2 years later, in 1765, the coming into being of America's first medical school, the medical department of the College of Philadelphia, are but a few of the evidences of the great efforts made to lift the level of medical practice in the Colonies.

Caspar Wistar, who was born in 1761, reflected during his entire lifetime the excitement and enthusiasm of an active participant in the birth of medicine on a new continent. After the battle of Germantown in 1777, many of the wounded were brought to the Wistar home for care. That early exposure to the suffering of his fellow man led Wistar, a devout Quaker, to choose medicine as a career. He apprenticed himself at the early age of 16 to Dr. John Redman, who had studied medicine at Leyden. In 1779, he enrolled at the medical department of the College of Philadelphia, where he received instruction from such distinguished physicians as Benjamin Rush, John Morgan, and William Shippen, Jr.

Upon completion of his studies in Philadelphia, he went abroad for 3 years to complete his medical education. He did most of his work at the medical school of the University of Edinburgh, from which he received his doctorate in medicine. It was the common practice in those days for American students to go abroad and tap the accumulated wisdom of European medicine. The extent of that practice is revealed in one simple statistic—in the period from 1765 to 1779, 112 Americans received doctorates in medicine from the University of Edinburgh alone.

In 1787 Wistar returned to Philadelphia and began the practice of medicine. It was a most challenging time for a disciple of the art of healing. Diseases, some of which we have conquered and many of which we have forgotten, continually threatened the existence of most Philadelphians. Hearty infants, who survived the threats of nutritional deficiencies, infections, and diarrhea, were later exposed to measles, diphtheria, and scarlet fever. Tuberculosis, the dread white plague, was the greatest killer of that time. Swamps, insanitary drinking water, and flies spawned malaria, dysentery, yellow and typhoid fever. Yellow fever was an annual threat to the 50,000 inhabitants of Philadephia. During the most terrible epidemic of 1793, Caspar Wistar was one of the heroic doctors who remained in the city and cared for scores of stricken patients.

The teaching of medicine also had its hazards. Following the European tradition, the faculty members of the Medical College of Pennsylvania taught anatomy by providing the students with bodies to dissect. That this was a fairly controversial practice is indicated by the fact that Dr. William Shippen, Wistar's predecessor as professor of anatomy at the medical school, several times barely escaped with his life. On one occasion, his house was attacked by mobs, and on another his carriage was showered with stones and a musket ball passed through the center of it.

Despite all these hazards, Wistar valiantly carried on and made enormous contributions to the medical and cultural life of Philadelphia and of America. As a professor of anatomy, he considered the anatomical specimens at the university inadequate, so he acquired, over the years, a large collection of models in wood and in wax. These very models later became the basic collection of the Wistar Institute of Anatomy and Biology. In 1811 Wistar published his famous two-volume "System of Anatomy," the first anatomical text to appear in this country and long the principal anatomical textbook in use in the United States. Anatomists recognize Caspar Wistar as the first to discover and describe the pyramidal protuberances of the ethmoid bone, which are still called "Wistar's pyramids."

Like most prominent physicians of his day, Wistar played an active part in the cultural life of our young Nation. He succeeded his friend, Thomas Jefferson, as president of the American Philosophical Society which had been founded by Benjamin Franklin in 1743. I am happy to note that, unlike most of his Federalist friends, he was a Democrat. At one time he was offered the Democratic nomination to Congress which he was forced to decline because of the heavy demands of his medical and teaching duties. His home was the weekly scene of gatherings of scientists and literary figures from here and abroad. After his death and for more than a century the famous Wistar parties continued.

The life and times of Caspar Wistar bring home to us the enormous debt we owe in medicine, and particularly in medical research, to the peoples of the world. Throughout the latter part of the 18th century, and for practically all of the 19th century, American medical practice was almost totally dependent upon the medical teaching and research resources of Europe. In Colonial times and in the first decades of the Republic, our medical men sat at the feet of their British and Scotch colleagues. During the four decades preceding the Civil War, French medicine was in a period of ascendancy; for the remainder of the 19th century it was the German medical school and the German medical research institutes which received the bulk of American pilgrims.

As well you know, medical research requires a considerable degree of maturity and a toleration of philosophical speculation. In the formative decades of this great Republic, the gigantic task of building a new nation developed in us a practical turn of mind which had little appreciation of contemplative research. In 1837 Gerhard, returning to Philadelphia from his studies in Paris, was able to announce for the first time the important diagnostic distinction between typhoid fever and typhus. This vital discovery made little impression in an America concerned only with practical cures.

Although individual physicans in America made valuable contributions in research, primarily in new techniques in surgery, in 1876 John Billings, in a single chapter in his "A Century of American Medicine," was able to describe the total achievements of American medical research. We had developed no tradition of Government support of medical research similar to that which existed in Germany and in France. Private support of medical research was practically nonexistent, and it is interesting to note that the Wistar Institute, formally opened on May 31st, 1894, was the first anatomical research institute to be established in America.

The opening of the Institute was made possible by the generous gift of $125,000 by Gen. Isaac J. Wistar, the grand nephew of Caspar Wistar. General Wistar is one of the most fabulous figures in American history—farm worker, dry goods store clerk, digger of gold in California and later in Colorado, trader and trapper in Indian country and Indian fighter, transporter of salmon, fish oil, and lumber on the West Coast, seaman, Philadelphia lawyer, successful president of large canal companies, traveller in distant lands, distinguished and wounded general in the Union Army during the Civil War and, above all, a leader of men, the master of his fate, the captain of his soul.

In outlining our debt to world medicine and world medical research, we could go back to Hippocrates and then cite the names and contributions of scores of medical researchers down through the centuries. For purposes of illustration, however, I would like to cite a disease which was very common in the South during my boyhood, pellagra. This disease, which we now know to be due to a nutritional deficiency, had a high and debilitating incidence. Furthermore, the mental breakdown which accompanied its more severe manifestations filled the wards of many a Southern mental hospital with its victims.

For the understanding which led to the conquest of this disease, we have to go back to 1554 when Johannes Lange published his famous treatise on nutritional anemias. Interestingly enough, he prescribed marriage as a means of curing young girls afflicted with such anemias—probably a sound prescription today. In 1735, Gaspar Casál, known as the Spanish Hippocrates, wrote the first clear description of pellagra. He applied the name "mal de la rosa" to the condition because of the reddish hue characteristic of the skin of pellagrous individuals. From Casál, a long chain of further research efforts culminated in 1920 in the epic discovery by the American, Joseph

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

Goldberger, that pellagra was due to a deficiency of niacin in the diet.

Here at the Wistar Institute, where one of your main lines of inquiry is the study of the proliferating cell as it affects the cancer process, I know you are deeply conscious of the debt you owe to cancer investigators who have labored for many centuries in all parts of the world. Cancer was frequently referred to in the ancient medical writings of Egypt and India, and more than 4,000 years ago the surgical removal of tumors was widely practiced by Indian physicians. In the Western world, it was Hippocrates who first delineated the distinction between benign and malignant tumors. A century ago, in his famous "Cellular Pathology," Rudolph Virchow outlined the methods by which cancer could be diagnosed by microscopic tissue examination. In 1895 the German physicist, William Roentgen, discovered the X-ray, and 3 years later Pierre and Marie Curie isolated radium. All of these and many subsequent discoveries not only advanced the treatment of cancer but they provided an invaluable set of tools for fundamental medical research on the nature of the malignant cell.

In a very real sense, you are now discharging your debt to these discoverers of the past. The research laboratory which we dedicate here today is shining evidence of the union of our National Government, private medicine and private enterprise in a joint effort to foster medical research on a level not hitherto reached in the entire history of mankind. Matching funds for this laboratory have come from the Federal Government under the authorization of the Health Research Facilities Act of 1956, which I was privileged to author and which proclaimed the intent of the American people to help support through their Government the construction of research laboratories in all parts of the country.

Yours is truly an international staff. The Director of the Institute, Dr. Hilary Koprowski, came to the United States from Poland that he might further his studies in cellular biology. His able coworkers on the staff include scientists from Belgium, Canada, England, France, Germany, Italy, India, Sweden, Australia, and the United States. It is particularly significant that one of the first fruits of this collaboration is the present mass vaccination with an oral vaccine against poliomyelitis of the people of the Belgian Congo.

Over the past few years many of us in the Congress have been concerned with the role America should play in lifting the health standards of the peoples of the world. In this second half of the 20th century America holds an increasingly solid position as the medical fountainhead of the world. Reversing the trend of the 18th and 19th centuries, the trek is now westward across the Atlantic to keep abreast of the latest developments in the art and science of medicine.

But in a world which modern communication and transportation make smaller each day, we become increasingly aware of the plight of our fellow men in many parts of the world. At the turn of the century the great physician, Sir William Osler, wrote, "Humanity has but three great enemies: fever, famine, and war; of these, by far the greatest, by far the most terrible, is fever." His words still ring true. We are aware of the fact that an underprivileged two-thirds of the human race is constantly afflicted by the ravages of disease. Millions of these people suffer from the age-old scourges of malaria, tuberculosis, and the various intestinal infections. In many countries of the world a third of the babies die during the first year of life, and life expectancy falls 30 and 40 years short of the Biblical 3 score and 10.

At present we are engaged in an effort to stem the spread of Communist imperialism, which is competing with us for the uncommitted peoples of the world. Communism finds a ready breeding place in the ill health and poverty of the submerged peoples of the world. Communist forces of militant medicine are on the march. We have reports that Russia is sending about 2,000 doctors a year to do medical missionary work in these underdeveloped areas.

Yet we who once fired the shot "heard round the world," and gave a new dimension to personal liberty in the founding of a republic which guaranteed life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness to all of its citizens, have been slow to meet this challenge.

In the closing days of the 85th Congress, I introduced a bill which would provide the mechanism through which this country would join with all the countries of the world in a united medical research offensive against the major killers and cripplers of mankind. The bill would create a National Institute of International Medical Research as part of the National Institutes of Health. The Institute would be charged with the support of worthy medical research projects submitted by competent investigators from any part of the world. It would also support the training of specialized research personnel here and abroad, and it would encourage and support the rapid international exchange of research knowledge concerning disease and disability.

In introducing this bill on the Senate floor, I pointed out that the unfinished tasks facing medical research are truly staggering in nature. For example, cancer, that most ancient enemy of man, is rising in its incidence in 33 countries of the world. What more priceless bounty could be given to the suffering peoples of the world than a cure for this universal disease?

In the current session of the Congress, 58 Senators joined me in the reintroduction of this legislation. During the last week in February of this year, hearings were held on this International Medical Research Act, and I think it is fair to state that it received unprecedented and overwhelming support from doctors, scientists, voluntary health organizations, and civic leaders.

Testifying on behalf of the American Medical Association, its president, Dr. Gunnar Gundersen, told our Senate committee of "a growing recognition that medicine with its resources and influence fully mobilized can perhaps do more for world peace than the billions of dollars being poured into armaments." Mr. John T. Connor, the president of one of the largest pharmaceutical companies in America, told the committee that "the International Medical Research Act stirs the imagination with its opportunities for a new breakthrough in international relations as well as in medical research."

Your own Dr. I. S. Ravdin, the distinguished surgeon who is currently serving as vice president for Medical Development of the University of Pennsylvania, told us that "we who have gained so much from the research of our own scientists and those from other countries, where good research has been done and is being done, must realize that the more quickly we can assist those less fortunate to begin to achieve what we have so fortunately achieved, the more quickly universal understanding will be won in our troubled world."

In essence, the Health for Peace Act is a 20th century enunciation of the ideals and aspirations which so influenced Caspar Wistar and his contemporaries in the early days of our Republic. In simple terms, it states our belief that disease is a universal threat to the family of man, and that we must unite our medical research efforts to wipe out this threat. It accepts the fact that no nation has a monopoly on medical research and that our own self-interest dictates a maximum effort toward the rapid pooling of the fruits of such research.

When this legislation has passed the Congress, and the National Institute for International Medical Research has come into being, I know that you here at the Wistar Institute will play a significant role in making medical research truly universal. Your contributions are precious today, but when they can be transmitted to the entire family of man they will become priceless.

So much has Caspar Wistar taught us, so much did he leave us in his example of dedicated service. Above all I should say he gave to us his impregnable and motivating philosophy in his own words—words spoken as he lay dying—

"I wish well to all mankind."

Loyalty Day, May 1, 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 27, 1959

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, May 1 has been set aside for the national observance of Loyalty Day in our Nation. Inspired by the Veterans of Foreign Wars, enacted into law by the Congress, given Presidential approval, it is an appropriate time to ask ourselves: What constitutes loyalty to America? Who is the truly loyal American citizen?

I believe loyalty is found in the American citizen who loves and reveres the Constitution and, because he loves it, obeys it—not just in precept but in practice.

Loyalty is found in the citizen who despises the demagog and any base attempts to place one class of people against another class. He is unwilling that any shall profit at the expense, or suffer at the hands, of any other class.

Loyalty is found in the citizen who prizes individual liberty. He remembers that there was such a man as Patrick Henry. He knows that all the powers of government have been conferred and exist to protect the liberties of all citizens. He refuses to exalt the powers of government at the expense of any citizen's freedom.

Loyalty is found in the citizen who recognies that ours is a government of laws—that the law must be independent and fearless. But in the words of our 26th President, Theodore Roosevelt, the loyal citizen knows that "No man is above the law and no man is below it; nor do we ask any man's permission when we require him to obey it."

Loyalty is found in the citizen who loves his fellow man—who wrongs no man—who believes in the nobility of hard work—who is frugal, honest, industrious and sincere. He believes that human dignity and worth are of supreme importance to the American way of life.

Loyalty is found in the citizen who desires to take an active part in the workings of our democracy. He recognizes that citizenship and responsibility are as one.

Loyalty is found in the citizen who knows that the future can be bright and secure only if we continue to apply the

knowledge of the past to the opportunities of the future.

The observance of Loyalty Day is a serious obligation. It is a time to evaluate our citizenship. It is a time to remind ourselves that "Loyalty is the holiest good in the human heart."

World Peace and Law Day U.S.A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH S. CLARK
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 1, 1959

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the address of Charles S. Rhyne, Esq., past president of the American Bar Association, which Mr. Rhyne is delivering at the Lamar School of Law, Emory University, Atlanta, Ga., today, entitled "World Peace and Law Day U.S.A."

I commend to my colleagues and other readers of the RECORD this extremely constructive and farsighted speech by one of our country's outstanding lawyers. The adoption of Mr. Rhyne's proposals to strengthen the World Court, to hold international conferences of lawyers, and to encourage all nations to recognize a World Law Day and eventually a World Law Year would advance materially the date on which the rule of law would replace the rule of terror in international relations. The American Bar Association and the entire legal profession in the United States have reason to be proud of Charles Rhyne's championship of this all-important cause.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WORLD PEACE AND LAW DAY U.S.A.

(Address by Charles S. Rhyne, past president, American Bar Association, chairman, American Bar Association Committee on World Peace Through Law, Washington, D.C., at Law Day U.S.A. exercises, Lamar School of Law, Emory University, Atlanta, Ga., May 1, 1959)

About 8 hours ago and some 5,000 miles from Atlanta a massive mobilization of Communist armed might went on display in Red Square in Moscow. This display of capacity to create terror is the Kremlin's most precious possession. The Communist masters want the whole world to see it. Today, across the length and breadth of America from the northern tip of Alaska to the southern tip of Florida a massive mobilization also is on display. In ceremonies conducted in city halls, schoolhouses, colleges, courthouses, and other places, over radio, on television, through newspaper stories, editorials, and in magazine articles the masters of America—our people—are holding up our most precious possession for the whole world to see; i.e., the rule of law.

What a contrast these May Days offer in the showcase of the spotlight of world public opinion.

Force, fear, and terror—embodied in communism versus freedom and individual liberty—embodied in the rule of law.

Smythe Gambrell and I spent 2 weeks in Russia last summer. An American newspaperman in Moscow gave me the best definition of the rule of law and communism I have yet encountered. He said: "When you are awakened by a voice at your door in the black of night and turn over and go back to sleep knowing it is the milkman, or the paper boy, then you are living under the rule of law, not communism."

Make no mistake about it, millions of peoples in other lands know of Law Day—U.S.A. To them it is one of the most meaningful and timely events ever to occur. This is true because the message it conveys is the dedication of Americans to the highest ideals and moral principles ever espoused by any nation since the dawn of civilization. Those are the ideals and principles known as the rule of law.

We live in a day when the eyes of the world are focused constantly upon America and all we do and say. In these days of almost instantaneous communications between all parts of the globe all people know what is going on in America day by day. Recent reports emanating from our country emphasize our ever-growing capacity to destroy mankind—our miraculous scientific and technical achievements. Law Day, and the ultimate thrust of the program it encompasses, gives a different report and an emphasis to our desire for peace and our leadership in searching for a method to achieve that desire. Law Day emphasizes our law buildup to create a peaceful world rather than our nuclear or missile buildup to act as our shield against Communist aggression.

In this context I wish to state what I hope will be the major message of Law Day to peoples in foreign lands. That message is this: We have and will retain, because we must, for their security and ours, leadership in destructive capacity but we are at the same time working to create a new system to replace force as the controlling factor in the fate of the world.

I wish I had the word power to describe this proposed new system adequately. Seemingly the public is largely unaware that it has been proposed and is being slowly and carefully, but nonetheless surely, brought into existence. We need, and do not yet have, a Paul Revere to carry a lantern to light the way in the minds of the people. We need, and do not yet have, a Patrick Henry to capsule the idea into a simple phrase all men will grasp. The significance of the ever-growing idea that law must and can replace weapons as a dispute-deciding mechanism must somehow be brought home to every American and every person on earth. What the rule of law—if used—can do for the world community must be realized by all men. They must be made to understand that of all the concepts developed by man since the dawn of history only the rule of law has the capacity to harness the miraculous discoveries of our era for man's benefit rather than his death. They must comprehend that ours is a program whereby nations will try their disputes out in courts rather than shoot them out by guns or bombs or by any other weapons they may have.

We live in the age of the people's will. The ever-rising educational trend and fast communications and transportation make this so. What happens anywhere affects people everywhere. What the people want strongly enough they will have. If civilization is to survive mankind must therefore be made to want the rule of law to prevail internationally so strongly that all peoples will rise up and demand and get that rule. All other ideas have failed to achieve and maintain world peace. But on the record of what it has done within nations the rule of law can create order and stability in the world community if it is given a chance to operate there.

A new world has been born in this century. If it is to be a lawful world thoughtful men must make it so. It will not just happen. Creation of that lawful world is the task the legal profession has set for itself. Our first step: Creation in the public opinion of the people of America of the potential of law in the world community. Law Day U.S.A. is one of our major instruments whereby that purpose can be accomplished.

Let us look at the record so far. What are the results of Law Day U.S.A. of last year? What can be expected from Law Day this year?

On May 1, 1958, in his Law Day message President Eisenhower said:

"The world no longer has a choice between force and law; if civilization is to survive, it must choose the rule of law."

In his state of the Union message to the Congress in January 1959 he said:

"All peoples are sorely tired of the fear, destruction, and the waste of war. As never before, the world knows the human and material costs of war and seeks to replace force with a genuine rule of law among nations."

In his broadcast on Berlin the President referred to the rule of law as a replacement for the rule of terror and said:

"Indeed, this is the peace policy which we are striving to carry out throughout the world. In that policy is found the world's best hope for peace."

In his Gettysburg College speech the President said:

"Another fact, basic to the entire problem of peace and security, is that America and her friends do not want war. They seek to substitute the rule of law for the rule of force."

Not only President Eisenhower but other leaders of his administration have urged the same idea.

Secretary of State Dulles in his last address before his unfortunate illness, said to the New York State Bar Association:

"In the swift flow of daily events it is easy to lose track of the broad strategy of our foreign policy. We seek peace, of course, but we seek it in what seems to us the only dependable way—the substitution of justice and law for force.

"This is a relatively recent concept and even today many do not accept it."

Vice President NIXON, in an outstanding address in which he proposed the writing into future agreements with Russia that the World Court would make binding decisions on all disputes over interpretations there of, said:

"I am now convinced, and in this I reflect the steadfast purpose of the President, and the wholehearted support of the Secretary of State and the Attorney General, that the time has now come to take the initiative in the direction of establishment of the rule of law in the world to replace the rule of force."

There is seemingly agreement that a drastic change in the trend of world events and drastic changes in our peace machinery are essential to avoid catastrophe. Sir Winston Churchill has characterized the existing situation as "not peace but a truce maintained by mutual terror."

Many leaders of our country have given their support to the idea of the rule of law as the machinery which offers the greatest potential. Senators COOPER, JAVITS, HRUSKA, HUMPHREY, KEFAUVER, WILEY, and many others have given their endorsement to the rule of law as a substitute for the rule of terror. Henry R. Luce and other great men of America are forceful espousers of this idea. There is in fact an ever rising tide of support at home and abroad. Prime Minister Nehru, Chancellor Adenaeur, Chief Justice Tanaka of Japan, and many of the other great men in other countries of the world have likewise endorsed the rule of law in the world community.

Duke University has created a World Rule of Law Center. Arthur Larson resigned as an aid to President Eisenhower to head that center. At Harvard, Columbia, Yale, Northwestern, Southern Methodist, Virginia, and many other law schools tremendous programs are underway to search out ways and means whereby law can best serve mankind internationally.

More than 100 State and local bar association committees have been created to focus upon the problems in this massive effort of lawyers to contribute their manpower and brainpower to a gigantic assault upon the unsolved problems and unsupplied needs in this field.

The impact of our more than 20,000 Law Day U.S.A. programs last year was felt in nearly every nation on earth. In July last year the International Bar Association, as a direct result of our experience, adopted the idea of a law day in principle for consideration by all their members. In Rome last September, judges from all over the world at the International Judges Conference spoke enthusiastically of Law Day U.S.A. to Federal Circuit Judge Warren E. Burger, our representative at that conference of 1,200 judges. In New Delhi this January lawyers from 52 nations, at a meeting of the International Commission of Jurists, often referred to what a great event Law Day U.S.A. was in discussing the legal proeedures and institutions required to achieve and maintain the rule of law within nations.

From far off Australia, Burma, India, and Japan, from next door neighbors Canada and Mexico, and from many other nations in Latin America, Asia, Africa, and Europe, have come inquiries about, and commendation for, Law Day U.S.A. The lawyers of many other nations are even now planning a law day of their own. The Inter-American Bar Association has urged its members to have law days. The International Bar Association has also approved in principle the idea of a law day for the world, with all nations—at least those of the free world—celebrating such a day on the same date.

A World Law Year similar to the International Geophysical Year should be considered as a next step. When we reflect upon the tremendous impetus which a world spotlight upon science through the IGY gave to scientific advances, we should try to have a World Law Year at the earliest possible time so as to achieve the same impetus for advances in a rule of law for the world. Such a World Law Year would stretch the minds of lawyers to the great achievements we must accomplish to harness the new miracles developed by the scientists for man's benefit rather than his death.

The spirit of Law Day is being carried out in our own country by plans and programs in every State and every local community on this our second annual Law Day U.S.A. And hand in hand with this effort is the work of the American Bar Association's Committee on World Peace Through Law. On Wednesday in Dallas, we completed the last of five regional meetings to focus the manpower and brainpower of the great lawyers of our Nation upon ways and means of establishing and maintaining peace through law. Henry Bowden and Charles Lokey of Atlanta attended the regional meeting for southeastern lawyers in Charlotte, N.C. At these regional meetings these practicing lawyers are asked to evaluate where we are and where we should go in this great program of world peace through law. Through editorial comment and news stories engendered by these meetings the great promise of a world ruled by law, instead of terror, has been brought to nationwide attention. Many of the Law Day speakers throughout our land today will speak on the objectives of this world peace through law program.

The International Bar Association and the Inter-American Bar Association both adopted resolutions this month approving this law for weapons program. They also have created special committees to aid it. In addition, their resolutions called upon all the lawyers of the world to do all that is necessary to forward this program toward a lawful world.

The reverberations of Law Day U.S.A. are thus of worldwide scope, effect, and importance. The record of one year's achievements is remarkable and most encouraging.

Despite contrary beliefs, the world largely runs on ideas and ideals. Nothing is as powerful as an idea—not even an atom. Especially is this true in our shrunken world where rapid communications and transportation cause almost instantaneous contact between Akron and Accra, New Delhi and New Haven. The idea and ideal of a world operating under the rule of law is fast becoming more and more powerful as more and more people comprehend the potential of a lawful world.

We have long espoused freedom and justice for man as the free world's promise. We have never quite spelled out how these most precious possessions are to be obtained by those who do not yet have them. If we now espouse the rule of law as a constructive and creative means to achieve and maintain freedom and justice between nations, as well as within nations, we will thereby offer a plan whereby people may turn our promise into reality.

The rule of law within a nation is made up of constitutions, statutes, customs, which grow into legal rules, and the legal procedures and judicial tribunals by which all of these hundreds of legal rules are applied, interpreted, and enforced. In essence the rule of law means all of these; it means also what is fair and reasonable under the moral standards which have come down to us in the accumulated wisdom of the ages.

In the beginning of time there was no rule of law. Might made right between men. But first in tribes, then in cities, later in city-states and finally in nations the rule of law slowly developed. This was done through a gradual creation and strengthening of legal processes, procedures, and institutions. This same process must be followed between and among nations if the rule of law is ever to replace the rule of terror in the world community. We will thus step by step gradually make a new use of an age-old idea through its expansion to control the new horizons of our era of explosive and rapid change.

I cannot emphasize too strongly that in seeking a world rule of law ours is the strategy of gradualism. We do not expect to create a lawful world overnight, or in a year, or in several years. It will take years and perhaps decades of great effort.

We are not going to make the mistake of attempting more than we can really accomplish. We urge as a first step only the application of the rule of law in a world judiciary to international disputes.

We are committed to the art of the possible. We are not urging world government or similar proposals.

We are not shooting for the moon.

We propose to move step by step, to build brick by brick.

We believe that a half of a loaf is better than no loaf at all and that a slice is better than no half loaf. We are willing to take this slice by slice.

Nor do we propose to flounder on the peril of perfectionism. After thousands of years we are still improving local laws, State laws, National laws, local courts, State courts, and National courts. If we waited until our traffic laws were perfect, for instance, before we allowed traffic to move, our streets would be empty of cars. We will make a start and work then for the refinements.

Let me list some of the main conclusions which I have developed through my association with this lawyer's crusade for peace:

1. The Connally reservation, under which the U.S. Senate requires the United States to sit as a judge of the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice (World Court) in each case filed there against the United States, should be eliminated. By such action we can show the world that we who live under the rule of law at home are now willing to do so in resolving justiciable international disputes with other nations. Until that reservation is eliminated—and only the Senate can do this—our talk about a rule of law in the world community rings rather hollow. That reservation has created such a roadblock to its door that the World Court has decided only 11 cases in the 13 years of its existence.

2. Our United Nations delegation should urge the World Court to sit at U.N. headquarters in New York. The Court is just too inaccessible at The Hague—another reason for its empty courtroom.

3. The World Court should also be urged to announce its willingness to sit in panels—as presently authorized—all over the world. That announcement would bring cases to the Court by eliminating the great expense of litigating at The Hague.

4. New regional courts should be created in such areas as the Americas, among NATO members and in other regions. The highly successful European Court of Justice which now decides disputes growing out of the European Economic Community has pointed the way here. Appeals should be from these regional courts to the World Court.

5. A world conference of lawyers should be held to focus lawyer and public attention upon the foregoing and other steps which could help move the nations of the world toward trying disputes out in courthouses under the rule of law instead of fighting disputes out on battlefields via bombs and other weapons.

6. As a foundation for the world conference of lawyers regional international conferences of lawyers should be held in Latin America, Asia, Africa and Europe to discuss how to achieve world peace through law.

7. Other nations should be encouraged to carry out their own Law Days so as to create a favorable public opinion within nations for this worldwide program of law to replace weapons. Even with two law days we in America have hardly brought our people to the point of full appreciation of the law's utility internationally.

8. A World Law Day should be held with all nations conducting their Law Day on the same date. This should so dramatize our cause as to capture the attention and imagination of all peoples for what law can do in the world community.

9. As a final big push to accomplish the essential "breakthrough" toward a lawful world a World Law Year similar to the International Geophysical Year should be carried out. Concentrated effort on a worldwide basis achieved many great things in the scientific field. The same technique should work in law as well.

While the people of the world speak many different languages and have many diverse forms of government, the rule of law is a universal idea and ideal which all men have in common, even in countries which do not have it. By placing governments under law nationally we have brought order and stability within nations. We must put nations under the rule of law internationally, thereby creating order, stability and peace. By creating a world ruled by law we erect a new standard of decency in international relations.

Supremacy of the rule of law within nations achieves and maintains freedom for man. Supremacy of the rule of law between nations can achieve and maintain freedom of man from the dread scourge of war.

Law Day, U.S.A., throws a spotlight upon what the rule of law can do for man if but

put to work in the world community. Thus is rendered a great public service to our Nation and to the peoples of all nations. In this great law for weapons program we lawyers have as our client civilization itself. And while our goal may seem ambitious it is certainly a goal which is not beyond the power of those to whom our plea is addressed, that is, the people of the whole world.

No greater challenge exists in the world of our time than that of creating a formula to prevent a war no sane man could ever want. We of the law know the rule of law is such a formula. Creating a workable plan to make this formula a success is our challenge, our obligation and our opportunity. We must stretch our minds to create the legal rules, the legal procedures and the courts which will do this in the world community. We could make no greater contribution to justify our heritage and to fulfill our destiny than to have inscribed large in history that we gave the best we had to bring into being a world where all men can live under the rule of law and thereby walk in freedom, in dignity and in peace.

What Loyalty Really Means?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 27, 1959

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, as is pointed out in an introductory statement in the Sunday supplement, Parade magazine, the Communists for years have used May 1 as a day on which to flaunt their disrespect for American institutions.

Recently a countermove has arisen, and more and more Americans have been using May 1 as a day to reaffirm their allegiance. By Public Law 85-529, the 85th Congress designated May 1 as Loyalty Day. It also is Law Day by Presidential proclamation.

In recognition of this first observance, Parade carries the following statement by John W. Mahan, of Helena, Mont., commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States:

WHAT LOYALTY REALLY MEANS

(By John W. Mahan, commander in chief, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States)

Today, as the Nation observes its first official loyalty weekend, every citizen should pause to ask himself, "What does loyalty really mean?"

Does it mean only that you love America's mountains, lakes, and gadgets? I hope not. I also hope your concept of loyalty is not a society where merely to disagree is to be disloyal.

To me, the greatest test of loyalty—of love for country—is your day-to-day respect of the rights of your fellow man. Your neighbor's right to voice his own opinion, his right to privacy, his right to his own property—these basic freedoms are the heart of our loyalty to the great American ideals of Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln.

I think it is ironic that the Communists, who preach peace and freedom, live in terror—terror of their neighbors, terror to speak their minds, fear of the midnight knock on the door. Loyalty to them is not in their hearts—it's a gun in their backs.

As a parent, I feel that my greatest responsibility to my children and my country is to pass on to the younger generation the inspiring ideas that have made Americans duly free men.

War is horror and bloodshed. But there are fates worse than death. Over the years Americans have known this. Battlefields throughout the world are testimony to America's allegiance to freedom.

To me, this allegiance—and loyalty—certainly must be one and the same.

It Seems to Me Says Harry V

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 1, 1959

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled, "It Seems to Me Says Harry V," which appeared in the March 1959 issue of the Insurance Index and written by Mr. Harry V. Wade, president of the Standard Life Insurance Co., of Indiana.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IT SEEMS TO ME SAYS HARRY V—THE LIFE INSURANCE INDUSTRY SHOULD STOP AND REGROUP ITS FORCES AT THE SENATE INCOME TAX HEARINGS TO INSURE SENSIBLE AND EQUITABLE LEGISLATION

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The author, Harry V. Wade, president of the Standard Life Insurance Co. of Indiana, has just returned from Washington where he attended the Senate Finance Committee hearings on the Federal taxation of the life insurance business. The Index is indebted to Mr. Wade for taking time to express his following views on these very important hearings.)

A long distance call from the Insurance Index requesting this article galvanized the lethargic composer of "It Seems to Me" into action after a 5- or 6-year vacation. It is occasioned by the Federal taxation of life insurance mess now existing in Washington. The word "mess" is used advisedly and accurately. Never has the life insurance business which for generations has been noted for its cohesiveness and generally good public relations, split up into so many sections. A woeful lack of dynamic leadership on the part of all of us has been demonstrated in the last few months. The writer was aghast at the way certain parts of the life insurance business viciously attacked other parts in front of the Senate Finance Committee. All of this bickering should have been conducted on the floor of some meeting room in a hotel, before any representations of any kind were made to Congress. Admittedly, no trade association has the right to stifle the speech or actions of any member, but the trade associations could have and should have thrashed out the entire matter even if they had to be in continuous session for days. As soon as this debacle has come to its bloody close, our ranks should reform.

The writer, of course, is not too conversant with any form, Federal or otherwise, of taxation and he is only generally familiar with the provisions and the probable results of the proposed bill as passed by the House of Representatives. However, in listening for a couple days to the testimony given before the Senate committee he was impressed with the fact that with but a few exceptions he was as conversant with the bill as most of those testifying. It is entirely possible that some of our very large companies who have sizable staffs to deal with matters of this kind have taken the proposed bill and reduced it to a draft of a life insurance tax return form but most of the life insurance companies have not had the staff to do this. Until such a feat has been accomplished, none of us know what the tax bill is going to do to us. In the case of my own modest sized company, although we have accurately estimated what the tax would have been on last year's basis and what it would be on the 1942 basis, our estimate of the tax to be imposed by the proposed bill varies anywhere from 90.4 percent to 139 percent of the 1942 basis. The writer was given the impression from a number of gentlemen representing other companies in Washington that their estimates varied perhaps as widely as did ours.

For better or for worse, the Federal Government is on a spending spree, and the good Lord only knows where it's going to end. Life insurance companies should pay their fair share of the bill, but it is most unwise for Congress to hastily enact any bill unless a thorough study has been made as to the bill's effect on the general economy. The writer is impressed with the fact that our Representatives in the House and our Senators in the Senate, almost to a man, are dedicated, hard-working people. They have no desire to work a hardship on either the stock or the mutual companies, the large companies or the small companies. On top of this, they are seriously concerned and are charged with the responsibility of setting public policy and in not upsetting our most delicate economy. It seems to me that they would be wise to have the Treasury Department draw up a tax blank either based on the House bill as enacted, or thinking of the Finance Committee after it has had several executive sessions. The Finance Committee could then send this draft of the blank to every life insurance company in the country and, in effect, require them or subpena them, to fill out the blank to the best of each company's ability, submitting same to the committee for further study. If some such procedure is not followed, all of us are guilty of going off half-cocked. For example, I heard the responsible actuary of a sizable company state that if interest on municipal bonds were made tax deductible, inside of 5 years phase two of the bill would be noneffective, due to the fact that the stock companies would go all out for municipal bonds (I end this rough quotation). If this gentleman is right, obviously we'll have the doggonedest bull market in tax-exempt municipals this country has ever seen. In fact, the market has already been affected by the threat of this bill. Although the bull market would help municipals, it cannot help but have an adverse effect on farm and home mortgages, industrial and commercial mortgages, bonds, and, moreover, the Federal debt itself. On the other hand, if municipals are not going to be tax exempt, then the cost of financing State, county, city, school district, etc., improvements is going to go up considerably. Certainly the vocal displeasures of the boys back home will be expressed to Congress. The thing to do is to so frame the bill that the ownership of municipals is made no more or no less attractive than it is at present—not an easy or quick operation, but one very important to the general economy of our Nation. Fortunately or unfortunately, the life insurance business constitutes a sizable segment of the security and mortgage market in this country. Therefore, all of us should go very easy in making such a drastic change in Federal taxation as is now contemplated. Nothing will be lost by taking additional time to thoroughly study all of

the possible effects of any tax bill. The life insurance companies are as much interested in the future welfare of our Government as any other group of citizens or corporations. In fact, for many reasons, we should be more so. Deliberative and prudent steps at this time should be the order of the day for both Congress and the life insurance companies. Let us not make quick but lasting errors by precipitate action which are not called for at this time. Cool thinking after a good bit of study will produce a tax bill that is fair to all and yet not upset the U.S. economy which is in a very delicate condition at this moment.

Commuter Passenger Service in New Jersey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 1, 1959

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, the people of northern New Jersey area are beset with critical problems as they seek to maintain essential rail passenger service. For the people of our State, many thousands of whom commute daily to New York, the problem has been growing for some time. Several of us have been endeavoring to keep commuter passenger service alive while States and localities continue to press for long-range solutions.

I received a recent letter from Orrin H. Lincoln, Jr., secretary of the Somerset Hills Transportation Association, which outlines the latest steps which this particular commuter group are taking.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Lincoln's letter be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SOMERSET HILLS
TRANSPORTATION ASSOCIATION,
Basking Ridge, N.J., April 14, 1959.

The Honorable CLIFFORD P. CASE,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CASE: This letter will confirm our telegram of April 9, 1959, concerning the rapidly deteriorating situation with respect to commuter transportation on the Lackawanna Railroad.

The Somerset Hills Transportation Association is a nonprofit organization with 10 trustees composed of the mayors and 1 citizen from each of the 5 Somerset Hills communities. It is the aim of this association to seek ways to maintain and improve the commutation service to our communities by the Lackawanna Railroad.

Following announcement by the Lackawanna Railroad on April 9, 1959, of plans to discontinue all local passenger service on June 9 unless it receives financial relief, the trustees of the Somerset Hills Transportation Association met and passed several resolutions.

A resolution was passed approving and endorsing the passing of assembly bill 257 in the New Jersey Legislature to eliminate taxes on passenger facilities of the D.L. & W. Railroad.

Another calls for a study by the association to determine if certain trains can be eliminated or combined and still render adequate or even improved service, and to confer with the Lackawanna on possible train schedule revision.

A third urges a public meeting of Lackawanna and Port of New York Authority officials to ascertain whether a joint agreement can be reached for port authority ownership and operation of the Lackawanna's Hoboken terminal.

A fourth suggests that the State should pay the Lackawanna for out-of-pocket deficits in operation of its passenger commuter service. A special committee was named to study the most equitable way for the State to raise the money needed to pay the deficit.

Another committee is distributing a questionnaire to commuters on the Gladstone branch to determine how public convenience and necessity would be affected by the Lackawanna's discontinuance program, and will use the results of the study in talks with the company and State officials.

The association will be willing to accept some reduction in service on the Gladstone branch, and higher fares, if our studies show that such changes are necessary. We would, however, expect a corresponding improvement in quality of service. When our studies are complete, we propose to meet with officials of the Lackawanna Railroad to discuss possible revisions of schedules to help cut costs.

Very truly yours,
ORRIN H. LINCOLN, Jr.,
Secretary.

The Foreign Aid Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 1, 1959

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, there has been much criticism of waste in our foreign aid program. I have been one of the critics. I shall continue to be. On past occasions I have offered amendments that would sharply cut parts of our foreign aid program. I have voted and will continue to vote for a reduction in appropriations for foreign aid where the record shows that this is the only effective way we can curtail waste.

On the other hand, there is one foreign aid program that has cost relatively little, that has already done much good, and gives promise of doing far more in the future. I refer to the program for technical cooperation, otherwise known as point 4.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial tribute to point 4 by the Milwaukee Journal be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

POINT 4—AFTER 10 YEARS

The point 4 program marks its 10th anniversary Thursday. In commemoration, former President Harry S. Truman, who espoused and sold the plan, is to be cited by the National Conference on International Economic and Social Development.

It's a citation the Nation might share. Point 4 was a great idea and resulted in a most effective and economical means of helping needy nations over the world.

Point 4 was proposed in Truman's inaugural address back in 1949. Its tag name stuck to it, whereas the three preceding points in Truman's program—which are still very much with us—have lost their numbers. The other three points were these: Unfaltering support for the United Nations; continuation of programs for world economic recovery; strengthening freedom-loving nations against aggression. Together, these have been the basis of our foreign policy for a decade.

The idea that underdeveloped countries could best be helped by technical assistance—by know-how—was first suggested in the State Department by a low-ranking public relations man, the late Ben Hardy. His proposal found no takers among his superiors. But it interested a White House assistant, who called it to Truman's attention. And Truman gave it wholehearted support.

It was a simple idea, really. It was that many peoples needed rather elemental and simple forms of assistance even more than big development programs. They could benefit most by learning elementary sanitation, how to get clean drinking water, how to improve agriculture and use better seeds and fertilizer, how to read and write, how to care for children, how to find ways to make money or improve living standards through simple crafts or new food sources.

Thousands of American technicians have gone out over the world in the last decade to work on point 4 projects. We have seen many of them in many countries—dedicated and trained experts working on the land and with the people. It is impossible to assess the good they have done.

When the Eisenhower administration came into office it changed the name of point 4 to the Technical Cooperation Administration. It didn't like the association point 4 had with Truman. But it is a tribute to the program that even today the men who run it and the men and women in the field and the recipients in foreign countries invariably call it point 4.

Of all air programs, this has been the most welcome, the least costly, and almost undoubtedly the most effective.

Governor Meyner Proclaims Loyalty Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 1, 1959

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a proclamation issued by Gov. Robert B. Meyner, of New Jersey, calling on the citizens of this country to observe Loyalty Week, April 26—May 3, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the proclamation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas an opportunity is provided annually for every citizen to reaffirm his faith in the United States of America through a program sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States; and

Whereas there have been periodical attempts over the last two centuries to stifle and destroy the hard-won rights of free speech, freedom of the press, and the right to worship as one chooses; and

Whereas each of us should make a personal pledge to uphold these God-given rights in the defense of which thousands of our fighting men have died on battlefields all over the world;

Now, therefore, I, Robert B. Meyner, Governor of the State of New Jersey, do hereby

proclaim April 26–May 3, 1959, as Loyalty Week in New Jersey, and I urge that all citizens of this State renew their undivided allegiance to the Government of the United States and the ideals which it defends and preserves. I further hope that all civic groups will in this week give expression to that loyalty through public demonstrations of all kinds; through the display of our National Emblem and through cooperation with our overseas veterans who sponsor this observation.

ROBERT B. MEYNER,
Governor.

Editorial Broadcast Over Station KRXK

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 1, 1959

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of an editorial broadcast by Gene Shumate, president of radio station KRXK over that station at 1:45 p.m. April 26, 1959.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On April 17, U.S. Senator HOMER CAPEHART, of Indiana, submitted an agriculture bill proposal on the floor of the Senate. On that date the Associated Press radio wire carried a few stories on the proposal, devoting little time to it, describing it as an elaboration of the soil bank plan. Little more has been said about it since that time. Friday morning KRXK Washington farm reporter Harry Lando devoted a couple of minutes to the Capehart farm bill and commented that it seemed to have little chance of being accepted.

A few days ago I received a copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for April 17. It was sent to me by Idaho Senator HENRY DWORSHAK. And I have spent a few hours this past week reading the proceedings of the Senate during the time of the Capehart proposal. I believe it has not been faithfully reported. For that reason, the KRXK editorial today will review some of the high points.

There are three sections to the Capehart proposal. One does have a resemblance to the present soil bank program, but there's one aspect that makes it so different that it's significant.

Before going into the bill further, I might mention that it is rather a surprise to find such detailed farm legislation being proposed by Senator CAPEHART. Although he is from a nominal farm State, Indiana, he has never been considered one of the farm-bloc Senators and I had always thought him more identified with the thinking of the National Association of Manufacturers than with any other group. Maybe that's because I knew that he himself was an industrialist and had manufactured electronic equipment. You are probably familiar with the names of Capehart radios and record players.

But the Indiana Senator came to his feet on April 17 and said he was going to propose a farm bill; furthermore, that he thought the farm problem was the most important issue facing Congress right now; and that his bill was not just for the relief of the farmer but for the general taxpayer as well.

CAPEHART quoted many figures. Among the most important were these: The total farm income last year was $13 billion—the cost of operating the Department of Agriculture was approximately $6½ billion, or about half of the total farm income—and that the U.S. Government now owns $9 billion of farm commodities. He made his point that farm commodity prices were depressed by the huge surpluses. And his proposal was to do something about those surpluses.

How would he do it? In three ways: No. 1, retire producing acres; No. 2, stop the Commodity Credit Corporation from selling commodities on the domestic market; and No. 3, develop research programs for increasing the potential for providing markets for larger production and stability of prices.

The No. 1 point is the one with some similarity to the present program, with a major exception the acres taken out of production would be acres that had actually been producing basic commodities in 3 of the past 5 years, and not just marginal land. It is the marginal land that has been put under the soil bank provisions, for the most part. The Capehart bill would pay the producer $25 an acre per year, to be paid semiannually, up to 40 acres plus half of the remaining eligible acres. As I understand it, it would amount to something like this: A Madison County dry farmer, with a farm of 1,000 acres, has—for the past 3 out of 5 years—had approximately 300 acres in wheat. He could retire 40 acres, plus half of the remainder, or 160, for a total of 200 acres. For this he would receive $5,000. Apparently, he could farm the remaining 100 acres in any way that he wished. The Senator puts another restriction on the program, however. The limit the Government would pay for unused acres would be $1 billion a year. In other words, he wants to take 40 million producing acres out of production.

Now, point 2, and this is the big one, and the one that news releases apparently missed. He would take the present surpluses off the market. The law would say that the Commodity Credit Corporation may not dispose of any commodity to which it has or hereafter takes title, except: And there's a long list of exceptions, including donation or sale for disaster relief, school lunches, national emergencies, et cetera, and at not less than current parity price plus reasonable carrying charges whenever the President determines it necessary to prevent hardship. In his comments on the floor of the Senate, Mr. CAPEHART pointed out that we now have a law which says the Secretary of Agriculture may not sell in the domestic market any of the $9 billion worth of commodities which we have on hand, except at 5 percent above the support price—not 5 percent above parity, not 5 percent above 90 percent of parity, as many people advocate, but 5 percent above the existing support price. Wheat is now supported at 75 percent of parity. CAPEHART points out that there's no reason why a private enterpriser should pay any more than 5 percent above 75 percent of parity, as it stands now. He knows where it is and he can get it at any time he wants to get it. The Senator contends this holds the price down—which it does, of course—and goes further to say that the individual producer has no chance against the present program.

What would happen if the Government went out of the wheat-selling business? And this holds true for other basic commodities in surplus. The price would go up, because the surplus would have disappeared overnight. True, it may have been an artificial disappearance, but it would have disappeared. The entire visible supply of wheat in the country right now is 1,600 million bushels, and of this the Government owns or controls 1,300 million. Take the 1,300 million off the market and the scramble begins to secure supply, and with the scramble the price goes up.

Apparently, it is the thought of Senator CAPEHART that thus reducing the supply, and combining that with the limiting of actual producing acres, the commodity market stabilizes and future surpluses will not be a problem.

So that's the essential meaning of the Capehart farm bill. The third section, additional research, is not new. It's been proposed before, but has never had the "crash" priority rating that the Capehart bill would give it.

I would suggest that all of you listening who are interested in farming make it a point to study this proposed legislation, and whether you are for it or against it, you write your views to Senators DWORSHAK or CHURCH, or Representative BUDGE. Our Congress is stalling on farm legislation right now. It seems pretty obvious that no one figures he has the right answer. Your letters will inspire greater push from Idaho because they will convince your Representatives that the need is now.

A Tax Cut You Can Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 30, 1959

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, one of the more basic elements in our American heritage has been our readiness to change to new ways, to adopt new ideas and techniques, and to forgo the outworn methods and practices of the past. The fluidity of American life has kept us experimenting, seeking, inquiring in an attempt to improve and develop.

Life magazine on April 20, 1959, published a striking editorial pointed sharply at our national addiction to a top-heavy, overage, agricultural subsidy program—an outmoded hangover from different, more difficult days. In this editorial, entitled "A Tax Cut You Can Aid," the editors describe the fallacy of retaining the old high-cost support system in an era of emerging giant corporate farms and in a revolutionary period of expanding production efficiency.

The existing system is costly, it is not providing real assistance where it is most needed, and it is fast becoming divorced from the realities of modern-day agricultural production techniques. The taxpayers, particularly the city consumers, are paying a double crushing tax under the present program, the article points out "the cost of the subsidy plus higher prices for food."

A new look at this expensively mushrooming program is essential. The problems of supply and demand as well as an adequate living standard for our farmers should be approached in the light of modern concepts and means, not through an antiquated, extravagant, subsidy program. To emphasize this need, I have the unanimous consent of my colleagues to have this recent editorial from Life magazine printed in the RECORD as part of my remarks:

A TAX CUT YOU CAN AID

Fellow taxpayer, on this annual occasion of wailing and gnashing of teeth, we have a question to ask you: If a man came up to you and asked you for a lot of money so he could raise the price of your food and of the

shirt on your back, would you hand it over—or sock him?

The answer is, you are handing it over, billions upon billions, and it is being used to raise the price of your food and clothing. We're talking about the subsidies being paid to farmers for crops that aren't needed, to raise new surpluses to pile on top of staggering existent surpluses.

This economic madness has now reached its ultimate absurdity with the multimillion dollar soil bank program which is enabling quite a few farmers to retire: by agreeing to take their entire farm out of production for many years, they can get enough Government money to sit back and do nothing at all. Does that make you feel good at income tax time? Well, listen to this:

Out of every tax dollar you pay this year for nondefense Government needs, nearly 20 cents of it will be spent on these needless handouts to farmers.

At this very moment you have nine billions of your money tied up in these surpluses. They are now so huge that it will cost you more than $1 billion this year just to pay storage and other charges.

You've got as much money sunk in this unwanted surplus as you will spend this year on the whole U.S. Army.

You're going to spend another $5.4 billion on supports this fiscal year. And it isn't all going, or originally intended, to help the struggling small farmer stay on his feet. The great bulk of it is going to corporations or other farm outfits with operations so huge that two of them got more than $1 million each in loans, while 15 others got more than $250,000. Such loans frequently wind up as subsidies.

The Government has now so much wheat stacked up that if not another bushel were grown this year we would still have enough for all our domestic and foreign needs. In spite of this you, the American taxpayer, paid $330,267.51 in the form of a loan to the corporation of Tom Campbell, the millionaire wheat king of Montana (Life, Mar. 23), who is perfectly capable of looking after himself.

Do you know how much of your tax money is going to support this wasteful and self-defeating program? Every single penny you pay above the basic 20 percent rate goes into the farm supports. The $5.4 billion now going into this is $2.2 billion more than the entire Federal budget in 1929.

Farmers, once free and independent, can now be arrested and prosecuted for growing too much grain even if they do nothing with it but feed it to hogs on their farms.

The Government has so much surplus cotton that it has been dumped overseas at less than the price paid. But U.S. shirtmakers have to pay an artificially high price for cotton, thus making your clothes cost more than they should. Make you happy? Well, reflect on the further fact that you paid $781,274 for a loan to Mississippi's Delta & Pine Land Co., a big corporation. The loan, unrepaid, became an actual subsidy.

Corngrowers, who recently voted to accept a lower support price ($1.12 a bushel) in return for freedom to plant as many acres as they please, are getting ready to plant what is expected to be the biggest crop in U.S. history. The prospect of even trying to cope with this surplus has struck Eisenhower's economizers with fear and trembling. To buy it up would send the already fantastic cost of subsidies right through the ceiling.

In short, the whole farm support program, which has cost you $18 billion in a quarter-century, is a colossal failure.

The only sensible thing to do about it is to get rid of it, stop it. Why go on pouring good money after bad?

The subsidies were enacted in the depression, when farmers were in desperate need. Today, farming is a big business, highly mechanized, performed mainly by large operators and enormously efficient. Thanks to chemical fertilizers and automation, each year it gets more out of every acre. There is no more reason why you should give a subsidy to this successful big business than to General Motors or any private operation. It can stand on its own feet. When it is left to find its own way in a free market you'll get cheaper meat, bread, and clothing. And the farm business will shake down to those efficient enough to survive.

Of course, that kind of a jolt will create distress for some of the smaller, marginal farmers who are on land that should not be in cultivation. But the taxpayers should be perfectly willing to spend whatever is necessary to relocate them. Such aid would only be a drop in the bucket compared to the billions now going to the big fellows who don't need relief.

Cynics in Washington say that no farm bill of any kind—for better or for worse—can be got through Congress in this political year when every other Senator is a would-be President. The cynics assume that you taxpayers will go on as before, merely shelling out this money for what is, in reality, a double tax on you—the cost of the subsidy plus higher prices for your food.

Well, you can prove the cynics wrong. In this country, the voter is king. When he squawks loud enough, Congress listens—even more so in a political year. So start squawking loud and long enough to put an end, for good and all, to this incredible farm scandal that is getting worse every year.

Merchants of Filth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. REES
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent approved by the House, I am including a brief editorial that appeared in the April 28, 1959, issue of the Washington Daily News entitled "Merchants of Filth." It is a brief and timely statement.

Postmaster General Summerfield and Chief Inspector, Post Office Department, David H. Stephens and their associates have been diligent in their efforts to deal with one of the most important problems affecting America today. The sending of this filth through the mail has become a big-time racket. It is estimated this business amounts to $500 million per year.

The editorial reads as follows:

MERCHANTS OF FILTH

Filth beyond the imagination of most decent people has been collected by Postmaster General Summerfield in his campaign against salacious matter in the mails.

The traffic in lewd merchandise amounts to half a billion dollars a year, according to Mr. Summerfield. And much of it is directed to children. Often obscene literature, advertising these merchants' wares, is sent to children who have answered comic magazine ads for toys.

A great difficulty in catching these people is due to the law which forbids investigators to open first-class mail. Here is a place where parents can help.

Give the postmaster promptly any such printed or picture matter you may discover, along with any available information concerning it.

Voluntary cooperation of this kind has helped obtain many convictions. You can help dry up this river of filth.

The Legislative Process and International Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 1, 1959

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, while our whole citizenry maintains a watchful eye on each new development in our foreign policy relations, I think it most desirable to pinpoint the vital role the Congress has in formulating and implementing foreign policy. This significant participation by the Congress had developed in a real sense only since World War II. Today we see the Executive negotiating with foreign countries, but in the framework provided by the Congress.

How and why this has come about and what meaning it holds, is the basis of a penetrating article written by Walter Surrey, of the District of Columbia bar, formerly Assistant Legal Adviser on Economic Affairs of the Department of State and former Director of the Military Assistance Program of the Department. A rereading of this article so impressed me that I commend it to the attention of my distinguished colleagues, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LEGISLATIVE PROCESS AND INTERNATIONAL LAW

(By Walter S. Surrey, of the District of Columbia Bar)

I very much doubt whether, before World War II, the American Society of International Law would have accorded the hospitality of its forum to a speaker proposing to deliver a paper covering the subject "The Legislative Process and International Law." It would have been most difficult in those days to conceive that any sustained discussion of international law in terms of the legislative process could have much substance or consequence.

Let us go back to the year 1936. It was in December 1936, that Mr. Justice Sutherland delivered the opinion of the Supreme Court in the case of *United States* v. *Curtiss-Wright Corporation*. This case was concerned with the question of whether the Congress could grant broad powers to the President in the field of international relations without establishing standards to guide him in the exercise of those powers. In discussing the relative powers of the Congress and the Executive, the Court said:

"In this vast external realm, with its important, complicated, delicate and manifold problems, the President alone has the power to speak or listen as a representative of the Nation. He makes underlying treaties with the advice and consent of the Senate; but he alone negotiates. Into the field of negotia-

tion the Senate cannot intrude; and Congress itself is powerless to invade it."

Indeed, the Court quoted with approval the report by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations dated February 15, 1816, reading in part as follows:

"The President is a constitutional representative of the United States with regard to foreign nations. He manages our concerns with foreign nations and must necessarily be most competent to determine when, how, and upon what subjects negotiations may be urged with the greatest prospects of success. For his conduct he is responsible to the Constitution. The committee considers this responsibility the surest pledge for the faithful discharge of his duty."

Or we could have used the year 1941 as a starting point of contrast when, in the case of the *United States* v. *Pink*, the Court quoted with approval the decision in the Curtiss-Wright case. It was in that same year that the Lend-Lease Act was enacted, which gave the President broad powers in the field of procurement and transfer of defense articles to other countries. The terms and conditions upon which the foreign government was to receive aid were to be those which the President deemed satisfactory, and the method of repayment was to be in kind or property or any other direct or indirect benefit which the President deemed satisfactory. The only significant congressional limitation was that the President was specifically forbidden to assume or incur any obligation on the part of the United States with respect to postwar economic policy, postwar military policy, or any postwar policy involving international settlements except in accordance with established constitutional procedure.

Now let us walk around and through the field of the U.S. foreign relations in terms of how the Congress today participates in the development and execution of our foreign policy, why this has come about, and what it means.

A convenient departing point might well be an examination of the first Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, contrasting it with the Lend-Lease Act of only 7 years before. The Economic Cooperation Act, unlike the Lend-Lease Act, was a complex piece of legislation covering a multitude of subjects in considerable detail and setting down definite conditions which the President was to obtain from the foreign governments prior to any furnishing of aid.

The undertakings which the foreign government had to assume as a condition precedent to receiving aid included promotion of industrial and agricultural production, internal fiscal and monetary measures, increase of trade with other participating countries, including reduction of trade barriers, full utilization of its assets, including the dollar assets of its nationals, increased accessibility to materials required by the United States to be provided to the United States and its nationals, publication of reports on the aid program, and additional provision of information required by the United States in connection with the aid program, the deposit and utilization of the local currency counterpart of grant aid, and submission to an arbitral tribunal of cases espoused by the United States involving property rights of U.S. nationals affected by governmental measures of a participating country.

These are only some of the principal conditions which were required by the Congress to be included in a bilateral agreement between the recipient country and the United States as a condition precedent to a country's being eligible to receive aid. The Congress went further: it wanted to maintain a running review of the progress of the administration of the aid program. Thus a bipartisan Congressional Joint Committee on Foreign Economic Cooperation was established, consisting of three members each from the Senate Foreign Relations and the House Foreign Affairs Committees, and two from each Appropriations Committee. The function of this committee was to "make a continuous study of the programs of the U.S. economic assistance to foreign countries, and to review the progress achieved in the execution and administration of such programs."

This characteristic of the ECA Act of 1948—the spelling out of detailed provisions for the administration and execution of our foreign policy in the field of economic aid—has been carried forward by successive Congresses in successive aid legislation. Let us examine how far this has gone by making a rather cursory but, I think, significant, review of the Department of State publication, "United States Treaties and Other International Agreements for the Year 1956."

In 1956 the United States concluded 260 treaties and other international agreements. Of these, only five were actually in the form of treaties. These treaties dealt with (1) a multilateral convention on slavery, amending the Slavery Convention of 1926, (2) a treaty of friendship, commerce and navigation, (3 and 4) two double taxation treaties, and (5) a multilateral treaty, the International Wheat Agreement. The rest were in the form of agreements not requiring the advice and consent of the Senate.

Of the other 250 agreements, at least 95 percent were entered into under authorization of legislation. This 95-plus percent includes parcel post, passport, and visa agreements and other agreements important to our Nation's orderly day-to-day living but not significant in that aspect of our foreign policy which is concerned with the maintenance of the strength of the free world in the cold war struggle. What is significant to our discussion, however, is that at least 179 of these 250 agreements were under legislative enactment which detailed to a very great degree the terms of the agreements, and that these agreements did concern themselves with the execution of our foreign policy in the waging of the cold war. One hundred and sixty-six of these 179 agreements were under one or more of our legislative aid laws, and 13 were under the Civil Atomic Energy Act of 1954.

Thus, the greater activity and the most significant activity in the conduct of our foreign affairs—those activities which are in the mainstream of our foreign relations, insofar as treaties and agreement are concerned—were in large part through Executive agreements whereby Congress not only authorized such agreements but set forth specific terms and conditions to be included in the agreements. Today, therefore, in the most important areas of our formal relations with foreign countries, the negotiation of those relations by the President are conducted in a framework provided by the Congress and governed by conditions spelled out in advance by Congress.

The significant factor in the establishment of these formal agreements, therefore, is often not what the President negotiates with the foreign government, but what the President negotiates with, or wrangles from, the Congress. Indeed, once this basic negotiation between the President and the Congress has been accomplished, and authorizing and appropriation legislation has been enacted, then the implementing agreement, that between the United States and the foreign power, may often be relatively easy. In order to look into the meaning of any such agreement, we should first look to the legislative histories of the authorizing and the appropriating legislation.

Why has this significant participation of Congress in the formulation and conduct of our foreign relations developed? Since the war, our foreign relations have really been carried out in two major areas. The first deals with our relations with the other half of the bipolar world, the Soviet Union and its satellites. Basically, although there have been some recent changes and others are portended by the newspapers, our foreign policy for this area has dealt, not in terms of reaching agreements, but in terms of waging the cold war through propaganda. There are, of course, exceptions to this, such as the granting of aid to Poland under Public Law 480, and our recent cultural exchange agreements with the Soviet Union, but essentially the course of our conduct of foreign relations with the Soviet bloc is one designed not to reach agreement.

How we conduct this propaganda battle, however, does concern the Congress; and the attitude of the Congress plays a large part in determining what the President can do in this field. Congress appropriates the money—or doesn't appropriate it—for waging this propaganda war. Congressional investigations can vitally affect the content of the propaganda, even to the extent of causing administration book burnings abroad. Congress attitude on mainland China plays a significant part in our nonrecognition policy. It is often true that Congress attitude in the first area, our relations with the Soviet bloc, is used to affect what the President wants in the second area, our relations with our allies, the neutrals and potential allies.

And it is in the second area of the conduct of foreign relations—our relations with our half of the bipolar world—that Congress plays a very decisive role. In the conduct of these relations, since the conclusion of World War II, our policy has derived from the fact that we are the member of our half of the bipolar world which has the money, and the execution of our foreign policy in this area revolves around our money. It costs the United States money to provide mutual defense aid; it costs the United States money to provide defense support aid (which in the old days we unknowingly, or perhaps crudely, termed economic aid); it costs the United States money to provide surplus agricultural commodity aid; it costs the United States money to provide equity capital to assist in the development of the underdeveloped countries; it costs the United States money to provide guarantees of private investments; it costs the United States money to provide point 4 technical aid; it costs the United States money to provide for educational exchanges.

The annual battle on foreign policy on the Hill deals primarily with the question of how much money the executive branch can get out of the Congress for the implementation of our foreign policy with respect to our half of the bipolar world. Now the fact that money is in large part the source of our foreign policy with respect to our half of the bipolar world leads to other consequences. At the outset the President, in getting up a program for the carrying out of foreign policy for the next fiscal year, has to make two basic decisions. The first is, How much money does he need to do what he thinks it is necessary to do. This is never really a clear-cut decision for it is in large part qualified or at least colored by the second question, How much money does the President think he can get out of the Congress? And if it is the administration's Congress, it does not necessarily mean that the task is any easier. Witness the present stronger Democratic than Republican support for foreign aid in the Congress.

The process of getting money out of the Congress is based on many considerations. In addition to how much is needed, there is the basic consideration as to how much a burden can be put on our own economy, both from the economic and the domestic political point of view. Other considerations are: What does the President have to do in the conduct of foreign affairs to induce the Congress to meet his demands and what terms will he have to offer to or accept from the Congress as conditions precedent to getting the money? And, mind you, these conditions laid down by Congress for the grant-

ing of aid can go quite far. For example, the Battle Act, as it is popularly called, or the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951, deals with the trade relations involving strategic materials between the recipients of our aid and the countries in the Soviet bloc. Here is U.S. legislation which sets down the trade relations of one group of foreign governments with another group of foreign governments as a condition to the first group receiving our aid. I am not saying that this is good or bad, but I am saying that it is a clear example of the extent to which Congress has gone in enacting conditions for the execution of foreign policy.

The fact is that our foreign policy, as regards our half of the bipolar world, can be summarized in one word—dollars—and this necessarily means that the Appropriations Committees have a much more important say in the conduct of foreign relations than was ever conceived by the Constitution or by tradition to be their responsibility. This is an enormously significant development. It to some extent reverses the constitutional role of the Senate and the House. The Senate in 1956 advised on and consented to five treaties, three of which were relatively unimportant; the House had to originate the appropriation acts to make possible around 170 executive agreements, all of which dealt with the waging of the cold war.

What does this development whereby Congress plays a vital role in the formulation and implementation of foreign policy mean to us? First, from the narrow point of view, whether one is the professor concerned with theory or the attorney concerned with a client's interest, it does require that one know how the legislative process operates. If we are practicing attorneys, it means we had better learn how to lobby; if we are textbooks writers on international relations and law, we had better understand the operation of the legislative process; if we are representatives of a foreign government, we had better learn as much as we can about this strange relationship between the Executive and the Congress.

The conduct of a large segment of the external affairs of the United States is no longer an esoteric subject. The development of our more significant foreign policies evolves from the same legislative process in the same manner as, for instance, authorizing and appropriating legislation on a roadbuilding program to counteract the recesison.

But more important, what does this development, involving the sharing between the President and the Congress of policy formulation and execution, mean in terms of the conduct of our foreign relations? From an overall point of view, I think it is good—a conclusion, I hazard the guess, with which few members of the Department of State will concur. Certainly it is more democratic. Certainly it requires the executive branch to think more about and justify better any given foreign policy program. Certainly it requires, in order to maintain continued congressional support, periodic "agonizing reappraisals" of our foreign aid programs, which in turn should result in the reformation of those programs to meet current conditions. This is particularly true today. Certainly it removes the weight of certain pressures, both foreign and domestic, on the executive branch. There is no more succinct reply to a foreign government's complaint than the finality of the sentence: "Congress says it must be done this way." And there is nothing so gratifying to the State Department policy executive as fending off a domestic pressure group by saying: "Tell it to the Congress."

But there is an inherent evil in this development which can only be cured, or at least curtailed, by wise action on the part of the President and his aids. Simply stated, it is that 96 Senators and, more significantly, 435 Representatives, cannot all be expected to be educated and sophisticated on all phases of our foreign policy, though generally they can be expected to be voluble, and always they can be expected to be decisive—they do have the vote. This means that the executive branch must cease being frightened by congressional intervention in foreign relations, particularly when combined with congressional lack of undersanding. The intervention is here to stay, so it is better to do something about the lack of understanding. Too often executive reaction is: "Congress won't like the fact that India and Pakistan aren't the friendliest of neighbors; tone it down or the appropriation will be cut." To paraphrase Joe Louis' famous remark on Billy Conn, "You can run away from a foreign policy problem, but you can't hide it."

The annual battle on foreign aid authorizations and appropriations should become more and more a day-by-day educational activity. It becomes increasingly more essential that the key committees, particularly the Foreign Relations, Foreign Affairs and Appropriations Committees, and individual key Senators and Representatives, be kept currently abreast of foreign policy developments. And this is not acomplished by spasmodic briefing sessions. It is best done by having an officer of an executive agency, such as the State Department or the ICA, or the Atomic Energy Commission, selected because he is knowledgeable on a particular problem, discuss that problem on the Hill from the very inception of his work on it. Admittedly, this task may generally be tiresome and often frustrating; but it is worth the effort. The Marshall plan, the Atlantic Pact and the first Mutual Defense Assistance Act were successfully initated because this effort was made.

It is also important that organizations and people interested in our foreign relations take more time to discuss the problems with congressional committees and individual Congressmen. I say discuss, rather than submit reports, because, while any Congressman is thoroughly literate, he generally has no time to prove it. And this does not mean that the discussions with a Congressman, by representatives of this society, for example, must be in terms of solutions—unless, of course, you represent a client.

Transmission of knowledge of the facts frequently is more important than transmission of solutions. And often it is equally important that the Congressman learn that there may be no easy or even relatively immediate solution, as may well be the case, for instance, with Arab-Israel relations.

One final word: To a significant degree a Congressman does reflect public opinion. He may help mold that opinion, but even then, the opinion he has helped mold comes back to mold and sometimes control his attitudes. Those who went along with McCarthyism on the State Department unfortunately found this to be true. So it becomes more important that the American people be more and better informed about our external relations—more and better informed primarily by the executive branch, but also by private organizations, such as this society.

Whether we think the development of Congress' role in foreign affairs is good or bad, it is a fact that the Congress now shares with the President in the development and, to a lesser extent, the execution, of our foreign policy. It is a fact that the overall conduct of a significant part of our foreign affairs is very much in the well of the House and Senate. The formation of the principal segments of our foreign policy is out in the open, debated and developed by a democratic procedure. It follows that an informed people and an informed Congress are the best guarantees that this method for the formation of our external relations will work at least moderately well.

Address of U.S. Senator A. S. Mike Monroney, of Oklahoma, at Paul M. Butler Testimonial Dinner in South Bend, Ind.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BRADEMAS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, on April 29, 1959, in South Bend, Ind., nearly 800 friends and neighbors from throughout the State gathered to pay tribute to one of Indiana's most distinguished citizens, the hard working, courageous and dedicated chairman of the Democratic National Committee, the Honorable Paul M. Butler.

The principal speaker at this great banquet in honor of Paul Butler was one of the finest Members of the U.S. Senate and another distinguished American, the junior Senator from the State of Oklahoma, the Honorable A. S. MIKE MONRONEY.

I am proud to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the splendid address delivered by Senator MONRONEY on this occasion:

I am a lucky Senator indeed to be invited here for this very happy occasion.

It's always a pleasure to come to Indiana to address the front-line fighting troops of the Democratic Party. It's much different here than in my State of Oklahoma. Here, in this area, it's hard to be a Democrat. Old, bad habits are hard to break, and so you face an uphill fight in every election.

In Oklahoma and other parts of the great Southwest it's hard not to be a Democrat. And so I am always glad to salute the people who turned the tide to win outstanding victories for our party in Indiana.

But to be here on this occasion—when a dear friend of yours and mine is honored by his fellow townsmen and others of Indiana—gives me particular pleasure. This warm and enthusiastic testimonial diner is a well deserved tribute to a great Democratic leader—Paul Butler.

When the invitation was extended to me I wondered why, out of all 64 Democratic Senators, I was lucky enough to be chosen to speak on this occasion.

Reflecting that South Bend's most famous product is the great Notre Dame football team, and knowing that Paul Butler is Notre Dame's No. 1 fan, I finally figured out why this honor came to me.

I asked myself what State had done the most in recent years for Notre Dame and I came to the very definite conclusion that undoubtedly it was Oklahoma. On the 50th aniversary of our statehood, November 7, 1957, Oklahoma was kind enough to Notre Dame to terminate our record-breaking chain of victories and to establish Notre Dame as the outstanding team in the Nation for that year.

It was a footnote for football history that the team we beat in starting this chain—Notre Dame—turned out to be the one that broke our long winning streak in the end. And so I was happy to accept this invitation as partial payment on South Bend's debt to Oklahoma.

I hope that before we turn to the urgent business of discussing the Republican Party and its current Washington product, you will permit some brief observations on the Democratic Party and its present chairman.

Many Democrats in the past have written distinguished records in the position that

Paul Butler fills today, but few, if any, have matched his achievement in rebuilding the party from the ashes of an overwhelming defeat in 1952 to the healthy, robust, aggressive force that it is today. With the party treasury deeply in debt, with even the bastions of the South in political ruins, Paul Butler began the long, hard task of creating an alert, alive, and effective Democratic Party.

He didn't do this on a one-State or a one-section basis, but sought to place the Democratic Party again in the forefront as the truly great national party.

Lets' face it—perhaps Paul stepped on a few toes, hurt the feelings of a few leaders in various sections—but his concern was for the health of the entire Democratic Party, and his courage and drive rebuilt this party to its effective position today.

It was inevitable that in this process, there should be sectional criticism. For Paul Butler has faced no less a task than to articulate for the Nation the broadest aspirations of a national party during a period when that party lacked the natural public platform which the Presidency provides.

Certainly we in Congress can take considerable pride in the fact that the record of the Democratic Party in both Houses contributed substantially to winning the sweeping public endorsement in last fall's elections. But we all are practical enough politicians to realize that elections are not won alone in the halls of Congress, but in the tens of thousands of precincts throughout the Nation. It was in rebuilding this party machinery for the Nation—to the State, to the county, to the township levels, that Paul Butler committed his attention and his leadership so effectively.

No one today who has seen the shambles of the Republican national organization—confused and befuddled, even though they still control the vast powers of the executive department of this Government—can help but realize the superb achievement that Paul Butler has wrought for his party. There has been no patronage; there have been no fancy appointments to ambassadorships; there have been no Cabinet posts—in fact, no executive power to serve as convenient leverage for Paul's rebuilding job. It all had to be done with bare hands and a determination that the Democratic Party would again be resurgent.

The record of the last congressional elections indicates the degree of this resurgence—when Maine joined our ranks with the election of Governor MUSKIE to the Senate, and Vermont sent to the Congress its first Democrat in more than a century.

The extent of this devastating defeat administered to the Republicans portends great days ahead in 1960.

This was done by Paul Butler—not by sitting in a Washington office and issuing pious declarations—but by traveling the long, tedious paths to the 48 States and in these States to the county seats, to insure that every party worker was trained and encouraged in performing the duties required in his particular area of responsibility.

This program has virtually transformed the great western reaches of our country from a happy hunting ground for musclebound Republicans to what approaches a monopoly of Democratic representation in the Congress and in the Governors' chairs.

I predicted in my closing campaign speech at Evansville that after November 4, 1958, the GOP would not be able to run the Republican elephant any more—they would just have to stuff him. And sure enough, not long ago they stuffed the world's largest elephant and placed it in the Smithsonian museum for all to see.

I am proud of the part that Paul Butler has played in stimulating young men of character and ability to enter the political field and to give us the greatest asset a party can have—young, enthusiastic and energetic candidates for positions of responsibility in State and National Governments.

The best illustration I know is here in South Bend, because the consensus among the press and others who watch young Congressmen come and go is that one of the brightest young stars of this victory is your own JOHN BRADEMAS.

Few men have come to the Congress or to the Senate, during my 20 years here, so well equipped as JOHN BRADEMAS. His educational background, his experience in the teaching field, and his practical experience in government make him one of the most brilliant young leaders in the new Congress. Of course, this was perhaps apparent to me somewhat earlier than to others, because of the insight he showed in selecting his administrative assistant.

But my opinion, which might be somewhat open to question, is shared by Speaker SAM RAYBURN, Majority Leader JOHN MCCORMACK, and the Democratic whip, CARL ALBERT. The fact that in his first term he won an assignment to the committee that handles two of the most important fields of government—namely, labor and education—proves the regard that the House leadership has for him.

I have the great pleasure also of serving with your new Democratic Senator, VANCE HARTKE, who has been my long-time friend. I met VANCE when he was promoting the first Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner at Evansville many years ago, when I was fortunate enough to be invited as speaker. I recognized his leadership then. I have admired and respected his progress upward in the political field, and I rejoiced, as you did, in his overwhelming victory in the election last November.

He has already won his spurs in the Senate. His ability has been recognized by the choice committees to which he has been assigned. I have the honor of sitting with him on the important Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, where he has already proven his competence in the wide field in which this committee must legislate.

Winning a position on the tremendously important Finance Committee is unheard of for anyone who has not had at least 6 to 12 years of experience in the Senate—yet he was given this assignment by LYNDON JOHNSON and the Senate leadership.

Because of his grasp of municipal affairs he also is making a mark for himself as a member of the District of Columbia Committee. This is indeed a record of achievement and one that marks him as a man to watch.

Other examples of Indiana's great Democratic resurgence reversed the ratio in the House of Representatives. Where once RAY MADDEN and WINFIELD DENTON held out against nine Republicans, the Democrats now have eight seats and the Republicans only three. Every crap-shooter knows that "eight" is a much better point than "two." But better still, let's concentrate on capturing those three to roll an "eleven" in 1960.

It is now my sad duty to turn to a less pleasant subject—namely "the team"—which is what the Republicans call the Eisenhower administration—to the chagrin of all good football fans. You know, even the worst football teams usually excel in some department. They've got a guy who can pass—or maybe a place kicker—or maybe a good center. If they haven't got any of those—then they at least have a good cheer leader, or pep club, or drum majorette, or band. But not this team. All it's got is a publicity agent.

But you just can't sell a bad performance no matter what kind of press agentry you use. The fans are lots smarter than the Republicans realize. Even the kids are too smart for the Madison Avenue selling job.

Let's look at the record. The farm front has folded up under Benson's hammer blows. While living costs are hitting new highs each month, farm prices are scraping bottom with new lows. This is the Benson policy of killing two birds with one stone—the consumer with high prices and the farmer with low prices.

The Benson policy was to reduce the farm surpluses by reducing the acreage and the price support levels and thus reduce production and the cost of the farm program. Shades of Wrong Way Corrigan—our surpluses are higher, our support prices much lower, our production greater. And the cost of the program to put the farmer in the fix he is in is six times greater than it was under the Truman administration—$6 billion today against $1.05 billion under the Democratic program of farm prosperity.

Instead of liquidating the surplus, Secretary Benson has liquidated the farmers. A total of 4,231,000 of our farm population has left the farms since 1950. What Secretary Benson referred to as the swollen bureaucracy of the Department of Agriculture in 1953 has gained in population under Benson by nearly 7,000 since that date.

But perhaps we can excuse the team on the farm front. After all, they only pass by the farms on the way to the golf courses. But with so many men from big business brought into this administration you would expect some degree of expertness in fiscal affairs.

Instead of the sound fiscal policy that was promised throughout 1952 and 1956—we have had a record number of fiscal fumbles to mar the game. Management of the budget has led to a continuing series of red figures and heavy deficits. This year the budget deficit will range upward to $12 billions in the red. The cost of paying the interest on the public debt in 1952 was $5.9 billion. This year the budget asks for over $8 billion to meet the new Republican interest cost for the largest debt in the Nation's history. An increase of over $2 billion because Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey, the Republican fiscal giant, planned it that way.

This interest cost—I might remind you—is second only to the cost of national defense in the budget. This $8 billion added cost buys nothing—it is a deadweight upon the taxpayers as this administration raised its own rent on the borrowed money.

The new fairytale budget—which the President and all of his Cabinet are urging us not to unbalance—never was balanced. The reliable Joint Committee on Revenue and Taxation has declared that the budget overestimates expected income in the amount of $1.6 billion. And even before that, the fairytale balance had been achieved by listing revenue from increased postage rates and gasoline taxes not enacted nor likely to be enacted by Congress.

Meanwhile, as a consequence of its tight money policy as an alleged weapon against inflation, the cost of interest rates to little business, farmers, cities and towns has climbed to the stratosphere to the tune of some $20 billions. These higher interest rates have had a direct impact upon the ever increasing cost of living for everyone.

During the campaign last November, the resistance to the Republican policy of tight money and higher interest rates voiced in Congress and by the Democratic National Committee played a definite part in the Democratic sweep.

People found out the hard way that the old definition of what the two parties stand for still holds true: The Republican Party believes in high wages for money—and the Democratic Party believes in high wages for people.

The sad fact is that the Republican piety over a balanced budget is a complete fraud—because it applies only to the budget for fiscal year 1960, the last complete budget year before the next election. It is to be achieved by cramming everything possible into the budgets for 1959 or 1961.

The budget for 1959 is already unbalanced and the Republicans couldn't care less whether it's unbalanced by $12 billion or $15 billion, as long as the 1960 budget is lily white. Likewise they aren't interested in 1961, since that is too late to have any immediate political benefit.

This administration is avoiding deficits—it's just shuffling them from 1 fiscal year to the other—in the hope that the political hand will be quicker than the voter's eye. The real tragedy is that the pea in this political shell game is our Nation's safety.

Remember the promises of 1952 and 1956 for a strong national defense? While our commitments abroad have multiplied like Texas jackrabbits, the administration's economy ax has cut deeper and deeper into the numbers and equipment of our military forces.

Year after year the manpower of our Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force has been cut. New weapons, ballistic missiles, and airlift have been squeezed to the minimum.

It has been the leaders of the Democratic Party that have sounded the warning and led Congress to vote more instead of less to strengthen our defense against the threat of expanding Communist military strength.

Our lagging missile program was drastically stepped up. Cuts in manpower proposed by the Eisenhower administration were resisted in Congress, and money was voted to build up—rather than tear down—our ground and sea forces. Most of the additional funds voted by the Congress were frozen by the administration—as was our fighting strength.

Even funds for our National Guard and our Reserve forces—made even more necessary by the reductions in the Regular Army—were cut by the administration, and restored by Congress.

But it has been in the field of foreign policy that our greatest shortages in ideas and ideals have occurred. We have slipped, and slipped badly, in furnishing leadership in this most vital field where the peace of the world hangs in tenuous balance.

The democratic leadership of the Congress has time after time rescued the President on the vital issues of foreign aid and foreign trade to overcome heavy Republican opposition. Congress cannot make foreign policy, but wisely and patriotically the democratic policy has been to keep it out of partisan politics.

Democrats in Congress have repeatedly offered new ideas and new ideals in the struggle to win the hearts and minds of the world's people. One billion people—almost one-third of the world's population—swing in the balance between communism and freedom. These are the populations of the new nations which have only recently won independence from colonial rule. They are looking for a new way of life. Our programs and our leadership can bring to their new freedom a new hope of an improved standard of living.

The shape of tomorrow's world will be decided by the way this billion uncommitted people choose. If they join the billion already under communism, then two-thirds of the world will be under a slave-state system—and the one-third of the world's people living under democratic governments will face gradual erosion of the areas committed to freedom.

The Democrats have shown great understanding of the need for a long-range modernized approach to meeting this Communist challenge in the cold war of economics. In the Senate in the last session of Congress we moved to change our outdated foreign-aid program from one of grants or accommodation-lending by Uncle Sam alone. We urged the administration to get the free world to join in an international banking system for a long-range program to supply financing for economic development by sound banking methods. To achieve this end, a substantial use could be made of the local currencies of these nations which we receive from the sales of our agricultural surpluses abroad.

The Democrats have supported also the vast expansion of peaceful uses of atomic energy. We have a deep feeling that instead of emphasizing the capacity of our bombs for catastrophic destruction, we would impress these billion uncommitted people more by showing how the horror of the atomic bomb could be beaten into a plowshare—to become mankind's greatest servant.

Instead of telling the world how many millions we can cremate with one big blast of a hydrogen bomb, we could far better tell them how we have developed means for making it work for man's survival.

Already we have crossed the threshold to find some 100 uses for atomic isotopes in the diagnosis and treatment of diseases. Soon, with enough research, we may find in atomic medicine the cure for cancer or other dread diseases that have beset mankind throughout history.

In agriculture, atomic wastes and byproducts can be useful in producing better strains of fruits and vegetables. New livestock breeds of greater size can be created through other byproducts of atomic energy.

In engineering, underground blasts have indicated great new uses for atomic energy in mining and petroleum recoveries. Perhaps some day underground blasts may develop new harbors along our coasts or along the coast of South America from one single explosion.

In large areas of the world where deserts meet the sea, poverty and starvation occur because of the lack of water for irrigation and human consumption. We are nearing a solution to the problem of transforming sea water to fresh water by desalting processes. Surely atomic reactors can hasten the time when we can make many areas, now worthless deserts, bloom like the Garden of Eden.

Many of you have seen the great transformation of farm life when the REA lines reach the farm homes of America. Life comes from the darkness of the 19th century into the brilliantly lighted world of the 20th century by the magic of electricity.

In most of the areas where these one billion uncommitted people of the world live, electricity is nonexistent or so expensive that only the very few can use it. This is because oil or coal must be shipped halfway around the world to supply the energy required to generate elcctricity.

If we could mass produce atomic reactors at relatively low cost and sell them on long terms, it would bring the hope of the electrical age to thousands of towns and villages of the world now in darkness. Instead of fuel of great bulk shipped at great expense, atomic fuel could be sent in by airmail. A package no larger than a pack of cigarettes can furnish the energy to light and heat a village of 10,000 people for an entire year.

These are but a few of the things we can and should do if the face of Uncle Sam which the world sees is to be the kindly smiling face that we know it to be. But the rest of the world does not automatically know the great spiritual values we hold. Deeds, not words, are required.

I feel if we can spend some 44 billions on the science of death, for our weapons and defense—and I'm for that amount and more—that we should tithe, and spend one-tenth of that amount on science for life.

We have the duty to provide the continuing leadership required if the world of tomorrow is to see our hopes of today realized. Thus can our generation give thanks for the blessings of our science—by sharing with others the abundance it can produce.

Minimum Wage Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 1, 1959

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, this month's American Federationist magazine contains an article by the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] entitled, "This Problem Can't Wait." The problem which cannot wait is that of raising the minimum wage to enable all of our citizens to make an equal adjustment to rising costs of living and the pressures of inflation.

I have the privilege of being a cosponsor with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and several other colleagues of S. 1046, a bill which would raise the minimum wage to $1.25 an hour, and extend its coverage. This bill would bring the Fair Labor Standards Act in line with the present day cost of living and the general standard of wages in the country.

I request unanimous consent that Senator MORSE's very cogent and pertinent article on this minimum wage question be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WAGE-HOUR ISSUE: THIS PROBLEM CAN'T WAIT

(By Hon. WAYNE MORSE, U.S. Senator from Oregon)

On February 16 I had the privilege of joining with Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY, of Massachusetts, in introducing S. 1046, a bill which would raise the minimum wage to $1.25 an hour and greatly extend the coverage of the act to employees not now covered.

There is at present a process in our social and economic life which bodes ill for the future of our great country, a gradual development among American wage-earners of a permanent depressed class numbering hundreds of thousands who have little realistic hope of keeping pace with the majority or of attaining what we like to consider a typical American way of life.

This development has been under way for nearly a decade. It has proceeded in boom times and in recessions alike. It is virtually unaffected by the rise and fall of employment or by the progress of organized labor at the bargaining table. It is unrecognized by most of our countrymen. Yet, unless it is checked, it can have the most profound impact upon our society.

This depressed class consists of American citizens whose earnings are keyed to the Federal minimum wage and a substantial fraction of the 20 million other workers who are wholly devoid of wage-hour protection because of exceptions now provided by law.

These are employees who, if covered by the Fair Labor Standards Act, earn $1 an hour or a few cents more and, if not covered, may earn as little as 50 cents an hour, with no premium for overtime.

Bear in mind that these are employed workers performing useful, indeed indispensable, functions in a wide range of business, industrial, and commercial enterprises.

They are employed, but no matter how long and hard they toil, they cannot earn enough to meet a basic minimum standard of food, shelter, clothing, and medical care.

Congress long ago decided that such a state of affairs was contrary to the national interest. The original Fair Labor Standards Act, which became law in 1938, pledged to correct and as rapidly as possible to eliminate conditions of employment detrimental to the minimum standard of living necessary for health, efficiency and general well-being of workers. The policy is clear enough; so, unfortunately, is our failure to carry it out.

It is an astonishing and tragic fact that the law is farther away from fulfilling its objectives today than it was 21 years ago. The minimum wage itself is less adequate, and a greater proportion of the working force is denied protection.

A few figures are illuminating.

The 1938 act set the minimum hourly wage at 25 cents, with a raise to 30 cents mandatory after a year and with a further increase to 40 cents provided through the operation of industry committees. At that time the average hourly wage in American industry as a whole was 63 cents.

Today the legal minimum is $1 an hour—but the industrial average is $2.19. A difference of 38 cents has become a difference of $1.19.

Equally startling is the record since the minimum of 75 cents an hour was established in 1950. At that time the average industrial wage was $1.38. The average has climbed 81 cents and is still rising; the minimum has gone up only 25 cents.

Even in the 3 years since the $1 minimum took effect, the average has gone up 30 cents.

And wages are only a part of the story. Paid vacations and paid holidays, pensions to supplement social security, sickness and accident benefits, medical and hospital insurance, supplementary unemployment benefits and many other socially desirable terms have become typical fringe benefits for many industrial employees.

Though the general public undoubtedly thinks otherwise, these terms are far from universal. To the depressed class of workers they are almost unknown.

Numerous studies of low-wage occupations, whether or not they are now covered by the law, have shown that the progress of the higher paid, organized workers does not trickle down to the rest. Let me note, in passing, that the reverse is also true. Since the very beginning, increases in the Federal minimum have had little direct impact on wages substantially above the minimum.

Moreover, the gulf between the lowest paid workers and others will continue to grow unless a remedy is found. Millions of workers are now covered by cost-of-living and improvement factor clauses, assuring them of regular wage increases even when basic contracts remain unchanged.

Thus the depressed class is not merely a low-paid group. It has assumed a distinct identity as a class increasingly isolated from the great mass of wage earners, a class that is denied the voice, the power and the progress of other American workers, a class condemned to poverty.

The penalties imposed upon these workers are not merely relative. The present minimum wage is simply not enough to meet minimum human needs. According to a Department of Labor study, a family of four requires an income of at least $2.25 an hour. Other studies have estimated the minimum living costs of a single person at nearly $3,000 a year, or nearly $1.50 an hour. At best, members of the depressed class are 33⅓ percent below a living wage.

Let me cite a truly ironical fact. In many cities the employed head of a family of four, who earns $1 an hour, would be better off if he quit his job and went on home relief—because home relief budgets for families of this size, even though they are designed simply to ward off starvation, frequently call for more than $2,000 a year.

I have referred only briefly to the question of wage-hour coverage, but this is of at least equal importance. The price of the 75-cent minimum in 1950 was a reduction in the number of workers protected by the law. Among those wholly excluded are workers in the retail and service trades, whose numbers are relatively greater with each passing year.

What does all this mean to the rest of us? In the narrowest and most selfish terms, it means money.

Poverty below the subsistence level, as we all should know by now, is quickly translated into slums, delinquency, and disease—and, therefore, into higher taxes to curb these evils.

Moreover, our national economic health is at stake. An expanding national economy, one that will absorb both the present unemployed and the 700,000 or so new workers who enter the labor market annually, can be achieved only if we have the ability to consume what we produce. We can't reach that goal while millions of our citizens are unable to afford even the bare necessities.

Our recovery from last year's recession is an apt example. All the economic signs were favorable toward the end of 1958. There was clearly a pentup demand for goods of all kinds; inventories were depleted; the shakeout had apparently run its course.

But in a matter of months the much-heralded revival had lost headway. Production soared, but sales lagged behind. Employment fell off. Inventories began to grow again. There weren't enough customers with money to buy what they wanted and needed.

We in the United States have never sought to bring about economic equality among our people. We picture our country as a land of opportunity, in which each of us can reasonably expect to prosper in proportion to his diligence and skill.

To be sure, we have not fully realized this goal, but for the most part, until recent years, we have recognized our shortcomings and tried to correct them. The Fair Labor Standards Act itself is an example.

Unless we continue on this course, unless we strive ceaselessly to make this a land of opportunity for all, we make a mockery of our own pretensions and place a heavy burden on our conscience as a people.

What do we propose?

First, we propose to raise the minimum hourly wage to $1.25—a modest step when it is considered that industrial wages as a whole have gone up 30 cents an hour since the $1 minimum was instituted.

Second, we propose to extend the coverage of the law to some 7,500,000 additional workers, most of them in the retail and service trades, with lesser numbers in a dozen other fields. This, too, is modest enough. It would leave more than 12 million workers still unprotected.

What possible objections can be raised against these proposals? Knowing the opposition as I do, I predict there will be three principal points of attack. One will come from the self-appointed "defenders of small business," who are in reality lobbyists for the huge chain and department stores. They will be raising a wholly untenable argument.

Our bill would apply to retail establishments with gross annual sales of $500,000 or more. These include only 3 percent of the Nation's retail enterprises, yet these 3 percent employ more than half the Nation's retail workers. The other 97 percent, the bona fide small businesses, would not be involved.

These big operations can certainly afford a $1.25 minimum and a 40-hour week. But surveys have shown that in practice they pay more of their workers less than $1 an hour than do the single-owner stores. By forcing the huge chains to met fair labor standards and by increasing the purchasing power of the lowest paid, we will help small businessmen, not hurt them.

Another equally specious argument will undoubtedly be raised by the Eisenhower administration—that our bill will be inflationary. But studies by the Department of Labor after each previous increase in the minimum wage have proved that this is simply not true. There has been no significant effect upon either prices or wages, and there is no reason to expect a different result this time.

Finally, the diehard opposition from low-wage States and low-wage industries will raise the tattered banner of local autonomy. They will claim that minimum wage regulation in retail and service industries should be left in State hands. But the record shows that the need is greatest in those very States where no action will ever be taken. The few effective wage-hour laws at the State level are in the States where wages are already higher than average and where union organization is strongest.

I hope that this year Congress will not be deterred by these baseless objections.

The problem confronting us is both grave and urgent. It must be met promptly and firmly if we are to maintain a sound economy, a good conscience, and the cause of democracy throughout the world.

The C. & O. Canal National Historical Park

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday, with 36 others including my sons, Don and Chris, I walked 14 miles along the towpath of the C. & O. Canal on the Potomac River above Hancock, Md.

No other Member can make this statement. My good friend and highly respected colleague—and leading conservationist—HENRY REUSS, of Wisconsin, did put in a momentary appearance during the lunch break. I also observed his lovely wife and two daughters walking on the towpath, but the only activity I personally observed on the part of my colleague was the consumption of a bottle of beer—from Milwaukee, by the way—at a time when the extent of my thirst was exceeded, and only by a hair, by the strength of the requirements of congressional courtesy.

It is alleged, incidentally, by Rick Wing, the administrative assistant to the gentleman from Wisconsin, that Mr. REUSS, his wife, his two daughters, his two sons, and his two dogs did in fact walk about two-thirds of the distance along the route of the hike. If this is true, and I suppose it is, then, of course, my colleague is two-thirds of a C. & O. Canal authority.

This expedition is the fifth organized by Justice Bill Douglas, of the Supreme Court, to call attention to the beauties of the towpath country which extend some 185 miles from Washington, D.C., to Cumberland, Md. Of course, the Su-

preme Court never interferes with the legislative branch but one does gather that there is a campaign to convince Congress that we should make the area into a national park.

The United States already owns it and the Park Service looks after it. National park status would allow the purchase, as money was made available, of lands between the towpath and the river, and the building of parking areas, picnic facilities and other improvements. It would also mean more publicity for the area and hence more use by more people.

WHERE THE DISPUTE IS

The cost would be negligible and, with respect to the purchase of adjacent properties, controllable. Almost everybody wants the Chesapeake and Ohio National Historical Park to be established. So where is the rub? The rub is that the hiking justice and his influential cohorts, local and national, want a bill that says nothing at all about the possibilities that 35 miles of the area, just above Washington, might have to be flooded out by a dam.

Of course this could be done by Congress even if the bill was silent, although this might be more difficult. I am glad conservationists and recreationists are powerful. Usually I contribute my bit to their weight. However, every Member, at least if he is from the West, is convinced that no single purpose approach to resource development is sound. We have to weigh multiple purposes and make decisions on the facts in each particular case.

That is what we must do here. We know that Washington may very well have a serious water problem in the near future. We know that one solution might be a dam on the Potomac River. Maybe we will have desaltification developed in time to make this unnecessary. Maybe the cost of such a dam, considering the expensive land to be flooded by the pool, would make it too expensive.

Maybe I did not hike far enough or fast enough. As you can see, I do not agree with my hosts. Perhaps in addition to bruising and blistering my tender feet, the hike addled my brains, for I find I agree with the Star's editorial and disagree with the Post's position—whereas usually I am in the reverse position.

WATER CAN'T BE IGNORED

I agree with our alert and able colleague, JOHN FOLEY, who represents that part of Maryland and who wants legislation to go through the House in this session. He recognizes that his colleagues who serve on GRACIE PFOST'S Public Works Subcommittee of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, and above all, the very able and conscientious Mrs. PFOST herself, cannot ignore the very real and proven problem of water for Washington, D.C.

When I heard my friends on the hike talk about the plottings of the public power lobby, I tried to tell them that whatever the hunger of any special interest group for a mere 10,000 kilowatts I could not imagine this being a real factor under the circumstances.

It was a lovely hike. I hope to do it against both at that point or in other places along the old C. & O. Canal. I thank my hosts, the C. & O. Canal Association, and pledge to them my full support for their national park—this year, with a reservation taking into account the possible needs of Washington for an assured adequate water supply.

I also want to express my thanks publicly to Mr. and Mrs. Jack Widmyer at whose home my sons and I were given hospitality at the end of our hike. Never did a shower, a change of clothes, and a chair seem so welcome.

Under leave to include extraneous matter, I am inserting a recent editorial and letters to the editor on the issue of all or none.

[From the Washington Star, Apr. 27, 1959]

HOW TO KILL THE PARK BILL

Advocates of the proposed Chesapeake and Ohio Canal Park have chosen a strange way to support their project before Congress. Their all or nothing opposition to any water-supply safeguards in the pending legislation could kill the whole park undertaking. For it is hard to believe that Congress would authorize a park along the upper Potomac River unless some provision were made for possible dams and reservoirs which engineers testified will be needed to assure adequate water in the future for the Washington metropolitan area.

Despite such testimony by Army engineers and District water authorities, National Park Service Director Conrad Wirth told a House Interior Subcommittee that he would prefer on bill at all to one which would sacrifice any part of the canal. If by this he meant that a canal park should have absolute priority over an adequate water supply for Washington, Mr. Wirth was expressing a viewpoint that is unrealistic and unacceptable to the District and the many communities around it whose health and safety depend on such water.

Fortunately, only a relatively small part of the proposed park would be taken up by the water-storage facilities. There is room, therefore, for a reasonable compromise which will leave most of the park undisturbed, while guaranteeing Washington and its suburbs the water essential to survival in some future emergency period.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post and Times Herald, Apr. 28, 1959]

NOT TONGUES BUT HANDS OUT

The logic of your April 22 editorial concerning the Chesapeake and Ohio National Historical Park, is indeed difficult to understand.

At one point you state, "Let there be an unequivocal reservation in the C. & O. Canal bill for whatever dams may become necessary, for Washington's water supply which must have first priority." And then you proceed to castigate Mrs. PFOST, the chairman of House Public Lands Subcommittee, for her insistence upon the very reservation which you advocate.

Mrs. PFOST has devoted more of her own time and more of the time of her subcommittee to consideration of the C. & O. bill than to any other single piece of legislation this year. I have attended virtually all of the hearings, and not once do I recall Mrs. PFOST having advocated, either expressedly or by implication, a power dam on the Potomac River.

The rural electric co-ops which you so unhesitatingly accuse of seeking a high dam at River Bend, having their hands out and being extremely vindictive and predatory, have not even entered an appearance at the hearings.

The position of the rural electric cooperatives in this matter is simply that if and when a reservoir storage project at River Bend becomes necessary to meet the water supply, flood control, and pollution abatement problems of the District of Columbia metropolitan area, incidental hydroelectric power be included if feasible. What it is that you find so inequitable and unjust in this position, I completely fail to comprehend.

Your edition of April 22 also carried a news story which correctly reported that representatives of wildlife conservation organizations, and the director of the National Park Service testified that they would rather have no Chesapeake and Ohio Canal Park bill at all than any which contains an effective reservation for later construction of a water storage reservoir at River Bend when and if such becomes necessary. This is about as unrealistic, uncompromising, and self-serving a position as has ever been taken before a subcommittee of the Congress of the United States.

How your newspaper can criticize members of the House Public Lands Subcommittee in their effort to provide a future water supply for this area is incomprehensible to me. The subcommittee wants to vote out a park bill. The electric co-ops want a park bill. But the childish all or nothing attitude of the Park Service and the wildlife conservation groups has, I fear, substantially reduced the chances of getting a C. & O. Park approved this year.

CHARLES A. ROBINSON, Jr.,
Staff Engineer, National Rural Electric Cooperative Association.
WASHINGTON.

I wish to make it perfectly clear that proponents of a dam at River Bend are concerned primarily with the indicated future needs of water supply for the people of the area. Dr. Abel Wolman's study of the pollution problem has already shown that the erection of a dam is necessary if we are to have a cleaner Potomac. Past studies of the Corps of Engineers have also pointed to the value of a dam above River Bend.

In the light of the information already available, it would seem that prudent people would support a bill which says, "Let us proceed with the establishment of a park as quickly as possible, and for the time being we shall not spend time, money, or effort on improvements in an area which may have to be inundated. Let us await the findings of the studies now under way and then act accordingly."

If a dam is shown to be necessary both for the purpose of providing needed water supply and for pollution abatement, it seems only logical that the power potential which such a dam would and could provide should be utilized. This is all that the rural cooperatives are saying; it is what Mrs. PFOST is saying. Neither the co-ops, nor the labor unions oppose a park—they want a park.

ALBERT K. HERLING,
Chairman, Potomac River Development Association.
WASHINGTON.

Two Christians in Politics: U.S. Representatives J. Edward Roush, of Indiana, and Byron L. Johnson, of Colorado

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BRADEMAS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I know that many Members of Congress

regard their service in public office as a religious vocation.

Two of the Members of Congress who best exemplify the description "Christians in politics" are our distinguished colleagues, the Honorable J. EDWARD ROUSH, Representative of the Fifth Indiana District, and the Honorable BYRON L. JOHNSON, Representative of the Second Colorado District.

I am very pleased to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a fine article concerning Representative ROUSH and Representative JOHNSON which appeared in the April 1959 issue of the journal, Progress, published by the International Reform Federation.

The article follows:

LOST AND FOUND

Every congressional election brings with it a turnover in the membership of the Congress. In the 1958 election the International Reform Federation lost two of its trustees. The Honorable William S. Hill, who had represented the Second Colorado District for nine terms, decided that he had enough and was not a candidate for reelection. The Honorable John V. Beamer, the fourth-term Congressman from Indiana's Fifth District, was defeated. The federation felt a real sense of loss. Not only had we lost the valued guidance and help of two able men, but the Nation had lost two leaders of marked moral integrity. We mourned the loss.

Since we could not live in the past, and our hopes for moral and social progress pointed toward the future, we interested ourselves in the successors of Mr. Hill and Mr. Beamer. And we discovered that the people of Colorado and Indiana had sent two young dedicated Christian gentlemen to the 86th Congress. We lost two outstanding elder statesmen. We found two youthful public servants with wisdom and courage to face the hazardous future. We believe that God had a hand in raising them up.

Congressman BYRON L. JOHNSON, representing the Second Colorado District, was a guest of the federation at the fellowship breakfast in January. He made a vivid impression on me as he gave his personal testimony to the importance of moral values and social idealism in building any sound legislative program. His presence in Washington church circles already has been felt as he has alined himself with worthy enterprises.

Mr. JOHNSON is a family man (two sons and a daughter); he is a churchman (Congregational). His political experience prior to his election to Congress included a term in the Colorado Legislature, and service as administrative assistant to the Governor of the State.

Congressman J. EDWARD ROUSH, representing the Fifth Indiana District, cherished an ambition to sit in the Congress from his early youth. The road was not easy. He was elected to the State legislature while still a student in the Law School of Indiana University. Five years later he was elected as prosecuting attorney for Huntington County. Two years later he was defeated in his primary bid for the congressional nomination. Prior to this political activity he had given 6 years to service in the Army during World War II and later in the Korean conflict. His perseverance was rewarded with election to the 86th Congress in 1958.

Mr. ROUSH is a family man (two sons and a daughter); and he is an active churchman. A member of the United Brethren Church, he has served as a member of the board of education of his denomination, and as a member of the board of trustees of Huntington College. Above all he is committed to the application of Christian convictions to practical politics.

The editor has written many times on the question of Christian vocations and he passes along the testimony of Congressman ROUSH as it appeared in the United Brethren.

"It has been my conviction that opportunities for Christian service are present and demanding to be attended to in every area of life, in every business and in every profession. In some areas the need is not quite so apparent. In some areas the road is rougher. In some areas the challenge is greater. But regardless, the reward—if the challenge is met—is gratifying.

"This has been my experience in my chosen profession (law) and in politics. People are clamoring for Christian lawyers, they seek out Christian businessmen and they like to vote for Christian office seekers. I have been blessed by having been elected to one of the high offices of our land. I have an opportunity which can come to only a few men. I see in this office an unusual opportunity for service—Christian service. I see in it an opportunity for Christian testimony, an opportunity which I intend to take advantage of."

Congressmen JOHNSON and ROUSH are two of the scores of public servants who feel that they have been called to service. They believe that God's best purposes for His children can be fulfilled through their dedication to His will. With that kind of leadership, I do not fear the future, even in such an age as this.

Amending Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act.

SPEECH

OF

HON. STEVEN V. CARTER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 29, 1959

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5610) to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, so as to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, to a country boy from Iowa all this oratory could be a wee mite confusing. It seems to me mighty significant if we check the record to see who the friends of H.R. 5610 and H.R. 1012 really are. It is easily apparent from what has been said here today that the employers, the Republican policy committee, and their agents here are supporting H.R. 5610. A few moments ago, the president of the Republican policy committee admitted that a confidential report had been issued to all the Republican Members subsequent to the meeting in the White House in which the Republican policy committee reports that the administration and the Republican Party are supporting H.R. 5610.

On the other hand, it is clearly apparent that the employees of the railroads, together with their supporters here, are definitely for H.R. 1012.

This might not be so significant if the arguments that they are using were valid. However, through the whole tone of the arguments presented by the opponents to H.R. 1012 this afternoon are the same arguments that were put forth by the railroad employers 13 years ago, when the employees first sought the benefits which H.R. 5610 takes away from them. These arguments are the same kind of arguments that were advanced when the first employees sought a fairer share of the benefits from our economic power in the days of Samuel Gompers. These arguments leave me cold, and I want to announce here and now that I am going to vote for H.R. 1012.

There have been five amendments to H.R. 1012 which make it identical with the bill that has just passed in the Senate and which take all the wind out of the sails of those who are supporting H.R. 5610 and opposing H.R. 1012. The first four amendments to H.R. 1012 as now being submitted are in H.R. 5610. They are:

First. The first amendment provides that the 10-percent increase in the retirement annuity applies only to annuities that accrue after the month of enactment of this act. This is the feature of the original H.R. 1012 which increased the cost to the railroads to $45 million and created the most objectionable feature.

Second. The increases in the retirement tax will not take place until a month after the enactment of this bill.

Third. The increase in the lump-sum payments is made only with regard to deaths occurring after the month of the passage of the bill.

Fourth. The maximum rate of contributions into the fund were increased from 3.50 percent to 3.75 percent.

Fifth. The Retirement Board during this emergency period in which we had so much unemployment is given power to borrow from the retirement fund for unemployment and sickness payments, and it will be repaid to the retirement fund, together with 3 percent interest.

H.R. 1012 with these amendments retains the present benefits that have been granted to the employees and at the same time grants them the increases to which they are entitled.

In comparing the fringe benefits to be received by the 700,000 employees of the railroads of America under this law with the fringe benefits being obtained by the employees in other transportation areas not covered by the law but obtained by contract, we find that the railroad employees still are not receiving as much as they should have. In view of all these considerations, it is easy to see why I am going to support the substitute bill, H.R. 1012, and vote in behalf of the workingmen of this great country. It is between you and your conscience whether you shall support the employers or the workingman, but there isn't any particular point in your claiming that by supporting H.R. 5610 you are supporting the workingman, because that bill takes the benefits away from the working people that they now have.

Pending a Reply From State, a Fact-Finding Trip to Nicaragua

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 1, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following press release issued from my office on April 29, 1959:

WASHINGTON, D.C., *April 29, 1959.*

Following is the text of an English translation of a letter to Congressman CHARLES O. PORTER, Democrat, of Oregon, from the Ambassador of Nicaragua, inviting Mr. PORTER to visit that country, and the text of a letter from Mr. PORTER to Secretary of State Christian A. Herter in which he invites the State Department to comment on the merits of the proposed visit.

PORTER said that "pending a reply from the Secretary of State, which I shall certainly weigh carefully before making the decision, I feel as though such a visit might well help the cause of democracy in this hemisphere as well as add considerably to my own knowledge on this subject." The names of those PORTER intends to take with him if he undertakes the fact finding expedition to Nicaragua are listed in the letter to the Secretary of State.

APRIL 24, 1959.

The Honorable CHARLES O. PORTER,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. REPRESENTATIVE: I am pleased to confirm the invitation which I personally extended to you on April 9, 1959, on behalf of the President of Nicaragua, Luis A. Somoza D., to visit our country accompanied by a group of persons whom you may wish to travel with you.

President Somoza has special interest in discussing with you general aspects of policy relative to Central America, as well as in affording you an opportunity of seeing by direct appreciation the real truth about Nicaragua in all its facets. He has instructed me to inform you, on his behalf, that it would be a pleasure to receive you and your companions as guests of the Republic of Nicaragua.

In order that you may more completely enjoy your sojourn in Nicaragua, we have decided not to prepare a formal program. Naturally, the protocol section of our foreign ministry will be at your disposal should you find it desirable to avail yourself of its services.

For the purpose of informing the Nicaraguan people of your visit, we will appreciate it very much if you would advise us some time in advance of the date of your arrival to Managua.

I take advantage of this opportunity to renew to you, sir, the assurances of my highest consideration.

GUILLERMO SEVILLA SACASA,
Ambassador of Nicaragua.

APRIL 28, 1959.

Hon. CHRISTIAN A. HERTER,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The President of Nicarauga has invited me to visit his country as his guest. He wants me to see for myself that Nicarauga, contrary to opinions I have expressed on occasion, is a democracy, not a dictatorship. I can bring with me any persons I choose to help me investigate the facts. Of course, I am to be entirely free to go any place and talk to anyone.

The suggestion of this visit was first made to be by our Ambassador to Nicarauga, Thomas E. Whelan, when he was in my office early in March. Later the Ambassador of Nicarauga invited me personally and we discussed the matter at length. I told them both that I had my doubts about whether anything useful could be accomplished and that I would consult with the Department of State upon receipt of a written invitation.

A copy of the invitation and a copy of the translation are enclosed. I will appreciate your comments and an opportunity to confer with Department specialists in due course.

If I accepted the invitation, my present plans would be as follows: Set aside a long weekend when I would miss on business on the floor of the House, which would mean I would have a maximum of 4 days for the visit.

Ask to accompany me the following: Robert Alexander, author of "Communism in Latin America" and professor at Rutgers University; Martin Agronsky, NBC commentator; John O'Rourke, editor of the Washington Daily News and former president of the Inter-American Press Association; and Ulises Carbo, subeditor of Presna Libre, Havana, Cuba; Fabricio Ojeda, Caracas, Venezuela; and perhaps others.

The trip would be publicized in and out of Nicaragua. Informed persons would be encouarged to write to me. We could stop briefly in both Costa Rica and Honduras to talk with exiles before going to Nicaragua. The entire group would of course be extensively briefed before leaving the United States.

In Nicaragua we would stay at a hotel and would not be entertained by the Somozas or the Government or by any other political faction. We would split up into groups of two or three to cover the prisons, the schools, the press, radio, the opposition, peasants, businessmen, and others, all more or less at random.

I told both Ambassador Whelan and Ambassador Sevilla-Sacasa that it is possible our report would be inconclusive because of the short time available. My own opinion, at present, is based on many talks with Latin Americans, including Nicaraguan exiles, and with U.S. experts, including several in your Department. I believe President Somoza achieved his office by force and fraud and maintains himself by the same means. I believe any liberalization of policy, such as allowing a free press and radio (which I understand do exist) and proclaiming amnesties (which I understand are more proclamation than fact), arise from his fear of revolution and the Somozas' wish to remain alive and continue to be enriched by the extensive wealth in Nicaragua which somehow has accumulated to their family.

My opinion is that any freedoms we might observe could be and would be set aside by the Somozas the minute they felt their dignity or wealth to be endangered.

These opinions of mine, widely held in Latin America, are not news to Ambassador Whelan or the Somozas. They apparently believe that I would alter them if I consented to visit Nicaragua.

If in fact, the Government of Nicaragua is firmly committed to democratic institutions, and if I could so decide from such a visit, then I'd like to say so publicly and rejoice accordingly. Of course, from here at this time, it would seem that one of the best proofs of good faith would be to arrange for free elections immediately.

Apart from the question whether I could do any good is the question whether the trip would do harm to surging democratic forces in Latin America. One Latin American friend of mine, a leading democrat, says Somoza wants to "use" me and that my visit would create confusion among the democratic forces of Latin America and disappointment to the Nicaraguan youth.

It is not clear to me why these results would have to occur. With this in mind I am releasing this correspondence to the press in the hope that others will express their opinions of the advisability of this trip and the best ways to make it worthwhile if I do decide to accept the invitation.

Very truly yours,

CHARLES O. PORTER,
Member of Congress.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer, plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Raymond F. Noyes is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

Appendix

Statement of Dr. N. R. Danielian Before the House Foreign Affairs Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 4, 1959

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, on April 27, 1959, the Committee on Foreign Affairs heard testimony on the mutual security program by Dr. N. R. Danielian, president of the International Economic Policy Association. For the interest of my colleagues, I would like to insert Dr. Danielian's thought-provoking observations in the RECORD.

Dr. Danielian, who is also president of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Association, is well known to many Members of Congress for his many years of effort in behalf of the development of the St. Lawrence Seaway. To him much credit is due for this great achievement.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include Dr. Danielian's statement as follows:

STATEMENT OF DR. N. R. DANIELIAN, BEFORE THE HOUSE FOREIGN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE, MONDAY, APRIL 27, 1959

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity of resenting some ideas on the mutual security program to your committee. I am appearing here on behalf of the International Economic Policy Association, which has been organized by a group of individuals interested in an effective international economic program, including mutual security.

Lest what I say later on may be misunderstood, let me state at the outset that we support the President's mutual security program. Although we are in no position to pass judgment on the exact amount of money required, we must be guided by the recommendations of the Executive and the conclusions of the appropriate congressional committees. Personally, I would go a step further and state that if the program could be made effective in stabilizing the political and economic conditions in the area outside of the Soviet orbit, I would not be averse to using larger resources. * * *

Having said this, I wish now to proceed to a consideration of the basic objectives and the methods whereby the mutual security program and complementary financial programs may be made more effective, for, unless we succeed in this, the whole structure of Mutual Security will crumble in American public opinion. Furthermore, even if we are successful in maintaining a flow of aid over the next 10 or 15 years, we may discover that we have not achieved the results we had hoped for.

In discussing this problem, I wish to make it clear that there is no criticism implied on our part of any individuals or institutions in government. In fact, we believe that the program has the best leadership and guidance under Douglas Dillon that we could possibly want and we share with him his desire to improve the program in every possible way.

Before reaching these conclusions that I shall present to you now, the International Economic Policy Association made a thorough study of the criticisms that have been directed at the mutual security program. I must make clear that these are not our criticisms but a compendium of what others—to a large extent Members of Congress—have been saying about this program. We made an attempt to analyze the main objections to it.

We completed the study last October and submitted it to the Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs in November. This study raised the following questions:

"I. What are the basic strategic and economic premises upon which the mutual security program is based, and are these premises valid in serving the long-range interest and security of the United States?

"II. What are the economic effects of the mutual security program upon the national economy and upon domestic industries which may be threatened by the financing of foreign competition, and do these economic effects threaten the long-range security of the United States?

"III. Is the administration of the mutual security program adequate enough in terms of personnel, procedures, structure, and methods of coordination to serve the security needs of the Nation?

"IV. Is the relationship between the executive and legislative branches of the Government in regard to foreign aid legislation being jeopardized by inadequate fiscal reporting, lack of clear presentation on the part of the executive agencies, or lack of adequate understanding on the part of the Congress; and, finally, are human relations factors not directly related to the merits of the mutual security program threatening its disposition?

"A thorough reexamination of these fundamental questions must be undertaken if the general welfare of the country is to be served."

We are assured that the State Department has given serious consideration to the criticisms summarized in this study. The Draper committee also has had a copy of it, and they have stated to us that it has been most useful to them in their current review of the program. Members of the Boeschenstein committee have also had access to this report. We are convinced that serious consideration is being given by the administration to the various points raised in this study. * * *

It is essential not to pull the rug from under the Executive at this time by drastic action and to give the administration an opportunity to review the programs in the light of these various recommendations.

* * * * *

Although I do not pose as a military strategist, I have tried to follow, as any informed person should, the evolution of our power relations with the Soviet bloc. I recall back in 1948, a week after the Republican National Convention in Philadelphia, I was visiting with Senator Vandenberg, then chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee in the Senate, discussing this very question. I told him at that time that, though the Marshall plan was necessary to revive Western Europe, it would not achieve security for the United States because once the Russians got the atomic bomb and the means of delivering it, we, sitting here in the capital of the United States, would be literally under the guns of the Soviets. This has come to pass.

I have been of the opinion since 1947 that the strategy of the Soviets was to gain time for the development of the ultimate weapons whereby they could threaten us directly from the Atlantic and the Pacific coasts and over the North Pole. They accomplished this by keeping us busily fretting over a two-dimensional strategy, concerned over boundary lines in Iran, Turkey, Greece, Berlin, and the 38th parallel, all peripheral situations which kept us busy in the production of conventional weapons, while they were busily engaged in the conquest of three- and four-dimensional power, namely, time and space, and atomic and hydrogen weapons. By emphasizing the third- and fourth-dimensional spheres of power, they have narrowed or eliminated the gap in the military balance of power between the United States and the Soviet Union. This, obviously, was one of their main objectives and they have achieved it.

The next objective has been to undercut the economic underpinnings of the Western world, particularly Western Europe and Japan. The breakup of the colonial system, an important economic prop of Western civilization, helped the Soviets in this program. The Marshall plan and other economic aid programs since, as well as our agricultural surplus disposal and military expenditures abroad, including offshore procurement, have taken the place of the income that West Europe and Japan used to receive from the colonial system.

These programs, of course, have helped build up the productive capacity of Western Europe and Japan, but have not solved the fundamental imbalance between the industrially developed nations and the rest of the world. Western Europe and Japan still need to import food, fuel, and industrial raw materials. In the absence of income from colonial possessions or from the U.S. taxpayer, they must pay for these imports through export sales of their own.

Into this situation, the Soviets have stepped with a variety of programs. * * *

While we are worrying about geographic lines of demarcation on the periphery of the Soviet empire, they are busily engaged undercutting the economic props of our allies, principally by three means: (1) through political subversion; (2) aid programs to encourage government-owned plants; and (3) dumping of products in world markets to undercut Western export markets.

These are the sticks of their inducements. The carrot is the offer to buy the surplus products of many countries in order to shift economic orientation away from us to the Soviet orbit.

* * * * *

The blatant attempts to take over political power through subversion, as in Iraq, ride upon the popular revulsion against poverty and oppression. These movements are successful, however, only because there is no effective opposition with a wide base of support against the Communist agitation. * * *

Iraq happens to be one of the countries in which there is a well-conceived developmental program, using 70 percent of the oil revenues which it receives; and yet the prospect of better economic future through these government-sponsored programs does not seem to have allayed the revolutionary and Communist instigated explosions. * * * Iraq is a case study that should be very carefully

analyzed, for it shows an instance of a paternalistic, government-sponsored and technically well advanced and well financed developmental program which has failed to stem the revolutionary tides. Why?

Before answering this, let us go to the next method that the Communists are using to undermine Western institutions: Government-to-government economic aid programs designed to put the governments of Asian and African countries into business. This should be no surprise, and certainly no cause for emulation, since one of the primary tenets of Communist philosophy is government ownership of the means of production. It is perfectly reasonable, therefore, that they should concentrate, at cheap interest rates, on luring the governments of underdeveloped countries into economic enterprises. At the same time, of course, they have not relaxed their effort to take over those governments through internal subversive action. Thus, they encourage governments to go into ownership of productive enterprise, and then they attempt to take over the government itself. Once successful, they will have achieved the objectives of Communist society; namely, making the state the purveyor of everyone's livelihood with consequent suppression of individual freedom. This also undercuts markets for the products of our allies. In this respect, time is on the side of the Communists because it is not likely that developmental programs, however speedy and extensive, will satisfy the desires of expanding populations in time to blunt the revolutionary ardor of many of these people.

Thus, an investment in plants by the Soviets in these countries, which they hope to take over by subversion, is an investment in a Communist future. Is emulation the answer to this problem?

The third Soviet method is underselling Western capital and Western products through politically induced low interest rates and low prices. This, again, will make it difficult for our allies to make a living by the sale of their products. * * *

What is the answer to this challenge and is the mutual security program meeting this challenge? In analyzing situations of political subversion, we find that what is lacking in those countries is an effective opposition. What is the natural base of opposition to communism, and what are we doing to encourage it?

In Western Europe the Marshall plan succeeded in holding the internal Communist movements in check because there was already an established propertied class and well-entrenched religious institutions. The two together have formed the basis of the Christian Democratic Parties which have held Western European democratic institutions inviolate against the strong minority Communist movements.

In the underdeveloped countries, however, there are no such basic institutions with a wide enough base upon which to build opposition to communism. * * * Our western civilization has been based primarily upon private ownership of property and business, which has created a class in society which is willing to stand up for its rights, even against the state. In the history of the Western World, the development of democratic institutions, the right of franchise, the protection of individual rights, the evolution of judicial systems to enforce them, are traceable to the rise of commercial and industrial interests. Individual freedom and democratic processes, in short, have historically developed in countries with a strong and diversified private ownership base. The groups with such an interest are the natural foes of communism.

The reason why there is no strong opposition in Iraq and most of the underdeveloped countries to revolutionary movements is the absence of a strong and broadly based private ownership group, with a stake in the protection of property and individual rights, whereas it is easy enough for Communists to develop well-disciplined cells among the poor. In country after country, the populace, spurred by Communist cells and aided by revolutionary use of fast transportation and instantaneous communication, are rising against the central governments sustained by the police power. Where the police power falters, the government falls, either by assassination, displacement, or exile.

If we are to stem or slow down the tide of revolution, in order to gain time for the developmental work to take effect, the only focal point of such opposition to communism must be the evolution of a private ownership group in those countries.

We must realize that the contest between communism and western civilization, having reached a state of military stalemate, is now in the area of economic and political institutions. If we believe that in the long run private ownership is the foundation from which will evolve political stability and individual freedom, the judicial system that protects private rights and democratic processes of popular election of governments, then our programs must encourage the institution of private ownership.

To think of our obligations to other nations only in terms of economic and technological developments would be to misread the portents of history in the same tragic manner in which we misread the military threats of the Soviet in terms of geographic boundaries in the past 12 years.

If we make this mistake, we may find that 10 years from now, although we have helped many countries with harbors, roads, and factories, we have lost their governments to Communist-induced revolutionary movements.

It would seem but a simple fact that, if it is in the interest of the Soviet to encourage government ownership of the means of production and to inspire revolutions to take over these governments, we, in our programs, should encourage the contrary to these policies, namely, the institution of private property, the evolution of legal systems that would protect property and individual rights. Those who acquire a stake in this system would, in effect, oppose, because of self-interest, the Communist movements, on the one hand, and government encroachments, on the other.

If this theory be correct, then it makes no sense to compete with the Soviet in the establishment of state-owned systems. On the contrary, we must spend every effort to persuade the governments of friendly nations that their own long-range stability depends upon the development of an indigenous private ownership group and that our aid programs should be so channelized as to create such groups in their native countries.

This will be much harder than present programs. There is likely to be even more waste of funds and the hardships and difficulties will seem to be insurmountable at the present time but, in the long run, it seems to me that it is only by the adoption of an institutional approach and not a technological or financial approach solely that we are going to be able to oppose communism in these other countries. It is said that such institutions do not now exist, that there is no manpower qualified in administration and technology, that there are no traditions and judicial systems upon which this concept can be built. If so, the challenge is so much greater.

Another aspect of this problem is that in the Soviet system all capital and technological knowledge is centered in the government, all foreign aid programs emanate from government policy and have the total resources and weight in manpower and technological know-how of the whole Soviet civilization.

In our case, the government commands but a small fraction, through taxation, of the national resources, and but an infinitesimal fraction of the technological know-how. In our society, both capital and knowledge, particularly in the technical field, is mostly concentrated in private hands. If we are to meet the Soviet challenge, therefore, doing it wholly through tax money and government institutions is like putting the junior varsity team against the first stringers.

This is no reflection on the caliber of the men who sacrifice much to serve their country abroad but it is a statement of fact that the government does not command the total resources of our people to meet the unified challenge of the Soviet. Hence, the engagement of our private resources in the development of this philosophy of economic development through private ownership is a necessary condition.

I do not subscribe to the theory, on the other hand, that private capital and private know-how can do the whole job because there are many situations in the world where the private profit motive and the fiduciary responsibilities of corporate managements in the safeguarding of their stockholders' money would not permit them to undertake this task on their own responsibility. Further, there are development projects of a nonrevenue producing nature, such as roads, harbor improvements, hospitals, and schools which are properly programs for government rather than private action. On the other hand, foreign aid resources and government employees are not, alone, enough to do the job.

Thus, we are confronted with the task on the one hand of redefining our political and economic objectives abroad in the underdeveloped areas and, secondly, of devising institutions which will bring together both Government and private resources for the accomplishment of a program which has institutional and judicial—as well as economic—objectives. This, I believe, is the challenge to the present and the succeeding administrations.

Much progress has been made in this past year in redefining the objectives as well as exploring means of accomplishment. Whereas the Draper committee has been considering the strategic values in the military and economic aid programs, the Boeschenstein committee and the Strauss study have explored the institutional aspects of this program and the ways and means of encouraging more private participation. Dean Donald David, now chairman of the executive committee of the Ford Foundation, sparked much of this interest in the partnership concept between private enterprise and Government to achieve these developmental objectives abroad. But very few have centered their attention on the main anti-Communist device, the only one which will make native people stand up and oppose it, namely, private ownership and the prospect of enjoying the fruits of their labors, under free and democratic institutions.

How do we implement such a program? The International Economic Policy Association commends the following proposals to the attention of the Congress: Tax incentives to private enterprise abroad must be granted to equalize the risks; extension of guarantees on investments against damage from civil strife; protection against currency depreciation and devaluations. Most important, perhaps, is the channelization of foreign aid funds and reinvestment of local currencies in productive enterprises abroad, through local financial institutions and private ownership units; development of partnership arrangements with U.S. or western private enterprise in construction, management, and training of personnel. The establishment of regional universities, as proposed by Senators MANSFIELD and JOHNSON, and others—perhaps one

for Asia, and one for Latin America and one for Africa—where able young men from the respective countries of the area can mingle together in an atmosphere of freedom and secure the advantage of a technological education under western teachers, with the use of mutual security and local currency funds; extension of an expanded agricultural surplus disposal program, through private channels over and above normal commercial markets, to relieve hunger and destitution, and to provide a capital base for new industrial enterprises; the use of private contractors in the accomplishment of developmental projects, with training of native personnel as a part of the obligation of the contract; clarification of antitrust laws * * * to permit a combination of American firms to pool their resources in the accomplishment of these objectives; the encouragement of conventions among nations, and development of judicial standards in each nation to protect private investments.

These and many other devices must be carefully studied, planned for and fitted into a pattern to accomplish the overall objective which must be defined as (1) our own national security; (2) the national independence of other countries; (3) the development of private property institutions; (4) the protection of individuals against arbitrary action of the state; and (5) economic development within the framework of these institutions. Out of this complex, I am sure, over a period of time, democratic governments, with greater stability, will emerge, as they did in the Western World from the time of the French Revolution.

In emphasizing private property rights, I want to make it clear that I include all forms of private property, individual, partnership, cooperative, and corporate. And in basing the institutions of individual freedom on private property, I am not unmindful of the fact that, historically, free labor unions have come into existence and flourished under the private enterprise system. I cannot conceive of free labor unions in a state where the government owns all the means of production.

In conclusion, I repeat that the mutual security program must be supported, as a vital holding operation, while the administration is engaged in a reevaluation of the objectives and the means. We cannot pull the rug from under our Government and create an economic vacuum. That would be just as drastic as pulling back all our military positions to the North American Continent.

Behind the Scenes With the Labor Unions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELMER J. HOFFMAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 4, 1959

Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the honorable body on the other side of the Capitol last Saturday passed the so-called labor reform bill. It will now come before the House for consideration and I commend to every Member the timely editorial of the Chicago Daily News of Saturday, April 24 which follows:

HE MAY NOT CARRY A CARD BUT—BRIDGES SHOWS HIS COLOR

The Senate has been wrestling with its conscience the last few days on the matter of a labor reform bill. In the nip and tuck voting, conscience has manifested itself in various ways, some indistinguishable from the applied pressure of powerful interest groups.

While this was going on, a remarkable and related interview before the House Un-American Activities Committee produced several items that should have been of interest to the Senators. The witness was Harry Bridges, the west coast leader of the Longshoremen's Union, who for 20 years has successfully dodged deportation.

Bridges had plenty of sharp retorts ready for the committee, but on the key question of whether he had ever been a Communist he pleaded the fifth amendment "for the first time in my life."

Bridges was reminded that he once threatened to call a longshoremen's strike to prevent American arms from reaching Chiang Kai-shek if Chiang attempted to retake the Chinese mainland. He hedged this threat, under questioning, by saying that a strike to prevent U.S. arms from reaching an ally would be a matter for the union to decide.

In other words, Bridges is saying his union has the right to nullify U.S. foreign policy, if indeed the Government should ever favor such an invasion, which we hope it would not. And on top of this startling doctrine, he adds that he would not bar a known Communist from office in his union.

Bridges also revealed a working arrangement with unions abroad—including some in Communist countries—that could produce a worldwide boycott of shipping in support of local strikes.

When all this is added up, the question of Bridges' Communist membership is really beside the point. What he stands for speaks lounder than any card he might carry.

To allow shipping on the west coast and in Hawaii to remain dependent on the whim of such a man stretches tolerance beyond reasonable bounds. Yet far from losing power he has been gaining more, in league with the racket-ridden Teamsters Union led by Jimmy Hoffa.

Hoffa has nearly succeeded in welding together a transport union combine—including Bridges' longshoremen—capable of paralyzing the business of the whole country. The Senators who are bleeding about a labor bill that might be too tough had better wake up before Bridges, Hoffa, and company show them what tough guys can do in the absence of tough restraints.

Odd Fellow Grand Decoration of Chivalry Conferred on Unknowns of World War II and Korean War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN DOWDY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 4, 1959

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, in 1940, the Independent Order of Odd Fellows conferred its Grand Decoration of Chivalry upon the Unknown Soldier of World War I. In connection with the May 3 ceremonies at the 25th annual pilgrimage to the tomb, the Grand Decoration of Chivalry was conferred on the Unkowns of World War II and the Korean war, the jewels representing the decoration to be placed with the World War I jewel in the Hall of Trophies at Arlington Cemetery.

I request that the presentation of the jewels by Sovereign Grand Master Fred L. Pardee, and the acceptance thereof by the superintendent of the cemetery, Mr. Lockwood, be made a part of the RECORD:

PRESENTATION OF GRAND DECORATION OF CHIVALRY BY MR. PARDEE

My brothers, sisters, and friends, on July 7, 1940, Grand Sire George S. Starrett (now deceased) had the honor to confer upon the Unknown Soldier of World War I the grand decoration of chivalry and to present to Colonel Lymon, of the U.S. Army and official representative of the U.S. Government, the grand decoration of chivalry jewel to be deposited in the Archives of the Hall of Trophies. Recently, our Government has erected two other tombs and in them have been placed the mortal remains of the Unknown of World War II and the Unknown of the Korean war.

The Government of the United States has once again conferred a high honor upon the Independent Order of Odd Fellows and has granted to us the privilege of conferring upon the Unknowns of World War II and of the Korean war, the grand decoration of chivalry and has graciously offered to accept from our hands the grand decoration of chivalry jewels. This decoration and the jewels which accompany it is the highest honor that can be conferred upon a member of our fraternity and is awarded only to a brother who has rendered outstanding service in the cause of Odd Fellowship above and beyond the call of duty. The grand decoration of chivalry and the grand decoration of chivalry jewel are comparable to the Congressional Medal of Honor.

As sovereign grand master of the Sovereign Grand Lodge of the Independent Order of Odd Fellows and as the representative of approximately 1½ million members of our fraternity, I most solemnly and reverently approach you and these Tombs of the Unknown for the purpose of presenting through you to the U.S. Government, these jewels, emblematic of the highest honor that can be conferred by our order. These jewels are to be placed in the Trophy Room beside that of the Unknown Soldier of World War I, there to remain in the custody of the United States of America as a perpetual symbol of the undying gratitude and deepest appreciation in which our fraternity and its members hold the sacred memory of our national and fraternal heroic dead and for the courageous and unselfish sacrifices they willingly made to preserve for posterity the priceless freedom and liberty bequeathed to us by our forefathers. In these Tombs of the Unknown lie the lifeless bodies of two Americans who symbolize all that is high and noble in our ideals and principles and who are also representatives of every man and woman who freely sacrificed their lives for the preservation of these sacred ideals. They also symbolize every true Odd Fellow who has given his life in the cause of his country. These ideals are in perfect accord with the teachings of our order for one of our fundamental principles declares that one cannot become an Odd Fellow in spirit and in truth unless he is grateful to his Creator, faithful to his country, and fraternal to his fellowman.

I deeply appreciate the honor that has been conferred upon our order and we have had specifically prepared for presentation, these jewels which I now place upon the pedestal.

Mr. Lockwood, Superintendent of Arlington Cemetery, it is with sincere gratitude for this most distinguished honor that has come to our fraternity, that I, as sovereign grand master of the Independent Order of Odd Fellows, now present to you these jewels, emblamatic of the grand decoration of chivalry, to be delivered into the custody and possession of the United States, together with our most sincere thanks and deepest appreciation.

ACCEPTANCE BY MR. LOCKWOOD

Mr. Pardee, on behalf of the people of the United States of America, I accept the grand decoration of chivalry jewels which your esteemed organization has presented to the Unknowns of World War II and the Korean war. I thank you.

Odd Fellows' 25th Annual Pilgrimage to the Tomb of the Unknowns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN DOWDY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 4, 1959

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, May 3, 1959, it was my privilege to serve as program committee chairman for the 25th annual pilgrimage of the Independent Order of Odd Fellows to the Tomb of the Unknowns. At the ceremony preceding the laying of the wreaths, the principal address was delivered by Sovereign Grand Master Fred L. Pardee, of Little Rock, Ark. I respectfully request that his address, as follows, be made a part of the RECORD:

ADDRESS AT TOMBS OF THE UNKNOWN

My brothers, sisters, and friends, we have assembled here this afternoon for our annual ceremony at the Tombs of the Unknown and I am deeply impressed with the solemnity of this occasion. We are most forcefully reminded as we gather in this silent city of the dead of the uncertainty of human life and that it is appointed unto men once to die. For many years our order has held its annual pilgrimage to the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier of World War I to pay tribute to the one who lies here unknown to anyone save God himself and who symbolizes all who paid the supreme sacrifice that we might enjoy the freedom and liberty which is ours today.

Almost 19 years have passed since Grand Sire George S. Starrett (now deceased) conferred upon the Unknown Soldier of World War I the Grand Decoration of Chivalry and presented to Colonel Lyman the Grand Decoration of Chivalry Jewel on behalf of the Odd Fellows and Rebekahs throughout the world. Since that time our country has been forced to engage in two other momentous wars which have resulted in thousands of our men and women paying the supreme sacrifice in the defense of our beloved Nation. In honor of these loyal and brave citizens who willingly gave their lives that we might enjoy the privileges and benefits which are ours today, a grateful Government has provided a final resting place for the Unknown of World War II and the Unknown of the Korean war and these beloved servicemen lie beside the Unknown Soldier of World War I.

We have gathered here today to pay tribute to those who represent the hundreds of thousands of our citizens who gave their lives in the cause of justice and liberty and it is fitting and proper that we pause amid the busy affairs of life and reflect upon the responsibilities that rest upon us. How important that we should examine our lives and take an inventory of our inner selves and then ask the question: Have I been true and faithful to the fraternity which I represent and loyal to the country of which I am a citizen? Do we as Odd Fellows and Rebekahs and as good citizens of our Nation, recognize the fact that we should conduct the affairs of our lives on a high and lofty plane and use our best endeavors to bring about the day when all the world shall be at peace and all men shall hail each other as brothers?

When an individual or a nation is possessed with power, that power can be a potent factor for either good or evil. From the very beginning of time, men have sought power for various reasons. Some crave power through wealth, some for political purposes while still others seek it through the social or business world. How careful we should be that the lust for power does not overcome the finer and nobler things of life. How forcefully we are reminded that an insatiable desire on the part of many leaders of the past to possess power to rule the world is the reason why we have the Tombs of the Unknown today. On the other hand, power can be a powerful factor for the moral and spiritual welfare of the world in which we live. Surely Odd Fellowship can be a source of power in this present age for the advancement of civilization and the opportunities for our fraternity to take its rightful place in the world today are gerater than ever before in the history of our order. To achieve success in this realm, we must recognize the source from which we come; that we are the creatures of a supreme being, a creator and preserver of the universe. We must also remember who we are; that we have been made in the image of God. This should cause us to realize our responsibility to our Creaator, our duty to our fellow man and our obligation to our country. Thus we will be a powerful factor for the betterment of mankind and our influence for good will be felt throughout the world: May we recognize that we are indeed a worldwide international fraternity whose principles and ideals are above reproach. Let us remember that we seek to improve and elevate the character of man and to bring about a better understanding and a closer relationship among peoples of all nations.

We must also remind ourselves that our Nation has been built upon the character and ideals of its citizens. No country can rise above the principles and ideals which are instilled into the hearts and lives of those who live within its boundaries. We are proud that this Nation has never been the aggressor in any war it has been forced to wage. We have taken up arms against the enemy when forced to do so to preserve our honor and the welfare of our country. The members of the Independent Order of Odd Fellows throughout the United States are proud of the fact that we are an integral part of such a great Nation and that the Odd Fellows and Rebekahs throughout the world subscribe to the same high ideals for which we stand in this great land where we are privileged to live.

These unknowns fought and died because they were imbued with a deep sense of responsibility not only to their own country but also to the world at large. They believed in universal justice for all and they were unwilling to compromise with the forces of evil in order to permit others to satisfy their lust for power and allow greedy men to gain control of the world for their own selfish desires. They were not afraid to do battle in the cause of justice so that right might triumph over might and they freely sacrificed their lives in order that we would be privileged to enjoy the freedom and liberty which is ours today.

From the very beginning, our Order has stood for those things which are high and noble and lofty. Our fraternity was founded on three of the greatest principles known to mankind; namely, friendship, love and truth. Odd Fellowship was builded on a solid and firm foundation and down through the years, is has stood the test of time. How important that we should put into practice in our daily lives these great principles of friendship, love and truth for through this medium we can truly be instrumental in bringing to pass that age when all the world shall be at peace and all men shall hail each other as brothers. May we as Odd Fellows and Rebekahs endeavor, as far as humanly possible, to attain that level of perfection which will cause us to always strive for higher thoughts, for nobler deeds and for greater achievements. May we ever remember that we cannot truly be Odd Fellows and Rebekahs unless we are grateful to our Creator, faithful to our country and fraternal to our fellowman.

As we have assembled here today to pay homage to our unknowns as well as to the thousands and thousands of men and women who have freely laid down their lives for our beloved country, may we be forcefully reminded of those immortal words spoken by Abraham Lincoln when he said "We here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain." May we ever realize that we should constantly strive to build a bigger and better America, an America that will not only be stronger from a physical and material standpoint but especially morally and spiritually. And as we strengthen the physical, mental, moral and spiritual walls of our mighty Nation, we shall also be the means of spreading the gospel of freedom and liberty to all nations, tongues and creeds throughout the world. May we so live and practice the teachings of our great fraternity that we shall be instrumental in sowing the seeds of friendship and brotherly love, of mercy and toleration, in the hearts of men and women everywhere. Thus we shall have a part in bringing to pass that era for which people in all ages have longed and for which these unknowns paid the supreme sacrifice; namely, that all the world shall recognize the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man, and the peace of God which passes all understanding shall reign in the hearts and lives of all people everywhere.

God has graciously blessed this great Nation of which we are a part and He has smiled with favor upon our beloved order which has grown and prospered during the past 140 years. We owe much to our Creator and to our forefathers who have builded well and who have been uncompromising in their battle with the forces of evil who would destroy all that is near and dear to each of us. These unknown soldiers possessed this same love for their country as well as this same uncompromising spirit and were unwilling to yield to the enemy even though it resulted in the sacrifice of their lives.

As we pay homage today to these brave servicemen of the past, God grant that it shall not be merely lip service. May the shining example which they have left to us be the means of inspiring Odd Fellows and Rebekahs everywhere to rededicate and reconsecrate our lives to the welfare of the beloved country to which we owe allegiance and cause us to solemnly resolve to practice the teachings of Odd Fellowship and live its principles and ideals to a greater degree than ever before.

And now, as I bring my message to a close, may we again be most forcefully reminded of our responsibility to our fraternity, to our country and to our God. May the memory of the heroic sacrifices of those whom we honor today inspire us to be more faithful to our order and more loyal to our country. May the gentle influence of friendship, love, and truth, of faith, hope, and charity, and of universal justice so permeate the hearts and lives of men and women everywhere that the entire world shall soon be privileged to know the same freedom and liberty which we enjoy today; that this mighty Nation which we proudly hail as our beloved country shall never again be called upon to take up arms against any people in any part of the world

and that the freedom and liberty which is ours shall triumph over the forces of evil and shall reign victorious until time shall be no more. God grant that we shall soon be privileged to see this glorious day and we can then proudly say to these brave men who rest in this silent city of the dead: "Truly, you have not died in vain."

Seventieth Birthday of Francis Cardinal Spellman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 4, 1959

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, today is the 70th birthday of one of the most distinguished and respected citizens of the United States, who I am fortunate enough to have as a resident of my district. Francis Cardinal Spellman, archbishop of New York since 1939, is one of those unique individuals who seem to spend their lives doing the most good for the greatest number of people in the most effective possible way.

It is a great privilege to call the attention of the House to this milestone in the life of so beloved a person and to include at this point an article which appears in today's New York Times in tribute to him:

SPELLMAN MARKS 70TH YEAR TODAY—CARDINAL PUTS HIS MILITARY VICARIATE FOREMOST IN HIS TWO DECADES HERE

(By George Dugan)

The world's best-known Roman Catholic prelate, with the exception of Pope John XXIII, will be 70 years old today.

He is Cardinal Spellman, archbishop of New York since 1939.

Yesterday, in an interview at his residence, the cardinal gave every indication that he expected to live and work well beyond the traditional 3 score years and 10.

Pink-cheeked and smiling, the spiritual leader of more than 1,550,000 Roman Catholics in 10 New York counties said without hesitation that his most rewarding experience over the last two decades was his ministry to the men and women in the Armed Forces.

The cardinal is military vicar of about 2 million Catholics serving their country here and overseas.

CHRISTMAS WITH TROOPS

Most of his Christmases in recent years have been spent with American troops in Korea, Greenland, Alaska, and the Far East. Age, it was clear, should not prevent another trip this year.

The prelate is regarded as one of the ablest administrators in his church. His bent for organization and his business acumen have made the New York archdioceses a model of efficiency and solvency.

But, despite a split-second daily schedule that would tax a man half his age, the cardinal has a warm, outgoing personality that is at its best in informal moments.

Today Cardinal Spellman will mark his birthday in relative quiet. He intends to celebrate mass at the Church of the Holy Ghost in Whitman, Mass., the town where he was born and the church where he served as altar boy.

On Tuesday he will be guest of honor at a birthday reception and tea tendered by the Ladies of Charity of New York Catholic Charities in the Biltmore Hotel.

MILESTONES OF PRELACY HERE

Twenty years ago, on May 23, Cardinal Spellman was installed as archbishop of New York. Some of the highlights of those two decades follow:

The Roman Catholic population in the archdiocese has grown from 1 million to 1,558,000. New York is the third largest See in the United States. Chicago is first with 2 million, and Boston second with 1,580,000.

St. Patrick's Cathedral was renovated at a cost of $2,500,000. This was exclusive of the mounting of the cathedral's monumental bronze doors, the rebuilding of the organ, and the installation of a new rose window.

New York Catholic charities expended nearly $55,500,000 for the care of families, the aged, neglected children, and the sick.

More than $40 million was spent on hospital expansion. Eleven million more is now earmarked for new projects.

An integrated ministry has been extended to some 500,000 Spanish-speaking newcomers to the city.

Yesterday the cardinal received a birthday letter from President Eisenhower. The President said: "On such an important milestone, I assure you of my warm felicitations, in which Mrs. Eisenhower joins. You can look back on your years of dedication to the people of your church and of our country with gratification and pride, just as you look forward to giving of your wisdom and experience to help solve the problems that lie ahead."

Have We Reached a Point of No Return?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELMER J. HOFFMAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 4, 1959

Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, every day our citizens are becoming more and more aware of the condition of our economy, the mounting national debt and the heavy tax burden to meet these demands. This awareness is expressed in layman's language in the editorial by Bud Booth, associate editor in charge of DuPage County editions, Paddock Publications, Arlington Heights, Ill., on April 9, 1959.

The editorial follows:

April is election month throughout DuPage County and in many other areas as well. Economy—the need for more of it—is an issue in many campaigns, and few citizens can be found frowning on any aspects of moneysaving as advocated by candidates for offices at all levels.

The people have become very aware of such needs—especially when they are confronted by another annual tax bill. And it's often a bill that has gone up measurably in the short space of 12 months. Economy thus becomes logical talking point with no little merit.

People going to the polls will have heard a whole group of suggestions as to how a candidate or party will curtail their taxes or, at least, give them more for what they're paying. It's at this point that we realize a sad tragedy of this day and age of advancements and improvements in so many directions.

All this economy talk is coming forth from the varied local levels of Government, but few—if any—citizens are going beyond what they can immediately visualize coming from their wallets or purses. This is minor league, obscure stuff when we glance upstairs to a place called Washington, D.C.

There's a little money being spent there too—we only wish it was just a little. It may as well be for how many times do we, as ordinary citizens, look upstairs to this major league of levying and spending and think about mentioning the need for economy to the people we've sent to the Nation's capital?

Do you know what our national debt is now?

Wouldn't you like some sunny day to learn that the money taken from your weekly pay check is going down—even a little?

Wouldn't it be nice to find the road that goes down before we reach the point of no return? We only hope that this point hasn't been reached already.

Each and every one of us has waited too long now by months and months in urging that some sort of blockade be applied to the national debt and the only way we get even a small fence put up involves writing our Washington representatives in letters by the hundreds and thousands.

Those who are serving us in the Senate and Congress as we want and deserve to be served will listen to these letters and they'll bring our voices to the floor provided we speak up with enough authority and in enough quantity to show that we're in no way a small minority.

President Eisenhower has the right approach and outlook to make national economy an actuality, but too many citizens we have elected and sent to Washington have put politics before consideration of such plans.

We fervently find that we have no space in our family finance picture to tolerate the relatively unimportant political desires of some of those we've voted for in preference to saving the money we would like to have saved.

About this time we'd like to be sitting down with a few thousand other newspaper editors that we know feel the same for this space will, unfortunately, be read by only 30,000 or 35,000 people at best.

Enough Anthracite Coal for 200 Years Available at Present Mining Rate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 4, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news article which appeared in the Wilkes-Barre Record of Wednesday, April 29, 1959:

ENOUGH ANTHRACITE FOR 200 YEARS AVAILABLE AT PRESENT MINING RATE

Looking ahead to availability of future supplies, authorities agree there is sufficient anthracite in place and minable to supply present markets at current rates of consumption for around 200 years, according to Anthracite Institute.

Though well over 99 percent of all anthracite produced in the Western Hemisphere is mined in a few counties in eastern Pennsylvania, embracing a surface area of only 484 square miles, relative importance of these counties in their share of the industry's total output has changed in recent years.

Over a 20-year period, Luzerne and Schuylkill Counties have averaged 67 percent of th total output. These, plus Lackawanna County, produced 81 percent of the output; and the three, plus Northumberland County, 92 percent of the total.

Changes have been brought about by a variety of reasons, including depletion and exhaustion of minable reserves, technological developments in extractive process and economic factors, including relative unit costs in different producing areas, the institute said.

Luzerne County mines in 1938 produced 44 percent of total production; 39.8 percent in 1943; 36.6 percent in 1948; 33.5 percent in 1953 and 33.1 percent in 1958.

Schuylkill County mines produced 21.1 percent total output in 1938; 23.7 percent in 1943; 29.3 percent in 1948; 33.3 percent in 1953, and 35.7 percent in 1958.

Mines in Lackawanna County produced 18.2 percent of total production in 1938; 15.1 percent in 1943; 14.6 percent in 1948; 11.7 percent in 1953 and 10.2 percent in 1958.

Northumberland County mines produced 8.8 percent of total output in 1938; 9 percent in 1943; 11.7 percent in 1948; 13.9 percent in 1953, and 12.7 percent in 1958.

In 1938 Columbia County mines produced 2.5 percent of the output; 1.4 percent in 1943; 2.8 percent in 1948; 2.4 percent in 1953, and 4.3 percent in 1958.

Carbon County mines produced 4.2 percent of output in 1938; 5.2 percent in 1943; 4.7 percent in 1948; 5.1 percent in 1953, and 3 percent in 1958.

Production for the week ending April 25 was estimated at 254,000 tons, bringing output since January 1 to 5,035,000 tons, 326,000 tons or 6.1 percent less than the 5,361,000 tons mined from January 1 to April 26, 1958.

REA Bill—Primarily a Political Gimmick

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. R. WALTER RIEHLMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 4, 1959

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Syracuse, N.Y., Herald Journal of Wednesday, April 29, 1959.

I do not condone the kicking of a dead horse, but I feel I should offer my colleagues this bit of evidence that the folks at home were not fooled by the Humphrey-Price bill. They saw through it for what it really was:

REA BILL—PRIMARILY A POLITICAL GIMMICK

Twenty years ago, in an attempted streamlining of the Federal establishment, the Congress established a logical chain of command for the operation of the Rural Electrification Administration.

The agency was housed in the Department of Agriculture. REA loans, which amounted to half a million dollars or more, came under the Secretary of Agriculture's review.

This arrangement was affirmed in another reorganization measure passed in 1953.

But the Senate has decided, by a 60 to 27 rollcall vote, and the House agreed, 254 to 131, that the review authority should be taken away from Secretary Benson; that is all REA loans can be approved, or rejected, by the REA Administrator and that's that.

Except that President Eisenhower has vetoed the measure. Democrats in both the Senate and House will try to displace the veto.

We have decided that this unnecessary legislation adds up to a political maeuver. Why?

The judgment is found in the REA record of the last few years, particularly since the Eisenhower administration took office.

In all that time, the Secretary of Agriculture has never interfered in any way with REA loan applications. That was the gist of testimony obtained at hearings in June 1958, and when the hearings were duplicated in March, this year.

The Congress, then, under its Democratic leadership has been putting in its time on a phony issue.

Republicans should rally to support the President's veto.

Gen. Milan Stefanik, a Slovak Hero

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 4, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, Europe, cradle of human liberty, has bred many champions of the rights of men and nations. Among these could be counted Gen. Milan Stefanik, the great Slovak hero, who saw his people achieve independence after the First World War and died in a tragic accident soon after.

Milan Stefanik was a brilliant young man who could have devoted himself happily and successfully to his great love, astronomy. In his early youth he had had to leave his native land, which was under foreign domination, and go to France in order to pursue the scientific studies which were his absorbing interest. After many trials and disappointments the young Slovak scientist at last gained recognition and by 1914 he was in fact regarded by continental learned societies as one of the brilliant young astronomers of Europe. But he could not smother love of his own land nor forget the shackles which bounded his compatriots. When war came in 1914, Stefanik, 34 years old at the time and at the height of his career, abandoned it all to enter the French Air Force and fight for the victory of the Allies. Combined with his active service was work in orgqnizing the Czechoslovak military forces in exile, who played an effective role in the war, and the Czechoslovak National Council from which the independent state of Czechoslovakia was to evolve. Victory brought with it its own sweet fruits of independence for his homeland and a position of national honor and service in his new country for the young war hero. In May 1919, an untimely accidental death cut short his fruitful and dedicated life.

We can hope that the Europe of our day will find other great souls like Stefanik's lead and organize and fight in pursuit of the ideals of human liberty and democracy which he held dear. New times brings with them new problems. In Stefanik's day the problem was national independence for particular European groups. Today the problem is how to achieve a unified, independent, and democratic Europe. In such a Europe Stefanik's Czechoslovakia, free of its Communist masters, could have a worthy place.

We could find no better way of honoring the memory of Milan Stefanik than in emulating his dedication and selflessness in advancement of the ideals of freedom which are yet so far from universal fulfillment.

ICEM and Refugees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 4, 1959

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the first two of a series of articles written by a distinguished and able journalist, Mr. Edward P. Kennedy, the political reporter of the Easton Express, published in my hometown, Easton, Pa.

Mr. Kennedy was invited by the Department of State to serve as public member on the U.S. delegation to the 10th session of the Council on the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration—ICEM.

The above-mentioned follows:

[From the Easton (Pa.) Express, Apr. 18, 1959]

A LOOK AT THE REFUGEE PROBLEM

(By Edward P. Kennedy)

Back in Easton after a 2-week trip to Europe, I am preparing a series of columns for next week, mainly on what I observed as a public member of the 10th annual conference of the Intergovernmental Committee on European Migration (ICEM) at Geneva, Switzerland. Heading the agenda was the refugee problem, given especial prominence because of designation of the period starting July 1 as World Refugee Year. In an unexpected extension of my trip, I went to Salzburg, Austria, and viewed several refugee camps partly housing Hungarian and Yugoslav escapees.

The trip included stops in Rome on the way to Geneva and in Paris on the way home. In Rome, I saw United States Representative FRANCIS E. WALTER, of Easton, who proposed my appointment, receive a decoration from the Italian Government for his assistance with migration of surplus populations. The Easton Congressman was on his 13th trip to Europe.

With WALTER'S party during most of the trip, and part of the time with U.S. Representative ARCH A. MOORE, JR., Republican, of West Virginia, I was impressed with the ease of travel by congressional and other VIP groups, State Department or other U.S. officials met us or saw us off at airports, facilitating going through customs and border police. Many were the invitations to dinners and cocktail parties, causing me to realize that an ironclad digestion is one of the prime qualifications of an American delegate abroad.

I found I concur with the analysis of others that there is less war fear abroad, at least in the sections I visited, than here. An American official in Switzerland told me that the Government in a recent period of crisis sent out a letter to its nationals suggesting, because of uncertainty, the purchase of foodstuffs and other materials. The purchases were made with no disorder nor sense of crisis, he said, suggesting that by contrast

a similar move here would arouse much hysteria.

As an it's-a-small-world note, I will report that the TWA plane which carried the Walter party to Geneva from Rome was in command of Capt. Walton H. Smiley, who lives near Stroudsburg. The Very Reverend Francis B. Sayre, of Washington, D.C., a member of the U.S. delegation, is a grandson of the Bethlehem resident for whom Sayre Park in that city was named.

[From the Easton (Pa.) Express, Apr. 20, 1959]

A LOOK AT THE REFUGEE PROBLEM—JULY 1 BEGINNING OF THE HUMANITARIAN YEAR

(By Edward F. Kennedy)

The bitter plight of refugees who fled across frontiers with nothing but the clothes on their backs was given especial attention at the meeting of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration I attended April 7–11 at Geneva, Switzerland. This was because the year starting July 1 has been designated as World Refugee Year, a humanitarian counterpart of the just-ended geophysical year.

ICEM's two-phase program deals with the refugee problem and also with that of the movement of surplus populations to countries which need more people. The organization, made up of 28 nations of the free world arranges transport for emigrable refugees and persons wishing to leave overcrowded countries. It also coordinates efforts to prepare these groups for successful lives in new, strange surroundings.

Although the refugees' need is well recognized, there appears surprisingly little agreement about their actual number. Estimates of the number of refugees in Europe and the world vary widely, I learned at Geneva and on a trip after the ICEM meeting to refugee camps at Salzburg, Austria.

The World Refugee Year program was discussed at a special ICEM session the afternoon of April 9, at which U.S. Representative FRANCIS E. WALTER, of Easton, was chairman. Before WALTER took the chair, Ambassador Alberto Berio, of Italy, the regular chairman, paid tribute to the Easton man who was awarded the Italian Order of Merit in Rome the week before for special service to the cause of migration.

WALTER voiced the hope that WRY will not be considered a mopping up operation. He emphasized that the refugee problem is of continuous nature, and that any attempt to solve it in 1 year would inevitably lead to frustration. He said, however, that manageable situations exist and a major effort may result in their solution.

WALTER at that time made no estimate of the number of refugees, but urged study to determine the size of the problem and what phase to ameliorate.

Dr. Auguste Lindt, the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, gave an estimate that present nonsettled refugees number around 123,000 with those who are emigrable, 43,500. He listed 32,000 in Austria, of which 12,500 can be emigrated; Italy, 9,500 with 8,000 emigrable; Germany, 49,000 and 5,000; Greece, 9,500 and 1,000; other Western European countries, he said, have 4,000; the Middle East, 5,000 and the Far East, 8,000, all emigrable. He termed the problem "very manageable, not astronomic."

Many refugees can be emigrated from countries of first asylum only with difficulty because they are the hard-core cases suffering from physical or mental disabilities. Some do not wish to move, so can be integrated where they are living.

Dr. Lindt suggested that government could observe the refugee year by accepting groups not normally admissible, by raising the age limits which now bar many, admitting refugee families now too large to qualify and admitting those presently not sufficiently skilled or those including physically handicapped. He urged that the idea should be abandoned that "all refugees are a social burden," since some may prove technical or economic assets.

Claude de Kemoularia, special U.N. representative for WRY, suggested aid for Arab refugees as a worthy WRY aim. Dr. Elfan Rees, representing the International Committee for the year, recalled that the idea for the effort arose from the writing of "three angry young men" in a British magazine and spread rapidly through Great Britain. He warned there will be a depressing effect on refugees—"the men who vote with their feet"—if the plan is unsuccessful.

A similar warning was given by John W. Hanes, Jr., heading the U.S. delegation. He said hopes of refugees can be raised only to be dashed if the program for WRY is not well conceived. He said a presidential proclamation soon will announce U.S. cooperation in the plan. He announced at this session contribution by the United States of $150,000 to aid new refugees from Algeria.

The Very Reverend Francis B. Sayre, Jr., dean of the Washington Cathedral and a U.S. public member, spoke as chairman of the U.S. committee on WRY. He had preached on the refugee program Easter Sunday over a TV-radio hookup and said it received much response in the United States. Representatives of 18 other nations pledged support of the WRY program.

At a press conference earlier that day, Walter gave an estimate that he thinks the European refugee problem is one having to do with "less than 40,000 people."

Some estimates run much higher. Walter, in the conference, cited a recent New York Herald Tribune editorial referring to "the world's 2 million refugees." A New York Times' story of April 8 on plans of the administration for evacuation of European camps speaks of an estimated 15 million refugees, "with some 160,000 in European camps."

The discrepancy in figures appears partly a matter of definition. Some cite all who have crossed borders, some list the nonsettled refugees, and some only those who are emigrable. Also, there seems a difference depending on whether the estimate is made by groups responsible for providing funds for the program, by professionals employed in governmental refugee agencies, or by philanthropic groups concerned with the refugee problem. Some have been so unkind as to suggest that high estimates are made by these last groups for fear they will "run out of refugees" and thus lose their reason for existence.

Livestock Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 4, 1959

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, one of the well-known and highly respected livestock commission firms in my congressional district has recently compiled certain statistics regarding livestock prices. The following statement and tables were prepared by the firm of Wagner, Garrison & Abbott, of Sioux City, Iowa:

Many times through past years we have been compelled to defend livestock feeders both by word of mouth and through this medium against those who would have the world believe that livestock prices are too high.

Contrary to this, we take the stand that the price of cattle either alive or on the hook is still a commodity that is selling below other commodities that make up our standard of living. To substantiate this statement we have compiled some authentic figures that prove conclusively that livestock prices are well behind many other major items that govern today's living standard.

Below is a comparison as of a given day in the years 1937 and 1958. These figures prove beyond any doubt that beef is the best buy for today's dollar—and that $30 cattle is not just a high point in a given market—but possibly a figure that could be used as a yardstick for future operations:

	October 1937	1958	Increase over 1937
			Percent
Top price for fat steers	$18.00	$27.25	51
Milk per quart	.12	.25	108
Bread per loaf	.08	.19	138
Coffee per pound	.25	.93	272
Bus fares	.709	.16	105
Movie tickets	.23	.50	117
Autos (Chevrolet)	730.00	2,600.00	256
Gasoline per gallon	.14¼	.25	54
Coal per ton	11.19	29.14	150
Steel per pound	.02½	.06	140
Copper per pound	.13	.25	92
Lumber (board foot)	.03	.12	300

These figures, plus other information we have at our fingertips, and of course, our own conclusions point toward a relatively high cattle market during 1959 barring unforeseen drought conditions.

IRBM, Not Bases, Said To Be Ready in Britain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 4, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news article which appeared in the New York Times of Wednesday, April 29, 1959:

IRBM, NOT BASES, SAID TO BE READY—PENTAGON SPOKESMAN HINTS SYMINGTON WAS CORRECT ON BRITAIN—DENIES DECEIT

WASHINGTON, April 29.—There are probably no complete intermediate-range ballistic missile installations in Britain, with weapons, launching platforms, and trained crews ready to fire, it was indicated at the Pentagon today.

The Defense Department refused to comment officially on charges by Senator STUART SYMINGTON, Democrat, of Missouri, that the Nation had been misled in believing that the U.S.-equipped IRBM bases in Britain were operationally ready.

The Senator specifically cited testimony by Gen. Nathan F. Twining, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, who told a congressional committee last January that the 1,500-mile weapons delivered to Britain were ready to go.

A Defense Department spokesman said today that Pentagon officials had never meant to imply that the entire weapons installation in Britain was combat-ready. In promising operational readiness of the missiles in Britain, officials here merely referred to the missile itself, and not to the allied equipment, the spokesman said.

The Defense Department spokesman noted that last September, at least 2 months before the original target date of December

1958, the first Thor IRBM was delivered by airplane to Britain.

It was a fully tested missile, capable of being launched with an atomic warhead. Its delivery, with those of an unspecified number of other missiles in the weeks that followed, fulfilled the implicit promise to the public in official statements, the spokesman declared.

Under the terms of the British-U.S. agreement, it was emphasized, the British were responsible for the construction of the bases. Moreover, the terms of the agreement called for the firing by British crews, with the nuclear warheads in the hands of U.S. officials.

The British crews did not arrive for training in this country until March 1958. The first British crew did not successfully fire a test missile until last month at Vandenberg Air Force Base in California.

MAY NOT BE READY TILL 1960

One estimate at the Pentagon was that the IRBM installations in Britain would not be fully operational—in the sense that everything was ready—until perhaps the end of 1960.

The Thors, developed by the Air Force, are the first intercontinental range ballistic missile weapons to be completed and deployed to operating sites by the United States. Another weapon, the Jupiter, developed by the Army, has also been completed. It is slated for deployment to an IRBM base in Italy.

The arrangements for British IRBM bases were initiated at the end of 1956. The final agreement was not signed by the United States and Britain until February 24, 1958. Over the last few years, leading U.S. officials, including President Eisenhower, have referred to the operational readiness of the Thor missile.

Actually, the final test of the missile, declaring it a combat-ready device, was made last June at the testing center in Cape Canaveral, Fla. But most military officials stated simply that the Thors would be operational at the British bases by December 1958.

The prevailing impression here has been that by declaring the Thors operational in Britain, officials have indicated that these weapons were capable of being fired, should war break out suddenly.

The possibility that the deployment of the operational missiles to British sites did not mean that they could be fired at those sites appears not to have been brought out until Senator SYMINGTON'S speech yesterday.

The Senator had been a consistent critic of the administration's defense policies.

Rhode Island Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AIME J. FORAND
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 4, 1959

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, May 4 is a glorious day in the history of Rhode Island. One hundred and eighty-three years ago, on May 4, 1776, Rhode Island became the pioneer State to declare its independence of monarchial rule. The formal severance took the form of the repeal of "an act for the more effectual securing to His Majesty the allegiance of his subject in this, his colony, and dominion of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations." Under this act the general assembly struck the king's name from all commissions, writs, process, and other legal proceedings, substituting the following phrase: "The Governor and Company of the English Colony of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations."

This declaration of independence, characteristic of Rhode Island's individuality and courage, must have been an inspiration to the more cautious and hesitating colonies and an incentive to the Continental Congress in its declaration for all the Colonies on the memorable Fourth of July. The heroic men who struck that courageous blow for civil and political liberty, struck not for themselves alone nor for us, but for humanity. Today, when a tyranny more sinister than that which they knew is pressing everywhere against the frontiers of the free world, their act should be an inspiration to all of us.

That act, by which Rhode Island stood forth the first free and independent commonwealth on the American Continent, was in keeping with a long standing tradition of freedom in the colony and the State. Rhode Island's first great contribution to the cause of liberty was in its founding. The independence of Rhode Island began, in fact, when Roger Williams first set foot on that free soil. He initiated the lively experiment of founding a most flourishing state in civil things alone with a full liberty in religious concernments. When in 1656 other colonies urged sanguinary edicts against the Quakers and threatened to sever all commercial intercourse unless Rhode Island joined in the persecution, this was their answer:

> We shall strictly adhere to the foundation principles on which this colony was settled, to wit: that every man who submits peaceably to civil government in this colony shall worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience, without molestation.

In his gift to the world of the doctrine of religious liberty, Roger Williams stands among the few preeminent benefactors of mankind.

Another field in which Rhode Island took the initiative was the opposition to British taxation acts. In the agitation over the Sugar and Stamp Acts, Rhode Island was conspicuously aggressive. In 1733 Richard Partridge, the colony's agent in London, wrote Governor Wanton a letter in which he said:

> The levying a subsidy upon a free people without their knowledge, against their consent—a people who have no representatives in the state here * * * is, I understand, a violation of the right of the subject.

Partridge presented a petition to Parliament for the colony, for the first time putting forth the doctrine which forbids taxation without representation, a doctrine which became the bugle call of American independence.

When war began, Rhode Island was not wanting in initiative. The day following the Battle of Lexington found 1,000 men on the march from Providence to Boston, but they were stopped by dispatchers from Lexington. Rhode Island troops were not only among the first to respond but they were apparently the best prepared. Washington Irving in his "Life of Washington" wrote:

> One of the encampments, however, was in striking contrast with the rest, and might vie with the British for order and exactness. Here were tents and marquees pitched in the English style; soldiers well drilled and well equipped; everything had an air of discipline and subordination. It was the body of Rhode Island troops, which had been raised, drilled, and brought to the camp by Brigadier General Greene of that Province.

In days of prosperity and luxury patriotic sentiment may lose its keen edge. Let us strive to keep alive our historic past. The knowledge that the light of religious liberty dawned in Rhode Island and that the principles of free democracy there reached, at an early date, a high state of development, must ever be a proud heritage to every citizen of our State.

A Bill To Provide Additional Means of Securing and Protecting the Civil Rights of Persons Within the Jurisdiction of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 4, 1959

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am this week introducing in the House of Representatives a bill which will amend the Civil Rights Act of 1957, by including therein some of the provisions which had been proposed in my previous bill in the 85th Congress, specifically the antilynching provision.

The legislation introduced at that time contained the 4-point program of the President, and, in addition, four other provisions, among them the strengthening of basic civil rights statutes by increasing punishment where death or maiming result from violation of these statutes.

During the hearings several years ago, some of our colleagues had suggested that there be a moratorium on a strong antilynching provision. Unfortunately, such a provision was not included in the bill as finally enacted, and recent happenings in Mississippi prove that now is not the time for a moratorium.

The entire country, and indeed the entire world, was horrified by the tragic demonstration of mob violence in Poplarville, Miss., and I am sure that the many justified protests against such a brutal and heinous crime are echoed by men and women of good conscience throughout the country.

We cannot assure that legislation of this nature will prevent the recurrence of such ruthless acts, but, as in the case of the Federal laws against kidnaping, the statute called for would certainly serve as a deterrent to those who would commit these atrocities.

Our Constitution is one of the greatest documents in the history of the world, and guarantees the protection of his life, property, and civil rights to each and every citizen, regardless of his race, creed, color or national origin. It is morally right that freedom apply equally to all Americans, and if we are to continue to preach democracy, freedom and equality

to the rest of the world, we must practice what we preach. When our own house is swept and clean, then and only then will these goals have true meaning.

It is most important that we prove to the world, particularly to those nations behind the Iron Curtain, and those on the brink, that the United States is a land where freedom and individual rights are respected and protected by the highest standards of justice. We cannot and must not countenance defiance of what is legally and morally right. We have a wonderful and enviable heritage to maintain, and it is up to us in the Congress to fulfill our responsibilities of leadership and to enact strong laws which will guarantee these basic rights, and wipe out the shame and disgrace all decent Americans experience when these acts of violence are perpetrated against our fellow citizens.

In the light of recent developments, I cannot overemphasize the importance of strengthening our Civil Rights Act, and I urge my colleagues to join with me in this move to restore our national pride.

The text of the bill follows:

A BILL TO PROVIDE ADDITIONAL MEANS OF SECURING AND PROTECTING THE CIVIL RIGHTS OF PERSONS WITHIN THE JURISDICTION OF THE UNITED STATES

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the Congress hereby finds that, despite the continuing progress of our Nation with respect to protection of the rights of individuals, the civil rights of some persons within the jurisdiction of the United States are being denied, abridged, or threatened, and that such infringements upon the American principle of freedom and equality endanger our form of government and are destructive of the basic doctrine of the integrity and dignity of the individual upon which this Nation was founded and which distinguishes it from the totalitarian nations. The Congress recognizes that it is essential to the national security and the general welfare that this gap between principle and practice be closed; and that more adequate protection of the civil rights of individuals must be provided to preserve our American heritage, halt the undermining of our constitutional guarantees, and prevent serious damage to our moral, social, economic, and political life, and to our international relations.

(b) The Congress, therefore, declares that it is its purpose to strengthen and secure the civil rights of the people of the United States under the Constitution, and that it is the national policy to protect the right of the individual to be free from discrimination based upon race, color, religion, or national origin.

(c) The Congress further declares that the succeeding provisions of this Act are necessary for the following purposes:

(1) To insure the more complete and full enjoyment by all persons of the rights, privileges, and immunities secured and protected by the Constitution of the United States, and to enforce the provisions of the Constitution.

(2) To safeguard to the several States of the United States a republican form of government from the lawless conduct of persons threatening to destroy the several systems of public criminal justice and frustrate the functioning thereof through duly constituted officials.

(3) To promote universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all, without distinction as to race or religion, in accordance with the undertaking of the United States under the United Nations Charter, and to further the national policy in that regard by securing to all persons under the jurisdiction of the United States effective recognition of certain of the rights and freedoms proclaimed by the General Assembly of the United Nations in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

(d) To the end that these policies may be effectively carried out by a positive program of Federal action the provisions of this Act are enacted.

SEC. 2. The Civil Rights Act of 1957 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"PART VI—CREATION OF A JOINT CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE ON CIVIL RIGHTS

"SEC. 171. There is established a Joint Committee on Civil Rights (hereinafter called the 'Joint Committee'), to be composed of seven Members of the Senate, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and seven Members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The party representation on the joint committee shall as nearly as may be feasible reflect the relative membership of the majority and minority parties in the Senate and House of Representatives.

"SEC. 172. It shall be the function of the Joint Committee to make a continuing study of matters relating to civil rights, including the rights, privileges, and immunities secured and protected by the Constitution and laws of the United States; to study means of improving respect for and enforcement of civil rights; and to advise with the several committees of the Congress dealing with legislaiton relating to civil rights.

"SEC. 173. Vacancies in the membership of the Joint Committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the Joint Committee and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original selection. The Joint Committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members.

"SEC. 174. The Joint Committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such places and times, to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, and to take such testimony as it deems advisable. The provisions of sections 102 to 104, inclusive, of the Revised Statutes, as amended (2 U.S.C. 192, 193, 194), shall apply in case of any failure of any witness to comply with a subpena or to testify when summoned under authority of this section. Within the limitations of its appropriations, the Joint Committee is empowered to appoint and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, technicians, and clerical and stenographic assistance, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as, in its discreiton, it deems necessary and advisable.

"SEC. 175. Funds appropriated to the Joint Committee shall be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate on vouchers signed by the chairman and vice chairman.

"SEC. 176. The Joint Committee may constitute such advisory committees and may consult with such representatives of State and local governments and private organizations as it deems advisable.

"PART VII—PROHIBITION AGAINST DISCRIMINATION OR SEGREGATION IN INTERSTATE TRANSPORTATION

"SEC. 181. (a) All persons traveling within the jurisdiction of the United States shall be entitled to the full and equal enjoyment of the accommodations, advantages, and privileges of any public conveyance operated by a common carrier engaged in interstate or foreign commerce, and all the facilities furnished or connected therewith, subject only to conditions and limitations applicable alike to all persons, without discrimination or segregation based on race, color, religion, or national origin.

"(b) Whoever, whether acting in a private, public, or official capacity, denies or attempts to deny to any person traveling within the jurisdiction of the United States the full and equal enjoyment of any accommodation, advantage, or privilege of a public conveyance operated by a common carrier engaged in interstate or foreign commerce, except for reasons applicable alike to all persons of every race, color, religion, or national origin, or whoever incites or otherwise participates in such denial or attempt, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall, upon conviction, be subject to a fine of not to exceed $1,000 for each offense, and shall also be subject to suit by the injured person or by his estate, in an action at law, suit in equity, or other proper proceeding for damages or preventive or declaratory or other relief. Such suit or proceeding may be brought in any district court of the United States as constituted by chapter 5 of title 28, United States Code (28 U.S.C. 81 et seq.), or the United States court of any Territory or other place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, without regard to the sum or value of the matter in controversy, or in any State or Territorial court of competent jurisdiction.

"SEC. 182. It shall be unlawful for any common carrier engaged in interstate or foreign commerce, or any officer, agent, or employee thereof, to segregate, or attempt to segregate, or otherwise discriminate against passengers using any public conveyance or facility of such carrier engaged in interstate or foreign commerce, on account of the race, color, religion, or national origin of such passengers. Any such carrier or officer, agent, or employee thereof who segregates or attempts to segregate such passengers or otherwise discriminate against them on account of race, color, religion, or national origin shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall, upon conviction, be subject to a fine of not to exceed $1,000 for each offense, and shall also be subject to suit by the injured person in an action at law, suit in equity, or other proper proceeding for damages or preventive or declaratory of other relief. Such suit or proceeding may be brought in any district court of the United States as constituted by chapter 5 of title 28, United States Code (28 U.S.C. 81 et seq.), or the United State court of any Territory or other place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, without regard to the sum or value of the matter in controversy, or in any State or Territorial court of competent jurisdiction."

SEC. 3. (a) Sections 241 and 242 of title 18, United States Code, are amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 241. Conspiracy against civil rights; interference with such rights

"(a) If two or more persons conspire to injure, oppress, threaten, or intimidate any inhabitant of any State, Territory, or District in the free exercise or enjoyment of any right or privilege secured to him by the Constitution or laws of the United States, or because of his having so exercised the same; or

"If two or more persons go in disguise on the highway, or on the premises of another, with intent to prevent or hinder his free exercise of enjoyment of any right or privilege so secured, they shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than ten years, or both.

"(b) If any person injures, oppresses, threatens, or intimidates any inhabitant of any State, Territory, or District in the free exercise or enjoyment of any right or privilege secured to him by the Constitution or

laws of the United States, or because of his having so exercised the same; or

"If any person goes in disguise on the highway, or on the premises of another, with intent to prevent or hinder his free exercise or enjoyment of any right or privilege so secured, such person shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both; or shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than twenty years, or both, if the injury or other wrongful conduct herein shall cause the death or maiming of the person so injured or wronged.

"(c) Any person or persons violating the provisions of subsections (a) and (b) of this section shall be subject to suit by the party injured, or by his estate, in an action at law, suit in equity, or other proper proceeding for damages or preventive or declaratory or other relief. The district courts, concurrently with State and Territorial courts, shall have jurisdiction of all proceedings under this subsection without regard to the sum or value of the matter in controversy. The term 'district courts' includes any district court of the United States as constituted by chapter 5 of title 28, United States Code (28 U.S.C. 81 et seq.), and the United States court of any Territory or other place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States.
States.

"§ 242. Deprivation of rights under color of law

"Whoever, under color of any law, statute, ordinance, regulation, or custom, willfully subjects, or causes to be subjected, any inhabitant of any State, Territory, or District to the depreviation of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured or protected by the Constitution and laws of the United States, or to different punishments, pains, or penalties, on account of such inhabitant being an alien, or by erason of his color or race, than are prescribed for the punishment of citizens, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both; or shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than 20 years, or both, if the deprivation, different punishment, or other wrongful conduct herein shall cause the death or maiming of the person so injured or wronged."

(b) Chapter 13 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding after section 242 thereof the following new section:

"§ 242A. Enumeration of certain civil rights

"The rights, privileges, and immunities referred to in section 242 of this title shall be deemed to include, but shall not be limited to, the following:

"(1) The right to be immune from exactions of fines, or deprivations of property, without due process of law.

"(2) The right to be immune from punishment for crime or alleged criminal offenses except after a fair trial and upon conviction and sentence pursuant to due process of law.

"(3) The right to be immune from physical violence applied to exact testimony or to compel confession of crime or alleged offenses.

"(4) The right to be free of illegal restraint of the person.

"(5) The right to protection of person and property without discrimination by reason of race, color, religion, or national origin.

"(6) The right to vote as protected by Federal law."

(c) The analysis of chapter 13 of title 18, United States Code, immediately preceding section 241, is amended as follows:

(1) Strike out—

"241. Conspiracy against rights of citizens."

and insert the following—

"241. Conspiracy against civil rights; interference with such rights."

(2) Immediately after—

"242. Deprivation of rights under color of law."

insert the following—

"242A. Enumeration of certain civil rights."

SEC. 4. Section 1980 of the Revised Statutes (42 U.S.C. 1985) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"Fourth. The several district courts of the United States are invested with jurisdiction to prevent and restrain acts or practices which would give rise to a cause of action pursuant to the first, second, and third paragraphs of this section, and it shall be the duty of the Attorney General to institute proceedings to prevent and restraint such acts or practices."

On Polish Constitution Day: Tribute to a Brave Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SILVIO O. CONTE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 29, 1959

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, today we take appropriate notice of a great day in the history of Poland—the 3d of May, the date of the great Polish Constitution, the first democratic constitution in the world.

This document guaranteed to all Poles, regardless of their class or rank, whether they were peasant or merchant, laymen or clergy, the great rights of equality, freedom of conscience, religion and speech, and a share in the Government for every citizen. This constitution was to be revised every 25 years. It was an ideal constitution, a forerunner of our modern democracy, and later it was used as a model by nations seeking to perfect their own way of government.

We all know that great tragedies which befell the Polish Nation and her brave people. But we know too that, despite the sufferings of invasions, partitions, and occupations, the desire for liberty has always remained strong in the hearts of the Polish people.

It was this longing for freedom—so often unattainable in their homeland—that brought many Poles to American shores. Poland's loss was to be America's gain. Once in this country they assisted us in our struggle for independence.

Ever since the American Revolution, Polish blood has been shed for American liberty. Thaddeus Kosciuszko, Casimir Pulaski, and hundreds of other Polish patriots fought with the Continental Army.

Americans of Polish descent fought in the Mexican, Civil, and Spanish-American Wars for the preservation of liberty. More recently in World War I, 300,000, and in World War II over 900,000 served to make our country secure.

Not only did Polish-Americans contribute to the security of our land, but they also aided in its development. These Polish immigrants came to this country endowed with a capacity for industry and love of God. Their assiduousness contributed to the growth of America. They assisted in the cultivation of our soil, in the construction of our railways, in the development of our coal, iron, and copper mines and in the expansion of our industries. Their religious faith made them peaceful, honest, and loyal American citizens. In addition, their cultural achievements have become an integral part of the varied culture of America.

It is appropriate on this anniversary of Polish Constitution Day that all Americans express their appreciation to the Polish-Americans for their contributions to the defense and development of our country.

At the same time all Americans should take this opportunity to reiterate their deep concern for the brave people of Poland who are deprived of freedom today. We want to assure these courageous men and women that we will never enter into any agreement with the masters of the Kremlin which will legalize and help to perpetuate the enslavement of the Polish Nation.

Until these men and women, who have so clearly shown their deep love for freedom, are free to choose their own way of government and live without fear of political persecution, we in America cannot enjoy our freedom to the fullest extent. For our hearts are burdened by the knowledge of the burden carried by our fellow men in Poland and the other brave nations now under Soviet control. In the deepest sense, their struggle must be our struggle, and our freedom will only be perfect when we have won for them the precious freedom for which they have struggled so long and courageously.

Increased Medical Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT ZELENKO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 29, 1959

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to provide funds for increased medical research by the National Institutes of Health, without adding to the Federal Budget or increasing the Federal deficit.

The bill will authorize the Postmaster General to issue a specially designed stamp of 4-cent denomination that would be sold to the public at a price of 6 cents. Purchase and use of this stamp would be strictly voluntary.

Two cents of each sale would be segregated by the Postmaster General as trustee of a national health research fund and turned over to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for use, as a gift from the American public, for additional research in cancer, mental health, heart disease, arthritis, and other of the medical research needs of the National Institutes of Health.

This bill would make it possible for over 170 million Americans to contribute directly and substantially toward medical research and to add their gifts to the funds now being spent by governmental and private agencies. At a trifling cost, the purchasers of these stamps, which will be usable as the equivalent of all U.S. postage stamps of equal denomination, would each add his or her might to the intensive efforts now being made by American scientists, doctors, and researchers, and have an important individual part in the medical discoveries that will result from this public fund. This mass contribution should amount to about $10 million a year.

Everyone receiving a letter bearing this distinctively designed stamp would know that the sender is playing a vital role in a total national effort for the improved health and well-being of all humanity.

This legislation was suggested to me by Mr. Paul Taubman, of New York, eminent composer and owner of the famous Steinway stamp collection.

By means of this law many millions of persons who do not earn enough to make substantial contributions toward worthy health projects can thus, in their small monetary but great charitable attitudes, render assistance toward medical research. I urge the passage of this legislation.

Resolutions on Disarmament and Nuclear Bomb Testing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. BURNS
DELEGATE FROM HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 4, 1959

Mr. BURNS of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, the Hawaii Mission of the Methodist Church, at its 54th session, concluded on March 9, 1959, adopted two resolutions with reference to disarmament and nuclear bomb testing. The Methodist Church of Hawaii has a distinguished record of service to the community. The resolutions adopted represent the serious thinking on matters of general concern which has characterized their contributions to the community. I wish to commend to the attention of the Members of Congress the care and concern of my constituents in the subject matter of the resolutions:

RESOLUTION ON DISARMAMENT

Whereas we believe that God, who is sovereign over nations and peoples, has made of one blood every nation of men, and wills that men should live together in an order of freedom and justice, and at peace with one another; and

Whereas we know today that if either the United States or the Soviet Union should commit its full power to all-out international war, mutual destruction would ensue; great cities would lie in ruins; whole populations would be destroyed; a radioactive plague would settle on the earth; and the well-being, perhaps even the existence of future generations would be placed in grave jeopardy; and

Whereas the lifting of the burden of the armaments race would not only serve to alleviate the fears that too often stifle international cooperation and lead to war but would have enormous economic benefits as well: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we plead with our Federal Government to continue discussions aimed toward universal disarmament by multilateral agreements no matter how difficult and trying the task may be, always determined to know that the only alternative left in case any given conference breaks down is a renewal of negotiations and never a renewal of arms race which would only lead to mutual suicide.

Adopted this 7th day of March 1959.

HAWAII MISSION, THE METHODIST CHURCH, 54TH SESSION,
——— ———, *Secretary.*

RESOLUTION ON NUCLEAR BOMB TESTING

Whereas a significant number of eminent scientists in the field of nuclear physics are deeply concerned over the increased danger of radioactive fallout resulting from tests of modern weapons of war; and

Whereas they agree, on the basis of certain facts gathered from previous bomb tests, that radiation is a very serious biological threat both to those living now and to generations yet unborn; and

Whereas the testing of modern weapons, because of their hideous destructiveness, produces an atmosphere of fear and distrust and thus jeopardizes our opportunities for a peaceful settlement of differences between nations: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we call upon our Territorial Legislature to ask the Congress of the United States to forgo all such tests while making every effort to secure reliable agreements from other nations to do the same, and be it further resolved that we ask our Government to continue and even intensify research that has to do with peaceful use of nuclear power.

Adopted this 7th day of March 1959.

HAWAII MISSION, METHODIST CHURCH, 54TH SESSION.
——— ———, *Secretary.*

Rural Development Workshop

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 4, 1959

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I wish to call attention to an important national meeting that will be held at the Jackson's Mill State 4–H Camp in my district, May 11 to 15. During that week, State and county leaders in the national rural development program will come together in workshop sessions to evaluate the program and discuss improved methods of moving forward with county, area, and State projects. Thirty States participating in the rural development program will be represented at the meeting, as will the cooperating Federal agencies.

According to present plans, leaders from the States will compare experiences and develop methods and procedures for further implementing and improving the program. State delegations, upon their return to their respective States, will provide similar training to their county workers. In other words, this will be a "how to do it" type of workshop.

Among other objectives will be a review of experiences to date in the various States; identification of the most common problems and the most productive procedures for conducting rural development work in the States and counties.

It will be a work conference in the strictest sense, with a minimum of formal presentations. The talks or presentations will be in the areas where the people from the States have signified a need for help.

The Jackson's Mill workshop on rural development marks an important milestone in the progress of this national program. Out of the 5-day conference should come a clearer understanding of what can be done within the framework of present programs to promote the economic development of the Nation's rural areas, small towns, and rural communities.

The workshop should act as a seedbed of ideas, generating many new and more effective development efforts in rural areas throughout the Nation. My district is honored to be selected as the site of this important meeting.

Textile Workers Union of America Maintains That Economic Situation in Massachusetts Would Be Improved by Enactment of H.R. 4488 and S. 1046

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 4, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the estimates by the research department of the AFL–CIO, showing the impact of the proposed improvements in the Federal wage and hour law on the economy of Massachusetts, as submitted to me by Mr. J. William Belanger, New England regional director of the Textile Workers Union of America:

TEXTILE WORKERS UNION OF AMERICA,
Boston, Mass., April 23, 1959.

Hon. THOMAS J. LANE,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. LANE: The research department of the AFL–CIO has just issued estimates showing the impact of the proposed improvements in the Federal wage and hour law on the economy of our State. I feel you will want to have these figures in connection with your study of the pending legislation.

In Massachusetts, an increase in the minimum wage to $1.25 and extension of coverage to unprotected workers, as provided in the Kennedy (S. 1046), Roosevelt (H.R. 4488) bills would require raises for an estimated 165,000 low-paid workers.

The required increase in total wage and salary payrolls in Massachusetts would be slightly over one-half of 1 percent.

Although small as a proportion of total payroll, the increase would be a considerable

addition to the purchasing power of the State's lower-income families. In dollar terms, the increase in purchasing power for Massachusetts' low-income workers would be an estimated $50 million a year.

You will understand, of course, that not all the low-income workers in any State can be reached by Federal legislation. And if you will study the terms of S. 1046 and H.R. 4488 you will find that there has been a specific exemption of small businesses, especially retail establishments, in the coverage section of the legislation.

Permit me to emphasize the fact that the problem of low-wage competition, particularly in the consumer goods fields, apparel, textiles, etc., is once again becoming very severe. We in New England are being hurt by the South, as well as other regions of the country. In addition, we have the problem of substandard operations right within our own State and in adjoining States. I refer to the type of operator who leases a closed textile plant, for instance, and, taking advantage of the plight of stranded workers, pays wages close to the absolute minimum allowed by law. One way to lessen the danger of this type of vicious exploitation is to increase the minimum wage.

It is our earnest hope that hearings on this legislation can be held within the next couple of weeks and thereafter brought to the floor of the Senate and House as promptly as possible. The economic situation in Massachusetts and in New England demands the earliest possible action on S. 1046 and H.R. 4488.

J. WILLIAM BELANGER.

Liberty Trees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURR P. HARRISON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 4, 1959

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, in 1775, Thomas Paine wrote a poem, "Liberty Tree," in which we find the lines:

From the East to the West blow the trumpet to arms,
Thor' the land let the sound of it flee:
Let the far and the near all unite with a cheer,
In the defense of our Liberty Tree.

Drawing their inspiration from Paine's words, the Junior Chamber of Commerce of Strasburg, Va., has undertaken the distribution of liberty trees, American white pine seedlings planted in red, white, and blue pots with soil taken from Jamestown, Bunker Hill, the Alamo, Valley Forge, Yorktown, and the historic Shenandoah Valley.

Tomorrow, Tuesday, May 5, the Strasburg Jaycees will visit the offices of each Member of this House to present one of these trees. A similar distribution is planned in the other body.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include an outline of the program, as follows:

The liberty tree program is a patriotic, nonprofit project of the Strasburg Junior Chamber of Commerce. It is designed to stimulate a greater appreciation of the American heritage and the privileges of American citizenship. As a part of this program the Jaycees in cooperation with selected members of the Strasburg High School will present to schoolchildren historical sketches on great leaders of the Revolutionary period, emphasizing their devotion to their country and their contribution to the American democratic system. Historical sketches to be presented this year are on the following: George Washington, Alexander Hamilton, Thomas Jefferson, Patrick Henry, and Nathan Hale.

Proceeds from the sale of liberty trees, after project costs, will be used to further patriotic instruction in the public schools, and establishing a scholarship, or grant fund, to render assistance to some college student, sophomore or above, majoring in history, and contemplating entering a career of teaching. This award will be made without regard to race, color, or creed. This fund is entitled the "Nathan Hale Fund."

Special acknowledgement and thanks are extended to the following persons and institutions for their assistance in furnishing soil samples used with each liberty tree:

1. The Jamestown Foundation with offices in Williamsburg, Va., and Theresa N. Freeman, staff member.
2. Capt. Arthur J. Reinstein, of the Metropolitan Police force, Boston, Mass.
3. Edith Simpson Halter, hostess-historian, the Alamo, San Antonio, Tex.
4. E. C. Pyle, superintendent, Valley Forge Park, Valley Forge, Pa.
5. Colonial National Historical Park, Yorktown, Va.

Mr. Speaker, I also include an inspirational message, written by John O. Marsh, Jr., the project director, which is included in a leaflet accompanying each tree.

THE THEME OF THE LIBERTY TREE

I am a liberty tree, and although I am just like the millions of American white pine seedlings planted in good American dirt across the length and breadth of our land, I am different. You see, I am a bit of your heritage, a part of your country, the spirit of America.

Let me tell you about the soil in which I grow, and as you learn my history perhaps you shall learn some of your country's, and I hope love your land more by its retelling. The bulk of it is from the Shenandoah Valley. George Washington passed over, or near it, many times as a young surveyor, and it has been suffering and sacrifice as your country was molded and reshaped by fire. Across this ground echoed the Rebel yell and the rumbling of Blue and Gray artillery.

Around my roots is the beginning of the patriot's dream—Jamestown Island, and though they, that brave handful of Englishmen who established their country's first permanent ettlement in the New World, could not see, nor imagine the fruits of what they began there, yet all the ingredients of their new country's greatness were present—hope, courage, sacrifice, fear, sugering, and a longing of freedom that made them journey here. Time and time again these ingredients of greatness reappear in the fabric of our heritage to create an American shrine as a tribute to its peoples' love of country. It is in the soil of some of these shrines I grow.

With me is a little of Bunker Hill, where wave after wave of British Redcoats in perfect cadence moved up its slopes, time and time again, to face the withering, decimating fire of colonial militiamen who would not flee and whose lines did not break, and when finally forced to withdraw they left an example and an inspiration to men who fought for the cause of liberty.

It was the same kind of raw courage that was to sustain your forefathers at the Alamo where your country was given a battle cry and a lesson in great sacrifice, so I'm glad part of the Alamo will help sustain me.

I want you to realize that this independence you enjoy, and, I am sure, love more than you often demonstrate, was not once so easily assured, but that hope was tried by despair; faith challenged by adversity. And to remind me of duty if in the face of misery; hunger in a land of plenty; cold in a nation of comfort, there is a touch of ground from General Washington's encampment at Valley Forge.

Victory is with me—Yorktown, where your liberty was won; but not without the help of others—here the French. From this great battlefield your ancestors were to return to their homes to build a growing expanding America in such seemingly far away places as New York, Connecticut, Georgia and all the other colonies. And America, the magnificence of which was beyond the patriot's wildest dream; but from Yorktown they marched in humility born of duty, unaware of the greatness they had done there, oblivious to the gratitude of posterity.

That's my story, it is the spirit of America; it is why I am part of your heritage. I hope you will plant me, care for me, help me grow, and as you see me, perhaps for just a moment, you will remember the soil in which I live, and what your forefathers did there to give you your country, and to make me a liberty tree.

Farmer Stanley Yankus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE E. SHIPLEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 4, 1959

Mr. SHIPLEY. Mr. Speaker, many of us have been reading the past several months about one Stanley Yankus, the farmer who owned and operated a farm in the great State of Michigan. He received a lot of support when the Government levied a $5,072 fine against him because he planted 35 acres of wheat on his farm when they had ordered him to plant only 15 acres. In receiving this attention, he has made a lot of friends. But when I picked up the Washington Post Friday, May 1, 1959, I read the following: "Farm Rebel Yankus To Go to Australia."

It is said that his decision was made primarily for his two sons, Russell, 13, Dennis, 11, and daughter, Karen, 3, and he has sold his farm and plans to leave the United States within 30 days. He has said that he thinks freedom has a greater future in Australia than in the United States. Stanley Yankus thinks that he has been done a great injustice by our Government, because he was penalized by one of the laws of this country. Has he forgotten or is he ignoring all the other laws that have protected and helped him so much? Is he going to ignore all the freedoms that he has had in this country, because he simply does not like or does not believe in one law and only one law. Every country must have laws to protect its people and economy, and so forth, but because of one law that he does not like he is willing to forsake the United States for a new country. Has he forgotten that the draft law is a law that many people do not like? Has he forgotten the mothers and fathers who lost their sons because of this law? Has he forgotten the income

tax law, which none of us particularly enjoy, but we accept it as part of the great freedoms that we enjoy here. Now because of one law he has decided to tuck his tail and run.

Has Stanley Yankus thought about how the Communist Party and the Kremlin will contort, misrepresent, and blow his picture up in other countries as a man who was abused so terribly by our Government that he has given up this country. Has he thought of the injustice he is doing to the United States by making this decision. This country has given him more opportunities as a freeman than any country in the world, and yet he is so quick to denounce and stain this Government which has been so kind to him and his family and the millions of others who live here.

If after very careful consideration, his decision still remains the same that he will move to Australia then I say to him take your bags and move out of this country, because you are not worthy to live here. Is he forgetting that only in this country could a farmer, build up his farm and prosper the way he has and then be able to sell this farm for $30,000.

Another privilege that he is enjoying is the fact that he can leave this country any time he wishes. This is another law we have here and he is not hesitant about accepting it. I think he should be ashamed to turn away from a country that has been so kind to him in so many ways and his given him so much. He is running away from the problem. Where is his backbone and his stamina? Where is his fight? Is not this country worth fighting for, Stanley Yankus? The parents who had sons killed in our past wars did not move out of this country because they disagreed with the draft law. They stayed here and continued to fight for and enjoy the freedoms this country has to offer. They did not turn and tuck their tails and run like a scared hound dog.

"Mr. Yankus, if you honestly and sincerely believe that freedom has a better future in Australia, why are you retaining your U.S. citizenship for 5 years? Are you afraid that you are wrong or do you know that you are wrong and intend to come back.

"If you sincerely believe what you have said about the United States, Stanley Yankus, I say to you, pack your bags, get on the plane and relinquish your U.S. citizenship, because you have no right here."

Revelry in the Face of Danger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 4, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in my extension of remarks, I include a timely and thought-provoking article, by Ralph McGill, and appearing in the Washington Post of April 30, 1959. Pretty much the same situation existed in our country in the period immediately preceding World War II. I hope Mr. McGill's optimism, as expressed in the last paragraph of his article will, if conflict comes prove to be correct.

It is hard to convince some persons—too many—that the best way to avert conflict and war is to be powerfully strong militarily, particularly in the area of military research and development, before the fact, and to have sound policies and firm leadership.

It is most important in the face of imminent danger to note the too large percentage of people who take the easy road, responding to and thinking in terms of hope alone, rather than the hard way, of viewing the present world situation from a rational and realistic angle.

To respond to hope is natural and we should think in terms of hope but to hope for the best, but be prepared for the worst.

Interpreting Mr. McGill's timely warning, that is what he urges.

REVELRY IN THE FACE OF DANGER—THOUGH MANY SEEK TO ESCAPE CRISIS BY IGNORING IT, HOPE IS SEEN

(By Ralph McGill)

A friend of mine from New York, whose trade is to work in that nebulous but exacting field called public relations, and whose further chore it is to entertain various clients whose bents run often to night clubs and the like, came to see me.

He looked haggard and there was no bounce in his step, and the bounce, as one and all know, is a necessary attribute to a man whose task it is to bring sweetness and light and mutual admiration where none, or little, before existed.

"I never saw such a frantic season," he said. "Night clubs in New York are doing well and in New Orleans the Bourbon Street strip and jazz joints are jumping with persons energetically seeking recreation. It fretted me because they were working so desperately hard at it."

He paused and sighed from way down deep. "I wrote something down for you," he said, and took from his pocket a sheet of folded paper. He read from it:

"With the enemy's approach to Moscow, the Muscovites' view of their situation did not grow more serious, but on the contrary became even more frivolous, as always happens with people who see a great danger approaching. At the approach of danger there are always two voices that speak with equal power in the human soul: One very reasonably tells a man to consider the nature of the danger and the means of escaping it; the other, still more reasonably, says that it is too depressing and painful to thing of the danger, since it is not in man's power to foresee everything and avert the general course of events, and it's better therefore to disregard what is painful till it comes, and to think about what is pleasant. In solitude a man generally listens to the first voice, but in society to the second. So it was now with the inhabitants of Moscow. It was long since people had been as gay in Moscow as that year."

"I won't ask you to be a quiz kid," he said. "That's from Tolstoy's 'War and Peace,' and the antics of myself and my fellow man over the weekend impressed it upon me."

I reached over to a shelf and get Byron's poem, "Waterloo," which deals also with a later event in the history of Napoleon. It begins:

"There was a sound of revelry by night,
And Belgium's capital had gathered then
Her beauty and her chivalry, and bright
The lamps shone o'er fair women and brave men;
A thousand hearts beat happily, and when
Music arose with its voluptuous swell,
Soft eyes looked love to eyes which spake again,
And all went merry as a marriage bell:
But, hush, hark! A deep sound strikes like a rising knell!"

It was the beginning of Waterloo and the destruction of the Napoleonic power.

This human, but nonetheless curious, effort to escape from the reality of a situation was never better illustrated than in the Confederate capital city of Richmond in the last anguished months before it fell. Mrs. Mary Boykin Chestnut's "Diary From Dixie" reports its frivolous, almost frantic, attempt to disregard what is painful until it comes.

Today many Americans are heeding what Tolstoy called "the second voice." They squirm away from the reality of the sacrifice in taxes and goods which must be made. They try to find an escape in criticism and doubting.

But there are enough who will face the issues to solve them. There is within the Republic the will and intelligence to find ways and means to meet the threat which is of war, yet not war alone, but war plus a fanatic ideology appealing to millions long without food, direction, education, information, or any concept of order. Those who insist on listening to that "second voice" are just the extra weight we must carry into the fight.

Asbury Park, N.J., Observed Loyalty Day, Sunday, May 3, 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1959

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, May 3, 1959, Post No. 1333 of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States of Asbury Park, N.J., sponsored its third annual Loyalty Day parade with some 10,000 participants from all over northern New Jersey. In addition to the parade Post No. 1333 of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States turned over to the city of Asbury Park a beautiful memorial which included a water fountain located in the community park.

This great demonstration of loyalty was witnessed by hundreds of the residents of Asbury Park and vicinity and it was my pleasure to deliver the principal address for the occasion which follows:

LOYALTY DAY ADDRESS BY REPRESENTATIVE JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, 20TH DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA, SUNDAY, MAY 3, 1959, 2:30 P.M., ASBURY PARK, N.J.

It is an honor to have been invited to participate in your annual Loyalty Day program which this year has nationwide significance since 1959 marks the first time the observance has been sanctioned permanently by the U.S. Government under Public Law 85-429, approved July 18, 1958.

As many of you know, it was my privilege for several years to introduce legislation in Congress annually designating May 1 as Loyalty Day.

Last year, it was possible through approval of House Joint Resolution 479, which I sponsored in the House of Representatives, to have the observance of Loyalty Day on the 1st day of May each year made permanent.

The department of New Jersey Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States has been among the pioneers in VFW circles on the east coast that inaugurated the observance of Loyalty Day over 10 years ago.

The VFW sponsorship of Loyalty Day was enthusiastically received and was accorded national recognition by receipt of seven consecutive awards from Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge.

The awards included the top award of the George Washington Honor Medal for the 1955 program and the foundation's highest recognition in 1953, 1954, 1955, and 1956—the distinguished service scroll for winning the fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh awards.

As many of you know, it has been my privilege on several occasions to speak in New Jersey during the observance of annual Loyalty Day programs sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars and supported by city, county, and State officials and other patriotic organizations.

This splendid community cooperation has made possible the success of Loyalty Day programs in the past and now that May 1 has all the aspects of a national holiday, it is no longer a VFW-sponsored observance but, in fact, is now officially approved by the U.S. Government and thus is deemed worthy of universal recognition and patriotic support.

It is always a pleasure to return to New Jersey because in my official capacity as commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States for three successive terms, I visited this great State on numerous occasions and, as a result, bonds of friendship were formed which have grown stronger down through the years.

Therefore I am enjoying this opportunity to once again visit my many friends in the Garden State.

It is indicative of the community spirit sweeping America in connection with Loyalty Day programs to observe that today's program is made possible by the zealous efforts of the third annual Loyalty Day parade committee comprised of representatives of the city of Asbury Park, the county of Monmouth, together with the district posts of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the American Legion and their respective ladies' auxiliaries.

The fine parade and the excellent program marking the 1959 observance of Loyalty Day in this community have earned the warmest commendation for all organizations and committees which have labored hard to achieve the success that has been attained.

Loyalty Day gives all Americans an appropriate occasion to lay stress on our blessings as free people at a time when the Kremlin is staging worldwide demonstrations and proclaiming that Russia is a workers' paradise.

It has been truly said that "loyalty means liberty" and since loyalty is everybody's job, it behoves all red-blooded Americans to maintain a vigilant attitude and to speak out in no uncertain terms against the danger of subversive forces within and the peril of international gangsterism without.

We should heed the admonition of Mr. David Sarnoff, chairman of the board of directors of the Radio Corp. of America, who said in speaking of loyalty in an address on Veterans' Day 1958, "loyalty to our country is loyalty to ourselves."

To Mr. Sarnoff's timely advice I should like to add that what we need as a people in providing inspiration and strength is a double-barreled dose of good old-fashioned patriotism.

To many people in the United States patriotism has become outdated and nationalistic.

The custom of displaying the Stars and Stripes proudly before the home on national holidays is almost a thing of the past.

Today the Communists of America as well as of the world are working harder than ever to bring America under the spell of the Kremlin dictators.

Only recently a top American official said that more espionage agents are at work in America today than any time in our history.

On Red May Day in the Red Square of Moscow, Nikita Khrushchev praised the Communist world and spread the Communist propaganda of the day.

His statements were publicized throughout the universe and carried on the front pages of the world press.

As usual the American people and our goal of world peace were held up to ridicule, by the Kremlin's No. 1 propagandist.

Mind you, even in the face of the Kremlin's brutal attacks on our Government and way of life, we have some Americans who are content to sit idly by and call patriotism outdated and nationalistic.

Yes, this same group are the ones who say we should not worry about Communists and ignore their constant efforts to destroy us as a nation.

Now let us talk frankly about our arch enemy, communism.

It is a deadly enemy. It is a deadly enemy because never for a moment does it abandon its two basic aims: to remake man, and to conquer the world.

It is particularly our enemy—not because we so choose, but because it has chosen us as its prime target.

Communism regards the strength and the way of life of the United States as the chief obstacle to its plan to remake its own people and to remake the world in the image of its blueprint.

Yes. We have been picked as enemy No. 1. No matter what President Eisenhower says or does, no matter whether the Secretary of State conducts himself with tact or tactlessness, no matter how well the tourist behaves when he visits the Soviet Union, nevertheless, we will still be enemy No. 1.

Whether our working class is prosperous, or hungry and jobless, or jobless and not hungry, we will still be enemy No. 1.

Whether we treat racial minorities decently, or indecently—we will still be enemy No. 1.

Whether we pull out of Berlin, Quemoy, or the Middle East or do not pull out of Berlin, Quemoy, or the Middle East we cannot disengage ourselves from this enemy.

Let us not listen to the siren song of those who tell us that we can get a release of tensions and a little peace in our time if we only disengage ourselves.

If we disengage ourselves we leave another strip of land to be occupied—a new place from which battle will begin.

Ladies and gentlemen, the Communists know, to be sure, that they cannot conquer us. They know a lot about our economic and military strength. And with this knowledge they do not covet for a moment the risks of all-out war with us.

There are two things which the Communists are determined with all of their might to avoid: One is all-out war—the other is all-out peace.

In their clever and deceitful manner they will keep us involved in this cold war as long as they have the power to do so.

Frankly, they do not wish an all-out war because they believe that time and history are on their side.

Let me repeat again, ladies and gentlemen, the Communists have picked us as enemy No. 1, and in so doing they have singled us out as the enemy of the things they are trying to do to their people and to their neighbors.

Regardless of the fact that in the Kremlin's eyes America is Russia's No. 1 enemy, the fact remains that not a day passes but that our Government makes a sincere effort to terminate the cold war and usher in an era of just and lasting peace.

In trying to achieve the goal of universal peace it is a significant and deplorable fact that Russia, as a government, lacks national integrity, as evidenced by her long record of broken promises.

Today thereare more demands for American-Soviet talks, and some are already underway.

Unfortunately, the odds are 13 to 1 that every Soviet promise will be broken, and to justify this statement let me remind you that in 1943 four pacts with Russia were signed by an American President, and all four were broken. In 1945 six pacts were signed with Russia, and five were violated.

In 1955 President Eisenhower traveled to Geneva to meet the Russians and the trip was fruitless.

In addition between American and Soviet foreign ministers there have been 426 days of talks since 1943 with these results:

(a) In 1943 three pacts signed and all of them violated by Russia.

(b) In 1945 and 1946 a total of 11 pacts were signed and only one was kept.

(c) In 1947 one pact was signed and Russia violated it.

In the field of disarmament nearly 500 meetings have been held and nothing has been settled as yet.

In fact, they keep asking us back on their terms for another round of so-called conferences.

Thus we see the Communist mentality and the utter lack of integrity on the part of the Kremlin.

The present threat to world peace over Berlin so carefully played up by the Russians should answer those smug Americans who think patriotism is outmoded and who prefer to ignore the fact that we are the No. 1 enemy of ruthless communism whose lack of integrity is evident by the long list of broken promises.

Ladies and gentlemen, involved as we are in a cold war that from the standpoint of cost could destroy us economically, the time for unity has come in meeting the challenge of the Kremlin.

As David Sarnoff said in comparing a cold and a hot war—"We can 'freeze' to death as well as 'burn' to death."

Ladies and gentlemen, this need for national unity must rise above partisan politics—for every American must stand shoulder to shoulder—to let the Red rulers and the world know we are standing firmly against Communist aggression that has plagued the world for 40 years.

In seeking national unity we have a strong ally in Loyalty Day because in its short history it has kindled the fires of partiotism by counteracting the mass demonstrations formerly held by the Communists here in the United States on May Day.

Unquestionably, Loyalty Day has struck the Reds a severe blow.

But, ladies and gentlemen, let us not sit back and bask in past glories but rather make our voices heard around the world, shouting that we are free, loyal, and united Americans, ready to fight if necessary to defend the heritage that has made this country a giant among free nations.

Let us pray that Loyalty Day will inspire, strengthen, and unite us as a nation so that all of us will receive "that double-barreled dose of good old-fashioned patriotism" which I have prescribed.

Such a brand of patriotism will give us a keener and deeper appreciation of our American system of government and those who found and preserved it.

It will continue to inspire us to keep faith with those illustrious Americans who since

the founding of this Republic have given their lives on the altar of freedom.

After all when we as Americans realize the true value of our blessings then we will give full time to promoting an unadulterated type of real love of country.

All of these things, ladies and gentlemen, are part and parcel of the broad field of true patriotism.

I say to you: True patriotism is the most effective antidote to godless communism and the ruthless cold war challenge of Soviet Russia.

By working together to protect, preserve, and to promote American ideals we repay our debt a sa nation to the American way of life that has done more for more people than any form of government yet devised.

One of the most inspiring features of Loyalty Day programs such as your program is the participation of proud Americans whose ancestry may be traced to foreign lands yet who appreciate the precious blessings they enjoy as American citizens.

Loyalty Day definitely provides a time for us to examine and restate in terms of today's needs the rights and responsibilities of American citizenship.

Loyalty Day is a day which should bring us to our feet to salute the flag of our country.

Also, it should awaken us to a state of continual alertness to the causes which would undermine our Nation.

Furthermore, this appreciation of our American citizenship will be stimulated throughout the year by individual and collective effort to learn more of the history and ideals of our great American heritage of liberty and freedom.

Ladies and gentlemen, as I conclude, let me leave this thought with you.

Today we are hearing a lot about the so-called wave of hysteria and fear resulting from the efforts to ferret out Communists and subversive elements in every walk of life.

Let me assure you that we have nothing to fear as a nation if every American worthy of the name will measure up to the high standards of citizenship as embodied in the type of Americanism exemplified by our forefathers and defended to this day on the field of battle by succeeding generations.

In short these are perilous times, for the Soviet challenge to the American way of life was never more real or of a more definite threat.

Therefore, on this loyalty day of 1959, let us heed the stern admonition of George Washington when he said that in times of dire emergency we should make certain that we put only Americans on guard.

Secretary McElroy Explores the Possibility of Vastly Increased Military Spending—Has He Changed His Mind?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 4, 1959

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, the subject of the status of our national defense and the specific requirements of the 1960 budget has already been explored in some detail during this session of Congress by Members of this body as well as by Members of the other body. One of the most eloquent and outspoken proponents of the administration's defense budget has been, of course, the distinguished Secretary of Defense, Neil H. McElroy. In testimony after testimony taken here on Capitol Hill, Secretary McElroy has defended the present level of military spending as adequate, and he has joined with other members of his administration in deploring what he has regarded as the serious consequences that might accrue as the result of any increase in military spending that might be proposed by this Congress. The Secretary maintained this position even though the Soviets have been outstripping us in the field of ICBM's.

I recall in this connection, Mr. Speaker, that when the Secretary appeared before the House Committee on Armed Services, he replied to a question which I directed to him on this particlular subject, and it appears on page 915 of the so-called military posture briefings before the committee:

Mr. STRATTON. How does the calculated risk that we are taking in the budget compare with the calculated risk that we took in 1959? Is it greater or less?

Secretary MCELROY. That is a question that I wouldn't know the answer to. My belief is that there is no serious calculated risk in any of these, and I think the fact that the Joint Chiefs of Staff have given me a signed memorandum which says that they see no serious gaps in the program indicates that the best people that we have in the military also feel this away.

Incidentally, Mr. Speaker, the signed memorandum to which the Secretary referred was the same memorandum to which each of the four Chiefs of Staff had also written certain detailed reservations, and the reservations were later submitted to the Preparedness Subcommittee of the other body and also appeared in full in the New York Times.

As is well known, Secretary McElroy has announced his impending retirement from the Government within the next few months.

In view of Secretary McElroy's stanch position in support of the military budget, I was profoundly surprised to read the other day in the press accounts of an address which the Secretary made to the Bureau of Advertising of the American Newspaper Publishers Association dinner in New York City on April 23, in which the Secretary was reported to have said that since the Soviet Union may shortly increase its military production by some 50 percent this country must also be prepared to match or better that increase, either by an overall boost in our gross national product or by some serious restriction of expenditures in nonmilitary fields.

The Secretary's speech, which seemed to fly completely in the face of his sworn testimony before the Congress and to represent a related recognition of the validity of the position of those Members of Congress who have questioned the adequacy of the 1960 military budget, struck me as an amazing document. I obtained a copy of the speech and I believe that it deserves very serious study by every Member of this body.

I also believe that, the Secretary's speech raises certain very serious questions which ought to be fully explored by the committees of this Congress without delay. If the Soviet potential is so substantial in the military field, and if it seems likely in the very near future that we may have to undergo such a drastic increase in military spending as the Secretary has suggested then how can we be quite as certain as the Secretary has been that the military expenditures for fiscal 1960 as proposed by the administration are indeed adequate and that no serious element of risk is involved?

In view of this statement by the Secretary, one might even wonder whether the Secretary's impending retirement really stems from a desire to return to civilian life or whether the Secretary is perhaps not quite as completely satisfied with the adequacy of the 1960 military budget as he has suggested.

To me the amazing thing about the Secretary's address is that it has caused such a minor ripple in the press. Only one article, to my knowledge, has explored the implications of this address, a report by Mr. R. H. Shackford, of the Scripps-Howard newspapers, which appeared in the Washington Daily News, Monday, April 27. Mr. Shackford suggests that the Eisenhower administration is, as he put it, "very gingerly trying to prepare the American people for bad news ahead—more taxes, harder work, greater productivity, fewer luxuries, and maybe even more governmental controls."

Secretary McElroy in his address says that the threat of increased Soviet military spending is something "which may force us to make some hard choices."

Mr. Speaker, if hard choices have to be made, then is it not well that the Secretary should discuss these hard choices now with the Members of Congress before the 1960 military budget is adopted? Perhaps if these hard choices do have to be made, then we ought to begin thinking about them this year rather than at some future date. Because the longer we put off such hard choices, the greater will be the risk we run that our response to the Soviet challenge will not be sufficiently great.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include both the text of the Secretary's address and also the text of the article by Mr. R. H. Shackford, which appeared in the Washington Daily News:

THE FREE WORLD'S COMPETITION WITH COMMUNISM

(Talk by Neil H. McElroy, Secretary of Defense, Bureau of Advertising dinner, New York City, N.Y., April 23, 1959)

The last time a Secretary of Defense was given the opportunity to address this distinguished group was in 1948—just 11 years ago—when Mr. Forrestal reported to you on the state of the Nation's defenses.

That year, 1948, was a year of great and historic change in the military and foreign policies of this Nation. Just to illustrate how momentous these changes were, I might remind you that on one day in June 1948—the Senate of the United States passed the first peacetime draft law in the history of our Nation and on the very next day, by an overwhelming vote, approved the Vandenberg resolution—a resolution that charted the course of collective security for the United States and the nations of the free world—a course we have been following ever since. These were 2 days in which the stream

of our history was diverted into new and untried channels.

The draft law of 1948, plus a supplemental military appropriation of over $3 billion in the same year, represented our first concrete efforts to rebuild our Military Establishment from its postwar low.

The Vandenberg resolution—in the foreign policy field—was an unprecedented departure from anything we had ever before attempted. Through this resolution the Senate of the United States advised the President of certain steps it thought he should take in the field of foreign policy. You all know that President Truman took this advice—first by negotiating the North Atlantic Treaty. In succeeding years President Truman—then President Eisenhower—established a whole series of mutual security arrangements—which today form the warp and woof of our national security policy. Undermine them or take them away and we would have to evolve a brandnew defense strategy, if we were given the time.

You gentlemen who publish newspapers know better perhaps than any other group in America what caused us to take those momentous steps in 1948. You remember because you lived through those postwar days of frustration.

Earlier, you had written about the hope for the United Nations Charter and world peace through international resolve and agreement. Then as the years 1945, 1946, and 1947 unfolded, your papers were forced, in truth and objectivity, to publish a different story—a story of partial disillusionment—of shaken faith in a scarred United Nations, stranded on the rocks of the Soviet veto. Gradually it became painfully apparent to you and, through you, to the American people, that the Communists had no intention of abiding by the spirit of the charter; that they were intent on nothing less than world domination; and finally, that we—the United States—were the main stumbling block in their path.

Like the practical people we are—we reacted to the all too apparent danger. Perhaps it was the brutal suppression of Czechoslovakia in February of 1948 that started us down the dual highway of rearmament and collective security we have been following ever since. Certainly this first forcible Communist conquest of a stable free government was a profound shock to our people. Again what they read in news accounts and your editorial pages shed an altogether new light on the power and complete ruthlessness of Communist aggression.

If Czechoslovakia wasn't enough to spell out the ultimate Communist aims—the beginning of the Berlin blockade in the following months of 1948 was the convincer. This was the first great proble into the moral and military backbone of the United States. Would we allow 2 million Berliners to starve? Would we turn them over to the Russians to be exploited? Or, would we take heroic measures?

You told the American people that story too—the story of the airlift—we flew supplies into beleaguered Berlin for month after month. We moved atomic bomb capable B–29 bombers to England. We broke the Berlin lockade. But, more important, we demonstrated to the Russians and the whole world that we would not yield a rightful position to a threat of force. We had met our first great post war test. It was only the first of many more to come in the years between then and now.

But in 1948, as you told this story, up and down the face of this peace-loving land—and told it as only a free objective press can—our people got the point. They always will when the facts are made clear to them. America's security was in danger. "Do something about it," they told their leaders. So their leaders did.

The Marshall plan sped through Congress—so did the Draft Act and large supplemental appropriations for the Armed Forces. Finally, in the closing days of the Congress, the Senate passed the Vandenberg resolution.

These steps were not easy for America to take. The Senate resolution was violently attacked on the floor of the Senate and in the editorial columns of some newspapers—as an absolute and utter abandonment of traditional American foreign policy. Opponents cried that it violated the counsel of George Washington and Thomas Jefferson to avoid permanent or entangling alliances. It undermined the United Nations. It would bring on a third world war.

Actually, the collective security policy of our Government was approved by our people in the beginning because it made sense to them as a way to avoid a third world war. It makes just as good sense today.

I have gone into this bit of history between Mr. Forrestal's appearance before you and mine tonight—for the reason that I think a clear understanding of the events of his day are essential to a comprehension of today's policies. If the people know why the Nation had no option but to go forward with collective security in 1948, they will better understand why we cannot go backward in 1959 and beyond.

I believe it is important for all of us to reexamine—and then retell—the story of the beginnings of today's military and foreign policy. The plain fact of the matter is that the strategic concept of this country for survival is collective security. It is a concept on which the military posture of the Nation is based. The reasons which led to the adoption of this national policy of collective security in the forties—have not lost their urgency or their cogency in the fifties, nor will they in the foreseeable future.

Basically, the doctrine of collective security requires strength among our allies around the world. They have the manpower and they have the will to preserve their independence. What most of the free world countries lack, is weapons to match the manpower and the will of their people. What we do, through our program of military assistance, is to provide such countries with appropriate weapons and with training in the use of those weapons.

The administration of the military assistance program has not been perfect, but it has been effective. The measure of its effectiveness will always be its deterrent effect on Communist advances into free world territory—direct and indirect. The program was inaugurated, just 10 years ago, to build up peaceful barriers to further conquest by Soviet communism. I believe it has fulfilled that purpose admirably, in spite of occasional blunders of administration.

Repeated, bitter attacks on our foreign assistance programs leave in their wake a very large, never answered question—What is the alternate national security policy to be if the doctrine of collective self defense is abandoned?

The President's Committee To Study the United States Military Assistance Program—otherwise known as the Draper committee—has recently given an answer to that question. The only alternate they could see to our foreign assistance program—and they so reported to President Eisenhower—was to take "our first stand in the last ditch." The Draper committee put it this way:

"The choice our country faces is very real and near at hand. In our fascination with our own mistakes, and the constant use of foreign aid as a whipping boy, we may be gradually choking this vital feature of our national security to death."

To this I can only add—with the full unanimous support of our Joint Chiefs of Staff—when we choke the military assistance program we have a strangle hold on our own military policy. That program is as much in our national self interests as the weapons in the hands of our own forces. Both are absolutely essential to our own protection.

Now let's take a hard look at our own defenses—our own weapons systems, never forgetting that they are integrated into the system of collective security I have just discussed.

Any nation which builds its defense position soundly does so on the basis of its special advantages. That is exactly what America has proceeded to do over the years. We believe—considering our geographical position, our allies and our military know-how—that the weapons systems we have evolved offer the best possible combination to keep anyone from attacking us.

Our planned programs for the future are responsive to all the variables in the formula which best defines America's security needs. They will respond to future intelligence of Soviet capabilities, to technological breakthroughs—which we constantly seek—and to the changing strengths of our collective security arrangements.

America has today the strongest air striking force in the world. This force is composed of the largest heavy bomber force in existence, as well as the largest medium bomber force. These forces are backed up by mobile carrier-based aircraft and tactical fighter bombers stationed in many strategic places around the world.

You may be sure that these bomber forces—all four of them—will be kept in any status of alert required to insure their ability to deliver unacceptable punishment to any nation which might attack us. They are peaceful barriers to aggression—peaceful but effective.

I feel before I leave the weapons business and get into other fields that affect the country's security I should make some comment on the so-called missile gap. There may develop within the next few days a disparity between the number of long-range intercontinental ballistic missiles in our stockpile and those in the Soviet Union's. I said "may develop," because whether a gap opens up depends in large measure on the willingness of the Kremlin to concentrate on the production of missiles to the full-rated capacity of the Russian nation and its satellites.

I believe it is wrong, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff believe it is wrong, to compare our heavy weapons delivery systems, category by category, and insist on being numerically greater in each. Our Armed Forces are built to fit our needs—presumably the Soviet's are select to fit what they consider to be their needs. So long as the United States continues to have an overall preponderance of capability to deliver high-potency weapons—on target—we need not fear attack. We have such a preponderance now, and no one in this administration—civilian or military—has any intention of allowing this condition to change.

The military strength of this or any nation is best measured by adding a sum total of its separate strengths into a composite whole. When this is done our military leaders, and again I refer to the Joint Chiefs of Staff, conclude that our composite strength is adequate and has no serious gaps.

This calendar year 1959 we expect to add to our powerful mixture of weapons delivery systems an initial intercontinental ballistic missile capability—not a large capability numerically—but we believe approximately as large as what the Soviet Union will have in 1959. Our planned future deployment of ICBM's, as we are financing them in the 1960 budget, provides numbers which in concert with our other weapons systems—such as our massive aircraft strength and the Polaris system—we believe to be fully ade-

quate to deter the outbreak of general war. The military program of this country is based solely on what is required for national security. It is not determined by budgetary considerations.

Next year a number of our atomic submarines will be carrying deadly Polaris missiles. Just one of these Polaris submarines on station, ready to fire, will have striking power hundreds of times more effective than the first and only atomic bombs dropped in combat.

The Soviets have made no claim to the development either of a nuclear powered submarine or a Polaris type missile. They are fully aware of the military advantages and relative invulnerability of this weapons system. So, while it must be assumed that at some future time, the Soviet arsenal will include Polaris type submarines, it seems clear that the United States has a considerable lead in this highly important weapons system.

Next year also, this country will add to its offensive armament powerful air-to-ground atomic missiles—which can be fired from our heavy bombers hundreds of miles outside target defense areas.

We confidently expect that our own military strength integrated with our collective security strategy will continue to be successful in discouraging Communist military attack on the free world. But acceptance of the belief that the Communists will hesitate to use military conquest as a means to their objective of world domination does not mean they will have given up the objective. It only signifies that the Soviets may decide that the use of military conquest has become unprofitable. We may be sure that such possible abandonment of one means will only cause the Communists to concentrate their efforts on other avenues they believe will lead them to absolute world power.

Thus, the United States and the other nations of the free world are bound to be projected into other spheres of competition. We must be alert to the dangers which may develop in the new areas. Let me name a few of these spheres. First and most important—the competition for the mind of man—all else is subsidiary to this battle — second, economic competition — third, competition in the field of education.

In the competition for the mind of man the free world has for export the best and most admired product in the history of mankind—freedom—freedom wrapped in all kinds of packages—packages so attractive that man has always jammed the world's market places wherever they could be possessed.

There is freedom of religion so ardently desired by the Buddhists of Tibet and the Moslems of the Middle East, not to mention millions of people behind the Iron Curtain—who have already lost this freedom to Communist Godlessness.

There is freedom of speech and of the press so respected by you and by me and so abhorrent to Communist countries where control of information media is indispensable to oppression. Freedom of the press and freedom of expression rocked all of Hungary in a few hours. It is something no Communist country can tolerate and survive. They let a hundred flowers bloom—in words of Mao Tse-tung—only so they can snip off the heads of the 99 they won't want to mature into dangerous thought.

There are many lesser freedoms—all of which we have and consider essential to happiness—and all of which the history of the modern world tells us man aspires to possess. There is freedom to travel, freedom to live as one wishes and where one wishes, freedom to work an one pleases, and at what one pleases and freedom to save and invest in ways which permit the individual to share in the growth of the country. All these freedoms are denied in the Communist world and will be denied to the people of any nation which comes under Communist domination.

The recent brutal aggression by Communist China against Tibet is a classic example of the utter worthlessness of Communist promises and agreements. The world remembers the words of Chou En-lai at the Bandung Conference—honeyed soothing words, cooing to all its neighbors that China stood—I believe "resolutely" is the Communist word—for noninterference in the internal affairs of others.

The dramatic flight of the Dalai Lama in the face of a formal agreement to respect the religious beliefs and political system of Tibet should convince the rest of Communist China's neighbors of its true intentions. Those intentions do not differ from those of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. They were aptly put by Mr. Allen Dulles just a few days ago, when he stated: ["Their] mission continues to be the subversion of the entire free world, starting, of course, with those countries which are the most vulnerable."

The problem we must solve is how to prevent those most vulnerable nations from being sucked into the maw of Communist promises, and thus lose their status as free nations. Somehow we must make the classic Communist pattern of penetration and subversion so obvious that it will be rejected summarily. Recent news dispatches and editorials from the Middle East and India indicate that Communist heavyhandedness in the Berlin crisis, in Iraq, and in Tibet is making its mark on the mind of uncommitted men. More of our resources and ingenuity must be devoted to delineating clearly these true images of the Communist technique and displaying them in the showcases of the world.

One of the dramatic demonstrations of popular decision between communism and the free world took place several months ago in Berlin where, as you well know, the Communist system exists in the very same city with a free government. In a city election where the lines were clearly drawn the Communist Party candidates of West Berlin received less than 2 percent of West Berliners' ballots. We expect and are confident that the world will make this same choice whenever free government and the Communist variety compete in the open market.

Now, I would like to speak about some of the tough decisions which face the people of this country if we are to prevail in nonmilitary as well as military spheres of competition with the Communist system. I have, in the past, labeled these as "hard choices."

We have a system of government by laws—where as much freedom of choice is left to the individual as is consistent with those laws. No one tells our large corporations how much of their profits must be plowed back into industrial expansion nor what kind of product they shall make for X years into the future. Similarly, no one tells Johnny or Mary or their parents, what their education and their profession shall be.

The Communist system of government controls is the very antithesis of ours. It prescribes what will be made, how it will be made and what will be done with the finished product. Then it decides how much of what is produced will be used for the direct benefit of the people—and how much will be used for military purposes or reinvested in expansion of the means of production. It likewise subordinates the wishes of the individual in its system of education—a system where quotas are established in each category deemed by the state as essential—and all facilities and resources—including human resources—are mobilized to meet the estimated needs.

Since we are in competition with a country which operates by a totally different set of rules, it may be necessary for us to tighten our belts and step up our national effort. Thus, in our long range competition with the Soviet Union in the economic and educational fields we may be faced with some difficult decisions.

In the economic field, for instance, the Soviet Union, for all its failure to meet announced goals, has made tremendous strides in developing its economy. Its total output is still less than half of ours but by diverting dictated percentages into designated channels they manage to stay on a par with us in some fields and perhaps even go ahead of us in others. For one example, the Soviet Union devotes twice as great a percentage of its gross national product to military ends as the United States for about the same total military expenditure as ours. They, similarly, devote nearly twice as great a percentage of their total output to industrial expansion as this country. All of these things they can do because the state wills that the people must do without the consumer goods their people want—and our people have in abundance.

The Soviet Union has recently announced a new 7-year plan and boasts that by 1970 or sooner she will advance to first place in both volume of production and per capita production. Our intelligence discounts this claim as propaganda but the discount is not so deep as to encourage complacency on our part. Indeed, we anticipate enough economic progress by the Soviets to predict probable necessity for change in some of our economic thinking and practices.

Mr. Allen Dulles estimates that the Soviet Union could, as a result of increased productivity over the next 7 years, increase her present military spending by 50 percent. This is an area where the Soviet Union's effort must be matched or bettered. It is, therefore, one of those areas which may force us to make some hard choices. We either have to boost our own gross national product so that whatever increase may be required in military spending will not disturb other areas of our economy or we have to cut down on expenditures in those other areas to compensate for the increased military budget.

The Soviet Union may also channel a large percentage of her increased resources over the next few years to expand her trade and aid policies with those vulnerable but uncommitted nations of the world. This course, too, many mean changes in emphasis in our own economy and sacrifices for our people.

We can no more afford to lose the economic competition with communism than we can afford to fall behind militarily. One of the major influences in attracting the mind of man to one system of government as opposed to another is demonstrated success in economic growth. Today the United States is the acknowledged leader. To maintain that position of leadership we may have to divert more of our output into upholding our worldwide responsibilities and less into what our people would like to have.

The only way I know to meet Soviet economic competition is to increase our own output. This may mean plowing back a larger percentage of our gross national product into capital investment for industrial expansion, the kind of expansion which will provide facilities for greater production of all types of goods including, if need be, more military hardware. It may mean that our people will have to learn to get along with less in current consumption. Othewise, we may come out second best in a competition for which there is no second prize.

I believe our economic system—like our social system—is the greatest in the world. We must keep both systems so healthy that no country to which a freedom of choice is still open would think of choosing the Communist way.

In the field of educational competition we likewise must surge forward. Not only must we keep pace with the rising demands of technology—but we must train more and better leaders in all fields of human activity—publishers, military, business, labor, teachers, politicians, diplomats, and many others. We must contrive to do this, within the basic framework of the freedom we prize so highly. This can be accomplished only by a truly massive national effort to encourage, help, and persuade our youth along educational lines which will marshal the Nation's intellectual resources.

We must devise means to reduce mental wastage to a minimum. This means identifying our talented youngsters early. But identifying them and their special talents is only a small part of the problem. They must then be encouraged and stimulated to continue their education in the fields for which they are best fitted. Parents, teachers, and community leaders must join in the effort to influence youth toward right decisions in the field of education.

Youngsters need guidance and intelligent persuasion. Both must come from knowledgeable and interested adults. It follows that a need exists to educate adults not only in what the Communists are truly after but in how their aims, objectives, and practices require certain special and continuing efforts in our own educational system. I know a great many of you publishers have taken the lead in fostering adult education along the lines I have suggested. This is a continuing task which requires community and individual leadership of the highest order. Those who understand the threat we face must communicate that understanding to all who touch the lives of our children to the children themselves.

The fact that we operate in this country on the principle of freedom of choice doesn't mean that we can't do something about guiding our young minds into channels which will increase our productivity and our capacity to give true leadership—intellectual and cultural as well as economic and military—to the free world.

We have certain known, well-defined gaps in our educational system—such as weaknesses in science, mathematics, and language instruction. Our educational leaders and responsible members of our communities are hard at work defining the extent of our educational gaps and now they may be bridged. Already they have concluded we will need better teachers and more of them and that we will have to pay them more. This will mean more taxes for our people—an unpleasant but, in my judgment, a necessary price to pay for the development of our most valuable resource. Another hard choice.

I know it is clear to all those here present that America does face a struggle for survival. In facing this fact we should occasionally remind ourselves that we have tremendous advantages over those who have announced that they will bury us.

We have stronger defense forces and we intend to keep this posture.

We have strong and loyal allies. We can and must keep those allies strong with whatever military and economic assistance is required.

We have a strong, healthy, efficient economy—the economic growth of Soviet Russia raises questions for us as to how we may best use the output of our economy in order to serve our own people and the free world.

We have a system of education which has made our country great—has offered opportunity unlimited for individuals with the right kind of guidance and the right kind of inner drive. Some gaps have developed—in curriculum weakness, in neglect of the teaching profession, and in lack of pupil motivation. These gaps are inconsistent with the requirements placed on us by our position of world leadership. They must be closed.

We have freedom—all the freedoms in the spectrum—freedoms without which the spirit of man withers and dies. Here, above all, is the source of our strength—the shine of our example for the rest of the world.

We seek only to preserve those freedoms—for ourselves, and for others who aspire to live and worship outside the suffocating, godless, Communist system. With these advantages and a sense of dedication to their preservation there is no struggle we cannot win.

[From the Washington Daily News, Apr. 27, 1959]

MORE TAXES, FEWER LUXURIES ARE IN OFFING—U.S. NEW "DIG IN" ERA TO TOP RED, EXPERTS WARN

(By R. H. Shackford)

Very gingerly, the Eisenhower administration seems to be trying to prepare the American people for bad news ahead—more taxes, harder work, greater productivity, fewer luxuries, and maybe even more governmental controls.

If high administration spokesmen mean what they are saying, they believe such steps will be necessary if the United States is to meet an intensified Soviet military-economic challenge.

The administration prophets so far are Central Intelligence Agency Director Allen W. Dulles and Defense Sevcretary Neil McElroy. Their cautious soundings are being made in the midst of the budget battle with Congress, but also as the economy surges toward record highs.

WARNING

Allen Dulles launched the first trial balloon in this direction early this month in a speech warning about the rapid rate of increase in industrial production in the Soviet Union.

He estimated that further Soviet increases in the next 7 years would make it possible for Nikita Khrushchev, if he wishes, to increase military spending 50 percent and divert large resources to his trade-and-aid campaigns in uncommitted nations.

The unpleasant possibilities in this for Americans was left to Mr. McElroy to discuss in his address to the American Newspaper Publishers Association. Although there was emphasis on the claim that the United States militarily is stronger today than the Soviet Union, the most important section of the address discussed the hard choices Americans will have to make to keep the balance that way.

HIS VIEWS

Mr. McElroy warned that the United States cannot let the Soviets best us in either military strength or economic competition. His picture went like this:

Military: "The Soviet Union's effort (possible 50 percent increase) must be matched or bettered. * * * We either have to boost our own gross national production so that whatever increase may be required in military spending will not disturb other areas of our economy, or we will have to cut down on expenditures in those other areas to compensate for the increased military budget."

Economic: "One of the major influences in attracting the mind of man to one system of government as opposed to another is demonstrated success in economic growth. Today the United States is the acknowledged leader. To maintain that position of leadership we may have to divert more of our output into upholding our worldwide responsibilities and less into what people would like to have."

THE LIST

Some things Mr. McElroy said would have to be done if we are to stay ahead of the Soviets:

Plow back a larger percentage of the gross national product into capital investment for industrial expansion.

Produce more military hardware, if the Soviets move in that direction.

"Learn to get along with less in current consumption."

"More taxes" to pay for better education.

"We anticipate enough economic progress by the Soviets," Mr. McElroy said, "to predict probable necessity for change in some of our economic thinking and practices."

He didn't detail changes contemplated, but warned that if we fail to meet the Soviet economic-military challenge, "we may come out second best in a competition for which there is no second prize."

The Original Thirteen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD H. BAKER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 4, 1959

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

THE ORIGINAL THIRTEEN

(An address by imperial Sir George E. Stringfellow, imperial potentate, AAONMS, of East Orange, N.J., before a large group of Masons and Shriners, assembled by Kerbela Temple, in the Scottish Rite Auditorium, Knoxville, Tenn., April 15, 1959)

Illustrious Sir Harold L. Gill, potentate of Kerbela Temple and members of your divan, past potentates, heads of units, presidents of Shrine Clubs, distinguished Masonic guests, brother Masons, fellow nobles and illustrious Sir Ed Hicks, past potentate, first vice president Southeastern Shrine Association and imperial potentates special aid for Tennessee, I bring you the greetings of the imperial divan, the board of trustees of the Shriners hospitals for crippled children and the 800,000 Shriners, which I have the privilege to represent.

Your temple, as many of you know, will observe its 44th birthday next July. Kerbela was the 138th of the 166 temples to be chartered and is now 88th in membership. She stands high in the council of the Shrine of North America.

Kerbela numbers among her membership, outstanding citizens, legislators, and statesmen. I would mention two of your outstanding legislators and statesmen, in the persons of the Honorable B. CARROLL REECE, and the Honorable HOWARD H. BAKER, who have rendered worthwhile service to your temple, to their congressional district and the Nation.

I wish to speak to you about the Shrine of North America. Its philosophy, its ideals, and its contributions to the brotherhood of man and the aid it has given to crippled children.

At first there were 13 members. That was June 6, 1871.

Now, scattered in 166 temples in the United States, Canada, Mexico, Hawaii, and the Canal Zone, there are more than 800,000 members of the ancient Arabic Order Nobles of the Mystic Shrine—800,000 Freemasons with reverent minds and merry hearts, dressing up in outlandish costumes to parade across the continent, just for the fun of it; and then, with a tenderness that passeth understanding, creating and maintaining their hospitals for crippled children, who might well go through life in pain and misery but for them.

These are the Shriners, members of an organization, formed as a sort of relax from the more philosophical work in the various rites

of Freemasonry; a playground, as it were, for highup Masons, but still not a part of Masonry itself.

It was sometime in the summer of 1870 that Dr. Walter M. Fleming wrote a ritual whereby weary and thirsty sons of the desert might rest and refresh themselves at some oasis on the long and sandy trail toward Mecca. Dr. Fleming's personal oasis was a tavern called Knickerbocker Cottage, located at 6th Avenue and 28th Street in New York and operated by William Fowler, who catered mostly to a rather select group of masonic brethren.

It was in this tavern that Dr. Fleming began to discuss his ritual and a possible new masonic order with such cronies as Billy Florence, the outstanding actor and comedian of his time; Billy Paterson, a linguist and printer; and Charles T. McClenachan, the Nation's top masonic ritualist and head of the Scottish Rite in New York. And then, on June 16, 1871, these 4 and 9 others met in the Masonic Hall in New York and agreed to organize the shrine. They established as a prerequisite that all members should be Knights Templars or 32° Scottish Rite Masons. But it was not until September 26, 1872, that the organization was completed and Mecca Temple in New York was formed, with Dr. Fleming as the illustrious potentate.

With the help of Florance, Paterson, McClenachan, and Fowler, Dr. Fleming surrounded the shrine with an aura of oriental mysticism, and established the legend that the order could trace its origin to the Caliph Ali, son-in-law of the Prophet Mohammed. And the shrine grew, slowly at first, with Dr. Fleming doing most of the work and paying most of the expenses. But it did grow, and on June 6, 1876, Dr. Fleming and others formed the Imperial Council, with temples under charter or dispensation in New York City; Rochester, N.Y.; Montpelier, Vt.; Cleveland, Ohio; Albany, N.Y.; Cincinnati, Ohio; and Troy, N.Y.

Dr. Fleming was elected imperial grand potentate and held the office until 1886, when he was succeeded by Sam Briggs of Al Koran Temple in Cleveland, who served until 1892, when more than 50 temples had been established.

Those were the rough years, when from time to time it was not certain that the shrine would live. But it did, and perhaps as much as anything else, it was the parades that really contributed to its eventual growth. The first parade of the shriners in their national convention was really more of a procession as the nobles, decked out in full evening dress, marched from the Old Dennison House in Indianapolis to the Scottish Rite Cathedral for their annual banquet. And in Omaha in 1892, there as a regular parade with a band and red fire, a mechanical elephant, Nubian slaves, and a sort of guard of honor that executed intricate steps, the forerunner of the present magnificent shrine patrols.

Through all the years, the shriners had made it a point to be charitable. There were Christmas baskets for the needy and money for victims of disasters like the Johnstown, Pa., and Galveston, Tex., floods; the San Francisco, Calif., earthquake and fire; the Jacksonville, Fla., yellow fever epidemic; and the Ohio River floods. But it was not until 1920 that the Imperial Council session in Portland, Oreg., that the shrine really found its glory and its soul. There, under the prodding of Imperial Potentate W. Freeland Kendrick, of Philadelphia, Pa., who fathered the idea, and following the inspired bubbles speech by Forrest Adair of Atlanta, Ga., the shriners established their hospitals for crippled children. In these 17 institutions of mercy, more than 100,000 children have had their lives made worth living. These little crippled children have never paid one cent for the help they have received. All races, all colors, all creeds have been welcomed in the mansions of mercy—and will continue to be.

This and more is the heritage that the original 13 began that June evening in 1871, a heritage more glamorous with each passing year; a heritage of the love of life.

Public Needs Protection Against This Kind

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 4, 1959

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues an article by Westbrook Pegler, which appeared in this morning's edition of the New York Journal American:

WHY SOFT-PEDAL THIS LABOR BOSS?

(By Westbrook Pegler)

To sincere, tenacious fighters against communism, the public presentation of the recent threat of a big strike against the nonmunicipal hospitals in New York was a discouraging experience. Our political parties and our press say they are against communism and pro-Communists. But when Leon Davis, the boss of this evil venture, in which the sick are hostages, was thrown into ugly prominence, a great mass of hand-dug verified material was ignored.

Davis has a background as red as a cut throat. He was born in Russia and did not come here until 1921. He has never shown any opposition to the force which is the only enemy of the United States in the whole world. His union's record is as bad as his own. Nevertheless, my own verified disclosure of facts and those by George Sokolsky in the New York Journal-American were, with trifling exceptions, the only recognition of this phase of the story that was presented to the public in New York during this poignant crisis.

With a large staff of pundit reporters and editors, the Times, in one editorial, refrained from mentioning even the title of this union, which is Local 1199 of the Retail Drug Employees. And, of course, the editorial gave no sign that this was anything but a straight labor controversy between a respectable American union, under law-abiding leadership, and a group of employers who had some errors to answer for, as indeed these employers have. The union, itself under Davis, however, had waged notorious picket-line warfare for 18 months against a midtown drugstore and this violence was fair augury of tumult at the hospitals. In fact, Davis frankly threatened assaults on the picket lines.

A "PROFILE" ABOUT DAVIS

The exception which I noted was an editorial attack in Roy Howard's World-Telegram, which also struck a slight, glancing blow in an excessively fair "profile" about Davis. In that latter opus the World-Telegram quoted Davis thus: "I didn't answer (the House Committee on Un-American Activities) because I didn't think it was any of their business."

The question was this: "Does your union comply with the non-Communist affidavit requirements of the NLRB?"

Actually Davis did not refuse to answer. He did answer that his union had not complied.

Further testimony ran thus:

Question. "Are you or were you a member of the Progressive Committee To Rebuild the American Labor Party in 1944?" (This party was a Communist front.)

Davis refused to answer, invoking freedom of speech, press, and association and the immunity of a witness from self-incrimination.

Question. "Were you a member of the Citizens Committee To Free Earl Browder?" (The former head of the American Communist Party.)

Davis invoked the first amendment.

Question. "We find from testimony that you signed a Communist Party petition No. 139 to place Isadore Begun on the Communist Party ballot in 1938."

Again Davis took the first and the fifth.

A few lines later, Davis declared that there was no Communist menace in this country. He said the Communist Party was not an "enemy of the American labor movement" and praised the Communists because they were "a help to the advancement of the people of this country."

A RIGHT TO KNOW

The signature "Leon Davis" appeared on two nominating petitions of the Communist Party in New York in 1940 and a third time the same name was written on an independent nominating petition, this one for the notorious Communists Israel Amter, Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, and James W. Ford.

Well, dammit, I am as much the press as any owner or publishing corporation. I say the people's right to know included this phase of this crisis right here in New York. I hear loud pietistical bawling from the publishers' conclave about the reluctance of Washington bureaucrats to reveal information about scientific matters which we lack even type to print. We lack even the intelligence to understand it.

Anyway, the remedy for that is good reporters and gadfly editors to make them get the story. I am discussing here suppression by the press, itself, of information in hand which the people have a right to know, and easily could understand.

Now this rotten union and Davis will get credit from their underpaid subjects for winning them raises which will be paid out of additional taxes.

In the World-Telegram profile, Davis frankly warned us that "if there is a picket line, somebody is going to get hit."

So, here we are taking this threat from a professional parasite who called communism "a help to the advancement of the people of this country."

Walla Walla Centennial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CATHERINE MAY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 4, 1959

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, it gives me particular pleasure and a great deal of pride to call to the attention of the Congress a forthcoming event in my home State of Washington, and more particularly in Walla Walla, a city of which the entire State is justifiably proud. The event is a triple centennial, celebrating the 100th anniversary of the formation of the Walla Walla County government, the naming of Walla Walla, and the charter for Whitman College.

The event, which is expected to attract notice from many parts of our country, takes place from May 11 to May 31 of this year. Program highlights include Western Week, May 11–17, Whitman Week, May 24–31, and the biggest day, May 16, which will include a centennial-Armed Forces Day parade among the many entertainment features.

The Walla Walla Centennial Association and the Whitman College Centennial Committee have made elaborate plans for this event which can be celebrated only once in a hundred years. An important part of the planning includes proper recognition to the famed Whitman College. On December 20, 1859, the legislature of the Territory of Washington granted a charter to Whitman Seminary, from which Whitman College has sprung by amendment of its original charter in 1883. This year Whitman College, in celebrating its centennial, commemorates the founding of the first chartered educational institution in the State of Washington.

I am very pleased to be able to invite all interested to come to Walla Walla in the State of Washington and participate in any of the many events which have been planned, and assure you of a most cordial welcome.

Compensatory Payment Plan for Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DELBERT L. LATTA
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 4, 1959

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I have received a letter from Mr. D. R. Stanfield, the executive vice president of the Ohio Farm Bureau Federation, Inc., setting forth reasons for the Ohio Farm Bureau's opposition to the compensatory payment plan for farmers which I should like to call to the attention of the Members of the Congress.

The letter follows:

OHIO FARM BUREAU FEDERATION, INC.,
Columbus, Ohio, April 13, 1959.

Hon. DELBERT L. LATTA,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR DELBERT: Our members are strongly opposed to what are commonly called compensatory, production or direct payments to farmers. A survey in the April 1959 Farm Journal shows that only 5 percent of Ohio farmers favor production payments.

This plan appears at different times in different forms, but the proposition is essentially that the farmer sells his product at the market price, and then the Government would pay him the difference between the market price and what the Government considered to be a fair price. Under this proposal the farmer is told he will receive high prices for his products and the consumer will pay low food prices. Everyone knows this is economically impossible.

A recent study by the U.S. Department of Agriculture shows that such a program would exceed $10 billion in cost and would make the American farmer dependent for a large percent of his income on Government appropriations. It would stimulate production in areas where we already have a surplus problem and would lead to a leveling of producer incomes. Direct payments on that portion of a crop that is consumed domestically, in effect would subsidize production for export. This is unfair to the domestic consumer and is looked upon by other countries as a form of dumping. This kind of trade jeopardizes our relationships with our friends in other parts of the world.

Sincerely,

D. R. STANFIELD.

Fryingpan-Arkansas Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. EDGAR CHENOWETH
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 4, 1959

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include in my remarks an editorial from the Pueblo Chieftain, Pueblo, Colo., on recent developments in the Fryingpan-Arkansas transmountain water diversion project.

It now appears that for the first time the State of Colorado will present a united front on this important reclamation project. I want to commend all of those who have worked to bring about this agreement between the east and west slopes of Colorado. They deserve great credit for what has been accomplished.

One substantial change has been made in the project. It has been agreed to construct the Reudi Reservoir on the Fryingpan River in place of the Aspen Reservoir on the Roaring Fork. The Reudi Reservoir will have a storage capacity of 100,000 acre-feet, as compared with 28,000 feet proposed for the Aspen Reservoir. This change has met with general approval, and will give the western slope of Colorado a storage reservoir for future development.

The editorial follows:

FRYINGPAN AGREEMENT IS A MAJOR STEP FORWARD

It was approximately 10 months ago when the east-west slope controversy over the Fryingpan project broke into a holocaust. It was announced in Washington then that conditional water decrees had been granted to the Basalt and the west divide projects and that the water filing for a conditional decree for the Fryingpan project had been overlooked.

Upon petition to the district court of Glenwood Springs, the hearing was reopened for the purpose of granting the Fryingpan sponsors an opportunity to present evidence in behalf of the filing for a conditional decree which, if granted, would have a prior date to the Basalt and the west divide projects.

The Southeastern Colorado Water Conservancy District had just been formed by court order and was in a position to push the hearing and suit in order to defend the claim made for the Fryingpan water filings.

During the ensuing weeks, Gov. Steve McNichols and Felix L. Sparks, director of the Colorado Water Conservation Board, appealed for time to try to work out a compromise between the Western and Eastern Slopes in order to provide united support in Colorado for the Fryingpan project.

The new conservancy district directors agreed to ask for a postponement of the hearings on the Fryingpan water decree in order to permit negotiations between Fryingpan sponsors, representatives of the Colorado River Water Conservancy District and the Colorado Water Conservation Board which is the official State agency representing all of Colorado in water matters.

Three representatives each were appointed to represent the two water district and the Colorado Water Conservation Board. Many meetings were held in Glenwood Springs, Denver, Pueblo, and in Washington with Colorado congressional Members to bring about a revised set of operating principles which would govern the use of water by the Fryingpan project.

Introduced into the Fryingpan project is the new Ruedi Reservoir which was chosen after approximately $75,000 had been spent by the State in engineering surveys to find a substitute for the controversial Aspen Reservoir.

Ruedi Reservoir will be almost four times the size of the Aspen Reservoir. Its entire capacity of more than 100,000 acre-feet of water will be used for both replacement and regulatory purposes on the Fryingpan and Roaring Fork Rivers.

Thus the new agreement gives the western slope the largest storage reservoir for future development since the construction of the Big Thompson project.

Waters of Ruedi Reservoir will be subject only to call by existing diversions and not for the west divide project which will have an earlier water date than the Fryingpan project. Construction of the west divide project as a part of the upper Colorado River storage project of 1955 is not anticipated for many years.

The Ruedi Reservoir was originally planned as part of the overall Basalt project for which a conditional decree was granted by the Glenwood District Court last year. The two conservancy districts will now join in a stipulation to be filed with the court at the scheduled hearing on May 25 for a common water date for the Ruedi and Fryingpan projects. But this will leave the west divide conditional decree of a prior date, which to some critics is a calculated risk insofar as water diversion is concerned in case the Fryingpan project is not authorized and constructed with Federal funds.

The new operating principles contain significant improvements over the original operating principles which were approved 8 years ago by the Colorado Water Conservation Board as the result of conferences of Eastern Slope and Western Slope representatives. Water for the Fryingpan diversion will now have priority over other uses of water from the Ruedi Reservoir so that the assurance of the diversion is even better now than it was previously.

In such a compromise situation, the Arkansas Valley interests agreed to certain limitations on useage and diversion of water which are actually not required under the Colorado constitution. It is a surrender of certain rights to water in the usual manner prescribed by law.

The alternative was a court fight over the conditional decree for the Fryingpan project which may have consumed 2 or 3 years. In the iterim, no authorization by Congress would have been possible because the water for the project would have been in doubt.

The western and eastern slope water districts have given final approval to the new operating principles and also to the provisions of the stipulation to be filed before the District Court of Glenwood Springs. The stipulation contains the basic revisions of the operating principles and upon which it is hoped the judge of the court will write his decree for the project.

If continued unity is maintained, all Colorado will be behind the project and authorization should be accomplished within a year. Introduction of the bill during this session will provide time for the clearance of all necessary reports for the hearings to be held in January or February of 1960.

It is a great step forward and we only hope nothing occurs in Congress or elsewhere which will prevent authorization.

The St. Louis Globe-Democrat Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 4, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial appeared in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch on April 15, 1959. It is a fair and generous statement of the value and need of competition in the newspaper field to a community. Reporting the news is a basic part of representative government and the larger and more complex the society is the more important this part becomes. I think few people disagree with the thought that legislative bodies, local, State, or Federal, should not have the power to control newspapers. We would soon lose the freedom of the press which is also essential to the operation of representative government. However, to preserve this very freedom, legislative bodies should have the power to investigate into the subject matter. It is a power that should be exercised with great restraint and circumspection, however. As anyone familiar with the power to investigate knows, it can be used to produce results by indirection which would be improper by direction.

The issue of whether an investigation by the Missouri Legislature is in order should be decided by these guidelines, I should think. I also think the public might well be informed on this aspect of the matter, in the instant case as well as the broad question of how well is the public being kept informed today on issues of public concern.

The editorial follows:

IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST

The Globe-Democrat strike is now nearing the end of its eighth week. St. Louis is nearing the end of 8 weeks without a morning newspaper.

The Post-Dispatch is not a party to the dispute, and we consider it improper to inject our opinion on the issues involved. But there is a public interest in the publication of two separate, independent newspapers in this community. We believe the public interest calls for an early settlement of the strike.

In all too many American cities, newspaper competition has disappeared. The Post-Dispatch does not want to see that happen here. When it became necessary for both St. Louis newspapers to achieve production economies by concentrating publication in one mechanical plant, the Post-Dispatch entered into an arrangement for that purpose. This action was taken in the belief that the economies made possible by a joint printing plant would insure the survival of separate ownerships and distinct editorial personalities.

No legislative investigation is going to settle this strike. No matter how much investigating any legislative committee does, the Missouri Legislature has no constitutional power to control newspapers and ought not to have such power.

This dispute can be settled only by the parties to it. Both sides, in our opinion, owe a responsibility to the public to reach an agreement that will permit the resumption of publication of the Globe-Democrat.

Poland's Constitution Day: An Anniversary for All Freemen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. QUIE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 4, 1959

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of the House the fact that May 3 marked a historic anniversary in the calendar of human rights and progress.

May 3 is a date of tremendous importance to the freedom-loving people of Poland who, while imprisoned behind the Iron Curtain, have the same aspirations for liberty as we.

It is a significant anniversary to the people of Polish extraction who are splendid citizens of our own country. They have contributed much and, in a very real sense, share the suffering which is being endured by their friends and relatives who are deprived of their liberties in Poland.

Finally, it is a date of great consequence for all of us who admire that nation's great role in the history of constitutional liberty.

May 3 was Poland's Constitution Day, marking the 168th anniversary of the adoption of Poland's Constitution.

It is more than just a date for the history books. It serves notice to the future that free Poland will rise again, will take its place once more with the free nations of the world.

The heroic revolution of June 1956 served notice to the Communist overlords, too. It told them, in graphic, human terms, that the Polish spirit cannot be extinguished by the naked force of totalitarianism.

We in this Nation have been edified by the noble resistance which has been exemplified by the Polish people. We pledge them that we shall not fail them, that we shall not forget their oppression.

Their imprisonment is a challenge to us all. It is a challenge to ourselves—for the man who proudly boasted that he will bury us cannot understand agreements.

Our only hope is to stand with the oppressed—for their courage is enough to sustain us as we wage the peace, as we stand determined not to bargain for temporary peace at the expense of those who are subjected to ruthless authoritarianism.

Mr. Speaker, May 3 and the days which follow it should be remembered as days in which the world lives in the twilight zone of half slave and half free. I pray that the day is fast dawning when all men will be allowed to take up their liberties where the gallant Polish people left off, when they were ruthlessly abducted by world communism.

I wish to extend my very best wishes and my fervent hope for liberty to the people of Poland, and to their relatives who have made such an edifying contribution to the heritage of our own country.

Democratic Leadership?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 4, 1959

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I am inserting in the Appendix of the RECORD an article that appeared in the New York Journal-American this morning:

MORSE'S QUARREL WAS WITH MR. LUCE
(By George E. Sokolsky)

There can be no reason in logic or morals to justify a Senator delivering a more than 3-hour diatribe against an American citizen who is invited by the President to serve her country, and then some Senators regarded their dignity as denounced when the lady landed a verbal uppercut at Senator MORSE. The Senate has no dignity and less gallantry when such attacks as Senator WAYNE MORSE permitted himself are made on its floor. When Joe McCarthy did it, perhaps in a better cause, he was denounced and reprimanded.

The fundamental concept which Senator FULBRIGHT and Senator MORSE sought to establish during their attacks on Mrs. Luce was that the Senate, while confirming a Presidential appointee to public office was entitled to demand political conformity, for an entire lifetime, to the party in power in the Senate at the moment of confirmation. This is, in effect, the argument being used against Secretary of Commerce Lewis L. Strauss. Neither Senator FULBRIGHT nor Senator MORSE can fill that bill, because they have shot wide of that mark themselves.

Senator FULBRIGHT, who has studied at Oxford and who admires the British system of government, suggested in 1946 that President Truman appoint a Republican Secretary of State and then resign so that the Government would be controlled by only one party. The Republicans had then won a victory very much like the Democratic victory in 1958. They were a majority in Congress whereas the President was a Democrat. Of course, Harry Truman did not resign in 1946 and the United States managed to survive.

Senator MORSE was a Republican when he first was elected to the Senate. When he could not have his way, he petulantly became a Democrat. He we reelected to the Senate as a Democrat. He had sought to be on the Foreign Relations Committee and could not get that as a Republican. The Democrats put him on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. He is chairman of a Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs which has a budget of $150,000. This makes WAYNE MORSE important in the life of Mrs. Luce because he could have used his power

and his committee's money to badger her during her term as Ambassador to Brazil, if he chose, to the disadvantage of the United States and of Brazil but to his personal satisfaction.

SHE'S NO SMALL BUREAUCRAT

Senator WAYNE MORSE has shown mixed qualities as a man. He is scholarly, at times brilliant, unreliable in his loyalties, individualistic in his attitude, bitter in attack, vindictive and, in relationship to Mrs. Luce, ungallant.

When he took on this lady, however, he was not dealing with a small bureaucrat afraid of a mighty Senator who could veto his career. Clare Luce is one of the most brilliant minds in this country. She has, to put it mildly, private means and is not afraid to lose a job. It is more than 20 years that I have known her, first as an editor of Vanity Fair; then as one of the more sophisticated playwrights of our country; then as a Congresswoman from Connecticut; but always as a sharp, keen mind that grasps central issues and that can in debate, knock her opponent over with a phrase. That one about WAYNE MORSE having become her enemy after he had been kicked in the head by a horse may have disturbed the dignity of some puffed-up Senators but it reduced WAYNE MORSE'S 3-hour diatribe to a laugh which is what it undoubtedly was worth.

Had Senator MORSE a real sense of humor, he would have gracefully kissed milady's hand and forgotten the whole business, and from what I have heard of the man, from some of his ex-colleagues on the Republican side, he is quite capable of doing just that should the mood come over him.

For actually, he has no quarrel with Mrs. Luce, whose career as Ambassador to Italy was one of astonishing brilliance and success. His quarrel is with Mrs. Luce's husband, who edits Time and Life and whose publications have on occasion given Senator MORSE cause for pique. Surely such a liberal as Senator MORSE does not visit upon the wife his annoyance with the husband.

There is one more point to all this: The Senate has been acting badly about confirmations. It delays without cause. It attacks without particulars. It is unfortunate for the country when this dignified body permits itself to be undignified.

Is the Alaska Statehood Act Unconstitutional?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 13, 1959

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, in view of a recent statement by Alaska's Governor Egan to the effect that Alaska would not agree to let any fish traps operate and that he feels Alaska can challenge the constitutionality of provisions of the act of Congress upon which the Alaska statehood depends, I wish to point out that such a challenge places Governor Egan and the State of Alaska in a most peculiar position. The act authorized statehood only on the basis that the people of Alaska voted to approve the conditions set out in the act. Among these was one that there should be a period of transition as to control of fish and game, and that during such period, the Federal laws should continue in effect and fish and game remain under Federal management.

The important law, and the one in question to which Congress referred, is the White Act, under which fishing with traps is permissible, subject to general conservation limitations, the same as any other fishing gear.

It is well known that the opposition against the use of fish traps has nothing to do with conservation; in fact, traps can be more effectively regulated for conservation purposes than mobile gear. Representative WESTLAND and myself, in whose districts so many fishermen live who are dependent on fish traps for their jobs, were responsible for this provision. It was added for the express purpose of giving those fishermen, as well as the operators, a period of time to adjust themselves and their operations, instead of having an immediate shutdown of fish traps.

If Governor Egan is correct that these provisions are unconstitutional, there can be a serious question as to whether or not Alaska is a State. In such case, Alaska may still be a Territory, or at least I have understood it to be a rule in interpreting laws that if a provision of the law is unconstitutional, then if the court finds that the law apparently would not have been passed without that provision, the whole act must be thrown out.

My good friend, the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. RIVERS] himself has admitted that the Alaskans voted to accept statehood subject to the conditions imposed by Congress, but he contends that they did not wish to do so—they did it only because they wanted statehood—and therefore should not be bound by their votes.

I do not believe the people of Alaska can accept conditions imposed by Congress and later, after having attained statehood, reject those provisions as not binding upon them.

Meanwhile let me suggest that any threats of lawless violence with respect to fish traps, if such are allowed to operate under Federal law, do not lend credit to the new State. In a frontier community, as with the Old West, one expected occasional brawls, but self-government and statehood are supposed to mean the end of disorder and asurance of the principle of a government of law and not of men.

Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 4, 1959

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, former Postmaster General James A. Farley spoke earlier this year before a group of advertising men in Detroit on the subject of "Politics."

BOLAND SUBSCRIBES TO JIM FARLEY'S POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY

During my 25 years of public service in the Massachusetts Legislature, the Hampden County government, and the Congress, I have always subscribed to the philosophy of politics expounded and explained so cogently by Jim Farley:

In politics the profit is not in material things, but in the satisfaction of serving your country, and your fellow man so that he will have a better way of life.

Mr. Farley then listed his 10 rules for the making of a successful politician. Both Mr. Farley's rules and his political philosophy should be a beacon for young officeholders.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I ask that an editorial printed in the Adirondack, N.Y. Daily Enterprise on January 31, 1959, entitled "Jim Farley on Politics" be printed in the Appendix with my remarks. I am sure that my colleagues will find the editorial interesting:

JIM FARLEY ON POLITICS

If there had not been a rigged Democratic State convention at Buffalo last summer, many people think Jim Farley, former U.S. Postmaster General and former chairman of the Democratic National Committee, would have been nominated to run for the Senate and that he then would have gone on to win the election.

Certain it is that Mr. Farley is popular around the State. However, his name was not even allowed to be placed in nomination at the convention. Frank Hogan, who was chosen by Carmine DeSapio over the protest of Governor Harriman, is an able man, but it would have been better for his candidacy and for the Democratic ticket as a whole if he had been nominated in an open convention, running against all the announced candidates, Farley, Finletter, Murray, and Dickenson.

Still better would be to have an open primary eystem in New York, as in many other States. Then candidates would be able to place their names directly before the voters and boss control would not be so easy to maintain. Strong party leadership might still influence primary results, but citizens would certainly have a far greater chance to express themselves than they do presently in the party conventions.

We are sorry that Governor Rockefeller and the Republican legislature did not put through a direct primary law. The Republicans have been just as guilty of undemocratic processes in their conventions through the years as the Democrats, though not so flagrantly as was the case with the DeSapio display of arrogant power last summer.

Perhaps from the GOP standpoint they are delighted to continue the present convention system if only because the Democrats seem determined to operate in such a thoroughly undemocratic way, thus giving the Republicans a dandy campaign issue.

Anyhow, we started out not so much to review the State election setup as to quote Mr. Farley on politics. Politics is often scorned for the reasons cited above, for chicanery that exists, for the compromises that are made, for the character of some politicians.

Politics is the art of governing. To govern well takes great skill, and it takes far more than that. "In politics the profit is not in material things," Mr. Farley recently told advertising men in Detroit, "but in the satisfaction of serving your country and your fellow man so that he will have a better way of life."

This is the essence of politics. This is basically why so many are attracted to it, to serve community or country.

Mr. Farley says he has 10 rules for the making of a successful politician: "A politician must have a good personality. He must have what we call character. He must be a substantial human being. He must work hard. He must be able to get other people to work for him and with him. He must have native ability and must be able to see and use ability in others. He must be aggressive but not to the point of being offensive. He must have a feeling for what people want. He must be able to make decisions. He must understand the meaning of the practical compromise without the loss of principle. Above all, he must be truthful."

Of course, politicians differ widely in their interpretations as to what people want, and in their effectiveness in translating those wants into law, appropriations, or other action. But being honest, having good character, and working hard will help a politician go a long way, just as these same qualities are essential to success in any other line of endeavor.

Educational Appropriations Urgently Needed

SPEECH
OF
HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 30, 1959

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 6769) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, there are many essential programs in the legislation before us. The security and well-being of the American people depend upon our continued support for these activities.

I believe that it is especially important that we maintain the full amount requested by the Committee on Appropriations for the Office of Education.

There has never been a time in American history when the education of our young people was so essential as it is today. The complex demands of the age offer a special challenge to the educational programs of the Nation.

I strongly urge the House to follow the recommendation of the committee in appropriating adequate funds to meet the full obligations under Public Laws 815 and 874. These two programs which provide funds for school operation and construction in federally impacted areas are essential. I am pleased that the committee is recommending sufficient funds to pay 100 percent of entitlements under the authorizing legislation. The committee recommendation would restore the 15-percent cut made by the Bureau of the Budget.

Last year, when the funds for this program were reduced, it soon became clear that our federally impacted school areas would be placed in an impossible position. Only timely action by the Congress in this session in restoring the cuts saved these school districts from sharp reductions in their educational programs. It should now be clear that the committee recommendation is no larger than necessary for the proper operation of legislation authorized by the Congress and proved by experience.

To indicate the support for this program in my State, many educators wrote, wired, or telephoned their dismay over the cuts that were made last year. Following are some of the persons urging the supplemental appropriation which we passed successfully a few weeks ago:

Mr. M. L. Reynolds, superintendent of schools, Pierre, S. Dak.

Mrs. W. T. McIlravy, clerk, Buckeye School District No. 13, Pierre, S. Dak.

School board, Wahehe School District No. 83, Greenwood, S. Dak.

Mr. C. J. Fiedler, superintendent of schools, Peever Independent School District No. 3, Peever, S. Dak.

Mr. C. L. Lehman, superintendent, Edgemont Independent School District 27, Edgemont, S. Dak.

Mr. Glenn H. Frary, superintendent of schools, Hot Springs, S. Dak.

Mr. Bernard E. Aho, superintendent of schools, Piedmont, S. Dak.

Mr. Ross P. Korsgaard, superintendent of schools, Igloo, S. Dak.

Mr. O. K. Ehlers, superintendent, Smee Independent School District No. 4, Wakpala, S. Dak.

Mr. Gordon A. Aaland, superintendent of schools, Wagner, S. Dak.

Mr. E. E. Grunwald, superintendent of schools, Sturgis, S. Dak.

Mr. S. M. Stickdale, superintendent, Todd County Independent School District, Mission, S. Dak.

Mr. M. P. Livingston, president, board of education, Pickstown, S. Dak.

Wileta M. Hawkins, clerk, Dry Run School District No. 12, Pierre, S. Dak.

LIBRARY SERVICES

The legislation before us also includes funds needed for the continued operation of our rural library service. This program has been of inestimable value to the people of rural America. It does not cost a great deal of money and it returns great dividends in the form of broader understanding, cultural advancement and reading enjoyment for our rural citizens. I urge the approval of this much needed item.

PRACTICAL NURSE TRAINING

There is great need in the country today for additional numbers of trained practical nurses. This is a need which gives every indication of becoming more acute in the years ahead. Here again, we have a fund request that is small in size but big in the dividends that it will return to the health and well-being of our people.

EXPANSION OF TEACHING IN EDUCATION OF THE MENTALLY RETARDED

I am especially pleased that the Committee on Appropriations and the Budget Bureau have recommended a million dollars to carry out the program which we enacted in the last Congress to benefit mentally retarded children.

As the sponsor of this program to expand the number of qualified teachers working with mentally retarded children, I know that it has widespread support throughout the country.

There are approximately 1 million mentally retarded youngsters in the United States who require specialized teaching if they are to become useful citizens. Unfortunately only about 15 percent of these children are given the opportunity to study under the direction of qualified teachers. The funds now being requested will begin a modest program designed to increase the number of specially trained teachers through grants to institutions of higher learning and to state educational agencies.

On next Saturday, I am to be the guest of the South Dakota Association for Retarded Children at their annual convention in Rapid City, S. Dak. This splendid association, whose current president is Mr. Laurie Larson of Sioux Falls, has performed an invaluable service to the people of South Dakota in providing understanding, public support, and facilities for the training of our mentally retarded children. I hope that I will be able to report to them that we have acted favorably on this modest request for funds to implement a most worthy program.

NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

As one of the subcommittee members who drafted the National Defense Education Act passed by the last Congress, I, of course, hope that the Congress will approve the funds requested to carry on this program in the next fiscal year.

The activities authorized in this act have won the enthusiatic support of those interested in education across the Nation on a scale that goes beyond even the most optimistic hopes of those of us who drafted the program.

I urge my colleagues to grant the amount which this legislation calls for and to support also the funds requested for carrying on the time-tested programs in the field of vocational education.

Kennedy-Ervin Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 4, 1959

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the Labor Committee in the House will be holding hearings this month on the Kennedy-Ervin bill which passed the Senate last Saturday by a near-unanimous vote. The Members of this body will then be called upon to vote on this vital piece of legislation.

HONEST WORKINGMEN AND CLEAN LABOR UNIONS STIGMATIZED

I am sure that all of my colleagues are well informed on abuses that have been revealed during the last 2 years by the McClellan committee in the Senate. There is no question but that reform legislation is desirable and needed. Senator KENNEDY, of Massachusetts, a mem-

ber of the McClellan committee and chairman of the Labor Subcommittee in the Senate, is to be commended for the hard work and long hours he has put in on the labor bill which has now come over to the House for consideration. Both he and the senior Senator from North Carolina, Mr. ERVIN, recognized the need for legislation in this session of Congress if we are going to move in the right direction to protect some 17 million honest workingmen in this country from the stigma that has been associated with labor unions because of some few crooked and unscrupulous labor bosses.

CORRECTIVE LAW NEEDED

Mr. Speaker, Columnist Walter Lippman wrote about the need for enacting this labor bill in his Washington Post article last Thursday. I ask that Mr. Lippman's piece be printed with my remarks. Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, had the Lippmann article inserted in the RECORD on that day. I would suggest that my colleagues read the column.

Fair Trade Not Fair to Consumers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 4, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the fair trade bill, H.R. 1253, coming before the Congress of the United States is not in the public interest.

Some of the reasons why this bill should be defeated are chronicled in an editorial appearing in the Binghamton, N.Y., Press on March 19, 1959 entitled "Fair Trade Not Fair to Consumers."

In addition to not being fair to the consumers, a fact ignored by those who push fair trade is that it will not help to save the little retailer who it is supposed to aid. H.R. 1253 should be defeated summarily.

The article follows:

FAIR TRADE NOT FAIR TO CONSUMERS

The price fixers are at it again. They're trying to ram through Congress a fair trade law to operate everywhere, regardless of State laws, that would permit manufacturers to fix the retail prices of appliances, drugs, and other branded products.

Fair trade laws operate oppositely in principle from antitrust laws and are opposed by the Federal Trade Commission and the Justice Department. The euphemistic label "fair trade" doesn't conceal from consumers that such laws are against the public interest and in violation of the American system of free competitive enterprise.

The transparent objective of such laws, or at least their effect, is to eliminate competition and boost consumer prices. It is a travesty of economic decency that a move of this sort should be launched at this time against tax-burdened, inflation-harassed consumers.

Fair trade laws aimed at discount houses which have become popular as American consumers have exercised their American right to shop around and get the most and best they can for their rubber dollars. Fair trade is not a little responsible for the popularity of discount houses.

Under the free American system no manufacturer should have the power to control the price of his product in retail markets or after it has passed from his hands. Such a manufacturer would whine like a pup if the prices of his raw materials were price fixed.

Federal fair trade laws of the past have had a hard road to travel in widespread violation, and in invalidation in State courts. State fair trade laws have been almost uniformly invalidated by courts as being in violation of State constitutions.

Members of Congress too often owe their elections to support of militant pressure groups which seek to prey economically on the people as a whole. Fair trade is predatory, aimed at benefiting and protecting the few at the expense of the many.

Existing fair trade statutes, such as the McGuire Act (based on contractual pretense) should be repealed. Instead, the fair traders in desperation try to compound the evils of past legislation in new.

As regards current fair trade proposals, the Federal Trade Commission reaffirms its past opposition. Chairman John W. Gwynne writes:

"The fixing of resale prices is inconsistent with the American system of free competitive enterprise and is contrary to the public policy expressed by Congress in the antitrust laws since 1890."

Law Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 4, 1959

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix today to give a belated commendation to the Institute of Military Law, and the Federal Bar Association, I include the Pentagon's observance from the Office of the Judge Advocate General. Enclosed is their program on Law Day, May 1, 1959. We were not in session on Friday or I would have made appropriate remarks at that time. Since this is the first day of session since Law Day, I hasten to give observance.

I would also like to include herein the President's remarks, issued at the Pentagon and to thank Major General Harmon and his staff for having such a fine program. I have had the privilege of working as a Reserve officer with these distinguished soldiers and lawyers, and they are dedicated advocates and professional lawyers of the highest ability and integrity.

I enclose at this point a program:

LAW DAY PROCLAMATION BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

I, Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States of America, do hereby designate Friday, May 1, 1959, as Law Day in the United States of America. I urge the people of the United States to observe Law Day with appropriate public ceremonies and by the reaffirmance of their dedication to our form of government and the supremacy of law in our lives. I especially urge the legal profession, the schools and educational institutions, and all media of public information to take the lead in sponsoring and participating in appropriate observances throughout the Nation.

PENTAGON LAW DAY OBSERVANCE, MAY 1, 1959, PENTAGON INNER COURT

(Sponsored by the Institute of Military Law; Federal Bar Association, Pentagon Chapter; the Judge Advocates Association)

The Institute of Military Law: Comdr. Gay E. Milius, Jr., USNR, president.

The Judge Advocates Association: Col. Franklin Berry, USAR, president.

The Federal Bar Association, Pentagon Chapter: Conrad D. Philos, Esq., president.

PROGRAM

Maj. Gen. Reginald C. Harmon, The Judge Advocate General U.S. Air Force Presiding

Presentation of Colors--Joint Services Color Guard

U.S. Army Field Band
Maj. C. E. Whiting, Director

The National Anthem---The U.S. Army Field Band and Chorus

Invocation-------Chaplain (Brig. Gen. R. P. Taylor
Deputy Chief of Air Force Chaplains

Selection-----The U.S. Army Field Band and Chorus

Recognition of distinguished guests.

Address-----The Honorable Stanley F. Reed, Associate Justice, Supreme Court of the United States

Benediction--Capt. Francis T. O'Leary, CHC, UNS
Assistant Director of Navy Chaplains

Recessional.

COMMITTEES

Maj. Gen. Reginald C. Harmon
The Judge Advocate General, USAF
Honorary Chairman

General Chairman Cmdr. G. E. Milius, Jr., USNR

Finance:
Maj. Gen E. M. Brannon, USA (JAGC) retired
Chairman
Col. C. E. Straight, USA (JAGC)
Col. A. J. Clark, USAF

Operations:
Maj. T. G. O'Shea, USAF
Chairman
Maj. N. J. Cipriano, USA (JAGC)

Press, radio, TV:
Maj. C. E. Barnes, USAF
Chairman
Lt. Col. R. W. Michels, USAF
Lt. F. L. Crowley, USA (JAGC)

Music:
Col. C. M. Munnecke, USA (JAGC)
Chairman
Col. J. L. Searles, USA (JAGC)

Reception:
Comdr. Katherine E. Shilling, USN
Chairman
Capt. Dorothy M. Schomp, USAF

Program:
Conrad D. Philos, Esq.
Chairman
Lt. Col. Mort Gold, USAF

PENTAGON OBSERVES LAW DAY U.S.A. IN COLORFUL CEREMONY

With the reading of the President's proclamation by Maj. Gen. Reginald C. Harmon, the Judge Advocate General of the Air Force, chairman of the event and spokesman for the military legal community, followed by a color presentation by the Joint Armed Forces Color Guard and a resounding rendition of the national anthem by the world famous U.S. Army Field Band and Chorus, military observance of Law Day U.S.A. was inaugurated at the inner court of the Pentagon today. In a ceremony reminiscent of an old-fashioned Fourth of July, area members of the various military services and Defense Department employees took a short time out from the business of running the Nation's Military Establishment to pay tribute to the body of law under which we live.

The program was conspicuously marked by the inspiring address of Associate Justice Stanley F. Reed, longtime member of the U.S. Supreme Court. Justice Reed, commenting on the concept of the rule of law and of government under law, took the opportunity to describe significant development in the rule of law between nations arising out of the United Nations Organization. Attention was also drawn to the body of military law which governs our Armed Forces and the role that the military lawyer plays in that regard.

Deputy Chief of Air Force Chaplains, Brig. Gen. R. P. Taylor, gave the solemn invocation. Prominent members of the military and civilian component of the Department of Defense participated, as did notable members of the Washington area bench and bar and many of the chief military law practitioners. The ceremony closed with a benediction by Chaplain Francis T. O'Leary, CHC, USN, Assistant Director of Navy Chaplains.

In programing this musical military and patriotic tribute to the law and the legal profession, the Institute of Military Law supported by the Pentagon chapter of the Federal Bar Association and the Judge Advocates Association, joins the nationwide effort of the civilian bar, initiated by the American Bar Association, designed to increase the appreciation of the importance of law in the daily lives of our citizens and to emphasize the contrast between the freedom under law which we enjoy and the tyranny which enslaves the people of one-third of the world today. In furtherance of the latter aim, the Pentagon ceremony was particularly significant.

Musical selections by the Army Field Band and Chorus, under the direction of Maj. Chester E. Whiting, before and throughout the ceremony created a holiday atmosphere in the attractively landscaped open area of the inner court of the Pentagon.

Comdr. Gay E. Milius, USNR, president of the Institute of Military Law, indicated that this was the first of what is hoped to be an annual affair.

At the end of the program Justice Reed made a marvelous address and I include his address as part of my remarks here:

Americans gather today in numerous groups, at the suggestion of our civil and military chief, President Eisenhower, to rededicate ourselves to the principle of government under law. It is a satisfaction to have this opportunity, under the auspices of this Institute, to participate in this ceremonial Law Day. It is gratifying to have this reconfirmation that our citizens, civil and military alike, fully realize that we are a people whose Government thus seeks freedom and justice for all under our Constitution. We cherish our liberties as matters of right, not as grants of a benevolent autocracy.

Today our military forces must necessarily be large. We are no longer isolated from the danger of sudden attack. Modern technology has so contracted the world that infractions of our peace, without time for long preparations, are possible. These forces are our protectors, however, with members drawn generally from our families, not a special military clique for enforcement of military rule. Our Founding Fathers felt little need for standing armies and deprecated their establishment for fear that arrogant militarism might get a foothold here and weaken civilian resistance to military usurpations of power. That danger seems imaginary now and will continue to be, so long as the whole people will to live in ordered liberty under law.

The law we honor today is the body of governmentally enforceable rules controlling the relations of man with his fellows. International law lies outside that definition except as our courts may adopt as their own the recognized practices for adjusting differences between citizens of different States or nations to settle disagreements as to their respective rights. As has been suggested by the Vice President, Mr. NIXON, and the Attorney General, Mr. Rogers, we would further the rule of law if nations, including ourselves, would now grant a wider jurisdiction to the International Court of Justice, of which our representative, Judge Green H. Hackworth, for many years Legal Adviser to the Department of State, is a member.

The American Bar Association is making an effort through its Committee on World Peace Through Law, under the chairmanship of Charles Rhyne, for such an advance. If we are not ready as yet to submit to binding decisions on treaties, as to matters essentially within our domestic jurisdiction, such as immigration or currency value or exports, we could have advisory opinions of such a court which would be useful as coming from an authority least likely to be influenced by ulterior reasons.

Thoughtful men even in the midst of exacerbating controversies over matters from Berlin to Formosa are actively working to extend the domain of the law into the world's international relations. If there can be accomplished a worldwide mobilization of men of the law throughout the nations, it will mark a true forward step toward a method for the adjustment of the inevitable frictions that arise in international affairs. Such an effort has especial appeal to our citizens.

It is to be hoped that we are seeing the beginning of the extension, as Wilfred Jenks surmizes in his recent work, of international law, relations between nations, to a "common law of mankind." With individuals of separate nations intermingling in worldwide trade, the creation of international organizations and area treaties such as NATO and the European community, the necessity is obvious. From this necessity springs the Declaration of Human Rights, the effort to agree on the seaward limits of national sovereignty, efforts to settle jurisdiction over Antartica, and rights in outer space. The rule of law approaches new fields.

There was a striking example of the effectiveness of treaties through the creation of the crime of aggressive war, by the Kellogg-Briand Peace Pact of 1928 to which Germany was a party, applied by the allies at Nuremberg to punish the German leaders who violated it.

We have seen the controversies and misunderstanding between our State sovereignties softened and largely satisfactorily adjusted through the use of judicial decisions to settle disputes. From the vantage point of today we see nothing unusual in having courts settle the boundary lines of States. Even when the Tidelands decision barred the rich oil stores of adjacent waters from exploitation by bordering States, the decision was accepted as binding until congressional action gave these public lands to the adjacent States. How much better to live under a rule of law where, for example, the waters of the Colorado may be equitably divided between the States that it touches, rather than to be appropriated by the strongest or wasted into the sea.

Our laws are not improvisations to meet unexpected situations but the product of generations of experience that reaches through the centuries. Our military law, too, has that background. The Founding Fathers were not unaware that life in the military forces differs from life among civilians even in peacetime. Only too well they knew the necessities for rigorous control during war. So it was that the Articles of Confederation provided that "The United States, in Congress assembled, shall have the sole and exclusive right and power of * * * making rules for the government and regulation of the said land and naval forces, and directing their operations." That is practically identical to our present constitutional provision. In fact Mr. Madison's notes show it was "added from the existing Articles of Confederation." If our national forces had been left to the control of the respective States, as No. 4 of the "Federalist" points out, we would not have had unity of command or absence of rivalry for military power between the States or sections.

This solicitude for the maintenance of a national army in accordance with the disciplines that experience had shown, persisted through the adoption of our Bill of Rights. Therefore the fifth amendment, by specific exception, omits the military forces from the requirement of a grand jury indictment, and the sixth amendment, by construction in ex parte Milligan, from the requirement of a petit jury. Since these exceptions withdraw from the military forces protections from arbitrary action greatly valued by civilians, they have been strictly construed in favor of the individual by the Supreme Court, as the recent cases of *Toth* v. *Quarles* and *Reid* v. *Covert* make plain.

Law is dynamic. It gathers "meaning from experience." The scientific advances of the first half of the 20th century, with its revolutionary introduction of motors, planes, electronics, its chemical discoveries in drugs and plastics, automation and atomic energy has not and will not leave society and economics unchanged. Nor will law be left unchanged. Certainly the field of law has felt the impact of these new forces, as has government. But however the tornado may toss the sea, it remains the sea. However strong the pressures of change, the basic concepts of justice remain unimpaired and adaptable to changing circumstances.

Momentous days lie ahead for law and lawyers. Our law must adjust itself not only to the advances of science, as it did when Causby marked for aerial flights a free space for navigation, or when *Reid* v. *Covert* extended concepts of our constitutional law as to jury trial in capital cases to include American citizens accompanying the Armed Forces in foreign lands. The lawyers of the Armed Forces must continue their labors with an open mind, be earnest in their readiness to learn from past errors, and adjust when experience and reflection show a wiser course. Present rules are at best abstractions from the current norms of society.

When words such as reasonable, fair, due process, negligence, or equal protection control judicial interpretation, guided by court precedents and legislation, their meaning will vary with ethical and social experience. The earnest efforts of many minds are needed to continue our life under a rule of law. We made a real contribution toward the rule of law when we accepted judicial determination of disputes between the States of our Union, and concerning the powers of Government under our Constitution. Would not that experience induce us to take the lead in submitting at least many of our international disputes to decision by the International Court of Justice at The Hague? Such a step would brighten the prospect of the achievement of mankind's hope of a world under law. It might save what Mr. Justice Birkett called the "supreme international crime" a war of aggression supreme because that crime contains within itself all of accumulated evil.

It is only comparatively recent that it has been recognized that citizens have rights as well as governments have power, and that only under a rule of law both needs could be satisfied. Since in a republic "all the citizens, as such, are equal, and no citizen can rightfully exercise any authority over another, but in virtue of a power constitutionally given by the whole community," machinery was necessary to adjudge rights. The 17th century philosophers who taught the theory of the inherent rights of man left unnamed the arbiter whose decision would

determine when fundamental rights were invaded by government. Obviously each individual cannot decide that for himself. "Fire burns both in Hellas and Persia; but men's ideas of right and wrong vary from place to place." If we are all to have our way, each would have a universal war against everyone—bellum omnium contra omnes. Everybody would sit in judgment on everybody. We found our answer in judicial review of actions challenged as unconstitutional.

Despite violent reactions against judicial decisions of constitutional problems that have continued since *Marbury* v. *Madison*, *M'Culloch* v. *Maryland*, and *Cohens* v. *Virginia*, no other solution has received general approval. Judicial review as to the validity of legislative or executive action has difficulties in administration but the alternative of unreviewable action has more.

Few governments allow judicial review on the issue of the constitutionality either of legislation or of executive action. The power of courts to pass upon the conformity of such actions with constitutional requirements was an American contribution to the evolution of democracy. Order requires that the power of decision as to constitutionality rest in some body. Our choice has been the courts, which can only interpret after open hearing, with full discussion, and a reasoned opinion.

We lawyers can be proud of the contributions of law to liberty and peace. All of us look forward hopefully to the perpetuation of our democracy through a fair administration of justice. May each member of our profession contribute his full powers to that high purpose.

Market Site Protested

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 4, 1959

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, since coming to Washington as a new Member of Congress in January, 1953, I have read and heard much about how beautiful southwest Washington will be when the redevelopment project has been completed. Now it seems that this section might be the location for a new market area, in addition to beautiful apartment houses, lawns and gardens.

I think that my colleagues might be interested in reading a letter that was written by Charles R. Roberts and printed in the letter box column in the Washington Evening Star on April 24 concerning this proposed southwest market site. I ask that the article be printed with my remarks in the Appendix:

MARKET SITE PROTESTED

Washington is one of the most beautiful cities in the world. Slum areas around the Mall, Constitution Avenue, and the surrounding area were cleaned out not many years ago. But now a new potential slum area is being projected a few blocks away. Within sight of Capitol Hill, the very heart of southwest Washington is about to be disfigured by a projected market, with space for 100 trucks and cars.

Where is the protest of the Fine Arts Commission? The market will be right down the avenue from the Mellon Gallery, and not far from the Smithsonian Institution, a neighbor to many other beautiful attractions of Washington. Citizens are up in arms and Congress is stirred because Members realize that an unsightly area is about to be approved by one of their agents, the Redevelopment Land Agency. Rats will be running in front of cars of Members of Congress, if final approval is given for the market near Capitol Hill.

If land were scarce, it would be a different story. But there is plenty of land for the market, according to real estate men, on the outskirts of the city. And they point out that it will help the traffic situation in Washington if the market is located on the edge of the city.

Why then does the market have to occupy choice land in the heart of Washington? Where are our plans for a new Southwest Washington? If we had vision and vigilance, even the railroad viaduct would be made as attractive as the old Roman aqueducts.

Citizens of the southwest section sold their homes and places of business, often reluctantly, with the hope that a renewal of the section would take place. Now they are discovering that good solid homes were taken down to make way for another Dixon's Court, so long notorious in the southwest area.

It's about time we all made some noise so that our children will not have to move into a ready-made slum area. The architects of our Federal city devised a beautiful plan for the Capitol Hill area. Let us realize their dream in our day.

CHARLES R. ROBERTS.

Against Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 16, 1959

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I believe if Congress begins passing foot-in-the-door Federal aid to education legislation, the Federal Government sooner or later will come to dominate our schools.

I recognize that many school officials have reason to become a bit frustrated and find that statements to this effect have a sort of hollow ring.

For example, in my State of Washington 36.5 percent of special school bond issues and 17.2 percent of special school levies in 365 different school districts during the past 2 years were rejected, either for want of a sufficient constitutional percentage of voters participating in the election or by a direct negative vote.

But, frustrated or not, anyone who says Federal aid does not mean Federal strings does not know the facts.

Recognition that Federal school aid would destroy local control out of his own experience, has been strongly voiced by Lloyd J. Andrews, superintendent of public instruction of my State of Washington.

Following is an article which speaks for itself. This is entitled "Andrews on Education" and is by a well-regarded news commentator, Charles E. Johns, who writes from Olympia, the State capital. I clipped this item from the April 29, 1959, isue of the Bremerton Sun:

OLYMPIA.—The views on education expressed last week by Lloyd J. Andrews, State superintendent of public instruction, make a lot of sense.

Andrews does not want the Federal Government messing around in State educational programs.

He thinks the National Defense Education Act came about only because a lot of people were scared by the Russians and that changing our education system to the Russian pattern of intensive scientific instruction is ill-advised and hysterical.

Speaking at Harding College, Searcy, Ark., he said:

"The Federal Government has absolutely no business offering Federal aid to the States for education. It is impossible for the Federal Government to aid a State. The best it can do is to collect taxes from the individuals comprising the State and then redistribute their money back to them * * * a process that sooner or later will bring control and domination of the educational program by the distributing agency."

Andrews questioned the credo of the National Defense Education Act that the defense of the Nation depends on the mastery of modern techniques developed from complex scientific principles.

He said the best defense of this Nation ultimately will be in its citizens, as individuals, joining together in their opposition to centralization of power in the hands of a few.

As for Washington school financing: "I would consider an ideal situation to be one where the legislature establishes the policy of the programs to be financed at the State level and the programs to be financed at the local level and then delegates to the chief school officer the responsibility of computing the cost based upon the level of spending for salaries, etc., as necessary to provide the proper personnel and facilities. As long as education is used as a political football, however, this sound and basic approach to the problem is impossible."

Andrews should know his subject. He served Spokane County as a State senator from 1953 to 1957, with assignment to the appropriations committee. He handled educational apropriations in the legislative post. He has now served for 2 years as the State's chief educational officer, and dealt with the problems from the opposite angle. The cost of education is the largest single item in the State's budget and it is constantly going up.

A Depressed Area

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE SILER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 4, 1959

Mr. SILER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I would like to insert a letter that I have just received from one of my constituents, Mr. J. Emerson Miller, 414 Lynwood Road, Middlesboro, Ky., which is in Bell County in southeastern Kentucky, an area where there is much need and considerable economic hardship and quite serious conditions of unemployment that call for the aid and assistance of the Congress of the United States. The letter from Mr. Miller, who is one of our earnest and respected citizens, is as follows:

MIDDLEBORO, KY., *April 9,1959.*

Conditions in Bell County are fast becoming a national disgrace.

Food, clothing, housing, educational opportunities, and medical care are all desperately needed in an area where depression has never ended, where large-scale poverty abounds, and, as Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, of Illinois, pointed out recently, "people are literally starving to death."

As a result of the economic blight that has been slowly spreading over this county for more than a decade, thousands of our people, young and old, are hungry, if not actually starving, from malnutrition; some suffering and slowly dying from lack of drugs and medical care.

On the basis of population, Bell County enjoys these dubious distinctions: has, perhaps, more unemployables than any of the Nation's 3,000 counties; in 1958 had more people receiving public assistance payments than any county in the State; has had in recent years more applicants for surplus Government food than any county, thousands of them in need but unable to qualify for aid because of various Federal and State regulations.

The per capita income of Bell County in 1953 was only $749; by 1956 it had fallen to $688; and has grown progressively lower with the cheapening of the dollar.

Of the county's 1,364 farms, in 1956 only 47 farmowners had incomes in excess of $250 for that year.

Ten thousand or more persons, or one in four, are depending on free government food to keep them alive; the April allotment to an individual for 30 days consisting of corn meal, dried milk, rice and a pound of butter, with a total retail sales value of approximately $1.25, which means slow starvation.

Thousands of miners, unemployed for years, are living in unrelieved want, not old enough to qualify for miners' pensions or social security.

Hundreds of unemployed workers, victims of last year's recession, have exhausted their unemployment compensation benefits and are having to fall back on relief.

Hunger is a daily experience for thousands, children staying home from school because they haven't the energy to study or don't have enough to eat for breakfast. I am reminded of one case—that of a little girl who hold her teacher she had only had a biscuit for breakfast, had nothing for lunch, and had to be taken home before the end of the schoolday.

Equally pathetic is the condition of the high school graduate, who unable to find a job and without means to continue his education, finding himself penniless in desperation tries to sell his blood to Knoxville hospitals.

Then there is the question of public health. A large group of the county's residents, perhaps thousands, are too poor to pay for medical aid, too poor or sick to visit a doctor's office, too poor to buy expensive drugs, and have no money for hospitalization or nursing care. No one knows how many fatally high blood pressure and other caridac and circulatory diseases exist in the county among the middle and older age groups and those chronically ill. Every year there are needless deaths, people who could have been saved by prompt medical attention at the first sign of complaint. There are all too many like an elderly man who remarked to me: "When we uns get bad off we uns jest die".

Our hard-pressed hospitals and overworked doctors must bear heavy costs of medical care of people who must have such care but can't afford to pay for it.

Something must be done to assure medical care and hospitalization for the medically indigent. A partial solution would seem to be the erection of a chronic disease hospital in the county, to be administered, perhaps, by the State department of health.

I earnestly hope the State's lawmakers will immediately recognize the need for and take steps to create such an essential facility. It would be a godsend to the increasing number of our aged.

J. EMERSON MILLER.

Need for Central Single Management and Procurement System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 4, 1959

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, as a matter of record, I wish to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a copy of a letter I recently sent Hon. Maurice H. Stans, Director of the Bureau of the Budget, relative to enforcement of Public Law 81–152—the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949—dealing with management and procurement matters, recommended by the Hoover Commission and approved by Congress, as well as the McCormack amendment to section 202 of the National Security Act:

APRIL 28, 1959.

Hon. MAURICE H. STANS,
Director, Bureau of the Budget,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. STANS: I am in receipt of your letter of March 17, 1959, and have given it careful study, and do not believe that it responds properly to my letter of February 21, 1959, as to content or spirit.

I am sure that you know, or at least your staff knows, of the interest I have had for many, many years in improving the supply management activities of the Government and, particularly, in the Department of Defense where so many billions of dollars are expended. Partly because of this long and intense interest, I was prompted to sponsor both Hoover Commissions, and have spent a great amount of time and effort in this area, which I consider lends itself more than any other to economy and efficiency.

When former Director Brundage indicated to the Government Operations Subcommittee on May 28, 1957, that the Bureau of the Budget recognized the importance of this area of management and was working on it, I was pleased, though it was immaterial to me whether the approach to improvement was through a reorganization plan, or pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921, or through the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, or through the general authority of the President of the United States, or otherwise.

I was interested in results and, quite frankly, I have seen small evidence of substantial accomplishments in this most important area. Certainly, I have seen no recent evidence that the Bureau of the Budget, which is the overall management arm of the President in these matters, has taken vigorous action with respect thereto.

Your letter of March 17 correctly indicates that I have opposed the concept of establishing still another supply service which would operate over and above the numerous existing supply services in the Department of Defense. What I think should be done is to merge or integrate, rather than create still more services. I think we need one effective supply service, rather than many separate and competing services.

It is also true that I have advocated that GSA should be given the tasks which were contemplated with the passage of Public Law 152, and also the means of redeeming them. This action was strongly advocated by the first Hoover Commission. GSA is now 10 years old, and I am sure that you are aware of the fact that it will never operate as planned unless it has the strong backing of the Bureau of the Budget. Specifically, GSA can never operate successfully in the large supply and service areas unless it is organized, staffed, and equipped to take over some of the large common supply and service activities now performed by the military agencies. Here again, I do not favor building up GSA and leaving the military agencies intact. There must be a transfer of stock, buildings, personnel, etc., if there is to be more efficiency, and this is a top management matter affecting organization.

I would suggest, Mr. Director, that the Bureau immediately try to delineate areas of common supply, particularly administrative-type items which can be turned over to GSA from the military agencies.

As a start, why not give it all types of office supplies, equipment, furniture, furnishings, etc., which are used not only by the military, but by numerous civilian agencies? I understand that GSA is serving the Air Force in this field, so why not extend the program to the Army and Navy also? In such a program I would expect, of course, that there would be less organization after transfers were made, than under current operations.

I also note from your letter that you tend to support the single manager systems which have been developed for a few classes of items in the Department of Defense. I am sure you realize that there are only 44,000 items in the single manager systems, and though some of these items are large in volume, the program is relatively small compared to the sum total of common items in the Department of Defense. For example, the general stores items in the services include 100,000 items or more, and even a cursory inventory analysis indicates there is a large duplication in these items in the military services. What has the Bureau done, or what does it plan to do to place these items under a single manager? I note from the Department of Defense appropriations hearings for 1960, part I, page 993, that criteria have been developed for the expansion of the single manager program, and also for the designation of the managers to operate the new plans. If this is so, why should there be long delays in starting other single manager categories? Certainly, with a vigorous standardization program there could be even more commonality with respect to these items.

I have made some inquiry concerning the unity in the military systems in the so-called theaters of joint command and find that a great amount of work needs to be done in the development of standard forms, procedures, regulations, etc., etc., in order that there may be effective and responsive supply systems to back up the unified commands.

I presume that you are aware that the Air Force has started a study as to its communication requirements in the space age. Many people, including myself, wonder why such a study was not directed to the communications needs of the Department of Defense at this time when the idea of joint commands is commonly accepted.

Within the last few days I have noted that the Navy is contemplating a rather important reorganization of some of its ordnance activities involving two or more services. Newspaper articles indicate that legislative action will be required in this respect. I wonder what overall studies are in contemplation at the Bureau of the Budget with respect to ordnance requirements among the three services.

I have also noted that the Army is currently developing a worldwide surplus property program. To what extent is this being geared to the entire program? And what is being done to stop the creation of needless surpluses? You stated in a recent "Face the Nation" program that, "we have consultations going on with the Department of Defense even now, currently, on that subject." This has been a live problem since 1942, and something more than consultations are required to make progress. Now, I am not unmindful of the factor of technological change and obsolescence in this picture. But, frankly, there are too many military services buying, storing, and distributing the 3½ or more million items in the Department of Defense supply systems. This is particularly so for common type items.

Frankly, I think that we must solve the organizational and other problems which help cause the annual generation of $8 to $10 billion in surpluses. If you think that the McCormack amendment, section 202(c)(6) of the National Security Act, as amended, is the correct basis to get the job done, may I inquire what is being done with the Bureau's support in developing an overall program to accomplish the objective? Here again, I am not unaware that good accounting is a tool to good management, but good tools are not enough by themselves.

I have written this letter at some length to indicate the scope and nature of some of the problems which confront us in the supply and service field as I have viewed them over a long period of time. The GAO has issued approximately 200 reports in the last year dealing with some of these matters, though they have not as yet, so far as I know, studied and reported on the organizational weaknesses in the supply and service systems themselves.

It seems to me that the Bureau of the Budget which represents the executive branch topside in management matters, including reorganization, and which has the responsibility for presenting the budget, should be extremely active at this time in an area where the stakes are the national defense and the national economy. If this is not a management and organizational problem of the highest order, then there is none.

Sincerely yours,

CLARENCE J. BROWN,
Member of Congress, Seventh Ohio District.

Poland's Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL B. DAGUE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 4, 1959

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, no one who believes in the sanctity of human freedom can remain silent in the face of the oppression that has been suffered by the gallant Polish people.

When the revolt against Poland's Communist overlords occurred in 1956 most of us entertained the fond hope that at long last a new day was dawning for those oft-oppressed but never subservient lovers of liberty.

In the 2 years that have intervened, however, we have seen the Communists reassert their authority and with the return to collective agriculture and the suppression of the press we can see these brave people once more being pushed toward the shackles that have been their lot decade after decade.

For as many years as we have been free this Nation has championed the cause of subject peoples everywhere and there have been times in the past when we have lent material aid to their liberation. Of late, however, we have too often pulled back and have been content to let our support center in pious platitudes and words of sympathy.

As we prize liberty for ourselves, even so do we have a responsibility to keep alight the flame that burns in the hearts of others. Let us with all of the resources at our command extend the hand of fellowship to our Polish brothers and implement our words with material aid.

Remarks of Acting Postmaster Robert K. Christenberry at Luncheon Meeting of Association of Buying Offices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 4, 1959

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to call the attention of my colleagues to the remarks made by Acting Postmaster Robert K. Christenberry at a luncheon meeting of the Association of Buying Offices at the Hotel Sheraton-McAlpin, February 18, 1959. This is one of a series of talks made by Mr. Chistenberry in an effort to better acquaint the patrons of the New York Post Office with the services which are offered and the ways in which the postal service can be made more efficient:

Mr. Burston, members of the Association of Buying Offices, and friends, yours is the eighth industrial group I have addressed since the introduction last June of our public postal education and mail improvement program. Although each of these has represented a totally different field, namely—department stores, the shipping industry, hotel, airlines, stock transfer agents, American Telephone & Telegraph, and Sales Executives Club—strange to say, the postal problems of all have been somewhat the same.

You businessmen know the importance of keeping open the lines of communication, and the necessity of connecting with trains, planes, and ships for the expedition dispatch and delivery of your mail. You know that although it is not among the higher-salaried units of your organization, your mailroom is an essential arm of them, and the one that sometimes is responsible for the firm's getting that bid or consummating a contract. Very often not too much attention is paid to this important segment of a business, and whether the practices and procedures employed are serving the best interests of your company. For example, is your mailroom equipment carefully selected; have your scales been recently inspected; is your postal information on rates—train, plane, and ship schedules up-to-date; are you avoiding the use of airmail and special delivery to business firms over weekends when they are closed; for faster service are you relying on airlift which is 4 cents mail sent by plane on a space available basis, instead of regular airmail; are you spending special delivery fees on parcel post packages instead of special handling; are you destroying spoiled envelopes and tapes bearing metered postage instead of redeeming them for 90 percent of their face value at the post office; are you sending out promotional material at first-class instead of third-class rates; have you checked any enclosures included with such material for proper weight; are you cooperating with the post office, and taking advantage of all the services available to its patrons?

The answers to these questions will readily determine whether you are operating your mailroom economically or extravagantly, and whether you are getting the kind of postal service which you expect and to which we feel you are entitled. Significant economies in mail operations and improved service can be obtained only by careful one-the-scene analysis and testing.

Airmail service is one of the most likely areas for realizing postage economies in any company. In appraising the relative merits of air versus surface mail, each company must consider a variety of important factors. One of these is the extent to which its mail is addressed to large cities. Although all large cities have frequent airmail service, many small towns have no direct airmail service; and as a result, a letter or package very often goes through many handlings and transfers. In addition, weather plays an important part; and when planes are grounded because of unfavorable conditions, the mail is forwarded by surface transportation, or is held for later plane transportation, pending favorable weather.

Many firms are unaware of the fact that the post office may forward matter bearing airmail postage via surface transportation if, in its judgment, equal or superior service will result.

One of the main points to bear in mind is—does the destination warrant the use of airmail? In some cases, the letter will arrive just as soon via ordinary first-class mail. For example, Delaware, Maryland, Connecticut, and New Jersey do not receive airmail service from New York. In general, avoid the use of airmail for distances under 200 miles. One of the common errors made by firms is the use of airmail to Philadelphia, Pa.

Among many firms, one of the most frequent mistakes is their failure to give not alone to their own mailroom but to the post office, advance notice of their large mailings. One company had to spend considerable money for postage and overtime pay to send its Christmas customer gifts by special delivery to assure their receipt by December 25—which could have been avoided had they planned their gift-giving earlier and used ordinary mail.

In the case of large dividend and proxy mailings, the New York Post Office has had considerable success in getting the corporations involved to let us have this mail in advance—particularly for distant points—so that simultaneous delivery is made to stockholders throughout the country on the due date. This has made for a greatly improved management-stockholder relationship; and the same procedure has been employed with department stores and advertisers in announcing their special sales and ads.

Simple errors involving incomplete or inaccurate addresses, and multiple letters to the same address are other ways of adding to your mailroom costs.

Postage meter machines should be utilized when the volume of mail warrants, as they are timesavers for your personnel and a record of postage expenditures over which management can exercise control. The value of this type of equipment is also reflected

in the fact that it expedites your mail within the post office—for it eliminates the facing and cancellation operations, and provides for earlier dispatch to trains, planes, and trucks.

The use of zone numbers also expedites dispatch and delivery of mail, for it enables even the least experienced clerk to sort mail much faster. We shall be only too glad to zone any of your mailing lists if you will send them to us. In addition, the separation of local from out-of-town mail likewise eliminates entirely the initial step in mail sorting. To assist in this latter respect, the post office advocates and offers without cost the use of labeled adhesive bands which should enable you to save on twine and rubberbands.

Another method of cooperating with the Post Office Department to help us give you improved mail service, is for you to mail early and often during the day, for—as our slogan says—"It's the better way." This, too, makes for more desirable connections with trains, planes, and ships; more evenly distributes the workload at the post office; and enables us to reduce night tours for the 70 percent of our force who are presently required to work after 6 p.m.—in order to handle the peak load which comes to us from the majority of firms at the close of the business day.

Apropos of this, we have recently introduced a special pickup service at 2:30 p.m. daily in ecrtain business areas, and I am happy to report that as a result of this innovation, we have increased our collections at this time of day from 30,000 to 300,000 pieces of mail. We are prepared to do the same for you members of the Association of Buying Offices, if you feel you would like to take advantage of it.

Another service available to our patrons without cost, is our postal information and training center which we expect to resume in the spring for representatives of business firms and their mailroom personnel to acquaint them with proper mailing procedures and practices, and familiarize them with the numerous methods and services available to them so that they may reduce their mailroom costs—as well as ours—and thus help us give them improved postal service.

This center will be in session every Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday, from 2 to 4:30 p.m. The weekly lectures which will cover various phases of postal matters are followed by a question and answer period.

The opening date has not as yet been scheduled, but if any of you are interested in participating just drop me a line and I'll be glad to see that you are notified. In the interim, however, our postal services representatives will be made available to you and your mailroom staff at any time to assist you with any postal problems you may have, make an analysis of your mailroom, and suggest where necessary, better mailing practices at reduced costs.

If, also, at any time any of you—individually or collectively—would like to make a tour of our New York Post Office to get a behind-the-scenes view of the largest and busiest post office in the world—the post office that serves 4½ million patrons of Manhattan and the Bronx through its 109 stations; the post office that employs approximately 37,000 people of all races and creeds; the post office that handles 34 million pieces of mail daily, and does a business of $800,000 daily; the post office that has a payroll of $12,500,000 monthly—I shall be happy, indeed, to make the necessary arrangements for your visit. This, I'm sure will give you a real insight into the magnitude of the operation that is ours here at New York, and make for a better understanding of our mutual problems.

It has been a real pleasure to be with you this afternoon, and to meet such an important body of men who, I understand, represent 95 percent of all department and specialty stores in the United States.

I trust some of the items I have highlighted will help you to effect economies in your mailroom operation, and will encourage you to feel that as taxpayers and users of the mails, you are shareholders in our postal organization, whom we are anxious to serve and whose friendship and good will we value and wish to preserve.

Polish Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 4, 1959

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, on May 3 many thousands of Americans of Polish ancestry celebrated the anniversary of the Polish Constitution of 1791. My colleague and friend, Congressman FRANK KOWALSKI, of Connecticut, has prepared a most fitting statement for this day which I would like to record.

The Polish people have a long and proud history of producing leaders of strength, courage and deep conviction. Americans of Polish ancestry have proved themselves time and again equal to and reflecting the image of the great Polish leaders.

It is my belief that as Americans who know the value of freedom, we should work continuously to help the Polish people gain greater independence from Soviet Russia. Those who seek our refuge from the present tyrants who control Poland should be welcomed to our shores.

Indeed, we must do all we can economically and diplomatically to help free the Polish people from the domination and rule of atheistic communism. There is another thing all Americans can do, each in their own way, that is to ask the Supreme Being to give the liberty loving Poles the courage, hope, and grace to carry on the struggle for freedom.

The statement follows:

POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY

(By Hon. FRANK KOWALSKI, of Connecticut)

May 3 is one of the most significant landmarks in the history of the Polish people. It was 168 years ago that the great Diet of Poland adopted a remarkable instrument of government that effected a peaceful revolution without resort to the violent and terrifying methods of the French Revolution. By the creation of that liberal and progressive Constitution, Poland's leaders led their countrymen from the feudal path of the Middle Ages to the broad and democratic highways of modern times.

By a very fitting double coincidence, the anniversary of the Polish Constitution falls in the midst of the 16th anniversary of the heroic uprising in the Warsaw ghetto—April 19 to May 16—which is being solemnly observed in Jewish communities throughout the world—and during the weekend in which Loyalty Day is celebrated in the United States.

The Constitution of 1791 introduced the principle of ministerial or cabinet responsibility in the Polish Government. The intricate and obstructive features of the old system and the many class distinctions associated with it were eliminated. A bicameral legislature with full lawmaking authority was created. Economic and social barriers between the nobility and the burghers were lowered. The townsmen recovered the local authority over the courts which they had formerly enjoyed but later lost to the central government. Religious toleration was established and the peasantry was taken under the protection of the law. The Constitution of 1791 thus abolished the worst abuses from which the Polish people had been suffering for centuries and proclaimed the great principles of political equality and representative government that have inspired the democratic movements of modern times.

The Communists have tried in vain to crush religion in Poland. The spirit of Polish resistance is symbolized by the Catholic Church, which has boldly challenged the effort of the Soviet overlords to erase the great religious traditions of the Polish people. Writers, students, and men and women in every walk of life have followed the lead of the church in opposing communism, even at the risk of their freedom and their very lives.

While this spirit lives—and it always will—the people of Poland will pray, and struggle, to win back their heritage of freedom.

Today America is proud to join in celebrating the anniversary of the Polish Constitution of 1791. The contributions which Americans of Polish ancestry have made to every facet of the life and culture of the United States are well recognized and strongly appreciated by all of our citizens.

Today our hearts are heavy because the Poles in their homeland are not permitted by their Communist oppressors to join with us in commemorating this great day. Yet the spirit of liberty, justice, and national independence in Poland cannot be exterminated by any totalitarian conqueror. The Congress of the United States joins all Americans of Polish descent in this celebration and heartily expresses its hope that once again the people of Poland will be able to observe freely and without fear the anniversary of their great Constitution and all that it means to the cause of freedom and justice.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 16, 1959

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of May 2, 1959:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

Failure by the House to override the Presidential veto was the big event of the week. The Senate had already done so by a vote of 64–29. That put it up to the House. The vote was 280 to override the veto to 146 against it. (I was against, the only Texan of either House or Senate.) This all started with a bill to transfer from Secretary of Agriculture Benson to the Rural Electrification Administration (REA) Administrator the authority to approve or disapprove the REA loans. Far short of making a logical or factual case for the need of such a move, this bill became a political move to discredit Secretary Benson, whom some critics would

blame for the farm program mess inherited from earlier administrations (and for the failure of Democratic Congresses to change it by legislation). Easily overlooked were the facts (1) that the Secretary had never disapproved an REA loan, (2) that the American Farm Bureau backed Secretary Benson and the President in their position, and (3) that the existing law is the result of Hoover Commission streamlining of Government. So it became strictly a political issue, as many saw it. Democrats voted to override the President (plus six Republicans) while Republicans (plus four Democrats) voted to support the President. There's far reaching significance here, considering that many spending bills to exceed the budget are awaiting the outcome, as a precedent. It appears now that a veto will not be overridden on spending beyond the budget, an issue more easily understood. I believe the public will support the President and those of us who believe in not spending more than we take in.

The Health, Education, and Welfare appriation bill passed handily, but with misgivings by some of us who think there is a limit to how much money should be spent. The bill totaling $3,348 million exceeded the budget by $181 million. Items receiving more money than last year (when expenditures exceeded the budget by $13,000 million) include: (1) Washington's Howard University for Negroes, $4.6 million, (2) vocational education grants to States $34 million, (3) sewage treatment plants $45 million, (4) a host of health services. Valid points to remember: (1) Costs, as well as benefits, should be weighed by Congress. It isn't enough idealistically to recognize a need; we must weigh its cost as well as determine if it's a Federal prerogative, (2) programs, once established as Federal in scope and needed should be made self-supporting; this means either cutting the amount to be spent (or limiting increase) or raising taxes to pay for them. Otherwise, we are not being fiscally responsible. An encouraging factor is the reduction of Labor Department appropriation by $23 million below budget estimates. It can be done.

Amendment to the Railroad Retirement Act, and Unemployment Insurance Act passed handily. Retirement benefits were increased 10 percent (as they were 4 years ago). Justifiable concern was felt over a program already running $169 million yearly in the hole. As an effort to correct this, taxes will be increased to employers and employees alike and will keep going up in future years (as a companion measure to social security taxation). The tax incerases are intended to make the program actuarially sound but there is still some question about this. Unployment and sickness compensation was increased from the present 50 percent of daily pay to 60 percent, and the daily amount ranges from $4.50 (to total of $039) to $10.20 (to maximum of $4,000).

For my part, I am concerned that the already financially jeopardized railroads are being overloaded with additional employer costs, with attendant risk to financial solvency to railroad management and workers alike, particularly in view of recent Federal loan aid to help railroads make both ends meet. The expenses of featherbedding still go unchecked, almost uncriticized.

Item of interest: Michigan under Governor Williams, political protege of Walter Reuther cannot meet its State employees' payroll (despite tax advances willingly made by the businessmen so badly maligned by both Reuter and Williams). And Messrs. Williams and Reuther would tell other States and the Federal Government politically how to operate government. Surely now, running out of money proves the fallacy of their teachings, that we cannot spend ourselves rich.

Debatable topic: Can individual human beings, whose intrinsic worth is undisputed by our religious beliefs, develop to their full potential in any society other than capitalistic? I have some ideas about this. How about you?

Israel Independence Day, 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 4, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, on May 3, Israel celebrates the 11th anniversary of her independence. Over the years the ties that bind together the people of America and Irsael have grown stronger. What is more, our two nations are drawn together by the bonds of common heritage and by the recognition that we both face the threat of Soviet Communist imperialism. This joining of popular feeling and national interest has created a union of America and Israel that is strongly and deeply rooted. Our national policies must be conceived in light of these realities.

There are few lands beyond our own shores for which the American people have as deep an affection as they have for Israel. This is true, in part, because of the many Jewish people in the American community. But our mutual respect is much deeper and more widespread than that. We recall Hitler's effort to obliterate the Jews who were unfortunate enough to live within his tyrannical empire. And we recognize that the Jewish people have created a modern democracy in the Middle East where democracies are few and far between.

When the State of Israel was created we rejoiced at the news, because we knew that at last these people who had endured so much would find a home in the land of their historic kingdom. As they fought for their statehood and finally secured their independence against overwhelming numbers of Arab bands, we rejoiced again and contributed materially to help establish the new nation. It is no exaggeration to say that the aid that has gone directly from the American people to the people of Israel since 1948 has been more than double the official foreign aid that has gone from the U.S. Government to the Government of Israel.

Our friendship and respect for Israel continued as we watched the desert blossom and a democratic society spring up. It is widely recognized that Israel has used American foreign aid to better advantage than any other state in the Middle East. A well-educated, industrious people, they have set forth with the enthusiasm and vision that only pioneers can muster to their cause. They have worked hard and have built a thriving, modern nation where formerly there was little but desert, poverty, and disease.

Today Israel lives in uneasy peace. There is the longstanding bitter dispute with her Arab neighbors which always threatens to erupt in violent border incidents. But now there is also the increasing Russian activity in the Middle East. The Soviets exacerbate local problems to gain influence and perhaps domination in some countries there.

Israel and the United States stand together on their most vital interests in the Middle East. Israel's security depends ultimately upon reaching some agreement with the Arab countries so that she can devote her resources to peaceful economic development in cooperation with her neighbors. Israel's security is also threatened by Soviet expansion. The United States desires the establishment of peace and voluntary cooperation among the Middle Eastern countries. Therefore, our two countries must work together for peace and cooperation in the Middle East.

On this day when Israel celebrates the 11th anniversary of her independence we extend our best wishes to the Israeli Government and to the heroic people of Israel.

Citation to J. Edgar Hoover by Our Lady of Mount Carmel Church of Bayonne, N.J.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 4, 1959

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, the United Sodalities of Our Lady of Mount Carmel Church of Bayonne, N.J., recently presented a citation to Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, at his office in Washington, D.C.

I heartily concur with the thoughts expressed in the resolution and commend the United Sodalities of Our Lady of Mount Carmel Church for this expression of their esteem.

The citation follows:

"Whereas J. Edgar Hoover has been Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation for 35 years; and

"Whereas during his brilliant career of courageous, conscientious, and able public service in laboring unrelentlessly in the interest of maintaining and safeguarding the laws of our Nation and protecting our country from the constant threats of subversive elements, especially the Communists who seek to destroy our way of life, guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States; and

"Whereas Mr. Hoover, during this long and faithful tenure has at all times applied himself constantly and diligently in his service to the United States and to its citizens, giving of himself and his time without regard for his health or personal safety, thereby meriting the highest commendation and acclaim from public officials, the press, law enforcement agencies, and citizens, not only in the United States but also throughout the world: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the director, president, prefects, and members of the United Sodalities of Our Lady of Mount Carmel, wish to recognize and extend their sincere and wholehearted appreciation to the Director

of the FBI, J. Edgar Hoover, for his outstanding contribution to the citizens of the United States and to commend him and the entire Federal Bureau of Investigation for their efforts, often silently but heriocally performed, under the most adverse criticism and opposition leveled against them; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the director, president, prefects, and members of the United Sodalities draw up and publish this formal citation, attesting their admiration, and gratitude to J. Edgar Hoover and the Federal Bureau of Investigation."

In witness whereof we have affixed our signatures on this 12th day of February in the year of Our Lord 1959 at Bayonne, N.J.

A Tribute to Judge Learned Hand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEWART L. UDALL
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 4, 1959

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, of the truly great living men in our land today Judge Learned Hand must surely stand in the front rank. Though, to the shame of us all, this distinguished jurist never won appointment to the Supreme Court, nevertheless many think he made his own court, for a time, the first court of the land.

Judge Hand is now retired, but, most fittingly, last month on the 50th anniversary of his appointment as a Federal judge an appropriate ceremony was held to honor him in New York. One of those who presented a tribute at this dinner was Mr. Justice Frankfurter and I am placing his brief tribute in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that it might have the wider audience it deserves:

FELIX FRANKFURTER'S TRIBUTE TO LEARNED HAND

May it please this audience: If Learned Hand is not to suffocate, one of us ought to desist from adding to the outpour of libations. Age, and a precious friendship of 50 years, perhaps make it appropriate that I undertake the uncongenial task of saving the man from the legend. Strange as it may sound, Judge Hand has, if not defects, certainly limitations. I have time to deal with only one of them. He has not been true to the test of the most important teaching of Socrates: "Know thyself."

With ample opportunities of self-knowledge, and after he had reached the Psalmist's age, he thus summed up his life:

"My life"—and since I like to be modern, I ought to say, and I quote—"My life has been uneventful, unadventurous, easy, safe, and pleasant." Could you really pick five more inadequate and inaccurate adjectives to summarize his life?

Uneventiful—if events take place merely in the world of action and not in the arena of the mind.

Unadventurous: if adventure requires the scaling of Mt. Everest and crossing Antarctica, and if there be no adventures of thought.

Easy: Can it really have been easy for him all these years to interpret the mysteries and the mumbo-jumbo of the nine Delphic oracles, and, at pain of a spanking, find clarity in darkness?

Safe: Has his life been safe, secure? He, safe and secure, who has been buffeted and battered by the largest self-doubt of any human being I have ever encountered?

And then he says "pleasant." Well, he has something there, but it is a sly bit of truth. Would he have had as much pleasure in life if he hadn't been there?

Really, for one who is conceded to be the greatest master of English speech on the bench since Holmes laid down his pen, that is a strange show of the misuse of language.

He won't mind, I hope, if I shall try to teach him a lesson in truth-speaking, even about one's self. And so, in substitution of his five inaccurate, inept adjectives I offer you my five adjectives: daring, romantic, antediluvian, sophisticated, and lucky.

Daring: Of course, daring. In a world in which the pressures for conformity are so on the increase, he has dared to be gaily and solemnly himself. He has dared to challenge passion, prejudice, and intolerance, even when parading in the name of patriotism and supported by the voice of the multitude.

Romantic: Isn't the man a romantic, the windows of whose mind are open to every wind of doctrine and who is ready to find the Holy Grail in the most unlikely places?

Antediluvian: Is not our judge antediluvian, who is guided by the reason of which he is the trustee and the delegate, and not the inventor, who deems his duty limited as a judge's duty should be limited and does not feel empowered to remold the world according to his heart's desire?

Sophisticated: Is a man not sophisticated who doubts his own basic premises and yet is guided by them until he discovers better ones?

Lucky: He has achieved the one thing in life that makes all the rest bearable—a happy marriage. Sheer luck. And he has been lucky in his failures. When years ago he offered himself to the electorate of New York (as a candidate for the New York Court of Appeals), they declined to send him to Albany. Now, hasn't he had a better time in New York than he could possibly have had in Albany, native city though it be? And with every respect—with every respect—for that great court, with awareness of his filial attachment to it and high regard for the great men, the truly great men, who have graced that court, surely it is a fact that the range of litigation, the problems that have come before this court, have been more teasing and exiciting even than the problems that come before the great court in Albany.

Finally—and here I may not have all of you or any of you with me; I can't help that—finally, he was lucky in not having drawn a successful ticket in that odd lottery by which men are picked for the Supreme Court of the United States. In the first place, down there his views would have been diluted eight-ninths and here only two-thirds. In the second place, I think almost inevitably, though certainly as authenticated by history, the controversies down there are more strident than they are in the quietude of Foley Square. In the plenitude of Learned Hand's gifts, one of them has been denied him, I think. I do not think he has gaudium certaminis, the joy of battle. Again, he certainly would have, because he should have, found himself more circumscribed in the life in Washington. He would have found himself more contained within the curtilage of the court and, thus, we would have been denied the moral leadership, the great influence of his courageous and eloquent free spirit all these years.

He has demonstrated and given heartening proof of the fact that moral influence, achievement of excellence, the fertilization of thought are not dependent upon place. And so, although Mr. Justice Holmes felt that the right place for Judge Hand, even while he was still a district judge, was Washington, and, if you will forgive me for saying so, although I spent not a little part of my life to promote that end as opportunity availed, I insist with deep conviction that he was lucky in not having won out in that strange lottery.

But luckier have we been that he was endowed with these gifts and has put them to the uses to which he has put them. After every one of us in this room will no longer be here, long after that, Learned Hand will still be serving society so long as law will continue to exercise its indispensable role in helping to unravel the tangled skein of the human situation.

Milwaukee's Civil Defense Director Outlines 10-Point Program for Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, we in Milwaukee feel that our Civil Defense Administration has done certainly as much, and probably more, than that of any other major city in the country in making our people aware of and interested in this vital phase of national preparedness.

Not only Milwaukee officials but also many of its citizens have expressed concern, which I share, that the Congress has given insufficient attention to civil defense. It is my hope that the recent reports of the Military Operations Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations, and the activities of other congressional groups covering civil defense, will result in the most serious consideration being given to the full implementation and improvement of the civil defense program.

In an address to the Milwaukee Foremen's Safety School on April 22, 1959 Milwaukee's civil defense director, Brig. Gen. Don E. Carleton, made an excellent presentation of the civil defense need, and of a program for industry. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include General Carleton's speech:

WHAT TO DO IF DISASTER STRIKES

We are at war. Whether or not we realize it, we are today engaged in an all-out war with imperial communism as represented by the Soviet Government. This war is being fought on all fronts—economic, political, and military—and I must emphasize at the outset that our loss of any one phase would be just as serious as the loss of the others. We must also not lose sight of the fact that a nuclear shooting war could at any time result from activities in either the economic or political theaters.

In Europe the Communists are waging war on the United States by every means short of shooting. On Moscow's orders, local Communists move swiftly into ready-made crises encouraging Algerian terrorists in France and unemployed workers in Italy. They have deliberately developed a crisis over Berlin, and have, whenever and wherever possible, infiltrated and spread confusion through labor and political movements.

In the Far East, Chinese Communists armed with Russian planes and artillery, periodically bombarded Quemoy and Matsu with the declared intention of taking

Formosa; all-out war or not. The United States is called the "paper tiger" by all Asia. Communism is the "way of the future."

In South Asia, Soviet and Chinese Communists are fighting hard—using all means, including guerrilla war in the jungles. Local Communist parties control a major State in India and are powerful supporters of the Indonesian Government. Once in power, any devastation from the dictated attitude is met by the Communists with devastating ruthless suppression as exemplified by what is going on in Tibet today.

In the Middle East they have used Egypt's Nasser to open the Arab nations to communistic infiltration. They seek to control the oil of the Middle East, not because it is needed by Soviet Russia, but because Middle East oil controls the economy of Europe.

COMMUNIST TARGETS

Africa, the uncommitted continent, is a target of Communist infiltration where race differences are fostered and intensified.

In Latin America, "Yankee, go home" is the cry. Communist agents roam this continent from bases in Mexico and Uruguay. Communist Party membership is soaring in Venezuela, Argentina, and Chile, as well as in Bolivia where our Embassy was recently stoned by street mobs.

Yes, my friends, we are engaged in a war that only our enemy seems wholly committed to fight. While we have attempted to serve and protect each separate agricultural, industrial, and financial piece of our national economy and at the same time fight and win a worldwide war. Gentlemen, this just isn't possible.

From a strictly military viewpoint, how do we stand?

The Imperialist Soviet Government has at this time 175 modern, up-to-date ground divisions, most of them armored and equipped since the end of World War II. This vast force stands poised in western Russia, Poland, East Germany, and Czechoslovakia and can be augmented by at least an equal number of fully equipped divisions from the Ready Reserve in 30 days.

In contrast, we can muster 14 regular divisions now at duty stations extending from Japan to Germany. We can add to that at least 80 more from our allies that are, however, of questionable availability and effectiveness.

On and under the sea, the Soviet imperialists now have a navy second only to the United States. However, they have a fleet of submarines numbering over 500. This is a greater submarine force than that possessed by the rest of the world combined. I ask you to contrast this with the fact that Hitler had approximately 50 submarines at the height of the blockade that almost succeeded in winning World War II.

The United States now has about 100 submarines, only about 20 of which can be considered modern. We do have, as far as we know, the only nuclear-powered subs in the world today, but the Soviets have demonstrated the ability to build nuclear motors that can be adapted to under sea craft.

A DANGEROUS OFFENSIVE WEAPON

The development of the intermediate range (1,500 miles) missile to be launched from beneath the surface of the sea, has radically changed the employment of the submarine from a defensive weapon to one of the most dangerous offensive weapons now known.

Eighty-five percent of our industry and all but 7 of our 50 largest cities are within range of submarine-launched guided missiles.

In the air, the Soviets have more than 1,000 intercontinental bombers. These are able to carry nuclear weapons to any target in this country. They also have about 20,000 light jet bombers.

However, as far as piloted aircraft is concerned, we are considerably ahead of the Communists as to quantity and quality, but it is still believed that the enemy has the capability of penetrating our defenses.

Most of our piloted interceptors would have limited combat capabilities against Soviet bombers at very low or very high altitudes, and enemy pilots could launch supersonic missiles from points beyond the range of our Nike defense.

With the launching of the Russian sputniks and luniks now in orbit around the earth and the sun, the Communists demonstrated their ability to produce intercontinental ballistic missiles which can be armed with nuclear warheads equal to millions of tons of TNT, that could reach any target in the world.

Although our radar warning system can be expected to give us almost certain warning of a piloted bomber attack, it is at present ineffective against intercontinental missiles.

PUSHBUTTON WAR

You should know that we have also been moving rapidly along in the development of our own ICBM's, and although these weapons cannot yet be considered operational, the Atlas and others have been tested over the full 5,000- to 6,000-mile range and landed in the designated impact area with acceptable accuracy. What is more encouraging, it was announced in Chicago a few weeks ago, that our Minuteman, a solid propellant ICBM would be operational by early 1960. Launching sites for these weapons are now being built. The Minuteman missile can be stored indefinitely in underground tubes that are virtually bombproof and can be fired by remote control to strike any designated target on the other side of the earth.

It looks as though the age of pushbutton war is almost here.

So what's to be done?

It is obvious that at this point in time, we may assume that we are just about even with the Communists militarily and that an attack on this country or our allies could be met with a devastating answer.

We must also accept the fact that the West has been steadily losing on the political and economic fronts. Since World War II, the Communist empire has increased from 192 million people to 960 million people and now has complete domination over one-sixth of the land surface of the world.

Our ability to compete with the Soviets on the world market and maintain our present standard of living is severely limited. In fact, as stated earlier, it simply cannot be done.

Khrushchev has stated on numerous occasions, "We are interested in granting economic aid to other countries for purely political reasons and are prepared to undersell the West regardless of cost. We will win, we will bury you."

RUSSIAN INDUSTRIAL GROWTH

Right here may I quote from a speech given in New Orleans recently by Allen W. Dulles, Director of the Central Intelligence Agency. Mr. Dulles seldom speaks in public, and when he does his words are worth heeding:

"Russia's present industrial growth rate is almost three times that of the United States. The Russians are plowing back into investment, 30 percent of their production compared with 17 percent in the United States. They are funneling about twice as much of their entire production and services to military ends as is the United States.

"They gear their economy to growth and military might while we gear ours to higher living standards. Last year the Russians manufactured only 1 auto for every 50 we produced, but they turned out 4 machine tools to our 1."

"If they succeed and we fail," warned Allen Dulles, "it will only be because of our complacency and because they have devoted a far greater share of their power, skill, and resources to our destruction than we have been willing to dedicate to our own preservation."

So what's to be done?

How vulnerable are we? How do our passive or nonmilitary defenses stack up against those of the Soviet?

The Russians have been working hard at civil defense preparations since World War II.

Moscow, Stalingrad, Leiningrad, and other Russian cities are equipped with underground shelters. In Moscow, they are said to be over 100 feet below the surface, in which entrance is gained by high speed escalators.

All new construction must include shelter.

All citizens between the ages of 16 and 60 must take a minimum of 20 hours a year civil defense training.

Neighborhoods and industrial areas are thoroughly organized to respond to the warning signals.

Industry has been following a strict program of decentralization since World War II. Much of the Soviet heavy industry has been moved into the mountains where underground factories have been built.

It is forbidden to build up urban areas in the vicinity of essential heavy industry. Shelter areas are provided in all industrial and business establishments.

NO U.S. SHELTER PROGRAM

In contrast, in the United States, any program for shelter against blast or the heat effects of an atomic explosion is nonexistent. A program for shelter protection against the widespread lethal effects of radioactive fallout is on paper only.

Although our population of 180 million is almost equal to the 192 million in Russia, it is concentrated in a land area about one-third the size of Russia.

Two-thirds of the U.S. population live in cities.

Seventy-one percent of our essential defense industry and 54 percent of our industrial workers are concentrated in 50 of our major metropolitan areas.

Four-fifths of our current population growth is taking place in metropolitan areas and the degree of concentration is steadily increasing.

This concentration of industrial production creates ideal targets for modern weapons of mass destruction. Big cities are easy to find, easy to hit, and easy to destroy with thermal nuclear weapons that measure their lethal area in hundreds of square miles.

So what can we do in industry now that will offer a better possibility of survival under nuclear attack?

1. Establish a self-help or civil defense organization in every plant by establishing an effective emergency communications system. Establish plant fire brigades which can be manned by trained volunteers from the work force. Maintain medical and first-aid facilities and train personnel in their use. Establish and maintain rescue teams through continual training. Complete your plant protection organization by establishing well-trained emergency wardens, welfare and police groups. And, by all means, make certain that you have a warning system that is continually operational.

Many of these things exist to a greater or less extent in large industrial organizations, but in almost all cases need refinement and expansion to meet the emergencies of a nuclear war.

2. Provide security plans for protection against espionage and sabotage. Most defense plants have them, but countless others take for granted that vital processes and equipment are adequately protected by a set of regulations.

3. Provide shelters by designating safe areas in existing buildings and including protective features in the design of new construction.

4. Provide a plan for evacuation, including reporting locations outside the critical target area where help, reception, and care can be obtained.

5. Plan for the continuity of management to include the selection and equipping of alternate company headquarters, the establishment of personnel succession lists, and the development of emergency financial arrangements.

6. Provide protection of vital records and documents by duplication and storage in vaults or areas safe from attack.

7. Provide a plan for emergency repair and restoration to include a system for quickly assessing damage and for restoring production including alternate arrangements for power, equipment, warehousing, and supply.

8. Establish industrial material aid agreements for Civil Defense by joining together with neighborhood industrial plants and facilities to provide assistance to each other in the form of equipment, materials, or personnel in time of disaster.

9. Provide for the decentralization of production. That is be sure that critical items are manufactured in more than one place.

10. Provide for the dispersal of new industrial plants. This is the employment of the simple military measure of using space for defense against attack.

Now, I have outlined the dangers we face, discussed our relative position with our declared enemy, and given you an outline of what should be done in industry.

It is obvious that if we are not going to lose this war there is much to be done.

In closing I quote from the National Plan for Civil Defense and Defense Mobilization signed by the President.

Industry: "The leaders of industry, agriculture, labor, and financial institutions are responsible, in cooperation with appropriate Government agencies, for planning and executing measures designed to assure the continued functioning or rapid restoration to functioning of the essential elements of the national economy."

It is not only the privilege, but the sacred duty of every citizen and every organization to do those things which are necessary to preserve our Nation when attacked; and, gentlemen, we are being attacked at this moment at home and throughout the world.

Tribute to Milan R. Stefanik

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 4, 1959

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, today we pay tribute to a great patriot of Czechoslovakia. General Miland R. Stefanik was the third of the "triumvirate of savants" who, in October 1918, founded the Czechoslovak State. Masaryk and Benese were the other two members of this famous trio.

Stefanik is in the grand tradition of men who gave their all for their country. During his youth he left his native land and went to Paris to study astronomy. He was a brilliant student and very highly regarded in his field. Ample evidence to this effect is provided in the fact that soon after his academic training he was appointed secretary of the Astronomical Observatory in France. This position sent him all over the world on astronomical missions. It was during this time that he became imbued with the spirit of forming the State of Czechoslovakia.

With the advent of World War I, Stefanik abandoned his career and enlisted in the French Army. His many faceted brilliance included the vocation of a military strategist. This was at once apparent and he soon was promoted to the rank of general. Combined with his active, effective role in the war, he was instrumental in organizing the Czechoslovak military forces in exile, and the Czechoslovak National Council which was to be the backbone of the new European state. After the war he was justly rewarded in his homeland with the cabinet rank of Minister of National Defense. Even though in ill health, Stefanik worked fervently and with great diplomacy for his newly constituted nation. Many here in the United States undoubtedly remember his learned and erudite lectures, especially those in Carnegie Hall, New York, in which he explained the Czechoslovak situation so expertly.

It was indeed a tragedy when, at the height of his world prestige, Gen. Milan Stefanik was killed in a plane accident on May 4, 1919. He was but 39 years old. In tribute to him, the Czechoslovakian Government erected a monument in his memory at the place of his death.

It is with pride and respect that I salute this man of many talents. May his guiding spirit be a source of continued hope and inspiration to the subjugated peoples of Czechoslovakia today.

Radiation Fallout From Nuclear Bomb Tests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 4, 1959

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD a television dialog between a panel of interrogators and my colleague the gentleman from California the Honorable CHET HOLIFIELD. The importance of the subject of radiation fallout from nuclear bomb tests is considered in the dialog. This subject will be explored further this week during hearings by the special Subcommittee on Radiation, of which Mr. HOLIFIELD is chairman:

"FACE THE NATION"

(As broadcast over the CBS Television Network and CBS Radio Network, May 3, 1959)

Guest: The Honorable CHET HOLIFIELD, Democrat of California, U.S. House of Representatives.

Moderator: Stuart Novins.

Panel: John W. Finney, New York Times; George Herman, CBS News; Nat S. Finney, Buffalo Evening News.

Producer: Ted Ayers.

Mr. NOVINS. Much has been said about the dangers of radioactive fallout, and most of what has been said has been contradictory. We have been told that there is danger, and we have been told that there is not danger. We have been told that experts in atomic energy are holding back important information from the public, and we are told that they are not holding back such information.

It is with the hope that some clear statement will be forthcoming that we turn to Congressman CHET HOLIFIELD, who is here now to "Face the Nation."

Representative HOLIFIELD, your subcommittee of the Joint Atomic Energy Committee goes into the fallout problem this week. But, of course, you have been close to it for a long period of time. So let's start the questions, if you will, with the first one from Mr. Finney.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Fine.

Mr. JOHN FINNEY. Well, Mr. HOLIFIELD, with that introduction, in your opinion, how great a threat does fallout pose to mankind?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. It depends upon the intensity of the fallout, and we must recognize that up until the moratorium, which is in existence now, that there has been an increasing tempo of bomb tests, and we will get into the degree of that intensity as we go through these questions today, I suppose.

But I would say that at the present time I do not think that there is a tremendous danger involved. There may be some danger which has not yet been able to be proven in a laboratory, but certainly there will be danger if bomb test increases in the geometric ratio that it has in the past 10 years.

Mr. HERMAN. Mr. HOLIFIELD, this danger does not exist in a vacuum. How can you compare it to the danger from other radiation sources, from X-ray machines, radium dials, and so forth? How big a danger is it, viewed that way?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Well, let me atack it in this fashion. The natural background radiation which exists in all parts of the world is generally conceded to be about 7 roentgens over a 70-year lifetime. The bomb test fallout to date has that raised one-tenth. In other words, in the place of ten-tenths of normal background radition, you have eleven-tenths. You have one-tenth more.

Now ,one mouth X-ray might give you from 10 to 20 roentgens. Now, that's on a specialized part of the body; that's not the all-over body exposure. But a GI who goes through the complete set of X-rays may get as many as 25 to 50 roentgens.

Mr. NAT FINNEY. Representative HOLIFIELD, I'd like to ask you a couple of related questions.

I believe that, as a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, you must have approved, either explicitly or implicitly, the various series of tests that have been conducted by the Atomic Energy Commission so far.

Is that correct?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. No. Those tests are held under the Department of Defense, in conjunction with the Atomic Energy Committee, but it is part of our national policy, and our Committe does not approve specific tests.

Mr. NAT FINNEY. Well, have you—have you disapproved of any of them, or attempted to stop any of them?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. No; we have not.

Mr. NAT FINNEY. I take it, sir, then, that it hasn't been in your mind that these tests that were conducted would do a substantial physical injury to the people of the United States, else you would have attempted to have prevented them, I take it.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. You are right. It is the unanimous position of all the 18 members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy that these tests are not detrimental, in a global way, to the people of the world. If there are—if there is any danger involved, it would be of such infinitesimal amount that I doubt if it could be proven

in a laboratory to be of deleterious effect upon a human being.

Mr. NAT FINNEY. And that, sir, is the basis upon which you have been agreeable to having these tests go on?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That is true. We feel that the national defense is important enough that if there is some risk involved, we must take that risk.

Mr. JOHN FINNEY. Well, then, Mr. HOLIFIELD, if this does not pose such a great danger, the threat of fallout is not a valid reason, then, for us to stop atomic tests at this point?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. It depends upon what you mean by the threat of fallout. If bomb testing continues, and it gets to the point where they have more and more radioactive fallout release, then it will become dangerous, and I think it is the fear of future danger more than the fear of present existing danger which has alarmed the people of the world.

Mr. NOVINS. Mr. HOLIFIELD, in the interest of clarification, is it true that this fallout is cumulative and that the danger is cumulative, it isn't just a case of being exposed at one time and if you get away with that, being safe? The stuff keeps building up, doesn't it?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That is true. All radiation is cumulative and the figures I give you of the increase of one-tenth of normal background radioactivity is an accumulative figure.

Mr. HERMAN. Mr. HOLIFIELD, it is usually said that the quid pro quo in the danger from testing is that we are building up a deterrent force with which to prevent a nuclear war which would be vastly more horrible. Can we afford to stop testing?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Well, this is a $64 question, of course.

Now, the national policy at this time, as expressed by the President and the Secretary of State, is to the effect that if the Soviets will agree with us to cease testing, and if they will inaugurate a system of detection and inspection which will prove that they are keeping their word, then we are willing to stop testing for the time being.

Mr. HERMAN. Then does the committee, the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy believe, with the administration, that a halt in all further testing will keep the relative military positions of the Soviet Union and the United States, as far as nuclear weapons are concerned, unchanged—their relative positions?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I could not answer for the full committee on this, because I think there is a diversity of opinion on the committee.

I would say that the problem of obtaining an adequate inspection and detection system is very great.

There is one factor which has never been brought into the political discussions between the negotiators in Geneva, and that is the problem of the great land mass of Red China, and it would be entirely possible for the Soviets and the United States to agree to cease testing, and it would be possible that unless the land mass of Red China was included in the detection and inspection system that there could be surreptitious tests by the Russians in the land mass of Red China.

Mr. HERMAN. What I mean, sir, was aside from the question of detecting tests, if the ban is carried out in good faith, does one side or the other stand to lose more in relative military strength?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Well, this is a question I do not think can be answered.

We do not know exactly what the Soviets have. We are confident that we are ahead of them, I believe, in most of the weapon development.

Mr. JOHN FINNEY. Mr. HOLIFIELD——

Mr. NAT FINNEY. Mr.——

Mr. NOVINS. Mr. John Finney, please.

Mr. JOHN FINNEY. Mr. HOLIFIELD, let's get it on the record here. Are you in favor of a test ban, and if so, under what conditions?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I am in favor of a test ban providing I could be assured that there was a detection and inspection system, worldwide, in effect which would insure that another nation would not obtain an advantage in the development of weapons.

Mr. JOHN FINNEY. In other words on terms which the Soviet Union thus far has refused to accept.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That's right.

Mr. NOVINS. Mr. Nat Finney, please.

Mr. NAT FINNEY. Representative HOLIFIELD, John Foster Dulles, in talking about these negotiations that we are now in, in Geneva, said that one of the reasons for going there was the imponderables of the situation, the world situation. And, it was quite clear, he made it clear that one of these imponderables is a worldwide agitation about fallout which makes, builds a level of anxiety.

Now, there are people in this town who believe firmly that the hearings that you are about to hold provide a perfect sounding board for that agitation against the United States.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Well, I do not share that opinion. I believe that in a democracy the people are entitled to the facts. It will be the attempt of this committee to bring out nothing but the facts. We will have men from both sides of the question testify before us. They will be scientists, in the main, who know something about it from a professional standpoint. Each side, the side that wants the tests stopped will be given, allowed to, individuals will be given, allowed the privilege of testifying, and the people that want them continued will be given the chance to testify. But in each case they will be asked to testify not on philosophical or political opinions, but to give us their professional opinion as to the specific scientific data involved.

Mr. NAT FINNEY. You don't think—do you think the harm that that will do the position of the United States in the world, and I take it that you watched the press tables during the first hearings——

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Yes.

Mr. NAT FINNEY. That that harm is justifiable?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I do not believe that there will be any harm done. I never believe that in bringing the truth to the people about scientific facts which have a very important impact upon their destiny, that in a democracy that you are doing harm. I think that you, as you spread enlightenment and knowledge to the people in a democracy, it enables them to participate in the function of government more intelligently.

Mr. JOHN FINNEY. Well, along this line, Mr. HOLIFIELD, there have been frequent charges that the Atomic Energy Commission was suppressing and withholding facts about fallout from the American people.

Since your hearings, earlier hearings in 1957 when much of this field was brought out into the open, do you think the Atomic Energy Committee has been guilty of suppression of fallout information?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I do not know of any specific case where vital information which should be made public has been withheld deliberately. There may have been some omissions or some slowness in letting some of this information out until it was properly checked.

You see, this is a very complicated subject. Our hearings 2 years ago filled two great volumes like this, and we expect to fill two more now on these hearings which will bring up to date the information which has not been publicized to the general public but which may have been released in many instances in scientific bulletins with very low circulation.

Mr. JOHN FINNEY. Well, then do you think the Commission has done a commendable vigorous job in exploring fallout and what threat it does pose to us?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Yes. I think that in the last year or so that they have been very diligent. Last year the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy furnished them with $17 million for this purpose. This year they are furnishing them with $20 million for monitoring and testing, and testing soil samples and air samples and water samples and milk samples and all these sort of things so that we can get the information.

Mr. HERMAN. Mr. HOLIFIELD, aside from the question of diligence do you think it is wise in principle to have the same organization which is putting strontium 90 and other fallout products into the air, being the judge and making the measurements and telling the people whether they are or are not safe from the products that they themselves are putting in the air?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. In principle, I think that a separate agency should have the function of monitoring all radiation of every type, because you have X-ray radiation and other types of radiation. From a practical standpoint, it seems that right at this time the AEC has the greatest number of trained people, and they are also able to get $20 million a year. I doubt if any civilian agency could get that much money to do this job. And until I'm sure that some separate agency can get that much money to continue the contractual work and the actual laboratory work that they are doing now in the AEC, I would be against changing.

Mr. NOVINS. Mr. Nat Finney.

Mr. NAT FINNEY. Sir, wouldn't that apply to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy of Congress, quite as well as to the Atomic Energy Commission? Don't you have both responsibilities too in the committee?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. We have the responsibility as long as it remains in the AEC. If for instance this responsibility was transferred to the Public Health Service, then it would go before another committee of the Congress.

Mr. NAT FINNEY. Then in principle sir, you believe that you should give it up?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. In principle, I would be willing to give it up, providing I was sure the Public Health Service could get $20 million a year. But you and I both know that on Capitol Hill it's very easy to get money for the Pentagon and it's very easy to get money for the AEC, but it's very difficult to get money for the Public Health Service.

Mr. NOVINS. Mr. HOLIFIELD, you pointed out a few moments ago that you thought you justified the risks of fallout on the basis of national security, that we had to take certain risks in order to stay at least equal to and hopefully ahead of the Russians.

But you also pointed out that even if the Soviet Union and the United States were to reach agreement on suspension of weapons tests, there still remains this vacuum which you described as the land mass of Red China.

Now, do you feel that on, again on the basis of national security, that it would be worth the recognition of Red China in order to arrive at some kind of means of negotiation with that government to insure that it be brought into any agreement that might be found possible?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. This gets into a different problem and a political problem of evaluation which many things must be considered.

I think, I'd like to answer you in this way: that I think the most important thing that could happen would be to do—to take any step which might be necessary to prevent a nuclear war. I do not see at this time how the detection and inspection system could function safely for our information, unless the land mass of Red China and every other

satellite nation in the world was included in the inspection system.

Mr. NOVINS. Well, then, the implication of what you are saying is that if it is necessary to recognize Red China in order to include it, you would go along with that?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. If it means the difference between having a nuclear war and not having one, and this is a first step toward preventing it, then I would say yes.

Mr. JOHN FINNEY. Well, Mr. Holifield, we have heard a lot of dogmatic statements from people on both sides of this issue of fallout. I'd like to ask you just one, two, three questions here, as to what we know for certain about fallout.

Do we know for certain how long that radioactive debris stays in the air, and how it comes down to earth?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. No; we do not. They are constantly revising their predictions on this. At first, I think Dr. Libbey thought that it would be 7 to 10 years before all of the stratospheric fallout of a particular bomb would come down. I understand that he has recently reduced that now to about 6 years.

I understand that there are people in the Defense Department that think it may be as short as 2 or 3 years.

Now, this does not change the factor of measurements. We are making the same measurements, whether it's 3 years or 10 years, so in one way, you might say, well, if all of a bomb radiation comes down in 3 years, at the rate we are measuring now, it would be less than if it came down in 10 years.

On the other hand, there is another factor that enters into it. Some of the short-life isotopes come down in the first 2 or 3 years, and they have not yet decayed, they have not burned out, in other words, where, if they stayed up there 10 years, they would burn out.

So this is a, this is a mathematical computation that is very difficult.

Mr. JOHN FINNEY. All right. Well, that's a very important and unknown factor.

Now, the second factor: Do we know what happens to that debris once it gets on the ground, how it goes into the plants, how quickly, how much the plants absorb, and how much they reject, and how it gets into animals and food supply? Do we know the exact ratios?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. We do not know the exact ratio. We have a great deal of information on that. We can measure the strontium 90 deposit on the soil. We can tell how deep it goes, how much there is there. We can measure it on the foliage. We can, in some instances, we can certainly detect it in milk, when it goes from the alfalfa the cow eats, into the milk, we can detect it there, and we can actually detect it in the bones of children after they drink the milk.

Mr. JOHN FINNEY. All right. Now we've got it into the children, and into the human beings.

Do we know how much damage is caused by a certain amount of strontium or caesium 137?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I don't think we know exactly what—what the damage would be.

Mr. JOHN FINNEY. So we have three great unknowns still, don't we, in this whole fallout picture?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Oh, I think we have many more than that, but three—I will agree to those three you mentioned.

Mr. HERMAN. May I speak to the point of a fourth?

Do we know where fallout is going to come, how it is to be distributed around the earth, in what regions, in what rainy or dry regions, and what belts of latitude?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Well, we have some information on that and we are going to have more that will be released in these hearings. We know this, that most of the fallout falls in the Temperate Zone. We know that it falls where rainfall falls, more than in desert areas.

Mr. NAT FINNEY. Mr.——

Mr. HOLIFIELD. So we are accumulating some knowledge of it.

Mr. NAT FINNEY. I'd like to ask just one followup question to that.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Yes.

Mr. NAT FINNEY. Do we have, do we know of one single human being who has become ill or has died from global fallout?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. No, sir; we do not.

Mr. HERMAN. Well, I'd like to speak to that point also, Mr. HOLIFIELD.

Does that actually prove anything? If we have an increase in numbers from, say, so many leukemia deaths to twice that many leukemia deaths, could anyone point to any one case of leukemia and say this comes from strontium 90, and this comes from an X-ray, a foot X-ray machine, and this comes from background radiation?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. You are speaking the truth. You cannot detect the difference, and we do not have enough years of statistical knowledge in order to say at this time that leukemia deaths are increasing or that they are not increasing, as a result of bomb tests.

Mr. NOVINS. Mr. HOLIFIELD——

Mr. HOLIFIELD. This is something we haven't found out yet.

Mr. NOVINS. In view of the fact that there are always unknown quantities and that there has not been enough time elapsed yet to collate all this information and to evaluate it, how can you possibly say that something is not dangerous, when you don't know what effect is being caused?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Well, we, we say that from the best scientific knowledge that we have, judging on the intensity of the radiation that we do not believe that it is harmful, at least it's not harmful enough that we can detect it.

Mr. NOVINS. You mean harmful to people currently alive?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Now let me—let me give you an illustration, a quick illustration.

If you get 7 roentgens in a lifetime from background radiation which includes normal background radiation and bomb test radiation, and if it takes, let us say—well, let us take the case of the Russell experiment on mice. Mr., or Dr. Russell used 100 roentgens on 5,000 mice and then he traced the genetic effect on 100,000 descendants of that 5,000 mice and found out that it did do genetic damage. But I point out to you that he used a hundred roentgens on a mouse in order to trace the genetic damage.

Now, when you talk about one-tenth of 7 roentgens or seven-tenths of 1 roentgen, causing leukemia or these other diseases, then I think you are in the realm of speculation and you are not in the realm of proven laboratory experiments.

Mr. HERMAN. Mr. HOLIFIELD, you have overwhelmed us with numbers on that, but is it not generally acknowledged by the geneticists at least that even an infinitesimal extra dose of radiation leads to at least an infinitesimal extra amount of damage to future generations?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That is a theory they all subscribe to but they cannot prove it.

Mr. NOVINS. Mr. HOLIFIELD, let us—

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The threshold—the threshold—the threshold of radiation damage has never been set, whether it is at 0 or 0.6 or 0.7.

Mr. NOVINS. Mr. HOLIFIELD, let me see if I can break through some of these fractions of roentgens——

Mr. HOLIFIELD. All right.

Mr. NOVINS. And get to what I think most people are probably interested in.

If I asked you, sir, what this current radiation and the foreseeable radiation is going to do to me or to any children I may have, what is your answer?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I would say that I do not know, nor neither do the scientists know exactly.

Mr. NOVINS. Then how can you say that this is safe?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Well, I don't think I have said that it was safe.

Mr. NOVINS. How can you say there is no danger in this fallout that is appreciable?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I said that I did not believe that there was any danger because it is impossible to prove that there is any danger in any kind of a laboratory experiment that I know anything about—of this degree of intensity of radiation. And I feel like that in this instance where there is no proof that this low degree of radiation causes deleterious effects, that the security of the Nation involves taking what risks there may be.

Mr. JOHN FINNEY. Mr. HOLIFIELD——

Mr. NOVINS. Mr. John Finney.

Mr. JOHN FINNEY. I would like to take a reverse side of this coin, that fallout is often used as a reason why we should stop tests. I would like to go into the military reasons why we might have to continue tests.

Do we not have to continue tests if we are going to have small high-yield warheads for our defensive missiles against enemy ballistic missiles?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Yes; we do have. This is a very important question that you have asked, because at this time our foreign policy is based on massive retaliation with large hydrogen weapons, megathons—1-megathon, 5-, 10-megathon weapons. We are completely ignoring the small weapon field. Now it might be possible that if you had small weapons that you could get by without using big ones. But if you put all your eggs into one basket of big ones, you either are not going to use them because your—you don't want to start that kind of a war, or if you do use them you have started something that I think will be very bad for civilization.

Mr. JOHN FINNEY. Well then are you as a member of the Atomic Energy Committee saying that we should continue tests to develop small tactical defensive war heads?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I am saying that unless there is the proper kind of a detection and inspection system that we can depend upon, where everybody stops, that we, that we should continue making tests for these small weapons. And I might point out that these tests can be made underground for small weapons without releasing any radioactivity into the air.

Mr. NAT FINNEY. Representative HOLIFIELD, I would like to take you in a little different area.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. All right.

Mr. NAT FINNEY. An old acquaintance of yours over a long period of years is in the switches over in the Senate, Secretary of Commerce-designate Lewis L. Strauss and the other day some pretty extreme statements were made about him.

May I ask, do you think that he should be confirmed?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Now; I would rather not answer that question. It has nothing to do with these particular hearings and I am not a Senator, I do not have to vote on confirmation.

Mr. NAT FINNEY. Do you think Dr. Inglis' statements about him are substantially true?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I haven't read Dr. Inglis' statements.

Mr. HERMAN. Let me put it to you this way: Do you have any feeling of national guilt because of the American program of developing nuclear weapons?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. No, sir, I do not; because we are faced with the development of the Soviets of these weapons and I felt that we had to do it in self-defense.

Mr. JOHN FINNEY. Mr. HOLIFIELD, I would like to go to the question of who is watching

out for our health on this? Who is watching out about the milk and how much strontium there is in it? Who is watching out about that Minnesota wheat in which we got some instances in which it had very high concentrations of strontium?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Well, part of this $20 million that the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has furnished the Atomic Energy Commission is being used for that very purpose. I have the reports here of the radioactivity in milk for many different places throughout the United States.

Mr. NOVINS. Do they vary very much—excuse me, Mr. Finney, go ahead.

Mr. JOHN FINNEY. They didn't find that Minnesota wheat, did they? That came from Minnesota.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Well, there are—are many different universities that are testing. Some of them are under contract to the AEC, and some of them are operating on their own. I think the Minnesota detection, soil detection program was under the University of Minnesota, I believe.

Mr. NAT FINNEY. Representative HOLIFIELD, do you consider that 113 units in that one sample of wheat, just taken alone, to be beyond the danger point?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. No, sir. No. You must remember that these measurements are in millionths of a millionth of a curie. They are very small measurements.

Mr. NAT FINNEY. Isn't it true, sir, that the average for the year, which is what you go by, was well within a safe range?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. It was well within what?

Mr. NAT FINNEY. Well within the safe range.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Yes; it was. It was about, I think, one-tenth of the permissible level.

Mr. HERMAN. In this same line of questioning, since we are asking you questions in the form of statements, as they do in the House, on occasion, would it not also be true to say that a maximum permissible concentration in wheat is the level at which if you eat wheat alone and nothing else for 50 to 70 years, you would get to a danger point in your body?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That's right. It, the maximum permissible level is for a 70-year lifetime period, and you would have to eat wheat alone to get it.

Mr. HERMAN. So that if wheat is a small part of your diet, then over-maximum permissible concentrations is not anything of a threat?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Well, there are many other factors that enter. The body discriminates and releases a great deal of that.

Mr. JOHN FINNEY. Mr. HOLIFIELD, just one quick question:

What do you think of the British proposal on the test ban issue, their idea that we set up a predetermined number of inspections on each side and attempt to get around this present deadlock?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I can't pass judgment on that, because I think there is a bigger problem involved, and that's the land mass of Red China. I think that has to be solved, and why they are not working on this I don't know, because any kind of a test suspension ban without including the land mass of Red China would be worthless.

Mr. NOVINS. Do you feel the State Department should be working on this, sir?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I certainly do.

Mr. NOVINS. Mr. HOLIFIELD, thank you very much, indeed, for coming here today to face the Nation.

Our thanks also to today's panel of newsmen: to Nat Finney, of the Buffalo Evening News; George Herman, of CBS News; and John W. Finney, of the New York Times.

Poison in Your Water—No. 70

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 4, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the Redwood City, Calif., Tribune of October 30, 1958, entitled "Water Pollution Robs Bay of Fish, Report Indicates":

WATER POLLUTION ROBS BAY OF FISH, REPORT INDICATES

(By Ray Spangler)

William Dillinger, regional public relations officer for the Fish and Game Commission, painted a bleak picture of the fishing situation in the south bay this week.

He talked before the Sequoia Kiwanis Club and showed a new Fish and Game Commission motion picture, "Fish in the Sea," about ocean sport fishing.

But his primary message was the one of dire water pollution south of the Dumbarton Bridge.

He reported on a study in 1957 by the air and water pollution people in conjunction with the Fish and Game Commisison.

At that time, the Game Commission established 22 stations south of Dumbarton Bridge from which it took bottom samples, set nets, and made other tests to determine the degree of pollution.

The findings, in brief, were that the bottom was a mess, that the fish were disappearing and that only sharks and a few perch could exist in that water.

There were no bass.

In the sloughs, the fish and game net caught nothing.

Dillinger admitted that there must be some fish in the sloughs, however, because there was an important "fish kill," mostly smelt, from pollution near Alviso last August.

It is his belief that the sewage and cannery wastes from San Jose, dumped into the bay with a modest amount of treatment, if any, merely move back and forth in the shallow basin, and make a sort of cesspool of the area.

He doesn't believe, for instance, that the stuff ever gets out into the ocean by tidal action.

"Unless there is a tightening of pollution laws, the condition will get worse and worse," he declared.

"There are various plans for the development of the shoreline of San Mateo County, which will require clean water for swimming, boating and fishing.

"It is time to start ungrading our standards. Now we are not even holding the line."

He agreed that some municipal sewer plants were improving, and I assume this applies to Redwood City, which has a vast addition underway to its treatment plant.

Dillinger feels that what progress is being made will barely keep up with the growth and population and increasing industrial wastes.

Another thing, he pointed out, is that there used to be more water flowing into the bay. Now much of it is held back for irrigation.

In former years the fishing was good, now he thinks it's poor.

Well, be that as it may, Charles Huttmann, our head pressman, has been fishing the bay for at least 20 years.

He usually fishes at Charleston Slough, just south of the Palo Alto Yacht Harbor, and considerably south of the Dumbarton Bridge.

He reports that there are always bass in the area, but that they are probably getting fewer and certainly getting smaller as each year goes on.

The reason: Water pollution, which kills the smelt, the primary food of the bass.

John Mackenhausen, Redwood City harbor master, reports that some of the outboards have brought in bass in the past 2 weeks. Other fish, some big ones, apparently hit by outboard propellers, have come to the surface and died on the beach.

The last big run of bass in this area, he recalls, was in 1940 at the San Mateo Bridge. It lasted for about a week, and during that time many fishing parties set out from Redwood City.

Otherwise, the Dillinger story is true: Too much pollution, too few fish.

The Fish and Game Commission's boat, the *Nautilus*, is berthed at the port of Redwood City.

Occasionally, its little diving boat, the *Mollusk*, is also moored here.

We trust that the legislature will some day get around to the job of reinforcing the water pollution control authority.

There was a time when we thought that the air pollution control should be channeled along the same lines. Now we are convinced that the San Francisco Bay Area Air Pollution Control District is so much more effective than the water pollution district that we see a need for a change in the latter.

Resolutions Adopted by Newark Archdiocesan Federation of Holy Name Societies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 4, 1959

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following resolutions which were unanimously adopted by approximately 550 members of the Roman Catholic clergy and of the Holy Name Societies of New Jersey at the annual convention of the Newark Archdiocesan Federation of Holy Name Societies, held at St. Mary's Church, Dumont, N.J., on Sunday afternoon, April 26, 1959:

Whereas the Federal Bureau of Investigation has, since its creation many years ago, performed commendable service in helping to protect these United States and its people against criminals of all types and also against subversives of all species of cunning and mendacity; and

Whereas in all its work and activities the Federal Bureau of Investigation has shown a deep regard for the constitutional rights of all individuals and thereby has added to the dignity and respect of our democratic system of government; and

Whereas much of the splendid record and achievements of the Federal Bureau of Investigation can be credited to its director, the Honorable J. Edgar Hoover, who by his efficiency and devotion to duty has given to the Bureau a very remarkable leadership based on morality and patriotism; and

Whereas Special Agent William G. Simon, presently in charge of the Newark office, and his predecessors in that office and the many agents serving under them have performed their work in an efficient and dignified manner: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Newark Archdiocesan Federation of Holy Name Societies in convention assembled at Dumont, N.J., on the 26th day of April 1959, That our sincere thanks be extended to the Federal Bureau of Investigation, its director, J. Edgar Hoover, to Special Agent William G. Simon in charge of the Newark office, and all the personnel of the Bureau, for their diligent and dignified efforts to protect our country against its enemies, both foreign and domestic; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to Director J. Edgar Hoover, to Special Agent William G. Simon, to our U.S. Senators, to our Congressmen, and to the newspapers.

Whereas the American Bar Association's Special Committee on Communist Tactics, Strategy, and Objectives has completed its report; and

Whereas that report in a brilliant analysis has called to the attention of the thinking populace of the world the impetus given the creeping menace of communism, which daily threatens the peace of the United States affecting subversive activity control laws, sedition statutes, security controls, interpreting the Smith Act, the utilization of the fifth amendment to the Constitution of the United States as a shield to inquiry concerning communism affiliation and various loyalty questions; and

Whereas the masterful analysis of Communist tactics in nullification of anti-Communist legislation, muzzling of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and congressional investigation, eliminating and invalidating security progress, the Communist peace offensive lack of good faith in summit conferences, abuses of international exchanges, its influence upon the organization of Red China, its breaches of good faith in nuclear tests, east-west trade, propaganda, humiliation by imprisonment of our citizens and by its sponsorship of anti-American demonstrations abroad; and

Whereas that report clearly explodes the carefully nurtured fallacies (1) that communism in the United States is dwindling in power because the party is dwindling in numbers; (2) that the Communist Party is just another political party; (3) that poverty breeds communism and that the only alternative to fearful coexistence is world war III with nuclear destruction of our cities; and

Whereas this report concludes with a congressional plan to safeguard the Republic by (1) renewed legislation to meet the impact of these Supreme Court determinations; (2) reconsideration of the policy of recognition of Soviet Russia and its satellites; (3) advocation of preparation of a plan of action; (4) a searching study of communism in accordance with the recommendation of His Holiness Pius XI in 1937; (5) a program of recommended reading so that the enemy of mankind may be truly known: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Newark Archdiocesan Federation of Holy Name Societies, in convention assembled, at Dumont, N.J., this 26th day of April 1959, That expression of deep and sincere gratitude to the American Bar Association, its chairman and membership be made for its long, exhaustive, and fruitful study of the subject matter; for its immediate awareness of the gravity of the subject; and does memorialize the Congress of the United States to study the report at length and initiate remedial legislation to meet the impact of Supreme Court decisions; to reconsider its policy of recognition of Soviet Russia and its satellites; to immediately embark upon the preparation of a plan of action; to initiate a deep and searching study of communism in accordance with the recommendation of His Holiness Pius XI in 1937, and to provide a program of recommended reading so that the enemy of mankind may be truly known and that the dangers of communism may be brought home to each and every citizen of this Republic; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Members of the Congress of the United States for the State of New Jersey so that the sentiment of this meeting may be spread upon the minutes.

Time To Face Facts and Meet the Increased Cost of Medical Care

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, on March 13, 1959, I introduced H.R. 5667. It is a bill to amend the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code so as to provide insurance against the costs of hospital, nursing home, and surgical service for persons eligible for old age and survivors insurance benefits, and for other purposes.

This bill is identical to the Forand bill, H.R. 4700. My able colleague from Rhode Island [Mr. FORAND] is well-aware of the pressing need in our Nation today to help senior citizens meet the mounting costs of medical care.

Other Members of this House have introduced legislation identical or nearly identical to the Forand bill. This bill and others like it are currently pending before the Ways and Means Committee. I understand that no action is scheduled.

I hope the committee will be able to hold hearings on this legislation. I believe a series of hearings held in various parts of this country would soon point up specifically the burdens now facing men and women in this country who need medical and surgical care.

An excellent fact sheet on our social security program as it was initiated, showing how it has developed, appears in the AFL–CIO News for May 2, 1959. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include it and a copy of the press release I prepared after introducing this legislation.

I am aware that there are programs now being developed by private firms to help face this problem of the cost of medical care. I am hopeful they may provide part of the framework for better and broader programs.

The article and release follow:

[From the AFL–CIO News, May 2, 1959]

MEDICAL LOBBY FIGHTS HEALTH CARE FOR AGED—STUDY SUPPORTS NEED FOR CONGRESS ACTION

On August 14, 1935, President Franklin Delano Roosevelt signed into law one of the most important and lasting improvements in our national policy, the Social Security Act.

The act provided for several programs: Old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, aid to the blind, and unemployment compensation. But the best known program which it established was the old-age benefit system which, in 1939, became the old age and survivors insurance program (OASDI). The D for disability was added in 1956. This is what most people mean when they think of social security.

In the years since 1935, many needed improvements in the social security program have become obvious, and some of them have been met. Coverage of the law, either voluntary or required, has been extended to include almost all employed and self-employed individuals in the Nation except doctors and Communists.

In 1956, after much controversy, an additional program was established to provide for social security protection for workers 50 years of age and older who are totally and permanently disabled, and therefore unable to hold jobs.

At that time Congress also lowered the retirement age for women from 65 to 62.

Furthermore, from time to time, Congress has increased the maximum and minimum benefits to keep up with the rising cost of living.

The social security program has weathered some vigorous attacks. In 1953, following the election of the Eisenhower Administration and a Republican Congress, a few reactionaries in the House conducted a series of hearings under the chairmanship of Representative (now Senator) CARL T. CURTIS, Republican of Nebraska. It became apparent that the committee was out to discredit, and perhaps destroy, the social security system.

But they misjudged the temper of the people and of their own administration. Substantial support was given the social security program, and during the following year Congress extended it instead of injurying it.

SENATE FIGHT ON DISABILITY

Political views on innovations in the system may be illustrated by the fight over granting benefits to disabled persons in 1956. The bill passed the House, which has proved generally more eager to make social security improvements, by a vote of 372 to 31.

In the Senate, however, the Finance Committee eliminated the disability provisions from the bill after 2 months of hearings, precipitating a vigorous political struggle.

On the Senate floor, the late Senator Walter F. George, Democrat, of Georgia, sponsored an amendment to restore the disability provision to the bill. His amendment was adopted by a vote of 47 to 45. Six Republicans and 41 Democrats supported the George amendment; 38 Republicans and 7 Democrats opposed it.

Historically, the establishment and expansion of social security programs have had the strong opposition of business groups and the medical profession, and the strong support of liberal and labor organizations. These groups are active today whenever social security legislation is considered by Congress.

Basically, the social security system is designed to give insured protection to all individuals from economic hardships caused by retirement, disability, or the death of the family breadwinner.

In large part this objective has been met. In recent years, however, an old problem has become more and more apparent and more

in need of solution. This problem is the cost of medical care of old-age and survivors insurance beneficiaries; the aged and widows with dependent children.

PRIVATE INSURANCE FALLS SHORT

Despite the general expansion of private health insurance plans within recent years including those growing out of collective bargaining agreements, the Government reported recently that about three out of five aged persons had no health insurance protection at all, either because such protection was not available to them at all or because the cost was prohibitive.

Typically, health insurance for older persons has many restrictions. It may cover only a few weeks of hospital care each year. The insurance company may reserve the right to cancel it at any time. Benefits may be inadequate. Therefore, health insurance protection may be wholly inadequate even to those who are covered.

Another obvious factor is the frequency of illness. Retired persons are much more likely, as a group, to experience serious illness than younger persons. Those who need health-insurance protection most, then, are those who have it least.

In response to this need, Representative AIME J. FORAND, Democrat, of Rhode Island, in 1957 introduced a bill to amend the Social Security Act by making hospital care and nursing home services available to social-security beneficiaries.

ADMINISTRATION OPPOSES BILL

The Forand bill received the immediate support of the AFL–CIO and other groups concerned with the welfare of retired persons. It also received widespread support from retirees themselves.

The bill was greeted with the opposition of the Eisenhower administration.

Initially, congressional response was cool. The House Ways and Means Committee, of which FORAND is a member, failed to hold hearings on the bill until late 1958, and then only as part of general hearings on all parts of the Social Security Act. The hearings were sufficient, however, to draw the battle-lines on the Forand medical care proposals.

Opposing the Forand bill, in addition to the administration, were:

American Medical Association, American Dental Association, National Association of Accident and Health Underwriters, Health Insurance Association of America, Blue Shield Medical Care Plans, National Association of Life Underwriters, Chamber of Commerce of the United States, National Association of Manufacturers, American Farm Bureau Federation, National Grange.

Those who support expansion of social security to include medical care, as proposed by FORAND, were: AFL–CIO, American Nurses' Association, National Consumers League, Group Health Federation of America, National Farmers Union, American Public Welfare Association, National Association of Social Workers.

Although no further action was taken by the 85th Congress on the Forand medical care proposals, the Ways and Means Committee did request a study and report from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The report has since been submitted to the committee. It contains abundant statistical evidence that retired workers have incomes too low to meet the rising costs of medical care.

REPORT SHOWS NEED

Furthermore, it shows that hospital and nursing benefits for old-age and survivors insurance beneficiaries are entirely practical.

However, the report did not indicate any change in the administration's opposition to the program.

On February 18, 1959, FORAND reintroduced his bill, H.R. 4700. Several Members of the House and Senate have introduced the same or similar bills.

In announcing its support for the Forand bill, the AFL–CIO Executive Council said:

"The nationwide interest in the Forand bill has further demonstrated the need for making hospital care and nursing home service available to social security beneficiaries. The high cost of medical services should no longer be permitted to bar older people and widows from required health care.

"Proposals advanced by organized medicine and the commercial insurance industry as alternatives to the Forand bill are grossly inadequate and unfair to older people. Only prepayment during years before retirement can make extensive and lasting health insurance available to the great majority of the aged."

Jurisdiction over H.R. 4700 in the House is in the Ways and Means Committee, which is currently considering unemployment compensation legislation.

The AFL–CIO has urged the committee to hold hearings as a first step in securing enactment of legislation providing hospital care and nursing home service for old-age and survivors insurance beneficiaries during this session of Congress.

PRESS RELEASE FROM THE OFFICE OF REPRESENTATIVE CHARLES O. PORTER

Legislation providing certain prepaid health insurance benefits for senior citizens eligible for old-age and survivors insurance benefits under the Social Security Act has been reintroduced by Representative CHARLES O. PORTER, Democrat, of Oregon.

PORTER'S bill, H.R. 5667, is identical to legislation introduced by Representative AIME FORAND, Democrat of Rhode Island. The Oregon Congressman joined Congressman FORAND in sponsoring the bill during the 85th Congress. There are minor revisions in the new bill.

As written, the bill provides certain hospital and nursing home services and surgical services. It is financed by increasing contribution rates of employers and employees by one-fourth of 1 percent each and of self-employed by three-eighths of 1 percent. The health benefits would cause about half the additions to total cost.

Under the section concerning hospital and nursing home services, an eligible person would be insured against the cost of hospital care. This includes a semiprivate room and such services as the hospital customarily furnishes its bed patients. The insurance system would not pay the attending doctor's bills, except for surgical services. There would be a certain freedom of selection of a surgeon except in emergency cases.

A patient would receive up to 60 days of hospitalization in a 12-month period. Nursing home care could total up to 120 days, less the number of days spent in the hospital during the same 12-month period.

Representative PORTER said he had found during his professional career as a politician and lawyer that illness in the family could be financially catastrophic.

"As people grow older they need more medical care, but they usually have less money," he said. "It is difficult to get adequate protection through private insurance.

PORTER said he had in no way closed his mind to the fact that it may be possible for private industry to take care of the Nation's rapidly increasing medical problem. He said he was hopeful that certain programs now being developed such as those designed for retired teachers might provide part of the framework for more expansive programs.

To date 10 Members of Congress have joined Representative FORAND in introducing his bill or similar legislation.

The REA Bill Veto Ill Advised

SPEECH
OF
HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 30, 1959

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, it is my earnest hope that the House will follow the commendable action of the other body and vote to override the President's veto of the REA bill.

As one of the cosponsors of this legislation, I regard this vote today as one directly related to the welfare of rural America.

I was greatly disturbed 3 years ago when the President vetoed the 90-percent price-support bill for agriculture. I was disappointed again last year when he vetoed our price freeze legislation. I do hope that this time we can be successful in overriding what I am sincerely convinced is an ill-advised veto.

Fair Trade Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 4, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the Oakland, Calif., Tribune on March 24, 1959, set out some excellent reasons why the fair trade bill should be defeated and should not under any circumstances become law.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include the article, as follows:

FAIR TRADE BILL

The Department of Justice has moved into the picture in the efforts to get a Federal "fair trade" bill through Congress and in doing so unlimbered a few lusty blows at this new effort to regiment the Nation's consumer.

Robert A. Bicks, one of the head men in the antitrust division of the Justice Department, told the House Commerce Committee that, for one thing, the proposed law would cost the American consumer at least a billion dollars a year and perhaps more.

But aside from the purely economic aspects he pointed out that the proposal as submitted by Representative OREN HAYS, Arkansas Democrat, contains some very definite assaults on the principles of competition in business.

For one thing, he said, such a law would "signal the abandonment of our time-honored free enterprise ideals for the distribution sector of our economy." For another, it would in effect repeal the antitrust laws for a wide area of retail business.

Also that it "would substitute Federal mandate for State or local discretion in vital areas of how much all Americans pay for products needed for daily living."

Those are all valid and logical arguments and they should be respected.

Appendix

Tenth Anniversary of the Point 4 Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 5, 1959

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by former President Truman at the Sixth National Conference on International Economic and Social Development, the subject of the address being the 10th anniversary of point 4.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF FORMER PRESIDENT HARRY S. TRUMAN ON THE 10TH ANNIVERSARY OF POINT 4 DELIVERED AT THE 6TH NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT, WASHINGTON, D.C., APRIL 30, 1959

I am delighted to be here this evening to join in celebrating the 10th anniversary of point 4.

I am most grateful to you for inviting me to come.

I thought it might be appropriate to review with you the origins of the point 4 concept as expressed in the inaugural address on January 20, 1949.

Some of the circumstances that suggested point 4 were foreign, and some purely domestic. If I am obliged to draw from a political situation some conclusions with which some of you may not agree, I suggest to you this is an historical statement—and that in this case I am acting as the historian. This is the way I saw it, and my only purpose here is to describe what I saw.

The basic policy from which point 4 and the Marshall plan grew was stated in the address to Congress on March 12, 1947, in which I asked Congress to vote emergency aid to Greece and Turkey. In that address I said:

"I believe that it must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures.

"I believe that we must assist free peoples to work out their destinies in their own way.

"I believe that our help should be primarily through economic and financial aid which is essential to economic stability and orderly political processes."

The programs of aid to Greece and Turkey that were developed during 1947 and 1948 were not just in the form of funds or supplies. They included technical assistance of the broadest kind. Hundreds of American technicians were sent to Greece and Turkey to assist in such fields as industry, agriculture, public finance, foreign trade, public administration, shipping, and labor.

The Marshall plan also included technical assistance. During the course of that plan, thousands of technicians went to Europe or were trained in the United States for the purpose of helping to increase European technical efficiency and productivity.

So you see that we in the Government were already thinking in terms of technical assistance by January 1949.

As some of you may remember, we had a presidential election here in November of 1948. The Democrats carried both Houses of Congress by substantial majorities and elected a President. Nearly all the newspapers and pollsters had been saying that the Republicans would win overwhelmingly, so the result of the victory by the Democrats was considered a startling upset and received great attention here and abroad.

Now what was the underlying and well-understood issue of that campaign? It was purely and simply whether the social and economic advances of the New Deal were to be continued or reversed, and whether the United States was going to continue its policies of vigorous leadership of the free world.

The New Deal had brought about fundamental and far-reaching changes in this country.

The power of Government had been invoked to restore our national economy after the depression.

It had been invoked to build a system of social security, to build a broad base of purchasing power among farmers and workers, and to right a long list of economic wrongs and injustices.

And it had been invoked on a broad scale for the relief and rehabilitation and recovery of our friends and allies abroad.

All this added up to a peaceful revolution in this country, and its course had been followed with intense interest all over the world.

Following the election of Republican majorities in Congress in 1946, Republican leaders had made no bones of the fact that it was only a question of waiting until the next election to put a Republican in the White House and reverse the course of the New Deal, turning the pages of history backward.

The meaning of the election of 1948 was that the American people had made it clear they would not tolerate any rollback of the social and economic advances made at home during the preceding 16 years, or any retreat from leadership abroad. They made it clear that they wanted the pages of history turned for the future and the Government of the United States to continue to be responsive to the needs of people at home and around the world.

This was all a matter of intense comment and conversation abroad at the time, and, I might add, considerable rejoicing. The whole free world looked to the United States for leadership.

It therefore seemed not only appropriate but of great importance that my inaugural address should speak not only to the Nation but to the world. It seemed important to declare that the United States was dedicated to help people meet their needs and to realize their aspirations not only at home but also abroad. It was important to say in effect that, the New Deal having just been ratified at home, the United States was willing to help other peoples achieve their own New Deals.

In January 1949, the world was still in a desperate situation. The cold war was just about at its coldest. Only a few months earlier, the Communists had taken over Czechoslovakia, and after that the Russians had blockaded Berlin. Aid to Greece and Turkey had given those countries improved prospects, but Greece's war against the Communists was by no means won. The advance of communism had been stopped in Europe, largely as a result of the policy declaration of the President of the United States on April 12, 1947. But Europe was still hungry and cold, with recovery hardly begun. However, the North Atlantic Alliance was in the process of negotiation, the Marshall plan was getting underway, and if the situation in Western Europe was not good, at least bold programs and policies of the United States designed to improve it were in operation. The policy was the foreign policy of the United States. It was to inform the Soviet Communist dictator that the free world intended to stay free. It was worldwide.

In some parts of the world, however, there was no assurance of American help. The Communists were on the verge of a complete victory in China. Communist war was raging in Indochina. In south and southeast Asia and the Middle East, the British, French, and Dutch Empires were breaking up into a multitude of new independent states—weak in administration, poor in technical skills, and lacking in capital. It was clear that that part of the world especially needed help and hope, and that U.S. policy should be directed to supply it.

There was not much that could be done through military aid. It appeared that technical assistance and investment capital were the most useful contributions we could make to the stability and well-being of the underdeveloped countries.

So you see, events at home and abroad—and the psychological situation both at home and abroad—all pointed to an inaugural address pitched to the needs of the world and reflecting the newly declared mood of the American electorate. The immediate and enthusiastic reception accorded point 4 proves, I think, that our interpretation of the mood and the need was correct.

Although point 4 has become a household word in many countries of the world, it is usually associated—especially in this country—with technical asistance only—as distinct from loans for economic development. I would like to remind you, however, of this other element; and I quote from the original statement of point 4 as follows: "And, in cooperation with other nations, we should foster capital investment in areas needing development."

Please note the words "capital investment."

It has often been pointed out that whereas technical assistance went forward in 1950, there was a long lag in beginning to meet the special investment needs of the underdeveloped countries. Today, however, I am glad to see that this problem is a major subject of discussion and effort and activity.

The first reason for delayed attention to the investment needs of the underveloped countries was the Korean war which diverted energies and resources from economic needs to security against Communist military aggression. Just before the Korean war, considerable thought was being given within the Government to the undertaking of extensive public investment, by a long-term loan program, in the underdeveloped countries. Not only would this enable them to mobilize their own resources, but it would also stimulate a world economic activity from which

Western Europe could earn foreign exchange through increased trade.

I do not mean to imply that this had reached a stage of major governmental concern or activity. But there were a number of people in several departments of the Government who were thinking along these lines, and this was a matter of policy discussion at the time.

All this went by the board when the Communists made their unprovoked attack in Korea. Thereafter, we had to shift the major emphasis to rearmament at home and military aid to our friends and allies abroad. Some economic aid continued but at a lower level and at a diminishing rate. All this was reflected in the Mutual Security Act of 1951.

The sad truth is that only now, 9 years later, are we beginning to recover the perspective we had before the outbreak of the Korean war and to get back on the rails leading to orderly world economic growth. By early 1953, we had about reached a point where we should have returned to major emphasis on development of the underdeveloped countries. But instead, for several years the primary emphasis was upon signing up the newly independent countries of Asia into military pacts and in furnishing them with arms, while neglecting their needs for economic development. The development needs of our Latin American neighbors were also overlooked until last year's demonstrations forced some attention to them.

Meanwhile, precious opportunities to combat communism have been lost. In October 1952, 5 months before his death, Stalin during the course of the 19th Communist Party Congress, called a sharp turn in Soviet strategy. In effect, he recognized that Western Europe could not longer be taken by subversion, and that—as proved in Korea—direct aggression was unprofitable. Communist strategy would thereafter be centered primarily upon Asia and the other underdeveloped areas, and the principal instruments were to be economic lures, infiltration, and domination. Stalin's successors have merely been carrying out the strategy laid down by Stalin himself, only more effectively than he could ever have done it.

The result has been that the Soviet Union has made enormous gains with its economic offensive while we have peddled military pacts. Two years ago, however, this country made a major move to meet the danger by establishing the Development Loan Fund. This fund is certainly a move in the right direction, though its authority is far too limited and its funds far too small.

This brings me to consider with you what is to be done at this session of Congress.

The administration is asking for a 1-year authorization for the Development Loan Fund and an appropriation of $700 million for loans to underdeveloped countries. This is all right as far as it goes. The trouble is that it doesn't go far enough.

State Department officials have said repeatedly the fund needs from $1 billion to $1½ billion this year. And yet the administration asks for only about half what is needed.

Another point:

It is well known that 1-year authorizations for development programs are wasteful and inadequate. Countries that are planning their development ahead, as in the case of India, are kept in doubt and are unable to move ahead with confidence. The authorization clearly should be for 4 or 5 years—as in the case of the Marshall plan. The Marshall plan was a 4-year plan agreed upon by the President and Congress before it started.

Finally, the purely bilateral approach to the investment needs of the underdeveloped countries is rapidly growing obsolete, and we need a new one—an international approach. We and the other industrial countries should find out what the investment needs of the underdeveloped countries are expected to be over a period of years. We should figure out how much capital is available to meet the needs. And we should work out a reasonable, cooperative plan designed to enable the underdeveloped countries to mobilize their own resources and support themselves at a higher standard of living.

We must have an adequate program. I think it is tragic that the administration has asked for funds that fall so far short of the need. It will be even worse, of course, if Congress does what there is so much talk of doing and slashes these already inadequate funds.

We cannot purchase security and peace by pinching pennies at a bargain counter. The needs of the times call for bold action even more than when point 4 was launched in 1949. We should be planning how we can use our strength and resources to the utmost rather than fearfully trying to hoard what we have.

A balanced budget is not our primary need in this time of great danger, although eventually we should have a balanced budget. We need a strong America even more than someone's idea of a budget. We need a strong free world. If we don't have it, a budget makes no difference.

There is a very pertinent lesson in the saying that it doesn't do a man any good to be the richest man in the graveyard. We may be headed for that epitaph.

I believe we shall be living under great tension and in great danger for a long time to come. The threat of war, whether cold or hot or lukewarm, will be the constant companion of this generation, and perhaps the next. The question is: How shall we conduct ourselves in this situation? Shall we ignore the danger? Shall we cower in fear?

I have a suggestion to make. It is that we as a Nation declare a war of our own—a war on poverty, hunger, ignorance, disease, and despair. A war waged at home and abroad. A war waged with the fullest resources of the Nation.

I am confident that, if we do that, we can avoid other forms of war, emerge triumphant over so-called communism—which is not communism but just plain dictatorship. Then we could build a peaceful and a free world. I am confident that in this course lies the greatest hope and promise of our civilization.

Lakeland's Baptist Institute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 5, 1959

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a news story and an editorial commendation which appeared in the March 15 issue of the Lakeland Ledger on the Florida Baptist Institute and Seminary. The school is comparatively new, and is making a tremendous contribution to the community, under the able direction of Dr. Albert Garner, its president.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BAPTIST INSTITUTE HERE IS GAINING MOMENTUM

Florida Baptist Institute and Seminary, founded here in September 1957, is making brisk progress.

Dr. Albert Garner, its president, outlined the school's progress so far and said indications point to a bright future.

Located on a 10-acre tract at West Walnut Street, the school received a State charter in February 1958, and was fully approved by the Florida Approval Agency and U.S. governmental agencies for the training of ministers and Christian workers last September.

Fifty-four students are now enrolled at the school and 100 have enrolled since the school was chartered, Dr. Garner said.

There is no tuition fee and the school is open to students of all faiths, Dr. Garner pointed out. The school is supported by annuities and gifts from American Baptist Association churches in Florida, Georgia, and Alabama.

Dr. Garner said the school has two major divisions in its training program.

The institute department includes a 4-year course of study in the English Bible and Bible-related subjects. The seminary department offers a 4-year course of study in Hebrew, Greek, and Latin, and a study of the Bible and Bible history in these languages.

Seminary work is open only to those who have college diplomas or special training above the high school level. Bachelor and master's degrees are offered to those who complete the prescribed seminary work.

Dr. Garner heads the faculty, composed of seven full-time professors.

The school was first started under the sponsorship of Grace Baptist Church on a 7½-acre tract. After the State charter was granted, the school purchased 2½ additional acres.

During the past year, buildings located on the new property were repainted and renovated. Classes are being held there now.

Dr. Garner said plans are being made to replace all of the dormitories, apartments, and the educational building with new buildings in a 10-year expansion program.

He said the program should begin in about 18 months.

In addition to heading the school, Dr. Garner is editor of the Baptist Anchor, a semimonthly religious newspaper with a circulation of about 5,000 in Florida, Georgia, and Alabama.

Dr. Garner is the author of four books and numerous pamphlets and booklets. His books are "The Church Covenant," "Bible Analysis," "Christian Doctrine," and "Pearls in the Psalms."

He was cofounder of Texas Baptist Institute, Henderson, Tex., and served as its dean for 8 years. He also served as head of the department of speech at Jacksonville (Tex.) College.

Dr. Garner holds an A.B. degree from Harding College, Searcy, Ark.; an M.A. degree from Baylor University, Waco, Tex.; and a doctorate in Bible languages from the Missionary Baptist Seminary, Little Rock, Ark.

He is married and has one son.

LAKELAND'S BAPTIST INSTITUTE

During the period of less than 2 years the Florida Baptist Institute and Seminary has been in operation in Lakeland, it has established itself as an institution of impressive vitality serving a lofty purpose well.

It, like all such institutions, reflects to a great extent the character of the man who is its president, Dr. Albert Garner, a young man of sincerity, enthusiasm, versatility, and vision. Like all able heads of educational institutions, he has surrounded himself with well-qualified faculty members.

Although the name of the Lakeland institution labels it as one of Baptist affiliation,

it is an institution open to students of all faiths, and it is unique in that no tuition charge is made.

The curriculum covers 4 years of study, with emphasis upon the Bible, Hebrew, Greek, and Latin. In addition to being a minister and an educator, Dr. Garner is an author. He has books, pamphlets, and magazine articles to his credit. He is much in demand as a speaker and makes weekend plane trips to other States to fill engagements.

His versatility has still another facet. He is editor of the Baptist Anchor, which circulates in Florida, Alabama, and Georgia.

The institution is situated on West Walnut Street. The present buildings are inadequate, and so Dr. Garner and his associates have planned a 10-year building program to replace each of the present buildings and add still more structures.

Thus, the institution is one that is an expanding asset for Lakeland and Florida and deserves generous support.

Address by Hon. Jennings Randolph, of West Virginia, at Dedication of Sheltered Workshop and Rehabilitation Center Building, Davis Memorial Goodwill Industries, Washington, D.C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 5, 1959

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me at the dedication of the Sheltered Workshop and Rehabilitation Center Building, Davis Memorial Goodwill Industries, Washington, D.C., May 3, 1959.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY U.S. SENATOR JENNINGS RANDOLPH AT THE DAVIS MEMORIAL GOODWILL INDUSTRIES DEDICATION OF THE SHELTERED WORKSHOP AND REHABILITATION CENTER BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D.C., MAY 3, 1959

General Maas, President Dulin, officers and members of the board of trustees, staff members of the Davis Memorial Goodwill Industries and guests, today we begin the observance of the 25th anniversary of the Goodwill Industries in Washington. Today we dedicate this rehabilitation center building to the further advancement of the cause for which so many of you have worked so tirelessly and devotedly—the cause of justice, not charity, for the handicapped—the justice of equality of opportunity.

This building crowns with success the efforts of many years, the hopes we have so long maintained for expanding opportunities to the disabled, and offers rich reward for the sacrifices and discomforts that staff members and workers have borne during this period of transition. It is with gratitude and thanksgiving to all of those who have contributed to its realization that we observe this latest milestone in the growth of the Davis Memorial. It is indeed a fitting climax to our first quarter century of existence and a hopeful portent of the future.

We have traveled far from those modest beginnings in 1935 when the operations of the Davis Memorial were limited to the workshop offering employment to a comparative handful of disabled men and women. In those 24 years the Goodwill Industries here in Washington has employed over 7,000 workers at wages totaling more than $5 million.

While today, with an annual budget approaching the million dollar mark, employment has reached 275 daily, and in 5 years is expected to be doubled. Yet such statistics do not alone tell the full story.

For today, as in the past, the concern of the Davis Memorial has been for the disabled man or woman as an individual person—not as a figure on the balance sheet. In implementing this concern, our workshop here has kept pace with the development in the philosophy of the sheltered workshop movement. We have, in keeping with the development of the Goodwill Industries nationally, advanced from the concept of the sheltered workshop as primarily and almost exclusively a place of terminal employment, to the acceptance of a dual function—on the one hand, offering continuous or recurrent employment for those for whom opportunities in competitive employment do not exist, and on the other, providing a transitional and diagnostic work experience for those who will graduate into competitive employment.

The ability to perform adequately this dual function is now assured, not only by these new physical facilities, but also by the excellent professional team of the Davis Memorial—including a physician, nurse, medical social worker, psychologist, occupational therapist, physical therapist, and prevocational supervisor.

Thus has almost a quarter of a century's striving finally been rewarded with the physical and professional facilities necessary to carry on the thrilling and dramatic task—the task of restoring disabled men and women to lives of fruitful, constructive, and independent endeavor.

The growth of our facilities and achievements here in Washington has been paralleled by advancement throughout the Nation as well. The Goodwill Industries together provided training, rehabilitation, and employment last year for some 32,000 men and women, with wages of $16,500,000 going to persons in training and workshop employment.

In the Federal-State program of vocational rehabilitation there has also been marked progress during the past year. According to Secretary Flemming, in his section of the recent special report to the President from the Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped: "Another measure of growth is the fact that over a quarter of a million handicapped persons were served by the State rehabilitation agencies last year." While, and I again quote from Secretary Flemming, "* * * nearly 75,000 handicapped individuals received rehabilitation services and were established in useful jobs. This was an increase of more than 3,000 over the previous year."

Similar progress has been achieved in the field of research and the training of professional personnel—the two areas on which the future depends most heavily for continued development. In 1958 the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation approved grants for 81 new research projects covering a wide range of rehabilitation problems, while currently there are more than 150 such projects underway.

Today, as a result of Federal training grants from the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, more than 300 graduate students finish their work each year to enter State and private agencies, compared to about a dozen a year prior to the OVR program.

In addition, training grants were made last year to 30 approved residency training programs in physical medicine and rehabilitation, covering traineeships for approximately 145 physicians, while grants have also been made to 25 of the 82 approved schools of medicine for the purpose of offering basic instruction in rehabilitation.

The Veterans' Administration is pioneering new fields through its current study of occupations held by epileptics and the homebound disabled—hoping to achieve for these groups what its previous studies did for the blind and paraplegics.

Thus, on many fronts there are signs of real and substantial progress. However, there remain several specific areas in which there is a compelling need for greater effort—each of which ultimately resolves itself into a question of communicating our message to the larger national community.

I need not labor here the general problem of creating a more favorable climate for the employment of the physically handicapped. For you ladies and gentlemen are well aware of this and of the employment record of handicapped persons—in such matters as safety, low absenteeism and low turnover, and high productivity.

However, I would like to refer you to an observation made somewhat more than a year ago, by Mr. A. J. Hayes, president, the International Association of Machinists. As Mr. Hayes stated:

"In our goal to place the handicapped in jobs, we are still not being fair with prospective employers in most cases. We produce records proving that the handicapped are able, loyal, productive and safe workers. But in the vast majority of our States, we leave employers of handicapped workers open to unfair liability in case of injuries to the handicapped. It is true that 43 of our 48 State workmen's compensation laws have provisions for some sort of second injury fund. But the real fact is that fewer than a dozen States have second injury funds of the type which really accomplish their objective. The rest of them leave employers wide open to extensive and unfair liability for subsequent injuries to handicaped persons. The result, of course, is to deny handicapped job applicants a fair opportunity of finding employment."

Thus, the revision of State laws in this field offers us, I believe, one of the major challenges in the effort to further equality of opportunity for the handicapped.

In closing, I would now like to address the relationship of employment of the handicapped to the needs of our Nation's productive system as a whole. It is estimated—according to the U.S. Department of Labor—that some 74 million employees will be needed to produce the $560 billion gross national product set as a goal for 1965.

On the basis of recent trends—and assuming a prosperous peacetime economy—we may reasonably expect to have a total labor force of approximately 79 million in 1965. This 79 million labor force would include an estimated 3 million persons in the Armed Forces, a minimum of 2 million unemployed, and the remainder—74 million in civilian employment. Thus it would appear that the 1965 labor supply will be numerically adequate.

But what are the full implications of this figure? Half of this increase of almost 10 million will be accounted for by women—most of whom will be in the younger and older age groups. Among men, the largest increase will be in the 14–24 age group—young men entering the labor force for the first time. The next largest increase will be in the 45–54 age group, and the remainder, 1 million, in the 55 years-and-over group.

Most of the increase in our labor force by 1965 will therefore be in the younger and older age groups.

Another factor which must be taken into account is the effect of permanent and tem-

porary disabilities incurred on the job. According to the current issue of the Monthly Labor Review, there were in 1958 1,810,000 such injuries, of which 75,700 were permanently disabling. The total loss of man-days, that is, immediate and future as a result of deaths and permanent impairments, is estimated at 160 million, or the equivalent of a year's full-time employment of about 515,000 workers.

Add to this figure those who will develop service-connected disabilities and those who will be partially disabled by home and traffic accidents, and it becomes apparent that the numerically adequate labor force of 1965 will depend greatly on what we do to keep it numerically adequate.

Part of the answer will lie in full employer utilization of the physically handicapped—and older workers—with employment by selective placement being the rule and not the exception. The U.S. Civil Service Commission has offered a guide in its pamphlet on selective placement and—according to Chairman Harris Ellsworth—is continuing its investigation by conducting a survey of approximately 30 of the larger agencies in this area.

However, the Government in this field can only propose; it remains for the local community and the individual businessmen to dispose. Thus, we return again to the problem of communication. Our responsibility is clear; not only to communicate to prospective employers that sound business recommends the employment of the handicapped, but that justice requires it—justice, not charity. For it is justice and the right to equality of opportunity which make viable the claim of the handicapped to a life of independence and a share in the fruits of our democracy.

United States, Israel, and the World Crises

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 5, 1959

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the very thoughtful and forward-looking speech about the situation in the Middle East by the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], delivered in Chicago on the occasion of the Jewish National Fund dinner to honor that able jurist and devoted public servant, Judge Abraham Marovitz on April 1, 1959.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES, ISRAEL, AND THE WORLD CRISES

(Excerpts from remarks prepared for delivery by Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, at Jewish National Fund dinner honoring Judge Abraham Marowitz, Chicago, Ill., April 1, 1959)

In the past 3 months the American people have focused their attention on the Berlin crisis, almost to the exclusion of any other international problem. This preoccupation with Berlin is understandable, but it can be dangerous. It can be dangerous because that divided city is not the only potential source of open international conflict.

The war which nobody wants could be sparked in Berlin. It could also start in Quemoy or Baghdad.

The delicate Berlin situation is the most serious crisis we have faced since the Korean war, and potentially the most serious Communist challenge since the end of World War II. But it is not the only crisis.

The crisis in the Formosan Strait, although relatively quiet at the moment, is also full of danger. And matters are boiling up again in the turbulent Middle East. Iraq, our former ally, has renounced her membership in the Baghdad Pact. And what is more important, it looks as though this important Middle Eastern country may be slipping from the twilight zone of neutralism into the midnight darkness of communism. * * *

In short, we are confronted with the possibility of a three-headed crisis—in Germany, in the Formosan Strait, and in the Middle East. This raises two serious questions: First, are we really prepared to meet a determined adversary on three fronts simultaneously? Second, if we are not, what should we do to become better prepared?

Berlin alone may test us to the limit. * * *

But this much we can say for the Berlin situation. We are entering into negotiations with the strength of a united Western position. We have the support of Britain, France, West Germany, and our other NATO partners.

Our present policy in the Formosan Strait enjoys no such united support. Our only ally there is Chiang Kai-shek.

Tonight, I want to focus my attention on the third potentially explosive situation—the Middle East. I fear that our economic, political, and military policies are not adequate to a serious challenge in this area. Further, I do not think we are doing all we should do to improve our position.

Consider the challenge and the stakes. The Soviet Union is engaging in a massive program of economic penetration into that strategic, oil-rich area. Her aim is not to foster economic development nor to encourage genuine national self-determination. Her aim is to expel western influence and to expand the Communist empire. Testimony submitted by the State Department in recent weeks shows that the U.S.S.R. is committed to lend Egypt and Syria, the United Arab Republic, a total of $949 million in economic and military aid.

Last week the Soviet Union announced economic aid to Iraq, totaling $138 million. This is in addition to the $120 million in military aid previously disclosed.

The pattern is ominous. The Russians are clearly exploiting the Arab hostility toward Israel to achieve her political purposes in the Mediterranean world.

In the face of this, it is my firm conviction that the United States response has been less than adequate.

* * * * *

I do not suggest that we should compete with the Russians in every country where they have established a foothold, regardless of the internal political situation.

If we competé wherever the Soviet Union offers an aid program we shall be letting Moscow decide how we shall deploy our aid. If we did, the Russians might well tempt us into wasteful squander.

I do submit, however, that in countries where the people and government understand our objectives and are struggling to attain political and economic freedom, we should be maintaining and, yes, expanding our program of assistance and cooperation.

There are countries in Asia and Africa, like India and Israel, where the rule of law prevails and where democracy is cherished and preserved.

What happens in these countries is crucial for the free world. If these countries falter and fail, then other nations in Asia and Africa may turn the Soviet way. It is sound policy to continue and increase economic aid where our dollars work and fight for freedom.

* * * * *

I do not need to tell this audience how important it is to maintain our program for Israel. In 1951 I was one of the 36 Senators who joined in sponsoring legislation in the Senate calling for a grant for Israel.

At that time Israel was struggling to resettle hundreds of thousands of Jewish refugees from the displaced persons camps in Europe and from the Arab countries in Asia and Africa.

The Congress provided $63 million as a grant to help Israel meet a tremendous crisis created by her own humanitarian impulses.

In subsequent years the U.S. Government has continued aid to Israel, and we are glad to see her tremendous gains. She has tripled her population, absorbed newcomers from all over the world, provided them with sanctuary, enabled them to work and prosper.

This spectacular demonstration of how a government has been able to unite and fully employ the three major resources—land, water, and people—is proving to be an inspiration to the new countries in Asia and Africa as well as to free countries in Europe and this Hemisphere. All of us have much to learn from modern Israel. She is serving the cause of democracy on a critical frontier—a great ally.

In recent years the U.S. aid program to Israel has changed. As she has made progress our Government has enabled her to purchase surplus foods and has loaned to her money from the Development Loan Fund. The amount that we have been granting Israel has declined from a peak of $70 million in 1953 to $7½ million in the current year.

This may be an encouraging reflection of Israel's progress. But I hope that we will continue grant aid to Israel as long as she needs it and can use it as creatively as she has in the past.

The administration has indicated that aid to Israel may now come to an end, and that assistance to Israel will consist entirely of surplus foods. In my judgment it would be a serious mistake to terminate economic assistance to this democratic country at a time when she still has massive economic problems growing out of her need to resettle her vast new population, and to build a viable economy.

In addition, Israel stands alone in the area. She must be able to defend herself. I noted a few moments ago the massive aid the U.S.S.R. is pouring into Iraq, Egypt, and Syria. The Soviet Union is extending this elaborate assistance to Israel's hostile Arab neighbors. On top of this the United States has been furnishing military aid to Jordan, Lebanon, Saudi Arabia, and until last July to Iraq.

Israel has not received a single penny of grant military aid. Thus, it would be wrong from every standpoint to end our grant economic aid to Israel now.

* * * * *

I do not need to tell this audience what Israel's development can mean, for you who were pioneers in the Jewish National Fund were the first to show the Near East how to reclaim barren and neglected lands.

You may take pride in the fact that you not only helped to restore the people of Israel to their ancient homeland, you may derive satisfaction from the significant fact that all over Asia and Africa today the story of Israel's challenging and exciting restoration is being told and is being emulated.

How gratifying it is to know that 70 countries of the world have now recognized Israel, and that beyond the immediate perim-

eter of Arab hostility and blockade there are peoples and governments which share our own understanding of Israel's restoration. Many of these countries have offered her sympathy and cooperation.

Israel's growing acceptance in the fraternity of freedom must be recognized eventually by her Arab neighbors who surround her and who still persist in blockade and belligerency.

I have always believed that an Arab-Israel peace will come. It may take time, for the Near East is still tormented and tortured by divisions and tensions. But the internal Arab conflict that now disrupts the region is not an outgrowth of the Arab-Israel tension. It arises from poverty and the inevitable clash between the haves and the have-nots. Unfortunately, most of the Arabs are have-nots. They are the victims of frustration and are easily incited by demogogues who play upon their misery.

I hope that our country will help the peoples of the Near East to a better life. The answer to the Soviet Union is not in arms, but economic development. We must do as much to help the people to utilize their water resources as we have done to find their oil.

Eventually, we will make it clear to these peoples that we have no imperialist interest, and that our major objectives are to help friendly peoples befriend each other, work in cooperation and preserve their own independence and sovereignty.

Let no one in the Near East, whether he be a local ruler or a distant commissar deceive himself into believing that he can dominate this region and use these people to serve his own ambitions for power.

Let the peoples of the Middle East understand that each nation there is entitled to live its own life and a much fuller life than it leads today, free from the aggression and subversion of enemies, free in the evolution of its own destiny. Our policy in the Near East should continue to help the governments there maintain their political independence and at the same time expand the opportunities for economic development and cultural self-expression for their people.

When the peoples of the Near East come to understand that our policy serves their own best interests they will work with us to resolve conflicts, strengthen democracy, and preserve peace.

Inflation Can Destroy Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 5, 1959

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, organized big business is conducting a nationwide campaign to convince little business that a bill which I have introduced to put a brake upon inflation is against the interests of all business. This is a misrepresentation, which would be apparent to anybody who has had the opportunity to examine the census of manufactures recently compiled by the Bureau of the Census. An analysis of the concentration of economic power based upon this census shows that in the industries on which our economy depends, more than 50 percent of the total output is handled by eight or fewer corporations.

Without giving the Federal Trade Commission or any other agency the right to put any ceiling on prices or to prohibit any price increase, I have introduced this bill, S. 215, to provide that in the case of any line of commerce a corporation falling into this category in which eight or fewer corporations handle 50 percent or more of the total output shall give advance notice to the Federal Trade Commission, the Department of Justice, and the Congress of the United States, before making such price increase effective.

We have had no hesitation in providing a cooling-off period in the case of labor. I see no reason why we should hesitate to provide a cooling-off period in cases such as are covered by this bill, cases which can easily produce inflation that will destroy the country.

In order that the full text of my opening statement explaining the bill may be available in the RECORD, I ask unanimous consent that my statement, entitled "Inflation Can Destroy Us," may be printed at length in the Appendix.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INFLATION CAN DESTROY US

(Opening remarks of Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, Democrat of Wyoming, before Senate Judiciary Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee at hearing on his bill, S. 215, to require concentrated industries to file advance notice before increasing prices, April 23, 1959)

Mr. Chairman, certainly nobody could ask for a more cordial generous and perhaps exaggerated introduction than that which I have had at your hands this morning.

I wanted the opportunity to discuss this bill because I think that we are dealing with one of the most serious problems that this Nation ever faced. In fact we are in this country now beginning to form the outlines of the world in which the next generations will live.

Things are changing so rapidly that we ourselves—this generation I mean—may live in this new world which will not be a free world, a democratic world, a people's world, unless we now in places of leadership and legislative and executive power open our eyes to what is going on.

The time has come to put the brakes on inflation. It is a task which may be accomplished only by the cooperation of leaders in business and the leaders in labor, working in cooperation with the Government.

This Nation can no longer be content merely to drift with the times, for, if we do, not only will the cost of living and the cost of doing business, as well as the cost of Government, increase, but we shall be giving meekly to Communist Russia the principal weapon by which it hopes to destroy the system of private property.

TREASURY BORROWING CREATES ARTIFICIAL MONEY

These are no idle words. I call as a witness the Secretary of the Treasury, Robert B. Anderson, speaking in New York only last Monday. In simple, blunt language, he said: "This country cannot have an enduring bright economic future with inflation."

To illustrate his point, he described the dilemma in which the Treasury finds itself when without funds raised by taxation on hand to pay the bills the Federal Government has incurred, the Treasury is compelled to negotiate short-term loans.

"If," said the Secretary, "I called up a bank and said, 'Will you loan me $100 million at 3½ percent interest for 6 months if I send you over a note to the effect?' the banker would probably say, 'Yes, I will.'

"Where would he get the $100 million with which to credit the account of the U.S. Treasury? Would he take it from the account of someone else? No, certainly not. He would merely create that much money, subject to reserve requirements, by crediting our account in that sum and accepting the Government's note as an asset. When I had finished writing checks for $100 million the operation would have added that sum to the money supply."

INFLATION CAN DESTROY GOVERNMENT

This is an example of how inflation hits the Nation itself. It causes the creation of artificial money, and the more artificial money the Treasury creates, the greater is the danger. How great it is at this moment is proven by the fact that there are now outstanding against the great Government of the United States more than $74 billion in bills and notes payable in less than a year. This is why the national debt is increasing. It has already reached the highest peak in history and there is no present outlook for its reduction. Indeed, we are given to understand that the Treasury Department will again this year ask Congress to pass a new law to raise the ceiling on the national debt.

It is easy to say that the Government should stop spending, but we are launched upon a national program of defense and mutual security for which no new taxes are proposed and which, therefore, compels the Government to continue borrowing from the banks and thereby injuring the credit of the United States.

Many of our leaders talk about economic growth and the necessity of expending funds which the Treasury does not have, but must create with the banks and through the banks to promote this economic growth. It is my contention that economic growth with the national debt at an all-time peak cannot be created by increasing that debt. The danger is, as I said, that the credit of this Government itself may be destroyed. To destroy this credit (and it is only necessary to read the daily reports of the market value of Government securities to know that the Government credit is worsening) is the principal objective of Soviet policy in the economic war. Moscow knows that the free world depends upon the United States for its survival. Moscow knows that many governments in the past have been destroyed by inflation, and the economic war which Soviet Russia is now waging against the United States is designed to add the name of this country to the list of those which have perished from inflation in the past.

BILL IS FIRST STEP TO HALT INFLATION

This is why we must put the brakes on inflation now. The bill which I have introduced, S. 215, and which is the subject of this morning's hearing, is intended to be a first step to bring inflation under control. I do not pretend that this measure is a cure-all. It is not price control, but it does constitute an invitation to the leaders of concentrated industry, on both the management side and on the labor side, to avoid price increases for the products they manufacture and sell without first showing at a public hearing that there is good sound reason for the increases.

WOULD HOLD DOWN PRICES

This is not a punitive bill. It does not impose any penalty for price increases. It levies no fine except a nominal fine of not less than $5,000 nor more than $50,000 upon any corporation "wilfully failing to give the notice" of its proposed price increases. I am confident that no corporation will wilfully fail to give this notice. So the question

arises, what does big management have to fear by explaining to the people, through notice to the Federal Trade Commission, that it has sound reason for increasing the cost of its products?

This is a measure designed to prevent by the light of advance publicity alone unnecessary and unwarranted price increases at a time when all the people and all governments in the United States, local, State, and National, are suffering seriously from inflation.

The bill was prompted by the fact that the increasing concentration of economic power in the hands of giant corporations is giving to big business management the power to regulate commerce, which the Constitution of the United States gave to Congress. "Concentration of economic power" is an easy phrase to use, to be sure, but it is difficult to define simply. Sometimes by business management it is regarded merely as a derogatory phrase used by leftists who would like to "soak the rich," as they say. It is nothing of the sort. It represents a harsh fact of our economic system, which, if not recognized by leaders in business, in labor, and in Government, may well destroy our system of government.

HANDFUL OF CORPORATIONS CONTROL PRICES OF ESSENTIAL COMMODITIES

The Bureau of the Census has proven the amazing nature of this concentration by means of the census of manufacture. This Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly, through a scientific analysis of the census, has proven that this concentration places in the hands of private management the power to control prices on commodities ranging from those which go upon the table of every family in the United States to those which make up the end products of all our basic industries.

CENSUS OF MANUFACTURING SHOWS HIGH CONCENTRATION IN INDUSTRY

Let us take some instances from the commodities, the value of which in national trade amounted to $1 billion and over when the census of manufacturers was made for the year 1954.

In 1954, there were 5,470 corporations producing $3,067,017,000 worth of bread and related products for sale in the United States. Out of this total, the 20 largest companies produced 40 percent, the 8 largest companies 31 percent, and the 4 largest 20 percent. Much as I dislike to leave this concentration of the production of bread for the people of the United States out of the scope of my bill, I did so because I wanted to point directly at the meaning of control which exists when eight large companies handle 50 percent or more of the total output.

Fluid milk and similar produces, like bread, constitute a familiar food in every household. In 1954, 4,572 corporations were engaged in this business, and the value of their shipments amounted to $4,233,983,000.

The 20 largest produced 36 percent, the 8 largest 29 percent, the 4 largest 23 percent. The meaning of this concentration becomes clearer when I put it this way: Of 4,572 corporations engaged in the production of fluid milk and similar products, less than one two-hundredths of the total number handled 36 percent of the entire business.

On the other end of the scale where we find that local companies do little or none of the business, we find a concentration of even greater dimensions. There were 102 corporations classified as steel works and rolling mills in 1954. Approximately one-fifth of the 102, or 20, did 85 percent of all the steel business in America that year. The eight largest did 70 percent, and the four largest 54 percent. Steel is an essential commodity for business, industry and Government throughout the Nation. When the price of steel goes up, the effect is felt throughout the Nation, but, obviously, when only four companies handle over 54 percent of the total output the decisions of the managers of those four companies inevitably sway the decisions of the managers of all the rest.

Certainly this is true when the time comes to pricing the product.

The same is true with petroleum refining. Here in 1954 there were 253 companies. The value of all the shipments was found by the Bureau of the Census to be $11,757,218,000. The 20 largest companies handled 84 percent of the total business, the eight largest 56 percent, and the four largest 33 percent. Let us state this in reverse order. With the 20 largest of the 253 companies in the business of petroleum refining handling 84 percent of the output, it is clear that 233 companies had to be satisfied with only 16 percent of the business. In steel, 82 of the 102 corporations had to get along with only 15 percent of the business. This is obviously concentration of control.

I want to emphasize at this point, Mr. Chairman, that I am not for Government control. Neither am I for private control in the hands of managers who are able to write their own tickets of responsibility, power and duties.

In 1954, 109 corporations were engaged in the manufacture of tin cans and other tinware, according to the Census Bureau. The total value of the shipments that year was $1,366,766,000. Of this total, the 20 largest companies handled 96 percent, the eight largest handled 88 percent, and the four largest handled 80 percent. Or, stated in other words, 89 of all of the 109 corporations engaged in this business had to be satisfied with a mere 4 percent of the total output. Thus does the concept of competition vanish, as well as the concept of local business, local competition.

It must be recognized, of course, by anybody who is familiar with modern industry of this type that big business is essential. There can be no doubt about that. We cannot turn the clock back to the days when there were steel businesses—I was going to say in almost every county of the United States, but scattered through the States. We cannot go back to those days because times have changed. But we must make sure, if we want economic freedom, that the public knows what is going on before the sledgehammer hits them by price increases.

In tires and inner tubes, there were only 27 corporations producing these commodities in 1954. The value of the shipments was almost $2 billion, $1,841,732,000. The 4 largest companies produced 79 percent of the total, the 8 largest 91 percent, and the 20 largest 99-plus percent.

So the story goes from beginning to end. Out of the 65 industries classified by the Bureau of the Census as producing shipments worth $1 billion or more, in 26 cases the largest 8 controlled more than 50 percent. Out of a total of 252 industries producing commodities the shipments of which were valued at $100 million to $999 million, those in which 8 corporations produced 50 percent or more numbered 112.

MANAGEMENT AND GOVERNMENT CAN COOPERATE TO FIGHT INFLATION

Since the bill deals only with those lines of commerce in which eight or fewer corporations produce 50 percent or more of the total annual sales, it is apparent that the measure is intended to deal with those corporations which can be called the superoperators. If the $10 million capitalization requirement contained in the bill is too small, this can readily be corrected.

I have no intention of asking those corporations which cannot participate in the power of management over pricing to be compelled to give notice of increases, because I well know that in far the great majority those companies are merely taking orders from the price leaders. The bill, therefore, cannot be called an attack upon business. It is only, as I said at the outset, an invitation to the managers of the most concentrated industries in the United States to demonstrate their good faith in the fight which all of the people of the United States must undertake to stop inflation if we hope to resist the drive of the Soviet communism to conquer us in an econmic war. It is only, as I have said, an invitation to the managers of these concentrated industries to demonstrate their good faith in this fight. The goal we seek is a goal which will be beneficial to business as well as to all who suffer from the rising cost of living.

More than that, with business and Government cooperating in good faith, there will be punishment for neither the people or the corporations. We know that our Government was created to preserve political liberty and economic freedom. We know that the Communist dictators desire to destroy both. If we don't prevent inflation from crippling the economic strength of this Nation, communism will take over. This bill, I sincerely believe, is the first step, an essential step, to put an end to inflation in the free world.

Salute to School Safety Patrols

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 5, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, this week school safety patrols from Wisconsin and all over the country will be attending the national school assembly here in Washington.

As a salute to this splendid program, I ask unanimous consent to have a brief statement on its merits printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

The promotion of greater safety through the school safety patrol program is indeed an outstanding program for instilling in our youth the necessity of ever-greater safety in the protection of life and limb.

I am delighted that between 350 and 400 safety patrols from Wisconsin will be in Washington for the 23d national assembly and parade.

According to preliminary estimates, it is expected that over 30,000 young people from throughout the Nation will participate. The various civic and fraternal groups, business firms, schools, and PTA's, labor organizations, and individuals who have contributed financially to make this trip possible for the delegates are, indeed, to be commended.

According to plans as outlined by Mr. B. A. Precourt, safety director for the American Automobile Association, Wisconsin division, which coordinates arrangements for the State group, a record number of about 16 Wisconsin communities will send delegates to this year's assembly. These communities include Adams, Eau Claire, Elkhorn, Hudson, La Crosse, Madison, Plymouth, Prairie du Chien, Racine, Reeseville, St. Francis, Strum, Wausau, Wauwatosa, West Allis, and Whitehall.

This colorful event is a tribute to the Nation's more than 750,000 patrol members who each day protect the lives of class-

mates at school crossings in communities throughout the country.

According to a survey, the school patrol program, since it was launched in 1922, has reduced the traffic fatality rate of children between the ages of 5 and 14 by nearly one-half. This is, in itself, a splendid tribute to the merits of this outstanding program.

Day of Decision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 5, 1959

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from Army magazine:

The day of decision on the fiscal year 1960 budget is rapidly approaching and the Congress, which throughout the session has exhibited a healthy skepticism toward the sufficiencies of the Army portion of the Defense Department budget, is going to have to come to grips with some very vital problems.

The problems are tough. The decisions of the Congress will affect world strategy and diplomacy, military security, and the economic posture of the United States. In considerirng the grave issues raised by the Defense budget the Congress has needed and has sought the best possible advice and counsel, ranging from the Pentagon Secretariat and the military chiefs to field commanders of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, and to civilian experts and scientists.

The published unclassified testimony of witnesses appearing before the Armed Services Committees and the Military Subcommittees of the Appropriations Committees of both Houses of Congress, plus the hearings of the new Space Committee, is, as is usual, appallingly massive. There is something of almost everything in these records: Words of wisdom and balderdash, trenchant analysis and rambling nonsequiturs. Those members of the committees who listened attentively, questioned wisely, and performed their homework are now close to being experts in their own rights. But even the most knowledgeable man in Congress may be torn by indecision when he compares what he is told by administration spokesmen with what he is told by field commanders.

Consider the dilemma of the most thoughtful and fair minded legislator when he compares the President's press conference statement that he wouldn't know what to do with an additional 30,000 or 55,000 soldiers if Congress voted them to him, with the testimony of Generals Norstad and Hodes that the NATO shield is understrength and needs more soldiers, and with the testimony that Koreans are serving in the depleted ranks of U.S. divisions in Korea.

The thoughtful Member of Congress may reflect on the one hand that the President has a record and a reputation as a professional commander that is second to no other living soldier. On the other hand he may recall that one of the principles that brought success to American arms in World War II was recognition of the fact that the field commander on the spot had a better understanding of his problems and requirements than did Washington. Adherence to this principle by Washington contributed to the successes of the SHAEF commander, Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower.

The Congressman may also remember that the man who really convinced Congress in 1951 of the wisdom of patricipating in the defense of Europe was not a spokesman of the White House or Defense or State Departments, but a soldier—again Dwight D. Eisenhower—who, like Joshua's emissaries, had gone to spy out the land and returned from Europe to report to Congress that U.S. participation in the collective defense of Europe was feasible and in the best interests of the Nation.

But the inadequacies of Army strength, as seen through the eyes of the commanders in the field, are only one of the many problems plaguing the Congress as it considers the Army portion of the Defense budget. Nor can the Congress be parochial and view the Army portion through blinders that shut out the rest of the Defense budget. The Congress must consider the whole and in doing so it must of necessity make grave decisions that will strengthen or weaken the security of the Nation, not during the fiscal year ahead but perhaps for years to come.

The Congress must consider the nuclear deterrent and how much is enough. It must analyze the meaning of the missile gap. It must make judgents about the military capabilities of Moscow and Peiping and the most likely manner in which those capabilities may be exercised.

But when all of this is done and Congress comes back to the Army budget, convinced of the need for increasing it in order to give the Nation a more balanced military posture, what is it to do? It will desire to give the Army a capability that will truly deter the Communists from engaging in military aggression of any kind. It will want to beef up the Nation's conventional capability against the likelihood of all forms of war other than self-defeating nuclear exchange, which is the way the President has characterized it. Self-defeating, obviously, for both opposing camps.

As Congress considers the needs of the Army it will inevitably begin to establish priorities. What Army program should it strengthen with additional funds and what program may be delayed? The Army needs more active Army strength and a strong and Active Reserve program for both the Army National Guard and Army Reserve. But the Army, as the Congress is aware, also needs more modern weapons. Congress knows of the Army's need for new rifles, machineguns, artillery, tactical surface-to-surface missiles, aircraft, tanks, trucks, radios and radars, and bridging equipment. It is also aware that the defense of the Nation against aerial attack cannot be disregarded and that the development of an antimissile missile is an element in the missile gap that must be closed at fast as is humanly posible.

All of these things are desirable; indeed they are necessities if the U.S. Army is to be the first class fighting force every American citizen wants it to be. But there are also fiscal limits that Congress respects. Conrequently priorities.

Congress should give high priority to the modernization of the field Army. That is, funds for tactical missiles, conventional arms, tanks, light aircraft, communications equipment, and so on. As Congress has been told by the Chief of Staff the funds given the Army in recent years for weapons and equipment of this kind have been insufficient to halt the rate of obsolescence. True, funds have been made available by the administration for piddling numbers of new rifles, machineguns, and tanks, and for tactical missiles but not enough to keep the Army up to date.

As the time comes for the Congress to make its final decisions on the 1960 budget, the priorities it establishes will determine the kind of military security this Nation will have. We hope and believe that Congress on analysis and reflection will place high on its list of priorities in the defense budget these three Army programs: a modernization program that will exceed the rate of obsolescence of Army weapons and equipment; a floor of at least 900,000 on active Army strength, 400,000 on the Army National Guard and 300,000 on the Army Reserve; the fullest possible support of the Nike-Zeus antimissile missile.

If on its coming day of decision the Congress does all of these things it will have shown that it is awake to its responsibilities and that its decisions on the programs it will support are realistic and every bit as important as the money it votes.

Gettysburg, Battles, and Patterns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 5, 1959

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I hope that a pattern for the future preservation of historical shrines can be established at Gettysburg in much the same manner as the battle itself determined, in large measure, the future of our Nation. That pattern would be a combination of local and Federal action to preserve the integrity of that sacred soil, local zoning to prevent mistakes of the future, and Federal land acquisition to rectify mistakes of the past. As I have stated before, the beginnings of local action on zoning has already been taken. I hope that the Senate will reinstate the acquisition process by restoring to the budget the necessary funds. With this in mind, I would commend to the Members the following editorial from a recent edition of the Baltimore Sun:

GETTYSBURG—THE ZONE DEFENSE

The National Park Service and Civil War enthusiasts are concerned over the encroachment of motels, hamburger and soft drink stands, garish signboards and other like evidences of commercialism on the sacred soil of the Gettysburg battlefield. Anxiety has been increased since a House committee cut out of the Interior Department budget a Park Service request earmarked for the purchase by the Government of 600 more acres of battlefield land.

Desecration of the battlefield is deplored by everybody but its prevention is not the responsibility alone of the Federal Government. The people of the town and its environs on which most of the battle was fought have a large share as Representative QUIGLEY, whose constituency includes them, has pointed out. He proposes that the local authorities establish zoning to prevent further commercialization.

Even if funds were appropriated for the purchase of the 600 acres it would only correct past errors. Zoning would offer permanent protection and remove the necessity of appealing periodically to the Federal Government to buy more land. Mr. QUIGLEY sees a better chance of the appropriation being restored by the Senate if the people of Gettysburg exert an effort to help themselves.

The battlefield is Gettysburg's greatest commercial asset. It attracts around 750,000 tourists a year and the number is expected to be greatly augmented during the centennial celebration in 1961–65. Tourists of course want places to sleep and eat and places where they can buy souvenirs. But there is a limit to how much of this sort of

thing can be tolerated without destroying the main attraction which is the battlefield.

It would be hard to find a case where intelligent zoning is so essential to commercial enterprise.

President Truman and the Point 4 Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 5, 1959

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address by Hon. Eric Johnston on April 30, 1959, at a dinner honoring former President Harry S. Truman.

Eric Johnston has a deep understanding of economic problems of the nations of the free world. His views are quite persuasive to many of us Members of Congress.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY ERIC JOHNSTON AT THE DINNER HONORING FORMER PRESIDENT TRUMAN, APRIL 30, 1959

Ten years ago, on a blustery day in January, an idea was born that has electrified the world.

The place of birth was the great portico of the Capitol of the United States. The occasion was the inauguration of our honored guest as President of the United States.

In his usual concise and clear and understandable way, the President was enumerating the principal points of a foreign policy program for his new administration.

Not many of us, perhaps, will remember the nature and scope of the first three points, as vital and important as they were. Let us recall them.

First, the President pledged his administration to the "unfaltering support of the United Nations," to strengthening its scope and effectiveness.

Second, he pledged through the Marshall plan and related programs to continue America's efforts to hasten economic recovery in Europe and elsewhere.

Third, he pledged to strengthen the arm of freedom-loving nations against external aggressors, to buttress the Atlantic community through NATO, to equip our NATO alliance with weapons.

But the fourth point—point 4 it became to history—was of a different order of magnitude. It touched the basic nature at the very core of our modern civilization. It boldly affirmed the vibrant potentials for growth in all men and in the nations of man throughout the world.

Point 4 came at a moment of monumental need. Perhaps all great ideas come to bear at such moments when time and circumstance are ready for their arrival.

Point 4 was created at the end of a cataclysmic war which had vastly shifted and warped and altered our old world much as the eruption of Vesuvius changed and altered the countryside and the adjacent towns of Italy many centuries ago.

What was the world like back in 1949, the world into which President Truman and our country were suddenly propelled into fantastic responsibility?

The free world in that year was at the precipitous edge of the cliff. Economically, politically—in terms of both its interior and exterior power—the Western alliance was then at a period of maximum tension.

Out of World War II had come two impelling developments to test the free world.

One was the startling and engorging power of Soviet Russia, committed with a driving compulsion to the takeover and swallowing-up of once free nations.

The second development was the sudden emergence of new free nations, a whole world of new nations born from the shreds and shards of old colonial empires.

And it was to these new nations that point 4 was ingeniously, brilliantly dedicated.

Coming with whirlwind speed into the 20th century, these newly free countries had enormous needs. They suffered every ravage of humankind. They knew hunger and poverty, disease and illiteracy, hopelessness and despair.

To draw back from the nethermost regions, these nations needed help, help of all kinds. But especially they needed the skills and the know-how and the techniques of advanced societies to advance themselves.

This was the purpose of point 4. It is this purpose that makes point 4 one of the great historic concepts of our modern era.

Point 4 caught the imagination of the world because it was not an extension of old imperialism, but a promise of freedom beyond man's imagining.

Point 4 gives human resources, skills, and know-how to people who then learn to help themselves. This is its genius. Point 4 technicians help people to do for themselves, not to have things done for them. Human dignity, thereby, is preserved and restored.

This is no charity which creates paternalistic feelings in the giver and degradation in the receiver. Rather, point 4 brings human beings to work together as equals, learning together those skills which have accumulated and been developed over the centuries, and which by quirk of circumstance are concentrated today in a few places.

Now we've had 10 years' experience in point 4. In this decade, thousands of point 4 technicians have worked in scores of nations, both under the American program and under the programs of the United Nations and of other countries.

It is such a short time, but it has been a time for learning tremendous lessons.

These past years, I think, have shown us the profundity of the original concept. Each year point 4 has become more meaningful, more significant. But its real achievement, I am sure, still lies ahead.

It has been said that good ideas become great ideas when put into effective action by men of vision.

Many good ideas never become great. They fail because there is no man to give them flesh, to bring them to life.

But the man who recognizes a good idea and makes it live has the quality of greatness himself. And so it is with the man we honor tonight, a man who knew how to act upon an idea whose time had come.

My friends, it is with the greatest of pride as an American that I now present to you the man who breathed life into a truly great human conception—Harry S. Truman, 32d President of the United States, the pioneer of point 4.

Understanding the East-West Position

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 5, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we recognize that the effectiveness of our national policies—in our representative form of government—depends to a large degree upon the readiness and the willingness of the people in our Republic to support such policies.

With the upcoming conference at Geneva on May 11 our conferees will indeed need the unified moral, realistic support of the country.

From time to time I am increasingly delighted to find in an ever-wider variety of segments of the economy thoughtful, constructive, realistic thinking toward the challenge we face in combating communism; as well as a display of practical realism as to how we can best cope with these challenges and theats to our security.

As a splendid example, the recent edition of Realtor's Headlines, published by the National Association of Real Estate Boards, carried a thought-provoking article (a) stressing the doggedness with which Communist leaders continue to pursue their goal of world domination; and (b) a realistic idea of what we, as a member of the world of free nations, will need in terms of contributions if we are to continue to meet the Communist challenge on many fronts.

Particularly, the editorial relates our mutual security program to the world challenge; further, it puts it into perspective with other expenditures for defense. To give my colleagues the benefit of this thoughtful approach to better understand our position, I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial by Eugene P. Conser printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNDERSTANDING OUR POSITION
(By Eugene P. Conser)

Far from the thoughts of most realtors is any consideration of the success or failure of this Nation's foreign aid program. We can be forgiven for we are not unique in that respect. Too many of our countrymen overlook it. We are far removed from its administration, and our disinterest can be excused.

Our lack of interest, however, could be a fatal fault. Let us analyze a few facts:

From within a national budget of $77 billion a year, more than $45 billion is spent to secure our peaceful existence among the nations. Of this amount, some $4 billion is designated as economic aid. The remainder is spent to maintain and strengthen our military defense. It includes aid to the military establishments of friendly foreign nations which we want to remain our friends and permit our continued use of military bases.

Why are we spending this money year after year, always with the threat that the cost will go higher—much higher? We do it to meet the threat of Communist expansion—a country-by-country takeover of nations whose peoples are not alert to the true nature of the "dictatorship of the proletariat" and might be either unwilling or unable to resist Communist aggression.

Are we justified in accepting this costly leadership to counteract the Soviet pressure to gain control of additional strategic areas? We are if we value our own existence as a free people and take seriously the repeated warnings of Soviet leadership, such as:

Marx: "The theory of communism is summed up in the single sentence: Abolition of private property."

Lenin: "As long as capitalism remains, we cannot live in peace. In the end one or the other will triumph."

Stalin: "Good words are a mask for concealment of bad deeds. Words are one thing, actions another."

Khrushchev: "If anyone thinks that our smiles mean the abandonment of the teachings of Marx, Engels, and Lenin, he is deceiving himself cruelly. Whether you like it or not, history is on our side. We will bury you."

Lenin: "Treaties and agreements are promises—like pie crusts—made to be broken."

Foster: "To my great-grandson—who will live in a Communist United States."

Lenin: "First, we will take Eastern Europe, then the masses of Asia, then we will encircle the United States. We will not have to attack. It will fall like an overripe fruit into our hands."

It is true that "seeing is believing." We have been seeing the boasts of Communist zealots come true. We know their objectives. We have seen them march on, cunningly turning the political control of one area after another into the hands of their ardent followers. That they have had some setbacks in the last few years can be credited to the understanding, the courage, and the dogmatic insistence of John Foster Dulles, frequently standing almost alone against the blind censure of friend and foe alike. Our efforts, however creditable, have not been enough. We continue to see one example after another of the ruthless march of communism.

Our foreign aid program—the bulwark of our resistance to communism—must always be open to the most critical analysis, for mistakes are certain to be made. To those of us who value personal freedom and choose not to live under a Communist dictatorship, its success is our first concern. We can rest assured there will be no lessening in the foreseeable future in the annual $40-plus billion cost of our protective covering. We can prate of lowered taxes, but it will be meaningless in a world of Communist conation. Our military defense will be useless if we stand isolated and encircled. Our need is to be only one among many free nations, each with a government freely elected, an economy of individual enterprise, and a landowning people. To give aid in strengthening any other type of economy is merely to help pave the way for communism.

Annual Convention of National Association of Plumbing Contractors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 5, 1959

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement which I have prepared relating to the forthcoming 77th annual convention of the National Association of Plumbing Contractors to be held at Miami Beach, Fla., from May 31 to June 4, of this year.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SMATHERS

Between the dates of May 31 and June 4, 1959, at Miami Beach, Fla., the National Association of Plumbing Contractors will hold their 77th annual convention. On these same dates there will also be a National Plumbing, Heating, and Cooling Exposition to demonstrate the progress of this industry.

It is the largest annual conclave of the combined plumbing, heating, and air conditioning industry in the United States. The association, itself, is the oldest trade association in the construction industry and represents a most progressive entity which has contributed substantially to the American way of life. The industry has helped America achieve the highest standards of health, sanitation and comfort in the world.

In its 77th year I am pleased to report that the association has been under the very able leadership of an outstanding native son of Florida. His name is Mr. John M. Rhoades, of Sarasota, Fla. As president of the association, he has served with honor and distinction. Through his efforts, the convention and exposition was brought to Florida for the first time in the association's 77-year history.

Florida is particularly proud of John Rhoades, not only for the contribution which he has made to this great industry, but as a citizen who has served well his community, his State, and his Nation.

Senator Keating's Approach to Eavesdropping Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
Hon. EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 5, 1959

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the New Orleans Times-Picayune recently published an excellent editorial commending the distinguished junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] for his sponsorship of antieavesdropping legislation. The editorial points out that the bill introduced by him—S. 1292—is designed to protect the right of privacy against unauthorized invasion and, at the same time, to facilitate the fullest use of scientific methods of crime detection by law-enforcement agencies. In the words of the editorial, "Senator KEATING is to be congratulated on the thoroughness and general balance" of his approach to this subject.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AIMS OF EAVESDROPPING BILL

Senator KEATING is to be congratulated on the thoroughness and general balance, in the public interest, of a bill he has introduced on the very complex subject of eavesdropping (most generally associated with wiretapping).

It endeavors to protect the private citizen, in every field where Federal legislation properly applies, from invasions of privacy represented by any form of instrumental "tapping," "bugging," etc. At the same time it confers the right of eavesdropping under proper judicial althority on Federal law enforcement officers "hot on the heels of crime;" and likewise protects law enforcement from "leakage" of the fact of application for authority. There are many ins and outs of the matter to which Senator KEATING evidently has given detailed attention.

It seemed surely to be the Senator's intent to do away with the weird coupling of terms in the Federal Communications Act which has failed to protect citizens against eavesdropping per se, or the recording of such intercepted data; but at the same time has hampered Federal law enforcement unduly by its prohibition of divulging such information (specifically as criminal evidence in courts).

For example, information lawfully obtained by State enforcement agencies would be made admissible in Federal prosecutions; and all past information obtained authoritatively by Federal officers, made admissible. The main tenor of the proposed bill is to lift crippling prohibitions against Federal officers. But in view of the troublesome language of the 1934 act, and absence of a repealer clause, it seems advisable for Senator KEATING to insert a section dealing directly and unequivocally, for the future, with the admissibility of "eavesdrop" evidence.

We can find no such direct, unmistakable language. It would be foolish to deprive Federal officers of eavesdrop authority such as is now obtained from the Attorney General, and at the same time retain the inadmissibility status for eavesdrop evidence. As it now stands the officers without elaborate ritual can at least obtain information which may lead to other evidence clearly admissible.

Dedicated Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 5, 1959

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD as part of my remarks a fine editorial about former Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, appearing in the Northwest Arkansas Times, the principal paper of my home town. I think this editorial expresses in a few words sentiments which a great many people in this country share.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEDICATED SERVICE

A dedicated man leaves office as John Foster Dulles bows out as Secretary of State. He has served the United States over a long period of years; served sincerely, the best he knew, and far beyond the highest call of duty in many cases.

He did not spare himself in the service he rendered to his Nation. His trips, made one after the other, to the far corners of the earth, must have been trying on numerous occasions. Doubtless the state of his health would have kept many lesser men home. But he went as he thought his duty called, without complaint, always with hope in his heart that his accomplishments would be worthwhile.

The challenges offered during his tenure in high office have been as great as any the world has ever known, and they have continued over the longest period of time in man's memory. He met them as they arose, maybe not always as some of us would have liked, and certainly not without cause for criticism in many cases, but he never shirked the responsibility of his office.

None of us will know the testing times through which he went as he turned a smil-

ing face. We knew he had the problems of the world on his shoulders, and that he bore up well to outward appearances. That they affected him personally we can never doubt.

There is sadness in the situation as the public-spirited man is stricken and retires from the office he loved. The people he represented for such a long period of time will have great sympathy for him in time of trial.

What Kind of Farm Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 5, 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a thoughtful dissertation on the proper national policy toward agriculture, presented by Arthur T. Thompson, editor of the Washington Newsletter of National Farmers Union, before a meeting of the New Jersey division of Americans for Democratic Action, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

In this speech, Mr. Thompson lucidly explains the purposes of national farm programs, and pinpoints the failures of the Benson farm policies to achieve these purposes. I regard this speech as such a fine presentation of the present confused farm program situation that it is worthy of inclusion in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT KIND OF FARM PROGRAM?

(By Arthur T. Thompson, editor, Washington Newsletter, National Farmers Union)

A proper national policy toward agriculture should result in an ample, but not excessive supply of farm products of the desired variety and volume, sufficient to maintain our expanding population on a healthful diet, keep our carryover reserves at a prudent level and cover export requirements. Under a proper national policy, farm commodities should be produced efficiently, that is, with a reasonable minimum of resource inputs, including labor, and without undue deterioration of the farm plant, especially the soil. These commodities should be available to consumers at the lowest possible cost consistent with a fair income standard for farmers and all others engaged in the essential transportation, processing and distribution of the end products.

Any intervention by the Federal Government to facilitate the realization of such a national agricultural policy should avoid waste and unnecessary expense and also avoid setting up undesirable new trends in social and economic organization.

How do we measure up to these various criteria at the present time? First, it seems clear that the Nation's farmers are producing very efficiently as individuals. The U.S. Department of Agriculture reports that the number of people supplied by one farmworker and the amount of farm output per man-hour have both about doubled in the last 15 years. Farm productivity in fact has risen at a much faster rate than that of industry and the end is not yet in sight.

As a consequence of this surge in unit efficiency, farm production in total has been quite sufficient for current market demand. It is, in fact, excessive by from 6 to 8 percent. This, however, is not quite the same as saying that the "healthful diet" needs of all of our population have been oversatisfied to the extent of 6 to 8 percent. Some studies indicate that perhaps up to 20 million persons without jobs, on pensions or low income subsist on deficient diets, particularly with respect to vitamin-bearing fruits and vegetables and animal proteins.

Thus it appears that current policy is defective in that it is resulting in overshooting the commercial market for farm products, yet at the same time is not bringing about adequate diversion of the excess to needy citizens who cannot fully provide for themselves through the commercial market. It should be noted that about 872 million pounds of food were distributed in 1958 by the U.S. Government to needy people and to school children through the national lunch program, but this by no means covered all supplemental requirements.

How does the present policy rate as regards food costs to the consumer? We find that retail food prices on the whole have remained stable during the past 10 years, much more so than for such other items as rent and transportation. This steadiness of the food price level has exerted a strong stabilizing effect on the Nation's general price level, since food accounts for about one-fourth of the average family's living expenditures.

According to the latest compilations by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, the yearly retail cost of the average urban family's food basket stood at about $1,065 in 1958 as compared with $982 10 years earlier.

What about income to the farmer? Here the story is somewhat different. Whereas 51 percent of consumer's dollar went to the farmer in 1948, by 1958 this proportion had fallen to 40 percent. Farm prices had fallen during the decade and at the same time the farm-retail spread has been increasing. On the average annual market basket cost this spread was $485 in 1948; in 1958 it was estimated at $638, an increase of more than 30 percent.

Since consumers normally do not tend to increase the proportion of their income they spend for food even with substantial increases in wages, it follows that the widening of farm-retail margins has a tendency to depress farm income. Along with this development, there has also been a substantial rise in farm production costs. A large part of the gain in agricultural production efficiency has involved large expenditures for machinery, fertilizers and such. A detailed Federal study made in 1955 showed farmers laid out $40 billion for production and family-living expenses, of which $8 billion alone went for the purchase, operation and maintenance of motor vehicles and machinery. The typical midwestern farm represents an investment of about $50,000 per worker, compared with about $15,000 per worker in industry.

Noting this uptrend in farmers' costs along with widening farm retail margins and execessive offerings to the market, it is not surprising that farm prices have failed to keep farm income on the same uptrend as for total national income. Owing largely to a temporary dip in certain fruit and meat production and to high average crop yields, farm returns in 1958 rose to a little more than $14 billion. This was about 22 percent higher than in 1957 but considerably lower, especially from a buying power standpoint, than in most of the postwar years prior to 1953.

Per capita farm income in 1958 was estimated at $1,068, somewhat higher than the previous record in 1951, but still only about 50 percent of the average per capita nonfarm income. Incidentally, this per capita farm income estimate includes both Government payments and off-farm income and it also reflects an allowance for home-grown food. Farmers do not share in nearly as much of the $5 billion to $7 billion Department of Agriculture budget as is generally supposed. A large part of the budget goes for general services, such as scientific research, meat grading, forest protection, soil conservation and marketing reporting, which are of benefit to the entire population.

From the standpoint of farm income then, the present agricultural policy again appears deficient.

It was mentioned at the outset that any Federal intervention in the agricultural field should avoid waste and unnecessary expense. What does the record show as to this? Regrettably it shows that the Government's programs have resulted in such a pileup of commodities—mostly wheat, feed grains, and cotton—that storage charges alone are running more than $1 million per day and by next year may be approaching $2 million.

This has come about because of an inadequate price support plan under which the Government agreed to accept commodity if the market failed to rise above the support level. In most cases, producers could not qualify for support without making acreage adjustments, but especially in the most recent years, the adjustments asked were not large enough and the incentives offered were too small to get the compliance necessary to curb overproduction.

Even now, the Federal holdings, excepting possibly in the case of wheat, are not as fantastically large as some people think—for example, feed grain stocks on March 27 represent not much more than a 100-day supply—but taken with the privately held supplies, they would have a disastrous effect on prices if suddenly turned loose.

Altogether, the stocks in Federal hands are larger than necessary by usual standards and they are not being utilized to the maximum possible extent to relieve dietary deficiencies either here or abroad. Thus, in a way, these stored supplies stand as a symbol of waste and inefficiency, a further defect in our current agricultural policy.

Lastly, there is a question as to whether our national agricultural policy as reflected in current Federal programs is encouraging desirable trends in social and economic organization of agriculture or whether on the contrary it is setting up objectionable trends.

Latest census estimates show that the number of farm people in this country now is down to slightly less than 21 million, a decline of 17 percent since 1950. Meanwhile, total national population has gone up to more than 175 million. Thus, only 1 American in 8 now lives on a farm as compared with 1 in 3 in 1910.

With the advance of technology, an individual farmer has been able to handle more land with the result that the average farm is now larger and more efficient, especially in the so-called commercial area which with about one-half of our farmers by number accounts for nearly 90 percent of our output. Some this consolidation, however, has involved substantially higher land prices, and larger equipment, hence a larger capital burden for the remaining farmers to carry. Advancing technology and price pressures have also accelerated the tendency to large-scale contract farming and vertical integration under the domination of feed companies, processors, and food distributors. This latter development has resulted in excessive expansion of production, notably in the chicken broiler busines, with the result that many independent family farmers have been ruined financially.

As for farmers in the so-called low-income areas, the present farm policy probably has not compounded their disadvantage, since they share proportionally (sometimes more

than proportionally) in Federal farm program benefits. On the other hand, they deserve more attention than they have been getting in the way of credit for those who are suited for expansion of operations and of education and other assistance for those preferring a shift to nonfarm employment. Incidentally, the out-migration of farm people in the main low-income areas since 1950 has been greater than for any other part of the country.

Thus, we see some desirable trends developing under the present agricultural policy (though some are proceeding too slowly) while other trends appear questionable. The factory farming system falls in the latter class. Firsthand observers contend that it is not really as efficient as it looks when everything is taken into account. Moreover, much of it is conducted today at lower wages than in industry. Carried to extreme, factory farming would develop higher costs and its managers conceivably would adopt the time-honored industrial practice of choking supply drastically any time the market failed to offer a profitable price.

In view of the aforementioned shortcomings under our present agricultural policy, what should be done? Should farming be returned to the free market, so as to put an end to the pileup of supplies in Government hands regardless of what happens to farm income? Or should the Federal Government recognize an obligation to maintain a sound agriculture and assist farmers in some fashion to meet the Nation's food needs without waste and undue income loss?

It is the view of the National Farmers Union that the excess production problem can and must be met, partly by greater utilization among marginal consumers both at home and abroad and partly by cutting back on plantings or marketings for the time being. At the same time, farm income should be given reasonable protection. It is held that this can be done with greater resultant efficiency of our farm plant and without undue cost to the Nation.

On the side of expanded utilization, Nation Farmers Union backs expansion of the school lunch programs, the inauguration of a food stamp allotment scheme and greater use of our surpluses in promoting economic development abroad. Food, for example, could be supplied abroad as part of the wages necessary to build technical schools, irrigation systems and so on.

If such expansion till leave us with too much farm output for domestic absorption at reasonable prices to farmers (and National Farmers Union believes this may be the case for some years to come), then the Federal Government should either set up machinery with which farmers can exert output control themselves or should overhaul present programs so that these become much more effective than at present.

Anything that is attempted should be comprehensive, that is, result in the desired adjustment of output as a whole. Under too many programs in the past, adjustment in one commodity has ben offset by a shift of land or other resource to some other commodity. Too many times aggregate volume of farm products has thus actually increased, with serious consequences for farm income.

Thus, under the National Farmers Union proposal, farmers would be offered a program for referendum approval under which individual producers would have an aggregate marketing quota expressed in dollars. Each producer would be free to produce whatever he liked of any commodity, so long as his total marketings did not exceed the limit.

How large would the national all-commodity quota be? It should be that aggregate quantity of crops, fruits, vegetables, livestock products, and so on which it is estimated on the basis of normal employment would bring prices high enough to yield returns to producers approaching parity income.

At this point, consumers might ask whether such a program might not reduce supplies too much and run up food bills unduly. In the first place, it is not intended that there would be any shorting of total food supplies for the American people. It is obvious that a great deal of the food being produced now is not going into consuming channels; thus a considerable adjustment could take place without affecting national consumption levels one iota.

Second, it may be pointed out that a very large change can be effected in net farm income from a moderate change in farm prices and from an even much smaller change in retail prices. A 10-percent increase in the average level of farm prices (equivalent to not more than a 4-percent change in retail prices) could mean as much as a 50-percent increase in net farm income.

In setting up an output target, National Farmers Union leans to the view of playing safe and then if supplies should prove a little too heavy for the price structure, make supplemental payments direct to the producer. In that way, the food would move on through consumption channels instead of going into a Government warehouse, while farmers at the same time would not be penalized as they are at present for maintaining an efficient, highly productive, agricultural plant.

Some day this Nation will have a population requiring all we can produce under the most efficient conditions. Let us not dissipate our assets of soil and trained farmers in the meantime.

The Need for Economy in Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 5, 1959

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial published in the Minot (N. Dak.) Daily News of April 25.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE AGREE WITH MR. LANGER

Do the men who control the Nation's purse-strings practice economy, and believe in it themselves?

We go along with Senator WILLIAM LANGER's idea that if economy is really to be the watchword on the domestic front, the executive and legislative departments in Washington should set the example.

We go along with him also when he says that they are not doing it and that Washington is running hog-wild with the taxpayers' money.

The senior Senator points the finger at the White House and at the Halls of Congress, and calls for the President and for Senators and Congressmen to take a voluntary cut in their salaries and office expenses. It would be our opinion that Senator LANGER is utterly sincere in this, and that the "hog-wild spending" he speaks of, is a form of extravagance to which a halt needs to be called. The executive branch of Government is spending money today at a rate which should be reduced.

Take the Department of Agriculture, for example. While Secretary Benson makes speeches on what he calls sound economics and the high cost of price supports, his Department has put more payrollers into his favorite branches than Henry Wallace would have dreamed of.

The White House itself is an unnecessarily expensive establishment.

All these things add up to a situation which makes those who use "economy" as a watchword look like hypocrites to the tax-paying public.

U.S. Rice Farmers Tap U.N. Technical Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 5, 1959

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Christian Science Monitor entitled "U.S. Rice Farmers Tap U.N. Technical Aid."

My colleagues will recall that in the last session of the Congress a bill which I sponsored, to provide for the establishment of a fish-rice research and experiment center, was enacted. This article is an excellent report on the progress which has been made since enactment of the bill.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. RICE FARMERS TAP U.N. TECHNICAL AID

(By Susanne Davis)

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y.—A Chinese expert is bringing ancient Asian know-how to farmers in Arkansas, helping them improve their techniques of fish farming. The United States—in a very rare departure from custom—is receiving technical assistance from the United Nations' Food and Agriculture Organization.

Rice farmers in Arkansas, Louisiana, Texas, California, and Tennessee may be able to develop a new industry and add considerably to their farm income as a result of this technical advice.

Working with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Dr. Shao-Wen Ling, the FAO's fish-farming expert, has developed ways in which American rice paddies can be used for raising fish as well as rice.

Dr. Ling has taught biology and worked for the Chinese Nationalist Government in the field of fish culture. He fled China in 1937 after the Japanese invasion and went to Hong Kong, where he worked for the British Government as fisheries biologist.

GOVERNMENTS ADVISED

At the end of World War II, he returned to China to organize a national fisheries research institute. In 1949 he joined the FAO. He has advised the Governments of Thailand, Ceylon, Indonesia, and Burma on fisheries and fish farming under the FAO's technical-assistance program.

Dr. Ling outlined the main steps in setting up an experimental fish-farming station in the news conference at the United Nations.

First of all, there must be a supply of the proper kind of fish to stock the flooded rich

fields. These fish must be bred to grow to maximum size on the food available.

Next, the fish must be harvested at just the right time to fit in with the rice-growing cycle. Later, they must be processed—freezing, canning, curing, and salting facilities must be readily available—and, finally, of course, the end product must be marketed.

The idea of fish farming occurred to rice farmers in Arkansas when they found that fish filled their rice fields during the flooding period. These fish were so-called trash fish—undesirable for eating.

AID SOUGHT

Rice growers thought it should be possible to have food fish instead, and applied to the fish and wildlife service for advice. Experience and knowledge in fish farming was lacking, so the farmers applied to Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas, for aid.

He introduced a bill in Congress to set up a research and experimentation station to study fish farming in connection with rice growing. The bill was approved, and $360,000 appropriated. And Dr. Ling, through the FAO, was hired to work with the fish and wild life service in setting it up.

Dr. Ling says that all the elements for a successful fish farming industry are present in the United States. There is plenty of land and water, he points out; there is no lack of equipment; the climate is suitable, and the amount of fish eaten can well be increased.

The United States meager fish consumption, only 12 pounds of fish per person per year, is a source of amazement to a Chinese, brought up on a fish diet. Dr. Ling says that as the population grows, there will be a greater demand for food.

SEA LARDER DEPLETED?

This increased need, coupled with the fact that the seas are getting "fished out," apparently has convinced him of the advisability of starting a new food-producing industry in the United States.

At the present time, fish farming in the United States is confined to raising game fish to stock rivers and streams for sportsmen. Expanding this practice, the edible buffalo, and cat fish which come to rice paddies naturally, could be raised as well, Dr. Ling believes.

In time, other species might be added and new kinds of fish from other parts of the world could even be introduced and cultivated, he says.

Dr. Ling is just finishing a 3-month tour of duty in the United States. His salary and expenses will be reimbursed to the FAO by the United States, which is not eligible to receive technical assistance aid without charge—it is not classed as an underdeveloped country.

Taxes: The Price We Pay for Civilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 5, 1959

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Paul Talbot Babson, entitled "The Back Yard," which appeared in the April 13, 1959, issue of the United Business Service of Boston.

This is the largest business advisory service in the United States, and its views are read avidly each week by thousands of the Nation's top business leaders.

Famous for its exhaustive studies of the country's economy and the soundness of its opinions on business trends, it has become even more widely appreciated for the "Back Yard" comments of its editor, Paul Talbot Babson, on good citizenship.

In his article he reminds us, as the late Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes once reminded us, that taxes are the price we pay for civilization; and, further, that in this modern world they are the price we pay for freedom from the Communist tyranny, which oppresses so much of the rest of mankind.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BACK YARD

(By Paul Talbot Babson)

After totaling the Government's share of my income via form 1040 the other night, I was complaining to Sue about the high cost of government. To which she made the very wifely comment:

"Don't you like it here?"

There was some spluttering on my part for a few minutes, but I finally simmered down and answered her question:

"Yes, I like it here."

And from what you read about other countries—even in the Western World—you certainly must agree that America, even with all its various taxes, is not a bad place in which to live.

As a matter of fact, it's a mightly pleasant place to live.

For from the Pocumtuck Valley to the top of the Tetons there's nothing like it for geographic grandeur. And where else in the world can you debate the virtues of a Ford, Plymouth, Chevrolet, or Rambler with your neighbor, rather than commiserate over the allocation system of acquiring family transportation.

Sure there are local and State taxes too—the newspapers tell us that both Massachusetts and Michigan are going broke, and that other States are following fast behind. But at least you and I have a chance to do something about this.

In so much of the world—in all those other countries—there's no chance for self-expression, no argument tolerated, no valid vote, no freedom of opinion or speech, no real dignity for the individual.

Sue's final thrust came as she signed the other end of the joint return, and I signed the check.

"Let's be happy there's a check to sign, and that you are allowed to sign it."

"North Dakota," Poem by Miss Mavis Merritt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 5, 1959

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a poem entitled "North Dakota," written by Miss Mavis Merritt, a sophomore at Central High School, in Grand Forks, N. Dak. The poem was first published at the request of Mrs. William Nelson.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NORTH DAKOTA

GRAND FORKS.—The following poem on "North Dakota" was written by Mavis Merritt, a Central High School sophomore:

"North Dakota, oh you of great lands
That seems to be made with God's own hands,
You with your crops that in the fields do grow,
You with your beauty that all should know,
The scenery you have is so very divine,
And to look upon it is a pleasure of mine.
Stretching along in so endless a space
Is this beautiful, happy, and wonderful place.
The weather is changeable, cold, and then warm,
But these changes bring joy and never alarm.
The stars as they shine down on you at night
Show only your kindness and your great might.

"North Dakota, oh you of great lands
That seems to be made with God's own hands,
You with your beauty that's known far and near
You with your country that knows no fear.
In spring all the creatures of your woodlands are gay
And all the year round they feel the same way.
Your people are happy and glad they live here
In this land that has brought an abundance of cheer.
Peace Garden State seems a wonderful name
All over the State it seems quiet and tame
A place of beauty, a place to see,
North Dakota is where I want to be."

—*Mavis Merritt.*

A Misleading Inaccuracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 5, 1959

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] has been supported by the Milwaukee Journal recently in his charge that the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Gen. Nathan Twining, has been caught in a misleading inaccuracy in giving the Congress a false picture of Britain's missile capability.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial supporting Senator SYMINGTON be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD following these remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A MISLEADING INACCURACY

Senator SYMINGTON has clearly caught General Twining, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, in what can be called a misleading inaccuracy, to stretch on the side of courtesy.

The Missouri Democrat, who is a former Secretary of the Air Force, recalls that last January Twining told a congressional committee that the Thor missiles this country had sent to Britain were sitting there ready

to go. Yet, when Symington visited Britain recently, he found nothing ready to go.

Secretary of Defense McElroy now concedes that the 1,500-mile Thors in Britain are not ready for firing. And a Defense Department spokesman has told the New York Times that in calling the Thors combat-ready Pentagon people meant the missiles themselves were ready, and not the related equipment.

If that is what Twining meant, that is what he should have said. The fact that he didn't is surprising because our concept of weapon development is on the basis of an entire system. That means that while a weapon such as the Thor is being developed, its launching equipment is designed and built, its operating and maintenance crews are trained, and even the technical handbooks written.

It is fitting that McElroy himself has stepped forward to set the story straight. But General Twining's conduct cannot be lightly excused. He made a misleading statement last January which he must have known was misleading. Its effect was to convince Congressmen that our British allies had a missile capability that they did not then have and still do not have.

The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff is the Nation's No. 1 military man. The civilian Secretary and the Congress count upon him for technical advice. And so, even though General Twining may be optimistic about America's overall defense position, it is essential that he supply full and accurate information.

Essay by Miss Linda Hugg on "A More Successful United Nations"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 5, 1959

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, Mr. D. D. Monroe, of Clayton, N. Mex., a very highly regarded friend of mine for many years, has just sent me a copy of a very fine essay entitled "A More Successful United Nations," by Miss Linda Hugg, a student in Clayton High School, and daughter of Mr. and Mrs. William A. Hugg, owners of Hugg's Department Store in Clayton, N. Mex.

Mr. Monroe advised me that for a number of years the Independent Order of Odd Fellows and its auxiliary, the Rebekahs, have conducted an essay contest through the local schools which has for its object exciting among high school youth of interest in the United Nations. The manuscripts are numbered and sent to a State committee, usually consisting of some member of the Supreme Court and other persons in high positions, who select the best manuscript from each city or county in the State. Then the lodge furnishes that winner with a trip to the United Nations.

This year, Linda was one of the contestants in Clayton, but before she could complete her manuscript, she was stricken with a liver ailment and has been confined in West Texas General Hospital for some time. She has undergone a series of serious operations, and at the present time is apparently well on the road to recovery, and we are expecting her to return to school before long to resume her studies. In the meantime, the contest was concluded and the State winners have been announced and will leave in June for the United Nations.

Because of her illness, Linda was unable to complete her essay until it was too late to enter it in the contest. I am so greatly impressed by the story of this young lady and the fine essay she has written that I want others to share it with me. Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A MORE SUCCESSFUL UNITED NATIONS

(By Linda Hugg)

Since the United Nations was established in 1945, it has shone as the light of hope and peace to the war-weary nations of the world. Here, it seemed, was a truly foolproof system, one that would free the world from the destruction of war, and enable the people to live richer, more secure lives.

And the United Nations has made the realization of many of these dreams possible. Through it, many disputes have been settled, and advancements have been made in many fields for the welfare of the people.

But, can any organization be absolutely perfect? Even after seeing the results of these tremendous movements, can it be said that this system is truly foolproof? Before we can answer this question, it is necessary to delve below the headlines, deep into the work of the United Nations, and understand fully just what the United Nations is, what it is doing, what it has failed to do, and how it is correcting these failures.

The United Nations is set up with six principal organs, the biggest of which is the General Assembly, the only body in which all 81 members are represented. This organ is regularly scheduled to meet once a year, though special sessions may be called by a majority of United Nations members, or by the Security Council.

Another important function of the United Nations is the Economic and Social Council, which is responsible for coordinating its economical, social, humanitarian, and cultural activities.

Probably the most influential and best known organ in the United Nations is the Security Council. This body is responsible for maintenance of international peace and security. It is composed of five permanent members—China, France, Russia, Great Britain, and the United States—and six other member nations which are elected for 2-year terms by the General Assembly.

Also in the United Nations, besides the principal organs, are the specialized agencies. These are the organizations which work on humanitarian projects, rather than the pursuit of peace. The most important of these are: World Health Organization (WHO) whose purpose is to improve the health and living conditions of the world; United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) whose purpose is to achieve international peace through education, science, and culture; and the Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO) whose purpose is to improve production and distribution of food and agricultural products. The United Nations has achieved much of its success through these agencies.

To understand the United Nations, it is necessary to know what it is trying to do. Studying the following purposes, found in the charter, will supply this important information. Those purposes pertaining to war are: "To unite our strength to maintain international peace and security; to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war; to practice tolerance and live together in peace; to insure that armed force shall not be used, save in the common interest."

Equally important are the purposes which concern peacetime activities: "To employ international machinery for the promotion of all peoples; to promote social progress and better standards of life; to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal right of men and nations; to establish conditions under which justice and respect for the obligations arising from treaties and other sources of international law can be maintained."

These are the purposes of the United Nations; these are the ideals that were set up as standards to go by, in order that the United Nations could work for the world to the greatest possible advantage.

Following these standards, the United Nations has offered solutions for critical situations all over the world. Perhaps one of the most important of these is the prevention of the Israelic-Arabic war from expanding into a general world nuclear war of holocaust proportions. The United Nations also mediated the conflict which led to an independent Indonesia, and, thanks again to the United Nations, war was prevented over Kashmir. Protection against communism is another goal of the United Nations, and in 1949, the threatened Communist aggression in Iran was extinguished, and the Soviet troops there withdrawn. The United Nations also had a big part in ending the Communist hostilities against Greece.

But the accomplishments of the United Nations must not be limited to the settling of disputes; equally important are its tremendous peacetime efforts to better the conditions of the world.

Along this line the specialized agencies have made much progress in promoting world health and human welfare. Aiding the move for educational advancement, UNESCO has been carrying on a global campaign for free and compulsory education, and has helped establish 33 national centers on fundamental education. Progress is being made in the way of economic advancement by bringing better living to less developed areas through international funds and the pledges of individual governments. And this is just a small, small portion of the United Nations great widespread program of human and world advancement.

Yet, even in the face of these outstanding accomplishments, how successful a United Nations do we have? Any organization has its defects; what are those of the United Nations? How critically do these flaws affect the people of the world?

To answer these questions, we should first look at, and understand the veto, as this is perhaps the main weakness in our United Nations. As was set up in the original charter, any action brought before the Security Council can be defeated by the negative vote of any one of its five permanent members. Although at the time this must have seemed like a necessary safeguard, since then the work of the United Nations has been so hampered by Russia's veto that many people believe this power should be abolished.

The Soviet Union has shockingly abused its privilege as a permanent member, and, with the 82 vetoes on its record, has frustrated the Security Council's work in such ways as blocking the admission of new members and preventing the peaceful settlement of disputes. Also, both greatly important, Russia's veto has left unsolved the problem of control of atomic weapons and has caused the failure of organization of an international police force.

And this brings us to the second main weakness—the lack of enforcement power.

Lord Cherwell, a British peer, put it this way: The Constitution of the United Nations is utterly indefensible. Its resolutions have no effective ways of being enforced, by arms or otherwise. The United Nations police force, in practice, is a mere pawn."

The charter provides for armed forces to be placed at the disposal of the Security Council. But agreement has never been possible with the Soviet Union on the nature of the armed forces to be made available, where they should be stationed, and who should command them. As a result the organization lacks the power to enforce its decisions.

A third weakness of the United Nations which, though not as well known as the others is just as serious, is the financing of the United Nations. This is a task which is becoming increasingly difficult, and a grave obstacle to the successful functioning of the organization. Unless the members of the United Nations demonstrate a greater willingness to accept their share of the financial burden involved, the cause of world peace could suffer a serious blow.

Staggering as these faults are, the situation is not as hopeless as it may appear to be. For although they may not have received much publicity, solutions, either permanent or temporary, have been found for many of the major issues confronting the United Nations.

Since the problem of the veto is probably the most crucial in the United Nations, what is being done about it is likewise most important. And, though unknown to a great majority of people, something is being done. Although the veto cannot be abolished without the rewriting of the Charter, it has been found possible to bypass it in several ways.

The first of these involved placing increased emphasis upon the role of the General Assembly, where the veto does not apply. The vigorous action taken by the Assembly in the Middle East and Hungary is evidence of the wisdom of this move.

In the second place many free world countries have entered into collective security pacts like the Rio Treaty and the North Atlantic Pact. These pacts have served as a constant deterrent to potential aggressors and have added new wings to the United Nations structure.

Third, instead of trying to get the words of the Charter changed, the effort has been made to change the way the Charter is actually used. In this way, the uniting-for-peace procedure enables the United Nations to act despite a big-power veto.

Concerning the problem of enforcement, various opinions have been given. There are many who argue that we will never have an effective collective-defense system unless a truly international police force is created. Others point out that our regional defense pacts, like NATO, have worked with considerable success and that we should move now to develop them into one integrated system. Still others see our best hope in improving the role of the General Assembly in the maintenance of peace. Surely, in one of these alternatives can be found the answer to this question so important to the United Nations future.

While the financing of the United Nations has become a serious problem, partly due to the inability of many member states to give much more than a token contribution, and partly caused by the reluctance of others to give to the United Nations when thousands of their own people are destitute, efforts are being made to improve this situation. Perhaps the answer lies in the latter group mentioned—at any rate, the Secretary-General is hoping for a good response to his recent call for funds. The world cannot afford to put a price tag on peace.

Each of the solutions mentioned is helping to build a more successful United Nations; yet, there is still a long way to go. Several of these are only temporary aids which, although easing the situation considerably, do not entirely solve the problem. No, the United Nations isn't perfect—in fact, many people believe it isn't even successful. But it can be. In the words of Henry Cabot Lodge: "The success of the United Nations in the search for real peace depends entirely on how much support it gets from its members when the going gets rough. We can either throw it away impatiently, and thereby greatly increase the danger of war, or we can perfect it in a way that will make future generations forever grateful that we had the patience and foresight to make this beginning."

Alaska Methodist University at Anchorage, Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 5, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, as one of the sponsors of the legislation which made Alaska our 49th State, I am particularly conscious of the need for adequate educational opportunities in this vast northern realm. Alaska's young people will not stay there as permanent residents unless they have genuine opportunities to be educated, both at the secondary and university levels. I am happy to report that the Methodist Church is making a great contribution to the sound and orderly development of Alaska by the building of Alaska Methodist University in Anchorage, which is Alaska's largest metropolitan community.

Already, ground has been broken for Alaska Methodist University on a campus of 248 acres. This occasion was especially gratifying to me, because the individual who had the honor of undertaking this ceremonial and symbolic task was Bishop A. Raymond Grant, of Portland, Oreg. Dr. Grant is one of our most enlightened citizens, as well as being a leading advocate of the construction and expansion of Alaska Methodist University. I should add the fact that Bishop Grant was assisted in the groundbreaking ceremonies by president-elect, Dr. Donald F. Ebright, of Alaska Methodist University.

So that Members of the Senate may appreciate the magnitude of this undertaking, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the contents of a brochure entitled "Alaska Methodist University," which has recently been issued by the board of missions of the Methodist Church, with headquarters in New York City.

There being no objection, the brochure was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALASKA METHODIST UNIVERSITY

Modern Alaska, Uncle Sam's last great frontier, faces the problem that every frontier of continental United States faced in its progress from a wilderness to a settled, fruitful community. The dawn of statehood accentuates this problem and brings into sharp focus the need for adequate provision for educating and training its youth within the frontier for the frontier.

In this most rapidly growing population area under the American flag, the student population is increasing at the rate of 16 percent per year. It is estimated that by 1960 Alaska will be graduating from 1,500 to 2,000 students from her high schools each year.

Studies made of Alaskan students going to other States for advanced educational training reveal that less than 5 percent return to Alaska upon the completion of their studies. Thus Alaska has been losing the cream of her potential future leadership.

Alaska has a tax-supported, land-grant university at Fairbanks and a junior college under the Presbyterian Church, U.S.A., in Sitka; but it does not have an independent, church-related, 4-year liberal arts college.

The Methodist Church is now engaged in establishing such a college to round out the advanced educational facilities of Alaska and thus make it possible for Alaska to educate and train her youth of today to become the leaders of her tomorrows.

It has been more than 30 years since the Methodist Church as a denomination has built a new college. This new frontier institution has been chartered as the Alaska Methodist University. It is to be located in Anchorage, Alaska's largest and most rapidly growing city, its most dynamic city, and its most easily accessible city. Within a radius of 300 miles of Anchorage live 64 percent of Alaska's population. Industrialists say that Anchorage will be the Chicago of Alaska's future.

The citizens of Anchorage have pledged over $700,000 toward the founding of this institution, and to date they have paid approximately $275,000 on their pledges. This is a miracle of faith in Alaska's future. It is also a miracle of confidence in the Methodist Church.

A site of 247.5 acres of land has been purchased from the Government by Anchorage citizens and deeded to the university for its campus.

Engineering surveys have been made and a master plan for campus development outlined. A board of trustees has been elected.

This is an advance special project, duly approved. It has this unique significance: It is the only advance special project unanimously accepted by the general conference at its 1956 session in Minneapolis and unanimously recommended to every local Methodist church for consideration in its advance special program for this quadrennium.

Now more than 8,000 Methodist churches are regularly supporting this project. These churches have already contributed over $1 million for the Alaska Methodist University. We hope to begin construction of our initial buildings when we have reached the goal of $2 million ($1 million for endowment, and $1 million for buildings). The Methodist men have joined in the crusade and are raising funds to purchase books for a first-rate library on the campus.

It will take $5½ million to get this 4-year liberal arts college of the Alaska Methodist University established.

Dr. John Gross, of the board of education, points out that the Methodist Church had gone into 11 frontier areas to build colleges and universities before these frontier areas became States. This was the 12th time Methodism made such a notable historic advance.

Defense of Small Business Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 5, 1959

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, the February 2 issue of Barron's Financial Weekly, which circulates widely in New England, carried an article critical of the Small Business Administration's record of collection of outstanding loans it has made to small business enterprises all over the country.

I do not feel that the criticism is well supported. I know that SBA's methods of making loans and of following through on collections are generally very good, helpful, and effective. Under the direction of Administrator Wendell B. Barnes, the agency has become a potent and appreciated force in the American economy. That responsible banking, investment, and business people agree was indicated recently in Boston when Administrator Barnes and others of his staff held a largely attended briefing session concerning the Investment Division of the Small Business Administration. The meeting was praised by many who attended.

I was glad to note, in a more recent issue of Barron's Weekly, that other readers of that publication disliked the critical article of February 2 and spoke up against it. A letter was sent to the editor of Barron's by officials of the Smaller Business Association of New England in defense of SBA's policies and methods. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the letter be printed in the RECORD as it appeared in Barron's Weekly.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN DEFENSE OF SBA

We have just seen your February 2 issue containing the article "Easy Mark." We find many instances where a failure to give all viewpoints leads to inaccurate and untrue conclusions. The article is distorted by intemperate criticisms and the omission of the many good points of SBA. It indicates little understanding of small business or appreciation for those who seek to help it.

At the Smaller Business Association of New England, we are almost daily in touch with one or the other department of the SBA Boston regional office. We know just how much care and attention is given to assuring loan repayments, for example, in setting up a loan contract. We know that Washington keeps careful check on its regional offices; we find in the Boston office a splendidly administered bureau of the Federal Government.

Your article loses sight of the great good done by SBA in helping small businesses to finance themselves. It is generally recognized that the smaller manufacturer plays a tremendously important role in our economy as component or prime supplier and that the so-called "big" businesses rely heavily on their smaller suppliers. We see many, many examples of loans to this type of company which are well handled and vital to the economy. We think that if you will examine the plus side, you will find SBA's loss experience to be excellent over the years and that by far the majority of borrowers keep right up with their due dates. Even banks have some losses, and we feel that the SBA officers perform their function with care and skill from the bank point of view.

SMALLER BUSINESS ASSOCIATION OF NEW ENGLAND, INC.,
LAURENCE F. BROOKS,
Executive Vice President,
JOSEPH D. NOONAN,
Executive Secretary.

Establishment of a National Park on Padre Island, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 5, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I wish again to call the attention of the Congress to the imperative need for immediate action in the acquisition of land and establishment of a national park on Padre Island in Texas. State and Federal legislators are working closely on this project, to preserve for the people this longest barrier beach along the shores of the United States.

However, the "No Trespassing" and "Keep Out" signs which mark private ownership and have already removed much of this Nation's shoreline from public use, are already springing up on Padre Island. We must act quickly to retain this area as a public playground, a historically valuable site, and a refuge for birds and game.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution passed by the Houston Council of Texas Garden Clubs urging that such a park be established on Padre Island.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ON PADRE ISLAND, TEX.

Be it resolved—

That the Houston Council of Texas Garden Clubs, including more than a hundred garden clubs with approximate membership of 4,500, endorse Padre Island as a national park.

That Padre Island with the largest undeveloped beach area in the United States provides a perfect haven for recreational seekers and provides a natural seashore park.

That Padre Island in its natural state should be preserved as a heritage for the United States.

That Padre Island with its treasures for nature lovers should be retained partly for bird sanctuaries. Many rare birds winter and nest on the island.

That it is imperative to pass the necessary legislation before the beauties and natural resources are spoiled by overdevelopment.

That Padre Island offers boating for both large and small boats, as the intracoastal canal lies between the island and the mainland and thus provides protective waters.

That development and the park could go hand in hand to preserve this beautiful area, so that generations to come will be enabled to enjoy the natural resources.

HOUSTON COUNCIL OF TEXAS GARDEN CLUBS,
By Mrs. K. C. WARFORD, *President.*

Heavy Gold Flow From United States Causes Global Concern

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 5, 1959

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, last Sunday's New York Times carried a front page story reporting that to the surprise of the experts gold continues to flow out of this country. In the last 2 weeks this gold loss attained a volume of $179 million. This is more than in the entire first quarter of this year.

This is a warning to us to take a hard, clear look at whether or not this country may be pricing itself out of the world market.

As the New York Times reports:

Only a pickup in U.S. exports, will provide any lasting solution to the problem. More and more it is believed that the future of exports will depend in major degree on the future of the U.S. price level.

This of course relates directly to the study I recently proposed by the Banking and Currency Committee of this body of the impact of the investment of American private capital abroad. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered printed in the RECORD as follows:

[From the New York Times, May 3, 1959]

HEAVY GOLD FLOW FROM UNITED STATES CAUSES GLOBAL CONCERN—INFLATION BLAMED AS LOSSES ON TRADE DEFICIT FOR 2 WEEKS TOP 179 MILLION

(By Edwin L. Dale, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, May 2.—The heavy outflow of gold from the United States has resumed. The situation has caused some concern, though not alarm, among American and international financial officials.

In the last 2 weeks, the United States has lost $179 million in gold, or more than in the entire first quarter of the year. Last year, the United States suffered its biggest gold outflow ever at $2,300 million.

The reason is that the United States is running a deficit in its transactions with the rest of the world. The main reason for the deficit is that American exports have remained sluggish while imports have been strong.

TWENTY BILLION GOLD STOCK

The United States has such a huge stock of gold—about $20,300 million—that it can withstand a deficit in its international balance of payments without much strain. But the deficit cannot continue indefinitely without trouble.

The results have led some authoritative international financial experts to revise their opinions about the outlook for this year. Some now feel that the United States this year will be a fairly heavy loser of gold, though they had earlier thought the balance this year would right itself.

The continued sluggishness of U.S. exports has led more and more officials to take seriously the problem of American goods pricing themselves out of world markets, though the statistics so far give little support to this idea.

STEEL NEGOTIATIONS WATCHED

In any case, some major figures in the international financial world have concluded that it is imperative that the United States not allow any resumption of inflation, on international payments grounds alone. Some believe that the steel settlement this summer will have a major bearing on the situation, for both practical and psychological reasons.

The gold outflow has also reinforced the determination within the Government to use the Government's fiscal and monetary weapons—balanced budgets and tight money—to prevent renewed inflation.

Although precise figures are not available, there is some evidence that the sudden resumption of gold departure in April can be accounted for by a special situation related to Britain.

The British have been gaining reserves all this year in their ordinary transactions. But they apparently decided to leave their gains in dollar form, rather than convert the dollars into gold, in order to build up the necessary balance to repay $200 million to the International Monetary Fund in March.

That payment was made. Thus any further gains in reserves by the British were probably converted promptly into gold, according to traditional British custom. That is what probably happened in April to account for a large part of the outflow of gold in that month.

However, this explanation really means only that the slowing of the outflow of gold in the first 3 months of the year was artificial. That is, the U.S. balance of payments was still strongly in deficit, but that for a special reason the gold figures did not show it.

DIFFERENTIAL IN INTEREST

Probably the major hope of those who believe the balance of payments will soon improve is that measures to promote economic expansion in Europe and Britain will soon take hold and that Europe will then begin taking more imports from the United States. Europe has been in a mild recession. Virtually all governments have lowered interest rates and taken other measures to spur demand.

The interest rate differential has high rates in New York and lower rates in London and Amsterdam and Frankfurt. It should also help the U.S. balance if the differential becomes great enough.

Short-term funds flow to the money center where the best interest yields are available. Such a flow into New York has the same effect on the U.S. payments balance as an equivalent amount of exports of goods.

But only a pickup in U.S. exports, it is believed here, will provide any lasting solution to the problem. More and more it is believed that the future of exports will depend in major degree on the future of the U.S. price level.

The National Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 5, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, billboards and advertisements recently have borne the slogan: "Your future is great in a growing America."

I agree with this, and I believe that in consideration of our national budget we should remember that this is a growing, expanding Nation. There is an old saying that "You only get out of something what you put into it." This, too, I believe, can be applied to consideration of the budget.

The St. Louis Post-Dispatch recently published an editorial concerning the report of the Committee for Economic Development, which I commend to the attention and careful consideration of the administration, the Congress, and the people.

To fully achieve the promise which the future holds, we should judiciously invest today to maintain our position of leadership among the free nations of the world, and to solve pressing national problems such as recovery for small businessmen and the family-sized farmer, and reduction of unemployment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch editorial sheet for April 6–12, 1959, under the heading, "Not by a Straitjacket."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOT BY A STRAITJACKET

The Committee for Economic Development will find wide acceptance for the conclusion of its research and policy committee that the Eisenhower budget is just about right. The assumptions behind the study, however, need to be reexamined by Congress in the light of the latest economic intelligence before final action is taken on the key appropriation measures in May and June. After all, the Eisenhower budget was put together last November and December. What is happening in the intervening months will have a direct bearing on the soundness of its premises.

Like many students, the Committee for Economic Development is haunted by a feeling that certain expenditures, especially for defense, ought to be bigger than the administration asked. But it finally winds up with the conclusion that if military outlays do have to rise, taxes should be increased to pay for any excess. This is said in a notably small voice. The Committee for Economic Development is no more enthusiastic about a tax hike than anybody else. It ought to know, furthermore, that Congress is not going to increase taxes short of a world emergency. That prospect should have become a leading assumption of its study.

Does it follow, then, that defense expenditures should be shoehorned into the Eisenhower budget even though risk to national security is incurred? That is the administration position, but an independent citizens' agency like the Committee for Economic Development ought to take a broader view. We believe the controlling factor should be, not a budget ceiling, but the clear needs of security. We believe the preponderance of evidence so far supports an increase in funds for missile development at least, and that Congress ought to make these funds available desipte budget considerations if it becomes convinced of the need.

The same goes for certain nondefense expenditures. So long as unemployment remains serious and the economy is significantly underproducing, it would be folly to cut back such job-creating expenditures as those for housing and urban renewal, which are badly needed on many other grounds anyway. It would be irresponsible, of course, for Congress to tear up the budget and go hog-wild on spending. But it could be almost as bad to become transfixed by the image of a statistical budget balance when the important things are production, employment, security, and economic growth.

There are two reasons for believing that some flexibility can be introduced into the Eisenhower budget without instantly bringing an inflationary catastrophe upon our heads. One is the growing possibility that as recovery continues tax revenues may exceed administration estimates. Business Week, for example, estimates that 1959 business profits will reach 50 to 55 billions as compared with Treasury estimates a few months ago of 47 or 48 billion. If that proves correct, the Treasury will have a comfortable chunk of revenue it wasn't counting on to meet any expenditures over the Eisenhower budget.

Secondly, it might be quite possible to run a moderate deficit of one or two billion dollars in the next fiscal year without generating the inflation which the Committee for Economic Development and the administration warn us against. During the present fiscal year, the administration has run an enormous deficit of $13 billion without generating inflation. So long as the labor force is underemployed and the industrial plant partly idle, who can say that a relatively small deficit of, say, 2 billions would do next year what 13 billions have not done this year?

Potential inflation at some future time remains a danger that must be guarded against. That is why it is so important to discourage wage increases which exceed rises in productivity and contribute to a further cost-price push. But fiscal policy does not have to be a straitjacket in order to be noninflationary. More important than a precise budget balance next year is what needs to be done to bolster national defense, to speed full recovery, and to reduce unemployment.

An Address Delivered by Hon. Harry F. Byrd, of Virginia, at the Fauquier County Bicentennial Celebration, Warrenton, Va., Friday, May 1, 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 5, 1959

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address by the senior Senator from Virginia, the Honorable HARRY FLOOD BYRD, delivered on Friday, May 1, 1959, at the Fauquier County Bicentennial Celebration in Warrenton, Va. Fauquier County is in the heart of that beautiful section commonly referred to as northern Virginia, and is noted for the fertility of its soil, its picturesque scenery, and the solidarity of its citizenship.

On the occasion of the celebration of the 200th anniversary of this county, the citizens of Fauquier paid appropriate tribute to our able and distinguished colleague, the Honorable HOWARD WORTH SMITH, who lives in and is a native son of Fauquier. As Senator BYRD pointed out, Judge SMITH is one of the greatest living Americans. I share the sentiments expressed by Senator BYRD and when the history of this turbulent period is written, the name of HOWARD

WORTH SMITH deserves and no doubt will go down in Virginia and American history as one of the most able, patriotic, and distinguished citizens ever to represent our State in the Congress of the United States.

On this auspicious and patriotic occasion our great Virginia Senator took time also to refer to the deplorable condition existing in this country as a direct result of the ineptitude, if not indeed the venality of the Warren court.

I am confident that the address of Senator BYRD will be read and appreciated by many Members of the Congress, as well as by thousands of American citizens. The address is as follows:

I am deeply grateful for this opportunity to join with you in the celebration of the Bicentennial Anniversary of Fauquier County.

First, I want to congratulate you on your fine representation in the Government of our State and Nation. They are fine citizens of the highest caliber and unquestionable integrity.

I want to pay especial tribute to your State senator, Bob Button, and your delegate to the Virginia House, Tom Frost. In all respects, they uphold the great traditions of Fauquier County in the General Assembly of Virginia.

I was formally invited here not only to participate in this delightful anniversary program, but also to help you honor one of the greatest American citizens of our age and time, the Honorable HOWARD WORTH SMITH.

HOWARD SMITH is a native of Fauquier. But, like you, his State and his country lay proud claim to his citizenship. His fame is nationwide.

He is a man who embodies a rare combination of talents. He is intensely patriotic, exceedingly able, and possessed of remarkable facility for accomplishment.

He is a farmer who, at the same time, knows the problems of agriculture and cherishes that wonderful sense of independence experienced only by those who work with the soil and marvel continually at its productiveness.

He is a banker who knows the problems of business and appreciates our free enterprise system as indispensable to the preservation of our democracy and our freedom, and to the protection of all the free world against Communist aggression.

He is a lawyer who, by tradition and by his training at the University of Virginia founded by Thomas Jefferson, knows that the primary purpose of law is to protect our liberties and freedoms from invasion and abuse, and that ours must be a government by law and not by men.

He is a judge, whose temperament is fashioned from moral courage, stubborn virtue, fundamental convictions, and the elegance of simplicity.

This is the man whom all of us have come to admire, and who is held in great esteem not only by those who know him personally, but also by those who know him only by the lasting reputation he has made.

People all over America join us in our gratitude for the full measure of distinguished service Judge Smith has rendered, and is rendering, to his country, his State, and his community.

Elected and reelected to Congress 15 times, Judge SMITH has only one political platform. It is not long. But it tells the story of Representative HOWARD W. SMITH, Member of Congress from Virginia, and it should be a part of the record of this ceremony commemorating the 200th anniversary of his native county of Fauquier.

I quote in his own words the platform on which he has stood for more than a quarter of a century in the Congress of the United States.

Here it is:

"I will not pledge my support blindfolded to any unknown measures, to any person, or on any subject, but will use my best judgment and discretion after careful study and concentration, and vote for such measures as I believe to be in the interest of the welfare of our country and in conformity with the wishes of my constituents."

In that simple statement, it seems to me we have the creed of an American statesman in his best tradition, asserting independence of thought and action; we have the essence of American statesmanship, withholding opinion and judgment until principles are satisfied.

We have the evidence of responsibility recognizing that public office is a public trust; and we have the manifestation of patriotism which should be engrafted on the bosom of every free American.

A man conscientiously adhering to that platform, with a clean record of performance, for 28 years is essentially a man of tremendous industry, a man of few words, and a man of fruitful action.

As a lifelong student of his Government, as a lawyer, as a jurist, and as a legislator, Judge SMITH knows the source of this Nation's strength and greatness, and at this moment he is doing his very best to protect them from subversion by the Warren court.

Fundamentally, our form of government rests upon the sovereignty of the States which form the Union. And for 6 years since Warren was appointed Chief Justice, the Warren court has struck directly at the roots of our democracy including a clear line of decisions destructive of States rights and concentrating power in the Federal Government.

Since 1953 the Warren court has handed down a number of decisions which would:

1. Limit the powers of the legislative branch of the Federal Government to investigate;

2. Open confidential files of the FBI and interfere with its administrative responsibilities;

3. Disregard the clear intent of laws, especially for evicting subversives from public positions;

4. Destroy the effectiveness of local police protection;

5. Strike down the rights of individuals;

6. Destroy the sovereignty of States guaranteed by the Constitution; and

7. Preempt and nullify perfectly good and constitutional State laws.

All of this does violence to American fundamentals.

Our Constitution establishes three branches of Government—legislative, executive, and judicial, but we find the Warren court assuming the authority of all three.

Under our system the central government has no authority except that granted to it by the States, but we find the Warren court destroying the rights of States, and preempting State laws.

The Warren court school decision is perhaps the most direct blow to State sovereignty to date. And it was a decision based on nothing in the Constitution, nothing in the law and nothing in the precedents.

It was simply a sociological determination by the Warren court expressing the personal philosophy of its membership.

The Supreme Court of the United States for more than a hundred years had held that the separate but equal principle, applied in public school education, was within the discretion of States—with no constitutional conflict.

But what did the Warren court do? Like a bolt out of the blue, it held that the U.S. Supreme Court, and the precedents of a century were wrong, and that decision after decision was invalid.

Now we are told the Warren court decision is the law of the land.

If this is so, it is the ultimate in judicial usurpation of the authority to legislate. If it is the law of the land, it is utterly without foundation in the Constitution.

The word education does not appear in the Constitution of the United States, and the only Federal law ever enacted in this field was passed by Congress to provide for segregation in District of Columbia schools.

But the Warren court school decision in effect amended the Constitution of the United States, and repealed an act of Congress.

To say this decision is the law of the land is to give the Warren court a divine right to be wrong.

If the Warren court decision can be extended to direct a certain Negro child to enter a certain schoolhouse, Federal courts can select textbooks, dictate the philosophy of teachers, and tell them what and how to teach.

The Warren court decision was handed down 5 years ago, and to this date more confusion has developed every day it has been allowed to stand.

The school decision is by no means all of the havoc the Warren court is playing with our dual system of State and Federal Governments.

Using the so-called preemption doctrine, the Warren court has struck down perfectly good and constitutional State laws all over this Nation simply on the grounds that there was a Federal law applicable in the same field.

In the final extreme the Warren court could use this doctrine to destroy our system of States merely by holding that Federal tax laws preempt State authority to levy taxes.

In view of our experience with the Warren court during the last 6 years, I wonder whether some such decision is now so far beyond the realm of imagination.

I have reviewed the record of the Warren court to emphasize the great effort HOWARD SMITH is making to correct the illegal decisions which are being forced upon us.

Last year he introduced legislation outlawing the Warren court's promiscuous preemption of State laws. The bill was passed overwhelmingly in the House of Representatives, but it was lost in the Senate by one vote as a result of a parliamentary maneuver.

If this bill had been enacted it would have been an effective curb on the Court for the future.

The bill has been reintroduced this year. The Senate Judiciary Committee is holding hearings on the bill at this time. We hope it will be enacted during the present session of Congress.

Whenever there is a tough legislative job to do, we find the hand of HOWARD SMITH at work. This is true with respect to drafting legislation, and with respect to committee action on bills before the Congress.

Think of the extremely important legislation he has sponsored. To name a few, there was the Smith Alien Registration Act of 1939 under which the 11 infamous Communists were convicted; there was the Smith antistrike bill which preceded the Taft-Hartley Act; there was the Smith-Connolly Act; and so on.

Think of his tremendous work as a great chairman of the powerful House Rules Committee, which controls legislation coming before the House of Representatives. Few people know the full extent and value of his daily work on this committee.

The great contributions of HOWARD SMITH to his country, his State, his district, and

his community could never be made by a timid man. They would never be made by a man without strong convictions and the courage to fight for them. They could never be made by a man with a lazy mind. They could never be made by a man without clear, direct and profound thought.

He has the complete confidence of his colleagues and associates whether they are Democrats or Republicans because they know he is honest; they know he is able; they know he is fair; and they know he is patriotic.

And you may be sure that the great demands of national and international issues on the time and capabilities of HOWARD SMITH will never distract his abiding interest in the Eighth Congressional District.

And to represent this district in the Congress of the United States is an honor of which any man would be deeply proud. It is the district of George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, John Marshall, Patrick Henry, Henry Clay, James Madison, Zachary Taylor, James Monroe, and Robert E. Lee.

No congressional district in the United States has produced so many great men who have had such a profound influence on the development of our country. Judge SMITH is their 20th century counterpart.

But with characteristic modesty Congressman SMITH says:

"My views are not original with me. They are bred in the bone, nurtured through generations in you and me in this section of Virginia from whose soil came those great statesmen of the past who, with their God-given inspiration, founded and started on its historical course the greatest Nation in all the history of mankind".

I say to you Judge SMITH not only represents the congressional district of these great men of American history, but, he, himself, stands today as one of the greatest living Americans.

Impact of Air Pollution Upon California Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS H. KUCHEL
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 5, 1959

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, a few days ago the Senate passed legislation, which had been introduced by my colleague from California and me, providing for a 5-year extension of the law under which the Federal Government is, and has been authorized to conduct research in the field of air pollution.

I hope and believe that the House of Representatives will approve the legislation, so that the Federal Government may continue its beneficent labors in this field under Federal legislation which I was delighted to sponsor some 4 years ago.

In this connection, Mr. President, I have before me a paper delivered before the board of regents of the University of California at Riverside, Calif., last February by Mr. John T. Middleton, which describes the impact of air pollution upon agriculture in my State. It is a most interesting paper. It is not long. I ask unanimous consent that it be set forth in its entirety in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IMPACT OF AIR POLLUTION UPON CALIFORNIA AGRICULTURE

(Presented by John T. Middleton before the board of regents, University of California at Riverside, February 20, 1959)

Air pollution means different things to different people. To the caveman in the south of France, it meant a nuisance and the soiling of his art works. To the Greek geographer, Strabo, it meant the vile odor of the dye vats in the ancient Phoenician city of Tyre. To the Londoner, it spells disaster; and to one-third of the California citizens, it means personal discomfort.

Air pollution in California produces a variety of adverse effects upon the public, including reduced work performance, impaired highway safety, eye irritation, and respiratory distress. To the California farmer, it means less money in his pocketbook. The paradox is that as more people come to California and require more food, the farmer has less to offer them because of the air pollution the people bring with them.

Since agriculture is an extremely important part of the State economy, it is important to know what impact air pollution has upon it. Where does air pollution affect agriculture and how? The effects of air pollution upon agriculture, in the form of sulfur dioxide from a smelter, were first noticed in the early 1900's in the area about the lower reaches of the Sacramento River in the vicinity of Selby. It was not until 1944, however, that a new type of pollution affected agriculture, this near San Pedro. By 1947 when the Los Angeles Air Pollution Control District was first established, damage to agriculture occurred in a triangular area bounded by Santa Monica, Dominquez, and El Monte. By 1950 the affected area in southern California extended from San Fernando to San Juan Capistrano to Riverside. Pollution also appeared for the first time in the San Francisco Bay area in 1950. The growing menace of air pollution, not only to agriculture but to the public health as well, brought about a collaborative study by the Los Angeles Air Pollution Control District, the California Institute of Technology, and the university for the purpose of determining the ingredients in smog responsible for damage. The telltale fingerprints of smog damage to plants showed these investigators that the culprit was an aggregation of some of the oxidation products of organic compounds. Plants were used to detect the toxic pollutants for there were no physical or chemical methods available. Plants are still used today because there are as yet no satisfactory instrumental methods of pollution detection.

In spite of these findings of this collaborative research team, the effects of air pollution became more widespread and were noticed in 1953 as far south as San Diego, as far north as Ventura, and as far east as the San Gorgonio Pass. In 1957 plant damage was first seen in the San Joaquin Valley in Bakersfield, Stockton, and Tracy. Last year, crop damage was seen in Fresno and in the delta.

Because of the obvious peril of increasing levels of air pollution in 1953, it was necessary to expand the research program initiated in 1950 in order to:

Identify chemically the phytotoxicant;

Relate eye irritation to plant damage and determine whether the eye irritant was the same contaminant as that causing plant damage;

Know whether the effects upon plants were limited to damage of leaf crops or whether also plant growth and product quality were reduced;

Make biochemical and physiologic studies of plants to learn what life processes were affected and to aid in understanding the possible physiological effects upon man; and

Determine acceptable levels of atmospheric contaminants.

Since this activity was multidisciplinary in nature, it required the establishment of an air pollution research committee on the Riverside campus as well as the formation of a statewide air pollution advisory committee designed to coordinate the manifold agricultural interests in air pollution on the four campuses concerned with instruction and research in agriculture.

The identification of the phytotoxicants was undertaken by the university in cooperation with the agricultural industry, the Air Pollution Foundation, and the Los Angeles Air Pollution Control District. Research soon demonstrated that sulfur dioxide was not an important atmospheric contaminant but that ozone, fluorides, perhaps some olefins, and especially incompletely oxidized organics were. Through cooperative studies made possible by the American Petroleum Institute and the Franklin Institute of Philadelphia, spectroscopic methods were employed to learn more about the chemical identity of the materials found in the witches' brew affecting agriculture. From this study it was discovered that there were a variety of complex oxygenated organic compounds, many of them unstable and short-lived. Some of these may be the much sought phytotoxin. Two suspects have been identified as peroxy acylnitrite and butyric hydroxy hydroperoxide. Further work on the identity of the toxicants is in progress at Riverside in an attempt to relate the gross manifestation of air pollution through plant damage and eye irritation to chemical studies utilizing infrared, ultraviolet, time of flights, and mass spectrometry, gas liquid chromatography, and electron paramagnetic and nuclear magnetic resonance spectroscopy.

Auto exhausts resulting from the combustion of a variety of fuels in several different automobiles produced eye irritation but not plant damage as shown by the studies conducted with the Air Pollution Foundation, the American Petroleum Institute, and the Stanford Research Institute. Research at Riverside has shown that the controlled oxidation of more than 25 hydrocarbons known to occur in organic compounds useful as fuels and in auto exhausts, regularly produces plant damage but not eye irritation. It has also been demonstrated that ozone at alert levels damages plants but does not irritate eyes. The Los Angeles Air Pollution Control District has reported that the greatest amount of damage to test plants occurs in areas having the greatest number of cars per square mile and that considerable eye irritation may also occur in this same area. Because of the simultaneous occurence of eye irritation and plant damage in an area with the greatest number of cars, it is generally conceded that both result from vehicular exhaust. However, although statistical analyses may show that these smog manifestations are correlated with the number of vehicles, research does not support this conclusion. There is now evidence to show that the toxicant responsible for eye irritation is different from that responsible for plant damage, and that they originate from different chemical reactions. Different control devices may be required to abate their damaging effects.

The farmer yearly loses about $8 million because he cannot market a variety of field and vegetable crops and many ornamentals, such as carnations, roses, and orchids, due to damage from air pollution. Air pollution also reduces yields in alfalfa, forage grasses, sugar beet, and tomato. Air pollution reduces the growth of oranges as much as one-third, increases leaf drop in lemons to seven times normal, and reduces fruit quality in apricots and grape because of excessive leaf drop. The protein content of alfalfa hay produced in polluted air is lower than that produced in clean air. Many flower crops continue to produce in polluted air but are of poor quality, the flowers small, and the leaves yellow. Cut flowers do not last as long when grown in dirty air as when grown

in clean. Some fruits stored in polluted air ripen faster than they should thereby reducing storability and consumer demand.

Biochemical and physiologic studies at Riverside have shown that the respiration of plants is increased by two to three times and that photosynthesis is decreased. This means that on smoggy days plants may use up more food in growing than they make. Research has also shown that air contaminants alter the permeability of cell membranes to such an extent that foodstuffs become congested in cells and are not transported as normally because water movement is impaired. It has also been demonstrated that the basic metabolism of plants is upset through interference with certain enzyme systems. It was discovered that the poisoning of these enzyme systems could be overcome by the topical application of antioxidans, such as ascorbic acid and reduced glutathione. The antioxidant qualities of these materials as well as zinc ethylene biodithiocarbamate may be beneficial use for man as well as protecting agricultural crops from damage.

Attempts to develop information on acceptable concentrations of atmospheric contaminants have shown that plants may tolerate sulfur dioxide at 0.2 parts per million, ozone at 0.2 parts per million for only a few hours, olefins, such as ethylene, at less than 10 parts per billion, and perhaps fluorine as little as 0.1 parts per billion. Cooperative studies with the Kaiser Steel Co., agricultural interests, and the university are now underway to better describe tolerable fluoride levels. No established concentrations of tolerance for the oxidized organic materials can be given, because the specific chemicals in the oxygenated complex remain largely unknown. Because they have not been identified, it is not only impossible to establish acceptable atmospheric standards, but it is also impossible to provide satisfactory control devices for their removal from the air. Control or elimination of the eye irritant is likewise hindered for lack of adequate chemical-physical information.

This brief discussion shows that air pollution has serious and adverse effects upon California agriculture. Some information has been gained on the identity of the air contaminants causing crop damage and eye irritation, but much more is required to aid in providing effective abatement programs and for the development of effective control devices. Research upon the effects of air pollution on agriculture has wide social implications. Some of these are embraced in the remarks of Sir Hugh Beaver, director of Her Britannic Majesty's air pollution control program, who says, "Good legislation itself will be ineffective unless public opinion supports it, for all experience shows that on public opinion, and on it alone, finally rests the issue." Effective conservation programs have been established for water, wildlife, soil, redwoods, even adobes. Since air is an essential natural resource in limited supply, it must be conserved.

Oil Import Policy Is Senseless

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 5, 1959

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Milwaukee Journal last Sunday editorially commended the President for ending the oil import quota on Canadian and Mexican oil; but argued irrefutably that even this improvement does not eliminate the inequity of the quota system itself.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this excellent editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OIL IMPORT POLICY IS SENSELESS

The defense argument upon which the recently imposed restrictions on oil imports were largely based never made sense as far as Canadian oil was concerned.

Petroleum produced in Alberta would be just as safe in the event of war and just as available for U.S. use as oil from the fields by North Dakota or Texas.

So President Eisenhower's order ending import controls over Canadian oil that enters this country via pipeline, truck, or train and Mexican oil that comes overland makes good sense.

But what is left unexplained is why the Canadian controls were imposed in the first place. If quotas aren't needed now, why were they needed 6 weeks ago? Why was it necessary to disrupt trade and further arouse the resentment of our Canadian friends over what they consider highhanded treatment by the United States?

The President's new order should help soothe the hard feelings, but it can scarcely restore Canadian respect for our way of doing things. And even though the order benefits Canadian producers and those domestic companies and consumers that use Canadian oil, it does not eliminate the inequity of the quota system itself.

The truth is that while quotas protect most domestic producers of oil they discriminate against the many companies that have geared their operations to oil imports. Quotas also penalize users of oil who would benefit from cheaper prices.

Passage of TVA Self-Financing Bill Vital in the Public Interest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 4, 1959

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. Speaker, in connection with our consideration of H.R. 3460 which is expected to reach the floor this week, I am sure that many Members of this body would welcome a review of the need for this legislation and a brief legislative history; therefore, under unanimous consent, I am inserting it in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The purpose of this bill is to relieve the Federal Government of financing additions to the TVA's power system by appropriations. Instead, it will permit the TVA to sell revenue bonds for building additional generating capacity.

The general provisions of this legislation are summarized in the report of the Committee on Public Works on this legislation, and I quote:

PURPOSE OF BILL

H.R. 3460 would authorize the Tennessee Valley Authority to finance needed additions to its power system by the issuance of revenue bonds in the maximum amount of $750 million outstanding at any one time. The bonds will be secured solely by the revenues of the TVA power system. They will be neither obligations of, nor guaranteed by, the United States.

The bill contains provisions essential for effective use of the bond financing authority. It permits TVA to fix the terms and conditions of the bonds and to enter into appropriate covenants with bondholders and trustees. It requires TVA to charge rates sufficient to operate the system, service the bonds, and meet obligations specified in the bill with respect to the appropriation investment in its power system. Under the bill, these obligations will include (1) payment to the Treasury of an annual cash return to be calculated by applying to the appropriation investment the average interest rate payable by the Treasury on its total marketable public obligations as of the beginning of the fiscal year, and (2) an annual payment of $10 million in reduction of the appropriation investment itself.

The bill does not change the basic provisions of the TVA Act governing the manner in which the TVA Board of Directors shall perform its statutory duties. Under the bill, the Board will continue to have sufficient flexibility to enable it to discharge its responsibilities efficiently and to enable Congress to hold it fully accountable for results. The bill does include a number of special requirements to insure that Congress will be kept fully informed of the use being made of the bond issuing authority. It also contains a provision limiting the area within which TVA power may be sold.

I know there are those who want no bill at all on this general subject. I know that there are those who feel that, if we are to have any legislation on this subject, it should be the most restrictive and most repressive possible legislation that this Congress could enact into law.

There are others who regard this bill as the most vital and important piece of legislation that this Congress will consider. It is most important to many of us because what we do here this week will affect the lives of the people of a great section of our country—an area of 80,000 square miles, comprising parts of seven States, for the TVA service area embraces parts of seven States and has a population of 6 million people.

Today, more than 150 municipally owned power systems and REA cooperative distribution systems in this area have an investment of $781 million, including the great steam plant being constructed by the city of Memphis, Tenn., which is now nearing completion and will go into service in a few months.

There are more than 1½ million power customers in the TVA area who, last year, purchased 19,000,900,000 kilowatthours of electricity. The TVA is the sole source of power for these 150 distributing systems with their 1½ million power consumers.

Therefore, I repeat, what we do here this week vitally affects the 6 million people of this great section of our country and these 6 million people are necessarily interested and concerned in this legislation and what we do about it. Our people need this legislation to finance their future power needs because as we all know the TVA has been denied any appropriations for necessary additions to its power capacities for the past 6 years. We are all aware of the continuing repressive actions and climate toward the TVA which has existed

during those years. We know that no appropriations at all have been made for TVA's power needs in the past several years.

During these last few years, TVA has been using portions of the profits from power sales to make some needed additions to its power system. But, we all know that no utility can possibly keep up with the demand for power in its area if it is limited to using only the revenue from its own power operations. The additional capacity the TVA has built and is building with its power revenue will not be enough to meet the growing demand for TVA power inside its present service area. Its margin of capacity over the demand is getting narrower and narrower. Unless it is able to find other funds, this great area of our country is certain to suffer a power shortage in 2 or 3 years.

What we will consider this week is an alternative method of financing—self-financing by the TVA and by the people of the area. A good portion of the bonds that will be authorized by this legislation will be sold to the people of the TVA area—and I assure you that they will buy them. They will be gilt-edge bonds which will be paid off by the TVA from the power sales to the people of the TVA area.

Surely, at this time, when we are so concerned with the need for reducing appropriations, the Congress will permit the people of our area to finance their own progress through enactment of this self-financing legislation. The bonds are taxable. They are not tax exempt bonds and they will thus produce revenue for the Government and yet the bonds will not be obligations of the Government and will not increase the national debt.

In short, this bill will permit the self-financing of the TVA—it will permit a great agency of our Government to meet its needs and obligations—and the local people who purchase the TVA power will not only pay the entire eventual cost, but they will purchase a large proportion of the bonds when they are issued and thus themselves finance the cost of the power they need.

Mr. Speaker, in our discussions on the TVA—a subject on which almost everyone has a most pronounced point of view—I sometimes think that we become so concerned with "fear" that one region of our great common country may make progress at the expense of another area, that we lose sight of the great contributions to the welfare of the entire Nation that the TVA has made and continues to make.

I am continually surprised to discover that many do not realize that well over 50 percent of the power produced—52 percent at this time—by the TVA goes to meet national defense needs in Federal establishments—in other words to the Federal Government itself. Among the great Federal agencies which obtained great blocks of power from the TVA are the Atomic Energy Commission plants at Oak Ridge and Paducah, Ky.; the great Arnold Engineering Development Center with its jet windtunnel testing facility at Tullahoma, Tenn. in the district which I have the honor to represent. There is also the great Red Stone Arsenal at Huntsville, Ala., where Dr. von Braun and other brilliant scientists are developing, improving, and perfecting the Thor, the Jupiter and our overall rocket and missile potentials and capabilities.

The savings in the cost of power to the Government as a result of the above direct service to Federal agencies are in themselves enormous. For several years now, the Federal Government has used more than 30 billion kilowatt-hours of TVA power annually. A saving of just 1 mill per kilowatt will represent a saving of $30 million a year but this is not the entire saving. As we know, the private utility industry has constructed two large powerplants that also serve the Atomic Energy Commission—EEI in southern Illinois and OVEC in Portsmouth, Ohio. The contracts under which this power is delivered were designed in such a way so as to come as close as possible to the TVA rate and in fact they are almost identical. In other words, these plants were built to meet the challenge of the TVA rates. Now these plants supply AEC with about 20 billion kilowatt-hours annually. And here a difference of only 1 mil per kilowatt would make a difference of $20 million a year in the cost of this power. Of course, nobody can tell what the AEC would have had to pay for power if the TVA had not existed, but in any event it is not at all likely that it would have been able to buy power as cheaply as it now does. So that the savings to the Federal Government in the cost of the power it uses itself, in its own defense establishments, are enormous—I would venture to guess in the area of $150 million a year.

There are many other ways in which the TVA has benefited the whole Nation. I think it is beyond argument that by providing a yardstick of power costs it has held down the cost of electric power throughout the country. It is notable that although we have suffered inflation costs in almost every other field, the cost of power throughout the United States has risen very little.

The TVA has also helped to develop more efficient means of generating electric power. The giant steamplants which it has been constructing have served as guinea pigs in engineering new and better steam generators which have been installed not only in the TVA area but through private utilities throughout the country.

In addition, the TVA has also helped the national economy in the purchases by TVA—and the 150 TVA power distributors—of materials and equipment. Over the past 12 years alone the TVA has bought $1,700 million worth of equipment and about $1 billion of that was purchased from States outside the TVA area.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to insert in the RECORD at this point a list of TVA procurement sources showing the amounts of purchases made in the various States of the United States last year and for the entire 25-year period that the TVA has been in existence. This table shows clearly that some portion of the funds expended by the TVA has gone to every State in the Union and that, indeed, most of the TVA money has been spent outside the TVA area:

TVA procurement sources

	1958	Total (1934-58)
Alabama	$4,085,918	$136,282,777
Georgia	1,080,134	31,255,106
Kentucky	42,470,818	221,187,036
Mississippi	231,017	9,452,169
North Carolina	245,815	14,524,458
Tennessee	40,253,475	486,824,250
Virginia	5,937,621	29,481,906
Total Valley States	94,304,798	929,007,702
Arizona	13,143	142,940
Arkansas	11,932	1,240,729
California	826,645	12,030,849
Colorado	22,730	1,197,154
Connecticut	369,385	8,384,414
Delaware	5,738	19,287,650
District of Columbia	71,234	2,574,982
Florida	164,716	8,472,350
Idaho		2,302,188
Illinois	13,027,423	149,059,385
Indiana	3,978,114	28,664,361
Iowa	79,542	1,760,898
Kansas	35,449	639,819
Louisiana	963,677	12,103,501
Maine	15,514	620,277
Maryland	892,084	7,564,450
Massachusetts	1,830,759	42,347,587
Michigan	1,365,356	22,339,208
Minnesota	71,615	8,482,068
Missouri	1,917,398	30,074,369
Montana	259	166,084
Nebraska	8,405	514,269
Nevada	187	139,108
New Hampshire	83,908	1,805,847
New Jersey	1,631,610	45,926,147
New Mexico	3,688	59,219
New York	20,822,877	189,965,956
North Dakota		54,009
Ohio	4,364,384	137,947,812
Oklahoma	1,203,828	5,606,991
Oregon	133,485	1,805,890
Pennsylvania	8,378,664	348,918,170
Rhode Island	226,072	2,526,362
South Carolina	43,971	1,935,643
South Dakota		708,660
Texas	820,065	8,172,520
Utah	786	2,882,587
Vermont	8,873	211,289
Washington	11,043	1,383,254
West Virginia	70,389	4,774,292
Wisconsin	1,346,649	64,094,053
Wyoming		20,113
Total other States	64,821,597	1,178,917,054
Foreign	422,763	5,676,659
Total	159,549,158	2,113,601,415

Furthermore, the TVA has stimulated the national economy by creating a great market for new electric appliances. In the TVA area, the purchases of electric appliances are running at the rate of a quarter of a billion dollars a year and since the war two and a half billion dollars worth have been purchased. I can assure you that somewhere around 99 percent of those appliances came from outside the Tennessee Valley.

In view of the above, it is apparent that this legislation is not only vitally necessary to the TVA area, but that its passage will benefit the Nation as a whole.

BILL REPRESENTS REASONABLE COMPROMISE

I want to point out and to emphasize that this bill, H.R. 3460, represents a reasonable compromise of many views after long and detailed consideration and deliberation. The issues of this bill have been debated both in the Congress and outside of Congress for more than 5 years.

No fewer than five sets of hearings have been held in the House and in the Senate on this legislation in the 84th, 85th, and the present Congress. The Senate passed a compromise version in the last session. But, the House in its crowded schedule did not get an opportunity to act on this matter, notwithstanding the excessive hearings and a favorable report on the bill.

Thus, the bill as it has reached us here has had just about all the sharp edges knocked off it and all the most controversial issues have been modified and compromised.

PRESIDENT RECOMMENDS BILL IN BUDGET MESSAGES

I might point out too that this legislation was proposed by President Eisenhower in his budget message of January 17, 1955—and I quote:

The Tennessee Valley Authority is giving immediate attention to the possibilities of financing further expansion of its power system by means other than Federal appropriations. The Authority has been requested to complete its studies in time to permit consideration by the Congress in this session of any legislation that may be necessary.

The requested legislation was submitted to the Congress later in 1955 and hearings were held on it in that year. On January 16, 1956, in the budget for the fiscal year 1957, we find this:

There is pending before the Congress legislation which the administration has proposed for financing steam-power facilities of the TVA through the sale of revenue bonds.

On January 16, 1957, in the budget for the fiscal year 1958 we find the following:

Legislation is recommended to authorize the TVA, subject to regular budgetary review, to finance new generating facilities by the sale of revenue bonds.

In his budget message of January 13, 1958, the President said—and I quote:

In accordance with my earlier recommendations, both Houses of the Congress have had under consideration legislation which would authorize the sale of revenue bonds by the Tennessee Valley Authority. I hope that action on appropriate legislation will be speedily concluded.

In the budget for this year, we find the following:

Proposed legislation will again be recommended to the Congress, its purpose being to permit the issuance of revenue bonds as an additional means of financing needed power facilities.

So Mr. Speaker, the President advanced this idea for this legislation in the first place and he has repeatedly called for passage of this legislation in his various messages to the Congress.

The members of the present Board of Directors of the TVA—Gen. Herbert D. Vogel, Mr. Arnold R. Jones, and Dr. Frank J. Welch—who has, as we know, recently resigned—were all appointed by President Eisenhower. I think it is significant that this Board has approved this legislation. May I quote from the letter written to our colleague, Mr. DAVIS, stating the Board's opinion on this bill:

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY,
BOARD OF DIRECTORS,
July 29, 1958.

Hon. CLIFFORD DAVIS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

In response to your inquiry we welcome the opportunity to express our deep concern that the legislation now before your committee to authorize TVA to issue revenue bonds be favorably reported and approved by the House at this session of the Congress. Enactment of self-financing legislation is urgently required to enable TVA to meet the growing defense and domestic demands for power in the area. We believe Senate bill 1869 as approved by the Senate last year provides a workable basis on which to undertake this new means of financing. Managerial flexibility commensurate with responsibilities delegated to the Board by law should be retained in bill in order to permit effective and efficient operations, and to insure minimum costs, including those of procurement, design, construction, and interest. TVA's plans, programs, and experience under the new legislation will be fully reported to the President and the Congress each year under existing law, as well as under special provisions for consultation and reporting incorporated in that bill. In addition the ceiling of $750 million included in the bill means that the Congress will have an early opportunity for full review of our initial experience. If the legislation is enacted we pledge our best efforts to administer it effectively.

HERBERT D. VOGEL, *Chairman.*
A. R. JONES, *Director.*
FRANK J. WELCH, *Director.*

H.R. 3460 represents a reasonable compromise of many views. The provisions of this legislation reflect 4 years of very careful analysis and consideration. In that time and in the process of going through the committees and through passage in the other body, this legislation has been changed and amended as no other legislation in my recollection ever has been. There are still some things in here that some people appear not to like. I might say that there are some things in this bill that we who represent the TVA area would prefer to have otherwise. As it stands now before you it is a reasonable bill that offers a reasonable solution to the continuing TVA controversy. As a matter of fact, in the form that it comes before you this bill apparently meets the approval of at least the greater number of the private power companies adjoining the TVA.

In this connection, I want to call your attention to the fact that Mr. Harllee Branch, Jr., president of the Southern Co., which is the parent company of five of the utilities which serve the area adjacent to the TVA, appeared before the committee. During the hearings Mr. Cramer asked Mr. Branch—and I quote:

As far as you are concerned, with the Vinson amendment, which merely provides congressional control over expansion of territories, and the Treasury Department and the Bureau of the Budget review of the actual selling and timing of the bonds, are you satisfied the latter as well as the former is needed so far as Government control of this bond issue is concerned; is that correct?

Mr. Branch replied—and I quote:

With respect to my companies, if there is protection against an expansion of TVA into our territory, my companies, as companies, have no concern:

He added:

The only thing I can speak for them on is to the point, please do not permit an unwarranted and justified encroachment in our territory.

In other words, he said that whatever his own personal opinions as an individual might be as to Treasury or Bureau of the Budget control, and speaking solely as a representative of his companies, and on behalf of the companies, their concern was for a territorial limitation.

It has been 4 years since the President made his first proposal for self-financing the TVA, and 4 years since Congress began to consider this measure. Meanwhile, the TVA has received no appropriations for increasing its power capacity. TVA's ability to meet the power needs of its area is becoming desperately limited.

A crisis caused by a shortage of power would deprive our people of the power needed for normal growth and would severely threaten the ability of the area to enjoy, on equal terms, the opportunity for development with the rest of the Nation.

The people of the TVA area have been thwarted on every hand and from many fronts—appropriations have been denied, opposition has been expressed against any further use of surplus corporate funds; and now sincere efforts to pass a workable and equitable self-financing plan are being opposed.

For years, the opponents of the TVA have been telling us that they are opposed to financing TVA's power operations through appropriations and suggesting that TVA go to the open money market for funds for additional capacity. That is precisely what the legislation now being considered by Congress proposes—to let TVA stand on its own feet. For years the enemies of TVA have been saying that they had no desire to destroy the TVA but merely wanted to remove the TVA from dependence on the Treasury. That is precisely what this legislation proposes. Despite his own expressed misgivings about the TVA, the President has said that he wants to maintain the TVA at maximum efficiency but he insists that he wants to free the Treasury of the financial burden for TVA's power function. That is precisely what this legislation would accomplish.

It is time that we disposed of this problem and faced up to our responsibilities, not only to the TVA area, but to the Nation. I, therefore, urge my colleagues not to be misled by misrepresentations and propaganda about this legislation.

Self-Financing Bill Will Increase TVA Payments to the Treasury

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
May 4, 1959

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, in connection with H.R. 3460, which we are scheduled to consider this week, one of the points at issue is the matter of the payments which TVA should make on account of the appropriation investment in the TVA power system.

There is much misunderstanding on how H.R. 3460 affects the payments by the TVA to the Treasury. In order to clear up these misunderstandings, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD an analysis of H.R. 3460 in regard to this matter.

The fact of the matter is that under H.R. 3460 the payments of the TVA into the Treausry will be at least 33⅓ percent greater than required under present law.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I believe a review of the record of the TVA in meeting its payment obligations under the present law is relevant and significant because it indicates and evidences the willingness and desire of the TVA to go far beyond the strict legal requirements of the statutes in discharging its obligations to the Treasury.

The TVA was required to make payments on the appropriation investment in 1948—a little over 10 years ago—through a rider to the Government Corporations Appropriations Act of 1948. The provisions of this rider are quite complicated. There are two interpretations of the payment requirements—which we may call the minimum and maximum requirements. It is very interesting to note that the payments the TVA has actually made in the 10-year period from 1948 and through the fiscal year of 1958, are greater than either the minimum or maximum requirements. This is clearly indicated by the following table which shows the minimum payment in column A, the maximum required payment in column B, and the actual payments made by TVA in column C.

SCHEDULE C–1.—*Payments to U.S. Treasury from power income under provisions of the Government Corporations Appropriation Act, 1948*

Fiscal year	(A) Minimum required under 1948 law	(B) Maximum required under 1948 law	(C) Actual payments
1948	$10,500,000		$10,500,000
1949	13,000,000	$8,705,981	16,000,000
1950	15,500,000	17,411,962	21,500,000
1951	18,000,000	26,561,589	30,500,000
1952	20,500,000	36,295,559	42,500,000
1953	23,000,000	48,551,875	57,500,000
1954	25,500,000	66,034,351	77,500,000
1955	28,000,000	87,627,219	127,500,000
1956	30,500,000	115,579,248	186,500,000
1957	33,000,000	148,436,909	216,500,000
1958	87,039,810	183,752,757	226,500,000

It will be noted first that the payments made by the TVA each year have exceeded both the minimum and the maximum requirements of the law. It will also be noted that the minimum legal payment required at the end of fiscal year 1958 was $87 million. The TVA has actually paid $226,500,000 or $139 million more than the minimum legal requirement.

Furthermore, it will be seen that under the most generous interpretation of the present law the TVA would have been required to pay $183,750,000 by the end of fiscal year 1958. Thus, the $226,500,000 the TVA actually has paid in that period is $42.8 million more than required by the most generous interpretation of the law.

H.R. 3460, which we will be considering, repeals the present payment provisions and substitutes for them provisions which will guarantee in return to the Federal Government at least 33⅓ percent more than under present law. I call the attention of my colleagues to the following paragraphs in the report of the Public Works Committee on H.R. 3460.

PAYMENTS BY TVA ON ACCOUNT OF THE APPROPRIATION INVESTMENT

Approximately $1,200 million of the total investment in the TVA power system has been supplied by appropriations and transfers of property from other agencies. The bill recognizes the position of the Government as the owner of the Corporation, and provides for a return on that investment in the nature of a dividend equal to the Government's current average cost of money. The Government is thus assured of a return equal to the current cost of the money invested in the past. In addition, there is provision for a payment of $10 million per year in reduction of the appropriation investment.

These cash payments are substantially larger than those required under present law. They represent, of course, only a part of the actual earnings by the Government on its investment. Over the years TVA has earned enough to cover operating and maintenance expenses, including full straight-line depreciation, and to provide in addition an average return on the total investment of 4 percent. That part of the earnings which has not been paid into the Treasury has been reinvested in new power facilities. As a result, the TVA power system is today a Government asset of much greater value than the net amount of the appropriations invested.

Some opponents of the bill have also suggested that TVA's obligation to make payments on account of the appropriation investment be placed on a parity with its obligation to bondholders. This suggestion disregards the fact that the Government is not a creditor of TVA, but its owner and sole stockholder. Bondholders always have a claim prior to that of stockholders, but the stockholders own and control the corporation and share in the equity built up by earnings and the bondholders do not. While the Government, as owner, is thus in a basically different position from that of bondholders, it will be assured of receiving the payments provided for since the bill requires that TVA charge rates for power sufficient to provide for the specified payments as a return on, and in reduction of, the appropriation investment, as well as payments on its bonds. The bill further protects the owner, the Government, as well as the lenders, the purchasers of TVA's bonds, by a requirement that TVA reinvest all depreciation accruals, or use them to pay off bonds or to reduce the appropriation investment.

Let me translate this into dollars and cents. The present Federal investment in the TVA is about $1.2 billion. Under the most generous interpretation of the present law, the TVA would be required to pay about 2½ percent of the investment annually or about $30 million. Under H.R. 3460, the TVA would be required to pay to the Treasury as dividends, an amount equal to the cost of the money to the Treasury. This year this would amount to something over 3 percent. Thus, the TVA would be required under H.R. 3460 to pay $36 million as dividends. In addition, it would have to pay $10 million toward retiring the Government investment. These two items total about $46 million this year or about $15 million more than would be required under present law.

In addition to this, let us not overlook that H.R. 3460 provides that the TVA must use all depreciation accruals either to pay off bonds, to reduce the appropriation investment, or to reinvest them in power facilities.

The fact that the TVA has repaid to the Treasury under present law far more than it was required by the strict legal interpretation of the law, indicates that we may well expect the TVA in the future as in the past to do more than the law requires.

Mr. Speaker, to summarize the requirements on the payments to the Treasury under H.R. 3460 we will be providing for a much greater return to the Federal Treasury than under present law.

TVA has a great record of payment into the U.S. Treasury—ahead of schedule.

Do Our Job in India Today or the Reds Will Tomorrow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 5, 1959

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, today's newspapers report that two of the outstanding young men in America's political life—the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] and the Vice President, Mr. NIXON, pleaded eloquently yesterday for assistance for India.

Support for this position was argued emphatically and eloquently by the Milwaukee Journal last Sunday. In doing so they quote the Reverend Ralph Keithahn, who returned last year after 32 years as a Congregational missionary in India. In a recent speech before the Wausau, Wis., Rotary Club, Keithahn, as the Milwaukee Journal said, put the basic issue about as simply as anyone could, as follows:

If we don't do the job in India today, the Communists will tomorrow.

And Keithahn went on to describe some of the encouraging progress India has already made.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this editorial from the Milwaukee Journal be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DO OUR JOB IN INDIA TODAY, OR THE REDS WILL TOMORROW

There will be a big meeting in Washington this week to discuss India and its relationships with the United States. There will be many speakers and thousands of words. It is unlikely, however, that anyone will put the basic issue any simpler than the Reverend Ralph Keithahn did to the Wausau Rotary Club the other day.

"If we don't do our job in India today, the Communists will tomorrow," he said, according to the Wausau Record-Herald.

Keithahn returned last year after 32 years as a Congregational missionary in India.

The speaker emphasized the gains made in India in its few years of independence. He told how 555 separate states have been integrated. Women, children, and untouchables enjoy unprecedented freedom. Hindus, Moslems, and Christians work together. He told how the British had dug but 50 wells in one state in 50 years; free India has dug or deepened 50 wells in that state in 7 years. He said that there was not a blacktop road in Madras state under the British, now every major road is blacktopped.

Some of India's progress was "almost miraculous," Keithahn explained. But there is a long way to go. And the Indians, many of them hungry and ragged, "are going to turn to the people who get the job done," he said.

The Labor Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 5, 1959

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I send to the desk an editorial from the Friday, May 1, edition of the Charlotte Observer newspaper, Charlotte, N.C., entitled "How Stands the Labor Bill?—Stronger Than Many Think," dealing with the Kennedy-Ervin labor reform bill we recently passed in this body.

I believe this editorial best explains the situation the Senate found itself in, and gives credit to a splendid piece of work rendered by the Senate in passing the Kennedy-Ervin bill.

True, this bill does not contain the most that some wanted, or the least that some did not want, but, as the editorial points out, King Solomon and Henry Clay could not have sat down and written a labor bill acceptable to everyone.

I request unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Charlotte Observer, May 1, 1959]

HOW STANDS THE LABOR BILL?—STRONGER THAN MANY THINK

King Solomon and Henry Clay could not sit down together and write a labor bill in 1959 that would be acceptable on both sides of the labor-management fence.

The U.S. Senate has tried, nevertheless. It has put together a bill through the double process of leisurely committee discussion and hectic floor amendments. And out of the pressure cooker has come, we think, a remarkably good piece of legislation.

It strikes hard at the thieves, the racketeers and the irresponsibles who, although a minority, have dragged down the good name of the entire labor movement.

It amends the Taft-Hartley Act to deal with some of the blatant union excesses in labor-management relations.

A very great deal has been said about what the bill does not do. Here are some of the things that it does do as it leaves the Senate and faces a relatively bright future in the House:

1. It requires detailed public reporting of union financial operations, including all income of union officers and loans of union money to officers.

2. It bars persons convicted of serious crimes from serving as union officers within 5 years after completing prison terms.

3. It requires a full public reporting of all trusteeships imposed on locals by national or international unions. It prescribes minimum standards for trusteeships. It limits them to 12 months unless the union can prove they should be continued. (Trusteeships have been a favorite device of the Teamsters Union in promoting top-to-bottom control of local union affairs.)

4. It requires full public reporting of financial transactions and holdings by union officials which might give rise to conflicts of interest. As in the other reporting sections, the Secretary of Labor is given broad investigatory and enforcement powers.

5. It bans unions from paying legal fees or fines of anyone indicted or convicted of violating the proposed law.

6. It requires secret ballot elections every 5 years in international unions, every 3 years in locals.

7. It protects members' rights to nominate candidates in union elections and to vote without reprisal. It bars use of union money to promote any individual candidacy.

8. It gives each candidate the right to have observers present at the balloting and vote counting. It gives each candidate the right to distribute literature to all members.

9. It empowers the Federal courts to direct new elections where improper conduct is found. Union members are declared free to bring Federal suits when they are the victims of serious undemocratic procedures in their union.

10. It bars shakedown picketing designed to extort money from employers. In some cases it also bars picketing to recruit members or to force employers to bargain.

11. It forbids unions to get common carriers to refuse to handle goods of certain firms. This is the "hot cargo" technique used by the Teamsters Union to put indirect pressure on strike bound or nonunion employers.

12. It makes it a Federal crime to embezzle union funds.

13. It places a fiduciary responsibility on union officials who handle funds and requires them to be bonded.

This is not weak, pussyfooting legislation. It may not be strong enough to satisfy Senator GOLDWATER or the National Association of Manufacturers, but neither is it weak enough to satisfy Dave Beck, or Jimmy Hoffa, or the Chicago labor thugs. Most of its provisions are soundly based in the ills and abuses that were paraded, month after dreary month, before the Senate Labor Rackets Committee.

Stronger legislation may still be required in such areas as secondary boycott and shakedown picketing. But the important thing now is to get this law onto the books at this session of Congress.

It would be something of a tragedy if, for the second year in succession, those who want everything prevent the country from getting anything.

Urgent Need for Further Cancer Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 5, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, because the Nation has just marked Cancer Control Month, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a provocative column on the whole general subject of malignancy in disease which appeared in the Oregon Daily Statesman, of Salem, Oreg., on April 27, 1959. The author of the column is Charles A. Sprague, editor of the Statesman, and former distinguished Governor of our State. Governor Sprague effectively describes the insidious nature of cancer as a disease which frequently strikes without symptoms or warning. His column should emphasize to us the importance of not only supporting organizations like the American Cancer Society, but also in voting more generous funds for the National Cancer Institute, which sponsors so many urgently necessary research programs throughout the land.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the column by Charles A. Sprague be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IT SEEMS TO ME

(By Charles A. Sprague)

Cancer isn't a pleasant subject to discuss, but April is the month when public attention is directed to this disease. The month's bulletin of the State Board of Health gives a résumé of Oregon's experience with this killer-disease. The most important fact reported is the growing incidence of lung cancer. It has become the principal site of deaths from cancer. Moreover the rate has shown steady and alarming increase over the years. Back in 1940 deaths from lung cancer in Oregon were at the rate of 5.9 per 100,000 population, which is the usual way of measuring frequency. This mounted to 12.3 in 1950 and to 19.3 in 1959.

The division between the sexes is pronounced. Of the 334 deaths from lung cancer reported in 1958, 287 were of males and only 47 of females. The male rate was at a high 33.2 per 100,000. Other leading loca-

tions of fatal cancers for men were prostate, stomach, large intestine, and leukemia; for women, breast, large intestine, uterus, ovary, and stomach.

The report has one hopeful note: Total cancer mortality dropped from 2,462 in 1957 to 2,426 in 1958. The decrease, however, was too small to indicate a trend. In 1950 the overall rate was 136.5 per 100,000, and in 1959, 140.3.

In age distribution the largest number of deaths from cancer occurred among those 65 years of age and older—1,374 or 14 percent. Second in this comparison was the group aged 45 to 54 years—848 deaths.

The fact which calls for relief is the mortality from lung cancer. Many authorities attribute it to smoking cigarettes. If that is a primary cause it looks as though filters have been of no avail. The statistics on lung cancer mortality give notice to males of the hazard of this disease; and they should lend urgency to the researchers who are seeking some means of preventing or curing cancer. It is appointed unto all once to die, but the goal is to have people live out a normal life span, and to be spared the suffering which comes from the ravages of cancer. In view of the testimony of competent scientists who have found cigarette smoking a probable cause of lung cancer the individual should realize the risk he takes if he clings to the cigarette habit.

Friday evening a San Francisco station televised an operation for lung tumor done on a patient in Stanford hospital. The patient didn't know he had a growth in his lung until it showed up in a routine X-ray. An attending physician described lung cancer as "insidious and silent." This points to the virtue of those chest fluoroscopings which aid greatly in detection both of tuberculosis and lung cancer.

Tribute to Gov. Edmund G. Brown, of California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 5, 1959

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I wish to call attention to an article from the Sacramento Bee of April 26, by Herbert L. Phillips, veteran McClatchy Newspaper Service political writer, who points out that Edmund G. (Pat) Brown, on his 54th birthday, has emerged as one of the leading political factors in the Far West.

Herbert L. (Pete) Phillips is one of the Nation's best informed and most experienced political writers. He has been the political editor of the McClatchy newspapers for the past 25 years. In that capacity he has followed closely several presidential campaigns, and is one of the outstanding authorities on California political history. His remarks about Governor Brown take on a significance which should be seriously considered. I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BROWN, AT 54, EMERGES AS NEW FAR WEST POLITICAL FACTOR

(By Herbert L. Phillips)

Gov. Edmund G. (Pat) Brown was 54 this last week. He cut his birthday cake with the comfortable realization that he had smashed more political records, upset more political applecarts and caused a greater stir in general during his 54th year than in all the rest of his life put together.

This seems an appropriate time to review the 12 months which have changed Brown from an able but run of the mill state attorney general to the acknowledged west coast strong boy of the Democratic Party.

Just a year ago, Brown, who had been unwilling to try for governor in 1954, was in the early stages of a gubernatorial campaign against nationally acclaimed opposition, backed by a powerful and long entrenched Republican hierarchy. He was hopeful, energetic, and full of fight, but frankly in doubt about where his support was going to come from and how much of it he could count on.

When the shooting was all over, Brown suddenly found himself hailed as a political giant killer.

The country was impressed with his triumph over William F. Knowland, long time Republican leader of the United States Senate who frequently had been mentioned in Old Guard circles for the presidency. It was astounded at his victory margin of more than 1 million votes.

Somewhere along the line there appears to have been a vast miscalculation of Brown's political character. Less than a year ago, a national magazine, undertaking a full dress analysis of the emerging Democratic standard bearer, pictured Brown as a kind of campaign worry wart, unsure of himself, desperately eager to please everybody, jittery about trivialities and hesitant to make decisions.

This is a far cry from the current estimate. Today Democratic politicians are touting the new Governor as an important Pacific coast factor in next year's presidential campaign. And, less than a week ago, Republican leaders were accusing him of dictatorial tactics, of unprecedented and unwholesome exercise of executive power to subvest the legislative process and drive the administration's many sided program through to enactment.

The truth is that Brown, in his first 3½ months in office, has proved to be a much stronger Governor than most of his critics, or even many of his friends, ever dreamed he would be. Given executive power, he has combined friendliness, good nature, and personal charm with an unexpected determination to fight, with considerable organizing skill and negotiating talent, for the things he advocated in last year's campaign and since has recommended to the legislature.

His responsible liberalism legislative programs, now entering the session's crucial stage, are nearly all on the move. Some of them have gone through to final enactment.

He has steered through and signed a State fair employment practices law. He will stump the State for it, he says, if opponents carry it to referendum.

Already he has obtained enough new tax money to offset an inherited treasury deficit from the previous Republican administration. A new California water fund has been established. Progress has been made on Brown's various regulatory, election, consumer protection, and labor reform bills. His parliamentary successes, thus far, have been surprising. His serious setbacks have been comparatively few.

Measures for more than 50 percent of his $202 million budget balancing tax program, to cope with another threatened 1959–69 general fund deficit, are halfway through the legislature.

Far from excessively cautious or indecisive, Governor Brown has evinced a marked willingness to tackle his program adversaries headon. That goes for the special interest lobbies opposing his revenue and other key proposals. Few Governors have stepped so sharply on so many sensitive toes in so short a time.

It is, of course, far too early to calculate accurately whether the Governor's flashy beginning will be climaxed by total victory on the big issues of the present legislature. The session runs until June 19. The really tough days are still ahead.

And it obviously is much too early for the loud tom tom beating which some of the Governor's well-wishers have started in connection with 1960, and their new hero's potential influence as a California favorite son.

Probably nobody realizes these things more keenly than Brown himself. He could land on his political face very easily if, for instance, his budget balancing tax program should fall apart during these next 2 months or his efforts to work out a State water program should fail.

Meantime, there is no denying that Brown's administration has opened auspiciously, that his resolute and progressive approach to State problems has been impressive, and that few figures in modern California politics have leaped into prominence with such rapidity.

The Governor can look back on his 54th year as one of great personal accomplishment and much progress toward governmental achievements as well. He will be a very fortunate man, and an even more potent force in Democratic politics, if the record book reads as well when he is 55.

Loyalty Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 4, 1959

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, on last Friday, May 1, Americans throughout the world observed Loyalty Day for the first time as a countermeasure to Communist May Day activities.

This past weekend was known as Loyalty Weekend because many of the parades and observances were held on Saturday and Sunday in communities throughout the United States. One of the most spectacular parades and demonstrations of American loyalty took place in South Hadley Falls, Mass., in my congressional district, where the parade was sponsored by the Massachusetts Department of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. More than 5,000 marchers participated, including Mayor Thomas J. O'Connor, of Springfield; Mayor Walter M. Grocki, of Chicopee; and Mayor Samuel Resnic, of Holyoke.

Mr. Speaker, the first observance of America's Loyalty Day was sparked by the Veterans of Foreign Wars who received the cooperation of President Eisenhower and the Congress. Mr. John W. Mahan, commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United

States, described what loyalty really means in an exclusive article for Parade magazines published Sunday. I had intended to include Commander Mahan's article with my remarks yesterday, but I was pleased to note that Congressman METCALF had it inserted in the RECORD with his remarks.

Balanced Television Programing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 5, 1959

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, a shocking picture of next fall's television offerings is presented by TV Columnist Anthony La Camera of the Boston Evening American and the Boston Advertiser.

He notes that there are three prime night-time hours between 7:30 and 10:30 p.m. 7 nights a week, and 3 networks, so that there are 63 hours of prime TV time each week. Although the Voice of Firestone, after 30 years, has been denied prime time, he notes there is prime time next fall for 18 crime and adventure shows and there is choice time for 27 westerns, which comprise 16½ hours of program time on the networks' schedules.

Mr. President, is this balanced programing? Does any one here believe that all Americans want is violence and murder, either of the long-ago frontier or the current gangster-con man variety. Surely the networks can, without help either from Congress or other outside critics, pry themselves loose from their supine slavery to the ratings which would seem to be ruling our airwaves. Even if—and it is a very "iffy" if—the ratings accurately reflected public opinion, as far as the majority goes, could we not have some attention paid to the minority? We have only so many airwaves, and they must somehow serve all the people.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD Mr. La Camera's columns of April 16 and April 19.

There being no objection, the columns were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Boston (Mass.) Advertiser, Apr. 19, 1959]

LOTS OF TIME FOR GUNS

(By Anthony La Camera)

At this moment, it isn't very easy for a TV columnist to follow that cheerful bit of advice which states: If you can't say something nice, then don't say anything at all.

For one thing, it would be extremely difficult to say anything nice about the progressively downward course which television programing has taken. For another, an individual would be remiss in his duty not to say something about the situation.

It is a situation which has been brought into sharp focus by the shocking case of Voice of Firestone and of the disillusioning implications which derive from it. As you may know by now this highly respected musical series is ending its 31-year broadcasting tenure on June 1—despite the desire of its sponsor to keep it on the telewaves in prime evening time.

ABC–TV doesn't want it any longer on Monday nights at 9, or anywhere else within the prime nighttime hours between 7:30 and 10:30. CBS–TV and NBC–TV each offered it a late-afternoon Sunday spot, but the sponsor declined on the understandable grounds that his program deserved a more advantageous showcase.

And so, there is no truly choice time available on network television for Voice of Firestone, even though its sponsor is willing to foot the bill. There is no room for it, even though the three networks are scheduling a shameful, staggering total of 27 western shows in their weekly lineups. Not a single half hour for a weekly good-music series, but plenty of prime segments for the 27 westerns which comprise 16½ hours of program time on the networks' schedules.

ABC–TV, which bumped Firestone off its roster for next fall, carries 10 of these westerns—three of them in the hour-long category. It is also the network which devotes 8 hours a week to Dick Clark and the musical inanities he dispenses to immature audiences. And Clark, who has displayed little talent, wit, or discrimination on his current programs, also will have a panel show on ABC next season—in prime time, yet.

So desperately determined are the networks to outrate each other in every time segment that they seem to have forgotten elementary principles of balanced programing. NBC–TV, which now carries nine westerns, is producing several more for the season ahead. CBS–TV, which now runs eight, has two or three others in the works. The same goes for ABC–TV.

How can there be room for Voice of Firestone on networks which have downgraded their competitive efforts to this ridiculous business of fighting gunfire with gunfire? Even in the nonwestern category, violence and murder have assumed unprecedented importance in programming structure. Although westerns represent the most overemphasized trend in video annals, you may be surprised to learn that the networks' prime evening hours also contain 18 crime and adventure shows.

NBC–TV alone schedules nine of these, CBS–TV runs five, and ABC–TV has four. As in the case of the westerns, there'll be several more crime and adventure entries next fall. The networks have yet to learn the simple virtue of moderation, and then they wonder why they are buffeted on all sides by individuals and agencies fighting for more equitable program operations.

The issue, it should be pointed out here, is not whether you or I personally like westerns. A reasonable number of good westerns is certainly most welcome on television. Nor does the issue revolve around one's personal feedings concerning "whodunits," which also rate reasonable exposure at proper viewing times.

The point of the whole thing is that millions of people who enjoy Voice of Firestone, even if they represent a minority, deserve some network attention on a weekly basis—and I don't mean in the inconvenient Sunday-afternoon strip known as the intellectual ghetto. Nor should they be expected to settle constantly for the fringe benefits which television magnanimously tosses their way.

Let us indulge briefly, in some simple arithmetic. Each night includes 3 hours of prime viewing time, and each network thereby has 21 hours of such time per week. Since there are 3 networks, the total number of prime viewing hours on network television is 63. Is it asking too much, then, for the networks to devote just a few of those 63 hours to weekly quality fare like Voice of Firestone?

It would seem to me that television belongs to all the people, and it would also seem that it is impossible for television to serve all the people merely by glutting its choicest viewing periods with westerns, crime shows and situation comedies. The test of any truly democratic operation, I maintain, is how well it observes the rights of both majority and minority groups.

Television has not always done too well by the minority audiences, I'm afraid, and the case of Voice of Firestone is a most recent and glaring example. Its forced departure may well result in a sizable batch of protesting viewer mail, and may it help to convince the television networks that they have gone too far with their one-dimensional, easy-way-out programing methods.

It is much better, and to their own advantage, that they be convinced in this constructive fashion than be harassed by stronger and more embarrassing pressures. All we can hope, meanwhile, is that they already haven't pushed their luck to the breaking point.

[From the Boston (Mass.) Evening American, Apr. 16, 1959]

FIRESTONE: A LAMENT

(By Anthony La Camera)

This has been a year of righteous wailing and public self-pity on the part of network television executives. Scheming critics are out to get them, some have complained. Congressional investigators are seeking to curtail their freedom, others have cried. They cannot operate properly under such pressures, they have bleated.

As a regular observer of the TV scene, I must confess to being awfully fed up with these embarrassing lamentations. If the networks are criticized, it is because of their own shortcomings and sortsightedness. If they are harassed by threats of Federal interference, it is because of their own inability or unwillingness to cope sensibly with programing problems.

To cite a most recent example, I cannot think of a more disgraceful situation than that which has cut short the 31-year life of the much-admired, oft-cited "Voice of Firestone." This distinguished series, which has brought immeasurable credit to the broadcasting world for three decades, has been kicked out of TV's primetime, evening schedules for next fall. There is no other way to say it.

Although its sponsor wanted to continue the musical show next season on Monday nights at 9, ABC–TV turned down his good money. The sponsor then waited for an ABC offer of another prime evening spot, somewhere between the hours of 7:30 and 10:30. But all that the network could make available, according to the sponsor, was the late Monday spot between 10:30 and 11 p.m.—which is not considered prime time.

The other networks magnanimously offered time to Firestone, too. CBS–TV was willing to sell the now sustaining time of Sundays at 5 p.m. to the sponsor, and NBC–TV came up with two Sunday possibilities, 5 or 6 p.m., neither of which has been very lucrative lately for the network. One certainly can't blame the sponsor for having turned down all these second-hand offers and then for deciding to discontinue the series after June 1. Why, after all, should a class A program have to settle for class C time?

RESPECTABLE RATING HERE

In a medium which provides choice nighttime segments for some 25 westerns, there should be a single, suitable half hour for

"Voice of Firestone," which has been bringing weekly pleasure to millions of loyal viewers. Yes, the program used to be regarded as one which limited its appeal to "long-hair" music lovers, but it has been varying its fare over the past season with gratifying results.

Whatever its ratings in other communities, they have been very respectable in the Boston viewing area. Last month, Voice attained an American Research Bureau rating of 20.9 against the powerful competition of Danny Thomas (26.2) and Peter Gunn (23.1). The junk-ridden Dick Clark Show got a much lower Boston rating of 14.3 for the same period, but I don't see ABC–TV bumping that musical monstrosity off prime time.

Although ABC–TV's president Oliver Treyz has boasted frequently about his network's policy of counterprograming, I would like to know what happened to this policy in the Firestone case. What better example of counter-programing than the slotting of a high-grade musical series opposite a situation comedy and a whodunit?

WRITE TO NETWORK, FIRESTONE

ABC–TV's Monday night schedule for the fall calls for three hour-long films in prime time. One is "Cheyenne," starting at 7:30 and then competing with two other westerns CBS–TV's "the Texan" and NBC–TV's "Restless Gun." A second is "Bourbon Street Beat," a whodunit adventure series starting at 8:30 and then competing with that other whodunit adventure series, "Peter Gunn." A third is "Adventure in Paradise," beginning at 9:30.

So what can "Voice of Firestone" fans do? Well, they might try writing to the American Broadcasting Co. at 7 West 66th Street, New York City, and also to Raymond C. Firestone, president of the Firestone Tire & Rubber Co., at Akron 17, Ohio. Perhaps a few sacks of protesting mail to the network and a few sacks of reassuring mail to Firestone can help to straighten out a frustrating situation which may have far-reaching repercussions.

What Should Be the Aims of the U.S. Foreign Policy?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GALE W. McGEE

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 5, 1959

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, on Sunday afternoon I was privileged to be the guest on a television show. I mention it because on the same program were two students, who rendered a particularly able performance. One was William Stall, from the University of Wyoming, a student of mine until this year. The other was a young man from Pennsylvania by the name of Philip Jurus, a 21-year-old senior student at Muhlenburg College. He was there because the League of Women Voters of Pennsylvania conducted a statewide contest among college students on the subject "What Should Be the Aims of the U.S. Foreign Policy?" His was the winning essay. I have read Philip Jurus' essay in that contest. I was so moved by its content that I am confident my colleagues in this body, which has a great deal to do with the foreign policy of the United States, will be as interested in it as I was. For that reason I ask unanimous consent to have the essay printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT SHOULD BE THE AIMS OF U.S. FOREIGN POLICY?

(By Philip Jurus)

At the end of the Second War War a newly polarized distribution of power emerged. At the one end was Russia, determined to destroy what remained of the old international status quo. At the other pole was the United States, a firm opponent of Communist power and a reluctant defender of the remnants of England's 19th century hegemony. The United States had inherited Great Britain's role as the pivot of the Western World; it became the main defender of the Anglo-American values. In this paper I should like to attempt to define these values in terms of the aims of the foreign policy of the United States.

We are making foreign policy in a period when the threat of nuclear war is constantly hanging over our heads and we have no alternative but to play our part in foreign affairs wisely and well.

Foremost in consideration of the aims of foreign policy is that every important move is based on one overriding consideration—whether it will advance the security and the wellbeing of the American people. In other words, the basic purpose of all our foreign policy is to safeguard the United States and promote the welfare and security of the American people. In general terms the aims of the foreign policy of the United States should be as follows:

1. To seek an international society in which men, goods, and ideas will flow freely and without obstruction throughout a wide area and in which the opportunity to pursue happiness is open to every man and woman.

2. To attempt to work through diplomatic channels such as the United Nations, and other international and regional organizations in pursuit of peace with justice.

3. To strive constantly to reduce international tensions and the burden of armaments.

4. To willingly share our knowledge and techniques with less developed nations to help provide a healthier and more rewarding life for their peoples.

5. To strengthen the economy of the United States by promoting mutually profitable levels of trade with other countries.

The task of fulfilling these general aims is very complex. George L. Record, unknowingly explained the situation we face today in a letter he wrote to Woodrow Wilson in 1919 stating that we "cannot set up machinery which will maintain justice in international relations among governments which deny justice to their own people." Today, we of the United States face both a great national state—Russia—and an international organization dominated by an ideology alien to our institutions and beliefs.

International communism and Russian ambitions have led to a position of great power rivalry with the West, and particularly with the United States. The challenge is political, military, psychological, and economic. This is not the only challenge that we are forced to meet in our foreign relations; we must also deal with other challenges—economic, social, political, ideological, etc. This tends to make the formulation of foreign policy even more flexible.

In attempting to state somewhat more specifically what the aims of the foreign policy of the United States should be, one must remember the complexity and flexibility of the world situation.

Looking at the free world in the formation of our foreign policy, we must remember that the interdependence of this free world is economic and social as well as military and political. Both of these aspects should be reflected in our American foreign economic and military aid programs. The military assistance should provide a shield against aggression, and the economic aid should help to remove the poverty and despair on which Communist subversion thrives. Our aid programs should in no way be one-way streets, but should be cooperative endeavors designed to help people who are free to remain free.

Our aid programs to Asia and Africa are very important. In these lands there is a growing desire by millions of people to secure more of the better things of life. The Communists are constantly trying to sell them on the idea that there is a short road—the Communist road—to better living conditions and greater political and economic influence. They cite the Russian example of achievement as proof of the validity of their way of life.

We must provide a long-term program designed to make available our economic and scientific know-how to those countries that want to help themselves. We must do so in such a manner whereby these people will feel that what is accomplished is the fruit of their hands.

In our own economic interest and quite apart from our other worthy objectives such as insuring a prosperous and peaceful world, we must keep open the channels of our import trade.

Following World War II, many nations, in order to halt the drain on their hard-currency reserves, drastically curtailed imports, placed strict controls on foreign exchange, and entered into discriminatory bilateral trade agreements with one another. The result was a strict government control over the trade of these many nations.

As a result it is necessary for the United States to meet with other nations of the world in international forums in persistent efforts to untangle the problems arising from these restrictive practices. We must make an earnest effort to have exchange controls, import licensing, and other restrictive practices relaxed.

There are now 21 new nations, and others at the threshold of independence. We must endeavor to assist them to retain genuine independence and to overcome the difficulties and dangers inherent in the early stages of independence when such states are susceptible to being absorbed into the Communist bloc and consequently losing their independence.

Up until this time we have been unable to agree on a workable disarmament plan. But we should not allow our unsuccessfulness to cause us to give up hope or to slacken our efforts. We must go on, inching ahead. We must seize every possible opportunity for genuine accord with the Soviet Union. But too, we must not permit ourselves to be trapped into confusing tempting promises with genuine proposals.

We must make every effort to control the spread of nuclear weapons to other countries. Such weapons in unreliable hands could light the fire of a terrible nuclear war. We should make every effort to develop peaceful uses of atomic power in these countries which are considered to be the "have-nots."

So far as territorial inspection with regard to nuclear power is concerned, we should be willing to start with a more limited zone, such as the area within the Arctic Circle, an additional part of eastern Siberia, Kamachatka, and Alaska. This proposal has already been made and I heartily suggest that the United States support it and make it a part of our foreign policy in this sphere.

Until we have definite proof that the Soviet Union is serious about disarmament,

I feel that we should continue producing and testing the best weapons that we can develop.

The first Soviet sputnik made what was once science fiction a very important reality. Outer space and satellites offer the possibility of many valuable benefits. Radio communications, unhampered by disturbances in the atmosphere and ionosphere, may be possible between the most distant points on earth. A worldwide system of television may be possible. Weather forecasting will definitely be improved. These are but a few of the new prospects that this new age opens up.

As a result of this, we should try to agree with the nations of the world upon certain fundamentals now while our activities in outer space are just beginning. We should attempt to develop some simple rules of conduct for the use of outer space, not only on our own grounds, but those of other nations too. This indeed, will not be a simple job, but such an endeavor should be started now before the complexities become even greater.

We should, in the aims of our foreign policy, hold the United Nations as a forum in which political challenges can be placed in their proper perspective and adjusted on the basis of reasonable compromises. But we should not overemphasize the limited importance of the United Nations in such a role.

The United States is undoubtedly well aware of the Soviet economic challenge to its security. In order to meet this challenge, we must have a greater flexibility and a greater assurance of continuity in dealing with economic aid problems. We must continue and even possibly expand our support for the bilateral aid of the United States and the multilateral aid of the United Nations.

We must maintain our leadership in the specialized agencies of the United Nations, such as UNESCO, ILO, and WHO. This will be very important, I believe, in view of the new Soviet interest in these agencies.

In cooperation with our allies, I think we must continue to strengthen and support regional collective security systems such as NATO and SEATO. We must also remember that these systems are important politically, economically, and culturally as well as militarily.

We need strong allies who can help us repel aggression anywhere, and strong allies need strong economies and stable governments; thus we must increase our aid to help these countries.

In our endless search for agreement with the Soviet Union and other countries, we must never allow ourselves to become discouraged, either with respect to particular foreign policy issues or with respect to the general trend of Soviet policy.

We must watch the dogged persistence of the Russians with equal persistence and determination on our part.

A very important part of our foreign policy should be the support of cultural exchange programs between the United States and other nations of the world. The exchange of entertainers, such as the San Francisco ballet troupe which recently won praise for its performances before the emperor of Ethiopia. Participation in trade fairs and exhibits is likewise of importance in order to let the world see the accomplishments of the United States and the willingness of the United States to participate in friendly relations with other countries.

In consideration of the aims of foreign policy, we must understand the long-range nature of the Communist threat and do our utmost to meet it. We must continue to support the United Nations and the causes it stands for. We must work closely with our allies and continue to avoid working alone. We must demonstrate to uncommitted nations of the world the enduring qualities of democracy and freedom. We must take our stand as a nation on high moral grounds. In conclusion, we must attempt a policy based on the hope of achieving a just peace and on firmness in opposing aggression.

The Jet Age Comes to Main Street

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALAN BIBLE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 5, 1959

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, last month the city of Las Vegas played host to thousands of persons at the initial World Congress of Flight. In addition to exhibits, air shows, and other dramatic demonstrations of aviation's rapid advancement, there were many illuminating addresses by leaders in that field. The increasingly important part being recorded by America's feeder airlines was well described by Joseph P. Adams, general counsel and executive director of the Association of Local and Territorial Airlines. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Adams' address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE JET AGE COMES TO MAIN STREET

(Remarks by Joseph P. Adams, executive director, Association of Local and Territorial Airlines [1])

Mr. Chairman and delegates to the First World Congress of Flight, I wish to congratulate the general chairman, Edward P. Curtis, the Air Force Association, and all other associations and individuals responsible for this significant conference, the success of which is assured by your presence.

Next, on the behalf of Mr. Gwin Hicks, chairman of the board of the Association of Local and Territorial Airlines, I extend the heartiest appreciation for inclusion of the local transport airline industry in this program.

The subject will permit me to discuss in these remarks the many factors that will accomplish the arrival of the jet age in Main Street, the symbol of the smaller community of the United States.

First, we need to focus on the present status of the local transport industry, which in addition to 13 local service airlines, includes 2 local transport airlines in Hawaii and 7 such carriers in Alaska. These carriers serve 516 domestic cities and 283 cities exclusively. To the extent that the jet age arrives in these 283 Main Streets, it will do so only by reason of the operation of local service airlines who serve them exclusively.

Approximately one-third of the total population of the United States is served by the local service airlines operating 35,586 route miles.

[1] Alaska Airlines, Inc.; Allegheny Airlines, Inc.; Aloha Air Lines, Inc.; Bonanza Air Lines, Inc.; Central Airlines, Inc.; Frontier Airlines, Inc.; Hawaiian Airlines, Ltd.; Lake Central Airlines, Inc.; Mohawk Airlines, Inc.; Northern Consolidated Airlines, Inc.; Ozark Air Lines, Inc.; Pacific Airlines, Inc.; Reeve Aleutian Airways, Inc.; West Coast Airlines, Inc.; Wien Alaska Airlines, Inc.

In my opinion, the arrival of the jet age on Main Street will be a triumphant event if three factors are present; namely, (A) a continued constructive regulatory and congressional atmosphere; (B) a continued successful reequipment program; and (C) a continued period of financial stability is maintained.

With regard to a constructive regulatory atmosphere, the air has never been cleaner, healthier, and more invigorating. The Civil Aeronautics Board is presently engaged in certification of many thousands of new route miles while at the same time undertaking to overhaul and improve the entire subsidy mail rate program.

Indicative of the regulatory atmosphere, I believe, is a quote from an address "Local Service and the Jet Age," delivered by the Honorable G. Joseph Minetti, member, Civil Aeronautics Board, before the Association of Local and Territorial Airlines in Honolulu, T.H., November 7, 1958, when he said:

"First, I see a tremendous challenge, and opportunity, which the operation of jets by the trunk carriers will have on local air transportation. I am convinced that the operation of jet aircraft with probably a 500-mile stage length or longer will greatly impove the status of our local service and Territorial carriers in the overall transportation system.

"I believe that, as the trunk carriers phase in their jet equipment there will be a greater tendency to concentrate on the major and long-haul markets. This would furnish the necessity, and opportunity, for local carriers to operate more substantial volumes of short-haul service. The local carriers have successfully performed this type of service when they have been called upon in the past."

How the winds blow in reference to the second factor, that of reequipment, can best be sampled by quoting from an address by the Honorable Louis J. Hector, speaking before an ALTA meeting in Denver, Colo., July 25, 1958, when he said:

"First, there are the proposals for reequipment. This subject has been talked about for years now, and I think we are all gratified that at last through the guaranteed loan programs things are beginning to happen. Of course, until recently even a guaranteed loan program wouldn't have done much good because the planes weren't there to be bought.* * *

"You now have the planes—some new planes and some old planes at new low prices—which seem proper for the job, and you have the financial machinery for buying them."

Further, it is appropriate here to call attention to the fact that the guaranteed loan legislation was sponsored originally and officially by the Civil Aeronautics Board and made requested legislation. For this, ALTA is deeply appreciative.

The subsidy moneys presently appropriated will insure the arrival of the jet age on Main Street. In this regard, it is opportune to state that the subsidy moneys go to the citizens of Main Street and not the airline corporations. As evidence of congressional intent on this subject, I will refer to the remarks of the distinguished senior Senator from our host State, Nevada, the Honorable ALAN BIBLE, who, when speaking here in Las Vegas, Nev., on Friday, April 11, 1958, said:

"The great social and economic strides made by America's smaller communities in recent years can be traced in large measure to the advent of feeder airlines. This convenient, speedy method of transportation broke the back of isolation which had been thrust upon these cities in former years.

"Dedicated to and specializing in service to the smaller communities of the Nation, these carriers have opened new industrial vistas which have contributed greatly to a continuing growth and development. This

ready accessibility of air travel has encouraged a decentralization of industry from the big metropolitan centers to the outlying areas. Your airlines have tied these small communities to their major trading centers and at the same time have brought about a broader based economy that benefits everyone.

"Although these airlines have more than a decade of solid achievement behind them, I believe that the real development of local air service lies ahead, provided the necessary stimulus is provided on the national level. It is my hope that the Civil Aeronautics Board will continue to lend encouragement and support to the industry and will examine and reexamine the needs of the smaller communities for air transportation. There should be no faltering until the ultimate goal is reached—and that goal is a nationwide network of airlines dedicated to local service.

"It should be made crystal clear that the airlines are going to need continual financial assistance during the period of expansion and introduction of new equipment to replace those old, dependable—but certainly outmoded—DC-3's."

The foregoing opinion of the learned aviation authority, Senator BIBLE, goes far in advancing the third factor mentioned in my introduction; namely, a continued period of financial stability.

The continued reequipment of local transport airline fleets is required if the several hundred cities that will never have long-range nonstop jet service are to enjoy the jet age. This reequipment program includes acquisition of larger postwar piston engine planes, the purchase of turbo-prop DC-3 replacements and the conversion of present piston engine aircraft to turbo-prop power. The members of ALTA are presently and successfully putting all three reequipment programs into effect.

The passenger appeal of all types of larger postwar aircraft has been significant in the recent yearly expansion of revenue passenger miles flown by local transport airlines. This annual growth of 10.2 percent in 1958, a poor economic year, surpassed the same measure of growth of the domestic trunk airlines which remained practically static during 1958.

While this satisfactory annual growth has been the result of the addition of larger postwar aircraft, such as the Convair 240 and the Martin 202, I am pleased to be able to give several recent examples of the passenger appeal of the turbo-prop F-27 as used by West Coast Airlines, Bonanza Airlines and Northern Consolidated Airlines, the ALTA member carriers whose statistics are available to me.

Of significance are the number of enplaned passengers by months that have occurred on West Coast's system during the more recent 6-month period compared to a year ago. These figures show an increasing percentage of growth over the corresponding months of a year ago. They are as follows:

	1958-59	1957-58	Percent
October	22,420	22,188	1.0
November	18,700	19,200	(2.6)
December	20,324	18,338	10.8
January	23,040	18,454	24.6
February	22,093	17,317	27.6
March	25,464	19,565	30.1

In comparing specific flights which were operated in October, November, December, January and February with F-27's with the same flights operated in the previous year, for the same months, with DC-3's, West Coast experienced the following increase in passengers per mile:

	Percent
October	39.55
November	42.77
December	48.09
January	47.40
February	50.76

Bonanza Air Lines, a more recent entrant in the DC-3 replacement parade, inaugurating F-27 service on March 29, has some encouraging "first" figures. In the first 10 days with 100 percent performance factor, load factors for the Silver Dart service averaged 63 percent.

Last week in Anchorage, Alaska, I learned that while no comparable figures were available on a route mile basis, Northern Consolidated Airlines had found passenger acceptance reflected in 1 month's revenue of $5,000 for sightseeing trips over and around Mount McKinley, a source of revenue never before available to the carrier.

It is my opinion that a continued successful reequipment program is assured the local transport airlines, thus creating one of the factors I consider necessary if the jet age is to come to Main Street.

The third factor necessary to bring the jet age to Main Street; namely, a period of financial stability for the industry, seems possible of acomplishment at this time.

The year 1958 may prove a memorable one for the local transport airline industry, as it was in 1958 that the Civil Aeronautics Board officially instituted steps that may well revolutionize present subsidy payment concepts as they relate to the public service values of airlines and now the jet age to the Main Street communities of these United States.

In emphasizing this recent favorable development and one having a direct bearing on the third factor listed earlier in these remarks as necessary to assure the arrival of the jet age on Main Street, I refer, in part, to remarks of the Honorable James R. Durfee, distinguished chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, speaking here in Las Vegas, Nev., on Friday, April 11, 1958:

"First and foremost, the Board has become increasingly convinced that our present ratemaking methods cannot achieve both financial stability for the carriers and subsidy control for the Government.

* * * * *

"Our present system does not provide the necessary incentive to remain on final rates. It provides no real incentive to minimize expenses under a temporary rate, and no definite dollars-and-cents standards by which carriers can judge their own performance.

"In our review of individual mail rates, and in talks with the managements of various carriers during recent months, we and our staff have become convinced that some drastic revision in approach must be found. You have undoubtedly noticed expressions of this conclusion in recent orders and opinions of the Board.

* * * * *

"By improvements in the ratemaking process, by route improvements that we hope to accomplish in the area cases, and by other regulatory improvements, we hope to create an improved atmosphere to complement the developmental steps that the carriers will be taking in the next few months, the new financing, the introduction of new equipment, the extensions of routes, all the things that promsie to make this 20th anniversary year a memorable one for local service carriers."

Next week, April 23-24, the member carriers of ALTA will hold a quarterly regional meeting in St. Louis, Mo. This meeting will feature the report and results of a research and development program on subsidy mail rate procedures directed by United Research Inc., at the order of ALTA and the ATA. This meeting will be favored by the attendance of senior CAB staff mail rates personnel with whom views on operating and practical considerations of the CAB proposed new subsidy mail rate concept will be explored.

Truly, at this time, April of 1959, the local transport industry is on the threshold of obtaining and realizing a (a) continued constructive regulatory and congressional atmosphere; (b) continued successful reequipment program; and (c) continued period of financial stability, which will insure the arrival of the jet age on Main Street as the dawn comes up like thunder.

In closing, I should like to remark that here today, as delegates of the World Congress of Flight, are assembled all of the Government individuals responsible for regulation and Congressional atmosphere and nongovernment persons responsible for public financial and personal acceptance of local transport airline success. To all of you assembled, and on behalf of the members of the Association of Local and Territorial Airlines, I thank you and request your continued splendid support.

Thank you.

Straight and Narrow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 4, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a very interesting editorial which appeared in the Lynn Item, of Lynn, Mass., on April 30, 1959:

STRAIGHT AND NARROW

We live in a time of paradoxes. The greatest threat to freemen comes from the practicing extremists in Moscow and Peiping. Yet among freemen themselves this is widely styled as the age of the moderates.

But there is tremendous confusion as to the place and meaning of the moderate approach in Government and politics.

Some men who are fundamentally moderates, in the sense that they eschew the extremes, do not like the term.

Naturally there are degrees of moderateness, and there is always plenty of room for debate as to whether a more moderate or a less moderate course of action is wisest in some aspect of domestic or foreign affairs.

But some who profess a distaste for the moderate outlook (while practicing it in many fields) try to suggest that it represents a lack of conviction. And sometimes that it spells lack of courage.

The implication here is that the farther you are away from center, the stronger are your persuasions and the stouter your will.

In truth, however, in a given situation it may require far more ingenuity and fortitude to cling to a moderate position than to one removed from the center. There are many, many times when the easiest thing in the world is to take what is commonly called a strong position.

It is very easy, for instance, to demand all sorts of remarkable additional services from Government, without facing for a second the hard realities of bringing them to pass or finding the money to pay for them.

Often in such cases the realist, the one who strives for programs that can be ap-

proved by a majority of lawmakers and can be supported, is upbraided for his weakness in espousing moderation.

The way of the moderate is not always the path of conviction and courage. No one approach has a monopoly on these qualities. But moderation frequently is the toughest, sanest course freemen can follow. And those who then take it are the very opposite of weak.

Statement in Opposition to H.R. 1253

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 5, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the statement made by Mr. Wayne G. Smith for the Greenbelt Consumer Services, Inc., before the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee on H.R. 1253:

Gentlemen, my name is Wayne G. Smith and I represent Greenbelt Consumer Services, Inc., with principal offices at 121 Centerway Road, Greenbelt, Md.

We are a consumer cooperative operating super markets, pharmacies, and service stations in the Washington suburban area of Maryland and Virginia, and in Westminster, Md. We have about 18,000 customer-members, and our business is operated in the interest of these members. Based on our experience in operating under fair trade in the State of Maryland, we are very much alarmed at the prospect of the Nation's economy being saddled with a price-fixing law on a national scale.

We have no particular ax to grind in this matter, unless concern with the welfare of consumers in general can be said to constitute a special interest. Much has been said pro and con about the effect of fair trade on business. It is our contention that consumers have the major stake in this controversy, and the voices raised in their behalf are all too few. Consumers, as a group, are relatively unorganized. They must depend upon their elected representatives in legislative branches of government to make sure that laws passed are in the public interest and not contrary to their welfare. Our purpose here today is to state in as simple language as possible, the consumers' case against fair trade.

We are opposed to price-fixing laws on any pretext, and are particularly opposed to so-called fair-trade legislation for the reasons we will discuss. Here are our principal points of objection.

1. Fair-trade limits competition at the retail level:

Our economy has long depended upon active competition to act as a spur to progress and to protect consumers. The dangers inherent in a lack of competition are well recognized and our antitrust laws were enacted to prevent such a contingency. Such laws might be said to constitute the consumers bill of rights.

Competition has provided the real test for business—both large and small. Competition in nearly all lines of business is intense. Any particular type of business that shows even a temporary easing of competition immediately attracts new entries, so the competition gets tough again. This is a continuous process and it is good for the economy. It acts as a spur to progress and efficiency, and discourages inefficiency and waste in business.

Price is a very important element in competition. You can't effectively compete if you ignore price, and to remove the element of price from the competitive picture is to slown down the whole process. Yet a retailer is forbidden by law to engage in price competition on an item that has been price fixed under fair trade.

Let's have a very clear picture of the importance of price competition. It has served as the sparkplug to provide an increasing demand for consumer goods. By exerting a continuous downward pressure on prices, it has opened up new sources of consumer demand. An increase in the consumption of consumer goods is the key to economic and industrial progress.

We have the most highly developed industrial system in the world. That didn't happen by accident. It came about as a result of the incentive provided by price competition.

Fair trade proponents have tried very hard to make a whipping boy out of price competition. They have employed all sorts of catch phrases, such as "Predatory price cutting," "Loss leader selling," "Indiscriminate price slashing," "Chaos in the marketplace," to mention but a few. They have endeavored to sell the idea that price competition as represented by the selling of an item at any point below an arbitrarily established fair trade price is unfair and bad for manufacturers, retailers, and consumers alike. The whole case for fair trade breaks down unless we can safely assume that one simple price is fair to all concerned, under all conditions. It is obvious to anyone even slightly familiar with retailing that such assumption cannot be made.

In all the discussion about fair trade we have never heard a definition of what is meant by "fair." If the word is to mean what it says, it should apply specifically to the conditions under which an item is sold.

The selling price of an item is made up of three principal increments:

1. The cost of the merchandise to the retailer.
2. The retailer's operating expense.
3. The retailer's profit.

For one selling price to be fair to two or more retailers, these three increments must be the same in all cases. For a price to be fair to the consumer, the retailers operating expense must be based on an efficient operation, and the profit increment must be fair and reasonable. It is obvious that no one selling price can satisfy all of these requirements, and there are very good reasons why this is so.

In making a purchase, a customer buys a package, consisting of an item of merchandise and an assortment of services, the cost of which is a part of the retailer's operating expense. These services are many and varied, and consist of such things as salesperson service, charge account availability, free delivery, free gift-wrapping service, free parking, air conditioning in the store, phone order service, and many more. Customers exercise a free choice as to what services they want in connection with their purchase and buy accordingly. To be fair the selling price should vary according to the combination of services involved. For example, a person buying a small electric appliance in a self-service store, who pays cash and takes the purchase with her cannot fairly be expected to pay the same price as a customer who is individually waited on in a service store, has the item put on her charge account, has it gift wrapped and delivered. Yet fair trade proponents ignore this entirely and tell us that one price is fair in both instances. We contend that the customer who purchased under the limited service conditions should not be expected to pay for services she did not get.

In the absence of fair trade, the limited service retailer is free to price his item according to the services that go with it. The fact that his selling price is lower than his high service competitor does not constitute loss-leader selling or predatory price slashing or any of the other derogatory epithets that fair-trade supporters use to cloud the issue. The fact that the price is lower is the simple result of its being based on acutal operating costs.

Even in cases where two stores offer the same services there may well be a justified difference in price, based on operating efficiency. Some people do a better job of running a store than do others. If the efficient operator is permitted to reduce his price to reflect his better efficiency, as he can in the absence of fair trade, both he and the consumer benefit, the merchant through increased sales, the consumer through a lower price. Again, this is not cut-throat competition. There is a sound valid basis for the difference in price. We can call it unfair only if we consider it unfair for a merchant to try to run a better, more efficient store than his competitor. If that constitutes unfair competition, then our retail system is in pretty sad shape.

This is one of the most alarming things about fair trade. It destroys the incentive to progress, and progress is the key to prosperity.

There is another point that deserves attention here. That is the matter of reduced price specials and their place in the competitive system. These are generally referred to by advocates of fair trade as "loss leaders" and we are told that they constitute predatory price competition which will result in chaos in the marketplace. The fair-trade people like to use the term "loss leader" regardless of whether or not the selling price actually represents a loss to the retailer.

The sale price does not necessarily represent a loss. The price is lowered in the expectation of attracting additional volume. If the expected extra volume results, the merchant gains, not loses by reducing his price. The practice of running sales is an old one in retailing, and was being done long before fair trade came along to fix prices. A large part of the newspaper advertising one sees consists of promotions with an appeal through reduced price specials. Such a practice is the very essence of price competition. Without it the promotional punch is lost and an advertisement becomes merely an announcement of availability. There have always been merchants who decried such practices. They were the ones who resented the need for aggressiveness in business. This was not a fight between big business and small business. It was a battle between the dynamic aggressive merchants and those who wanted to maintain their volume without the exertion of active price competition. History has shown that the public has rewarded the aggressive retailer by patronizing his store and enabling him to grow. Thus the small business of yesterday has become the big business of today. The consumer has been the judge, and has decided who shall grow and who shall remain small.

According to fair-trade advocates, loss-leader selling, as they call it, is a vicious practice and should be prevented. They contend that such advertised specials are merely come-ons and that once the customer is in the store she is often switched.

We have shown how it is impossible for one price to be a fair one under all conditions of retailing. The net effect is that the single price selected to be the fair-trade price is the one which will give a satisfactory profit to the retailers with the highest operating

costs. It is immaterial whether the high cost of operation is the result of costly services or inefficiency. The fact remains that the price is high enough to satisfy the high cost operator, and the consumer who wants a lower price, and is willing to accept the limited service that would make a lower price fair, is the one who pays the bill. She pays either for service she didn't want and in many cases didn't get, or she pays for the retailers' inefficiency. In either case, the consumer loses.

There is still another way in which fair trade tends to push prices higher than they need be. The law encourages competition between manufacturers for the retailers business by guaranteeing higher profits. This is a competition to give the distribution system the profit. The distribution system already gets about 50 percent of the consumer dollar. Sound economic thinking would be to reduce the cost of distribution, pass the saving along to the consumer in the form of lower prices, and benefit by the increased sales generated by lower prices.

3. Fair trade has not accomplished its avowed purpose of protecting the small businessman:

Fair trade has been widely billed as being the protector of small business and it is on this basis that proponents of the bill have attracted most of their supporters. If we are to give credence to this claim, then we must assume that what small business really needs is to be protected from price competition. Such an assumption is completely contrary to the economic facts of life.

Most successful small businesses are successful because of their ability to compete—in price as well as in other respects. The point that is sometimes overlooked is that if they are successful, they don't stay small. They grow.

Most aspects of price competition involve nothing that the small retailer cannot do if he has the initiative and the desire. In fact, to deny the small retailer the right to enter into price competition on nationally known brand items, is to deprive him of one of his best competitive weapons. If we doubt that small business can compete in price, we have only to look at the States of Vermont, Missouri, and Texas, and the District of Columbia, which have never been hampered by fair-trade laws. There is no indication that small business in these areas has suffered from lack of fair-trade laws.

In promoting "Fair Trade" as the protector of small business, the public has been given the impression that the problem is that of small business fighting against big business. Since most of us like an underdog, this has been a clever way to make a knight in shining armor out of fair-trade laws.

Actually, the biggest problem facing small business today has nothing to do with "Fair Trade", nor is it a matter of the small versus the big. The problem is how to cope with change. The changes facing retailers today are different from the changes that have faced them in the past, but are no more serious.

Let's look at some examples. Over the years following World War I, many businesses were fighting to solve the changes brought about by paved highways and the automobile. Countless small retailers in country towns were forced out of business because people chose to drive to larger cities. Retailers had to accept this change because there was nothing they could do to stop it. They didn't like it, but most people considered it progress. Any attempt to curtail road paving or automobile production in order to protect small business would have had a hard time getting support.

Let's look at another example, the appearance of the cash-and-carry grocery store in a retail community where the established stores offered credit and delivery. Such newcomers were generally not welcomed by the other business firms for a very basic reason. They were different. They represented change and the old established stores did not want a change, any more than they wanted the change brought about by paved highways and the automobile.

The fact that the cash-and-carry stores prospered and grew was due to general public acceptance of the particular combination of goods, services and prices they offered. From these small stores grew many of our large chains of today, and the combination of goods, services and price was gradually changed and developed into the super markets we now have. It is probably safe to say that the public in general considers that todays super market represents real progress in retailing. That must be true, since the growth of such stores has depended on wide public acceptance.

It is axiomatic that progress involves change, and in our free enterprise economy there will always be change as long as people try to find a way to do things better.

Small business can be protected only by its own ability to cope with change, and not by legislation which eliminates competition and stifles initiative and progress.

4. Fair trade is opposed to the traditional concept of private property ownership.

This objection needs very little elaboration. Under our system of private property ownership, the owner of a piece of property has the general right to the control of that property including disposal as he sees fit. Under fair trade the retailer has bought an item and paid for it, but he isn't free to dispose of it as he chooses. The manufacturer, though he no longer owns the merchandise, still controls the selling price. We are told that this is necessary in order to protect the manufacturers trade mark.

We contend that it is not in the public interest to try to protect he value of a trade mark by law. The only interest the public has is in protection against deception. The protection of the value of the trade mark is the manufacturers problem.

5. Fair trade legalizes price fixing.

Fair-trade laws legalize the fixing of prices at the retail level. The law tries to take the sting out of this fact by specifying that items so price fixed should be in free and open competition with other items of a similar kind. However, regardless of what the law says, it serves to encourage price fixing across the board. With the price on an item firmly established and published, and with no chance of change through competition, it becomes a simple thing for the manufacturers of similar items to just by chance establish the same price for their products. Such administered prices always manage to be high enough to give exorbitant profits to everyone in the distribution system. Everyone profits except the consumer.

There are many more legal and technical objections to fair trade but these have been adequately covered by the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and Agriculture, and the Federal Trade Commission in reports they have submitted opposing fair trade.

We have taken the consumer viewpoint in the objections we have made to fair trade. In closing, our summation is simple. Our stores are operated in the interest of consumer members. We are opposed to fair trade because it places unfair and unwarranted restriction on our ability to operate our stores for the benefit of the consumer.

We strongly urge that your committee vote against H.R. 1253. Thank you for your courtesy and for the opportunity to appear before you. It has been a pleasure.

ICEM and Refugees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 5, 1959

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the next two articles written by Mr. Edward P. Kennedy, of the Easton Express, published in Easton, Pa.:

[From the Easton (Pa.) Express, Apr. 21, 1959]

A LOOK AT THE REFUGEE PROBLEM—PRIMITIVE CONDITIONS IN CAMPS FOR ESCAPEES

(By Edward P. Kennedy)

The worst examples of refugee housing in Austria seem on the way out, but there is no guarantee that a new push of escapees from Iron Curtain countries wouldn't bring back a horror of ugly living conditions.

That was the impression I got on a quick trip to Salzburg, Austria, April 11, after attending a meeting of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration at Geneva, Switzeralnd. The trip was arranged as a followup to the ICEM deliberations which were partly on ways to speed up refugee movements in the World Refugee Year starting July 1.

The worst of the refugee housing I saw was at the Parsch camp, on the outskirts of the charmingly medieval Austrian city. There, a group of drab, unpainted barracks-like buildings had been partly emptied. The frame structures were to be abandoned by the end of December and probably burned.

The fetid smell in the building was sickening. Small apartments of two shabby rooms led off dark central corridors. Although there were about 40 such apartments in a building, each had only one water spigot, one toilet, and several greasy laundry tubs. The apartments had the most meager furniture of rough lumber, and crude wood stoves.

One such apartment was occupied by a happy and excited family with five children, all born in the 9 years the family had stayed at Parsch. The father is tubercular, probably the reason they have not left Austria. Across the hall lived an elderly woman with her daughter and several children. The woman said her three sons in Milwaukee, Wis., were unwilling to have her live with them. She, too, seemed happy. Their happiness, it was explained, was because they expect soon to leave the dingy camp for new refugee housing going up elsewhere in the city.

We drove to the site of one such project, a colorful, modern building which will house 27 families and 8 single persons. It is being built at a cost of $45,000 provided by the U.S. Escapee Program, according to Paul Kelly, U.S. Escapee Program Chief in Salzburg. The city provided the land and utility connections. The refugees designated by the World Council of Churches, will pay a slight maintenance cost and for utilities and water. This "rent" is expected to be between $4 and $8 a month.

A family of seven like I saw at Parsch will have three rooms and private bathing facilities, a water faucet, a private toilet, place for a portable bathtub and laundry tub and electric heating. Some improvement over the grim camp.

Kelly said that the refugee housing is needed not only because many families remaining in Austria are handicapped, with little income, but also because of an acute

housing shortage in the country. Rents are extremely high and illegal "key charges" before an apartment can be occupied complicate the situation.

In another section of the city, I saw more elaborate housing being prepared under the program of the United Nations High Commissioner. Rents under this program will be considerably higher than at the U.S. Escapee Program project, so may be difficult for poorer families to use.

I saw the refugee selection center, where ICEM gives detailed physical examinations to all refugees, and where there is office space for three "selection missions" from receiving countries. There, a Swedish mission recently chose 50 tubercular refugees and their families in a humanitarian effort to give haven to these "hard core" cases long in Austrian camps.

I saw an old people's home maintained by the Austrian Government for some 300 Russian and Polish refugees. I visited the Pierre Jacobson Center built with U.S. funds, where ICEM has its offices and some refugees are housed. The center is expected to be expanded in a move to centralize in Salzburg all refugee processing in Austria. Up-to-date IBM equipment permits rapid selection of any kind of refugees wanted by a selection mission.

At the center, James Carlin, ICEM Chief of Operations, listed the Austrian refugee caseload as 12,137 "new" Hungarians, 2,785 "new" Yugoslavs, 130 other new escapees and 20,000 "old" cases, those prior to October 1956. About a thousand a month are moved out of Austria by ICEM, Carlin said.

I heard discussion in Salzburg whether the German-speaking groups moved from the satellite countries after World War II are favored by the Austrian Government over more recent refugee groups.

There was speculation whether the World Refugee Year might have some effect in intensifying the problem in Austria by causing some self-supporting refugees to want benefits, and to bring more refugees across the border into the country.

There was some criticism of the Austrian Government policy in turning back Yugoslavs who came across the border because they appeared economic refugees, who seek only to better themselves rather than political escapees fleeing imprisonment or death. Some felt it would be better to aid all who wish to leave the Iron Curtain countries; to foster this protest by those who "vote with their feet" to the fullest extent possible.

It was pointed out that Russia apparently is distressed by the refugee movements. Since 1953, it has conducted "return to the homeland" propaganda which has caused some reversal of the westward trend across the border. Those who oppose the Austrian policy feel that return of Yugoslavs who crossed the border for economic reasons only aids this Russian program.

[From the Easton (Pa.) Express, Apr. 22, 1959]

A LOOK AT THE REFUGEE PROBLEM—TO EXAMINE U.S. CAPACITY FOR ABSORPTION

(By Edward P. Kennedy)

U.S. Representative FRANCIS E. WALTER, of Easton, disclosed plans in Geneva, Switzerland, to hold hearings soon to determine the capacity of the United States to absorb the people who are coming in so rapidly.

WALTER told of the proposed immigration hearings during a press conference held April 9 at the Palais des Nacions—the home of the United Nations in Europe and former headquarters of the League of Nations. The conference was held preceding a meeting by the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration in the building. WALTER was in Geneva as a U.S. delegate to the ICEM meeting.

The delegates planned, among other things, observance of World Refugee Year starting July 1. The press conference—for the most part about immigration regulations which will affect the movement of refugees from Europe during World Refugee Year—was given by WALTER as a controversial world figure in the immigration field.

As the conference opened, the Easton Congressman was presented to European newspapermen and press service representatives by Marcus Daly, ICEM Director who is from Lincroft, N.J., and at one time was a student at Lehigh University. Daly introduced WALTER as the man known in the world today as Mr. Immigration and as the founder of ICEM. "His wise counsel and guidance have left their indelible marks on the age-old problem of man's desire to move in search for betterment of his worldly lot," said the Director.

WALTER mentioned the proposed hearings after he was questioned about whether he favors abandonment of the quota system set up in the Walter-McCarran Immigration Act of which he was cosponsor. The Easton man said he opposes strenuously dropping the system because nobody has suggested a better formula. He recalled that he said before the act was passed that the numbers entering had to be determined by mathematicians, not politicians.

The Congressman gave his views on the size of the problem by citing that an infant is born every 11 seconds in the United States and an immigrant enters every 2 minutes. With no quotas in effect in the Western Hemisphere, he said, Mexican immigration has increased from 2,500 in 1953 to 80,000 in 1958. There is a still larger immigration from Canada, he said, and more than a million Puerto Ricans live in New York City alone.

Many of these people locate where the housing and school crises are most acute, Walter declared, concluding that immigrant "digestion" is a slow process and "until we determine what our capacity is, it seems to me we have to move along with the old law without increasing the number of people except in regard to family relation cases."

In reply to a question, Walter said, however, that he would be "very much opposed" to placing quotas on immigration from the Western Hemisphere countries.

Questioned about new legislation on immigration, Walter recalled that he recently introduced bills extending for two years permission to tuberculosis sufferers to enter the Nation, and to increase the admissibility of brothers and sisters of immigrants, so families can be reunited.

He said he also is considering proposing legislation to require that 5 percent of money earned by Latin American countries by sale of U.S. surplus agricultural commodities must be earmarked for land settlement purposes. Under present legislation, 20 percent of the sum must be used for erecting facilities for processing the countries' agricultural products. The additional 5 percent, Walter said, would be used to provide housing, land preparation and other facilities for immigrants.

Another query was whether Walter expects to solve the remaining refugee problem in Europe through the parole provisions of the Walter-McCarran Act, as was done with the Hungarian refugees. Walter indicated the problem is not that large particularly since he said many refugees do not want to emigrate. Then he took issue with a statement he said had been made that the Hungarians were admitted through a "loophole in the law." He said that, when the law was written such emergencies were envisaged and the parole provision was not "an accident."

In introductory remarks at the conference, Walter said that the dislocation after World War II, when "upwards of one million people were wandering about the highways and byways of Europe," has been "very largely solved." ICEM now, he said, should "concern itself with problems that continue because of the surplus populations in some areas and the great need for immigration in other areas of the world."

Justice Department May Look Into Egg Price Fixing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 15, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a newspaper article with reference to the present serious egg price situation:

JUSTICE DEPARTMENT MAY LOOK INTO EGG PRICE FIXING

(By C. T. O'Brien)

WASHINGTON.—There is a genuine likelihood now that the Department of Justice may become interested in egg prices—and how they are set.

Two important men on Capitol Hill want to know the facts, and clear suspicions—and they will go to the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the Justice Department to settle the matter.

They are Representative CLARK THOMPSON, Texas Democrat, and now chairman of the Poultry and Egg Subcommittee of the House Agriculture Committee; and Representative CHARLES H. BROWN, Missouri Democrat, who led the Small Business inquiry on the poultry industry a few summers back.

Representative THOMPSON picked up the hint of witnesses this week that perhaps there is price fixing in poultry and eggs on the part of the big buyers. Alabama witnesses explained how buyers for the big grocers just wouldn't pay over certain prices, and would hold out until the price was right and the poultryman glad to sell.

Mayor John Wagner, of Estell Manor, indicated that perhaps buyers got together and talked about prices. (He didn't say that, but many producers did—off the record.)

So Representative THOMPSON said there may be real trouble here. There is every chance that out of the hearing would come the incentive for the Justice Department to investigate.

Later, the Congressman told the Times-Journal he would bring it to the attention of the U.S. Department of Justice.

* * * * *

FATHER POSITANO

The Reverend Father John Positano, of St. Mary's Church, East Vineland, was among the large crowd of delegates to Washington this week, and was given the floor of the committee for a few moments. Father Positano won the compliments of Representative CLIFFORD G. MCINTIRE, of Maine, for his coming to the Capitol to suport the poultrymen of his area.

PEOPLE

The poultrymen who flocked here from many States this week were a quiet group, with little favor for demonstrations. They showed themselves on the steps of the Capitol Hill buildings and expressed views quietly, but there was no decrying of officials or departments as seen in such bus-carried movements of a few years back.

Perhaps it was opportune that the first poultryman witness in the subcommittee on poultry and eggs was quiet, mild, lucid John Wagner, mayor of Estell Manor. Wagner, conservative in his black suit, was obviously not a man who would lead demonstrations, and committee members sensed it. (The evening before the hearing, Mayor Wagner even looked up friends here to get a refresher course in committee decorum—to make sure Capitol etiquette was covered.) The attitude and action of the poultry delegation were important in winning the complete sympathy of the committee.

The Exploration of Space: a Challenge to America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 5, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD portions of a significant address on the exploration of space and what it means to America, delivered at Texas A. and M. College, College Station, Tex., on April 22, 1959, by Dr. Charles S. Sheldon II, the technical director of the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

As chairman of the former Select Committee on Astronautics and Space Exploration, and as a member of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, I regard the issues Dr. Sheldon discusses as extremely important to the Nation. We are in a struggle for the minds of men, and we cannot overlook that in the world of today our military defense interests are of paramount importance to our survival. At the same time, outer space affords wonderful opportunities for the benefit of men everywhere in peaceful applications. The excerpts which follow are concerned with these points:

THE EXPLORATION OF SPACE: A CHALLENGE TO AMERICA

(By Dr. Charles S. Sheldon II)

To some people, the gradual unfolding of the vast scale of creation and man's miniscule size has led to a philosophy of retreat, introspection, and passivity. To others, although these discoveries are sobering, they represent a challenge, and a feeling that man's destiny is to gain first hand acquaintance with increasingly large parts of this universe. First comes the goal of free fall in orbit beyond the atmosphere; then the exploration of the Moon; eventually the occupation of bases on Mars, and possibly other planets or satellites in this solar system; and in the ultimate future, travel to and colonization of other worlds remote by today's standards from our own solar system.

Some of these developments may seem so distant as hardly to come within the realm of serious discussion. But this is inaccurate in the context of our present headlong pace, snowballing progress in science and technology. Many wise men are being proven quite mistaken by the overconservatism of their judgments on what is possible. Perhaps it would be unkind to identify the famous who doubted that man would ever build a heavier-than-air flying machine, that the atom would be split, that rockets could reach the vicinity of the Moon. * * *

All of this scientific knowledge is necessary in successful combination with all our technological and engineering prowess, to achieve practical results in space travel. But more than this is required. There also has to be a willingness to channel our interests, attention, and resources in directions which will translate possibilities into actualities. And as I shall attempt to show before I finish, this is not a free choice open to us to follow or to disregard with impunity. Mankind has already made the choice, and America must share in this adventure, or be left behind to wither and indeed to be destroyed. * * *

In the face of a national will to return to peace and normalcy, military budget cuts of the postwar period held down the overall level of support for missile development in the United States. We had the atomic bomb and aircraft which we felt could deliver it. This deterrent was believed sufficient to keep the peace. The weight of early nuclear weapons ruled them out as practical warheads in long range rockets anyway, according to the best paper calculations. We did learn something about guidance for pilotless aircraft which could save our aircrews from heavy losses on raids, and we saw that missiles could also replace many antiaircraft guns. These observations helped to provide components which at a later time were to aid our space program.

Nobody really knows why the Soviet Union decided to go ahead with the development of long-range ballistic missiles at so early a stage after World War II. We had equal access to the German plans for building the A9/A10 intercontinental missile. But we felt it could not be pointed with sufficiency accuracy over great distances, and that its warhead would not deliver sufficient punch to be worth the cost for such a delivery means. We felt that air-breathing missiles, eventually with ramjet power and supersonic speed, were a more logical course. Intricate inertial and radio guidance, celestial reading instruments, and terminal radar map reading and infra-red homing seemed to be what would pinpoint such devices at their ultimate targets thousands of miles away.

This American decision, with some dissent, was our general policy until the thermonuclear breakthrough in 1953–54 gave us the possibility of building high-yield warheads at a moderate weight to offset ballistic inaccuracy. What had made sense earlier was revolutionized and outmoded by the new technology. So by 1954, our course was changed, and work undertaken on the present group of long-range ballistic rockets. * * *

The story of what has happened since is pretty well known to everyone. There were delays in the Vanguard program. The Soviet scientists at international meetings acted coy about their plans. Actually, anyone who read the New York Times carefully in the months before the first sputnik could find most of the parameters given which described its time of launching, weight, orbit, instrumentation, and even radio frequencies—many of these facts coming as surprises to both the lay public and scientists as well.

Sputnik I had a weight of 184 pounds, and was accompanied by a carrier rocket of unstated but considerable size which also stayed up for some time. A month later Sputnik II with Laika went up with a weight of 1,120 pounds, remaining attached to a carrier rocket in the weight range of 4.4 to 6.6 tons. An immensely heavy geophysical rocket was launched early in 1958 to sample data from space and the upper atmosphere in a vertical shot. A variation on this fully equipped automatic space laboratory was launched in May 1958 as Sputnik III. It is still circling the Earth, over 2,900 pounds, although its carrier rocket of many tons reentered the Earth's atmosphere a few months ago. Sputnik III apparently broadcasts data on command over the U.S.S.R., solar cells supplying the necessary power. Mechta, the Soviet planetoid, is circling the Sun, with over 3,200 pounds of weight. Although most people assume that it was intended to hit the Moon, some scientists make a case for its being a deep space probe which on remote command can still send back data. It may be designed to establish interplanetary distances with greater accuracy, in preparation for a Venus shot in June of this year. Only time will tell us who is right in these speculations. In listing the Soviet accomplishment, one should not overlook the shot to 280-some miles of a 3,700-pound stabilized rocket containing two dogs who were returned safely to Earth after their ride. All of this adds up to an impressive record of accomplishment. No talk belittling use of "brute force," or joking about use of German scientists or hidden failures can hide the fact that there have been substantial accomplishments and that the program has a momentum behind it which must be gravely considered.

The Soviet Union has not let us visit launching sites; it has not given out particulars of launching vehicles; its release of data has been slow and probably incomplete. But this much seems true: The Soviet Union has available boosters of great power, quite possibly an engine with an output of 250,000 pounds of thrust which can be clustered in two, three, or four-unit groups. The Soviet Union has guidance sufficiently good that all three sputniks had virtually the same perigee of orbit, and, despite a northern launch site, was able to send a lunar probe close to the vicinity of the moon. The Soviet Union has not needed to miniaturize instruments to the same degree we have, but even so claims to have packed thousands of transistors into Sputnik III, and uses solar cells to keep them working. The Soviet Union in Sputnik II demonstrated a capacity to put up a working biocapsule which required years of advanced study and experimentation. The Soviet Union has sufficient tracking and computing equipment that it was able to prepare detailed timetables of orbits very soon after launching. The Soviet Union in Sputnik III alone mounted all the experiments planned for a whole series of American IGY satellites, including most of the programs planned for the year following the IGY. Even if it is argued that some of these experiments interfere with each other, the fact remains that synoptic data on many phenomena were provided, and that these all became available for analysis to support later experiments months in advance of any possibility of obtaining such information in any Western program of sattelite launchings.

All of this adds up to a very serious challenge to the technical supremacy of the Western World.

Now there are many people who jump to false conclusions about the nature of this challenge and also about any comparison between the United States and the Soviet Union. With regard to the comparison, it does not degrade the U.S. effort to admit the reality of the Soviet accomplishments. This has little to do with the Communist versus the capitalist system, or comparative intelligence, or the wisdom of leadership. It is not a matter of domestic partisan politics either. It is perfectly consistent to laud the achievements of our own country, and at the same time to recognize the dangers of not doing more in the future. Now with this prelude, let us review our current position.

In full public gaze, we have had many launching attempts. The marginal Van-

guard program in nine shots has managed to put up a 3-pound test device which in an eccentric orbit still broadcasts a signal using its solar cell power source. The only full-scale 20-pound Vanguard sent cloud cover data while its batteries lasted, and it remains to be seen whether the computers can reconstruct the first crude maps of cloud cover.

More data has been returned from the Explorer series of satellites, including the important facts about the Van Allen radiation belt, and the propagation effects of the Argus experiment. The Air Force and Army lunar probe attempts revealed the existence of two layers of radiation above the Earth, and Pioneer IV sent 15 pounds into an orbit around the Sun after a distant pass at the Moon. Its radioed signals were heard longer than those of any other manmade object so far as we know. The Atlas of Project Score achieved another first, with its 150 pounds of instrumentation for relaying voice and teletype messages around the world. The first Discoverer seems to have gone into a polar orbit, and the second Discoverer has almost certainly accomplished the first successful return of a capsule from orbit, as well as representing the largest U.S. payload yet put up.

All of this represents a solid record of accomplishment. In weights, we still lag far behind the Soviet Union, which lag is related to the limited amount of thrust we have been able to assemble for space experiments. We cannot say which country is ahead in guidance and in communications, even though many individuals are quite willing to offer opinions on this subject. We cannot say positively which country has learned more from its experiments. The Soviet scientists should have, but they have published less, and we have been extremely skillful in our use of instrumentation.

It would be a mistake to think of space experiments as the exclusive interest of the United States and of the Soviet Union. It is true that these are the only two countries which to date have attempted to put devices into orbit, but this is only a part of the picture. Over a longer period of time, British and German study of space technology has been at least as sustained as that in the United States and the Soviet Union. The fundamental knowledge on which all space flight will be based is of course a universal heritage of the studies conducted in many lands. More specifically today, there are many nations making countributions to space technology, and many which would like to do more. * * *

What satellite projects lie ahead of us? Developments are coming so rapidly that any prediction is hazardous, but several have been programed, and they will have far-reaching consequences. There will be a continuing program to explore the characteristics of near space, to map the radiation belts, to learn more of the magnetic field of earth, to study the input into and output of energy from Earth, to study cosmic rays, and otherwise to complete the work started under the IGY.

Communications satellites will become a regular and important part of our system of transmission and relay. * * *

Other satellites will supply navigational information to all ships and aircraft, free from the problems of weather. The first of this work will come within the next year or so.

Within 2 or 3 years, we should be ready to obtain fairly good cloud cover information from satellites, as a follow-on from the present Vanguard II experiment. Within 10 years we can expect to have very complete weather reporting from space, with detailed maps of all the clouds and storms on earth. Estimates presented to the House committee are that the United States alone should realize annual savings to the economy of at least $4 billion, once these data are flowing in regularly, and are combined with other weather prediction research results using big computers. This should be more than enough to pay for the entire space program. It also represents a necessary first step to any future program to control climate, a development of sweeping implications for mankind.

The Department of Defense is understandably reluctant to talk about future military satellites, but open testimony before committees and news articles made clear that within a few years we should have very sophisticated reconnaissance satellites in orbit. These will be capable of photographic and television scanning of the surface of the Earth. Pictures with a degree of definition far in excess of anything seen on commercial television can be returned in live form, or returned from time to time in facsimile. Some will come back in recoverable capsules containing either magnetic tape or photographic film. In time, the world will be thoroughly mapped, and it will be possible to observe industrial changes, or troop concentrations. Corresponding civilian uses will include the preparation of position charts for all ships, and the carrying on of iceberg patrols.

Perhaps of particular significance, such satellites will relay reports instantly of any surface, airborne, or space nuclear activity and any launching of missiles. Such satellites will not only see visually, but will scan other parts of the radiation spectrum, such as cloud penetrating radar and as infrared. Various combinations of inspection satellites will afford us maximum warning, and we hope therefore safety, in an age when surprise attack could destroy our Nation. * * *

My discussions of emerging space capabilities have only indirectly implied the urgency which surrounds endeavors in this field. Certain important conditions should be clearly understood. There is no way that space technology for peaceful purposes can be distinguished from that for military purposes. Those who possess it can use it for either end, given a decision to do so.

A second point, which is implicit in my narration, is that any early ability to put payloads into space rests on military rocketry. Thus only the United States and the Soviet Union have a current capability to put up meaningful satellites or space probes, with the British coming along in this direction. * * *

Why is there urgency to space development? In the debates about space, differences in definitions are part of the reason for dissension. If the ballistic missile is regarded as a space weapon, then most people can understand that it must have a very high priority. At the present time, the ballistic weapon is virtually unstoppable and even 15 minutes warning of its coming would be fortunate. This leaves very little time for countermeasures, although we should be able to get part of SAC off the ground. But if antiaircraft defenses continue to improve, the deterrent power of SAC aircraft will tend to decline although there are ways of extending their usefulness. I think one can recognize the grave consequences for this Nation if the time should ever come when the punishment the Soviet Union would have to absorb were to fall to less than the benefits they feel would accrue from destruction of the United States. Our best assessment is that this time has not arrived yet, and the best proof would seem to be our escape from attack. What causes great concern is that decisions made today with regard to our defense will affect our military posture 5 and even 10 years from now. All of this means that the most serious attention must be paid to our missile programs, including all the supporting systems. Every effort must be given to study of various countermeasures as well.

But then there are those who distinguish space research from work in missiles, and see no urgency in the work done on satellites and space probes. I have already sketched for you commercial and scientific reasons for being interested in space. I think I have also indicated some of the military reasons, too. It is hard to imagine projects of greater priority than the reconnaissance satellite and the infra-red detector satellite in a time when even minutes of warning are so precious in saving the Nation. These systems are integral parts of our evolving defense. If we are fortunate enough to be able to arrive at workable agreements for disarmament and inspection, such devices will continue to be important. * * *

Let us look ahead not too far into the future. Suppose that more and more satellites are put into orbit by a number of countries, and that this is done without international inspection. Probably many will be reconnaissance devices, often with anti-radar paint, and remaining radio-silent except when triggered over home territory to give back information in short bursts on frequencies not previously announced. Some will be labeled scientific satellites whose batteries have gone dead. Many could be cheap balloons, used as passive reflectors. In other words, any anti-ICBM radar system might have a lot of material in space which would have to be spotted, and assessed as to its significance. And some of the supposed derelicts in space could actually be satellites with thermonuclear warhead capsules, riding in orbit, waiting for the day when they are commanded to reenter and to strike preselected targets. Some of the experts say that a satellite or a space station is too vulnerable to be a military weapon because once its orbit is established it could be blasted to bits by a missile, even though the debris would not fall to earth. But what would be the cost of shooting at every decoy in space, and what would be the consequence of destroying the manned space stations of another nation? Only the ability to send up a manned, maneuverable device, capable of approaching, inspecting, disarming if need be, and attaching retrorockets to return the satellite to earth would seem a feasible way of protecting the national security. This makes the man-in-space program much more than a circus stunt.

The studies of space are so interrelated with other advanced developments in military technology that our committee, after hearing all the testimony, has concluded that a well-developed space capability is extremely important to the Nation for military as well as scientific and commercial reasons.

A second way in which space technology affects the national security relates to the shifting, complex, but no less real field of political and psychological war, a prominent part of the cold war. The thesis has been advanced, and it may have some validity, that when the great powers have reached an uneasy balance of terror, related to their deterrent capabilities, the war will be fought in other areas. And one of the chief of these may be the struggle for scientific supremacy in the eyes of uncommitted nations. Absolute proof of the importance of these things may not be easy. But many serious students believe that the position of the free world in the Middle East was definitely worsened by Soviet successes with sputniks in the fall of 1957, when our satellites would not go. Certainly every successful Soviet launching seems to have been calculated to extract the maximum propaganda value. But we must also remember that successful propaganda usually requires substantial real accomplishment to make it believed. * * *

It is quite important to recognize that space exploration is not the only challenge. Every part of our scientific and technical

heritage has contributed to our space abilities and our space work should return dividends to many other fields of endeavor. For example, there are those who say, "We have enough problems here on Earth. Why waste the taxpayer's money on space?" But space research may solve problems of photosynthesis, food supply, and controlled thermonuclear power, helping people here on Earth. * * *

This is the briefest introduction to the topic of space exploration and the challength it offers. I hope it represents a personal challenge to some of you. For it is your efforts in the next decade or two which should carry us successfully across space to explore our solar system. And your children, if you give them the opportunity, should carry man across the void to the stars.

Red Cloud's Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 5, 1959

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the plight of the American Indian is without question one of the serious problems confronting the people of this Nation. The difficulties of our Indians have not been given the full attention which they deserve.

Perhaps this is a partial result of preconceived ideas and notions which too many people hold in regard to our Indians. Too often I have had the reference made to me that the Indian refuses to help himself.

Anyone remotely acquainted with our Indians recognizes that an assertion of this type is as unfair as it is untrue.

There is no question in my mind that the American Indian—given half a chance—is fully competent to assume a conscientious, dedicated role in sharing the duties of good citizenship. Unfortunately, too many of our Indians have never even had that half a chance.

But there are striking examples of what the Indian can do for himself when even a minimum of opportunity is presented. As one excellent instance of this, I am happy to invite attention to a fine report on one of the mission schools in the Oglala Reservation in South Dakota. This is the largest of the Sioux Indian reservations.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article, "Red Cloud's Children," from the May 1959 issue of the Columbia magazine be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RED CLOUD'S CHILDREN

(By John M. Zwach)

If I were to tell you that you'd get an emotional thrill, a sense of excitement, and a spiritual stimulation you'd carry with you a long time, simply by visiting a school, you'd probably think I was having a pipe dream. But that is exactly what I do tell you, and it is no dream. For this school is different.

Far out on the extreme western plains of South Dakota, just 4 miles north of a little Indian town called Pine Ridge, is Holy Rosary Mission.

Holy Rosary is a boarding school—the largest mission boarding school for Indian children in the Nation—located on the great Oglala Reservation, the Nation's largest Sioux Indian reservation.

These are the vast, wide-open spaces, under the "big sky." Students come from a radius of 100 miles. Many live as far away from the mission as 300 miles. There are more than 500 Indian boys and girls who come here to learn the white man's books. They are as young as 6, and as old as 18. They go from the first grade through high school.

"Well and good," you may say, "but there are many Indian schools in the Nation. There are many Indian missions. What is so different about Holy Rosary at Pine Ridge, S. Dak."

As one who has spent the most of his life in education, I would say the great, important difference is this:

Of those students who graduate from Holy Rosary High School, the number who go on to college or other higher learning such as nursing, is twice the national average of all high school students.

These are Indian children. These are children whose great-grandfathers were literally born in the stone age. How does Holy Rosary do it? What is their secret?

Part of the answer, of course, lies in the children themselves and their wonderful eagerness and ability to learn. Part lies in the fact that the Jesuit fathers and Franciscan nuns recognize the great potential of these noble people and with infinite patience and understanding have learned how to develop it.

Let me tell you of my visit, as an educator, interested in education.

My first impression was one of well-scrubbed poverty.

The buildings and the facilities are a far cry from what one would term modern. In fact, for the most part they are old, very old. But everything is neat, clean, and in order.

Much of the equipment is ancient, superseded material which was donated by other schools who thought it was worn out. But thanks to the ingenuity of the Jesuits and Franciscan Sisters—with this equipment, with limited funds provided almost entirely from charity—they are literally working wonders.

The meals are simple, but they are good, thanks to Franciscan cooking. The farm, the dairy and the truck garden operated by the Jesuit Brothers provide a large portion of the food. And, on these sandy, rocky, plains and hills, this is no easy accomplishment.

It is a well-known fact that in many of our modern, tax-supported schools, with all of their magnificent equipment, discipline is an increasing problem. I wish you could see the atmosphere of friendly, happy discipline at Holy Rosary. All day long, activities are going on all over the place. Groups of girls are working in the domestic departments—preparing meals, readying dining rooms, washing dishes, sweeping dormitories. Boys are helping in the blacksmith shop, the carpenter shop, the dairy, and various work projects. By a system of relays all of this work is accomplished during the boarding school day, with no sacrifice of class or study time. During my visit and in my chats with students, I noted no feeling on the part of the pupils that their daily schedule is a bit more rigorous than that of other schools. For them it is all normal routine, taken for granted. At tasks, which many white pupils would do only under compulsion, and not with the best of grace, these Sioux Indian boys and girls sing.

But the main purpose of Holy Rosary is not just to teach these children how to work (which, in my opinion, should be an important part of any child's education), nor simply to keep them well fed, clothed, and housed. It is to give them an academic training which will enable them to go on to university or some other form of higher learning. It is to equip them to be able to make their way in our technological, specialized, competitive world.

This takes on greater significance when you realize that on all of our Federal Indian reservations there are only a few high schools which are accredited by the universities. This includes high schools operated by the Federal Government. The rigid academic training at Holy Rosary could well be emulated by some of our regular schools.

The program for all students includes 4 years of foreign language, 4 years of English, 2 years of science, 2 to 3 years of mathematics, and 2 years of history. In addition, girls get 2 years of typing and shorthand, and boys who wish to do so can also take typing.

On the strictly vocational level, but in addition to the academic courses, girls are trained in cooking, sewing, planning meals, and social events. The boys get training in the blacksmith shop, the carpenter shop, the garage, the dairy, the farm, the bakery, the shoe repair shop, and the poultry yard.

This is far cry from what one finds in so many schools for these forgotten and neglected Americans. For years now, many Indian schools have stressed simple manual arts, such as basketmaking, woodworking, weaving, and the like—straight through so-called high schools.

This is certainly not the case at Holy Rosary. Here a first-class education is paramount. All else is pushed far, far into the background. It is working—almost like a miracle.

Graduates from this poverty-stricken school on the windswept plains are doing well in a dozen colleges and universities. Many have been honor students. A number of kind people in various parts of the country are helping make this great work possible by taking young Sioux into their homes to attend local colleges and universities.

Today we find Sioux teachers training white pupils; Sioux nurses caring for white patients; Sioux officers commanding white troops. There are Sioux Franciscan sisters and Sioux Notre Dame sisters. One young Sioux recently entered the Jesuit novitiate. These are the great grandchildren of Red Cloud, Crazy Horse, Black Elk, learning to live in this new world, learning to live as their reservation-born fathers and mothers were not permitted. All they need is a chance, and Holy Rosary, as best it can, is giving it to them.

But that best is not good enough. This magnificent school is in dire need. Some of the buildings in use have been there since 1888. A program of replacement and enlargement is imperative. Government support, in the form of educational grants to children, has been cut back to such an extent that it is now but a small part of the entire operation.

In spite of all its obstacles and difficulties, Holy Rosary is the most remarkable school I have ever visited. No institution I have ever seen is more deserving of our Christian and American help.

The Passport Office

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 5, 1959

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, for several years I have been telling the

Passport Office of the wonderful job they do for the people who need their help, and the fine treatment my office has always had from them. I am happy to see that other people feel that the Passport Office is rendering excellent service, and have seen fit to write about its activities.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "'New Look' at the Passport Office," which appeared in the May 1959 issue of Reader's Digest.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW LOOK AT THE PASSPORT OFFICE

A friend of mine in Washington, D.C., pulled out her brandnew, crisp green passport and showed it to me with a look of wonder. Having heard that it took up to 5 weeks to get such a document processed, she had applied 2 months early. "But the Passport Office came through in just 4 days," she said.

The new, brisk efficiency of the U.S. Passport Office is due largely to its Director, Frances G. Knight, a slender, bright-eyed woman of 52 who looks 10 years younger. Like a housewife with the spring-cleaning urge, she has cut redtape, thrown out sacrosanct procedures, speeded up service and, in the past 4 years, saved U.S. taxpayers more than $2 million.

In May 1955, when Miss Knight moved in, Americans, responding to the lure of travel in unprecedented numbers, were swamping the office with half a million passport applications a year. With its limited budget and insufficient personnel, the agency was unable to cope. There were delays of 5 weeks or more in the issuing of passports, and a backlog of 182,000 unsorted applications had accumulated.

In her 15 previous years with the Government, Miss Knight had earned a reputation as an eager beaver with a passion for eliminating waste and inefficiency. Now, bypassing three State Department echelons (the Passport Office is a branch of State), she paid personal calls on the Chiefs of the Civil Service Commission, General Accounting Office and General Services Administration (the Government's housekeeping agency). "We need a complete reorganization plan," she said. "Can your experts help us?"

Although surprised by her unorthodox approach, the agencies responded with enthusiasm. Teams of specialists swarmed through the Passport Office, investigating its procedures, studying its work-flow system. They found some surprising anachronisms.

For one thing, though it handled several million dollars a year, the office had no up-to-date accounting machinery: receipts were recorded on long, handwritten worksheets. For another, there was one 5-day period during which 5,000 phone calls could not be handled because of inadequate switchboard facilities. And, during that July and August, 10,400 man-hours (worth approximately $22,000) were lost because it was too hot to work in the overcrowded, poorly ventilated building.

The experts made sweeping recommendations for improved methods of handling mail and money, more rapid filing and work-flow systems. Miss Knight herself, stopwatch in hand, studied each of the 150 separate operations in processing a passport. Then, armed with hard facts and a definite plan, she stumped Capitol Hill. Impressed with her convincing presentation and worried by complaints about passport delays, Congress granted her a $600,000 emergency appropriation—to cover the cost of hiring more people, getting automatic equipment, and moving into better quarters.

Space was found in an air-conditioned building. To furnish it, Miss Knight trudged through Government warehouses, picking out used pieces which could be inexpensively reconditioned to look like new. Then, with modern machines installed, the new work pattern was set up.

Instead of being processed through eight separate sections on four different floors, passports are now channeled through two sections on one floor. In place of the six separate typings previously involved in issuing a passport, one now suffices. A change to shelf filing released 1,700 cabinets (for a net saving of $49,000 in space and equipment), and a new file system enables clerks to handle 1,300 documents a day instead of 300. Because it was found that there were about 100 questions a person could ask about passports, the answers have been put on forms—thus reducing individual replies by 75 percent.

Since the GSA experts discovered that only half the space in the 32-page passports was ordinarily used, Miss Knight had the booklet cut to 20 pages, saving $48,000 a year. And because another study indicated that only one out of 200,000 pieces of regular mail is lost, she discontinued sending out passports by registered mail—thus saving an additional $150,000 annually.

With these and other economies, savings were effected despite the investment in new equipment, added personnel and higher salaries. The office continues to be a money-maker for the Government: Last year, on an operating budget of $2 million, it took in $4,852,000 from passport fees.

Increased efficiency is only part of Frances Knight's policy. She believes that the public is also entitled to comfort and the personal touch. The results are visible in the more cheerful surroundings at the six field agencies: Boston, New York, Chicago, New Orleans, Los Angeles, and San Francisco. For years passport applicants in New York City—20 percent of the Nation's total—had sweltered during the rush season in long lines at two small offices. In 1956 the two agencies were consolidated into one enlarged, streamlined, air-conditioned office in Rockefeller Center. At all field offices Miss Knight installed Teletype machines so that applicants could get special rush service at a low fee.

Two new field agencies will be opened this year—in Miami and Seattle. Half of all passport applications are still filled out in court clerks' offices. When Miss Knight learned that these clerks have to spend a lot of time simply answering questions, she supplied counter cards detailing the requirements for completing a passport application: proof of U.S. citizenship, identification, two photographs and a $10 fee ($5 for a renewal).

Miss Knight recently had a go-around with Government lawyers about the regulation requiring a passport applicant to bring along an identifying witness, and got the requirement lifted for those who could supply adequate documentary proof of identity. Not only is this more convenient for the applicant but the traffic at passport offices is cut in half. Until recently, persons traveling to foreign countries on private business were required to furnish letters stating the reasons for their trip. Miss Knight said to her legal counsel, "That's unnecessary, and none of our business anyway." The requirement was eliminated.

Miss Knight—in private life Mrs. Wayne Parrish, wife of an aviation-magazine publisher—maintains a pace that would wear down most men. After putting in a 10- to 12-hour day at the Passport Office, she leaves orders that all emergency calls be referred to her home. The secret of her continuous energy is an eagerness to dig into a variety of new problems that sprout each day. It may be a Sunday call from a Congressman concerning two constituents stopped at the gangplank, their passports declared invalid because they had cut them down to fit their wallets. (She allowed the two travelers to sail and arranged for new passports to be issued by the U.S. consulate in Liverpool.) Or it may be a dispute concerning the citizenship of a baby girl born to a British woman on a Dutch airliner flying over Poughkeepsie, N.Y., en route to Canada. (The child was eventually ruled to be an American citizen.)

Frances Knight's occasional bypassing of "channels," plus her outspokenness, has aroused some opposition. Her boosters are in the majority, however. Says Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, of New Mexico, "Miss Knight's is the most satisfactory office to deal with in the whole Government." The Senate Committee on Government Operations has suggested that other executive agencies might well imitate the Passport Office's pattern of reorganization to improve their own operations.

Although pleased with the progress to date, Miss Knight keeps a constant eye on the future. With the advent of jet airliners, it is estimated that the already burgeoning tourist boom will lead to more than a million Americans' applying for passports in 1961. So, Miss Knight has a new mechanization and streamlining operation under way right now—with a goal of 48-hour processing time in view for this summer.

Father Positano Practices Musical Medicine on Unfortunates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 15, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to include a very interesting article about Father John Positano, formerly of Lawrence, Mass., who is now pastor of St. Mary's Church in East Vineland, N.J.:

PRIEST PRACTICES MUSICAL MEDICINE ON UNFORTUNATES

(By Maggie Lieberman)

VINELAND.—The Reverend John Michael Positano, O.S.A., pastor of St. Mary's Church in East Vineland, is a priest who plays his prayers.

For the past 16 years, this former professional musician has scouted, trained and organized talent from among lay persons to bring "musical medicine" to hospitalized veterans, shut-ins and prison inmates.

"To visit the sick and the imprisoned, bringing along a little musical gift with the visit, are corporal works of mercy," noted "Father John," the name which has been fondly bestowed upon this friendly priest.

Father John came to East Vineland 8 months ago and has already delivered a dose of his tonic to the Leesburg State Farm twice and to the New Jersey Memorial Soldiers' Home in Vineland.

FORMS GROUP

"I was here only a few weeks when Howard Yeager, superintendent of the State prison farm, called, saying he understood I had some entertainment. I don't know where he heard of me, but I took a flyer on it," he said. "I couldn't refuse—I've never refused anyone. I took a chance; picked up some parish talent and contacted some of the pro-

fessional musicians with whom I've worked and we went to the State farm."

Ever since then, in line with his many pastoral duties at St. Mary's Church and two mission churches, St. John's in Mizpah and St. Joseph's in Richland, he has been visiting the shut-ins, wounded servicemen and prison inmates as an activity of the Apostolate of Good Will Branch of the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine—which is only one of the many activities he has organized at St. Mary's Church.

A native of Freeland, Pa., he is a former professional musician who specialized on the clarinet and was the leader of the Pennsylvania Bellhops, a group which played in most of the Pennsylvania coal region cities. Then he went to New York City and worked with radio before ending his 9-year professional career to enter the seminary.

DID USO WORK

After his ordination in 1942 by Archbishop Francis Spellman in St. Patrick's Cathedral in New York City, Father John was assigned to south Philadelphia. It was during his 11 years there that he first organized his musical group to do USO work.

He scouted among the youth, teenagers, Boy Scouts, adults, policemen, taxicab drivers, firemen—anyone with talent—and trained and organized them to form a group which performed for the USO, the Jewish welfare board, the Salvation Army, the Red Cross, and other agencies that were working for the men in the armed services.

"We covered the whole Fourth Naval District, playing in the Navy Hospital, numerous veterans' hospitals and on the battleship *Wisconsin* just after it was commissioned in the Philadelphia Navy Yard," the priest reminisced. "I took the troupe any place where there was a need and request to entertain our soldiers from anyone—regardless of creed or color," he continued.

"Now, my work is done primarily as an act of charity, but during the war it was my contribution to the war effort," Father John remarked.

Father John, like Pope John XXIII, boasts of "being in prison," where he took his musical remedy.

He also appeared on television. In 1951 when the USO was going out of existence, his reputation was such that ex-president Harry Truman's Committee on Religious and Welfare in the Armed Forces urged him to make a national appeal on the "We the People" program, asking communities to pick up where the USO left off.

Ordered to take a rest in Florida for about 3 months after his assignment in Philadelphia, the ambitious priest, who does all his musical work during his free time and on a voluntary basis, began to organize a group there because he "noticed there was a need for it."

He then went to Europe for the same length of time where he visited USO centers and as an "unofficial advisor" shared his ideas for entertaining the soldiers, particularly the Sixth Fleet which was stationed in Naples.

For the next 5 years, Father John who had become known as the "Benny Goodman of the Cloth," was stationed in Lawrence, Mass., in the first naval district. No need to say what he continued to do. It was there that the term "musical medicine" was first applied to his "free prescriptions" by veterans who drew an analogy between Father John's cough syrup, a patented Massachusetts-made medicine, and Father John Michael Positano's "musical medicine."

PRESIDENTIAL PRAISE

While in Lawrence he received three letters of commendation from the White House for his work.

Paging through a huge scrapbook, the priest showed citations which he received from Rear Adm. John H. Brown, Jr., in 1953 and Rear Adm. J. L. Tinney in 1945, both of the Fourth Naval District. In 1946 he received a citation from the then Secretary of War, Robert P. Paterson and from the American Red Cross.

The priest also received the USO gold medal and the Italian Star of Solidarity from the Italian Republic in 1952. He also holds national citations from the Catholic War Veterans Auxiliary and the Italian-American Veterans who have named him national honorary chaplain.

Father Positano lists as one of the top awards a gold engraved card certifying his honorary life membership in the American Federation of Musicians Union. He received this in 1953.

In addition to receiving letters of recommendation for his work, Father John was instrumental in getting over 20,000 pieces of mail sent to servicemen in the hundreds of hospitals he visited. He has worked with more than 400 talented persons and numbers many successful professional musicians among his host of personal friends including Perry Como, Jodie Sands, the Jaye Brothers, Jerry Veale and Lou Monty.

PLAYS HIS PRAYERS

He is master of ceremonies for all the variety shows he presents in hospitals and prisons. The programs range from classical and jazz music to song and dance teams.

"God gave me a talent which I have put to use even after my ordination," he humbly said. "There's no use letting it lie idle."

But there is more to it than just using his talent. Father John spreads good will without making any discrimination.

"As a professional musician I realize the effect of music on the minds of people—it gives them a lift and boosts their morale. It shows them they still belong and that we have an interest in them," he said.

In a way, Father John is actually playing some of his prayers.

Big Union Leaders Versus Rank-and-File Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 5, 1959

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, COPE, the political arm of AFL–CIO, preaches democracy and civil rights, yet big labor bosses deny their rank-and-file members the basic right to a secret ballot and to an accounting of union funds. "By their deeds shall ye know them."

President Eisenhower, with the help of Secretary of Labor Mitchell, proposed labor legislation to curb the abuses of labor that have been spotlighted by the Senate Labor Rackets Committee. The President proposed to deny tax exemption to the funds of any labor union whose officials deny their members the right to a secret ballot or who refuse to give an accounting of union funds.

COPE opposed the President's proposal and offered in its stead the Kennedy proposal—a bill that purports to give the rank-and-file their basic rights but provides no adequate means of enforcing those rights.

Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Richmond (Va.) Times-Dispatch of Saturday, May 2, 1959, states so well the problem and the situation confronting this House in connection with the so-called Kennedy labor reform bill that I include it as a part of my remarks. I am in complete accord with the editor. He expresses my views much better than I can:

UNION LEADERS VERSUS THE PEOPLE

If smart politicians were better statesmen, they'd be better politicians as well. They would stop cringing before organized minorities, and appeal for support to the great, unorganized majority, which includes the more intelligent members of labor unions.

Reelection of the late Senator Taft, of Ohio, by a record-smashing majority, despite bitter opposition from union leaders, clearly demonstrated the truth of this political axiom.

The majority will vote for a candidate it can trust, but will stay away from the polls rather than make a choice between wishy-washy partisans who have tried to outdo each other in angling for the support of minority blocs.

We feel certain that millions of union members were shocked, humiliated and angered by the racketeering, corruption, malfeasance and underworld tie-ups unearthed by the McClellan committee.

We feel that a majority of the rank and file consider themselves primarily Americans, as well as members of the AFL–CIO syndicate. No decent, law-abiding citizen likes to be affiliated with any form of dictatorship. We may assume that they are anxious for a labor law with teeth in it.

Unless they are far less intelligent than we believe, they must realize that laws proposed to curb abuse of power within the unions are opposed principally by AFL–CIO top brass, anxious to perpetuate the incumbent hierarchy.

Union members desirous of democratic procedure within all unions must therefore look for leadership outside their own organization—among candidates willing to risk defeat at the polls by championing needed reforms.

The jockeying for position by Democratic presidential aspirants is not an inspiring spectacle. They are proceeding on the assumption that they cannot hope to be nominated or elected without labor support.

They forget that the AFL–CIO is not a political entity, but represents some 16 million individual citizens, who will cast a secret ballot for the candidate they trust—not necessarily the one their leaders tell them to vote for.

It speaks well for the statesmanship and political courage of President Eisenhower and Vice President NIXON that both have denounced the inadequacy of the Kennedy labor bill, despite its 90-to-1 passage in the Senate (with Arizona's GOLDWATER casting the lone dissenting vote).

The President has asked for a stronger bill, specifically House amendments banning secondary boycotts and blackmail picketing, and the settlement under State authority of no-man's-land disputes outside the purview of the National Labor Relations Board.

These amendments would effect relatively minor reforms. The basic threat of union monopoly power would not be lessened by much. Yet they could be a step in the right direction, which seems to be about the best we can hope for from a congressional majority intimidated by fear of reprisals at the polls.

Senator KENNEDY and bipartisan liberals, with an eye on 1960, are hoping for final passage of a watered-down labor bill which would be acceptable to union leaders and the general public. Such a bill would be innocuous.

If a House majority can be made to realize that basic reforms and curbs of monopoly power are demanded by the majority of voters, we may still hope for passage of a bill to meet Senator MCCLELLAN'S minimum requirements.

Where Is Free Competition Under the Fair Trade Laws?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 5, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial appearing in the Charlotte (N.C.) Observer of March 30, 1959.

That editorial entitled "Where Is Free Competition Under the Fair Trade Laws?" chronicles some of the reasons why the fair trade bill, H.R. 1253, now pending before the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee should be defeated.

WHERE IS FREE COMPETITION UNDER THE FAIR TRADE LAWS?

Eight years ago the U.S. Supreme Court knocked the props from under the fair trade laws—those laws that say a dealer is obligated to sell a manufacturer's products at a certain price even though he has made no agreement to that effect.

This, said the Court, is "price fixing by compulsion."

Since then the courts of 15 States, plus those of Hawaii and Puerto Rico, have held similarly. There is little doubt that the trend is running against such laws, and for the very best of reasons. It is because of this trend that the effort is now directed toward a national law of blanket application.

In the eyes of the Justice Department, such a law would be "an affirmative approval by Congress of the elimination of competition. * * * The bill would suppress competition at the manufacturing level and at all levels of distribution. * * * [It] would enable price rigidity by proprietors which would not necessarily take into account the changing economic conditions of a free competitive system."

To the Federal Trade Commission it would pervert the letter and spirit of the antitrust laws, prevent the healthy backwash from consumer to producer which keeps prices from getting out of hand—in short, make it a crime to give the public a bargain.

To the Commerce Department, it would amount to Federal endorsement of the right of manufacturers to set prices at all levels, a dangerous precedent contrary to current concepts of property rights.

To the Agriculture Department, it suggests the maximum that "price competition is healthy throughout the distributive system and should be encouraged rather than prevented."

Justice sees also "an unwarranted encroachment on the sovereignty" of the States. Congress has no business imposing trade restrictions that the States have just rejected, the Government's lawyers contend.

The Justice Department says it made a survey 3 years ago of eight cities not covered by fair trade laws. It checked the prices of 132 common drug, houseware, appliance, and similar articles. It found the prices for these commodities averaging 19 percent below the fair trade prices fixed for other areas.

We can readily understand the inclinations of a manufacturer who has build up a brand name and wishes to protect both the name and the price he thinks should match it. Neither is it hard to understand the views of many retailers who handle such merchandise and see themselves undersold or discounted.

Their views, while understandable, should by no means become the public policy of the country, adding to the rigidities that already beset the pricing and merchandising structure.

If something is wrong with competition, the answer is more of it and not less.

District of Columbia—An Island Possession?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 10, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on February 17, 1959, I introduced H.R. 4630 to provide local self-government to the District of Columbia. Many of our colleagues introduced similar measures.

In this connection I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article which appeared in the April 1959, issue of the National Voter, a publication of the League of Women Voters of the United States:

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—AN ISLAND POSSESSION?

Congress has agreed to admit Hawaii with its civilian population of 578,000 to the Union. Last year 167,000 Alaskans became full-fledged citizens. But 825,000 people who live in the District of Columbia are still stranded on a 69-square-mile island—the only part of the United States of America where local residents have no vote for anything and no control over the local government under which they live.

Recently a Member of Congress, during a floor debate, called Washington "a city and yet not a city; a political entity and yet not a political entity." This is perhaps as good a definition as any of the city's status.

Washington is in reality two cities: One of stately buildings and green vistas which thousands of tourists see when they come to visit their National Capital; the other of mostly middleclass homes, many shabby side streets, and some appalling slums. It is beset by all the problems of any community where many families are moving to the suburbs in search of space for growing children.

It is this second city, second-rate by almost any municipal standards, that supports the beautiful and impressive Federal facade. Eighty-eight percent of the operating and maintenance expenes of the whole city this year came out of the pockets of Washington residents. Even the fascinating zoo, owned by the Smithsonian Institution, is operated and maintained by District of Columbia taxes.

Fifty-three percent of the District's land area is tax exempt, including land owned by the Federal Government, foreign embassies, and many national organizations. Unlike other cities of its population class, Washington can collect no tax from its major industry and largest employer: the Federal Government. The Federal Government makes a contribution to the local budget, but whether this is in lieu of taxes Congress is reluctant to say. The amount of this contribution varies from year to year. In fiscal 1959 it is $20 million, or 12 percent of the budget. The House proposes making it $25 million next year, under a continuing authorization for $32 million. The 85th Congress authorized a salary raise for District of Columbia employees but did not appropriate money to pay for it.

Because of the uncertainty of the amount Congress will agree to contribute each year it is no easy matter for the three Commissioners—the District's "city managers" (appointed by the President) who must present the budget to Congress—to plan annual expenditures. If the Senate agrees to the appropriation bill recently passed by the House there will be a $9 million gap between what the Commissioners believe is needed and what they can spend next year. Congress suggests that District of Columbia taxes be raised.

Local taxes paid by Washington residents, including the District of Columbia income tax (comparable to a State income tax) go into an earmarked fund in the U.S. Treasury and must be appropriated annually for the District's needs.

The District of Columbia tax structure is a hodge-podge of what in other communities would be municipal, county, and State taxes. District of Columbia rates are now about equal to those in the surrounding metropolitan area where Washington spills over into Maryland and Virginia.

WHO'S IN CHARGE HERE?

Washington has the largest city council in the world—the 534 Members of Congress. In the House of Representatives 2 days a month are set aside for District affairs, the second and fourth Mondays of the month. Mondays are the days most Congressmen consider the least important of the legislative week and Monday sessions are often poorly attended since the extra day allows Members to take long weekends in their own constituencies. When the House passed the fiscal 1960 appropriation for the District of Columbia budget March 16—a Monday—there were 28 Representatives on the House floor.

District matters are screened by four congressional committees with a combined membership of 109 Representatives and Senators on the House and Senate District of Columbia committees and appropriations committees. There was some difficulty this year in getting Members to serve on the District committees but most of those who do serve give a great deal of time and devotion to their duties.

Before the Commissioners present the District of Columbia budget to Congress they consult with many citizen groups about what should go into it. Most of these same groups also appear before the District committees when hearings are held. The District of Columbia League of Women Voters has done this for years. Other groups which appear regularly are the PTA, the citizens associations, and, possibly the most influential, the board of trade. But there is not much civic leadership in the city. Why worry about conditions which you cannot control? After all the evidence is in, Congress decides how and how much money may be spent.

Congress also takes up many local matters, such as the garnishment of wages for debts, bus fares for school children, and increased benefits for widows and orphans of firemen and policemen, which have been occupying the House committee intermittently since the beginning of the current session.

THE DISFRANCHISED

Washington residents were not always as helpless in relation to the solution of local problems as they are now. Before 1870, residents of the District elected their own mayor and city council. They were represented in Congress by a nonvoting elected delegate. Between 1871 and 1874 the President appointed a governor, members of a legislative assembly, and a board of public works, and the people elected a 22-member house of delegates and a nonvoting delegate to the House of Representatives. Before and during that time the city had contracted a

debt for needed improvements, chiefly streets and sewers. A citizen group appealed to Congress to take over the local government, relieving residents of the responsibility of the debt. So Congress provided the form of government in force today, disfranchising District of Columbia citizens in the process.

Since 1946, bills have been before Congress to give Washington some form of self-government. The Senate has passed such bills four times, but the House has never had an apportunity to vote on such a bill.

The bill on which home-rule supporters are pinning their hopes this year would provide a territorial form of government—a governor appointed by the President, an elected legislative assembly, a board of education created by the assembly, and a nonvoting delegate to the House of Representatives. Congress and the President would retain the right to overrule assembly decisions, thus satisfying the constitutional requirement that "Congress shall exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever, over such District * * * as may * * * become the seat of the Government of the United States." The Supreme Court has ruled that this power may be delegated.

This is the form of government that Alaska and Hawaii have put aside in becoming States. Can the District now move up the ladder a rung and inherit the mantel of government which they have cast off? Maybe, if there is enough understanding of the District of Columbia problem in the States to convince individual Members of Congress that it is time for Washington residents to assume their civic responsibility.

Law Day, U.S.A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. LEVERING
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 5, 1959

Mr. LEVERING. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the observance of Law Day, U.S.A., on May 1, I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, under leave granted to me, a statement by the Honorable Charles B. Holtsberry, judge of the court of common pleas, Licking County, Ohio. Mr. Speaker, it has been my pleasure to know this distinguished jurist for a number of years. This article appeared in the Utica (Ohio) Herald on April 30, 1959, and is well worthy of the consideration of my colleagues.

The statement follows:

LAW DAY, U.S.A.

(By Hon. Charles B. Holtsberry, judge, court of common pleas, Licking County, Ohio)

On May 1, we celebrate Law Day, U.S.A. Today, the law is the concern of the average man as it never was before. It is the mortar which unites men into a social order. In America the county courthouse is the symbol of a free judiciary where inside its doors the dignity of the individual will be respected and his equality of equal rights protected.

Our heritage comes from the toil, strife, wisdom, and foresight of our ancestors. We observe, therefore, Law Day, U.S.A. to renew our faith in the rule of law as the guarantee for happiness in organized society and for peace and harmony in a troubled and anxious world.

At a recent midwestern World Peace Through Law conference in Chicago, I was pleased, as your Licking County judge, to be the Ohio delegate. Our program, under the leadership of the American Bar Association, is aimed at substituting throughout the world the rule of law instead of a rule of terror.

The new approach, which demands the support of every American citizen, is through international law. This seemingly complex term really boils down to something quite simple. It means merely the effort to express and write out the rules of ordinary decency among nations. Its spiritual fuel is the belief that certain universal concepts can be brought together into the fabric of law.

Never in our history has there been a time so balanced between danger and opportunity. Conflict in the past meant killing each other, now it means killing the future, too.

Therefore, let us today proclaim and rededicate ourselves, each in our own way, to that solemn task to preserve and pass on to the citizens of tomorrow the heritage of liberty under law which is rightfully theirs.

Let us proclaim and stand firm to establish the rule of law among the nations of the world in this age of the atom and of outer space. Let us be proud in our community that every church is a monument to freedom of religion; every newspaper a fulfilment of the promise of freedom of the press; every courthouse a symbol of equal justice under law.

John A. Scott Reports: An Analysis of the Proposed Cutbacks in Army and Marine Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BRADEMAS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Senate last week voted unanimously to halt a reduction in the Marine Corps which had been ordered by Pentagon leaders in defiance of Congress, and the Senate also directed that the Army maintain its personnel at 900,000 rather than reduce our military manpower as urged by the administration.

These votes reflect a concern on the part of many Americans that our country may not be adequately prepared to deal with so-called limited-war situations. Lacking limited-war capacity, we may be confronted either with being nibbled to death by possible aggressors or forced to fight only an all-out nuclear war. Either of these alternatives obviously poses grave danger both to our national security and to the maintenance of world peace.

On April 26, 1959, over Station WSJV–TV, South Bend-Elkhart, Ind., Mr. John A. Scott, vice president of the Truth Publishing Co., a Marine Corps officer with a fine record of combat service and a former mayor of the city of South Bend, gave a most interesting talk in which he expressed his own deep concern over the proposed cutbacks in Marine and Army forces.

Because I believe Mr. Scott's discussion an intelligent and penetrating one, I should like to include the text of his remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

Some years ago Rudyard Kipling paid tribute to the British Tommy, the faithful fellow down in the ranks of the British Army whose courage defended the Empire.

Remember how Kipling put it? He said, "It's Tommy this, and Tommy that, and 'cuss him out, the brute.' But it's 'savior of 'is country when the guns begin to shoot'."

In a number of wars, the United States has had reason to thank our GI's—our soldiers, sailors, and marines—for preserving our own liberties.

Meanwhile, the science of warfare has made fearful strides. Now the headlines tell of missiles and rockets and space ships. We are constantly torn by fears that Russia may be gaining on us in these weapons.

The Senate's emphatic and unanimous approval of Christian Herter as Secretary of State showed the determination of Americans to stand together against Russia, however we may differ on domestic issues. And certainly the immense faith of Americans in the military wisdom of President Eisenhower is a major factor in this unity. In fact, the President's enormous prestige has actually reduced to a minimum any criticism of his defense program. But this may be dangerous. Too many people may be assuming that the next war, if ever it comes, will be simply a matter of pressing buttons, and of whom presses enough buttons first.

We are referring to the "men-versus-missiles" question that now confronts Congress. The President's program reduces the strength of the Army to 870,000 men, and of the Marine Corps to 175,000 men.

Is a reduction of this nature safe? Have we actually come to the time when the foot soldier—the GI in the field like the British Tommy of old—is no longer "savior of 'is country when the guns begin to shoot?"

Tonight let's examine exactly what this reduction in force will mean to the Marine Corps and to the defensive position of the United States. Because, in order to maintain three divisions of Marines, 200,000 men are required—25,000 more than the President's program will provide. These three Marine divisions are forces in readiness. One of them is poised for action on the East Coast, one on the West Coast and one is stationed overseas in the Pacific area. As recently as a year ago, the President considered it necessary to commit one of these divisions to action in the Middle East, and Marines landed in Lebanon.

We keep hearing about nuclear push-button warfare and about missiles which will go thousands of miles, and even about space platforms. But since the end of World War II, there have been 18 limited, or brush-fire, wars. And in none of these wars was the nuclear bomb employed as a weapon. Nor, we may add sadly, did the fact that we possessed nuclear bombs deter the aggressor from starting to shoot.

Just where do we stand? There are so many conflicting reports. For instance, a major news source reported the other day: "From the military standpoint, Russia has lost the edge on the European front. * * * Allies now have combat forces on the ground to match Soviet forces in Germany." However, when you read on you discover there is a fateful catch. You find that "Allied strength cannot expect to hold an allout Russian attack on the ground and would have to use allout nuclear war." So, if Allied strength on the ground must have all-out nuclear support, is our ground strength enough?

And Europe is by no means the whole story. How about the other danger spots at far corners of the earth? In the whole world, according to Gen. Nathan Twining, Chairman of the Joint Chief of Staff, the allied troop strength is 6 million men, while the U.S.S.R. bloc has 7.8 million men. Is it safe to be

reducing our U.S. troop strength when the allied forces already have 1.8 million fewer troops?

Of course we could become sentimental about what the foot soldier has meant to the United States. We could recall how the marines went to Iceland in 1941 when no other troops were available; how the marines were first to spearhead the Guadalcanal offensive; how the marines turned the tide at Pusan in Korea. Or we could recall some of the heroic actions by the Army on D-day in Europe, or in Italy or in South Africa. But sentiment is not our purpose. We are thinking not so much of the past as of the future. What makes some of us so sure that the Russians will choose nuclear weapons when they make a major bid to take over the world? Maybe the Russians will be crafty enough to realize that nuclear war could be as hard on themselves as on us. Such a belief on their part might actually be behind the current indications that the Kremlin may be ready to talk about nuclear disarmament—perhaps even with inspection, who knows? After all, it might be easier to check up on whether bombs are being exploded than upon how many troops a nation has. And with the immense population in the entire Communist world, they have more potential to draw upon for troops in the field.

Instead of blowing us to bits all at once, who knows but what it may be Kremlin strategy to nibble us to death, a piece at a time—a little aggression here, a little aggression there, each successful because we don't have enough troops to prevent it—and because in each case we are reluctant to risk the retaliation which nuclear arms would bring?

Obviously we are making a case tonight for preserving the present manpower levels of Marines and Army. And we fully understand that cost is a vital factor. As much as anyone, we are concerned about the size of the Federal budget, and all that Federal deficits can mean to our economy.

Well, congressional experts estimate that $150 million is the amount involved in maintaining both the Marine Corps and the Army at levels their top officers consider necessary. That is about the cost of three intercontinental ballistic missiles.

Are we, then, suggesting that the United States needs fewer missiles and more men? This suggestion actually has been made by top leaders of both the Army and of the Navy. A startling revelation came last March 30 when Congress made public a censored transcript of a secret hearing before the Defense Subcommittee on the House Appropriations Committee. It was revealed then that both Gen. Maxwell Taylor, Army Chief of Staff, and Adm. Arleigh Burke, Chief of Naval Operations, believe that we have more atomic retaliatory power than we need. Said Burke, and this is a direct quote: "I think we should put more money into limited (war) capability." Furthermore, General Taylor revealed that the Joint Chiefs of Staff had never specifically approved or disapproved of the proposed Army cutback from 900,000 to 870,000 men and had never reached complete agreement on force tabs, setting forth the precise military forces that would be required to execute strategic plans.

We do not specifically defend any particular branch of the service in this matter; it is the philosophy and the strategy of defense that concerns us. And General Taylor's remark raises the question whether the Joint Chiefs are showing the leadership we should expect. Defense Secretary McElroy expresses confidence in our overall military position. But can we ignore these expressions of concern from top men in uniform about the sheer number of troops we can count on in case of crisis?

The day may again come when the GI's will be called upon as "saviors of their country when the guns begin to shoot."

We only hope enough of them will be there to answer the call.

Sol Hurok Contributes to International Understanding Through Exchange of Artists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 5, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I believe that one of the great opportunities for understanding among the peoples of the earth is for an exchange of talented performers in the fields of the theater, the ballet, athletics, music, dance, art, and many other activities.

The Bolshoi Ballet, presently performing in New York City, is helping to acquaint Americans with the artistry of Russians in this difficult and intricate art. It is my hope that Americans with similar skills can demonstrate them to the plain people of the Soviet Union. In this way, a bridge may be painstakingly forged between two different realms.

The Bolshoi is currently in America due to the determination, contacts, and energy of a man who has brought many great artists to our shores—Sol Hurok, himself an immigrant. I wish there were a counterpart of Sol Hurok in Russia, so that Russia's people could learn at first hand of the talent and skill of Americans in the theater, ballet, and related activities.

I salute a man who has been able to narrow, if only slightly, the chasm between the Soviet world and the free world. In the April 1958 issue of the Reader's Digest appeared an excellent portrait of Sol Hurok, written by Gerald Goode. Its title was "S. Hurok Presents." In tribute to Sol Hurok, I ask unanimous consent that this article, as condensed from Mayfair Magazine of Toronto, Canada, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"S. HUROK PRESENTS"—THE UNSCHOOLED IMMIGRANT WHOSE LIFE'S GOAL HAS BEEN TO BRING THE WORLD'S GREATEST ARTISTS TO THE PEOPLE OF AMERICA

[Condensed from Mayfair]

(By Gerald Goode)

During a rehearsal in a New York theater a Spanish dancer inadvertently whirled under a ladder left on the stage by a hapless electrician. Terrified by superstition, the dancer lunged at the stagehand, who darted for the wings. The pusuit led over the footlights and up the aisle of the empty theater to the rear. Suddenly both men stopped short—and burst into laughter. Before them stood a squarely built man of middle height, impeccably dressed in striped pants and oxford gray coat. With quiet and leisurely dignity, he was manipulating a yo-yo.

This was Sol Hurok, whose trademark, "S. Hurok Presents," has made him known throughout the United States as one of our few genuine impresarios. For the past 40 years Hurok has "presented" to America the most opulent ballet and classical drama, the world's greatest singers and finest pianists and violinists. As impresario he not only finances and books the concerts of the great performers but guides their careers. Wise in the ways of artists, Hurok's manner exudes calm amid the volcanoes of temperament that surround him. He has used the yo-yo to soothe the jitters of many a high-strung star.

Hurok will go to any lengths to keep his performers happy. Before a ballet engagement in Chicago, he discovered that the name of a petulant director had been erroneously reduced in size on the advertising posters. New strips with the director's name in proper size were hurriedly printed, but not a man could be found on a Saturday to paste them up. So Hurok and I, his publicity manager, mushed through snowy streets, he with paste pot and I with brush, until every poster in the city was altered.

I first met Sol Hurok in 1930. He was 38, a shrewd-eyed man with a fringe of thick brown hair rimming his bald dome. Sitting in the cramped windowless office he occupied on Times Square, the walls solidly lined with photographs of musical greats, he told me of his life's goal: to bring the world's outstanding artists from the four corners of the globe to all the people of America, particularly those of modest means. If he, an unschooled immigrant unable to read a note of music or play a single instrument could thrill to classical music and beautiful ballet, why not everyone else in America?

He spoke in middle-European accents, in sentences that telescoped and tumbled every which way without apparent grammatical joints. Though his syntax faltered, his enthusiasm never did. He was a man with a mission who, said the New York Times, "has done more than any other man toward the building up of the countrywide American audience of music lovers."

Hurok's admiration for great talent amounts to unashamed hero-worship and he can divine a master performer much the way a dowser finds underground water. He has managed such famous personalities as Marian Anderson, Artur Rubinstein, Jan Peerce, Patrice Munsel, Isaac Stern, Roberta Peters, and most of the finest ballet companies and theatrical importations of this generation, including Britain's Old Vic and France's Comédie Française. Today he manages the supreme favorite of the ballet world, the Sadler's Wells—recently renamed the Royal Ballet of Britain—the first company to hold a television audience of 37 million persons for 90 minutes of wordless ballet. This was a surprise to the television industry but not to Hurok. He had been proving for years that culture pays, if it is the best.

One of Hurok's greatest assets has been an uncanny faculty for sensing the mood of the people. At the start of the depression he launched Mary Wigman, exponent of the modern dance movement facetiously called the soul-searching or flat-footed school. Before he signed her, I hinted to Hurok that perhaps something gayer, like the Folies-Bergère, might be more diverting in distressed times. Hurok disagreed, declaring that what misery really wanted was company. He was right. Wigman's dances of grief and darkness seemed to arouse a self-identifying response in her audiences. They shouted for encores and went out into the gloom purged and happy. For three successful seasons the box office throve.

Then Hurok rediscovered the ballet. Again his timing was magical. Classical ballet had been forgotten for years in this country. After prohibition's repeal something in the air suggested that audiences were ripe for

more gracious forms of entertainment. From Monte Carlo, Hurok imported an expatriate Russian ballet company and, with a glittering society premiere, ballet was officially reborn. Although it took a little time for Americans to accept athletic males dancing in white, blue, and purple tights, within a few years ballet became vastly popular.

More recently the impresario proved again that he is the perfect barometer of that public known as the Hurok audience. On a visit to Britain he attended the Edinburgh Festival in Scotland and was excited by the pomp and pageantry of a group called the Scots Guards and Massed Pipers. He signed them for an American tour.

His associates shook their heads in shocked disbelief. "Why would anyone pay to see a parade of uniformed guardsmen and kilted bagpipers?" they asked. Hurok persisted, and the guards proved to be a sensational success. In four performances in Madison Square Garden, each of which Hurok attended, a sellout audience thrilled to the marching maneuvers, the skirling bagpipes, the crimson uniforms with their bearskin headdresses. Throughout the country the guards were so popular that last winter Hurok repeated the tour with another spectacular marching group, the Black Watch of Scotland.

No musical background propelled Hurok into his career. If he heard echoes of music, they were the sounds of balalaika bands playing for country dances in the small Russian village where he was born, the son of a hardware merchant. He came to this country in 1906, a youth avidly curious about America. When he landed at Ellis Island he was wearing two suits of clothes and three sets of underwear and totaling a goose-feather pillow. His total capital was $1.50. He got a job as a streetcar conductor but was fired for calling out the names of streets in a gibberish only remotely resembling English. Later, while selling hardware at $8 a week, he began going to the opera. One evening after he had heard Caruso from the top gallery of the Metropolitan, he said to himself, "Someday, S. Hurok, you are going to manage people like that."

He began by carving a niche for himself as chairman of the entertainment committee of a workers' lyceum in Brooklyn. As a sideline he formed a musical society for managing concert artists. With the awe of a stricken fan and the brass of an autograph hunter, he won his first client, the violinist Efrem Zimbalist, who agreed to give a workers' concert in Brooklyn at dollar-top prices. The concert was a success and Hurok quit cutlery to hang out his shingle as a concert manager.

First he announced that concert prices were too high; he had felt the pinch in his own purse. In 1915 he engaged the New York Hippodrome, an elephantine hall of rococo and red plush, and presented such top stars of the times as Tetrazzini and Schumann-Heink for a series of Sunday concerts. The admission price was $2 top. Because many of his prospective concert-goers had never been out of their local neighborhoods, he advertised detailed instructions, with diagrams, on how to reach the hall by subway, elevated, and streetcar. The seats could be bought at drugstores in the Bronx and Brooklyn. Thus, for perhaps the first time, working folk heard the same great stars as the well-to-do.

Today nearing 70, Hurok leads a simple life in the modest New York apartment where he lives with his wife, a former Russian actress. But there is always vodka and caviar on hand for friends who drop in. And at the inevitable party following one of his premieres Hurok may be seen dancing a conga or an old-fashioned waltz with members of the company. When he leaves, he will be wearing the rakish beaver fedora and carrying the silver-tipped ebony cane which together with "S. Hurok Presents" have long been his trademark.

Countless honors have been showered upon Hurok for his work as a one-man agency for international cultural exchange. Yet with the artists he admires he still retains a worshipful manner. Whenever one of his attractions is performing within striking distance, he invariably attends. Standing at the back, he can be seen—and heard—beating his palms together with machine-gun-like reports.

Hurok has been called the Mahatma of Music and the Barnum of the Arts. But to millions of people he is best known as the man who has brought a richer life to Americans of all classes.

Where Fortunes Are Being Made Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 5, 1959

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, last year I offered an amendment to the major tax reform bill to require executives receiving stock options as compensation to pay a regular, full income tax on it. The bill passed. The amendment was defeated. At that time I pointed out that the Federal Treasury is losing many millions of dollars through this loophole. Because top management can avoid taxes in this way, the ordinary taxpayer has to pay more to make up the Treasury loss.

Recently U.S. News & World Report ran an excellent article describing just how this loophole benefits the top executives of America's biggest corporations. The article also shows how widespread this practice has become. Because I intend to push for this tax reform once again this year, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection the article was ordered printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From U.S. News & World Report, May 11, 1959]

WHERE FORTUNES ARE BEING MADE AGAIN

A great many officials of U.S. corporations suddenly are becoming very wealthy—at least on paper.

At a time when other investors are paying record prices for stocks, these executives are getting bargains. They are buying large blocks of stock in their own firms at prices set several years ago, when stock prices generally were much lower. In some cases, the "insiders" are paying one-half or one-third of what the stocks are worth on the open market.

Thanks to the bull market stock options are proving a windfall for thousands of management men, big and small. A whole new wave of plans is being promulgated in the hopes that stocks will go still higher, so that today's prices, taken as the basis for new options, will be bargain prices a year or two from now. Stockholders already have been asked to ratify scores of option plans, similar to those shown in the table.

HOW OPTIONS WORK

The charts at the end of this article explains how stock options can lead to riches in a bull market. The following is an actual example from the records of one of the Nation's largest manufacturers:

In January 1953, this company offered key executives a large amount of stock at a price of $315 a share, the market value of the stock at that time. One vice president received the right to buy 4,000 shares at this price at intervals until 1963. In the first 3 years, he bought 1,200 shares.

Then, in January 1956, the stock was split 15 for 1, and the option price was adjusted accordingly to $21 per share. By that time, the split stock commanded a price of more than $60 a share.

In the next 2 years, the vice president bought 6,000 shares of split stock at $21. Then, when stocks were depressed in the summer of 1958, he sold 6,000 for $42 per share. His profit on these stocks came to $126,000. On this, he paid a capital-gains tax of 25 percent, leaving a profit after tax of $94,500. He still had 18,000 shares purchased at $21.

In February 1959, the market price of the stock had moved back up to $54. The vice president again became a buyer to the tune of 12,000 shares at $21.

At last report, this official held 30,000 shares for which he had paid $630,000. Their value on today's market, where the company stock has gone still higher, is nearly $2 million. If the vice president sells his holdings 4 months from now and if the market price of the stock does not change in the meantime, he will have a profit, after taxes, of nearly $1.1 million, counting the $94,500 cleared earlier.

A CHANGE IN SENTIMENT

The same experience, usually on a smaller scale, is being repeated in many firms. A year ago, when stock prices were low, after the sharp break in 1957, option plans were viewed with less enthusiasm. Some officials found their stocks were worth less than they had paid for them. It became clear that purchases on stock options do entail risk. Not many new plans were being proposed.

Today, the situation is reversed, because of the skyrocketing of stock prices to record levels. For many firms, the plans now coming out represent a second round. Earlier plans, introduced after Congress liberalized the tax treatment of options in 1950, have run out and are being extended and in most instances greatly expanded. They have proved attractive. Here is why:

So far as the official is concerned, the price he pays for the stock is fixed from the time the option is granted until the stock is purchased. Very often there is a small discount—up to 5 percent of the market value—in the setting of the option price initially.

If the market price of the stock rises above the option price, the holder of the option stands to make a clear profit. If the market price falls, he sits tight and lets the option go. He may put off buying for as long as 5 years.

In short, the company executive has some of the advantage of owning stocks, without the usual risk, until he actually buys.

When he decides the time has come to buy, he has a windfall that is not counted as taxable income until he sells the stock. Says he pays $50,000 for stock worth $100,000. He is richer by $50,000, but without any increase in taxable income, provided the option price was set originally at 95 percent or more of the market value then prevailing. If he holds the stock 6 months, he applies the capital-gains rate, a maximum of 25 percent, to the profit. This means that profits from stock options usually are worth a great deal more, in income after taxes, than the same amount of salary.

You can see why many officials are at least as interested in stock options as they are in pay raises.

A BUSINESS INCENTIVE

Now, how does all this work out from the company's point of view?

The chief idea behind options is that they encourage company officials to work harder, since they stand to gain when increased earnings are reflected in higher market prices for the stock. Buying stock also is supposed to give key personnel a greater interest in the firm and make them less likely to leave.

Many companies feel it is cheaper to use stock options than it would be to pay salaries high enough to attract and hold keymen. Some stockholders have argued, however, that there are two ways of looking at the cost.

Money paid by the company in the form of higher salaries would be deductible for tax purposes. In giving stock options, on the other hand, the companies are selling stock for less than they could get in the open market, and these discounts are not deductible as business expenses. It is also contended that the sale of stock dilutes the equity and profits of the shareholders.

In practice, stockholders almost never refuse to approve a stock-option plan proposed by management.

VARIETY OF PLANS

Some plans are tailored for one or two top executives. Others cover hundreds of key employees. A number of big companies have plans for purchase of stock by all employees, in addition to the special options for executives. Some have salary-deduction plans enabling employees to accumulate the required funds over the years.

Some officials find they have to sell stock obtained on old options in order to pay for stock available on new options. Companies do have rules to discourage the quick resale of optioned stock for profit taking. Yet, stock market authorities contend that a large proportion of the optioned shares are not retained as permanent investments.

This year, in the bull market, attention is on the advantages of the stock options. The opportunity to buy shares at what may later appear to be bargain prices is being sought eagerly by management. The evidence to date suggests that 1959 will see a new record for the number of companies and shares involved.

NEW OFFERS OF STOCK TO COMPANY OFFICIALS

Some option plans recently submitted to stockholders for approval:

American Can: 30,000 shares for officers and key employees.

Carrier Corp.: A reduced option price of $49.03 per share on 21,022 shares.

Chrysler: 256,486 shares at $52.49 per share for 66 officers and employees and 53,440 shares at $49.94 for 23 officers and employees.

Douglas Aircraft: 190,840 shares for officers and key executives.

Gillette: A 5-year extension of present plan; increase of 100,000 in number of shares available.

Island Creek Coal: 80,000 shares for management employees.

Minneapolis-Honeywell: 75,000 shares for executives and key personnel.

Republic Aviation: 150,000 shares for officers and other executives.

Revlon: An additional 60,000 shares for executives.

Rexall Drug & Chemical: An additional 150,000 shares for key employees.

Sinclair Oil: 750,000 shares for 200 or more key employees.

Thatcher Glass: 10,000 shares at $32.19 per share for one official.

Thompson Ramo Wooldridge: 150,000 shares for officers and key employees.

U.S. Gypsum: 400,000 shares for officers and key employees.

Westinghouse Electric: 500,000 shares for about 400 executives.

(Source: Standard & Poor's Corp., and individual companies.)

July 1954: XYZ company gave its president, John Doe, an option to buy 25,000 shares of XYZ stock at $30 a share. This was the market price at that time. Under the option, he could buy the stock any time within 5 years.

July 1956: XYZ stock was down to $25 on the market. President Doe held off, delayed exercising his option to see what happened to the market.

April 1959: XYZ, having caught fire in the market, had bounded up to $75. President Doe, still well within his 5-year period, exercised the option, bought the entire 25,000 shares at $30. Total price: $750,000. Paper profit: $1,125,000.

Now: President Doe has a choice: (1) Sell the stock immediately, realize his gain, and pay taxes at the full income tax rate; or (2) take the risk of a market decline, hold the stock for at least 6 months, until October 1959, or later, and then pay a capital-gains tax of no more than 25 percent.

October 1959: If President Doe sells his 25,000 shares at $75, he will realize a net profit, after capital-gains tax, of $843,750.

Conservation and Development of National Forests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY ALDOUS DIXON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 5, 1959

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to briefly comment on a report received from the Secretary of Agriculture on March 24, 1959, entitled "Program for the National Forests." It is a report which I think is long overdue and one which deserves our thoughtful attention. It has been referred to the Agriculture Committee, of which I am a member, and hearings have now been scheduled for May 14 and 15.

The program as outlined in the report provides for a marked increase in all national-forest activities, including the necessary research. It is a sound long-range program designed to make these public properties produce a maximum of public benefits under a system of multiple-use management.

I have a deep and sincere interest in the seven national forests in my State. This interest stems from my close association with the administration of these valuable lands and from my activities over many years in helping to get some of the most important watershed lands in Utah placed under Forest Service protection and management.

The national forests in Utah play a unique role in the economy of my State. Besides attracting thousands of tourists, campers, fishermen, and big-game hunters, they are the high rugged mountain ranges which intercept the moisture-laden clouds from the Pacific Ocean and cause them to dump their precious load of rain or snow, and then release it slowly throughout the year into our parched desert valleys. Without this water, Utah could support only a fraction of its present population. Water is one of the scarcest and most valuable resources we have. Most of the water we use comes from national forest watersheds.

The wisdom of protecting and properly managing these important watershed lands is nowhere more dramatically illustrated than along the Wasatch Mountains just north of Salt Lake City. Before these lands were placed under the Forest Service they were burned over and damaged to such an extent that summer storms caused several serious floods which took many lives and caused millions of dollars in damage to personal property. Under Forest Service protection and management these lands have been rehabilitated, the floods have stopped, and the water can once again be used for irrigation and domestic purposes. We have found out through experience that flood prevention is practical and can be accomplished. Unfortunately we still have many watersheds in the national forests of Utah that need similar treatment. This new program for the national forests recognizes this and similar problems and provides for an intensified plan of corrective action.

In Utah, watershed conditions are closely associated with the grazing of livestock. The high mountain ranges in the national forests furnish summer grazing for thousands of ranchers and livestock producers. The improvement of these key range areas to sustain high-yield forage production is urgently needed to stabilize this important part of our economy. For example, there are over 600,000 acres of national forest land in Utah which is suitable for grazing and which can be greatly improved through revegetation. Although some progress is being made, the work is not being accomplished as rapidly as it should be. If the revegetation work in Utah is continued at the present rate it will take 30 to 40 years to complete the job. We cannot afford to wait this long.

In reviewing the report it was reassuring to learn that the program provides for accelerating these activities; also that it sets forth a balanced and positive program of development and management for all the renewable resources of the national forests, including water, forage, recreation, wildlife, timber, and other land uses. All of these resources are needed for a growing America.

Polish Constitution Day

SPEECH
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 4, 1959

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the Poznan revolt of June 1956, was but another demonstration of Poland's deep-seated dedication to democracy and freedom, a dedication which was first evident on May 3, 1791, when the Polish people proclaimed Europe's first written constitution. And today, as we watch the rulers in Poland tighten their hold and repress human rights, we are sad-

dened, for this, too, has been the lot of Poland for hundreds of years.

The country was partitioned throughout the 19th century, yet the national image was kept alive by the continuing fight for freedom, a fight, incidentally, accompanied by a significant intellectual development. In 1918 independence was once again achieved, but 20 years later Poland again became an unwilling pawn in Europe's power politics. We will not forget that Poland in 1939 was the first nation to take up arms against violence and aggression.

Present-day Poland is living through an uneasy period. The freedom promised in 1956 lasted less than a year. As many of us feared, the Communist leaders grew impatient with the toleration of rights and freedoms, and they reverted to the traditional pattern of Communist rule—subservience to the party. We in the United States salute Poland on the 168th anniversary of Constitution Day, and we sincerely hope that one day soon it may again enjoy real freedoms.

Poland's Constitution Day

SPEECH
OF
HON. THOMAS E. MORGAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 4, 1959

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I need not recite on this floor the long history of friendship and association between the Polish and American peoples, a history which goes back to the very foundation of this country. Nor need I recite, Mr. Speaker, the proud achievements of our Americans of Polish descent who have played such a prominent role in the development of our country. As I look around me here in the House of Representatives, I see living and convincing proof on that score.

Mr. Speaker, 168 years ago Poland secured her Constitution. I only wish that Poland had been as fortunate as was the United States in having had an opportunity to develop its resources and its institutions without partition, dismemberment, and without the more recent enslavement by the Red tyranny of Soviet aggression.

Poland was not to be so fortunate for, following World War II, the Red wave engulfed the Polish nation. A few years ago we were heartened by the sudden resurgence of the Polish national spirit and the Polish love of freedom. When the Polish people rose up and endeavored to throw off their Soviet yoke, we felt a thrill at their bravery and we were hopeful that a new day had dawned for our friends in Poland. We still have that hope. There is no doubt that the lot of the Polish people has improved but there are serious doubts as to the future course of the Polish Government. We only hope and pray that the Polish people will ultimately have their full freedom and independence so as to realize their full capabilities and their dignity as a completely independent nation.

The Best State of the 50

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 5, 1959

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by the celebrated naturalist, Donald Culross Peattie, entitled "The Best State of the 50," which was published in the New York Times magazine section of Sunday, April 26.

Mr. Peattie is one of the ablest and most scholarly naturalists in the country. He is the author of such famous books as "An Almanac for Moderns," "Green Laurels," "Singing in the Wilderness," "Audubon's America," "The Record of a Naturalist," and many others of recognized quality. Along with Edwin Way Teale, Mr. Peattie is a naturalist of the John Burroughs school. He is an observer who has traveled in all parts of this country and in many areas of Europe.

It is very interesting to note that he has selected Illinois as the best State in the Union. Illinoians are not boastful, but we are naturally pleased that he should think that our State merits such recognition. We hope that we may justify the high opinion which Mr. Peattie holds of us.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BEST STATE OF THE 50
(By Donald Culross Peattie)

From the original 13 these United States have expanded to 50—States, chiefly, which the Founding Fathers never dreamed of admitting to our shoestring Republic. Furthermore, these lands belonged then to Spain, France, England, Russia. To acquire them the Founding Fathers would probably have predicted nothing but war with the great powers, or purchases beyond our dreams in the days of a financially tottering treasury. In any case, there would be ferocious Indian warfare.

Now we have rounded out our half hundred of States, and today any American can travel about in the 50 of them with the wonderful feeling that it is all part of home. At least that is what I have found, and I have visited all but five. It has been asked of me which of them all I consider best.

I could make out a case for many of them and must hesitate in choosing. California? California is the State I have, in recent years, elected to live in. There's nothing wrong with it; the trouble is too many people have the same idea. More than 500 people a day enter the State, not just as tourists who expect to depart, but as permanent residents. But still I love it, with its miles of misty blue lupine and orange poppy under great old oaks, its enormous trees in the redwood and the giant sequoia belts, its deserts and snowy Sierra Nevada.

Arizona or Wyoming? I bow before the Grand Canyon and I salute the sagebrush, but even with such grandeur and magenta-mixed beauty, I cannot make them my choices. Massachusetts, Connecticut, Maine and Vermont? They, like the Golden State, have enthusiasts enough.

Why not pick Virginia, which still has so many beautiful homes in the tidewater region that it is sometimes known as the chateau country of America? Everywhere it speaks of history—colonial times, the Revolution, the Civil War. These are memories no longer bloody and hate-filled; only the courage lingers on.

Or Kentucky? I have never met a kindlier people than the Kentuckians. I have heard the eastern meadowlark sing there, and seen the spring lambs gambol; and if the bluegrass and the mint juleps are not really native, Kentucky has the credit for them.

Then, turning westward, there's Colorado, with more high peaks in it than any other State in the Union. I love even the old buffalo plains, with their whistling sagebrush and downbending grasses. How magnificent is the Front Range of the Rockies, see from that plain. And the famous Spanish peaks—ancient volcanoes, it is said. I love the snow-fed cirques, like icy gems scattered on the foot of the peaks. I love Aspen, after the cultured people have gone and before the skiers have arrived, when the aspens are all atremble with golden fire.

But not of these is my choice. I shall choose, as amends from a son to a neglected mother, a State I was born in but left long ago.

I'll call Illinois the best.

I don't expect anyone to agree with me except several million suckers (natives of this State, so-called for the ugly-faced fish that feed at the bottom of its sluggish streams), and in Washington, D.C., my friend Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, and—wherever he is—Adlai E. Stevenson.

I hear cries of protest and ridicule: "What's good about Illinois?" "Chicago has the worst crime rate in the world." (It hasn't, not any more. Several cities excell it, including Los Angeles.) And then there's always the trite one: "It is a good State to come from." That last could be a blade turned against me, for at 20 I left the State. I did not come back to it and stayed for years, but now live in California because my work as a naturalist takes me to that so-various State with its forest and deserts, mountains and long seacoast.

Why, then, do I say Illinois is best? It has no gorgeous scenery, no stately antebellum mansions, no hallowed customs and no true cosmopolitanism like New York City's. In fact, just the opposite. Illinois is the best State precisely because it is so American.

More, it is heartland. As Castile is of Spain, as the plain of Beauce is the granary of France, or Tuscany of Italy, so Illinois is core America. Yes, even in the large number of the foreign born in Chicago. It is American in its unappreciated beauty of plainness—something that Thoreau would have understood perhaps, something that the three poets of the State who really sound to me like Illinois give voice to—Sandburg all the time, Vachel Lindsay sometimes, and Edgar Lee Masters in the one truly great book of poetry that he produced, "Spoon River Anthology."

Illinois is beautiful, it seems to me, as only a great fertile plain can be beautiful. If I cannot have a range of snowy mountains, then give me a great teeming plain, and not mere hilliness, which shuts off rather than provides a view. In Illinois you can see right down to the horizon. You have 180 degrees of an arc of sky, be it the aching blue of spring, when meadowlarks and bobolinks throw the twinkling gold of their songs into your ear, or a sky with vast moving clouds, castle-in-Spain clouds, in the days of summer thunderheads.

A tree, too, on the prairies, has meaning for me as mere woodsiness never has. When in Illinois you need a tree, for shade or the vertical breaking of the horizontal lines, there is a tree. In the Atlantic Coast States, for example, such a tree as a cottonwood is just another tree, short lived and too tall

for you to back away and look at it because of the woodsiness around you. But in one of the first accounts of the Prairie State, "Waubun, or the Early Day," by the wife of a captain at old Fort Dearborn, the single beauty of a far-off poplar is described, now near and clear, now mistily distant on the prairies. So with me, a cottonwood is a short-lived queen whose last golden raiment falls from her smooth body in the hour before the little death that is winter.

"Yes," I hear some saying, "I have been to Illinois several times. I motored across it as fast as I could." Or, "I took a train, pulled down the curtains against the sheer monotony of the State, and went sound asleep until I was well out of the place.

Goodby, stranger; next time take a faster train; step on that accelerator; my State is not for you. I'm sorry you didn't have the time to drink from Ganymede Spring, the best, the coldest water I ever tasted, as it comes rushing, crystalline, from the base of a famous bluff, Eagle's Nest. Spring and bluff were both named by that fearsome blue-stocking, Margaret Fuller, who said of the view from the top of the bluff: "Florence and Rome are suburbs compared with this capital of Nature's art."

And I am sorry for you if you had no time to go to Starved Rock with its wild primroses, the true subarctic mistassini primrose with pale lavender petals and yellow throat. Francis Parkman found it worth his while to go there in the days when travel was difficult, to see the spot where, on a high natural castle of rock, La Salle established a French fort in 1682 and, according to legend, a band of beseiged Illinois Indians later met starvation. They would not be dislodged and stayed, in their pride, till death overtook them.

Yes, and I'm sorry that you could not see the lofty and murmurous virgin white pine groves. You didn't know we had such places? No; how could you? These spots don't advertise on billboards, they don't charge admission. Ilinois is the least touristical of States. Nobody comes to Illinois for the climate, heaven knows; nobody comes to see the sights unless in Chicago. Illinois is just itself, soliciting nobody. Yet the French soldier-explorer, La Salle, and the Jesuit priest, Marquette, said of it, over and over, "Beautiful, beautiful."

Typically Illinoisan, it seems to me, was the canteen set up in a station on the Santa Fe Railroad during World War II. Where other cantens had long, official-sounding titles, or were members of some alphabet-soup organizations of that period, this kitchen was called simply the Parent's Canteen. You saw it at all hours staffed with middle-aged women belonging to no organization but their own, waiting to serve the uniformed sons of other parents.

Corny? If you like. You could call Florence Nightingale corny, or Clara Barton, or Walt Whitman in his letters and poems as a male nurse in the Civil War. Illinois is corny. It produces the best corn grown in this country, or anywhere in the world.

I never heard a place where bird song and the spring song of the frogs sounded so sweet. If you camp out on some hillock where swamp and orchard and prairie grass meet, you will hear full more than half of the species of land birds of eastern North America—the wild telegraphy of crows, the "flick-up wick-up" of flickers (called high-holers in Illinois), the golden rolling call of orioles, the jingling doorbell cry of redwings. And there is always the raucous call of herons (farm boys call them cranes) and the warning cries of king rails to their tiny coal-black chicks.

And the frogs. What I still hear in my dreams is the rising, bubbling sound of the swamp tree frogs, a thin "pee-yee-yeep." And the trilling tree toads who, like the stuttering black-billed cuckoos, prophesy rain.

The State flower is the modest violet, and it is a good choice, for there are scores of species—the butterfly, the sister, the hooded, the larkspur, the longspur. What some call dogtooth violet is a member of the lily family. And that flower called shooting star, with its upward-and-backwardly flaring petals, like some pointed comethead rushing to earth, is really a close relative of cyclamen.

In early spring, when the plum thickets fume with snowy blossoms on the dark, gnarled old finger-twigs, comes the moment when millions of spring beauties spread a carpet under the thicket. In autumn, the prairies change like the colors of the sea, with the rough purple of ironweed, the royal purple of Liatris, the purple and mauve of joe-pye weed, the smoky drift of asters through the woods.

For there are woods, of course—the prairie groves and, in every county, a strip called "the river woods." But there are three completely characteristic trees besides the cottonwoods: The bur oaks and the red haws (we called them thorn apples) that lean old elbows on the ground, making a perfect playhouse for every Illinois country child and, towering above, the shagbark hickories that, like Homer's soldiers who fought naked in their leathern armor, stand soldier-straight in their long strips of bark that is forever being sloughed off and replaced.

I love, too, the old-timeliness of Illinois towns, with their streets deep-shaded in vaulted elms and their yards never fenced against neighbors so that the children run in and out of each other's frame houses or play those favorite dusk games all over the block, while the June bugs bang against the screens.

I like the typical county courthouse of an Illinois town, be it Boomtown, Byzantine, Catfish Corinthian, or bearing some faint mansard-roof resemblance to the Paris Opéra. I even like the bad statuary—the blackened greenish copper of a Civil War soldier standing on a granite pedestal, with his kepi and cape, and the pyramids of cannonballs which do not look as if they would ever fit the long-nosed cannons beside them.

Some of the towns are true gems. I'd pick St. Charles on the Fox River, for simple and mellowed beauty. I'd call Galena a positive museum piece, redolent of times when hopes were high in the now-abandoned lead mines.

I sometimes wish I lived in one of the old towns on the Mississippi where the gulls make it seem like a seaport and the houses rest low on the ground, the long grass almost on a level with the old porches to which only lilacs or clematis give a partial privacy. And fondly I remember Grand Detour, with its unpaved streets, its two famous rival hotels where the Negro cooks tried to outdo each other with luscious chicken and custard pie.

Most antique of all Illinois' settlements is the carefully restored hamlet of New Salem. Photographs show that the last of it was tumbling downhill into the Sangamon River when it was saved from final disaster by the State parks system. Here Lincoln clerked in that famous store, read law, and here, fond tradition holds, he loved the girl Ann Rutledge, the real love of his life.

I never saw a better job of restoration than that of New Salem. Every last bit of pewter, every account book is there, every house. They even have the right weed growing around the privy. It's pokeweed, with its inky berries, edible "greens" and poisonous roots.

You can go, too, to the Lincoln House in Springfield, where he lived most unhappily with his wife, Mary Todd Lincoln, who, for reasons no one knows, recognized the future President of the United States when she saw him as a small-time lawyer.

Then follow up the towns that lie on the path of the Lincoln-Douglas debates. They fought in Ottawa, in Quincy on the Mississippi at Alton, at Galesburg and in Freeport, where 15,000 came from all about to hear these two, and stood in a light drizzle or sheltered in their wagons.

These towns are still there, not totally changed from the days of the great debates. Only in Chicago are Lincoln's quiet traces obliterated. Elsewhere his greatness marches invisibly across the wide, plain land. For there are mighty footsteps in the prairie grasses as they bow before the wind—footsteps of a brave and simple past, leading to a confident tomorrow.

Politics in the Marketplace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 30, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial, which appeared in the American Banker of April 15, 1959, is worthy of the attention of our colleagues:

POLITICS IN THE MARKETPLACE—IS IT STUNTING OUR BANKING GROWTH?

We find in Barrons Weekly, which apparently believes that progress in finance can be made only by making the big banks bigger and the little ones disappear, a woesome wail that politics must not interfere with effective competition.

The editorial of April 6, which is being mailed around in reprint form, entitled "Hobbled Banking," calls the laws that govern banking antiquated, and notes that in California, the Department of Justice is attempting to rule over a merger, while in New York State, legislators voted down a bill which would have overhauled the State's banking system for the first time since 1914.

These actions, Barrons charges, will stunt the growth of banks, retard their technological progress, entrench local monopolies, and inflate the cost of lending and borrowing.

WHAT—NO GROWTH?

Them's serious charges, pardner.

It is as though there has been no growth on the part of American banks, and those stunted multibillion dollar unit banks in Chicago, and the citywide branched banks in New York with their multibillion assets, are just dying on the vine.

It is as though there is no competition except where some down-river banks spread their branches far and wide.

It is as though the whole progress made by the United States under its system of thousands of independent banks somehow lacks luster in comparison with the progress made by those great countries like England, France, Italy, Spain, and other lands where branch banking, directed from a few central cities, has been the historic pattern of banking service.

It is as though borrowers in the smaller cities and towns of the United States were being gouged by their local bankers, as though all that is necessary to save them is for them to surrender their local financial independence to the far-away management of some branch banking system.

The charge is also made that small banks cannot equip themselves for the new electronic age in accounting. According to a recent Barrons estimate hardly 500 of the 14,000 banks in the United States can equip themselves with today's computers. Thus,

preserving smallness for its own sake delays technological advances that would enhance efficiency and lower costs. Of today's computers, this is undoubtedly true. Of tomorrow's computers, simplified, standardized, and miniaturized, it will not be true, and solutions can even be found for interbank cooperation in the use of more expensive machines.

The conclusion drawn by Barrons from the unwillingness of the legislators to write the death knell of unit banking, and the tendency of some authorities to suspect that branch banking may lead to worse monopoly situations than may exist under unit banking, is that all these struggles between the savings banks, commercial banks, savings and loan associations, have "thrust politics into the market place," and that this is bad. It has resulted in an "artificial barrier to expansion" of the New York City banks, and "harmed the smaller institutions" which may be ready to sell out to the city banks. And then it cites "the wider damage done to the system as a whole by freezing the status quo."

REFERS TO LONG ISLAND

Getting down to cases, the Barrons editorial charges that branch banking in Long Island has given control of two-thirds of one county's banking to two banks (if that is bad why give possible control of them to Wall Street banks?) and that failure to enlarge the New York City banking district has "deprived the Long Islanders of local banking conveniences and services they want and forced them to pay more than necessary for some they do get" (which seems to belie the argument previously voiced that branch banking brings lower costs to the public).

The net of the Barrons editorial is that "in this jet age, the United States hardly can continue to plod along with horse-and-buggy laws," and "neither legislatures nor courts should try to decree which bank ought to grow and which should be hobbled. * * * The basic decisions as to how to compete most effectively for the favor of customers should be left to those in the executive suite."

Such is the argument for the unlimited expansion of branch banking in the United States.

It would apply just as aptly to the concept that all U.S. banks should be branches of a few big ones located in New York City, Chicago, or San Francisco. It ignores the fact that it was not politics that defeated the New York State omnibus bill for enlarging the branch banking districts, but the determined effort of people who believe that unit banking contributed sufficiently to the national growth to have a right to be heard against the arguments of the branch banking proponents.

Self-Financing Bill Maintains Congressional Control Over TVA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 4, 1959

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, as we all know, H.R. 3460, the TVA self-financing bill, will soon reach the floor for consideration.

In order to clear up some misunderstandings regarding congressional control, I am inserting in the Appendix of the RECORD, under unanimous consent, an analysis of the effect that H.R. 3460 will have on congressional control over the TVA.

Mr. Speaker, I have examined this matter carefully. I have studied the analysis of the bill made by both the proponents and opponents. I believe it is clear that this bill does not reduce congressional control but increases control over the TVA.

Let me make clear at the outset that in this matter of congressional control there is one very great difference between the TVA and most of the other Government corporations covered by the Government Corporation Control Act. Unlike most of the other corporations, the TVA comes to the Congress each year for appropriations for its nonpower program. It will continue to do so even after the passage of this bill.

As a member of the Subcommittee on Appropriations that hears the TVA budget requests each year—I want to report that over the years during which I had had the distinction of serving on this committee I have observed and can testify that the TVA has been subject to more intensive, grueling and close budgetary scrutiny than perhaps any other agency of our Government.

With that in view, let us see what this bill provides in the way of congressional control.

First. This bill does not exempt the TVA from any of the budgetary procedures normally applicable to Government corporations.

Second. The TVA would still submit to the President and the President would still submit to the Congress not only TVA requirements for appropriations, but also TVA's budget for its power operations.

Third. Thus, when reviewing the appropriation budget of the TVA, the Congress would continue in the future as it has in the past to look over the corporate budget and the budgets for its power operations.

Fourth. I can assure you that in this Appropriations Subcommittee the members of the subcommittee look over the power budget very carefully and I can assure you that if ever the TVA should propose to do anything in regard to its power program that required action by Congress, that fact would be called to the attention of the Congress in the hearings of the Appropriations Committee and during the consideration of the appropriations bill on the floor.

Fifth. TVA will be required to include a detailed statement of its revenue bond financing operations in each of its annual reports to the Congress. That report would also be available for review by the Appropriations Committee and other committees of the House.

Sixth. Furthermore, the General Accounting Office would continue to audit all of TVA's operations, including those under the bond program and to file an annual report of such audits with the Congress. This, too, would be available to the Appropriations Committee and other committees of the House, as well as to the membership as a whole.

Seventh. In addition, TVA could not begin construction of any new power producing projects—whether it was to be financed from bond proceeds or power revenues—until Congress and the President were notified of its plans and 90 days of a single session elapsed without passage of a concurrent resolution disapproving the project.

Eighth. Finally, this bill authorizes the TVA to issue only up to a total of $750 million worth of bonds outstanding at any time. This will call for an early and orderly review of TVA operations under this bond authorization. And the Congress will have the opportunity to review this whole program and make any changes it finds desirable.

Ninth. I should like to recall also that TVA is completely a creature of the Congress. The Congress may at any time repeal the TVA Act or make any changes it desires to make in that act. As a matter of fact, that is precisely what we are about to do this week.

Tenth. Finally, I might remind my colleagues that there is one other aspect in which the Congress exercises far greater control over the TVA than it does over any other government agency to my knowledge. I refer to the fact that the Congress may remove any director or all of the directors of the TVA at any time by a joint concurrent resolution. This is provided in the TVA Act.

So, Mr. Speaker, this is ample control. I cannot see how any reasonable person could say that the TVA is not properly under the control of the Congress. All these controls give to the Congress the power to formulate the policies of the TVA, but they grant to the board of directors of the TVA the power of decision over the purely detailed business operations which any corporation, performing a business function, must have to operate efficiently and economically. I am very much afraid that those who propose more stringent control are far more interested in hindering and hampering the TVA then in preserving proper controls by the Congress.

The fact is that those who are criticizing the lack of control by the Congress are really objecting to the fact that this bill does not give the Budget Bureau and the Secretary of the Treasury complete control over the TVA.

I might point out that the history of the TVA legislation all along the line from the beginning makes clear that it has always been the intent of Congress to maintain the independence of the TVA from the executive branch—so that it would be removed from politics and political considerations.

It is alleged for example that this legislation would exempt the TVA from operations of the Government Corporations Control Act. A careful reading of the legislation and of the Government Corporations Control Act makes clear, as the report of the Public Works Committee develops, that the TVA will receive precisely the same treatment under the Government-Corporations Control Act as other Government corporations that have the same authority to sell bonds to the public. For example, the Government Corporations Control Act does provide that the Secretary of the Treasury will have control over bonds issued by

Government corporations which sell the bonds directly to the Treasury or which are guaranteed by the United States—but it exempts from Treasury control the bonds of other Federal corporations which are not guaranteed by the Federal Government and sold to the public. The bonds of the TVA will not be guaranteed by the Federal Government and they will be sold to the general public. They, thus, fall into the same category as the bonds of the Federal intermediate credit banks, Federal land banks, and the banks for cooperatives, which are all exempt from control.

I believe we all agree that Government corporations should all be treated the same way depending on their functions and responsibilities. This bill provides that the TVA will advise and consult the Secretary of the Treasury before issuing any bonds. By doing this and giving the Treasury adequate control over the timing of TVA bond issues, this bill actually gives the Treasury more control over the TVA bonds than it now exercises over the bond issues of other Federal corporations.

In this connection, I might point out that our colleague, Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, made a very significant comment during the hearings. Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, as we all know, has had some experience in the financial world and during these last hearings on this legislation he said:

> It would appear to me that if the Secretary of the Treasury does not give his approval to the offer of these bonds, it would be very difficult to sell them. For instance, if these bonds were to be issued, and the Secretary of the Treasury asked for a deferral for 45 days for certain reasons, and those reasons were not acceptable to the Corporation, I think the Corporation would have a great deal of difficulty in marketing the bonds with the Treasury Department's objection still standing.

And I further quote:

> Do you think that the general public would buy these bonds, if there were an outstanding objection on the part of the Treasury Department with regard to them?

In other words, Mr. AUCHINCLOSS points out that whatever is or is not written in any bill, if the Secretary of the Treasury announced publicly that he did not approve of some bonds offered by some Government corporation, it is very unlikely that there would be a market for such bonds. In view of this, there is no necessity to give the Secretary of the Treasury power that he does not need. Our history makes plain that if we give somebody the power to do something—and in this instance we would be giving the Secretary of the Treasury the power to intervene and even veto the plans of the TVA—that power eventually wil be used, and probably used contrary to the policy of Congress.

If we in the Congress want to maintain control of the TVA it would be highly inconsistent to give control to the Secretary of the Treasury who has no knowledge of the problems of the TVA. The bill maintains and insures, not Budget Bureau, but congressional control.

What's Behind the Smear on the FBI?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 5, 1959

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the battle against the Communist conspiracy is a struggle which is carried on continually, day and night, throughout the four corners of the world.

Contributing immeasurably to the efforts being made to meet the challenge of the Kremlin leaders is the vigilant, determined program of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, headed by J. Edgar Hoover, one of this Nation's great patriots.

It is not unusual, therefore, to find that this great investigative agency is subject to the harassment and attack of the Communists. The Communists know that the FBI has been in the forefront in protecting the security of this Nation.

A valuable contribution to understanding some of the attacks on the FBI is contained in an article "What's Behind the Smear on the FBI?" carried in the May issue of the Columbia magazine.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT'S BEHIND THE SMEAR ON THE FBI?

(By James C. G. Conniff)

Like most Americans, you probably sleep better just knowing we have an FBI. It is a 50-year-old Federal instrumentality which is responsible to the President, the Attorney General, the Congress, the Bureau of the Budget and, ultimately, to the courts and press of a free Nation governed by law. It protects us against enemy agents, kidnapers, white slavers, bank robbers and such, in more than 140 different crime categories. It does all this through a field force of over 6,000 brave, quiet individuals known popularly as G-men. Everyone is proudly aware that their Director is a legendary figure named J. Edgar Hoover.

Everyone is aware but, for the umpteenth time in FBI history, all of a sudden it seems that not everyone is as proud of our G-men and the job they do as you might reasonably expect a law-abiding patriot to be. There is a decidedly vocal segment of our citizenry that feels very much other than proud of Hoover and the FBI, as a matter of fact, and it has lately been reinvigorated to say so. Almost as if somebody threw a switch and a recording began to play, John Edgar Hoover and his G-men are anything but popular with this wedge of robots, and their tape-recorded braying has only one purpose: to delude the rest of the country, if it will hold still for the gas pipe, into believing that it is not the criminals they pursue who pose the gravest threat to our freedom and safety, but the Honorable J. Edgar Hoover and his special agents of the FBI.

For almost a year now, these practitioners of the durable pastime of FBI-baiting have been at their vicious sport with unmatched virulence. By lie, halftruth and innuendo they have tried with mounting vigor to undermine and besmirch the accomplishments, not to mention the motives, of our Justice Department's high-principled, disciplined investigative arm. What's more, they have launched their attack in precisely those areas where long ago J. Edgar Hoover decided his Federal Bureau of Investigation should excel: Fidelity, Bravery, Integrity.

That is the motto the letters FBI spell out on the Bureau's blue and gold shield. That is the code under which its people consistently operate. Yet in the past twelvemonth those keystones of human decency and sound democracy have been zeroed in on with unprecedented malice. Dazed and angered, the average loyal American has only one question: Why?

Make no mistake, there is only one answer: Moscow wants it that way.

The latest smear campaign against our FBI got off to a smashing good start on May 4, 1958, with a televised Mike Wallace interview of 74-year-old multi-millionaire Cleveland industrialist Cyrus S. Eaton. This Eaton is the same longtime friend of the Soviet Union who this past winter played host to the Kremlin's murdering road-agent Mikoyan and through him happily accepted a gift of Trojan horses from Khrushchev.

Said sly Cy in part to Mike Wallace, "I always worry when I see a nation feel that it is coming to greatness through the activities of its policemen. And the FBI is just one of the scores of agencies in the United States engaged in investigating, in snooping, in informing, in creeping up on people. This has gone to an extent that is very alarming."

When Wallace asked him what about convictions won on FBI evidence against "Alger Hiss, atom spies Julius and Ethel Rosenberg, Harry Gold and David Greenglass, as well as Russian spy Rudolf Abel," Eaton deftly sidestepped. Before millions of televiewers he continued to harp on his "worry" and his "alarm," not about commie-lovers and Red spies, but about American security measures. In arrogant disregard of the facts, this accommodator of Soviet objectives maintained that internal security practices among us have been carried to such extremes that "we have even praised the FBI for violating the rights of free men."

In this country, by due process of law, free men are publicly proved to have abdicated certain aspects of their personal liberty when they conspire actively to destroy freedom for all men. However, that is a consideration of logic which will never budge the likes of Cyrus Eaton an inch from monomaniacal certainty that no matter what the evidence to the contrary, Russians don't play dirty pool but, in prudently helping them avoid temptation, we do.

The old tycoon, who can spot a dollar anytime at the end of a maze of holding companies or commissars but can't smell a rotten political campaign for world conquest when it is under his hooked nose, stubbornly insisted to Wallace that "Hitler in his prime, through the Gestapo, never had any such extensive spy organizations as we have in this country today."

You can read most of the relevant excerpts from this perilous farce in a two-page leaflet titled "Is Criticism of the FBI Un-American Activity?" There are also reprints of some bend-over-backward editorial comment when Eaton thereupon conferred with the House Un-American Activities Committee to kind of clarify, if clarification were needed, his political sympathies. But the really interesting bit is on the back page. Under the tip-off title "You and the FBI," it is a seven-paragraph manual of instruction, piously pegged to the Bill of Rights, on passive resistance to lawful authority—specifically when, as the FBI must, it is trying to do its job of guarding our internal security.

Where can you get this interesting leaflet? From the Emergency Civil Liberties Commit-

tee, as I did. And what is this outfit with the frightening oompah of crisis in its name? By a 1956 definition of our Senate Judiciary Committee's Internal Security Subcommittee, it is nothing but a Communist front. The definition is worth quoting for the light it throws on this lethal shenanigan of our would-be Red destroyers:

"To defend the cases of Communist lawbreakers, fronts have been devised making special appeals in behalf of civil liberties and reaching out far beyond the confines of the Communist Party itself. Among these organizations are the * * * Emergency Civil Liberties Committee. When the Communist Party itself is under fire these fronts offer a bulwark of protection."

These fronts do more than that. They aggressively perpetuate and reinforce in print lying solemnities like Cyrus Eaton's phoney concern for our freedoms, and thereby do a service to the Soviets in misleading many who were lucky enough to miss the original cloud of Red ink squirted on their TV screens by this guileful old cuttlefish-pawn.

These fronts also have organized help. And not just from deluded industrialists like Eaton, who followed up his FBI blast to let himself be quoted in the Cleveland Plain Dealer for October 8, 1958, as blaming world tension and mistrust of Russia on "the misconception of the people of the United States about the Soviet Union, its people, resources, and present government," and claiming to believe of the Red leader who has threatened to bury us, "I am confident that in Khruhchev we have a man with whom we could deal."

In the recently snowballing Red campaign to sandbag the FBI from behind by ruthless distortion of the facts, the Communist fronts are being massively aided and abetted by publications like the Nation. This is a liberal magazine and cannot accurately be described as Communist. But the California Senate Factfinding Committee on Un-American Activities puts its finger on the crux of the problem as long ago as 1949 when it pointed out that periodicals like the Nation have over the years become so infiltrated with the Communist Party policy that they serve the interest of the Communists and confuse liberals on many issues, much more than do some of the Communist publications.

The editors of the Nation proved this resoundingly with their October 18, 1958, issue. They devoted its entire 58 pages to an alleged objective appraisal of Mr. Hoover and his Bureau smeared soberly on the cover in black as "The FBI by Fred J. Cook" and hooked artfully into Cyrus Eaton's constitutional right to attack the FBI on TV. The article is a dull, spuriously learned rehash of misrepresentations and doubletalk about the FBI since its inception, a hack-and-hatchet job which has been magnificently exposed and cut to ribbons, point by untruthful point, in the crackling prose of straight-talking journalists like George E. Sokolsky, Edward J. Mowery and Westbrook Pegler.

Fred Cook, the Nation's hireling for this vicious attack is a New York World-Telegram and Sun rewrite man who has lately been playing closer and closer footsy with the Nation and its Moscow orientation. Any good newspaperman will check his facts with the source but for his smear job on the FBI—as you might expect—Fred Cook never went near the Bureau. Unhappily, young people reading the October 18, 1958, issue of the Nation in college libraries will have no way of knowing that.

Our tax-exempt Fund for the Republic might face up to its vaunted patriotic purposes by airing the truth about the FBI among those same young people, however, since it did not boggle at taking a full column advertisement in the issue of the Nation which smeared it. The only other ads were a second column of eight squibs, one a plug for articles of Communist Party interest in Political Affairs.

The anti-FBI barrage continued with increasing savagery via a six-part series which began early in December 1958, in the Militant—official weekly publication of the Socialist Workers' Party—and ran through mid-February 1959. A sampling of titles ("J. Edgar Hoover, Chief of Thought-Police," "FBI's Files 75 Million Under Watch," "J. Edgar Hoover's Flock of Stool Pigeons," "The FBI Is Persecuted") will give some faint idea of the devotional tone adopted by writer Henry Gitano.

Before this issue of Columbia sees daylight the New York Post may have begun the multi-part series of articles in which it has been promising/threatening for months to present a "balanced report" on Hoover and the FBI. How "balanced" this continuation of the all-out smear attack on the FBI will be may be inferred from the fact that reliable sources have disclosed the existence of "Operation Gumshoe," a Post reportorial device for unearthing dirt about the boss G-man and his Bureau, and nothing but dirt. Under FBI-hating Post Editor James A. Wechsler, this series is expected to be the most corrosive set of lies ever put together. Among people who don't know the facts, it may conceivably have more harmful results than just boosting Post circulation.

What are the facts? Are they facts only because the FBI says they are? Is the FBI a snooper outfit spending our tax money as it pleases to "creep up on" loyal, law-abiding Americans? Does its Director actually run a national thought police-trained and deployed strategically to take over this country the minute a dictator-minded strong man enters the White House? Are the FBI and its corps of special agents a steadily mushrooming menace to civil rights? Should you, as a good citizen, do all in your power to thwart FBI men when they approach you for legitimate information? Are you, indeed, an informer when you go to the FBI with well-founded suspicions, observations or facts about threats or actions inimical to civil rights or national security?

For this writer, who in years past has been privileged more than once to report on the inner workings of the FBI and the performance of its Director, the American answers to these questions are as familiar as the workings of his own conscience and as reassuring as sunrise. When, therefore, the G-men and Mr. Hoover become victims once again of the old Red-inspired squeeze play in a small but potentially subversive fragment of our free press, when they are given a hard time because they have done well their job of keeping the pressure on those who would betray this Nation, it is a great satisfaction to expose the Kremlin's lying mouthpieces by telling the truth about the FBI.

Perhaps the first thing to get clear about the FBI is the kind of assignment it has. It is exclusively an investigative agency for the Department of Justice. It goes after the facts—all the facts and only the facts. When it has them, it neither evaluates them nor makes recommendations for or against prosecution. It simply turns them over to the Department of Justice. Whether they warrant presentation to a Federal grand jury is then up to the Attorney General of the United States, and not Hoover.

The type of investigation the FBI conducts will also allay fears that our Constitution is in danger of being dumped by a Gestapo boss and his goons. Since J. Edgar Hoover began in 1924 to shape the FBI into a precision tool for a highly specialized task within the checks and balances of constitutional democracy, there has never been an FBI investigation of the "shotgun" or all-embracing variety in which many innocent people are clobbered in hopes of nailing one or more guilty parties. Each FBI investigation is painstakingly concentrated on an individual against whom some charge has been made serious enough to bring him within FBI investigative jurisdiction. No matter what the dupes and fellow travelers of the Communist Party and its fronts may allege to the contrary, therefore, the FBI is not free to snoop at random. Its special agents may not drop in on you to brighten a dull afternoon with probing questions about your own or your neighbors' private affairs. By law, FBI men may not go among their fellow citizens to "fish" for information unless they are specifically authorized to do so.

Furthermore, J. Edgar Hoover keeps exceedingly close tabs on where each one of his 6,000-plus special agents is or should be at any given time. Through a lightning-fast, rigidly organized chain of command, he can contact anybody in the Bureau whenever the need arises. So if, hypothetically, some fellows claiming to be FBI men are grilling you or roughing you up somewhere, be sure of these few facts: (1) if they're really special agents of the FBI, you will have been shown and allowed to identify their credentials: a card with picture, signature and Bureau seal, and/or a leathercased badge; (2) in which case, a letter, telegram or telephone call to J. Edgar Hoover personally, citing time, names, and circumstances, will get immediate action.

The reason for such close supervision and stern sanctions is that Hoover is well aware how flawless in fact and reputation the FBI must be at all times if it is going to succeed in its delicate but crucial assignment. Hence he sees to it that the training of agents, chosen in a ratio of the best 1 out of 100 topflight applicants, bears down heavily on courtesy, nonviolence and tact. Word of an FBI man's having roughed up a citizen, therefore, would demand and get investigation without delay. It is significant that no such charge has ever been validated on being looked into—and as Hoover points out, you can be sure that if this were a cover-up pattern of the FBI in its own interests, sometime, somewhere, somebody would have gotten the facts to the newspapers and/or the courts and successfully hobbled or caused the disbanding of what would then certainly seem to have become the nucleus of a conscienceless, musclebound Gestapo.

But Hoover's training program goes further than just teaching agents to keep their hands off law-abiding citizens. It even goes beyond the deep-seated ritual courtesy of every special agent. An FBI man is carefully trained not only in the techniques of effective investigation, but also—particularly in loyalty checks for people seeking sensitive Government jobs—he is schooled in phrasing his questions so that by no possible misinterpretation could the person answering get any idea that the man or woman under discussion is not a loyal American citizen. The protection of the individual's good name is one of J. Edgar Hoover's chief concerns. It ties in closely with his constant hammering on two basic facts about the FBI: (1) It must fulfill its duty to protect our internal security at all costs except (2) the cost of the individual citizen's civil liberties.

Hoover has consistently maintained that civil liberties and law enforcement are coextensive manifestations of the government by law, not by men, which our Constitution provides. "Law enforcement," he will tell you, "is a protecting arm of civil liberties." The FBI Director conceives that by enforcing the law, the policeman and the courts join hands to make meaningful the rights guaranteed in our statutes.

To make sure that this fundamental American outlook is part of every special agent's equipment, Hoover sees to it that in the 13-week training period his men undergo they receive intensive instruction in Constitutional law and the Bill of Rights, among other things, and that they study Federal criminal procedure, the law on searches and seizures, interviews and confessions, and above all the moral and ethical reasons behind the need to protect without exception the rights of the individual. The rules of evidence are also gone into thoroughly, along with laws governing matters over which the FBI has been given jurisdiction by Presidential directive, Act of Congress, or ruling of the Attorney General.

One of many ways in which lawful authority insures that the FBI practices its own preaching is control over the wiretap. The smear-alarmists would like you to think FBI men can listen in on a phone conversation at will. Actually, each and every use of a wiretap must be authorized in writing by the Attorney General.

Among the many truths about the FBI's concern for civil rights which Communist fronts like the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee will not share with you is the way it conducts special civil rights schools for those special agents who deal with civil rights cases. The Bureau regards these cases as of the greatest importance. A special Civil Rights Section at the FBI's Washington headquarters supervises the extensive field work involved, the interviewing of often hostile witnesses, and even the accumulation of evidence against law enforcement officials who may at other times have worked hand in hand with the FBI.

For J. Edgar Hoover the matter of civil rights is so vital that he is and always has been an outspoken foe of anything like a national police force. Especially in times of emergency, highly placed men in our Government have urged this measure to protect our security. Even when they have offered to let him handle such a police force the way he's run the FBI, Hoover has always opposed them because he feels that that is indeed the beginning of a police state.

Instead, he has developed, since 1935, the FBI National Academy to share FBI criminology and investigative know-how with local law enforcement officers throughout the Nation, and to train them as police administrators and instructors. With two sessions a year, the National Academy now has some 3,500 alumni. These have returned home to share their new knowledge with brother officers who chose them to attend. Says J. Edgar Hoover, "We estimate that over 100,000 local law enforcement officers have benefited, directly or indirectly, from the National Academy." To Communist troublemakers who try to undermine our whole law enforcement setup by claiming that the FBI is a glory-grabbing outfit hated by local police departments, the good relations and improved police work brought about by the National Academy are an effective rebuttal.

To prove innocence as well as to determine guilt is behind everything the FBI does. More than one suspect has been exonerated by an FBI Laboratory or fingerprint check, and oftener than they realize, on the local level, citizens can be thankful their police have studied at the National Academy such subjects as "Ethics in Law Enforcement," "Laws of Arrests, Searches, and Seizures," "Rules of Evidence," and "The Constitution and the Bill of Rights."

Smears by the Kremlin's playthings notwithstanding, our FBI is remarkable among 18 Federal investigative agencies (revenue, postal, narcotics, immigration, etc.) for having walked the tightrope of its internal security assignment not only without infringing civil liberties but even at a financial profit. The economy-minded FBI drives its fleet of 3,000-odd cars 6 years or 60,000 miles each, for example, and while this year its budget is a record $102,500,000 chunk of the roughly $1 billion it has cost us since J. Edgar Hoover became Director in 1924, the Bureau's work in that time has brought into the Treasury over $1½ billion in fines, savings on cases that did not have to go to court because FBI evidence was so airtight, and recoveries of funds. Little items like the FBI's 96 percent-plus conviction record, in other words, have in the last 35 years made for us taxpayers over half a billion dollars more than the FBI cost us.

But that is not why robots like Cyrus Eaton, Fred Cook, Henry Gitano, and James A. Wechsler are hurting like blazes to get Hoover and disperse our principal means of keeping track of the borers-from-within. They hate him and the FBI because he will not stoop to their methods, will not utilize illegal means even to protect our free institutions, but continues to insist that we can do the job within the orderly framework of our American system of government. How? In two ways: (1) by seeing to it that without hindering its work we keep the FBI under control through annual reviews of its performance by the Congress, the Bureau of the Budget, and the Attorney General, as well as through direct supervision by the executive and the judiciary, and (2) by recognizing that since loyalty is mainly a moral rather than a legal obligation, every citizen has the moral duty not to hold back from duly constituted authority factual information about activities or threatened activities which menace the peace and security of us all. "Especially," says J. Edgar Hoover, "where his information pertains to national security."

Hoover's greatest disappointment, I learned on a recent trip to Washington, is the apathy of the American people to the extent and power of Communist infiltration among us. We are doing so much to combat the Reds overseas, he feels, but so little to balk their progress here at home. On the other hand, the FBI Director is thankful there are so many patriotic organizations, like the Knights of Columbus and the American Legion, that are trying to fight the good fight, no matter how much they too are hooted at.

The resistance and indifference which militant patriots run into may be dissipated somewhat, Hoover thinks, by this quiet peek at the facts about an old favorite among complaints by the smear artists. It involves the charge that the FBI may take us over without warning, in spite of there being only 1 special agent for every 29,000 Americans.

For every special agent of the FBI, however, a recent count shows there are at least 5 Communist Party members in the United States, and an estimated 50 fellow travelers. How about that, Cyrus? Fred? Henry? Get rid of Hoover and the FBI and who do you think will be taking over who?

Reclamation and Development of the New Jersey Meadowlands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 5, 1959

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following testimony which I gave before the House Appropriations Committee, Subcommittee on Public Works, requesting funds for New Jersey's meadowlands, May 1, 1959:

The refrain from George M. Cohan's old song made a great point in being only "45 minutes from Broadway." Broadway points up the fact that New York City is perhaps the world's most expensive piece of real estate. The heart of the New Jersey Meadowlands is not 45 minutes from Broadway, it is but 5 minutes away.

This close to the world's largest city lie upwards of 35,000 acres of barren swamps that challenge the imagination of city and industrial planners and engineers who see in these wasted acres, land upon which could be built great industrial and transportation facilities which are needed for the future development of metropolitan New York as the world's greatest manufacturing and shipping city.

Indeed, the challenge has captured the imagination of some of our youthful student engineers, several of whom have developed plans in which they envision beautiful and extensive residential housing standing on reclaimed meadowlands. One such student has fully developed comprehensive plans for construction of vast apartments which would house some 600,000 people. Imagine what relief such a project would bring to the desperately overcrowded residents of New York City.

The Port of New York Authority is aware of the great potential of the meadowlands and they have appropriated large sums for piecemeal reclamation of certain areas. But their entire planning considers eventual development of only a very small portion of this total of wasted acres.

This tremendous area of swamp, surrounded by some of the world's most valuable real estate is a huge cancer in the world's greatest shipping and industrial area. It is a vast tract sodden with raw sewage, this garbage and refuse of the cities, which produces nothing for man, but a few bales of salt grass.

The reclamation of this tract, which extends for some 20 miles or more and is from 2 to 8 miles wide would provide a badly needed backup area for the operation of the great port of New York, including the hundreds of piers on both sides of the Hudson River and, the waterfront shipping and industrial plants as far south as Elizabeth, N.J.

The full reclamation of this wasted meadowlands, or reclamation of even a substantial portion is too staggering a project for any group of interested municipalities, counties or the State of New Jersey. All of the communities bordering on the meadowlands and Bergen and Hudson Counties, however, have made joint studies reaching back many years.

Reclamation and development of any sizable portion of the New Jersey meadow is too great an undertaking for even the big Port of New York Authority. The leadership is so vast and challenging, an undertaking must come from the Federal Government, and this is just, considering that the benefits that would be derived would accrue not alone to the communities in the area and business and industry of New York, but would benefit the commercial and industrial development of the entire eastern seaboard.

The metropolitan area of New York and New Jersey has long suffered while great attention has been given to the other areas of our Nation. Down through the years the amount of Federal assistance for this area has been one of inverse proportion to the amount of Federal taxes paid. The higher the Federal contribution from the metropolitan area has been, so inversely has the amount of Federal assistance decreased in this area.

The area that I represent has long been considered a distressed labor district.

Reclaiming the New Jersey meadowlands would completely revitalize New Jersey. It

would create thousands of jobs, reduce local taxes by creating new rateables. It would greatly increase Federal income by stimulating our entire economy in this area.

I sincerely feel that no investment by the Federal Government could reap greater returns from the Federal Government and the people of the metropolitan area.

Once the reclamation is a reality there would be a thousand-fold return to the Federal Government for every dollar that went into making it possible.

I am sure the committee is aware that although substantial public funds are required t oget a full-scale reclamation and development project underway, there would follow tremendous private investments in the building of the great industrial plants, storage facilities, and shipping terminals—and even the vast residential apartments which our young and inspired student engineers envision.

The whole idea of reclaiming this vast tract of swamp and making of it a useful and productive area is too vast a project to be discussed before this learned committee in any detail. The possibilities are almost beyond the imagination of man.

I urge the distinguished members of this committee to favorably consider the proposal that there be included in the fiscal year 1960 appropriations bill funds to get started an engineering study that will lead to the realization of a full reclamation and development of the New Jersey meadowlands.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to make as part of my testimony, the attached letter from the Assistant Chief of Engineers for Civil Works of the Department of the Army.

I wish to express my thanks to you, Mr. Chairman, and to the other members of this committee for the privilege of presenting my views.

What's Fair About It?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 5, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial appearing in the March 23, 1959, edition of the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Post.

That editorial describes fair trade as price fixing, not in the public interest and as being inconsistent with the enterprise and is contrary to the public policy expressed by Congress in the antitrust laws since 1890.

WHAT'S FAIR ABOUT IT?

New efforts to enact legislation to permit manufacturers of branded products to fix retail prices began last week in Washington. We hope they will be brief and unsuccessful.

Congress began hearings on a national so-called fair trade bill which would operate everywhere, without regard to State laws and without the approval of distributors. It would permit manufacturers to set prices below which their products might not be retailed.

That might be considered fair to certain retail merchants who fear competition, but it isn't fair to 175 million consumers who would be put at the mercy of a market rigged a la European cartel.

This country has been fooling around with fair trade laws since several States enacted them in the depression 1930's. In order to keep those laws from conflicting with Federal antitrust regulations, Congress in 1937 passed the Miller-Tydings Act which said, in effect, that the fair trade laws were exempt from antitrust provisions. Thus encouraged, retailers obtained such laws in 45 States by 1950.

But the Supreme Court held in 1951 that retailers who did not sign pricing agreements with manufacturers could not be forced to charge specific retail prices. Thus the Miller-Tydings exemption did not apply to nonsigners. Then came the McGuire Act of 1952, which legalized contracts specifying both minimum and maximum prices. It also authorized States, under their fair trade laws, to make the fixed prices binding on wholesalers and retailers who did not sign contracts with manufacturers.

Since 1952, however, courts in Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and 15 States have declared the nonsigner provisions of fair trade laws unconstitutional. Several big manufacturers, recognizing the trend, abandoned fair trade practices.

We must say that we agree wholly with the Federal Trade Commission and the Department of Justice in their opposition to fair trade laws. Chairman John Gwynne of the FTC has summed up the issue neatly in this language:

"The fixing of retail prices is inconsistent with the American system of free competitive enterprise and is contrary to public policy expressed by Congress in the antitrust laws since 1890."

Manufacturers should be free to charge whatever the trade will bear for their products. But they have no business telling retail merchants what they, in turn, should charge. That destroys initiative and undermines the competitive system which is the foundation of a free American economy.

If Congress has faith in the free enterprise system, it will reject fair trade legislation.

The Rule of Law—America's Contribution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAMER H. BUDGE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 20, 1959

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include in the RECORD an address by the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, the Honorable FRANK T. BOW, delivered before the Stark County Bar Association, Canton, Ohio, on the occasion of Law Day, USA, May 1, 1959. Mr. Bow, an eminent attorney in his own right, is superbly qualified by training and by his fundamental concept of the relation of the law to the individual to speak with authority on his topic, "The Rule of Law—America's Contribution." The address follows:

THE RULE OF LAW—AMERICA'S CONTRIBUTION

(Address of Hon. FRANK T. BOW, Member of Congress, 16th District, Ohio, before the Stark County Bar Association, Canton, Ohio, Law Day, USA, May 1, 1959)

One of the most significant and hopeful developments of recent times is the increasing interest everywhere in the development of the rule of law as opposed to the rule of force in the world.

In observing Law Day, USA, we are taking a leading role in this development and today I want to speak of the significance of Law Day, USA, in a broader sense than its impact upon the people of our Nation. I ask you to think with me about the impact of this tribute by Americans to the rule of law upon the people of the world.

I sincerely believe that Law Day, USA, has helped create a new public image of the United States of America in the minds of many people in other nations. In a day when military victory has been rendered an obsolete concept, our national security depends as much upon winning and keeping friends in other nations as it does upon weapons. Law Day, USA, has won us friends by focusing worldwide attention upon the foundation of our greatness—the rule of law.

Ideas, ideals, and moral standards are all important in our all-out contest with communism for survival in this shrunken world. Law Day, USA, has made many in other countries realize that underneath our economic and social progress, and primarily responsible for that progress, is a way of life which only the rule of law can guarantee.

Law Day, USA, spotlights liberty, equality and justice as our most precious possessions. These are ideals which all men cherish. But before Law Day, USA, their meaning to Americans, and the part they play in our daily lives, were never made clear to those of other lands who looked at the surface, or end results, rather than the underlying basis of our system.

In the world of ideas, perhaps the most significant development of our time is a gradually evolving reliance upon the rule of law as a major weapon to defeat the evils of communism. At first blush this may appear to be an overambitious goal for the rule of law. But let us think it through together.

The rule of law is the antithesis of communism. It recognizes that men have rights as individuals and that both the individual and the Government are subject to the law. The rule of law means order, stability and the greatest possible degree of human freedom. Communism, on the other hand, enthrones society rather than the individual. Under communism in practice the state is all-powerful. Communism by its very nature creates and thrives upon constant conflict, turmoil, fear and a lack of individual freedom. Where the rule of law prevails, freedom of man exists. Where communism prevails, freedom of man is nonexistent.

The challenge to act lawfully is one of the most potent we can throw at the Kremlin. In his famous speech to the 20th Congress of the Soviet Communist Party in 1956 Khrushchev spent 7 hours denouncing Stalin for violating Soviet law and promising that he—Khrushchev—would obey it. Seemingly Khrushchev feels a need for some obeisance to the idea of law and evidently he is sensitive to charges of illegality. One thing is certain, the Soviets have a profound desire to be considered a modern, enlightened, civilized, law-abiding nation.

Communism and our rule of law must be constantly contrasted. Law Day, USA, and the ideas, ideals, and programs it encompasses constitute one of the most meaningful ways of keeping that contrast before the eyes of the world.

While it has not occurred with the dramatic impact of an atomic explosion, or the blast-off of a satellite or an ICBM, one needs but to follow the record in recent months to see that President Eisenhower has made the worldwide rule of law the central core of our foreign policy. Since Law Day, USA, May 1, 1958, every major foreign policy statement of the President has contained a reference to the necessity of replacing the rule of terror with the rule of law in the world community. In his Law Day, USA, address he said:

"The world no longer has a choice between force and law; if civilization is to survive, it must choose the rule of law."

In his state of the Union message to the Congress in January 1959, he said:

"All peoples are sorely tired of the fear, destructions and the waste of war. As never before, the world knows the human and material costs of war and seeks to replace force with a genuine rule of law among nations."

In his broadcast on Berlin the President referred to the rule of law as a replacement for the rule of terror and said:

"Indeed, this is the peace policy which we are striving to carry out throughout the world. In that policy is found the world's best hope for peace."

On April 4, in his Gettysburg College speech the President said:

"Another fact, basic to the entire problem of peace and security, is that America and her friends do not want war. They seek to substitute the rule of law for the rule of force."

Not only President Eisenhower but other leaders of his administration have urged the same idea.

Secretary of State Dulles on January 31, in his last address before his unfortunate illness, said to the New York State Bar Association:

"In the swift flow of daily events it is easy to lose track of the broad strategy of our foreign policy. We seek peace, of course, but we seek it in what seems to us the only dependable way—the substitution of justice and law for force.

"This is a relatively recent concept and even today many do not accept it."

Vice President NIXON, in an outstanding address on the rule of law in world affairs to the Academy of Political Science, said:

"I am now convinced, and in this I reflect the steadfast purpose of the President, and the wholehearted support of the Secretary of State and the Attorney General, that the time has now come to take the initiative in the direction of establishment of the rule of law in the world to replace the rule of force."

There is also an ever-rising tide of support abroad. Prime Minister Nehru, Chancellor Adenauer, Chief Justice Tanaka of Japan and many of the other great men of the world have endorsed the rule of law as a peace policy for the free world.

We do not always realize that the eyes of the world are upon us constantly. Our pushbutton homes, our automobiles and gaudy gadgets are the envy of many who have yet to reach our economic status but desire it. We so-called rich Americans are not always pictured as people with deeply felt moral principles and ideals in the Hollywood movies, books and other export items which portray life in America. Portrayals in books, magazines and movies of gansters and high living in our country lose us friends. But now in Law Day, USA, we have moved to the center of the stage of public attention in our country a picture of what Americans believe in and the real substance our country is made of in the field of ideas and ideals. Thus through Law Day, USA, other peoples see us as we really are—a people deeply wedded to the highest ideals and principles ever adhered to by any nation since the dawn of civilization.

Despite contrary beliefs, the world largely runs on ideas and ideals. Nothing is as powerful as an idea—not even an atom. Especially is this true in our srunken world where rapid communications and transportation cause almost instantanteous contact between Akron and Accra, New Delhi and New Haven. The idea and ideal of a world operating under the rule of law is fast becoming more and more powerful as more and more people comprehend the potential of a lawful world.

The ever-rising trend of education in formerly underdeveloped nations contributes further to the importance of ideas in the current battle for the minds of men between the free world and the international Communist conspiracy. We have long espoused "freedom" and "justice" for man as the free world's promise. We must now espouse the rule of law as a constructive and creative means to achieve and maintain freedom and justice between nations as well as within nations.

The rule of law within a nation is made up of constitutions, statutes, customs which grow into legal rules, and the legal procedures and judicial tribunals by which all of these hundreds of legal rules are applied, interpreted, and enforced. In essence the rule of law means all of these; it means also what is fair and reasonable under the moral standards which have come down to us in the accumulated wisdom of the ages.

A new world is being born in this century. If it is to be a lawful world thoughtful men must make it so. It will not just happen. Who better than lawyers can realize and project the potential of law in the world community? We are a profession dedicated to public service. Certainly no greater public service can be rendered than developing the formula whereby law will replace weapons in the control of the fate of humanity.

While we of the free world speak many different languages and have many diverse forms of government, the rule of law is a universal idea and idea which all men have in common. By placing governments under law nationally we have brought about order and stability within our nations. We should now offer this great idea for adoption as a new standard of decency in international relations. There too it would, if applied, create order, stability, and peace by placing nations under law internationally.

Law Day, USA, has already had an incalculably significant impact upon the thinking of the people of the world. It has stretched the minds of lawyers and laymen to new possibilities and new approaches to a problem that has troubled man since the dawn of civilization—the establishment and maintenance of peace. We must make its effects this year both within and without our Nation even greater than last year.

Supremacy of the rule of law achieves and maintains freedom for man within nations. Supremacy of the rule of law can achieve and maintain freedom of man from the dread scourge of war.

Law Day, USA, spotlights what the rule of law can do for man if but put to work in the world community and thus renders a great service to our Nation and to the peoples of all nations. In this great program we lawyers have as our client civilization itself. And while our goal may seem ambitious it is certainly a goal which is not beyond the capacities of our client—the people we represent, if they but want it bad enough. Let us therefore work and strive to create that want through law days and in other ways so that the people will demand and get a world rule of law. A world in which law will grow so strong it will tower over fear and prevail throughout the entire world.

Some of my friends have expressed to me the fear that we may go too far too fast in this effort; that our zeal and enthusiasm may cause us to sacrifice basic principles of American freedom and sovereignty.

I recognize that danger and I think it is well that a word of caution be raised at this time. We do not want to, nor do we need to, fall into the pitfalls of the world federalists. Sovereign nations can develop the rule of law without sacrificing their individuality, and that must be our goal.

We lawyers must prove that law can succeed where other ideas have failed in man's age-old quest for a formula for peace. In the preparation, trial and presentation of this case we have a responsibility greater than we have faced in generations.

By training and tradition lawyers are leaders in public affairs. From time immemorial lawyers have performed the functions of leadership in the discussion and clarification of great public issues and programs. This we have done nationally, in States and in local communities. Here we must lift our eyes to encompass a greater area and a greater issue than any we have yet coped with in the past. We must do it because there is no other professional group which has the know-how, the training and the capacity to do the job that must be done. If there was ever lawyer's work this peace through law program is it. We cannot expect doctors, or dentists, or scientists, or any other professional group to assume leadership. Either we do it or it is not likely that this task will be done at all. That is and should be a most sobering thought for each one of us as we face up to the work required to build a "lawful" world.

Some say that peace through law in the courts is an idealistic dream which cannot be realized. But in doing so they deny the facts of history. America was built on idealism. Idealism burned fiercely in the breasts of Washington, Jefferson, Madison, and all of those other great forefathers of ours who founded our Nation as a government under the rule of law. They utilized law and the courts to make our rulers subject to the ruled. Such a plan was pure idealism when adopted, but it has worked. If we ever reach the stage when idealism is a curse rather than a virtue, our Nation will have lost the ingredient which has made it the greatest the world has ever known. Woodrow Wilson said: "The world is run by its ideals. Only the fool thinks otherwise."

No greater challenge exists in the world of our time than that of creating a formula to prevent a war no sane man could ever want. We of the law know the rule of law is such a formula. Creating a workable plan to make this formula a success is our challenge, our obligation, and our opportunity. We must stretch our minds to create the legal rules, the legal procedures, and the courts which will do this in the world community. We could make no greater contribution to justify our heritage and to fulfill our destiny than to have inscribed large in history that we gave the best we had to bring into being a world where all men can live under the rule of law and thereby walk in freedom, in dignity, and in peace.

Drain on U.S. Gold Cuts Hoard by $2.3 Billion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 29, 1959

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I have requested permission to extend my remarks for the reason that this Nation is drifting into a serious situation on gold, as is pointed out by Elmer Roessner in his article released by the McClure Newspaper Syndicate. He directs attention to the fact that American imports last year were $3 billion in excess of our exports. This is probably due to

the reciprocal trade program, and it has resulted in a reduction of more than $2 billion in our gold supply because of foreign demand for gold to compensate for the difference in trade balance.

Mr. Roessner's article is as follows:

DRAIN ON U.S. GOLD CUTS HOARD BY $2.3 BILLION

(By Elmer Roessner)

The drain on the U.S. gold hoard continues.

Between February 26, 1958, and April 22, 1959, a total of $2,291 million was withdrawn by foreign nations. That left us $20,409 million, the lowest holding since February 26, 1947.

How? And more importantly, why?

The "how" is easy. Foreign governments are entitled to get gold for their American credits. Foreign citizens can't get gold directly for their credits, but they can turn the credits over to governmental banks which can convert them to gold.

A French exporter, for example, may sell 400 small autos to an American distributor for $1 million. He turns the dollars over to a government bank, getting francs in exchange. The bank can get American gold for the million.

Foreign governments hold perhaps $8 billion of American credits now and foreign citizens hold slightly less than $7 billion. These consist of American currency, bonds, checks and deposits on American banks. Foreigners also hold several billion dollars worth of American securities and real estate which could be turned into currency, and then into gold.

Therefore, foreign governments could conceivably demand all the gold in Fort Knox, where half our gold supply rests, and in the other depositories.

They wouldn't do it all at once, because if they tried Congress would embargo gold shipments. Besides, as long as foreign governments have faith in the dollar, American credits are just about as good as gold in their own vaults would be.

Reasons why foreign governments have claimed more than $2 billion in gold in the last fourteen months are somewhat more complicated.

IMPORTS EXCEED EXPORTS

One important reason is the decline in exports. Last year the United States imported about $3 billion more in goods than it exported. This built up foreign holdings by that much. For various reasons, some traders and governments wanted to exchange some of their credits for gold. One reason might be to balance their assets, holding part in gold, part in currency.

Another reason is a slight weakening of confidence in the dollar. Coupled with fears that the dollar may be devalued. The London Financial Times said, "There is no doubt that some foreign holders of dollars have felt that recent developments in the American economic situation have brought the danger of a devaluation of the dollar in terms of gold so much nearer that it would be a good idea to convert part of their balances into gold."

If the United States devalued the dollar, such as by raising the price of gold from $35 to $70 an ounce, it would wipe out half of foreign credit holdings.

Related to the decline in exports is the rise of investments abroad. When an American company spends $100,000,000 of its United States money to buy a plant in, say, England, the money eventually flows into British central banks, who can demand gold for it.

Treasury officials, for the moment, are not worried. They feel that the outflow is temporary and that the inflow, which has prevailed over most of the years since 1929, will soon resume. In fact, some say that the outflow is evidence that the economies of friendly nations are strengthening, thereby building up the total might of the democracies.

Statement of Adm. Arthur W. Radford Before the Committee on Foreign Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 15, 1959

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement before the Committee on Foreign Affairs, House of Representatives, by Adm. Arthur W. Radford, U.S. Navy, retired, former Chairman of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff:

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, it is a privilege and a pleasure to appear before your committee in support of the proposed Mutual Security Act of 1959.

I appeared before the Committee on Foreign Affairs a number of times prior to my retirement from active military service, and on those occasions discussed various aspects of our foreign policy and related military implications.

I found it always to be an interesting and refreshing experience.

My last appearance before your committee also was in connection with our mutual security program. That was in June of 1957.

At that time I testified as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Today I am testifying as a private citizen serving at the request of the President on his Committee To Study the U.S. Military Assistance Program.

That Committee, as you know, for the past several months has been engaged in an independent, objective, and bipartisan analysis of the military assistance program and, necessarily, of the several economic assistance programs.

I know that you have discussed our Committee's work with our able chairman, the Honorable William H. Draper, Jr., and that he has presented to you the unanimous conclusions of the Committee and considerable information about its procedures in arriving at those conclusions.

So I propose to avoid repeating what Mr. Draper has presented to your committee.

I am in agreement with the views that he has presented, and I would like to lend whatever support to those views that I can.

To that end, I will highlight several aspects of the military assistance program, hopeful that this will be of help to your committee.

Some 10 to 12 years ago, the United States became faced with the stark reality of the Communist objectives of worldwide domination, and with the Communists' willingness to use military power to achieve those objectives.

At that time we chose to assist in maintaining the freedom of all countries in the world which had the desire to remain free.

And we made that choice a basic facet of our foreign policy.

We recognized our own need for allies.

We recognized our allies' need for us.

We recognized further that only through a mutuality of effort could the free world be prepared to meet adequately the threat of Communist aggression and at the same time avoid the risk of a shattered economy within a United States standing fully mobilized and waiting on its own shorelines.

The success of this course of action depended to a large degree upon the strength of our allies.

Our allies' strength in turn relied in great measure upon the military assistance we could provide.

Thus a vital part of this basic facet of our foreign policy has been to provide military assistance to those free world nations faced with the threat of Communist domination either from within or from without their borders.

It seems reasonable to assume that U.S. foreign policy supported by our military assistance program and combined with the umbrella of American military power has played a dominant part in putting the brakes on Communist expansion.

I think it is not necessary for me to expand upon the importance of military assistance as an instrument of our present foreign policy.

I would like to comment, however, upon what I consider to be one of the most important aspects of our military assistance program—its relation to the U.S. military posture and its bearing upon that posture.

The military assistance program is an adjunct to our own Armed Forces.

In fact, it is an extension of our own Armed Forces.

And it should be considered to be just that in all of our national thinking.

There is no doubt that U.S. military forces would have to be expanded at greatly increased cost were it not for the military forces of other free world nations supported by our military assistance program.

And I would say emphatically that if those other military forces were not available we would have to revise radically not only our entire military program but also our present strategic concept.

Consider the many countries around the periphery of the Communist bloc, particularly those which are in direct contact with the Communist military threat and thus more directly vulnerable.

Unless we propose to abandon these nations, we must help support their military forces or be prepared to add forces of our own.

The impossibility of substituting our own forces is apparent immediately when you consider the magnitude of the friendly military forces—more than 5 million men—that we support directly or indirectly through the military assistance program.

The United States alone simply does not have available the forces necessary to match the Communist bloc in manpower at every point of possible aggression around the world.

Nor could the United States alone afford to maintain such forces on active duty for an indefinite period.

Our committee during its study has been impressed continually by the fact that nothing has changed over the past 5 years to indicate any lessening of the military threat posed to the free world by the Communist bloc.

On the contrary, the Communist military threat actually has increased.

This increase is due to the shrinkage of the world in time and space, a shrinkage brought about by advancements in technology.

It is due to improvements in weapons and in weapons systems available to the Communist bloc.

And it is due to the Communist bloc's expansion and improvement of its own military forces.

Considering this, there is no valid basis which would warrant any curtailment in our military assistance program.

In fact, Mr. Draper pointed out to your committee that our study found that the present military assistance program and the program proposed for 1960 have slipped somewhat below the actual requirements.

The slippage, gentlemen, is at the very time that the Communist military threat has increased.

And it is at the very time that the Communist bloc, these past few years, has launched its own economic offensive against the free world.

The economic offensive means that the Communist bloc was able to maintain and increase its military threat and at the same time develop and expand its collective economy to become able to make substantial economic assistance available to nations outside its orbit.

This in no way involves any lessening of the military threat.

It represents a relatively sudden increase in what had been a fairly limited capability of the Communist bloc to extend economic assistance.

Thus we are faced, in effect, with the serious added problem of a Communist economic offensive.

Our committee believes that this and other factors mean that the proposed budget for fiscal year 1960 for economic assistance is the minimum required and that, by fiscal year 1961, loans for economic development will probably be needed at a rate of at least $1 billion a year.

But increased economic assistance cannot and should not be accomplished at the expense of the military assistance program.

In my view we cannot afford to scale back our military assistance program to any substantial extent, at least in the foreseeable future.

The only alternative to continuation of the military assistance program that I can see is one based upon a political-military withdrawal to what is referred to as "Fortress America."

I am sure that this proposal has been examined many times in the deliberations of your committee.

In my opinion, such a political-military withdrawal could lead only to chaos and catastrophe for the free world.

I outlined by views on such a withdrawal in my last appearance before your committee, and I outlined them this way:

I am convinced that adoption of any such policy would lead inevitably to the surrender of most of our allies and to the isolation of the Western Hemisphere, surrounded by the vastly-increased strength of the Communist bloc. Further, I am sure that the United States, as we know it, cannot long exist in a Communist-dominated world.

I should say that the execution of the military assistance program by the Military Establishment is a task which requires a great deal of hard work. It is a task that has no glamor.

I would be the first to hope that we could get out of the military-assistance business at an early date.

I would like to believe that this is possible.

Unfortunately, I see no hope at the present time of any such possibility.

Military assistance is much too vital a part of our overall efforts to sustain the free world against the threat of Communist domination.

I can perceive no realistic alternative or substitute.

The scope and level of our military assistance program is of vital importance in any consideration of the program.

At this point, the initial round of military assistance to those countries participating in the program has been just about completed.

Now the problem becomes essentially one of continual modification, one of continual modernization of these forces to keep them abreast with the development of military art.

This is becoming increasingly costly, unfortunately.

In summary, Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee:

I believe that the Communist military threat to the free world is greater today than ever.

I believe that the Communist economic threat and its capabilities are expanding.

I believe that nothing has changed within the past 5 years which would permit the U.S. military assistance program to be reduced.

I believe that more funds should be provided to military assistance for fiscal year 1960, rather than fewer funds.

I believe that the economic assistance request for fiscal year 1960 is the minimum needed.

I believe that greater assistance probably will be required in the future.

I believe that the assistance programs should be put on a long-range basis.

And I believe that both programs—the military and the economic—are essential to our national security.

Reduction of Wheat Surplus Means Reduction of Taxpayers' Burden

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 5, 1959

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial, which appeared in the Washington Post on May 1, sheds some sensible light on one phase of the farm problem:

MOUNTAINS OF WHEAT

Congress ought not to delay any longer its attack on the country's mountainous surplus of wheat. Some observers say that the legislators will not dare to go home this summer until they have done something to relieve this glut. It is estimated that at the end of this season the Government will be holding 1,150 million bushels of wheat—enough to supply all domestic requirements for nearly 2 years. Storage costs alone on such a vast supply are enormous. It is incredibly shortsighted to go on piling up additional surpluses while these unwanted stores remain a burden on farmers and taxpayers alike.

The Agriculture Committees of both the House and Senate are trying to cope with the problem, but it seems to us that they are moving in the wrong direction. A House subcommittee has voted to cut wheat acreage 20 percent and increase the price supports from 75 to 85 percent. The net result might be even more wheat instead of less. Experience has shown that when farmers are required to trim their acreage they pour on the fertilizer and produce more from a smaller area.

In the wheat-control system, moreover, there is an enormous loophole that accounts for a large share of the increased production in recent years. Any farmer may grow up to 15 acres of wheat without regulation or penalties. This has encouraged many farmers who never grew wheat before to plant up to 15 acres, thus greatly expanding the total crop. The subcommittee would reduce uncontrolled acres to 12 on each farm, but at the same time it would increase the incentive to plant by sharply boosting the support price.

No tolerable reduction of acreage quotas is likely to shrink the surplus as much as it should be shrunk unless Congress is willing to reduce its props under prices. The most reasonable course would be to lower supports and ease the acreage restrictions. That would minimize the incentive for every farmer to plant up to 15 acres of wheat. Incidentally, 78 percent of the farmers responding to a recent poll in the Farm Journal favored lower price supports and fewer controls and only 7 percent voted for high supports. More than half (55 percent) urged that the Government get out of agriculture entirely.

We do not think such a precipitate move would be wise. But surely Congress ought to move toward freer market prices that would permit some wheat to be used for animal feed and thus hasten reduction of the surplus. It is difficult to see anything but disaster in the regressive squeezing of quotas and artificial lifting of prices to a point where utilization of the surplus becomes virtually impossible.

Tribute to Daniel A. Reed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, nothing I may say could possibly add dignity to the life nor splendor to the spirit of our departed friend, Daniel A. Reed. He by his own life enriched the lives of all who felt the tolerance and kindness of his great heart.

In paying this brief tribute to this great man I am prompted by sincere human affection.

For 25 years, during the entire time that I have served in Congress, I have enjoyed the friendship of this Christian gentleman, who by the nobility of his soul, the courage of his manhood, and the magnificence of his manner endeared himself to all his colleagues.

Although Dan Reed was a statesman in the true sense of that word, he knew that the greatness of a Nation is not built by the crafts of statesmanship nor by the arts of artisans. He knew that the greatness of a nation must be built upon the moral fiber and fabric of people. He held fast to the verities of true religion and to the finest virtues of patriotism. He was dedicated to the immutable principles of justice and to the ancient institutions of freedom. He was devoted to the high and holy ethics of our civilization. He by his life built many grand monuments in the hearts of his countrymen and made many contributions to the welfare and happiness of the people of the world.

For many years I worked with him in the Interparliamentary Union, the oldest and the largest peace organization on earth. By his work in the Interparliamentary Union, he endeared himself to men and women around the world. He walked always in the paths of righteousness and he sought to find the pinnacles of peace and to lead mankind to the altars of liberty.

I happened to be with him in Rome when he was first stricken. He was a picture of magnificent manhood, strong, robust, and dynamic but always gentle and kind.

The tender sweetness of his genial manner was a living inspiration to his colleagues in Congress and to all who had the privilege of his friendship. He possessed all of the splendid virtues and fine sensibilities of true greatness. He rose to the full stature of mankind and he died in the faith of his fathers. He left his name without blemish, a heritage of honor to his children and his children's children. I knew of his great and true devotion for his lovely wife and I extend to her and to all the members of his fine family my very warm and sincere sympathy and express the hope that the Lord of mercy may sustain them in their hours of bereavement.

Eulogy Delivered by Hon. Daniel J. Flood, of Pennsylvania, at Memorial Service Honoring Walter Harrison Hitchler

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 5, 1959

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following eulogy delivered by Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD, Member of Congress, at a memorial service honoring Walter Harrison Hitchler, in Dickinson School of Law, Carlisle, Pa., Saturday, May 2, 1959:

We have come together this afternoon to pay our heart's tribute of respect to Harry Hitchler. Here, truly, was a gentleman; and here, too, was a distinguished citizen, a valiant soldier, a wise administrator, a renowned educator, and a great scholar who wove many threads into that endless fabric we call the law, and added fundamentally to man's understanding of the problem of living with his fellowmen.

Walter Harrison Hitchler, whose passing has been so widely mourned in legal circles not only in the Commonwealth but throughout the Nation as well, has crossed the bar and has seen his Pilot face to face. He stands before the great Dean on High, his dignified bearing proclaiming the Patriot dedicated to his country's cause and the scholar and administrator maintaining and enhancing the high stanards of legal education with which the Dickinson School of Law came to be known under his able direction.

No words of eulogy, I feel sure, can enhance the great record of the career of Walter Harrison Hitchler, our late beloved friend, teacher, and dean. His own deeds of a lifetime in themselves have built a memorial which will be long lasting.

There is even a question in my mind whether, with characteristic modesty and reserve, he would have approved a formal ceremony such as today's for the purpose of honoring his memory.

Nevertheless, it is fitting that we should take this occasion to pay tribute to one who played such a vital role in the history of Dickinson School of Law over a span of years covering a half century and whose whole life was devoted to service.

Service to the law, which he loved.

Service to this school.

Service to the State of Pennsylvania.

Service to the Nation as a soldier in World War I and in civil capacities.

Service to the community of Carlisle and to numerous causes in its welfare.

And, above all, service to God and his fellow man.

His charities were like the man himself, quiet, unassuming, without affectation. There are many today who do not know that scholarship funds that helped put them through their law courses came from the dean's own pocket.

Dr. Hitchler possessed in abundance that unusual combination of legal knowledge and the facility to impart it to others which makes a teacher great.

Anatole France has written that "the whole art of teaching is only the art of awakening the natural curiosity of young minds for the purpose of satisfying it afterward."

Dean Hitchler stirred that curiosity in young minds, and he not only satisfied it but, even more, he developed in his students that earnest and entire devotion which the law, as "a jealous mistress," demands.

And he imparted not merely a knowledge of specific codes and statutes but the spirit and principles of the law, and the lore and traditions of the profession.

Today the seeds which he planted over the years in these Halls are bearing fruit in courts all over this land—both on the bench, before the bar—in legislative halls of State and Nation.

It was a rare gift he possessed and he shared it with others. He gave of himself, to this institution and to his students who imbibed of his knowledge.

His career at our law school covered a span of half a century. Yet his devotion to the school and to his students never flagged. As a great legal scholar, his presence added stature to the Dickinson School of Law. As an humble man, however, he always sought to give without thought of reward. Thus his colleagues remember him as a quiet, but inspiring man, who set high standards for them by his amazing fund of knowledge, his ability to transmit it, and his exemplary behavior in all situations. His students remember him as a brilliant, but demanding preceptor, who encouraged them to levels of academic endeavor, and reward, that they had never before attained. How well they could understand the feeling of Cicero when he wrote: "Not only is there an art in knowing a thing, but also a certain art in teaching it." The dean had that art.

All admired and respected him, and all developed a warm affection for him, as a man who served unceasingly the causes to which he was dedicated.

I think these verses from a poem by Stephen Vincent Benet might also apply to Dean Hitchler:

"Thomas Jefferson,
What do you say,
Under the gravestone
Hidden away?

"I was a giver,
I was a moulder,
I was a builder
With a strong shoulder.

"I liked all learning
And wished to share it
Abroad like the pollen
For all who merit."

In the years he was among us here he was indeed a giver, moulder, and builder.

With all his great public responsibilities, he never hesitated to extend his efforts down to the community level. The people of Carlisle remember him as a tireless worker in local Red Cross drives, in establishing USO facilities, and in other community projects. His expenditures of time and effort were unquestionably enormous.

Nor were his interests limited to the classroom and to public service. This many-sided man loved athletics, and was a formidable opponent on the tennis court, as well as a respected instructor of tennis for the college teams. He was an unofficial adviser in basketball, and rarely missed a football game. As a great master in the classroom, he often appeared swinging a baseball bat, which he used to illustrate points his students were never to forget. It was with nostalgia that I learned recently that there are still some of these old baseball bats in his office.

Modest as he was, Dean Hitchler could not escape commendation for his many extraordinary efforts. His writings in the field of criminal law, articles that often appeared in the law review, were recognized as products of an authority in the field. Happily, his own beloved Dickinson College was one of the first to bestow honors on the man, by awarding him a doctor of civil laws in 1932. But other schools also recognized his merit. In 1939 he was awarded a doctor of laws from St. Francis Xavier College of Loretto. Muhlenburg College in Allentown and Albright College in Reading also presented him with honorary degrees.

I think one of the tributes that pleased him most, however, and this is because he was so firmly devoted to his own law school, was the decision of the board of trustees to name one of the dormitory wings in his honor. Hitchler Hall will long remain as testimony of the respect and warmth with which he was regarded by those most intimately associated with him. As a friend and dedicated servant of the Dickinson School of Law, he would want no more.

Through an act of his great generosity, the school of law will continue to see the proof of his dedication to his students, the school, and the law. I am sure you all know that he bequeathed the bulk of his estate for the benefit of the Dickinson School of Law. Students who are in need will thus continue to feel the munificence of this man, who even after his death will be responsible for paying the tuition of worthy scholars. Truly, the generous influence of Dean Hitchler will continue to be felt by all who have or will be connected with the school.

I think it not too bold a statement to call him a great man. He, more than most, embodied the qualities of greatness we cherish most because of their rarity. I think of the words of Matthew Arnold, who said: "Greatness is a spiritual condition worthy to excite love, interest, and admiration; and the outward proof of possessing greatness is, that we excite love, interest, and admiration."

Those of us who knew Dean Hitchler saw this proof of his greatness. Who among us can remember him without love, interest, and admiration?

Dean Hitchler was a native of Plymouth in beautiful Wyoming Valley—that seedbed which has produced some of the most outstanding lawyers, jurists, and educators in the entire vibrant history of our Commonwealth. He was proud of his native heath and despite his long residence outside the valley, he was well known there, having spent many summers at his cottage in Harvey's Lake. It is fitting that he rests where he was born. But a proper share of his spirit will surely stay here at Dickinson, where so much of his work was done, and where his influence was so great.

It was nearly 53 years ago that Harry Hitchler came to Carlisle to teach at the Dickinson School of Law. He had graduated from the University of Virginia in 1905 and thereafter spent a short time at the beginnings of a private law practice. But his abilities and natural inclinations led him to a career in law teaching. He was a member

of the law school faculty for 48 years, half of which period he served as dean. It was in June of 1954 that he retired, of his own choice. Yet even in retirement he continued his active work, and served as adviser to students and members of the faculty at the law school, who had not yet come to think of him as retired.

Dr. Hitchler was a great lawyer and law teacher. For a number of years he taught courses in equity and carriers. But like most of his former students, I remember him best as a teacher in criminal law, a highly technical subject to which he had made extensive and important written contributions. He was the author of "Hitchler on Criminal Law," and there is nothing in Pennsylvania legal writing that exceeds this opus in quality. His countless law review articles were distinguished by their penetrating legal analysis, cogent reasoning, and clarity of expression. It is no exaggeration to state that Dr. Hitchler's teaching brought enlightenment to three generations of students, and stimulated the minds of a large number of the most brilliant lawyers and judges in Pennsylvania. Dean Hitchler loved the law, and he was superb in analyzing and explaining it. The depth of his knowledge, his vigorous standards of scholarship, and his command of clear and graceful English, spoken as well as written, made him a great teacher, respected and admired by thousands of students now practicing throughout the Eastern United States.

But he also entered another and perhaps larger and more important area, that of public service. Four Pennsylvania Governors, W. C. Sproul, George Earl, Arthur H. James, his boyhood friend, and John S. Fine, all turned to Dean Hitchler to carry out commissions in this field.

He was editor of Pennsylvania Statute Laws, 1919–23, and was named in 1937 one of the eight men to study changes in the Commonwealth criminal procedure. In 1948, he was made a member of an advisory committee to aid a legislative group studying modernization of the penal laws of Pennsylvania.

In April 1939 Dean Hitchler was named by Governor James to a post on the Pennsylvania State Liquor Control Board. Shortly after he was sworn in as a member of the board, he was designated as its chairman. Dr. Hitchler held the post, which he described as "the toughest job I ever held," until May 1940 when he resigned to devote full time to his position as dean of the law school.

Though primarily a scholar and teacher, Dean Hitchler was above all a patriotic American, and in both World Wars he served his country with distinction.

In 1917 he answered his country's call to the colors and was a second lieutenant of infantry. Later he was a first lieutenant in the Officer's Reserve Corps and subsequently was promoted to the rank of captain. During World War II, he served as chairman of the Alien Enemy Hearing Board for the middle district of Pennsylvania.

I have spoken of Harry Hitchler as a scholar, administrator, and public servant. But he was also a man, a friend. He possessed qualities which, at first sight, appear contradictory, but in his life complimented one another to form his character of rare uniqueness. He was spiritual, but never sanctimonious. He was high-minded yet always human. He was distinguished in the affairs of men, but essentially modest and humble. His sense of humor was keen, but he was never flamboyant.

Whether in war or peace, Dean Hitchler believed in discipline, but even more important, he believed in and he practiced self discipline. He never demanded of another what he would not glady do himself.

He was a gentleman to the core, a man of impeccable integrity to whom honor was never merely a word, but life itself. He was a great and wonderful human being.

God's greatest gift vouchsafed to man is a full and rich and productive and useful life. Harry Hitchler, through his talent, his energy and his character has left his blessing on us and on all his fellow men. We shall think of him as not having died, but as having lived—usefully, vibrantly and blessedly.

And for that life, though our hearts are saddened through its translation into the eternal realm, all of us are profoundly grateful.

"I can not say, and I will not say,
That he is dead; he is just away.
With a cheery smile and a wave of the hand,
He has wandered into an unknown land,
And left us dreaming how very fair
Its needs must be, for he lingers there.
And you, O you, who the wildest yearn
For the old time steps and the glad return,
Think of him as faring on as dear
In the love of there and the love of here.
Mild and gentle as he was brave,
When the sweetest love of his life he gave
To simpler things, where the violet grew
Kindly as the eyes they were likened to.
Think of him as still the same, I say,
He is not dead; he is just away."

The Mutual Security Bill—Technical Cooperation Activities in Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 5, 1959

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, ever since the inception of the point 4 program, the United States has cooperated with underdeveloped nations in working toward improvement of existing educational programs. Considerable progress has been achieved, but vastly more remains to be done.

The problem of widespread illiteracy is a major concern in the newly developing countries of the world. While the estimated percentage of illiteracy for the world as a whole is just under 50 percent, the percentage runs as high as 98 percent in some of the underdeveloped areas. As the rate of national progress is generally believed linked to a country's educational system, there is a growing desire for educational improvement.

The rapid industrialization and urbanization of hitherto backward countries adds to the necessity of educating their citizenry. They find their educational systems, which lag from 50 to 80 years behind those of the more developed countries, suddenly faced with the problems of modern living. All of these countries have serious deficiencies in their educational systems, deficiencies which pose critical problems for the future.

Moreover, leadership needs in these areas will require a broader educational base. If the educational system of a country is inadequate to train its leaders, the country must do without the quantity and quality of leadership essential to its progress, or depend upon institutions in other countries to provide such training. This situation not only handicaps the nation in meeting its leadership requirements, but also prevents the mass of people from participating intelligently and constructively in the democratic process.

As the needs may vary from country to country, every effort is made to adapt our assistance to the local exigencies. In some instances the reorganization of some phase or phases of the national education system is necessary. In others, introduction of a whole new phase such as trade or industrial education where none previously existed is urgently required. All too often teacher preparation is inadequate; in some countries the average elementary school teacher in rural areas has had no more than 4 to 6 years of elementary schooling. Instruction in the classroom is usually by rote memorization, without the use of instructional materials on any satisfactory scale.

Our technical cooperation programs recognize the diverse needs, and seek to work out a plan whereby those needs can best be achieved with the available resources. Underlying all ICA education programs is the thesis that training and demonstration are uppermost in the thinking and planning of United States technicians serving abroad. While programs run the gamut of educational problems in developing countries, the foremost project efforts are in teacher education — vocational, agricultural, trade and industrial, home economics and leadership training. Rapidly rising in importance is the area of English language training, which becomes increasingly significant as broader avenues of knowledge and information are made available.

Much of the training provided under our technical assistance programs is the responsibility of American colleges and universities. This development is emphasized by the fact that approximately 25 percent of ICA's present college contracts with American universities are in the field of education. Participants in the program may be brought to the United States for training and observation purposes, many of whom will have major responsibilities for carrying on some part of the program on their return. The ICA programs are carefully coordinated with the International Education Exchange activities of the Department of State, and the cultural exchange programs of USIA.

The teacher education program has already recorded some outstanding accomplishments in various areas of the world, a few of which I shall mention at this point.

Jordan, for instance, had no teacher education facilities prior to the inception of the U.S. Operations Mission in 1952. Today she has four teacher training institutions and teacher training classes in two other schools offering instruction to over 400 full-time students. Inservice education classes train yearly about 400 additional teachers who have had no prior professional teacher training, and a summer-school program for teachers has grown from a 10-day session catering to 200 teachers to a full 6 weeks' session for 500 teachers. Jordan is even now expanding her physical

facilities to permit increased enrollment and in addition has admitted day students for the first time.

In Iran, the ICA education program has expanded rapidly and soundly. In 1952, only 17,000 teachers were available to cope with a school population of about 5 million. Today over 40,000 teachers are serving the country and over 70 percent of these have received summer school training through the assistance provided by ICA.

The National Teachers College in Tehran, the only teacher training institution of college rank, has been upgraded in curricular offerings and staff. Demonstration or laboratory school facilities for the 22 normal schools in the 10 provinces of Iran have been developed at the request of the Iranian Government and through this medium newer educational practices are taught.

Nigeria is receiving assistance in teacher education from ICA through the provisions of a contract with Ohio University. Ten staff members are engaged in training the instructors of elementary teacher training colleges. This project, serving about 100 college instructors, is assisting the Ministry of Education to upgrade its instruction, develop new materials, train commercial teachers, and improve the general teaching environment. Thirteen weeks are spent at a center of instruction and then the Ohio University team goes out to the colleges for the next 13 weeks where they work closely with the instructors in their classrooms.

One of the most striking examples of education program achievements in the Asia and Far East area is found in the results of the regional teacher training program involving Thailand and Laos. By this program teacher training facilities in Thailand are made available to trainees from Laos which has completely inadequate facilities for training teachers. During the first year of operation, 30 Laotian teachers were trained in Thai facilities. During the current year, 83 Laotian prospective teachers are in training in Thailand.

In reviewing the success of the program at the end of the first year, Laotian and Thai Ministry of Education officials were so pleased with the program that they commenced discussion of possibilities of a cultural treaty between the two countries to cover all aspects of educational exchanges. Prior to this project, organized with ICA assistance, no cooperative activity between the two ministries had ever been carried out. Not only is an impact being made on the critical teacher shortage in the region, but a definite contribution toward improved intercountry relationships has been made by the project.

The southeast Asian regional English project is another well-received activity in this area. It is working toward the development of English as a common bond of technical and high-level communication in the region.

Teacher training schools have been built and are being operated with ICA assistance in Laos and Cambodia where only highly academic French écoles normales existed previously with graduating classes of 10 to 12 students per year. The new institutions will graduate 100 teachers each year.

Large-scale technical education programs have been developed in the Philippines, Thailand, Pakistan, and India to help these countries meet critical manpower shortages.

Hundreds of Asian educators have been trained in the United States for technical and professional responsibilities in their home countries through ICA's participant training programs.

Vocational industrial education assumes major importance for countries which are moving suddenly and rapidly into the industrial age and this is true of all the less developed lands in some degree or other. The problem must be attacked in a variety of ways, depending on the stage of industrialization already reached and resources and needs of the country. A striking example of the diverse approaches required is furnished by two neighboring countries in Latin America, Brazil and Paraguay.

Brazil is already developing rapidly in industry, but found her system of training skilled workers inadequate for her needs. Under the technical cooperation program, improved curricula and teaching methods have been introduced into Brazil's 23 federal industrial training schools and many of the apprentice training and state industrial schools. About 2,000 teachers and supervisors have been trained in Brazil, and some 200 in the United States. Textbooks and other teaching materials have been prepared, produced and distributed. One of three important regional trade schools for the training of teachers and supervisors for vocational schools has been established at Curitiba and is in full operation. The others are at La Paz, Boliva and Lima, Peru; a fourth will soon be in operation in Guatemala. In cooperation with Brazilian industrialists, a widespread and well-supported system of training-within-industry course has been established and is in operation directly in the industrial plants, and under it, over 300,000 foremen and supervisors have already been trained.

By contrast, Paraguay had no school for trade and industrial training, and no technicians sufficiently trained in their own crafts or in education to provide an administrative or teaching staff for one. Here, even after a school was built, under American supervision, all courses were taught at first by American technicians, and an American with a Paraguayan associate administered the school. As rapidly as possible, however, Paraguayans were trained to take over. Within a few years, the school was being completely staffed and administered by Paraguayans, and in addition to the training of technicians in the school, measures had been adopted to provide for a steady flow of trained industrial teachers. The Paraguayan Union of Industrialists was quick to recognize the value of the school, and took it under their protection and partial support. Largely through the Union of Industrialists, graduates of the school can confidently expect immediate employment. The ninth graduating class, this year, should bring the number of graduates thus far substantially over three hundred. Branch schools have been established, or are in process, in four other centers throughout the Republic. Here is an example of an entire vocational education system for a country being created under the program, and now operating on its own steam, with American help reduced from full operation to advisory services.

The great economic paradox of Bolivia is that it has immense resources in minerals, lands and forests but a population that is largely unproductive. Indians make up over 60 percent of the people of the country, and they are over 80 percent illiterate, with all that this implies in the way of being unprepared to create wealth and contribute to a modern economy. Bolivia needs more and better agriculture and a variety of small industries, but first of all her people must become literate and acquire the skills needed to become producers. Since the population is largely rural, the responsibility rests upon the rural schools.

The International Cooperation Administration is assisting the Bolivians in the development of a school program which will meet the specific needs of the rural population and make the schools more influential in the lives of the people. To reduce illiteracy is only the beginning. U.S. technicians, working with their Bolivian counterparts, are training teachers—both pre-service and in-service—in more modern teaching methods, introducing a more functional curriculum, and developing more effective teaching materials. And the schools are reaching the adults, too, teaching them to speak Spanish as well as their Indian language, to read and write, how to make simple home and farm improvements, and introducing them to the basic principles of better agriculture practices and health habits. It is estimated that some 60,000 rural people are constantly benefiting from the ICA rural education program in Bolivia.

The Bolivians are proud of their new rural school program and they appreciate the part that ICA has played in bringing it about. An eloquent and unexpected note for the ears of U.S. technicians was struck by a village priest who celebrated a field mass at one of the rural normal schools during the "Day of the Indian." He told his audience that many people are carried away by the idea of communism, thinking that it would give them everything they wanted. "But what," he asked them, "has Russia ever done for us? Not one crumb of bread have we got from Russia. But from the United States we get not only material bread but also spiritual bread and intellectual bread."

This incident, Mr. Speaker, illustrates the profound impact of our education assistance program to the developing countries. While this activity comprises only a part of our technical cooperation program, it is invaluable in terms of the friendship and goodwill created.

Rural Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 5, 1959

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, Madison County in my district is one of the leading counties in the Arkansas rural development program. In order to inform my colleagues of the fine work which is being done in Madison County, and the outstanding cooperation of all agencies and groups, I ask leave to include in the RECORD an article from the March 1959 issue of the magazine Rural Arkansas:

DAIRY EXPANSION NO. 1 GOAL IN MADISON

HUNTSVILLE.—Just about everyone got in the act when the Madison County Rural Development Committee decided that its first priority goal would be to strengthen the county's dairy program, says County Agent Howard McCartney. This decision followed a survey which indicated that over 70 percent of the commercial farmers in the county depended on dairying for part of their income, and that dairying was the main source of income for 35 percent of these farmers.

The county has taken some long steps toward its goal in this field. Holstein heifer calves were imported from Wisconsin and distributed among farmers who wanted to expand their dairying operations. The joint efforts of the subcommittees on agriculture and on credit helped accomplish this. The local bank cooperated by loaning money at a reduced interest rate to farmers buying these heifers.

The agricultural committee was also successful in getting a graduate veterinarian to settle in Huntsville. Previously there was no veterinarian in the county.

The subcommittee on public facilities was successful in getting a telephone line run to the home of the technician for the local dairy breeders association, which has strengthened the artificial breeding program.

The county has other ambitious ideas in mind, and McCartney predicts that real growth will be seen within the next few years as this effort continues.

More than 750 additional rural telephones are being installed in Madison County as a result of the efforts of the rural development subcommittee on public facilities, according to County Agent McCartney.

Mr. McCartney says that plans are under way to install telephones over most of the county in the next 5 years. This is being made possible through REA loans for telephone expansion. The public facilities committee in rural development has encouraged local telephone companies to obtain such loans in order to extend service to rural areas not now being served. The committee has also worked on a publicity campaign to encourage rural people to want telephones in order that lines which are built will be practical and economical from the standpoint of the telephone companies.

The county is served by the White River Telephone Exchange which until recently had 80 phones in the county, and the Madison County Telephone Co., which has increased from 315 to 450 phones in the past year. Future plans of these 2 companies call for more than 1,200 telephones. Already many old phone sets have been replaced with new ones. Old central switchboards have been replaced with new ones, and within the next 18 months all telephones will be dial. Just a year ago they were all of the old-fashioned crank type.

The committee is working now to inspire the Hindsville area, which is served by another company, to improve their service and extend it to the entire area.

The work on telephones is just one of the many projects which the public facilities committee is working on. It is also working on road improvement, a sewage system for the county-seat town of Huntsville, electric service to all rural families, and many other projects.

Federal Aid—Fact or Fiction?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT P. GRIFFIN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 30, 1959

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I include an editorial from the Leelanau (Mich.) Enterprise and Tribune of April 30, 1959, which sets forth very cogent reasons for questioning support of H.R. 22, the so-called Murray-Metcalf bill, as a solution to the problems of school construction and teachers' salaries:

FEDERAL AID—FACT OR FICTION?

Michigan Education Association leaders, who have expressed their approval of a plan to provide so-called Federal aid to education should take 5 minutes to read a recent statement on this subject by Congressman GERALD R. FORD—then an hour to reexamine their position.

Congressman FORD, now serving his sixth term in Washington as representative from Kent and Ottawa Counties in Michigan, is recognized by men of both parties as one of the ablest leaders in Congress. This is what he thinks of the Federal aid to education bill:

"The Federal aid to education bill (H.R. 22) is in trouble in the House Committee on Education and Labor, where it is currently being considered. It is reported that those who have been vigorously supporting the bill are seeking ways to save some of its provisions. A compromise may be effected which would made the Federal assistance a temporary measure rather than a permanent policy, and it is hoped by some that as a minimum the bill may be amended to include a need and demonstrated effort test.

"As written, H.R. 22 authorizes an appropriation equal to $25 for each school-age child for the fiscal year 1960, $50 for 1961, $75 for 1962, and $100 for each year thereafter. The total cost of the fiscal year 1960 would be $1,025 million, in 1961 the cost would go up to $2.2 billion, in 1962 to $3.3 billion, and in 1963 to over $4.7 bifilon. The amount thereafter would increase as school population increases.

"Federal funds would be allocated to the States solely on the basis of school population with no reference to the State's need for assistance nor with any consideration to the State's efforts to meet its own needs. Within each State, however, priority for school construction is to be given to those local districts where the need is greatest.

"The bill, as written, authorizes a State to use the Federal money either for school construction or teachers' salaries or both. However, there is nothing in the bill to assure that any teacher will receive an increase in salary because of the enactment of this legislation nor is there any assurance that a single classroom will be constructed in a given State. Moreover, there is nothing in the bill as written to guarantee that the sum total of all moneys, local, State, and Federal, spent on education will be increased by the passage of H.R. 22. There is nothing which requires a State to use the Federal funds as a supplement to its own; there is nothing which prevents a State from using the Federal funds as a substitute for its own.

"H.R. 22 obviously needs general revision. Major consideration should be given to assisting those areas in our country which have demonstrated that they desire to meet this educational need but lack the economic basis for doing so. If we are to have Federal aid to education, it should be solely restricted to those areas. There can be no justification at this time for further Federal taxation to dole out funds to those States which are financially able to meet their own educational needs."

Poison in Your Water—No. 71

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 5, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the Daytona Beach (Fla.) News on October 9, 1958, entitled "Pollution in Indian River."

The article follows:

HEALTH UNIT REPORT: POLLUTION IN INDIAN RIVER

Discharge of raw sewage into the Indian River at New Smyrna Beach has resulted in gross pollution of the stream from the foot of Crawford Road to the south city limits.

The entire river * * * especially the western side * * * shows gross fecal contamination," David B. Lee, director of the State health department Bureau of Sanitary Engineering, reported following analysis of water samples taken during a continuing health unit pollution survey.

"This area should not be used for bathing or other recreational purposes and the removal of shellfish for human consumption should be prohibited," Lee said.

Lee, in a letter to New Smyrna Beach Mayor Robert L. Arnau in reference to the city's sewer lines, said:

"It has been brought to our attention that new connections are being made, from time to time, to the existing sewage collection system of New Smyrna Beach.

"As you are aware, the sewage is discharged without any treatment into the Indian River.

"These waters grossly are polluted and constitute a potential health hazard. It has been the policy of this agency that no sewer extensions should be made without adequate sewage collection and treatment facilities.

"Further connections to the system can result only in making a bad situation worse.

"We have worked with the city of New Smyrna Beach for more than 10 years in an attempt to provide sewage treatment facilities.

"Our records show that plans covering certain treatment facilities were approved by this office several years ago, however, due to the circumstances no such facilities have been constructed.

"Further pollution of the receiving waters through lack of sewage treatment will result in denying the city its full opportunity to expand and grow.

"We urge that the city take all possible steps to construct suitable facilities so that the growth of your city will not be hindered by lack of such a necessary utility," Lee wrote.

The pollution survey will continue through the winter and spring in order to secure data on pollution during periods of lower temperature and seasons when the population is higher.

In the meantime, County Sanitary Engineer George Scott said today, the river pollution survey, which eventually will encompass all of Volusia's coastal waterways, will be expanded to include Ormond Beach.

Work on the Halifax River in Ormond Beach will begin in the near future, he said, although the results virtually are a foregone conclusion.

An earlier survey showed gross pollution in the Ormond Beach sector due to discharge of raw sewage into the river from the city's Granada Avenue sewer line.

The line still is in operation and no treatment facilities have been provided.

U.S. Center Shifts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AL ULLMAN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 29, 1959

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have always been proud to consider myself a far westerner. However, the commendable action of Congress in admitting Alaska and Hawaii to the Union has given my district a new prominence in being the geographical center of the 50 States.

The change in our geographical center to Baker County, Oreg., has been noted in an editorial first appearing in the Santa Rosa, Calif., Press-Democrat and reprinted in the Baker Democrat-Herald. Under unanimous consent I respectfully request permission that it be reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The editorial follows:

U.S. CENTER SHIFTS

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The following editorial is reprinted from the Santa Rosa (Calif.) Press-Democrat.)

If you were brought up believing that Smith County, Kans., is the geographical center of the United States, you'll have to forget it and learn something new.

The geographical center of the United States is in Baker County, Oreg.

Nothing's happened to Smith County, Kans. It's still there. But with Alaska and Hawaii becoming States, the western boundary of the United States is now the Aleutians and the Hawaiian Islands instead of the Pacific coasts of Washington, Oregon, and California.

And Baker County, Oreg., only a few hundred miles from the Pacific coast, is right smack dab in the middle of the new boundaries of the 50 States.

We have nothing against Smith County, Kans., but Baker County, Oreg., is a lot more interesting.

It's a county of towering mountains and fertile valleys, rich in agriculture and forests, and one of the best fishing and hunting areas in the country. In its early days it was gold-rush country. Like the mother lode of California, it is still rich in minerals, but cost of production is greater than the artificially low price our Government has set on gold. And, like the mother lode, it produces far more in agriculture than it did in the more spectacular days of gold.

Not only is it the new geographical center of the United States, but Baker County seems destined to become a year-round vacation playground for the West. Its potential as ski country is tremendous, its unspoiled wilds are being discovered by sportsmen and summer vacationists, and it is the gateway to the spectacular Hells Canyon area. Its location is only a drive of a day and a half from either southern or northern California.

"Brand of a Man," the western novel by Santa Rosa author Thomas Thompson, which we recently ran as a serial, was laid in early day Baker County.

Summit Meetings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. EDWARD ROUSH
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 5, 1959

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Carl R. Leiter, social studies teacher, Central Junior High School, Kokomo, Ind., has sent me an essay, entitled "Summit Meetings," written by one of his students, Kendall Crook, 13 years of age, eighth grade, living at 137 South Forest Drive, to acquaint me with the type of work some of his students do over and beyond their regular assignments.

You read a great deal in the newspapers about juvenile delinquents, but very little about the youngsters who typify and represent the youth of America. More should be printed about our outstanding young citizens to encourage and stimulate them to utilize their talents and ability. I am so impressed by the research, understanding and lucid thinking exhibited by young Kendall in his composition that I am including it in the RECORD, as follows:

In this essay, I intend to relate my feelings toward the proposed summit conference later this year, I have done a little research into the field of summit meetings and conferences of the past.

The first major conference in recent years, the Cairo Conference, was held on November 22–26, 1943, during the height of World War II. The three great powers, the United States, Britain, and China, met there to discuss certain pledges to "bring unrelenting pressure against their brutal enemies by sea, land, and air." The members pledged to receive from Japan certain territories gained in 1914, Formosa, the Piscadores, and that Korea in due time should become wholly independent. Their main objective for the moment though, was to "persevere in the serious and prolonged operations necessary to procure the unconditional surrender of Japan."

Before we go on I would like to extend back into history to the Treaty of Versailles in 1919. This treaty was instigated by the "Big Four," represented by Orlando of Italy, Lloyd George of Britain, Clemenceau of France, and Wilson of the United States. This treaty, which officially ended World War I, was signed by almost every significant nation on earth except the United States. It later made a separate treaty with Germany in 1921.

After the Cairo Conference of 1943 came the Teheran Conference of November 28–December 1, 1943. The "Big Three" in the European war; the Soviet Union, the United States and Britain. In this Conference, most of what was said was about the "maintenance of the independence, sovereignty, and territorial integrity of Iran." The Allies realized the heavy economic burden forced upon Iran and promised to protect and assist her. This treaty was violated by the Soviet Union. How? And why? Because in 1946, after the war had ended, Russia refused to withdraw from the Iranian province of Azerbaijan. Iran appealed to the United Nations and Russia immediately withdrew. But this incident was a forecast of things to come from Russia. Russia had done this just to show off her military strength and touch off a series of crises to plague the world.

During February 4–11 the Yalta Conference was held at Yalta, in the Soviet Union. This meeting was called for two special purposes; the occupation of Germany, and terms under which the Soviet Union entered the war against Japan. The "Big Three" (U.S.S.R., the United States, and Britain), were to divide Germany up into sectors and invite France to take over a sector. Each nation was to keep its sector open to inspection. Violated. As you know, Russia set up a puppet government with a typical communism government in her sector. Russia entered into the war against Japan only weeks before it ended. In reward for this, she occupied North Korea and Manchuria. She also occupied certain Japanese territory and Outer Mongolia. Russia repudiated a pact with China after the war by supplying the Chinese Reds with firepower.

The last World War II conference was held at Potsdam, Germany, on July 26, for the expressed purpose of outlining the terms by which Japan would be allowed to surrender. In the declaration the terms were numerous and relating to the surrender of certain Japanese territory, the punishment of war criminals, etc. Russia was not represented. The nations represented were China, the United States and Britain. Fortunately, Russia was not represented at this conference or this might have led to more concessions to her for her meager part in the Japanese war.

In 1955, the Geneva Conference was held at Geneva, Switzerland. The representatives were Eisenhower (United States), Bulganin (U.S.S.R.), Eden (Britain), and Mendes-France (France). They met to discuss certain international disagreements, among them (1) negotiations on the Indochina War and (2) an agreement on the truce line of Korea. This was not violated to any great extent by any party. All in all, though, this conference settled nothing.

Also, this should be mentioned: In a conference after World War II, Russia agreed to let the Allies have free access to Berlin. In 1949, as you know, Russia cut off all western routes to Berlin, resulting thus in an airlift in which millions of tons of goods were transported by air to the besieged city of Berlin.

As to the proposed summit meeting, I may seem like a pessimist because of my views on the subject. I think that the proposed summit meeting will be like the Geneva Conference, solving almost nothing. Some are even more pessimistic by saying this will be another Munich. Some optimists say that this meeting will lead to a peaceful and more prosperous world. But, as for me, I think, for one, that the various series of contemporary crises will not be halted. Nor do I think that Germany will ever be unified. I think that soon Iraq will become almost

totally Communist and this will stir up increasing tension in the Middle East. About the crisis in the Far East, I think that this crisis has come to a head and will gradually subside. But tension will continue in the Far East and all over the world indefinitely.

Reserve Officers Incentive Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. O. C. FISHER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 5, 1959

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a speech I made last evening before the Reserve Officers' Association and their guests at an annual banquet held at the Bolling Field Officers Club in Washington. The address is as follows:

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, it gives me great pleasure to be with you tonight and I feel signally honored at being given the opportunity to speak to you.

As many of you know, my interest in Reserve matters goes back many years. As a Member of Congress and member of the House Armed Services Committee I have witnessed the slow but nonetheless inevitable recognition by the Congress of the important role played by our Reserve Forces in the total defense of our Nation.

Prior to World War II and for a few years thereafter, our legislators looked upon our various reserve organizations as quasi-military groups whose primary role was to insure the availability of a trained militia in event of war or national emergency.

This concept, in its simplest form, therefore meant that the Congress, and indeed most of our citizenry, did not contemplate any significant use of Reserve personnel on active duty except during periods of armed hostilities.

Unfortunately, international events which have transpired since World War II have demonstrated that this concept is indeed fallacious.

After World War II our Nation attempted to return to its traditional military posture, that is, a small active duty force composed, for practical purposes, solely of Regular personnel and a large inactive Reserve organization. However, we soon discovered, to our dismay, that because of the precarious international situation we were forced to augment the size of our active duty forces in a manner commensurate with the degree of international tension that existed. The result, of course, is that today our active duty forces are composed of large numbers of both Regular and Reserve personnel.

We have approximately 2½ million men on active duty with the defense establishment today. In order to maintain necessary flexibility in our personnel strengths, a significantly large percentage of this number is necessarily Reserve personnel. For example, at the present time over 180,000 of the 322,000 officers on active duty with the Armed Forces are Reserve personnel.

I have made these points simply to set the stage for my next observation. Because of the traditional concept, which had become accepted by our legislators, that our active duty forces will, in peacetime, be composed almost exclusively of Regular personnel, our personnel legislation has failed to contemplate any career status for Reserve personnel on active duty.

Thus, although we have maintained since World War II large numbers of Reserve personnel on continuous active duty, we have given scant recognition to the necessity of providing some element of career security to such individuals. True, our personnel legislation developed since World War II includes statutory authorization for the retirement of Reserve personnel who complete 20 years of active duty, but no significant or adequate provision has been made in the statutes to provide for the interim period of active duty during which our Reserve members may, for one reason or another, be involuntarily released from active duty.

I am happy to say, however, that on March 20, 1959, the House of Representatives, recognizing this problem, passed legislation which for the first time provided equitably for Reserve personnel on extended active duty regardless of whether or not they will be permitted a full or limited military career. This legislation which is entitled "The Reserve Officers' Incentive Act of 1959" was originally developed by the subcommittee of which I am a member. The subcommittee's actions were subsequently unanimously approved by the full Armed Services Committee, and the House of Representatives passed this legislation without a dissenting vote.

Now, let me briefly explain what this legislation will do.

H.R. 5132, the Reserve Officers' Incentive Act of 1959, has a twofold objective: First, to raise the critically low rate of retention of Reserve officers beyond their obligated tours of active duty with the Armed Forces and, second, to provide for more equitable treatment of those Reserve officers who supplement the Regular corps but who may not be continued on active service long enough to qualify for retirement. Stated simply, these objectives will be realized by providing a substantial increase in the amount of readjustment pay made available to Reserve officers involuntarily released to inactive duty.

The Reserve Officers' Incentive Act of 1959 has five main features as follows:

First, it makes contracts mandatory rather than permissive for Reserve officers on active duty after the first 2 years of commissioned service, but eliminates the present one-half of 1 month's pay for these first 2 years.

Second, if he completes a contract, a Reserve officer would receive 2 months' basic pay for each year served under that contract, whether he is released involuntarily or not. Under present law he receives one-half of 1 month's basic pay for each year served, but receives nothing if he leaves the service at his own request.

Third, if the Reserve officer, while rendering satisfactory service, is involuntarily released during the term of the contract, he would, under this proposal, be paid 2 months' basic pay for each year that he has served under contract. In addition, he would receive 1 month's basic pay and allowances for each year of the uncompleted contract. Under the present law, if he is involuntarily released during the term of a contract, he can receive only one-half of 1 month's basic pay for each year served, or 1 month's basic pay and allowances for each year of the uncompleted contract, but not both.

Fourth, as a transitional measure for those presently on duty who would be eligible for a contract under this proposal and who may be separated involuntarily, the bill would provide more equitable treatment for those who have served on active duty for more than 10 years by increasing the present rate from one-half of 1 month's basic pay per year to 2 months' basic pay per year beyond the 10-year mark.

Fifth, finally, this legislation would provide that if a Reserve officer has rendered satisfactory active commissioned service for a period of 14 years, he will either be given a Regular commission, be released from active duty with appropriate readjustment pay, or given a contract that will carry him to retirement eligibility. Such a Reserve officer who has served 12 years under contract would, if released, receive the equivalent of 2 years' basic pay as would a Regular officer with 14 years of service if involuntarily released.

I have only briefly outlined the major portions of the act, but, as you can see, it provides statutory recognition for the Reserve officer who is released involuntarily to inactive duty prior to retirement in approximately the same manner as is provided by statute for the Regular officer similarly situated. Therefore, the importance of this significant change in the history of Reserve legislation lies in the fact that it provides a "magna carta" or "bill of rights" for Reserve personnel on extended active duty and assures them that in event they elect to continue to serve their country, come what may, their unselfish contribution to the national defense will be appropriately recognized.

Anniversary of Polish Independence

SPEECH
OF
HON. CHARLES A. VANIK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 4, 1959

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, May 3, Americans in communities throughout the Nation celebrated the 168th anniversary of Polish independence. I join my colleagues in paying special tribute to the framers of the Polish Constitution of 1791. The people of Poland and those Americans of Polish descent can be proud of this rich heritage of freedom which stemmed from the adoption of their constitution. This document was inspired by the American Declaration of Independence and it included within its framework the fundamentals of freedom written into the U.S. Constitution several years earlier. It is fitting and proper that we remember each year this sister document of freedom which symbolizes with our own the will of man to achieve liberty for himself, his family, and his community.

While the people of Poland have been less fortunate than we in preserving their freedom in their homeland, they have persevered in their efforts to regain liberty each time it was taken from them by war and political partitions. In addition to their brave resistance to tyranny at home, they have sent to our own shores their sons and daughters who have made a major contribution in our own struggle to maintain the institutions of democracy. Americans of Polish descent who live in Cleveland as well as in every other American community have been stable, prudent, and reliable citizens. They have contributed in every line of endeavor. They have been a part of the greatness of our country.

It is to be hoped that a relaxation of artificial barriers which exist in Europe will permit greater communication between citizens of the free world and Iron Curtain countries. Communism cannot long survive in its present tyran-

nical form if it is thus exposed to the free exchange of ideas which would result from increased personal contacts between citizens of our countries.

Freedom or Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. D. BAUMHART, JR.
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 5, 1959

Mr. BAUMHART. Mr. Speaker, I wish to submit at this time a reprint of a letter written by Mr. Dudley White, Jr., editor of the Sandusky Register, Sandusky, Ohio, relative to the situation of my constituent Mr. John Donaldson, of New London, Ohio. I wish to also bring to the attention of the Congress the text of the reply to Mr. White's letter, from Jack Z. Anderson, Administrative Assistant to the President, The White House, dated April 22, 1959. I am sure many will find these letters, and the reprint of Mr. White's editorial which appeared in the Sandusky Register and in the Norwalk Reflector-Herald, of interest:

SANDUSKY REGISTER,
April 14, 1959.

Maj. Gen. WILTON B. PERSONS,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR GENERAL PERSONS: Never before this time have I ever traded on my father's name. I am deliberately breaking that rule now.

Enclosed please find an editorial. I can only say that I wish that I had written this piece myself, but I must give the credit to the publisher of a small weekly paper in my home county—Huron County, Ohio.

I believe the editorial to be self-explanatory and it concerns itself with a case that is probably all too familiar to you. Our farm situation is hodgepodge and I, no better than anyone else, know the answer.

I am hoping however, that this editorial can be shown to President Eisenhower. The general theme of the editorial clearly shows the breakdown of an American principle—dignity of the individual—that concerns many Americans throughout this Nation.

I realize that I am undoubtedly imposing on past friendship and I know how busy you all are, but I must say that I feel that the content of this editorial is of great import to every American citizen. It is thought provoking, to say the least.

I thank you most sincerely for taking time to read this note.

Very truly yours,

DUDLEY A. WHITE, Jr.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, April 22, 1959.

DEAR MR. WHITE: In General Persons' absence from the city I am replying to your letter of April 14 with which you enclosed an editorial which had been run originally by the New London Record. I share your feeling that the writer of this editorial touched upon a fundamental principle in our national life, raising a clear warning about trends which could weaken the freedom and dignity of the individual.

As you know, this administration has been deeply concerned about the straitjacket regimentation which is imbedded in the farm program. The basic legislation authorizing this program was passed under a Democratic administration in 1938. It was continued and supported by Democratic administrations as long as they were in control.

The programs developed under this legislation were part of the legacy inherited by the Republicans in 1953. The President and his Secretary of Agriculture promptly called attention to the weaknesses and dangers of the mandatory programs and asked Congress for legislative changes which would permit more flexibility and less control.

There has been some progress, but it has been slow. Only a small part of the corrective legislation requested has been adopted. Democratic majorities in the Congress have consistently declined to accept recommendations from the administrative branch of Government. Instead, they have upheld and continued high-level price support and related programs which may have had some justification during depression or wartime emergencies but which had long outlived their usefulness.

These are the programs which lead to regimentation and loss of individual initiative. They are the programs responsible for Mr. John Donaldson's troubles. They are the programs which the administration, again this year, has urged Congress to amend and correct.

We have checked with the Department of Agriculture about the wheat program and the situation regarding Mr. Donaldson's operations in 1957, the year mentioned in the editorial. Under the law, wheat marketing quotas—with their penalties for exceeding farm acreage allotments—are, in general, binding on all wheat producers when quotas are approved by at least two-thirds of the eligible producers who vote in a national referendum.

This is true for an individual farmer, even if he did not vote for the quotas and did not take advantage of available price support programs. There are two exceptions. Quota penalties do not apply to any producer who does not harvest more than 15 acres of wheat, or to a producer who harvests not more than 30 acres and obtains a feed wheat exemption—feeding all the wheat on his own farm, and selling none.

Department of Agriculture records show that measurement by Government agents put Mr. Donaldson's 1957 wheat at 23 acres, as compared with his farm allotment of 11 acres. All producers are notified of their rights of appeal under administrative procedures when they feel there are errors in the operation of the program. Mr. Donaldson apparently did not take advantage of his rights of appeal under these procedures.

We understand that when the case went to the U.S. Court of Appeals, the court ruled that because Mr. Donaldson had not used the right to appeal under the administrative procedures he was not in position to reopen the determination of basic facts about his wheat acreage. In other words, he did not exhaust his appeal rights under administrative procedure before coming to the court.

We, of course, greatly regret the incident which has caused so much difficulty for Mr. Donaldson, but feel that under the controlling laws the Department of Agriculture had no other course but to proceed with mandatory enforcement action. This administration will continue to seek changes in legislation which will lessen mandatory controls and give farmers more freedom of initiative in producing and marketing.

Sincerely yours,

JACK Z. ANDERSON,
Administrative Assistant to the President.

[From the Sandusky Register, Apr. 16, 1959]

SWEET LAND OF LIBERTY

A week ago Thursday John Donaldson said he is going to move out of the United States. He is going to sell his farm out on Fitchville River Road and move his family to a farm he plans to buy in Canada.

Almost everybody around here knows John. We know he is no hot-head. We know he is far from being a screwball crusader.

Stop practically anybody on the street and they'll tell you that John is quiet, gentlemanly guy with an above average amount of considered judgment.

So why is John doing this?

Is he mad at the Government?

Is he unpatriotic?

Is he a poor loser?

No, it isn't any of these things. The basic reason is very simple.

John has always held his head up and he wants to continue to do so.

He is a man who believes self-pride is indispensable in a well-balanced individual.

And he believes in man as an individual and feels very strongly that every man is entitled to enjoy the dignity of his position as a person.

The loss of these basic human rights of self-determination, John believes, make him less than a man and not much more than a statistic, properly filed and numbered, in the records of the U.S. Department of Agriculture with cross references in the U.S. Department of Justice.

All this is pretty strong language. Is it really this bad?

Let's look at the facts.

John owns 389 acres of land down the road from Barrett's Chapel. His family has owned this property since the American Revolution.

He has farmed here since 1937, except for 4½ years during World War II when he served with the 37th Division in the Pacific.

The family has always used this land to earn a living for themselves.

The family has always determined how the land could best be used, year after year, to provide a livelihood.

Now John feels that if a man cannot determine how his land or machine or store should be used, he does not own that property.

This, he feels, is especially true if his use of this property in no way affects his neighbors or his country and especially if he has never accepted a nickle's worth of wheat subsidy from anyone.

For the past 2 years John has not been permitted to vote in the wheat referendum because his allotment from the Department of Agriculture has been under 15 acres.

In the year 1957, the Department of Agriculture said John planted 23 acres of wheat.

That year John employed a certified surveyor to measure his wheat. In a sworn statement, the surveyor stated that John's wheat measured 14 acres, plus or minus one-half acre.

John was not permitted to offer this evidence in his defense in court.

According to Clarence May, John's attorney, the Government offered no evidence whatsoever to back up their claim that he planted 23 acres.

John asked for a jury trial, citing his rights under the Constitution. This was denied him by the court.

This left John with no choice. Either pay the fine and shut up or seek another solution to a situation he knows in his own heart is unjust and unfair.

John wants to continue to farm. He has a family to provide for. Should he continue to pay fines year after year, with no chance to defend himself or should he seek a place where he will be permitted to do this?

The answer to this must come from each of us.

How we answer it or if we don't bother to answer it at all, will determine the kind of future each of us will have in this country for years to come.

As it is done to any one of us, so can it be done to each and every one of us.

"Fidel Castro: Liberator or Dictator?"—The Critics Review Jules Dubois' New Book

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 27, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following book reviews which appeared in the New York Times for April 5, 1959, and the Washington Daily News for April 7, 1959:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 5, 1959]

FROM THE SIERRA MAESTRA TO HAVANA, THE IDEALS NEVER CHANGED

(By Herbert L. Matthews)

Jules Dubois, the Chicago Tribune's noted correspondent for Latin America, has performed a remarkable tour de force in this book. He himself says it was written in 20 days, which is almost incredible—for it is a full, solid, well-documented work that will stand up. The haste with which it was written means that there are errors and lacunae, but the errors are minor, the omissions few.

One must expect that the books written about Fidel Castro during these first months of his power will be either adulatory or critical. There can be no such thing as an "unbiased," "impartial" study because no one can write intelligently about the revolution unless he was somehow identified with it. Dubois is a sincere admirer of Fidel's but a man who at least knows him, knows Cuba and knows the historic background out of which he came.

There is a typical letter from Fidel Castro to Jules Dubois printed at the beginning of the book. The letter concludes: "Should your book contain errors and should your opinions expressed therein be mistakes or unjust, I shall not hesitate to express my own opinions about the contents of the book when it is published."

Errors there are, but not of a sort that the rebel leader need care about. The opinions are neither "mistaken nor unjust," and if Fidel does not find this book to his liking he is hard to please.

Dubois' book is at the same time a biography of Fidel Castro and a history of the revolution. He does the latter job better because there is considerable documentation available and he personally covered a great deal of the war. He was obviously handicapped in getting information about Fidel's early youth.

The book picks up authority and importance with the famous incident of the Bogotazo. This was the uprising in Bogotá, Colombia, during the ninth Inter-American Conference in April 1948. Fidel took part in it as a visiting student delegate, and Jules Dubois was there as correspondent for the Chicago Tribune.

The next big incident came more than 5 years later—the attack on the Moncada Barracks in Santiago de Cuba on July 26, 1953. Mr. Dubois' account of the assault is sketchy, but the story of the trial of Fidel Castro afterward is excellent and much the fullest yet available in English.

The incident was a peak in Fidel's life and in the revolution and it was later to give the July 26 movement its historic name. The eloquent self-defense of Castro before the court was circulated clandestinely during the last few years of the Batista regime and the trial already figures as one of the most important and dramatic in Cuban history.

Mr. Dubois is right to devote a number of pages to this defense. Anyone who reads it carefully will understand much that is happening today in Cuba. Fidel proclaimed in that 5-hour speech the ideals of the social revolution he is now trying to put into effect: to restore sovereignty to the people, to achieve a more equitable distribution of land and profits from industry and agriculture, the confiscation of all of the property of all the malfeasants and other measures affecting housing, education, and employment.

Other documents, many of them unconscionably long—for there has seldom been a Latin American hero so overflowing with words as Fidel Castro—bolster the picture with their consistent theme of social revolution. Fidel has never wavered or changed in that respect. He misjudged his own future role so completely as to say: "I have renounced beforehand every post after the triumph." That was naivete, not hypocrisy. The ideals, however, never changed.

The detail piles up excitingly and copiously as the revolution progresses. Here are some of the dismal facts of the Ambassadorships of Arthur Gardner and Earl E. T. Smith, the blindness of the State Department, the frightening callousness of the Pentagon.

Mr. Dubois prints a photograph of Ambassador Gardner hugging Gen. Francisco Tabernilla, Batista's chief of staff, which was truly symbolic of the warmth shown at all times by Mr. Gardner to General Batista and his associates. Ambassador Smith was blamed by Cubans mostly for his refusal to face the facts and his failure to grasp what was happening. This led him into policies that played the Batista game, as the author shows.

The turning point in the rebellion came in July–August 1958, when the hard-pressed Batista made his last serious offensive and was badly beaten. This coincided with the unity pact of Caracas (July 20, 1958) and the creation of the Civilian Revolutionary Front. The unity pact finally brought together all the leaders and all the parties of the opposition in an agreed program. A failure of the opposition to unite had been one of the major reasons for the inability to overthrow the Batista regime. It was at that time that anyone knowing what was happening in Cuba could say with confidence: "Fidel Castro is going to win. One cannot say when or how, but the defeat of Batista is certain."

In most cases Mr. Dubois wisely allows the facts and documents to speak for themselves. It is a brilliant job of digging and collating, even to the confused pattern of events at the time Batista fled and the dramatic 6 weeks that followed.

[From the Washington Daily News, Apr. 7, 1959]

DICTATOR OF THE LEFT?—BOOK PROVIDES BETTER UNDERSTANDING OF CASTRO

(By John Hoover)

Jules Dubois' book on Fidel Castro (just published by Bobbs-Merrill) ought to be required reading for every American shocked and outraged by recent evidence of anti-U.S. feeling south of the border.

All the principal sources of Latin distrust and dislike of us can be found in these pages. On them is told the story of the Cuban premier's campaign to break the brutal Batista dictatorship.

In the telling, is revealed the ignorance and misunderstanding (on both sides) which are, of course, at the bottom of much of the trouble between Latin America and North America.

Take as a point of departure the widespread North American attitude toward Castro: Suspicion that a dictator of the right has been supplanted by a dictator of the left; a lukewarm good will overlayed with apprehension that communism has gained a toehold on our flank.

These feelings have been engendered by—

The summary drumhead trials and executions of "war criminals."

The quick assumption of power by Castro and delay of elections.

The rather coy disavowals of communism and the presence in positions of influence of leftists reputedly more sympathetic to Moscow than to Washington.

The quick redistribution of land and threatening moves against big business, much of which is heavily capitalized from the United States.

Continual saber-rattling toward the remaining hemisphere dictators.

Mr. Dubois' account of the Castro revolution provides a context within which these suspicions can be viewed in better understanding. With such an understanding one still has room to judge Castro, either as a wholesome development in American politics or as a hemispheric disaster. Mr. Dubois doesn't pretend the issue is settled.

THE TRIALS AND EXECUTIONS

Latins often point out that seldom has there been a period in which U.S. citizens lived without the benefit of constitutional rule. Terror and brutality of despots is something completely outside our experience. Our indignation at the savage treatment of prisoners of war and subjected people by the Axis nations was one reason for the war crimes trials after World War II and the United Nations' anti-genocide pacts.

One of the first laws decreed by Fidel Castro after he had invaded the Sierra Maestra in December 1957, was provision for quick trial and punishment of the principle agents of Batista's cruelty. Partly, at least, this was done to prevent mobs from dealing with their tormentors in kind; the purpose was to make such summary justice as humane as possible.

Mr. Dubois points out that Castro was astounded when the trials had the effect of antagonizing the free world and the author speculates that if there had been no trials the world might have excused the killing of many more as inevitable revolutionary zeal.

Mr. Dubois does not gloss over the fact that justice was severely abused in some trials—particularly in those of the airmen accused of bombing towns and villages which were not military objectives.

This is the case in which the verdict freeing most of the pilots was overthrown by Castro who ordered retrial and conviction.

But for most of those shot, Mr. Dubois says, there was ample documentation of extreme brutality.

CASTRO AND POWER

Throughout the revolutionary period Castro always disavowed any desire for civilian power. He said he would not take an executive post.

But, as Mr. Dubois points out, he deliberately made a long triumphal march across the island as soon as victory was won, relishing the public plaudits and making sure that control was in the hands of friends wherever he went.

He had dictated the acceptance as provisional president of Manual Urrutia Leo, a respected judge who had been persecuted by Batista for insisting on the rule of law.

The "revolutionary junta"—composed of all anti-Batista forces—had a far abler candidate, Senor Felipe Pazos, a distinguished financier and statesman. However, it deferred in favor of Castro's choice. Then, when the government teetered in the early days of 1959, Castro accepted the role of premier after it became apparent that contradictions were arising from the separation of powers. Castro obviously was the law. The cabinet was then headed by Premier Jose Miro Cardona. It would make decisions that were countermanded by Castro. For Castro

to accept the title of premier was only to make fact of fancy.

Castro has said that he would like to be elected president under fully constitutional means.

But, he has also said that as of now there is no party in Cuba but the 26th of July movement and that if elections were held soon he would be elected president.

He has stated he wants political parties to have time to organize and present their programs to the public so that any election will reflect the will of the Cuban people, but right now there is a sort of "truce" on; there is little or no criticism of Castro from political oppositionists. They simply don't want to take a chance.

CASTRO AND COMMUNISM

Castro has a definite program he has outlined again and again in his long-winded public appearances and in equally long-winded manifestos.

Castro has denied repeatedly that he is a Communist. He has also refused to describe himself as militantly anti-Communist. His brother, Raul, heir apparent who is considered further left than Fidel, when asked his political affiliation usually replies, "If I were a Communist I would belong to the Communist Party. The only party I belong to is the 26th of July." During Raul's formative years he went to Prague and to Moscow for political indoctrination.

The next closest Castro associate, Ernesto (Che) Guevara, who has been officially declared a "native" Cuban, although he was born in Argentina, is also vague about his politics. He was in Guatemala during the leftist regime of Jacobo Arbenz Guzman and has expressed great admiration for that government.

He says he was denied a position in Guatemala because he would not join the Communist Party. Others doubt that given reason.

Mr. Dubois details Fidel Castro's program at great length. It includes rather drastic redistribution of land from large holdings, both governmental and private, to the campesinos, or farm workers. It includes low cost housing for the poor, and rollback of electric and telephone rates. Castro declares he's still for private enterprise but against exploitation. He says he seeks to wipe out the chronic unemployment of something more than 1 million of Cuba's 6 million population.

SOCIAL REFORMS

Citizens of the United States are prone to forget that many of the social reforms sought by Latin American politicians have been reality in the United States for generations.

Our own homestead laws insured that most of the North American land was owned and controlled by the men who developed it and worked it. Since most of the States were organized before the great migration to cities, the political power has customarily been held by small farmers.

Organized labor has been growing ever stronger since the turn of the century and has forced ever improved working conditions and wage standards.

Since the days of Theodore Roosevelt big business in the United States has been restricted by antitrust laws; the limiting force of graduated income taxes has been placed against great wealth.

None of these reforms have got very far in Latin America and in many places laborers, both industrial and agricultural, have been virtually enslaved to owners of property under a colonial enterprise system that is a far cry from what we know as free private enterprise (which is not so private and certainly not absolutely free these days).

According to Castro's program, as detailed by Mr. Dubois, more private foreign investment in Cuba will be encouraged. But Castro wants the profits to remain in Cuba, and he wants Cuban workers to get a better share of the income.

THREATS TO DICTATORS

Castro could hardly be expected to love Rafael Leonidas Trujillo who supplied Batista after the United States cut off shipment of arms in March 1958, and who now provides haven for the deposed Cuban. Fidel has also made threatening gestures toward the Somozas of Nicaragua who also sent military supplies to Batista.

Mr. Dubois does not think the Castro regime will intervene directly in the affairs of those dictatorships and indeed his Government has already recanted some early extreme remarks. At one moment, Castro threatened withdrawal from the Organization of American States if the dictators weren't tossed out. His Government quietly backtracked on that one, and got him off the hook.

On the other hand, it is felt likely that Cuba will provide comfort for exiles and will encourage "homegrown" revolutions against her dictator neighbors.

Latins have found it hard to understand why the U.S. Government, cherishing stability, has often been able to stomach the worst despots. They cannot reconcile our reverence for democracy and civil rights with our willingness to pay off the dictators and reap huge profits under an economy that exploits low standards.

They often feel we have more real respect for property than for people.

Unfortunately, all too often the only citizens of the United States Latins ever see are the wealthy who can afford to take luxury cruises and stay at high-priced hotels. These people tend to find more in common with the feudal overlords whose burden of wealth is borne by the poverty-stricken multitudes throughout South America.

This helps explain much of Castro's tub thumping.

All these points are made clear in Mr. Dubois' story of the 9-year fight of Fidel Castro against Fulgencio Batista.

There are documents galore. They all attest to Castro's attitudes. There is also documentation of the crimes of Batista against the Cuban people.

Few people are better able to put the material into perspective than Mr. Dubois who has been a topflight Latin American correspondent for the Chicago Tribune for many years. And he is a reporter who goes out in the streets to get the news instead of waiting for government handouts.

Unfortunately his accounts of the action of the revolution are a bit sketchy, but it is remarkable that he could have got out any sort of an account in the short time that has elapsed since the Batista empire crumbled on January 1, 1959.

May Day, Law, and Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 5, 1959

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excellent editorial which appeared in the Bayonne Times, May 1, 1959, entitled "May Day, Law, and Youth":

MAY DAY, LAW, AND YOUTH

Today is Youth Day for the Elks and Law Day for the New Jersey Bar Association and May Day for all of us; it's time to do some cheering on all counts. The Elks are placing talented young people in positions of prominence all over town, and the bar association has been sponsoring an essay contest on "Law Day, U.S.A., What It Means to Me" among high school students of the State. They're both excellent activities, because they bring young people into contact with politics and political philosophy—a fancy way of saying what makes democracy tick.

Democracy depends absolutely on the quality of the people it places in office, and on the political understanding of the community. Both the Elks and the bar association are trying to draw the attention of young people to politics, what it means locally and what it means internationally. Locally it makes so great a difference that almost everything that takes place in a municipality for good or ill traces back to politics. This is true whether we begin with education or housing or prosperity of local business or job opportunities or attractiveness of general plan or anything almost else. In international affairs, which is where the bar association's emphasis lies, politics is the difference between tyranny and freedom. Dictatorship by definition is government in the absence of law; the dictatorships have laws by way of window dressing for their own people and as propaganda fodder, but the very essence of dictatorship is government untrammeled by law. The bar association in its essay contest prompted hundreds of New Jersey students actually to think about their country's government by law and the Communist countries' government by dictatorship. May Day is a time for youth, for fun and frolic, and it's also a time to think of springs to come. The Elks and the bar association are helping all of us to do just that.

Our Airline Worked—Our TVA Hasn't Yet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. CARLTON LOSER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 5, 1959

Mr. LOSER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am placing in the RECORD the last of three articles on Afghanistan written by the editor of the Nashville Tennessean, Mr. Coleman A. Harwell, who is on a world tour.

This article concerning the establishment of the airline by our country and its value to the West, as well as the observations made about the Helmland River project, will be of extreme interest to you and I commend it to your reading.

The article follows:

OUR AIRLINE WORKED—OUR TVA HASN'T YET

(By Coleman A. Harwell)

KABUL, AFGHANISTAN.—Some boners have been pulled on this strategic cold war front.

Consider, for instance, the time back in 1956 when Russia's traveling salesmen, Bulganin and Khrushchev, dropped down out of a murky sky and "presented" Afghanistan with $100 million in credit.

Western influence hereabouts hit a low point. Anyone making book would have had to give the stable entry including the United States a very poor chance in the running at that time.

OUT FOR AN AIRLINE

Soon thereafter someone—probably the Afghans, but it isn't easy to determine just

who—decided that Afghanistan should have an airline. We are not certain when Russia came into this particular picture, but the record is clear that there was considerable exchange between U.S. officials here and in Washington. Delays occurred, as they usually do in such important matters. The Afghans said it seemed to them the United States wasn't much interested.

Then 1 day, and rather quickly, too, for a project of this size, the United States said OK, it was ready to see to it that Afghanistan did have an airline, and a good one.

Two hours later, the story goes, the Russians advised that they were ready to provide an airline. But an agreement had already been made with our people. And so it seems that the men in Moscow made a mistake.

There may be ample room for argument as to the value of the airline project to us and the West. But it seems to me to have lots of merit.

RED WINDOW DRESSING

Russia has done a number of dramatic things in Afghanistan, things that have window-dressing appeal. Such as oiling a few streets in Kabul. (Incidentally, they are beginning to show wear and tear rather soon, but they still are strong talking points.) On our side, the airline project has been the one hot sales item.

Ariana Airlines is now flying regular schedules from Beirut to Tehran to Kabul, and from Kabul to Karachi, Pakistan, and New Delhi, India. It connects Kabul with Kandahar in the south and Herat in the southwest. It has two trim DC–4's and four good old workhorse DC–3's. During 1958 Ariana averaged 2,000 passengers per month, in 1959 it will do better. This includes the popular special runs to Mecca for the great annual pilgrimage of Moslems.

Afghans love to fly; they are proud of flying on their own line. Our flight in was packed with them.

There are 26 Americans here developing the line and 50 to 60 Indians, skilled pilots, mechanics and accountants. As Afghans learn the jobs, they take over. Many are in mechanical and office jobs now. Ten young men are training as pilots in the United States, five at Park Air College, St. Louis, and five in Texas. They are reported making good progress.

But a thing that its American sponsors think is especially important is that the airline is a private enterprise. That is, the American portion of it. And it is being operated like one, with cleanliness, punctuality and good bookkeeping all stressed.

Roger Lewis, vice president of Pan-American Airways, came in on the same plane with us, for the annual board meeting being held here. He said that Pan-Am put in $200,000 and owns 49 percent of the stock. Afghanistan owns the rest. Pan-Am has three of the seven directors.

The United States is putting up $14 million to provide the American personnel under the U.S. technical aid program, as well as airport navigational equipment and training. He said the operational report at the meeting showed the line making good progress. If it continues, he said, Pan-Am will be able to illustrate the efficiency of private enterprise.

IT'S A TOUGH JOB

It stands to reason that no private firm could be expected to go into such an unchartered and remote operation as this without Government aid. Unless and until other American airlines show they were denied a chance to compete for the job, it seems logical to assume that Pan Am was handed a tough job, rather than a bonanza. Regardless of this aspect, it looks like a good operation.

One thing is certain. Lewis made good on his plan to get back to New York Saturday, after arriving here Tuesday and attending meetings through Thursday. The airport, flooded when we came in, was dry by Friday. Ariana service resumed that day; he caught Pan Am's round the world flight somewhere down the line and, with the benefit of an 8-hour time gain, was on the dot in New York. That puts Kabul mighty close to us, and the people here know it.

SOME SETBACKS, TOO

It would be nice to report that all our undertakings here are as encouraging. But that is not the case.

The Helmland River project has been hanging over our heads for several years. Afghanistan started an ambitious reclamation project in 1939 to put thousands of desert acres into cultivation. They spent heavily, bogged down.

In 1946, the American contractors, Morrison-Knudsen, came into the picture.

Four years later, the United States took a hand with loans through the Export-Import Bank. In all, we have put about $39 million into this big irrigation-reclamation-hydroelectric job, which has often been called their TVA and which is in fact, named HVA.

Benefits are already available in the valley. Thousands of acres have been drained of floods; others assured a satisfactory year-round water supply.

But one big trouble seems to have been that we boosted the HVA too high; people were given the impression they would have a program rivaling TVA's in a short time. When the program did not materialize, HVA became a target of abuse.

Afghans often remind you that thousands of acres expected to be made productive proved to be salty and thus hopeless.

And one Afghan at least is still peddling this old story from the early Morrison-Knudsen days. He said that in the past when Americans on the job came into town to shop or to make a business call, they left their cars running burning precious gasoline. He went on to explain that this was because the contractors had a cost-plus-10-percent contract with the Government; thus, the more the job cost, the more money the contractor made.

Whether there is any basis of fact in this isn't the point. The point is that we need to get this job straightened out. Lots of good work has gone into it, lots of progress has been made. Many people here—Afghans and Americans—have confidence in it. But apparently we do not have a complete, thorough engineering plan for the job, after all these years.

It is reported that the subject is under consideration in Washington now. With all the engineering skill we have for such projects, with all we have invested thus far here, with the urgent necessity of (1) removing Helmland from the area of hostile scorn, and (2) turning it into a bright spot of American achievement in this important area, it is to be hoped that positive action will be taken. We need a solid survey and plan for Helmland. And without further delay.

A PLAN FOR EDUCATION

Another big element in our work here is in the field of education. A team from Columbia University is working with the Afghanistan Government on building up a school system that will assault the country's big illiteracy problem, probably 90 percent.

A team from the University of Wyoming, suitably chosen in view of its climate and soil, is helping in the agricultural field. Both are well regarded by the people they are working with. Education is democracy's greatest force.

Very real competition is being waged in the propaganda field. Some subtle, some not very.

All embassies are permitted to issue information bulletins, with limited circulation. Bulletins are issued by the United States, Britain, United Arab Republic, India, Pakistan, and, of course, Russia and Red China.

They're all four-sheet, mimeographed affairs.

OURS IS HELPFUL

Ours is not a bad news sheet—certainly very helpful to Americans who have no source of news but a 15 minute daily English news program over Radio Kabul, or the local government press, in case you read Persian or Pushtu.

Russia's is, as expected, a dreary propaganda effort. One day's issue, with no typographical relief, covered these juicy news items: Soviet statement on NATO's 10th anniversary; a report on industrial output in the state of Kirghiz; the forthcoming 7-year plan.

Unhappily, there is no Western news service coming in here. United Press International has a contract to serve the local national press service, but has had wire trouble for a year. Meanwhile, Russia's Tass gets its service and UPI hopes to solve its problems soon.

Also, unhappily, there are no Western newsmen here, UPI has a local newsman, who files an occasional piece, which must clear his superiors. The news here may not make headlines every day, but it is worth more attention than it is getting from the West.

Operation of the New York State Bridge Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 5, 1959

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, important in the successful operation of our Government is the functioning of those governmental administrative organizations known as authorities. These are traditionally operated on a bipartisan basis and with a view to technical achievement rather than political accomplishment.

One of these authorities which has achieved great distinction in my State is the New York State Bridge Authority, which has recently submitted its report for the year 1958 to Governor Rockefeller. The bridge authority, which is under the chairmanship of Hon. John S. Stillman, of Cornwall, N.Y., administers the important transportation functions involved in crossing the Hudson River in my State.

Although the bridges which the authority controls are not located in my congressional district, these important river crossings play a most significant part in the life and economy of millions of people in the State, including those living within my district.

For that reason, it is a pleasure to include in the RECORD a fine editorial commenting favorably on the bridge authority's annual report which appeared in the Catskill (N.Y.) Examiner Recorder on March 19, 1959:

MORE ABOUT OUR BRIDGES

The New York State Bridge Authority has presented to the Governor a report on its operations for the past year. It contains interesting facts. Incidentally it proclaims that the authority's objective is "A Greater Hudson Valley." That alone rates congratulations to authority members John S. Stillman, of Cornwall; Ernest M. Happner, of Kingston; Dr. John L. Edwards, of Hudson, and William Haas, of Coxsackie, who serve without pay. They have well demonstrated that objective. And again, incidentally, we wish the throughway authority would adopt a similar objective, which certainly would include an interchange at Coxsackie.

Established by act of the legislature in 1932, the bridge authority is an independent public benefit corporation responsible to the traveling public, river communities and authority bond holders—but is not a part of any department of State government.

The authority has a staff of 159 persons contributing to the economy of this area, and its service also contributes—providing river crossings for some 99 million cars since its organization. The authority has devoted considerable attention to maintaining and improving the bridges and their facilities. During the past year, $88,040 was sent in repainting the Rip Van Winkle span which now has the benefit of a new 2.2-mile highway connection with Route 9 on the east. The Bear Mountain bridge roadway was repaved and the structure repaired at a cost of $90,365. At Poughkeepsie headquarters grounds around the administration building were graded and improved at a cost of $35,000; the toll plaza widened, a fourth lane installed and a toll booth completed. That cost $185,000. The authority's 1.3-mile road linking Route 9-W and Route 32 with the Kingston-Rhinecliff span, costing about $1.3 million, is expected to be opened later this year.

These and other facts of the 1958 report indicate the progressiveness and good service of the bridge authority members and the excellent investment the public made in Hudson River crossings.

U.S. Schoolboy Brings Aid to Korea Orphanage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES M. TEAGUE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 5, 1959

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress the story of Richard Adams, the student body president of the Pacific Grove, Calif., High School. Richard recently traveled to Korea with gifts of clothing from Pacific Grove to the children of Korea. This outstanding operation of international good will would never have been possible without the fine help of the Navy's Military Sea Transportation Service, which took Richard and the gifts to Korea on one of its ships and arranged the program for his visit. The story is told in the following article from the May 1959 issue of the magazine MSTS and the official report of Lt. Comdr. A. W. O'Leary, the commanding officer of the MSTS office in Pusan, Korea:

U.S. SCHOOLBOY BRINGS AID TO KOREA ORPHANAGE

The warm-hearted crew of the refrigerator ship USNS *Bald Eagle*, which unofficially supports the Chong Duck Wan Orphanage at Pusan, Korea, recently got an unexpected assist.

Seems a former engineer aboard the Pac ship mentioned the project to his daughter, Rosalin Knowlton, a student at Pacific Grove High, California. Rosalin, vice president of the student body, started a campaign which netted 5,000 pounds of clothing for the tiny tots.

On February 23, the *Bald Eagle* sailed from Alameda with the precious cargo aboard. With it, to make the delivery to the orphanage in person, went 17-year-old Richard Adams, student body president.

Arrangements for Richard to travel aboard the MSTS ship were handled by the Monterey Peninsula Council of the Navy League and the U.S. Naval Postgraduate School in Monterey.

Pusan is a regular stop for the *Bald Eagle*, and the Chong Duck Wan Orphanage a regular stop for the crew while in port. Donations from friends and charitable organizations supplement those made by the crew.

REPORT CONCERNING VISIT OF RICHARD ADAMS

At 0800 on March 21, 1959, Richard Adams debarked from the USNS *Bald Eagle* and was greeted by a reception committee including Lieutenant Commander O'Leary, Miss Lim, director of the Chung Duk Wan Orphanage, representatives of the local press, and schoolchildren, who presented Richard with the traditional welcome of flowers.

All persons then embarked in a procession of assorted vehicles which made its way out of Pusan, following the coast some 12 miles to Su Yong, a tree-covered neck of land looking out over sea and mountains. Here the children and officials of Chung Duk Wan Orphanage were on hand to greet Richard, who had traveled some 5,000 miles to personally present some 3 tons of clothing collected by Pacific Grove High School for the children of Korea. The official presentation ceremony was held in a small hall festooned with flags and flowers, and highlighted by speeches by Richard and local notables, including Mrs. Kim Son, wife of the Governor of Kyong Sang Nam Do Province. The Governor's small son was also present, and began the series of presentations by shyly placing a large wreath of flowers about Richard's neck. Mrs. Kim also added to the traditional exchange of gifts with a lacquered photography album sent from the Governor. Mr. Lim Chang Nam, father of the director, graciously thanked Richard for the orphanage and also sounded what was to be a keynote of his Pusan visit when he stressed that though the people of Pusan had had many contacts with American military and government officials, that this was the first time they had been visited by an American student. The popping of flashbulbs and whirring of newsreels, later shown throughout Korea, were eloquent testimony to the interest aroused by Richard's visit. The ceremonies were further enhanced by a presentation from the orphanage to Captain Rhoads of the *Bald Eagle*, whose crew members had felt that they also should "get in the act" with a spontaneous donation of their own gathered while underway to Pusan. After the benediction by Rev. Kim Hyun Kyu, the proceedings received their final touch when Richard went outside to a point overlooking the bay and planted a tree commemorating his visit.

The afternoon ceremonies opened at Tung Ju Commercial High School where Lt. (jg.) Clayton, executive officer of this command, has been donating his spare time as a teacher of English for the past several months. A huge banner proclaiming "Welcome Richard Adams" placarded over the front of the school, met the eyes of the visiting party as they arrived in MSTS vehicles. After a short meeting with school officials, they proceeded to an assembly hall already filled to overflowing with students, teachers, and reporters from the Pusan area. To begin the festivities, chosen students performed songs and dances in Richard's honor. Then after some remarks by Mr. Chang Chin Kwon, who acted ably as interpreter throughout the proceedings, and by Lt. (jg.) Clayton urging his students not to be bashful, a question and answer period began. As it turned out, this admonition was hardly necessary as the students, who had been carefully chosen for the honor of attending his meeting, displayed a tremendous curiosity about American schools and customs. Richard answered their many and varied questions with considerable ability and even when seemingly stuck for an answer showed a sincerity and humor which obviously won the hearts of his listeners. When asked by a shy eighth grade girl what American teenagers did on dates, he hesitated and then with a smile replied, "I'm afraid that's confidential." During the entire proceedings reporters were seen busily jotting down notes for articles that subsequently appeared in the local papers. Technicians from two of Pusan's radio stations taped the discussion for later presentation. Finally after the last speech had been made, Richard and his party, laden with gifts, departed amid a confusion of farewells and congratulations.

Finally, last but not least, Richard enjoyed one of the high points of his visit, an inerview at the Governor's mansion. Governor Kim Kyoo Jin and his wife provided a most gracious reception, serving tea to their visitors and entertaining them with great kindness. The Governor inquired about Richard's experiences in Pusan, noting that he had been following his experiences in the local newspapers with great interest. The interview lasted for over half an hour and ended with mutual thanks and goodbyes.

MSTSO, Pusan feels that Richard Adams' visit was an unqualified success. All the work, interest, and expense devoted to bringing him to Pusan and arranging activities for him here were more than justified by the results of his stay. Not a single untoward action marred what must have been a singular adventure in his life, and what was both an exciting and educational experience for all naval personnel concerned.

Reclamation of New Jersey Meadowlands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 5, 1959

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to insert in the RECORD the testimony of Mr. Ben Schlossberg, the director of the department of industrial and real estate development of Hudson County, before the House Appropriations Committee on behalf of reclamation of New Jersey meadowlands. The following also concurred in the testimony of Mr. Schlossberg: Board of Chosen Freeholders of Hudson County; Patrick Mullane, president, Hudson County Building Trades Council; Joseph Quinn, president, Hudson County Central Labor Union; Irving Zeichner, president, Hudson County CIO Council; Albert Handel, chairman, New Jersey Association of Real Estate Boards; Mr. Samuel G.

Sutphen, president, Jersey City Real Estate Board.

The testimony follows:

TESTIMONY OF BEN SCHLOSSBERG

The county of Hudson urges this committee to recommend an appropriation of $500,000 for the purpose of conducting a survey affecting the streams and river basins as outlined on page 22 of Public Law 85-500.

As the result of many conferences, we are convinced that the Army Engineers have the ability and facilities to conduct this survey. Proper reclamation of the wasteland of the meadows is a necessity which only the Federal Government can initiate.

The success of this endeavor will lead eventually to thousands of millions of dollars in new ratables and give employment to thousands of people in our area.

We are pleased to have you read nine issues of the Sunday Newark News of New Jersey, which brilliantly gives the history of the meadowlands affecting our area. It was written by John T. Cunningham.

The Jersey meadows extend about 28 miles in length and 4 miles in depth through the counties of Hudson, Bergen, Essex, Union, and Middlesex.

Dutch engineers, viewing the marshes in the shadow of the Empire State Building, declared "only in America could it happen." Thus, do Europeans regard our waste of a treasure.

It is estimated there are 30,000 acres of marshes, a fifth of which has been reclaimed.

The reclaimed portion gives an inkling of the value of this land when it is considered that built on it are massive electrical generating stations as heavy as a 50-story building; railroad marshaling yards through which 30 million tons of freight pass annually; two airports, heavy industrial plants, some of the largest truck terminals in the world; ship terminals; refineries and petroleum distribution centers.

These developments are industrial proof that the marshes can be conquered and put to profitable use.

This conquest of the meadows, however, has been piecemeal and different methods of reclamation have been used, and the cost per acre is about the same as upland acres.

What is needed at this time is a survey which would be the basis for overall reclamation of the meadows with a view toward planned development.

From the survey, we would find the real extent of the poorly chartered marshes; basic soils and engineering data.

Without this survey, the marshes will remain a wasteland in the midst of overoccupied land. The survey should tell us where to erect dikes and locks and pumping stations without regard to geographical borders.

Then, with the land reclaimed, industry would have a place to expand, municipalities would receive new tax ratables and our people would have more job opportunities as the overall economy was given a boost as the last frontier of the metropolitan area opened up.

Incentives, Not Subsidies, Meet Human Needs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 16, 1959

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, I have just read an editorial in the May issue of Nation's Business which strikes me as being one of the most logical and concise evaluations of the road we are treading toward socialism that I have seen in a very long time. I hope that all my colleagues will read it, and I wish that every taxpayer could read it.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the editorial to which I have referred:

INCENTIVE, NOT SUBSIDIES, MEET HUMAN NEEDS

The day's most costly question is:

"Don't you believe in meeting human needs?"

Only the wicked can answer "No".

This permits those with schemes for spending Government money to smear with a nasty stick anyone who dares to challenge their proposals.

So long as an ounce of emotion outweighs a pound of logic the Government can thus be embarked on all sorts of adventures calculated to meet human needs that the people or their State Governments have been unable or unwilling to meet.

Presumably the needs are genuine and urgent. Presumably the plans for meeting them are well intentioned.

The misfortune of our country—and of other benevolent countries before us—is that economic forces are not swayed by good intentions. The evidence of this is on clear view in dozens of places:

Thirty years ago the Government undertook to meet the human needs of farmers. Today the farmers' needs are only slightly less but the Government's problem is monumental.

Twenty years ago Government attempted to legislate a balance of power between working men and employers. Today we have a labor despotism that dares threaten Government officials who fail to carry out its orders.

More recently, in an effort to build up stockpiles while meeting the needs of a war economy, Government artificially stimulated production of strategic metals at home and abroad. Today, with the stockpiles overflowing, we are using, among other things, quotas, tariffs, and subsidies in an effort to stabilize the metals industry.

Government dabbling in other economic fields has been equally disillusioning. The benefits are either less than expected or overbalanced by the resulting complications.

Human needs are not met by complications. They are met by an economic system strong enough and versatile enough to support jobs. Jobs, in turn, produce the goods by which needs are satisfied.

Fortunately, our economy as originally set up had a great deal of built-in equilibrium. It has always managed to straighten itself after every push to the left. It has been able to do this because it offered rewards and opportunity to those who were willing to work. Each new Government effort to meet human needs reduces those rewards and opportunities a little.

Oppressive taxes and controls impede private effort. So Government must shoulder additional responsibility, reducing further the field for individual action.

Subsidies to a group or community require, in fairness, subsidies for those with whom they compete. Eventually the subsidies become a right to which the beneficiaries are encouraged to believe themselves entitled.

When the Rural Electrification Administration was created 24 years ago it was authorized to lend money at 2 percent interest to speed electrification of farms. Now, with farms 95 percent electrified, the President has suggested that the interest rate be raised to equal Government's borrowing cost.

This caused Senate Majority Leader LYNDON JOHNSON to urge the borrowers to "fight with beer bottles" if necessary to keep their advantages. House Speaker SAM RAYBURN asked, "Why not a little subsidy for the millions who, until a few years ago, were the underprivileged?"

With equal logic we can continue unemployment benefits to those who were recently unemployed, sickness benefits to the recently ill, depressed-area aid to communities recently depressed, educational benefits to the recently illiterate.

We can, and in truth are, building an increasing group that depends on Government rather than ambition for advancement.

In Michigan and Pennsylvania, unemployment remains high, though in those and nearby States jobs are available for skilled people. Employment agencies observe: "Unemployment benefits are very attractive."

Apparently they are less attractive in West Virginia. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY of that State urges aid for depressed areas so that "100,000 unfortunate West Virginia boys can come home." The 100,000 left their native State to find employment. What Representative BAILEY wants to stop is the spirit that kept this country from remaining a narrow band of States along the eastern seaboard.

Even where that spirit still exists today, Government intervention is working to erode it. A young man who recently started his own business reports sadly, "I was determined to get along without Government help—but all my competitors were getting it. Now I'm getting it, too—every bit I can."

It is time to consider if this is the sort of society we want. Shall we force individuals to accept Government help, or shall we encourage them to be self-reliant and ambitious?

How Congress acts on the subsidy measures urged in this session can go a long way toward setting our course.

We can depend on the individual to meet his own human needs by offering incentives, giving him room to grow and prosper.

Or we can so conduct ourselves that Khrushchev's statement, "Your grandchildren will live under socialism," becomes a prediction rather than a threat.

Address of Mr. Justice Felix J. Aulisi of the New York State Supreme Court in Connection With Naturalization Proceedings for New Citizens Conducted at the Plattsburgh Air Force Base, Plattsburgh, N.Y., April 20, 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 5, 1959

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, in these days few things are more precious than the privilege of United States citizenship. For that reason, those occasions when people complete the procedures which are necessary to become naturalized as United States citizens are tremendously important and mark a high point not only for them personally, but also for our Nation. It is highly important that the presiding justice in charge of these proceedings should make clear to those taking on the responsibilities of citizenship something of what is not only a great privilege but also a great obligation.

Mr. Speaker, I was especially moved the other day to read some remarks that were made at one of these naturalization proceedings by one of the outstanding justices in all of New York State, a close friend and a constituent of mine, Mr. Justice Felix J. Aulisi of the New York State Supreme Court, who resides in my district in Amsterdam, N.Y. Justice Aulisi was presiding at proceedings held, most appropriately, at one of the great bases in New York State designed for the protection of our people against Communist aggression, the Plattsburgh Air Force Base. The remarks of the justice are some of the most moving which I have ever had occasion to read, and I believe that they deserve the careful attention of all Americans.

Incidentally, the great American jurist who made these remarks came to this country himself as an immigrant, as he points out in his remarks, and, therefore, not only understands the meaning of citizenship acquired in this fashion, but also is himself living evidence of the continued operation in our country of the great American dream and the important debt which we in America owe to persons who have come to our country from other lands across the sea.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include not only the remarks of Justice Aulisi, but also a press account of this precedent shattering occasion which appeared in the Plattsburgh Press-Republican of April 21, 1959:

ADDRESS TO NEW CITIZENS BY HON. FELIX J. AULISI, JUSTICE OF NEW YORK SUPREME COURT, AT NORTH STAR SERVICE CLUB, PLATTSBURGH AIR FORCE BASE, PLATTSBURGH, N.Y., APRIL 20, 1959

Friends, I am always greatly moved on these occasions when we welcome our new citizens. It is a time when we all appreciate anew what it means to be an American and reminds us of the many blessings and privileges we enjoy on this continent and particularly in this country.

The same small beachhead for freedom that was established when the Thirteen Original Colonies broke away from the mother country has now been enlarged to become freedom's greatest bastion and bulwark; and people in many lands, who are not able as we are to enjoy the God-given rights man was meant to enjoy, long to come here and live among us and be one with us.

It is particularly appropriate that these ceremonies be held here at the Plattsburgh Air Force Base, for the Strategic Air Command is indeed freedom's first line of defense, and we owe immeasurable gratitude to the men who stay here ever on the alert to meet the awesome challenges of today. As we hear them flying above us night and day, we might do well to consider how great their effort really is, the intensity of their mental and physical application to the techniques of modern aviation, and remember, friends, that this mighty flying force is made up of men, human beings, and in many cases they are quite young, some not so young, but all of whom must at times exert great tenacity and coax an extra ounce of effort from tired muscles and weary minds, for such has always been the demand of military excellence.

There is reason for dwelling on these matters as we extend the hand of welcome to our new citizens, to consider that along with the privileges that we enjoy as Americans go responsibilities: The responsibility to keep informed so that we may vote intelligently on the issues that confront us, the responsibility to obey the laws of our country, and today, with America occupying as it does a position of world leadership, we must carry freedom's banner high and set an example worthy of emulation by the rest of the world.

Being a real American is more a matter of heart and mind and spirit than it is of being in a particular geographic location. Those who live in this country and flout our laws or deceive and manipulate other human beings to their advantage are not real Americans. They live here and enjoy the privileges of being Americans but they have never really become Americans, for the real America is an ideal more than it is a place.

So very often our newly naturalized citizens put the rest of us to shame when it comes to devotion to this country and in maintaining high standards of citizenship. Therefore, we welcome you with enthusiasm, for, as we may be of some help to you, you, likewise, and sometimes to an even greater degree, strengthen and renew us.

Despite the fact that our country today is subject to criticism at times in various quarters of the world, the world's people are not deceived as to the true nature of America. For if this, our country, be the land of oppression, why do the fugitives of East Germany and elsewhere always run west instead of east? This fact must be, and I am sure is, a thorn in the side of communism.

And we are proud that not only individual citizens like yourselves come to join us, but now we have two whole new States willingly and enthusiastically becoming part of the United States of America, and the whole world knows these are States, and not satellites.

Friends, let us keep in mind and adhere to the terms and principles enunciated in the oath of allegiance just sworn to by these new citizens. If we do that, there will be no doubt about our individual happiness and success, for we will thus insure the future greatness of America, with equal opportunities for all citizens. We are limited here only by our own capabilities and by our desire to go ahead.

There are no first- or second-class citizens in this country. We believe in the dignity of man, we are not concerned with racial or religious background or from what land the individual migrated.

Fifty-seven years ago, a little Italian boy was born in Salerno, Italy. At the age of 12 years his shoemaker father brought him to the United States. Through the generosity of the American way of life and its institutions, many honors have been bestowed upon him, among which was to be a major in the U.S. Army during World War II. That little Italian boy is the presiding judge of this court today.

May God continue to bless America. May it also bless all of you.

[From the Plattsburgh Press-Republican, Apr. 21, 1959]

TWELVE WIVES OF AIRBASE SERVICEMEN BECOME CITIZENS AS COURT BREAKS PRECEDENT

Twelve young foreign-born wives of Plattsburgh Air Force Base servicemen and one airman took the oath of allegiance which made them citizens of the United States of America in an onbase ceremony, Monday at 11:30 a.m.

The naturalization proceeding was believed to be the first of its kind ever to be held on a military installation.

Supreme Court Justice Felix J. Aulisi administered the oath of allegiance to the new citizens. He spoke briefly on the meaning of citizenship, narrating his own immigration from Italy as a boy some 57 years ago.

The long-awaited certificates of citizenship were distributed to the group by Col. George W. von Arb.

Wives receiving certificates were Mrs. Billie Budd, China; Mrs. Wesley Rhodes and Mrs. Carl Hast, Ireland; Mrs. Jerry Workman and Mrs. Russell Schneider, Germany; Mrs. William Macomber, Italy.

Mrs. Wilson Cal, Japan; Mrs. John Kulp, Mrs. Wayne Moneymaker, Mrs. James Lockbaum, Mrs. Clyde Parrish and Mrs. Carl Hagge, England; and A-1C Helmut Machate, Germany.

After a luncheon held at the North Star Service Club, the new Americans proceeded to the Clinton County Clerk's office, Margaret Street, where 26 residents of Plattsburgh and the surrounding area were assembled for naturalization.

In the words of smiling Mrs. Danielle Oosterbaar, French-born wife of Alberte Oosterbaar, Chazy, this second naturalization ceremony was very impressive.

Before the ceremony we worried about the big responsibility and the duties of citizenship, but the Justice made us feel completely at ease and as though we were already one of the family. It was an unexpected and wonderful welcome, Mrs. Oosterbar continued.

Immediately after the new Americans received their citizenship papers at the county clerk's office they and their families were guests of honor at a tea sponsored by the local Saranac Chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution.

PRESENTED FLAG

At the informal gathering, which was held in the DAR rooms at 56 Cornelia Street, each of the wives was presented with a miniature American flag.

Those who became citizens at the county clerks' office were: Vera Doreen Kulp, Dannemora, and Beryl Joy Parish, 10 North Main Street, natives of England.

Isabele Seiden, 66 Elm Street; Mary Anna Madigan, West Chazy; Alberte Oosterbaar, Chazy; O'Brien Benis, Tupper Lake; Rita May Brunelle, Chazy; Euphemia Sandy, Chateaugay; Denis Bedard, Mooers; Judith Ann and Gerald Dayhaw, Tupper Lake; Marcel Joseph BarGregor, 13 Lorraine Street; Micheline and Lucie Patenaude, 120 East Sharron Avenue; Ewart Strange McLennan, Peru; Josephine Aubin, Keeseville; Delima LaPlante, Mooers; Ida May Sherry, Malone; Howard Coombs, Saranac Lake; former residents of Canada.

Joseph and Joanna Detry, Dannemora, natives of Belgium.

Ginette Wood, Wolfe's Trailer Court; and Jacqueline Pleus, Ticonderoga, natives of France.

Daniela Katzinstein, Ticonderoga, native of Israel, and Svein Hvamb, Schenectady, N.Y., a native of Norway.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

Appendix

Congressional Control of TVA Maintained

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 4, 1959

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, in view of the great interest in the effect that H.R. 3460, the TVA self-financing bill, might have on the control of the TVA by the Congress, I request unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD the following analyses of this legislation in regard to this matter.

Some time ago I requested the Board of Directors of the TVA to prepare an analysis on this point. Such an analysis was transmitted to me on April 16 in a letter signed by Mr. Arnold R. Jones on behalf of the TVA Board of Directors. I might recall to my colleagues that Mr. Jones was formerly an assistant director of the Budget Bureau, and I think we may safely presume that his concurrence with this analysis is evidence that it is an accurate and objective analysis.

Director Jones' letter and analysis follows:

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY,
Knoxville, Tenn., April 16, 1959.

The Honorable JOE L. EVINS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. EVINS: As requested in your letter of February 26, we are transmitting herewith a statement concerning the major points raised in the remarks of Representative BEN F. JENSEN, of Iowa, which were printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for February 24 at A1364.

We hope that the facts set out in the statement will be of help to you.

Sincerely yours,

A. R. JONES,
Director.

CONGRESSIONAL CONTROL OF TVA UNDER THE REVENUE BOND FINANCING LEGISLATION

TVA is a creature of Congress, and subject at all times to legislation Congress may enact. Accordingly, Congress always has had control of TVA and would continue to have such control under the revenue bond financing legislation.

The purpose of H.R. 3460 and similar bills is to authorize TVA to finance the electric generating and transmission capacity required to meet the increasing demands on its system by issuing revenue bonds. These revenue bonds would be payable solely out of the power revenues received from TVA's consumers. Payment of the bonds would not be guaranteed by the United States. The proceeds of the bonds would, in effect, be considered as part of the corporate funds of TVA. Their proposed use by TVA would remain subject to the same continuing review by Congress as presently exists with regard to use of TVA's power earnings.

H.R. 3460 does not exempt TVA from any of the budgetary procedures normally applicable to Government corporations. These would still require TVA to submit to the President, and the President to present to the Congress, estimates of TVA's financial condition and operations for the current and ensuing fiscal years, together with the facts concerning TVA's actual financial condition and results of operations for the last complete fiscal year. The annual review of these budgets would bring to light any actions of TVA which might call for action by Congress.

H.R. 3460 contains additional safeguards against loss of congressional control over TVA. Under its provisions, TVA would be required to include a detailed statement of its revenue bond financing operations in each of its annual reports to the Congress. The General Accounting Office would continue to audit all of TVA's operations each year and to file annual reports of such audits with the Congress. TVA could not begin construction of any new power-producing project until Congress and the President were notified of its plans and 90 days of a single session of Congress elapsed without passage of a concurrent resolution disapproving the project. TVA would be authorized to issue bonds only up to a total of $750 million outstanding at any time. According to present estimates, TVA would have to have additional authorization within 5 years. This would present Congress with an opportunity for any review of TVA's past actions and future plans that might be desirable.

I should like also, Mr. Speaker, to insert herein the portion of the report of the Public Works Committee on H.R. 3460 which refers to congressional control:

PROVISIONS FOR CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW

Under H.R. 3460, TVA's bond financing operations will be subject to continuous congressional scrutiny. The bill provides no exemption from the budgetary procedures normally applicable to Government corporations. TVA's annual budgets will be submitted each year, and will include a report of TVA's anticipated use of bond proceeds just as its past budgets have always included reports of anticipated use of revenues.

The hearings on this and previous bond financing bills have revealed considerable misunderstanding of the budgetary procedures applicable to Government corporations under the Government Corporation Control Act. Under sections 102 and 103 of that act, each corporation is required to submit to the President, and the President transmits to Congress as part of the annual budget, a full report of the corporation's financial condition and the results of its operations for the last completed fiscal year. Estimates of its operations for the current and ensuing fiscal years are presented at the same time. In the case of a corporation whose statute permits it to issue bonds or utilize its revenues for specified purposes, the presentation includes its anticipated use of such bond proceeds or revenues. When its actual use of revenues or bond proceeds varies from the estimates so presented, the corporation must be prepared to furnish an explanation of the variations when it presents its estimates the following year.

The authority to issue bonds and use bond proceeds and revenues (as distinguished, in the case of most Government corporations, from use of funds for administrative expenses) is not granted by annual appropriation acts but by the corporation's basic statute. Section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act, which provides for congressional review of the budget programs of Government corporations, expressly states that its provisions "shall not be construed as preventing Government corporations from carrying out and financing their activities as authorized by existing law, nor as affecting the provisions of section 26 of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act, as amended" [under which TVA is authorized to use its revenues for purposes connected with its power program]. Accordingly, restrictions on issuance of bonds or use of bond proceeds or revenues as authorized by a corporation's basic statute requires substantive legislation. The annual budget presentation and appropriation committee review, however, bring to the attention of Congress any actions of a corporation which may call for such substantive legislation.

TVA will also be subject to two additional reporting provisions which will keep Congress fully informed of TVA's actions and plans. One of these is a requirement, written into H.R. 3460, that TVA include a detailed statement of its operations under the bill in the annual report which it files with the Congress in December of each year. The other is the existing requirement, which will not be affected by the bill, that the General Accounting Office audit TVA's operations annually and file a report covering each such audit with the Congress.

In addition, the bill contains a special provision under which, except with the approval the the President during a national defense emergency, no bond proceeds or power revenues may be used to begin construction of a new power-producing project until Congress and the President are notified and 90 days of a single session of Congress have elapsed without the enactment of a concurrent resolution disapproving such construction.

Apart from these specific provisions, the committee is aware that the limitation in the bill on the maximum amount of bonds outstanding at any one time to $750 million will mean that TVA can finance under the bill only those new power facilities that will be required over the next 5 to 7 years. Before the end of this period, TVA will have to return to Congress with a request for new legislation increasing the amount of bonds which can be outstanding. This will furnish an occasion for an exhaustive review by Congress of the whole subject.

Some opponents of H.R. 3460 proposed amendatory provisions which would have limited TVA's use of bond proceeds and power revenues to the exact estimates contained in the annual budget submitted to Congress as modified in appropriation bills. Amendments such as this are often described as making TVA subject to the Government Corporation Control Act. In fact, they would have the contrary effect. With respect to TVA's use of its power revenues, such amendments would actually change the existing provisions of the Government Corporation Control Act as quoted above; and with respect to the use of bond proceeds, such an amendment would subject TVA to a far more inflexible procedure than the Government Corporation Control Act now makes applicable to other Government corporations authorized to issue bonds, even including

those issuing bonds directly to the Treasury or bonds which are guaranteed by the United States.

Successful revenue bond financing will necessitate efficient management. To call on TVA to finance needed new capacity by this method, and at the same time deny it such essential management tools as the flexibility in the use of its revenues which it has had in the past, or the flexibility in the use of bond proceeds which the discharge of its responsibilities will require and which other corporations have at the present time, would defeat the whole purpose of the bill.

In this connection also, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to the remarks made by Mr. Charles J. McCarthy, general counsel of the TVA, during the hearings on this bill, as reported on pages 66, 67, 75, and 76 of the hearings:

This bill submits bond issues to the same type of budgetary controls as the revenues of the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the bond issues of other corporations.

If you will bear with me for a minute, I think it would be helpful if I take just a couple of minutes to discuss the Government Corporation Control Act.

That act was enacted back in 1945. At the time it was enacted there were some 40 different corporations. Some of them were incorporated under State law without any express authority from Congress. Congress was seeking some way to bring their operations under congressional scrutiny.

The Government Corporation Control Act recognized the fact that corporations had been created to do special jobs that required greater flexibility than was available under the procedures applicable to Government departments. It did not provide that the expenditures of Government corporations might be controlled by the appropriation process. It provided a special procedure for corporations. A corporation is obligated under section 101 of the Government Corporation Control Act to submit to the President its estimate of expenditures during the current and ensuing years. The President includes estimates in his budget which goes to the Congress. That budget is presented to the Appropriations Committee. But the Appropriations Committee does not have to include a provision in the bill authorizing the expenditure of corporate funds. Those funds can be spent in accordance with the basic authority of the corporation.

The corporation may exceed those estimates if necessary, explaining each year. There is a special provision as to the Tennessee Valley Authority that nothing in the control act shall affect the rights which the Tennessee Valley Authority has under section 26 of the TVA Act, which section authorizes it to use revenues.

In 1947 an attempt was made to amend the Government Corporations Control Act, so as to put the expenditures of corporate funds under the appropriation process. That proposal was defeated and instead a provision was adopted which authorizes inclusion in the Appropriations Act of limitations applicable to administrative expenses. The act says in the administrative and operating expenses but the legislative history makes clear that the term "operating" was not intended to make the requirement any broader than the normal administrative expenses of the corporation. So any corporation can use its funds to carry out its statutory programs without getting express authority, and an attempted limitation on that authority in an appropriation act is subject to a point of order.

I might add that the limitation as to administrative and operating expenses is not applicable to the Tennessee Valley Authority, because section 26 of the act expressly authorizes the use of revenues for those purposes.

Far from providing for getting out from under Budget control, this bill retains and preserves Budget control over bond proceeds, in the same way that Congress exercises that control over the programs of other corporations.

There are other provisions in this bill for congressional control. The Tennessee Valley Authority is required in its annual report filed in December of each year to advise Congress fully of the operation of this section. Its accounts are subject to audit by the General Accounting Office, which files a report each year with the Congress. In addition to that there is a $750 million ceiling which, as Mr. Wessenauer points out, will require that the Tennessee Valley Authority come back to Congress in a very short time for a review of its operations under this section.

There is a further provision that no new project can be undertaken until the Tennessee Valley Authority notifies Congress and 90 days have elapsed during a single session.

* * * * *

I would like to say just a word about this question of control again; to say that Congress is losing control over the Tennessee Valley Authority seems to me to be a very odd statement. Congress could not lose control over the Tennessee Valley Authority if it wanted to. The TVA is a creature of Congress. Congress can repeal the TVA Act tomorrow. It can amend the act, or do anything it wants to with it.

As indicative of the tightness of control, there is even a provision in the Tennessee Valley Authority Act which permits the Congress to remove the Directors by concurrent resolution.

The question is not—and I am perhaps getting into a philosophical discussion here rather than a legal one, but the question is not whether the Congress is going to lose control over the Tennessee Valley Authority; the question is how that control is going to be exercised—what control devices are appropriate to the relationship that we have here to the task which Congress has entrusted to the Tennessee Valley Authority?

When Congress passed the Tennessee Valley Authority Act it set up a corporation and gave it a certain degree of flaxibility, because it recognized that the program that it wanted the TVA Board to carry out could not be carried out by one of the old-line Government departments. That flexibility was necessary.

It gave the Tennessee Valley Authority Board responsibilities, it gave it the tools that it needed to carry out those responsibilities.

Congress said to the Tennessee Valley Authority Board, We are going to keep an eye on you. We are going to keep you accountable, but we are going to give you a reasonable degree of flexibility and hold you accountable for the results.

The Tennessee Valley Authority is the sole source of power supply for an area of about 80,000 square miles. The utility business is a natural monopoly, as Wendell Willkie himself testified back in 1939 on the bill to authorize the Tennessee Valley Authority to issue bonds to buy the Tennessee Electric Power Co. properties.

The Tennessee Valley Authority has an obligation to produce the power that is necessary to serve the needs of its customers. Congress has told it to do that. The question now is, what controls do you need?

Well, the market itself is the basic control. There is no reason for the Tennessee Valley Authority to build any plants beyond those needed, but when there is a question of how many kilowatts of capacity should be installed, or where a plant should be located, that should not be a political question. That is an engineering and economic question. And the Tennessee Valley Authority Board has to make that decision on the basis of the studies made by its staff.

If you say to the Tennessee Valley Authority Board, finance capacity you need by issuing revenue bonds, but you have to come to Congress and get what amounts to an appropriation authorizing you to put in so many kilowatts before you can issue any bonds, you are taking that control over engineering and administration out of the TVA Board, and you are putting it in Congress. If that is where Congress wants it, that is one thing; but if Congress is going to exercise that type of control, then TVA cannot operate a power system.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is clear from the TVA Board, the General Counsel of the Authority, and the committee that ample congressional controls are incorporated in this legislation.

The Post Office Department's Commemorative Stamp Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 6, 1959

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, the Post Office Department is conducting an effective commemorative stamp program that is making an unique contribution to the national effort for better worldwide understanding.

Under the leadership of Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield this program is attracting widespread favorable endorsement as it disseminates information about the ideals and aspirations of this Nation.

The latest evidence of the effectiveness of this program is reflected in the action of the National Philatelic Museum of Philadelphia. This leading philatelic authority has just awarded its Man of the Year trophy to L. Rohe Walter, Special Assistant to the Postmaster General, who is in overall charge of the Department's stamp program.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include in the RECORD a newspaper report about this well merited award by Belmont Faries, Star Stamp editor, which appeared in the Sunday Star of April 26, 1959:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Sunday Star Apr. 26, 1959]

WALTER IS HONORED AS MAN OF YEAR

(By Belmont Faries)

L. Rohe Walter, special assistant to the Postmaster General, was honored here last week as "Man of the Year in Philately."

Mr. Walter, whose public relations assignment includes responsibility for the Post Office Department's stamp program, received the silver trophy given annually by the National Philatelic Museum in Philadelphia to the person who did most for philately during the year.

Norman Haac, president of the museum, made the presentation at a dinner meeting of the Washington Philatelic Society Wednes-

day night at which Mr. Walter was guest of honor and speaker.

Mr. Walter, who has worked with the Stamp Advisory Committee in a broad program designed to make the most effective use of stamps in propagandizing American ideals at home and abroad, accepted the award as one given for a team effort by a group of dedicated, able people.

Most of the members of the advisory committee were on hand for the dinner at the Arts Club, which drew a capacity crowd including philatelists from New York, Philadelphia, and Chicago.

Cuba Called Communist Beachhead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 6, 1959

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following article appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald of May 4.

Mr. Stuart Novins is well known to many Members of Congress as he has acted frequently as moderator on the CBS "Meet Your Congress" program.

Mr. Novins' frank and intelligent reporting of what he found in Cuba is very refreshing after the ifs, buts, ands, and whitewash that have been showered over the whole question.

Mr. Novins may have had his last trip to Cuba, for the time being, but at least he has brought back some useful information:

CUBA CALLED COMMUNIST BEACHHEAD

NEW YORK, May 3.—Cuba is a dictatorship and is rapidly becoming a Communist beachhead in the Caribbean, a Columbia Broadcasting System correspondent declared tonight.

"The inescapable fact is brutally simple," Correspondent Stuart Novins said in the CBS-WTOP television program, "Studio 56." Novins returned recently from a 2-month stay in Cuba.

Under Premier Fidel Castro power is being taken over by the "best organized Communist apparatus in the Caribbean," in the opinion of Western diplomatic sources, Novins reported.

Communists have moved into key spots in the army, press, radio, schools, and unions, the correspondent added.

"There is no evidence to support the charge that Fidel Castro is a member of the Communist Party," Novins said. "It is most probable that he is not."

Despite this, Novins said, "he has provided and supported a climate for Communist expansion. He has provided and supported an open expression of anti-Americanism that is spreading fast."

Novins said the head of the Cuban Confederation of Labor was a Communist underground worker, and that a television and radio network taken over by the government, now called Rebel Radio, is run by a Communist.

With the Government cracking down on opposition newspapers, "there is, for practical purposes, no free press in Cuba today," he reported.

Novins said that "Raul Castro, brother of Fidel and named by Fidel as his successor as head of the revolutionary movement, denies he is a Communist.

"The record shows that in 1953 Raul went to Vienna for a Communist-front congress and then disappeared in Bucharest, behind the Iron Curtain, for several weeks," the correspondent said.

With Communists popping up everywhere, "many Cubans believed that Castro may already be too deeply enmeshed in Communist support to pull out. All are agreed that if anything happens to Castro physically, Cuba would be plunged into the worst blood bath of its history," Novins said.

He expressed fear that a blood bath may come anyway, because anti-Communists "feel they have now no course to take but violence."

The only solution is free elections, Novins concluded, but elections seem a long time away. He said Castro repeatedly promises free elections but changes his mind about when they will be.

ICEM and Refugees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 6, 1959

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include two further articles written by Mr. Edward P. Kennedy of the Easton Express, published in Easton, Pa.:

[From the Easton Express, Apr. 23, 1959]

A LOOK AT THE REFUGEE PROBLEM—ITALY ASKS INCREASED IMMIGRATION TO UNITED STATES

(By Edward P. Kennedy)

Italian representatives in presenting a decoration to U.S. Representative FRANCIS E. WALTER in Rome April 3 suggested that the United States open a little wider the links of the chain of immigration into this country.

The decoration of Commander of the Order of Merit of the Italian Republic was pinned on the Easton Congressman by M. Carmine de Martino, under secretary of state for foreign affairs. The award was made at a sumptuous luncheon attended by Italian and U.S. Embassy officials in the Palazzo restaurant on a hill high above Rome. The restaurant is in a building built by Mussolini for his mistress, Claretta Petacci.

The Italian delegation was one of the most active at the meeting of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration April 7-11 at Geneva, Switzerland, reflecting Italy's position as the most important export nation of surplus populations. WALTER stopped in Rome on the way to Geneva, where he was a U.S. delegate at the ICEM meeting.

At the Rome function, de Martino cited unemployment in Italy and pointed out that the number of unemployed is almost the same as the number of Communists in the country. He said he believes that reducing unemployment will reduce communism.

He pledged that Italians sent to the United States will have decidedly anti-Communist feelings and will be trained so as to be useful citizens. He urged legislation to bring in more easily collateral relatives—brothers and sisters—of Italians now in the country, as well as skilled workers.

Accepting the decoration for the American Congress and people, WALTER said he has introduced legislation to increase the preference for collateral relatives. He reminded, however, that some trained in Europe as skilled workers so they could be accepted by countries needing populations had decided after training to stay in their home nations.

De Martino spoke through an interpreter but understood English well enough so that WALTERS' reply did not have to be interpreted.

The Italian official made one of the principal addresses at Geneva, stressing the work of ICEM in transferring people from overpopulated countries to those needing more residents. Overpopulation such as exists in Italy, he said, means in social terms "a high level of unemployment and under-employment and it is not too much to say that in this evil may be seen the principal cause of the persistence in our country of important extremist elements." ICEM's help in the fight against unemployment, he declared, "is a contribution to our efforts to consolidate democracy in Italy."

Mentioning the vast movement from Italy over the years, De Martino said that emigration in the last century was an individual matter and early this century a state function. Henceforth, he declared, it will be "of an international character which should be the subject of multilateral arrangements." He called for transforming ICEM into a permanent organization with a new conception of its functions, one in which it will initiate its work in the countries of surplus population, and conclude it only when the emigrant has been firmly and satisfactorily resettled with all his family in the country of emigration.

The speaker cited some social problems which have arisen in migration, such as shortage of housing, the inadequacy of social insurance systems in some nations, and fluctuations in exchange rates affecting remittance of savings. He suggested that ICEM, although constitutionally limited in its activities, should promote a more intensive and decisive action for the protection of the basic interests and human rights of the migrants.

In his speech, De Martino made a strong plea to the committee to hold its meeting next spring in Naples. "By that time," he said, "ICEM will have moved its one-millionth migrant, more of them from Italy than any other country." He said "that the idea of ICEM first was conceived at Naples in 1951, although the organization was formed later that year at Brussels, Belgium."

The Italian delegation was nearly the largest at the meeting, exceeded in size only by that of the United States. It held a large cocktail party one evening—the largest of any delegation—in what was interpreted as part of their drive to bring the spring 1960 meeting to Italy, and to obtain an expanded ICEM program.

There was considerable discussion during the Geneva meeting of the Italian and other proposals to place the organization on a firmer and more permanent basis and to expand its activities farther beyond its original function as an agency to transport both refugees and surplus populations.

Some expressed the feeling that voluntary refugee agencies and individual governments should carry on most of such expanded activities. However, the ICEM Council approved expansion of the program of pilot projects being set up to show the way to facilitate resettlement. Two such projects are being set up this year, one to train emigration and immigration officials of various nations in Canada at cost to ICEM of $60,000. The other, costing $298,000 in Italy, will provide vocational training for 300 migrants selected for emigration overseas.

As other phases of this kind of activity, ICEM missions help in preselecting candidates for particular immigration schemes; in many they aid in assembling the documents needed before a visa can be issued to permit migrants to enter a country. ICEM fre-

quently provides or arranges for medical preexamination, preliminary clearance, and other assistance to the selection missions of receiving countries. These services are designed to speed the processing of a potential migrant as well as to ensure the more effective matching of a European worker with an opportunity available in an oversea country.

ICEM also provides orientation and vocational and language training for many migrants to facilitate integration in their new land. In most receiving nations the committee provides, in close liaison with the interested governments, services ranging from reception of ICEM-assisted newcomers to the establishment of job-placement networks.

All these programs either prepare migrants for life in new countries before they embark or after arrival and thus are considered legitimate parts of the work of ICEM.

[From the Easton (Pa.) Express, Apr. 24, 1959]

A LOOK AT THE REFUGEE PROBLEM: VAST RESETTLEMENT TASK IS FACED BY ICEM

(By Edward P. Kennedy)

Deliberations on the international level are not much different than those of the lowliest local governing body. This was one of the conclusions I drew from attendance at the ICEM meeting April 7 to 11 at Geneva, Switzerland.

The nearest local analogy to ICEM, I thought, was the Eastern Area Regional Planning Commission. Both it and ICEM are made up of representatives of autonomous governments—national governments in the case of ICEM and municipal governments locally. Both organizations are hampered by the complete autonomy of their members, and must depend on cooperation to get anything done.

There are surprising similarities in financing. Countries receiving immigrants are supposed to pay some of ICEM's transport costs, but the amount they will pay varies. For instance, Argentina pays $87 a person and Venezuela, but $40. As a result, ICEM always has a deficit in transport costs. All the 28 member nations theoretically should join in meeting this continuous deficit, but in practice less than half do. At the recent Geneva meeting, it was reported that only seven had contributed to this special fund. In practice, much of the deficit has been met by the United States.

Similarly, the effort in the regional commission has been to obtain per capita contributions from all members, but traditionally less than half the municipalities made the payments. For years, most of the financing was done by the city of Easton.

Some protests were heard because Great Britain was not a member of ICEM, although Australia and Canada belong. Neither, it was reported, has England paid for transportation of her Hungarian refugees, taking the position that she had done her share by maintaining them after they arrived.

Some criticism of the ICEM staff for failing to reach decisions and to improve programs had a familiar local government ring. The administration was accused by some of being too busy carrying on liaison and discussing procedural details to step up actual migrations.

Some clashes on the Council floor were amusing. One concerned the question of validating as official observers the representatives of a relief agency. A Canadian delegate asked why the Council need take such action when the meeting was public, and the agency men could sit in anyway. The action was taken over the Canadian's objection. It was suggested later that the relief organization could use its official observer status at the meeting in a drive for funds from the public, perhaps explaining why it made the request.

The surroundings of the meeting were interesting. It was held in one of the smaller meeting rooms at the Palais des Nacions, which was equipped with headphones such as are used in the United Nations Building in New York. The phones gave each speech direct and also translations in English, Spanish, and French.

One unresolved conflict at the meeting was on the pronunciation of the abbreviation ICEM. Some called it "ickem," others "ice-em." One explanation was that the first pronunciation is most frequently used in the United States, the second in Europe.

An interesting question was posed to me by a South African delegate. He wondered if the Pennsylvania Dutch area here would be especially willing to receive immigrants from Holland or Germany, because of the ethnic similarity. It was uncertain of the answer.

Generally, my impression of the ICEM program was that it is advancing into a field where, besides transporting migrants, it will pay increasing attention to preparing them for resettlement in other countries, and to getting them well started in their new homes. Stronger commitments by member countries would give the program more stability, it appeared, and launch it more firmly on such an expanded program. Some danger was posed in indications of a recent decline in numbers moved by ICEM, pointing to a need for recruitment of more migrants and arrangement for their placement.

It appeared that the number of political refugees to be moved by ICEM in Europe is dwindling rapidly, and—barring new floods of escapees from behind the Iron Curtain—this phase of ICEM's activity should taper off. This would leave it freer to handle the movement of surplus populations depressing the economies of Italy and similar countries to Australia and countries in the Western Hemisphere needing more people.

If, as appears likely, an unusual effort is made for European refugees in the World Refugee Year starting July 1, most of the drab European prison camps may soon be closed. Even without WRY efforts, the program to get the refugees into better, healthier housing is well underway, at least in the Salzburg, Austria, area, I observed.

Still remaining will be the vaster problems of the European refugees escaping Red China and huddled in far worse conditions in camps at Hong Kong, and those of the Arab refugees in the Near East, and newer escapees from fighting in Algeria. Some perhaps dramatic effort to aid these unfortunates seems likely in the refugee year linked with the admission of additional refugees into the United States to help ease the problem.

Tribute to Sid Simpson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 6, 1959

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, mysterious are the vicissitudes of human life. Frail and precarious are our best holds upon human happiness. A brief while ago our friend and beloved colleague, Sid Simpson lived and labored with us. Heaven has now crowned his life. In the golden hours of his grandest achievements his soul slipped through the curtain of stars to the place we call "The Great Unknown." He has gone across the Crystal Sea to receive the full reward and the glorious fate which he by his strong faith so richly merits.

Many long years I cherished Sid Simpson's friendship. By his intelligent devotion to duty, his unswerving fidelity to truth, his great integrity and the honest and courageous manner in which he discharged all of the vital functions of his high office, he distinguished himself in the service of his country and endeared himself to all of his colleagues in Congress. He was a good, a great and a gentle and modest man.

I express my deep sympathy to his charming wife and lovely daughters and to all of his loved ones, all of whom can take just pride in the life he lived. To Sid Simpson's loved ones may I say that my earnest prayer for them is that the Light of Heaven will illuminate their pathway and be the Master Light of all their seeing and may the Lord's blessing rest upon them.

The Speed and Depth Records of the U.S.S. "Skipjack" Reveal Progress in the Development of the Navy's Task Force of Nuclear-Powered Ships

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 6, 1959

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday April 11, 1959, at 8:15 p.m., eastern standard time members of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy were guests of the U.S. Navy on board the U.S.S. *Skipjack*, the worlds fastest atomic-powered submarine when it traveled faster and deeper than any submarine before it.

During the recordbreaking speed and depth cruise, members of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy held an official session of the Committee, and the witnesses before it were Vice Adm. Hyman G. Rickover, "father" of our Nation's atomic submarine, Capt. E. P. Wilkinson, U.S. Navy, former commander of the U.S.S. *Nautilus* and now commander of the Submarine Division 102, and Cmdr. W. W. Behrens, U.S. Navy, commanding officer of the *Skipjack*.

The 18½-hour cruise of the U.S.S. *Skipjack*, during which time it established a speed and depth record, is another accomplishment of the Navy's program of the design and development of a group of nuclear propulsion plants in a wide range of its ships, from submarines to the largest aircraft carriers.

So that the average American can appreciate the military might that the Navy is building for the security of the seas and of this Nation, I wish to call attention to the following summary of nuclear-powered ships which have been authorized by Congress to date.

Nuclear-powered ships authorized by Congress

SUBMARINES

	Type	Launched	Started sea trials	Builder
SSN 571 *Nautilus*	Attack	Jan. 21, 1954	Jan. 17, 1955	EB Division.[1]
SSN 575 *Seawolf*	do	July 21, 1955	Jan. 21, 1957	Do.[1]
SSN 578 *Skate*	Small attack	May 16, 1957	Oct. 27, 1957	Do.[1]
SSN 579 *Swordfish*	do	Aug. 27, 1957	Aug. 9, 1958	Portsmouth.[2]
SSN 583 *Sargo*	do	Oct. 10, 1957	Aug. 2, 1958	Mare Island.[3]
SSN 584 *Seadragon*	do	Aug. 16, 1958		Portsmouth.[2]
SSG(N) 587 *Halibut*	Regulus missile	Jan. 9, 1959		Mare Island.[3]
SSN 585 *Skipjack*	Fast attack	May 26, 1958	Mar. 8, 1959	EB Division.[1]
SSN 588 *Scamp*	do	(4)		Mare Island.[3]
SSN 589 *Scorpion*	do	(4)		EB Division.[1]
SSN 590 *Sculpin*	do	(4)		Ingalls.[5]
SSN 591 *Shark*	do	(4)		Newport News.[6]
SSN 592 *Snook*	do	(4)		Ingalls.[5]
SSN 593 *Thresher*	do	(4)		Portsmouth.[2]
SSN 603	do	(7)		New York Shipbuilding.[8]
SSN 604	do	(7)		Do.[8]
SSN 605	do	(7)		Portsmouth.[2]
SSN 606 *Tinosa*	do	(7)		Do.[2]
SSN 594 *Permit*	do	(4)		Mare Island.[3]
SSN 595 *Pollack*	do	(7)		Do.[3]
SSN 596 *Plunger*	do	(7)		Ingalls.[5]
SSN 607	do	(7)		Do.[5]
SSR(N) 586 *Triton*	Radar picket	Aug. 19, 1958		EB Division.[1]
SSN 597 *Tullibee*	Hunter-killer attack	(6)		Do.[1]
SSB(N) 598 *George Washington.*	Polaris missile	(4)		Do.[1]
SSB(N) 599 *Patrick Henry*	do	(6)		Do.[1]
SSB(N) 600 *Theodore Roosevelt*	do	(4)		Mare Island.[3]
SSB(N) 601 *Robert E. Lee*	do	(4)		Newport News.[6]
SSB(N) 602 *Abraham Lincoln*	do	(4)		Portsmouth.[2]
SSB(N) 608	do	(7)		EB Division.[1]
SSB(N) 609	do	(7)		Unassigned.
SSB(N) 610	do	(7)		Do.
SSB(N) 611	do	(7)		Do.

TOTALS

Radar Picket	1
Attack	22
Regulus	1
Polaris	9
Total	33

[1] EB Div: Electric Boat Division of General Dynamics Corp., Groton, Conn.
[2] Portsmouth: Portsmouth Naval Shipyard, Portsmouth, N.H.
[3] Mare Island: Mare Island Naval Shipyard, Vallejo, Calif.
[4] Under construction.
[5] Ingalls: Ingalls Shipbuilding Corp., Pascagoula, Miss.
[6] Newport News: Newport News Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co., Newport News, Va.
[7] Authorized.
[8] New York Shipbuilding: New York Shipbuilding Corp., Camden, N.J.

SURFACE SHIPS

	Type	Status	Builder
CG(N) 9 *Long Beach*	Guided missile cruiser	Under construction	Bethlehem.[1]
CVA (N) 65 *Enterprise*	Aircraft carrier	do	Newport News.[2]
DLG(N) 25	Guided missile destroyer.	Authorized	Bethlehem.[1]

[1] Bethlehem: Bethlehem Steel Co., Shipbuilding Division, Quincy, Mass.
[2] Newport News: Newport News Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co., Newport News, Va.

Mr. Speaker, in commenting on the above summary of nuclear-powered ships, I should like to call attention to the fact that while the nine Polaris submarines under construction or authorized could place more than a hundred million tons of nuclear force on targets behind the Iron Curtain, yet, I am disturbed by the fact that there is not included in the program a sufficient number of fast attack submarine vessels. With that thought in mind, on April 16, 1959, I introduced a bill, H.R. 6483, which authorized the Secretary of the Navy to undertake the construction of 100 nuclear-powered attack submarines at the rate of 20 per fiscal year, starting with the fiscal year which begins July 1, 1959, to augment the 20 already authorized or under construction as mentioned in the above summary.

Mr. Speaker, the best way to destroy a submarine is with another submarine. Since our nuclear submarines have no peer, I strongly urge that H.R. 6483 receive early and favorable consideration so that the Navy will immediately begin construction of the 100 attack submarines as the answer to the Russian submarine threat.

Another point I would like to make is that failure on the part of Congress to authorize immediate construction of the attack submarines provided for in my bill, H.R. 6483, will amount to a national admission that we do not intend to protect the lead we now have in the nuclear submarine field. Frankly, as I see it, we have no recourse in the light of the Russian submarine threat but to immediately construct these additional nuclear-powered attack submarines.

Greece

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. CARLTON LOSER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 5, 1959

Mr. LOSER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including two additional articles by Mr. Coleman A. Harwell, editor of the Nashville Tennessean, which were written during his recent travels in Greece.

Mr. Harwell is accompanied by Prof. Kenneth E. Olson, Northwestern University School of Journalism, on a world tour under the auspices of the State Department's exchange program.

The articles follow:

[From the Nashville Tennessean, Apr. 3, 1959]

GREEKS OFFER GLORY FOR TOURIST GOLD

(By Coleman A. Harwell)

ATHENS.—We have seen the beautiful harbor where Paul first landed to bring Christianity to the West and the prison believed to be the one from which he was sprung by an earthquake.

We have viewed the narrows inside the Bay of Salamis where one of the most dramatic naval battles of history was fought and the hills from which the confident Persian, Xerxes, saw his expected triumph turned into bitter defeat.

We have walked through the grove whose name is the most famous in sports history, Olympia; have seen modern young Greeks sweating in the sun as they toiled to reconstruct the natural stadium where other youngsters vied for honors 2,500 years ago in events that are still being reenacted throughout the world today.

We have stood where Plato and Socrates unshackled men's minds; where Aeschylus and Aristophanes created drama; where architecture was given form, where sculpture reached its zenith; where political life was explored so thoroughly by Solon, Themistocles, Pericles, and others that we can still learn from them today. (You can say that again.)

THE BEAUTIFUL LAND

In 2 weeks of walking, motoring, and flying, we have covered hundreds of miles in a beautiful and hospitable land and have witnessed the scenes and sensed the atmosphere in which Western civilization began.

Returning then to Athens, after a northern excursion, we sought to make a local phone call from our hotel room. It took 45 minutes to get it through.

We cite the telephone delay, not as a complaint against this attractive and pleasant hotel, but to indicate the Greek dilemma on tourism today. The Greeks aré well aware of it and are striving mightily to overcome it.

There is at hand another golden age for Greece, different from that of Pericles, but very real, if the country can take advantage of it.

The floodtide of Americans who have enjoyed Italy's offerings—ancient and modern—would take to Greece with equal relish. Northern Europeans—English, German, French, and others—who have often found reason to come to Greece for warlike purposes also have not failed to find its sunshine and blue waters, as well as its history, reason enough to come to peace.

The attractions are ample; the handicaps almost as numerous. Chief among the latter are the lack of hotel space, personnel to man the hotels, and inadequate roads. The Grecks are beginning to apply themselves to these with gusto.

SEVEN MILLION DOLLAR HOTEL

Ground has been broken on the Conrad Hilton here on Queen Sophia Avenue. Original plans for 400 rooms have been increased to 500—all air-conditioned of course. The $7 million cost will be financed in half by the Greek ship owner, A. Pezoz, who lives in New York, and half by the Greek loans. Hilton will operate it. Profits can be exported without limit.

The deluxe Athenee Palace Hotel is spanking new. The elegant Grande Bretagne has

added 200 rooms, has air-conditioned and renovated the rest; the deluxe King George has added a floor.

Our hotel is a good example of tourist development. It is the Alexiou, or Alex, and is a modern, eight-story, white stucco and blue shuttered structure, with a first floor lobby visible through glass trimmed with brass. The 100 rooms are compact but ample, with good-looking, useful modern chests and wardrobe. The restaurant and some rooms are still under construction, and should be ready by June.

The staff is as gracious and willing as could be. The manager speaks Greek, English, Italian, French, German, and Spanish perfectly, is studying Russian. His pretty German wife, whom he married while working for a hotel in Germany, learned Greek in 2 months, speaks English and French too. Several other deskmen and bellboy-elevator operators speak English as does the telephone operator. But this happened to be her day off and the man substituting needs a few more months to polish his English.

The staff of the Alex could not be more eager to please or, for that matter, more successful in doing so. Our cheery little bellhop, about 17, was even able to teach me to say "evdomo," which means seventh, my floor. And the maid and I were able to communicate in an odd mixture of English, Greek, German, and Italian concerning laundry which, more importantly, came back promptly and clean.

The young owner of the hotel, who started from scratch as a builder, made use of Government loans which have been created to encourage tourism. He says, however, the saving in interest isn't worth all the restrictions and red tape.

Throughout Greece, the Government is financing small 30- to 50-room hotels. We stayed in two of them, had lunch in another, and found them all enjoyable. But many more are needed. Our hotel in Salonika reminded me of the Maxwell House before it was renovated. Yet it was full, even in March.

Passable roads lead to all parts of Greece, but extra caution is needed. There isn't room to pass a big truck at a sharp turn, and, as in America, that's where you meet them. Make way. And don't try roads under construction. We took the cutoff from Larissa to Salonika and were rewarded with some beautiful views of the Aegean, and of the spectacular Vale of Tempe along the Pinios River, where Venus used to bathe. Even these, however, failed to compensate for the delays at numerous construction points, where Greek Army engineers and civilian workers were building a fine new highway.

The countryside in early spring is beautiful. In southern Peloponnesia the fields are turning green; almonds and apricots and apples are in bloom. Olympia was warm enough for a half-hour nap in the shade of big pines, and the view from ancient Sikyon, which was a Greek Florence high upon a hill, is a thrilling panorama.

PLAINS OF THESSALY

North of Athens, the scenes are even more spectacular. The plains of Thessaly, overlooking at one point the scene of the battle of Thermopylae, recalls part of the Northwest. You come out of rugged mountains, with corkscrew roads, onto the flat, rich plains, constantly passing shepherds and their flocks of sheep being fattened for the Greek Easter in May.

The Aegean is its own shade of Mediterranean blue, paler but vivid too. And Olympus, completely clad in snow, with a vast cloud barely touching the top as though Apollo were returning from a venture, is a rare treat.

The city where Paul landed in Macedonia, Neapolis, is now Kavalla, which is one of the most beautiful harbors of the world. The area north of Salonika is replete with reminders of Paul, especially nearby Phillippi, where the famed prison stands as part of the interesting ruins unearthed by French archeologists.

The future of Greece is highly speculative. My optimism for the country is based largely on the prospect of a thriving tourist development. Not only does tourism produce income, it creates an openmindedness almost certain to result in economic progress.

[From the Nashville Tennessean, Apr. 10, 1959]

HOW WILL WOMEN AFFECT GREEK POLITICS?

(By Coleman A. Harwell)

KAVALLA, GREECE.—The other evening in this coastal city of northern Greece, we were discussing weighty matters in a small dinner group of Greeks and Americans. Someone raised the question as to whether women's votes in Greece, recently granted, will benefit the leftists or conservative political parties.

The conversation revealed sharply divided opinions along these lines:

In the cities, men and women vote together, so it will be hard to judge the effect of the feminine vote. But in the rural areas, where women's votes will be recorded separately, their influence can be clearly determined.

ACCORDING TO ORDERS

In a country where men have always been dominant, especially in central Thessaly and northern Macedonia, women will vote as told.

Women are more conservative than men. They are more inclined to let well enough alone, rather than risk something worse. So they'll usually stick to the status quo while men, the more adventuresome sex, are registering a protest. Therefore, women will vote conservative while men are tending to the left.

Not so. When a woman's husband is unemployed (there are 13,000 unemployed of 25,000 peak workers in tobacco processing plants here) and when her children are hungry, she is going to protest. Like other animals, the mother is ferocious when aroused.

BUT LOOK—

Women's votes have had little effect in other countries, notably the United States. Some people said they would clean up politics in America, but look.

Yes, do look. Political machines are having rougher going. Political ideals are higher. The candidate with sex appeal goes further today. Credit, or blame the women.

Perhaps, but none of this applies to Greece. No woman ever invades the all-male cafeneion (coffee shops, where men settle and unsettle the world's problems twice daily).

At this point, one of the group said that of course it would be impolitic for a visitor to comment on an internal problem of a country, but that something had come to his attention the day before which he felt he should mention to his Greek hosts.

In a city not far away, he said, he was having dinner at an attractive place, which was described to him as a bridge club. He said the thought occurred to him during dinner that in America a bridge club can't exist without women, and he was eager to ask if women came to this club. He hesitated to ask, however, because he was afraid that such a question in Greece might be like asking an American if he took his wife to the pool hall. But just then, he said, he heard a sudden burst of bright conversation, pitched at a nonmasculine key, and a group of four women, accompanied by four men, entered the room. Two tables of bridges, no less—plus conversation.

Now, he went on, he did not want his hosts to think he was commenting on the political situation in Greece, but he did feel there was a certain obligation between the male element of the world which crossed international barriers. And he felt he should warn his Greek friends that just such a thing had happened in America some years ago, and now look at it. No place in America is safe for men today. Even the saloons in some cities have been turned into cocktail bars.

A GOOD LAUGH

The visitor wasn't certain how his little story would be taken. It was thus very pleasant—and reassuring—to hear the interpreter laugh and, when he'd told the story in Greek, the others joined heartily.

When the session ended and we were saying goodnight, one of our Greek friends laughed and said, "Now I go to surrender to my wife."

A delightful evening, but informative, too. These people are concerned about the vote of the pro-Communist EDA Party. They well may be. Their vote in this distressed area is as high as 50 percent and they fear it may grow in the coming municipal elections.

Unhappily, the liberal center parties are suffering because of poor leadership. The hope is that the conservative government of Premier Karamanlis will become more liberal, do more for distressed areas, especially here where the Communists are winning votes of people who basically hate everything the Reds stand for but who hearken to their promises of work and food.

The women's effect on this? Your guess may be as good as anyone's.

NOTES IN PASSING

The hospitable abbott in the monastery overlooking Salonika had his housekeeper serve us in a traditional way. She passed a tray with a bowl of jelly and glasses of water with a spoon on top of each. You take a spoonful of jelly, eat it slowly, drink some water and then put the spoon in the glass. Afterward, strong, thick coffee. Prices here are not cheap but better than in France or Italy. A single room in a first-class Athens hotel will be about $4.50 to $6, compared with $6 to $10 in Rome. Some Americans living here say when they take family vacation trips they stay in second-class hotels in small towns and the rates are about 60 cents each. Sorry I can't recommend these to the average U.S. tourist who wants a soft bed and private bath.

A nice meal in a modest family restaurant, including a glass of wine, can be had for 75 cents. Had my first steak in Greece at elegant Floca's Restaurant in Athens. Delicious filet was $1.35. Most Greek taxis are new U.S. cars, many sent by relatives in United States. Taxis are given special tax status, make good investments. Some owned by whole family; some used as dowry.

American Protestants in Athens hold nondenominational services in beautiful St. Andrews, high on hill overlooking city. Crowd filing in looked like any U.S. church group. Shiny-faced little boys tugging at one another, little girls with flat straw hats, teenagers making talk.

My introduction to Greek hospitality: Taken to wedding of U.S. Greek employee and local girl in small town. We three Americans ushered into little home, served meatballs and retsina wine which tastes of rosin. Little girls danced about in circle. Then some grownups, including the bride, danced. Wedding was in jam-packed village church. Everybody stands. Solemn rites intermingled with crowning ceremonies, smiling, circle dance, rice throwing. Favors for all—sugar-coated almonds wrapped in starched cheese cloth.

Passage of TVA Self-Financing Bill Vital in the Public Interest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 4, 1959

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, in connection with our consideration of H.R. 3460 which is expected to reach the floor this week, I am sure that many Members of this body would welcome a review of the need for this legislation and a brief legislative history; therefore, under unanimous consent, I am inserting it in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The purpose of this bill is to relieve the Federal Government of financing additions to the TVA's power system by appropriations. Instead, it will permit the TVA to sell revenue bonds for building additional generating capacity.

The general provisions of this legislation are summarized in the report of the Committee on Public Works on this legislation, and I quote:

PURPOSE OF BILL

H.R. 3460 would authorize the Tennessee Valley Authority to finance needed additions to its power system by the issuance of revenue bonds in the maximum amount of $750 million outstanding at any one time. The bonds will be secured solely by the revenues of the TVA power system. They will be neither obligations of, nor guaranteed by, the United States.

The bill contains provisions essential for effective use of the bond financing authority. It permits TVA to fix the terms and conditions of the bonds and to enter into appropriate covenants with bondholders and trustees. It requires TVA to charge rates sufficient to operate the system, service the bonds, and meet obligations specified in the bill with respect to the appropriation investment in its power system. Under the bill, these obligations will include (1) payment to the Treasury of an annual cash return to be calculated by applying to the appropriation investment the average interest rate payable by the Treasury on its total marketable public obligations as of the beginning of the fiscal year, and (2) an annual payment of $10 million in reduction of the appropriation investment itself.

The bill does not change the basic provisions of the TVA Act governing the manner in which the TVA Board of Directors shall perform its statutory duties. Under the bill, the Board will continue to have sufficient flexibility to enable it to discharge its responsibilities efficiently and to enable Congress to hold it fully accountable for results. The bill does include a number of special requirements to insure that Congress will be kept fully informed of the use being made of the bond issuing authority. It also contains a provision limiting the area within which TVA power may be sold.

I know there are those who want no bill at all on this general subject. I know that there are those who feel that, if we are to have any legislation on this subject, it should be the most restrictive and most repressive possible legislation that this Congress could enact into law.

There are others who regard this bill as the most vital and important piece of legislation that this Congress will consider. It is most important to many of us because what we do here this week will affect the lives of the people of a great section of our country—an area of 80,000 square miles, comprising parts of seven States, for the TVA service area embraces parts of seven States and has a population of 6 million people.

Today, more than 150 municipally owned power systems and REA cooperative distribution systems in this area have an investment of $781 million, including the great steam plant being constructed by the city of Memphis, Tenn., which is now nearing completion and will go into service in a few months.

There are more than 1½ million power customers in the TVA area who, last year, purchased 19,000,900,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity. The TVA is the sole source of power for these 150 distributing systems with their 1½ million power consumers.

Therefore, I repeat, what we do here this week vitally affects the 6 million people of this great section of our country and these 6 million people are necessarily interested and concerned in this legislation and what we do about it. Our people need this legislation to finance their future power needs because as we all know the TVA has been denied any appropriations for necessary additions to its power capacities for the past 6 years. We are all aware of the continuing repressive actions and climate toward the TVA which has existed during those years. We know that no appropriations at all have been made for TVA's power needs in the past several years.

During these last few years, TVA has been using portions of the profits from power sales to make some needed additions to its power system. But, we all know that no utility can possibly keep up with the demand for power in its area if it is limited to using only the revenue from its own power operations. The additional capacity the TVA has built and is building with its power revenue will not be enough to meet the growing demand for TVA power inside its present service area. Its margin of capacity over the demand is getting narrower and narrower. Unless it is able to find other funds, this great area of our country is certain to suffer a power shortage in 2 or 3 years.

What we will consider this week is an alternative method of financing—self-financing by the TVA and by the people of the area. A good portion of the bonds that will be authorized by this legislation will be sold to the people of the TVA area—and I assure you that they will buy them. They will be gilt-edge bonds which will be paid off by the TVA from the power sales to the people of the TVA area.

Surely, at this time, when we are so concerned with the need for reducing appropriations, the Congress will permit the people of our area to finance their own progress through enactment of this self-financing legislation. The bonds are taxable. They are not tax exempt bonds and they will thus produce revenue for the Government and yet the bonds will not be obligations of the Government and will not increase the national debt.

In short, this bill will permit the self-financing of the TVA—it will permit a great agency of our Government to meet its needs and obligations—and the local people who purchase the TVA power will not only pay the entire eventual cost, but they will purchase a large proportion of the bonds when they are issued and thus themselves finance the cost of the power they need.

Mr. Speaker, in our discussions on the TVA—a subject on which almost everyone has a most pronounced point of view—I sometimes think that we become so concerned with "fear" that one region of our great common country may make progress at the expense of another area, that we lose sight of the great contributions to the welfare of the entire Nation that the TVA has made and continues to make.

I am continually surprised to discover that many do not realize that well over 50 percent of the power produced—52 percent at this time—by the TVA goes to meet national defense needs in Federal establishments—in other words to the Federal Government itself. Among the great Federal agencies which obtained great blocks of power from the TVA are the Atomic Energy Commission plants at Oak Ridge and Paducah, Ky.; the great Arnold Engineering Development Center with its jet windtunnel testing facility at Tullahoma, Tenn. in the district which I have the honor to represent. There is also the great Red Stone Arsenal at Huntsville, Ala., where Dr. von Braun and other brilliant scientists are developing, improving, and perfecting the Thor, the Jupiter and our overall rocket and missile potentials and capabilities.

The savings in the cost of power to the Government as a result of the above direct service to Federal agencies are in themselves enormous. For several years now, the Federal Government has used more than 30 billion kilowatt-hours of TVA power annually. A saving of just 1 mill per kilowatt will represent a saving of $30 million a year but this is not the entire saving. As we know, the private utility industry has constructed two large powerplants that also serve the Atomic Energy Commission—EEI in southern Illinois and OVEC in Portsmouth, Ohio. The contracts under which this power is delivered were designed in such a way so as to come as close as possible to the TVA rate and in fact they are almost identical. In other words, these plants were built to meet the challenge of the TVA rates. Now these plants supply AEC with about 20 billion kilowatt-hours annually. And here a difference of only 1 mil per kilowatt would make a difference of $20 million a year in the cost of this power. Of course, nobody can tell what the AEC would have had to pay for power if the TVA had not existed, but in any event it is not at all likely that it would have been able to buy power as cheaply as it now does. So that the savings to the Federal Government in the cost of the power it uses itself, in its own defense establishments, are enormous—I would venture to guess in the area of $150 million a year.

There are many other ways in which the TVA has benefited the whole Nation. I think it is beyond argument that by providing a yardstick of power costs it has held down the cost of electric power

throughout the country. It is notable that although we have suffered inflation costs in almost every other field, the cost of power throughout the United States has risen very little.

The TVA has also helped to develop more efficient means of generating electric power. The giant steamplants which it has been constructing have served as guinea pigs in engineering new and better steam generators which have been installed not only in the TVA area but through private utilities throughout the country.

In addition, the TVA has also helped the national economy in the purchases by TVA—and the 150 TVA power distributors—of materials and equipment. Over the past 12 years alone the TVA has bought $1,700 million worth of equipment and about $1 billion of that was purchased from States outside the TVA area.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to insert in the RECORD at this point a list of TVA procurement sources showing the amounts of purchases made in the various States of the United States last year and for the entire 25-year period that the TVA has been in existence. This table shows clearly that some portion of the funds expended by the TVA has gone to every State in the Union and that, indeed, most of the TVA money has been spent outside the TVA area:

TVA procurement sources

	1958	Total (1934–58)
Alabama	$4,085,918	$136,282,777
Georgia	1,080,134	31,255,106
Kentucky	42,470,818	221,187,036
Mississippi	231,017	9,452,169
North Carolina	245,815	14,524,458
Tennessee	40,253,475	486,824,250
Virginia	5,937,621	29,481,906
Total Valley States	94,304,798	929,007,702
Arizona	13,143	142,940
Arkansas	11,932	1,240,729
California	826,645	12,030,849
Colorado	22,730	1,197,154
Connecticut	369,385	8,384,414
Delaware	5,738	19,287,650
District of Columbia	71,234	2,574,982
Florida	164,716	8,472,350
Idaho		2,302,188
Illinois	13,027,423	149,059,385
Indiana	3,978,114	28,664,361
Iowa	79,542	1,760,898
Kansas	35,449	639,819
Louisiana	963,677	12,103,501
Maine	15,514	620,277
Maryland	892,084	7,564,450
Massachusetts	1,830,759	42,347,587
Michigan	1,305,356	22,339,208
Minnesota	71,615	8,482,668
Missouri	1,917,398	30,074,369
Montana	259	166,084
Nebraska	8,405	514,269
Nevada	187	139,108
New Hampshire	83,908	1,805,847
New Jersey	1,631,610	45,926,147
New Mexico	3,688	59,219
New York	20,822,877	189,965,956
North Dakota		54,009
Ohio	4,364,384	137,947,812
Oklahoma	1,203,828	5,606,991
Oregon	133,485	1,805,890
Pennsylvania	8,378,664	348,918,170
Rhode Island	226,072	2,526,362
South Carolina	43,971	1,935,643
South Dakota		708,660
Texas	820,065	8,172,520
Utah	786	2,882,587
Vermont	8,873	211,289
Washington	11,043	1,383,254
West Virginia	70,389	4,774,292
Wisconsin	1,346,649	64,094,053
Wyoming		29,113
Total other States	64,821,597	1,178,917,054
Foreign	422,763	5,676,659
Total	159,549,158	2,113,601,415

Furthermore, the TVA has stimulated the national economy by creating a great market for new electric appliances. In the TVA area, the purchases of electric appliances are running at the rate of a quarter of a billion dollars a year and since the war two and a half billion dollars worth have been purchased. I can assure you that somewhere around 99 percent of those appliances came from outside the Tennessee Valley.

In view of the above, it is apparent that this legislation is not only vitally necessary to the TVA area, but that its passage will benefit the Nation as a whole.

BILL REPRESENTS REASONABLE COMPROMISE

I want to point out and to emphasize that this bill, H.R. 3460, represents a reasonable compromise of many views after long and detailed consideration and deliberation. The issues of this bill have been debated both in the Congress and outside of Congress for more than 5 years.

No fewer than five sets of hearings have been held in the House and in the Senate on this legislation in the 84th, 85th, and the present Congress. The Senate passed a compromise version in the last session. But, the House in its crowded schedule did not get an opportunity to act on this matter, notwithstanding the excessive hearings and a favorable report on the bill.

Thus, the bill as it has reached us here has had just about all the sharp edges knocked off it and all the most controversial issues have been modified and compromised.

PRESIDENT RECOMMENDS BILL IN BUDGET MESSAGES

I might point out too that this legislation was proposed by President Eisenhower in his budget message of January 17, 1955—and I quote:

The Tennessee Valley Authority is giving immediate attention to the possibilities of financing further expansion of its power system by means other than Federal appropriations. The Authority has been requested to complete its studies in time to permit consideration by the Congress in this session of any legislation that may be necessary.

The requested legislation was submitted to the Congress later in 1955 and hearings were held on it in that year. On January 16, 1956, in the budget for the fiscal year 1957, we find this:

There is pending before the Congress legislation which the administration has proposed for financing steam-power facilities of the TVA through the sale of revenue bonds.

On January 16, 1957, in the budget for the fiscal year 1958 we find the following:

Legislation is recommended to authorize the TVA, subject to regular budgetary review, to finance new generating facilities by the sale of revenue bonds.

In his budget message of January 13, 1958, the President said—and I quote:

In accordance with my earlier recommendations, both Houses of the Congress have had under consideration legislation which would authorize the sale of revenue bonds by the Tennessee Valley Authority. I hope that action on appropriate legislation will be speedily concluded.

In the budget for this year, we find the following:

Proposed legislation will again be recommended to the Congress, its purpose being to permit the issuance of revenue bonds as an additional means of financing needed power facilities.

So Mr. Speaker, the President advanced this idea for this legislation in the first place and he has repeatedly called for passage of this legislation in his various messages to the Congress.

The members of the present Board of Directors of the TVA—Gen. Herbert D. Vogel, Mr. Arnold R. Jones, and Dr. Frank J. Welch—who has, as we know, recently resigned—were all appointed by President Eisenhower. I think it is significant that this Board has approved this legislation. May I quote from the letter written to our colleague, Mr. DAVIS, stating the Board's opinion on this bill:

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY,
BOARD OF DIRECTORS,
July 29, 1958.

Hon. CLIFFORD DAVIS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

In response to your inquiry we welcome the opportunity to express our deep concern that the legislation now before your committee to authorize TVA to issue revenue bonds be favorably reported and approved by the House at this session of the Congress. Enactment of self-financing legislation is urgently required to enable TVA to meet the growing defense and domestic demands for power in the area. We believe Senate bill 1869 as approved by the Senate last year provides a workable basis on which to undertake this new means of financing. Managerial flexibility commensurate with responsibilities delegated to the Board by law should be retained in bill in order to permit effective and efficient operations, and to insure minimum costs, including those of procurement, design, construction, and interest. TVA's plans, programs, and experience under the new legislation will be fully reported to the President and the Congress each year under existing law, as well as under special provisions for consultation and reporting incorporated in that bill. In addition the ceiling of $750 million included in the bill means that the Congress will have an early opportunity for full review of our initial experience. If the legislation is enacted we pledge our best efforts to administer it effectively.

HERBERT D. VOGEL, *Chairman.*
A. R. JONES, *Director.*
FRANK J. WELCH, *Director.*

H.R. 3460 represents a reasonable compromise of many views. The provisions of this legislation reflect 4 years of very careful analysis and consideration. In that time and in the process of going through the committees and through passage in the other body, this legislation has been changed and amended as no other legislation in my recollection ever has been. There are still some things in here that some people appear not to like. I might say that there are some things in this bill that we who represent the TVA area would prefer to have otherwise. As it stands now before you it is a reasonable bill that offers a reasonable solution to the continuing TVA controversy. As a matter of fact, in the form that it comes before you this bill apparently meets the approval of at least the greater number of the private power companies adjoining the TVA.

In this connection, I want to call your attention to the fact that Mr. Harllee Branch, Jr., president of the Southern Co., which is the parent company of five of the utilities which serve the area adjacent to the TVA, appeared before the committee. During the hearings Mr. Cramer asked Mr. Branch—and I quote:

As far as you are concerned, with the Vinson amendment, which merely provides congressional control over expansion of territories, and the Treasury Department and the Bureau of the Budget review of the actual selling and timing of the bonds, are you satisfied the latter as well as the former is needed so far as Government control of this bond issue is concerned; is that correct?

Mr. Branch replied—and I quote:

With respect to my companies, if there is protection against an expansion of TVA into our territory, my companies, as companies, have no concern:

He added:

The only thing I can speak for them on is to the point, please do not permit an unwarranted and justified encroachment in our territory.

In other words, he said that whatever his own personal opinions as an individual might be as to Treasury or Bureau of the Budget control, and speaking solely as a representative of his companies, and on behalf of the companies, their concern was for a territorial limitation.

It has been 4 years since the President made his first proposal for self-financing the TVA, and 4 years since Congress began to consider this measure. Meanwhile, the TVA has received no appropriations for increasing its power capacity. TVA's ability to meet the power needs of its area is becoming desperately limited.

A crisis caused by a shortage of power would deprive our people of the power needed for normal growth and would severely threaten the ability of the area to enjoy, on equal terms, the opportunity for development with the rest of the Nation.

The people of the TVA area have been thwarted on every hand and from many fronts—appropriations have been denied, opposition has been expressed against any further use of surplus corporate funds; and now sincere efforts to pass a workable and equitable self-financing plan are being opposed.

For years, the opponents of the TVA have been telling us that they are opposed to financing TVA's power operations through appropriations and suggesting that TVA go to the open money market for funds for additional capacity. That is precisely what the legislation now being considered by Congress proposes—to let TVA stand on its own feet. For years the enemies of TVA have been saying that they had no desire to destroy the TVA but merely wanted to remove the TVA from dependence on the Treasury. That is precisely what this legislation proposes. Despite his own expressed misgivings about the TVA, the President has said that he wants to maintain the TVA at maximum efficiency but he insists that he wants to free the Treasury of the financial burden for TVA's power function. That is precisely what this legislation would accomplish.

It is time that we disposed of this problem and faced up to our responsibilities, not only to the TVA area, but to the Nation. I, therefore, urge my colleagues not to be misled by misrepresentations and propaganda about this legislation.

British Reaction to Montgomery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK J. BECKER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 6, 1959

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, in light of recent statements made by Lord Montgomery, more familiarly known as Field Marshal Montgomery, dealing with our President and officials of our Government, as well as the American leadership, I take leave to insert in the RECORD today two paragraphs from a letter I have just received from an English friend of mine for 40 years. These paragraphs are very significant, I believe, and self-explanatory. I am also inserting, following this letter, an editorial from the British Daily Telegraph published in London.

I am certain that no American newspaper could deal more severely with Lord Montgomery than does the editorial of the Daily Telegraph:

DEAR FRANK: I sat up late last night to see and hear the television play made by CBC of "Mark the Mountebank." He is a congenital idiot in a lot of things he says and does and his timing on this occasion has been particularly unfortunate, as have been his references to people's health. You will be interested, I know, to learn that his effort this time has been badly received here as the leader in today's Daily Telegraph will show. He speaks, of course, as a private citizen but, as a great soldier, he should be more conscious of his sense of responsibility.

I think the President dealt well (very) and with dignity, with the questions put to him about the telecast in the States. He does not have to defend himself to you, nor to our people.

The article from the British Daily Telegraph follows:

UNSILVER SPEECH

As much in timing as in tone Lord Montgomery's television views about American leadership are to be deplored, the more so since they reflect popular fallacies which are too deeply ingrained to need public encouragement by so distinguished a voice. The only excuse for a field marshal launching into controversy is to air unpopular truths. To give credence to popular falsehoods is a sad waste of Lord Montgomery's talent for courageous frankness.

How can the field marshal complain of the lack of American leadership when the very policies which he later advocates are precisely those which the United States has consistently and successfully championed, in the face of sustained criticism from within the alliance? He would like to see the forces of Western Germany guarding the NATO front in Europe; he wants the West German Army equipped with tactical nuclear weapons, and above all he believes that if there should be a roughhouse in Europe, American blood must be shed on the first day. He must know that during the past 6 years it has been the American administration which has fought hardest for these self-same aims and that today it is the Americans who resist all pressures to adopt new policies which might endanger these aims.

How then can he justify his claim that the leadership is passing to the British? Does he really believe that the British are doing more than the Americans to encourage the Germans to guard the NATO front or to equip the West German Army with nuclear weapons or to keep the American Army in Germany? Paris and Bonn hold an entirely contrary view. To them it is British rather than American leadership which is rather suspect. This chauvinistic distortion of the facts, coupled with tasteless and irrelevant references to Mr. Herter's crutches—the field marshal was actually reminded that Franklin Roosevelt, whom nobody ever accused of being incapacitated from leading, was a cripple—can only harm the cause which in the past he has done so much to serve.

Sigma Delta Chi Founders Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. QUENTIN BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 6, 1959

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, April 17 of this year marked the 50th anniversary of the founding of Sigma Delta Chi, an organization dedicated to the highest ideals of journalism. It was fitting that the anniversary be marked by a proclamation, reprinted herewith:

PROCLAMATION BY GOVERNOR OF THE STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA

Whereas Friday, April 17, 1959, is the 50th anniversary of the founding of Sigma Delta Chi, the national professional journalistic fraternity—an organization dedicated to the highest ideals of journalism; and

Whereas members of this organization include a majority of North Dakota's working professional newsmen, who labor continually and unselfishly to further the progress of their State and contribute to the knowledge of its citizens; and

Whereas the North Dakota members of Sigma Delta Chi, like their 17,000 fellow members elsewhere in the Nation, have strived ceaselessly for preservation of the people's right to a free press; and

Whereas the State of North Dakota is privileged to have among its organizations an undergraduate chapter of Sigma Delta Chi at the University of North Dakota, as well as the statewide North Dakota professional chapter of the fraternity;

Now, therefore, I, John E. Davis, Governor of the State of North Dakota, do hereby proclaim Friday, April 17, 1959, as Sigma Delta Chi Founders Day in North Dakota and urge all of its citizens to pay tribute to Sigma Delta Chi, expressing appreciation to its members for the work they do to keep us informed, promote our State and community enterprises, and protect our rights and privileges.

In affixing my signature to this proclamation, I take especial note of the fact that members of Sigma Delta Chi will be in Williston April 16 and 17 to observe their golden anniversary with fitting exercises, and to

participate in the annual meeting of the North Dakota Press Association.

Given under my hand and the Great Seal of the State of North Dakota here in my office in the State capitol at Bismarck, N. Dak., this 9th day of April 1959.

JOHN E. DAVIS,
Governor.

Attest:

BEN MEIER,
Secretary of State.

Farm Surpluses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 6, 1959

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, over the years, our Nation has been accumulating a staggering amount of surplus farm goods. At present, for instance, we have enough wheat in Federal storage bins and graneries to supply all the needs of our Nation and our world export market for almost 2 years if not another grain of wheat is planted.

These Government-owned surpluses amount to some $9 billion. They are costing us some $1 billion a year for storage and interest charges alone.

The problem confronting Congress is, What is going to be done about our farm surpluses and how are we going to prevent them from growing even larger in the future? In my opinion, this is one of the most pressing problems which Congress has to face. A realistic look at our present agriculture support policies by Congress is long overdue.

First of all, it might be well for us to determine just who is in favor of our present farm support programs.

The taxpayers do not want them. They are paying for our agricultural program out of their pockets to the tune of some $7 billion annually, the third highest amount in our Federal budget. Only costs for defense and interest payments on our outlandish national debt total more money.

The consumer does not want them. The artificial value placed on farm products by our Federal Government is robbing him of many dollars a year in extra food and clothing bills. Expenditures for food and clothing generally add up to a large portion of the average family budget, and any artificial increase in these two items means a lower standard of living for the average family.

The farmer does not want them. In a recent survey by Farm Journal magazine, 78 percent of the farmers who answered indicated that they considered present price supports for farm goods too high, while some 55 percent of these farmers said they thought the Federal Government should get out of the agriculture business entirely.

The administration does not want them. The present price support program is helping to throw our Federal budget out of kilter and is contributing to a top-heavy budget for the Agriculture Department. In addition, Congress has not seen fit to provide our Secretary of Agriculture with programs he has requested.

Who wants farm price supports then? If consumers, taxpayers, our President, and Secretary of Agriculture and our farmers are opposed to the present program, that seems to take in the vast majority of people in the United States.

All that appear to be left on the other side are some Members of Congress who benefit politically and a few big farm operators who have been reaping rich benefits from our Federal Government without harvesting a crop.

It seems to me that the majority of Congressmen should catch up to the will of the people in this very important matter. We cannot continue to throw away money in billion dollar lots to support a program which has not and cannot work. We cannot continue to pay our big farmers thousands of dollars apiece not to grow crops. These people do not need Federal money anyway. They are doing fine.

We are going to have to give the farmer back his freedom. That is the only fair way of doing things. We have to start reducing our ridiculously large stock of surplus foods, and that is going to take some backbone on the part of Congress.

Besides our school lunch programs, our surplus food distributions to those who need it here at home and abroad, there is another way we can use this extra food. That is in promoting the settlement of our new State of Alaska. I have introduced a bill this session, H.R. 5761, which would permit homesteaders to Alaska to receive surplus Federal food while they are clearing and settling their land. This seems to me to be the least we can do for these brave people. This distribution of food to homesteaders would not cost our Federal Government very much dollarwise, as we would have to store the surplus food for a number of years anyway if our present agriculture policies are permitted to continue.

We are going to have to get rid of our farm surpluses. We are going to have to stop wasting our Federal revenues on an agriculture program which is causing more harm than good. We are going to have to return our basic freedoms to our farmers, who are hampered only in this respect by Congress and its failure to pass an agriculture program which faces up to the problems confronting our Nation.

People Want Gold

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 6, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I wish to include the following article on gold by Mr. Harry Sears, of Angels Camp, Calif., which appeared in the April issue of the Western Mining and Industrial News. Mr. Sears is president of Calaveras Central Gold Mining Co., Ltd., and chairman of the Western States Gold Committee. He is recognized as one of the outstanding authorities on gold in the United States. He has been invited to participate in a conference with the Secretary of the Treasury on May 13 to discuss our general gold policy and the problems involved. The article follows:

Three words describe a condition as old as civilization—people want gold.

They express human emotions, the desire for power, wealth, adornment, or merely personal satisfaction, plus some sense of safety.

For 25 years our people in this country have been denied the possession of gold, except in the form of manufactured products. The Government asserts complete control.

END OF THE ROPE

But we have reached the time when this Government, having failed to provide us with sound money and a sane and honest fiscal policy, find themselves deeply enmeshed in a rapidly growing inflation, with the greatest indebtedness in the history of the world, with an irredeemable paper currency, based only on debt, with no sound monetary reserves which can be used under their present system, and from all quarters come their confessions that they need some solution to their problems, but have not found it.

JUST TALK

We still talk about dollars but do not use them. The Federal Reserve notes which we use instead of money merely carry the insignia which has been familiar to us for years, but because of constantly shrinking purchasing power, this paper currency is valued only in pennies and when translated into an equivalent of what a dollar should be in value, for almost any transaction in our daily lives, we are met with high prices, but these are merely the result of multiplying our currency units, because of their constant loss of purchasing power, into the number required to bring their usefulness to the necessary amount demanded for goods and services in our daily transactions.

GOLD IS EXCEPTION

There is one outstanding exception to this perfect pattern. The price of gold, which was set by Government decree in 1934 and which the Treasury has refused to alter, has been steadily reduced since the originally proclaimed $35 per ounce, so that translated into the purchasing power of the paper currency which is paid for it by the Treasury, the price of gold becomes: $16.80 per ounce with a 48-cent dollar; $11.55 per ounce with a 33-cent dollar; $8.75 per ounce with a 25-cent dollar; $3.50 per ounce with a 10-cent dollar; 35 cents per ounce with a 1-cent dollar.

And by applying the same factual figures to the sales of gold by the Treasury we find that during the past year between $2 and $3 billion in gold has been sold to foreign central banks and their government and private customers, in addition to all the gold which was supplied by the Treasury for commercial use in this country and abroad, at the same reduced prices.

STUPID

The proponents of this suicidal and fantastic stupidity have the audacity to call such results the "value of gold," and groups of economists and monetary experts are constantly seeking to have conversion of this Federal Reserve currency into gold, at the $35 price and a favorite slogan with them is that any increase in the price of gold would be inflationary.

The root cause of the inflation stems from the practices of the Federal Reserve System,

their multiplication of printed currency based on debts, the removal of gold from all monetary use in the United States and the unlawful Treasury practices and propaganda regarding gold.

BEYOND CONTROL

The inflation has been built by the government because they wanted to build it, but it is getting beyond control and the people are searching for safety and a way out of the confusion. They are beginning to turn to gold.

We are at the date of an important anniversary. Twenty-five years ago the Gold Reserve Act of 1934 was passed by Congress. This is claimed as the authority for the gold regulations and practices of the Treasury; and that Congress acted under its Constitutional power to "Coin money and regulate the value thereof," but Congress has used no such power with regard to this act, and the Treasury has been clothed with no authority.

MISLEADING

That was some time ago, the details may be quite dim in your memories, but again please note the title, the Gold Reserve Act of 1934. This very title is misleading and its interpretation has been appalling. Few people have read it and realize its actual powers and limitations and during this quarter of a century we have been taught fundamental errors and have been herded into mistaken understandings and have been taught false beliefs regarding gold. Our Government officials have promoted fictions and claimed powers which are outside the law and which they do not possess.

Our rights and the peoples' rights are fully supported by law and are directly contrary to the claims and practices of the Treasury.

LET'S GET THE FACTS

So that there may be some order in this confusion we review provisions and purposes of the act.

The Government took title for the United States, to the gold coins and monetary gold bars which had been in the vaults of banks for many years or which had been turned in at the Treasury or Federal Reserve banks by our citizens in accordance with Presidential demands.

We need not here determine the legality and morality of Congress in blindly following Presidential orders and stripping the American public of their gold, in 1933.

This was in the period when the President ordered Congress to pass laws and not to hesitate because of doubts as to their constitutionality, so acting under the assumption that possession denoted authority, title to this gold was declared by the act, to pass to the Government.

THE LAW

But it is extremely important that we know what was provided as to gold owned by the Government, we therefore quote from the act: "No gold shall hereafter be coined, and no gold coin shall hereafter be paid out or delivered by the United States.

"All gold coin of the United States shall be withdrawn from circulation and together with all other gold owned by the United States, shall be formed into bars of such weight and degree of fineness as the Secretary of the Treasury may direct. No currency of the United States shall be redeemable in gold.

This is the important provision of the act and through improper interpretation of these words, or through intentional disregard of their meaning, the Treasury and other Government departments have indulged in a program of skullduggery toward gold which violated the basic property rights of all citizens and has almost entirely destroyed the gold mines and gold producing districts in 13 Western States.

LAW DEFIED

They have confiscated the gold which was taken from its owners, in defiance of law, and they have been parties to the imposition of frauds on our citizens generally, through misrepresentation to them that gold was the basis of a reserve to provide safety for users of the present irredeemable currency.

With gold clearly and completely removed from all monetary use in the United States it lost its former identity as money, and became a simple commodity, and Congress then had no greater power over it than over any other commodity.

The fact that some of it is stored in Treasury or Federal Reserve vaults, or Fort Knox, gives it no monetary standing or character for the Gold Reserve Act specifically terminated any monetary use of gold in this country. The term "bullion" has no monetary significance. It merely means "metal in the mass" and the term has been in common use for centuries.

JUST A COMMODITY

All gold owned by the United States thus became merely a commodity stored in Government warehouses in 1934, and the Secretary of the Treasury merely became the custodian of the warehouses. It is thus exactly the same as the commodity gold produced from the mines and is subject to all safeguards for property which our Constitution and laws provide.

The act gave no authority to the Secretary of the Treasury to set a price for gold and to maintain such a set price during the years of inflation when the purchasing power of irredeemable Federal Reserve currency dropped steadily so that now it is only accepted on the basis of from 25 cents to 33 cents on the face value of the so-called dollar. This means that in buying gold from a producer the Treasury pays for it with irredeemable paper currency of which the purchasing power has been so reduced that it pays only from $8.75 to $11.50 per ounce, and not the much touted $35 which is publicly held forth as the rate the Treasury pays.

The Secretary has a set of regulations but owing to the fact that he is only dealing in commodity gold, just as any private citizen would deal in it, he has no authority to control or enforce commodity gold. But in spite of this he compels gold producers to secure a license from him before they can melt their gold and place it in marketable form and he also demands that they contract to sell the gold to him, at his price, to avoid having this license canceled.

Of course gold cannot be produced at these prices, except in a few special cases and as a byproduct from other metals.

There were about 4,000 operating gold mines in production when they were preemptorily closed as an asserted war necessity, in 1942. After years of idleness the great majority of these could not attempt reopening because economic difficulties of inflation and currency depreciation had made a higher gold price mandatory. A few mines attempted reopening but after heavy losses were forced to again close down. This is the condition of more than 95 percent of all gold mines in the country.

FRAUDS ON THE PEOPLE

Another provision of the Gold Reserve Act of 1934 gave the Secretary of the Treasury authority to buy and sell gold, at home and abroad. Sections 8 and 9 provide for these purchases and sales at varying prices, with no special price specified. As this was virtually a public trust it was his duty to see that these purchases and sales would be properly conducted and the laws respected, but this has never been done.

The gold policy of the Treasury was concisely stated by former Under Secretary Randolph Burgess in testimony before a Senate Committee in 1954, when he said:

"We buy and sell gold freely with other countries at the price of $35 an ounce and we sell gold to foreign banks and private owners as well."

There was a lot of loose language and fancy phrases in the act and in the proclamation of the President which announced it in 1934, but none of this could vary the essential fact which the act established.

When gold was completely removed from monetary use in the United States there could be: No gold dollar, no gold content of the dollar, no gold monetary reserves.

MERE TOKENS

In addition, there is a statute which declares that no obligation of the United States could be measured in gold, therefore no matter what the President said, surplus language describing unauthorized and nonexisting facts have no effect and establish no rights, but in view of what has since happened one announcement by the President should be remembered. He said:

"In pure theory, of course, a government could issue mere tokens to serve as money—tokens which would be accepted at their face value if it were certain that the amount of these tokens were permanently limited and confined to the total amount necessary for the daily cash needs of the commodity."

This could well have been an advance description of managed currency and the present Federal Reserve notes. Since they have no ascertainable value they fit the description of a "mere token to serve as money." They are accepted far below face value for it is certain that the amount of these tokens is not limited, either permanently or temporarily, and they are not confined to the daily cash needs of the community but are contributed in fantastic amounts as gifts all over the world. Thus vast amounts accrue in the hands of foreign banks and private owners as well, which are given the fancy title of foreign trade balances and the Treasury honors these by selling them gold at $35 an ounce.

BRAINWASHED

Nevertheless throughout the years, Government officials, bankers, business advisers, economists, teachers and Members of Congress continue to think and talk about these nonexistent gold formulae and our currency as though they were real. They have been so effectively brainwashed that they continue to delude themselves and others by repetition of untrue and wholly fallacious theories.

For years we have been conducting our lives under this irredeemable and constantly depreciating currency. In testifying before the Senate Finance Committee in 1957, retiring Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey, who had just admitted that the purchasing power of the dollar had dropped to 48 cents, was asked:

"But you do think that as long as this inflation keeps up, the savers and pensioners and people who have paid on insurance for 20 to 30 years, are the forgotten people, are they not?"

To this Secretary Humphrey replied:

"They are definitely forgotten people who have been injured * * * They are severely injured."

IT IS PLAIN ROBBERY

In these words was the confession of the Secretary of the Treasury regarding your bank balances and savings.

In spite of the contempt for the legal and property rights of our citizens and gold owners, as shown by the gold regulations and Treasury practices, gold is extremely important to the Treasury as a screen to conceal their real position.

If the deposits in our banks are injured by saving our shrinking currency, there could be no question that gold producers have a greater injury illegally forced upon them.

Their gold is taken under coercion by a Treasury acting without authority and they are forced to accept Federal Reserve currency in exchange for their gold. They are brazenly robbed.

PUBLIC MISLED

In spite of the Treasury's repeated insistence that U.S. citizens cannot possess gold, they misrepresent gold to the people in order to mislead the public. In hearings before the Senate Finance Committee in 1957, former Treasury Under Secretary Randolph Burgess admitted:

"We have got a kind of gold standard and to the extent the people have confidence that we are going to keep the money nailed down to the value of gold, it is easier to sell the bonds."

We have had no gold money or monetary gold in this country for a quarter of a century. Gold held by our Government is merely metallic gold as a commodity.

It is in the same class as the gold which is owned in the thousands of gold mines and properties throughout our Western States.

RIGHTS DENIED

The rights to produce this gold and sell it are on an equal footing with the rights of our citizens to purchase it and to hold it, or to sell it as they may choose.

Congress has no power to enact laws or to authorize regulations which abridge these rights of possession and when the Secretary of the Treasury attempts to enforce such regulations he is acting illegally and without authority.

A current case in the Federal court bears directly on this. It concerns possession of gold bullion by a man in the State of Washington, charging him with a criminal act for which he was arrested, tried, and sentenced. During recent years there have been many instances where others have been treated in this fashion and in most cases they have not contested, having been overawed by the long standing propaganda and claims that the Government had this power, or they could not afford the cost of an appeal.

COURT DECISION

This case was appealed, and after consideration by the Court of Appeals, has been remanded to the original court for corrective action or dismissal. The criminal charge for gold possession was based on original emergency orders of the President early in 1933 and upon subsequent Treasury regulations and the Gold Reserve Act of 1934, but it was found by the U.S. Court of Appeals that there are no criminal penalties provided in the Gold Reserve Act for possession of gold and no criminal statutes authorized by Congress.

Of course, the conditions under which the original Presidential emergency orders were issued, no longer exist. In 1933 they were used to force the people to turn their gold coins and bullion over to the Treasury and later, title to this gold was given to the United States in the Gold Reserve Act of 1934. It all became commodity gold and gold coinage was wiped out.

COIN BAN LIFTED

In fact, even the Treasury has recently lifted bans on the possession of gold coins and they are now permissible to be held by the public and are classed as collectors' items. But the old criminal bogey, as to gold bullion, is still held over the heads of the people by the Treasury. It is interesting to note the language of the Court of Appeals in reversing this case:

"It seems vital as a matter of national policy that emergency regulations and almost dictatorial powers granted or conceded in the turmoil of war, cold war, economic revolution, and the struggle to preserve a balanced democratic way of life, should be discarded upon return to normal conditions, lest we grow used to them as the fittings of ordinary existence. Executive regulations drafted and confirmed for an emergency should expire with the emergency."

Since the Gold Reserve Act of 1934 established the status of gold owned by the United States as merely commodity gold, and abolished any former status it may have had as money, or monetary gold, it had the effect of establishing all gold in the United States as commodity gold and as private property.

NO AUTHORITY

Neither Congress or the Secretary has any power or authority to prevent United States citizens from buying, selling, or holding gold; or

To prevent the mining or processing of gold in the United States, or to make regulations which would interfere with the proper conduct of such business by the owners of this gold, or any mineral deposit containing same; or

To set a price limit on gold, or to compel its owners or producers to sell it in any manner, or at any price which does not conform to valid laws regarding private property; or

To require gold miners and producers to have any form of license in order to melt their gold, which is a necessary part of mining to change it from the form of a concentrate in which it is mingled with other metals, and to prepare it for sale; or

To confiscate privately owned gold or to assess any owner with a penalty or a threat of penalty, because of its possession; or

To appropriate or take possession of privately owned gold, in any manner which violates the property rights of the owners, or contrary to any valid law made to protect them; or

To misrepresent the status of gold owned by the United States and to state or imply that it is in any manner connected with the present irredeemable currency in common use.

LEGAL PRINCIPLES

In considering newly mined gold from properties in the United States and summarizing the laws which must be obeyed by the Secretary of the Treasury we find he is governed by the following well-settled legal principles:

Private control of commodities and private property is unconstitutional.

Private property and property rights of all United States citizens are protected under our Constitution and must be so recognized and respected.

Private property of citizens is protected from seizure or confiscation.

Private property cannot be taken for public use without just compensation and this cannot be determined without a hearing.

It should come as a welcome breath of hope for the future of the gold-mining industry to consider that although in the past we have been singled out and made the victims of lawless treatment by our Government, we have well settled rights which can be invoked and can reverse this condition for the future.

Gold producers have been an isolated industry with limited public contacts in the past but the drastic effects of the manufactured inflation has brought gold into fresh prominence and as the cycle of inflation continues the doubts and the growing resentment of the people can compel the Government to establish and use real reserves of gold, for there could be swift collapse of the multiplication of paper currency now being used.

PEOPLE WANT GOLD

In recent years there has been increased buying of gold in free countries abroad. Our substantial citizens have been adding to their holdings, but these had to be handled as bulk purchases since the sales were large and the storage abroad was expensive, so this was never a practical market for our modest citizens.

But there has been preparation underway for some months to bring the advantages of a free gold market to us close at home, and on such a scale that it could be a popular market. With expenses cut to a minimum it can serve all classes. This is about ready to function in Canada and trading would be on the open commodity markets both there and here in the United States. The gold will remain in bank valuts in Canada and warehouse receipts will be traded on the market.

Even in its preliminary steps the volume of demand for gold is causing surprise in Canada and they see that here is a world market in the making. But we can forsee that it will not be necessary even to go to Canada or to trade there, for we now know that morally and legally there is a clear right for us to have a free gold market here in the United States, and to start the building of such a market. The growing fear and unrest in the minds of our own people can be a factor of great importance.

CASE IN COURT

Among other steps, there is a carefully prepared case in progress in the Federal Courts to terminate all control of newly mined gold through Treasury regulations.

Our citizens have watched their bank accounts wither and fade in the purchasing power of their deposits and they have plunged into the stock market to multiply their shrinking dollars only to find that this is now even a bigger gamble than horse racing.

They want something tangible, that could be safe and dependable but whose value can grow as it attracts increased public demands for its possession.

Throughout history, this has always been the function of gold. It has not been permitted to register its value in this country during the past 25 years. That value should soon show at more than $100 per ounce.

Let us therefore view this as a fresh start when we turn away from the past and forsee a far different future.

A Bill To Amend the Trading With the Enemy Act Dealing With Copyrights, Trademark Properties, and Motion-Picture Film

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OREN HARRIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 6, 1959

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced a bill to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act dealing with copyrights, trademark properties, and motion-picture films. In order to afford the Members of the House of Representatives and the general public a better understanding of this bill, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter dated April 13, 1959, from the Attorney General addressed to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, requesting introduction of this legislation, and an explanatory memorandum of the bill prepared by the Department of Justice:

APRIL 13, 1959.

The SPEAKER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: There is attached for your consideration and appropriate reference

a legislative proposal to return to its former owners or their successors-in-interest, certain property vested under the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended (50 U.S.C. App. 1 et seq.). This property, which is presently administered by the Office of Alien Property in the Department of Justice, consists of vested copyrights, trademarks, and unexpired contract interests involving copyrights and trademarks. The proposed legislation would effect a statutory divestment of the Government's title to these properties without any necessity for the filing of claims or any other formal action by the former owners or their successors-in-interest and thus without the necessity of any administrative processing by the Office of Alien Property or any other agency of the Government. The measure would also authorize the transfer of all vested motion picture film prints to the Library of Congress for retention or disposition by the Library as it sees fit. The proposed legislation would not return the income or proceeds received by or accrued in favor of the Office of Alien Property from any of the divested assets prior to the effective date of divestment.

The purpose of the draft bill is to bring to an end the administration of the above-mentioned categories of vested property. In the absence of legislation of this nature, the Government will be faced with the prospect of continuing the administration thereof for an indefinite period of time.

The future income to be derived from the vested copyright, trademark and film properties is not substantial and will no doubt steadily decrease. Accordingly, enactment of the bill would not appreciably diminish the total amount of vested funds ultimately available for financing the program of compensation to American war damage claimants which the administration has recommended to Congress for enactment.

An explanatory memorandum is attached to the draft bill which analyzes its provisions and explains at greater length the reasons supporting its enactment.

Early legislative action on this proposal would be a major step toward termination of the World War II alien property program.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this recommendation.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM P. ROGERS,
Attorney General.

EXPLANATORY MEMORANDUM RE PROPOSED BILL TO AMEND THE TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT, AS AMENDED

Among the various categories of enemy-owned assets in the United States which were vested under the Trading With the Enemy Act and are administered by the Office of Alien Property as a consequence of World War II are copyright and trademark properties and prints of motion-picture films. A description of these categories and their status under present law are set forth below.

1. Copyrights: Vested copyright interests number more than 300,000 in all. These include not only directly vested copyrights but also interests in prewar contracts relating to the use of copyrighted material in the United States. Inasmuch as copyrights have a statutory life of 28 years and may be renewed for an additional 28 years, it is obvious that the ownership and administration of vested copyright interests by the U.S. Government will continue far into the future in the absence of legislation authorizing the disposition of such interests. In the fiscal year ended June 30, 1958, the Office of Alien Property received approximately $131,000 in royalities for copyright licenses and contracts. The amount of such royalties will no doubt steadily decrease during the years to come and at some point will fall below the costs of administration.

2. Trademarks: There is presently a total of 300 vested trademarks and trademark contract interests. Trademark registrations are effective for 20 years and may be reregistered at 20-year intervals as long as the trademark is used. As a result Government ownership and administration of vested trademark properties may continue indefinitely under present law. Income produced by these properties during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1958, was only $20,000 and it is anticipated that this figure will decrease in future years. Accordingly, the cost of the trademark program will no doubt soon exceed the income it produces.

3. Prints of motion pictures: The Government presently owns several million feet of vested motion-picture film. This property is perishable and all of it will ultimately have to be destroyed. Little of this material has more than nominal commercial value and the income received from rentals thereof is insignificant.

The purpose of the proposed bill is to terminate the administration by the United States of the above-described vested property and thus to hasten the end of the World War II alien property program. Inasmuch as the three types of assets vary in the problems of disposition which they present, the proposed bill treats them separately in three new sections to be added to the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended (50 U.S.C. App. 1–39), as follows:

Section 40: This section would relieve the Government of its ownership of vested copyrights and unexpired copyright contract interests by a statutory divestment requiring no action on the part of the Office of Alien Property. The effect of this section would be to restore the ownership of the divested property to the persons in whom it resided prior to vesting or to their successors-in-interest. The divestment would not extend to royalties or other income received by or accrued in favor of the Government during the period of its ownership and would not prejudice the rights of the persons who have licenses issued by the Office of Alien Property in respect of vested copyrights.

It should be noted that the divestment would serve to return copyrights and unexpired contract interests therein to persons and firms in the East Zone of Germany. Thus, although such persons and firms would not receive the return of any money in the hands of the Office of Alien Property, they would become entitled to any income from their copyrights and contract interests which might accrue after divestment. Investigation in Germany has disclosed that practically all the former owners of valuable copyright properties who were located in the East Zone of Germany prior to World War II have now established themselves in the West Zone. As a result the amount of future income payable to former owners in the East Zone from the copyright divestment would be negligible.

The proposed section 40 excludes from return by reference to specific vesting orders the copyrights and contract interests connected with the publication in the United States of Hitler's Mein Kampf, the diaries of Paul Joseph Goebbels, the memoirs of Alfred Rosenberg and a work by a leading Nazi, Otto Skorzeny. The moneys collected in connection with these works are of course also excluded from divestment. A photographic history of the Nazi Party formerly owned by Heinrich Hoffman, its official photographer, has been excluded from return. In addition, the copyright to a scientific motion picture entitled "Meiosis" has been excepted from divestment because of its wide use by American educational institutions. Since this copyright was owned by an East German firm prior to vesting, divestment might impede its future use in this country.

Section 41: This section, which deals with vested trademark properties, also employs the technique of a statutory divestment. However, it excludes, by reference to specific vesting orders, certain possible reversionary or other similar rights relating to trademarks and good will which since prior to World War II have been assigned to and held by vested enterprises which are still controlled by the Government under the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended. In general, these vesting orders are catch-all orders issued as a precautionary measure for the purpose of cutting off any unknown or undiscovered rights which may have been retained by enemy nationals with respect to the good will, trademarks and trade names of these vested corporations. Although these nebulous reversionary rights may be nonexistent or without any real value, their divestment in favor of the former owners might invite unnecessary harassment of vested corporations and their involvement in litigation with respect to those portions of their businesses in which the trademarks are used, notwithstanding the fact that the vested corporations for many years have operated these businesses independently of these former owners.

The proposed section 41 provides that where a trademark or a trademark interest was owned prior to vesting by a person in East Germany, it will be divested in favor of a person in the Federal Republic of Germany if a competent agency of the Federal Republic certifies that an equivalent trademark has been registered by it for such person.

The divestment would not extend to income received by or accrued in favor of the Government from trademark properties during the period of its ownership and would not prejudice the rights of persons who have received licenses from the Office of Alien Property in respect of vested trademarks.

Section 42: Some motion picture film vested by the United States was seized by our Armed Forces overseas and is in the custody of the Library of Congress; other film seized in the United States is in the custody of the Attorney General. Although custody is divided, title to all of the prints is in the Attorney General.

Subject to stated exceptions, this section authorizes and directs the transfer to the Library of Congress of title to the prints in its custody and to those prints in the custody of the Attorney General as to which the Library exercises a right of selection. The section affords complete discretion to the Attorney General and to the Library to dispose of prints in their respective custody.

Obion-Forked Deer Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT A. EVERETT
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 6, 1959

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, there appeared in the Sunday Morning, May 3, edition of the Commercial Appeal, an outstanding newspaper of Memphis, Tenn., an editorial relative to the Obion-Forked Deer project, known as the west Tennessee tributaries.

The Congress last year appropriated $75,000 for the advance engineering and planning for this project. The General Assembly of Tennessee passed legislation early this year which would furnish

the rights-of-way and maintenance of this project.

We in the Midsouth appreciate the great interest shown by the Commercial Appeal in flood control and drainage matters which are so important to us. The editorial of May 3 follows:

OBION-FORKED DEER PROJECT

The economy of the Lower Mississippi Valley being pegged as it is on effective and adequate flood control and drainage facilities, any progress along that line benefits the whole area and all its people.

One of the most important projects of the type relates to the Obion-Forked Deer areas of West Tennessee—a project as vital to Memphis as to Dyersburg or Union City. It was authorized more than a decade ago on the basis of a comprehensive report of the Corps of Engineers and a survey which determined that the ratio of benefits to cost more than justified the undertaking.

The drainage program was delayed until an agency to be responsible for acquisition of rights-of-way and maintenance could be set up. The last general assembly provided for this and all that is needed now is a Federal funds allocation.

Some sportsmen have expressed fear that the project would do great injury to recreational potentials, but the fear seems to have little but hypothesis to support it. Recurring flood misery and damage in the Obion-Forked Deer areas, on the other hand, are stark matters of annual record.

The Obion-Forked Deer project is wanted and needed by the agricultural and business interests of the sections which will be immediately benefited and it is a need which is paramount.

When the original study on the west Tennessee project was being made, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service found that damages to fish and game in the area might be reduced by a $70,000 annual total in the Obion and Hatchie River Basins but that the figure might be cut by remedial works. No work was authorized for the Hatchie, thus that figure would appear to be excessive if applied only to the Obion.

In their 1948 report on the Obion-Forked Deer Rivers above the backwater limits Army engineers asserted that average benefits of $885,000 to croplands alone might be expected to result from only that portion of the improvement. That calculation was based on 1946 farm prices. The benefits expectation would be higher today.

There should be no controversy between the communities and area which the Obion-Forked Deer project is primarily designed to assist and wildlife enthusiasts. There is no room for it. Adequate control and development of our water resources are basic to our progress and in all related undertakings protection of life and property and enhancement of land values must take precedence.

Truman Sees No Change in Policy Under Herter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 6, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, there is no one better qualified to discuss foreign policy than former President Harry S. Truman. During the period he was President of the United States, he conducted his duties, particularly in the field of foreign affairs, with sound vision and intuitiveness and with great courage.

In my extension of remarks I include an article written by former President Harry S. Truman for the Bell Syndicate, Inc., and appearing in the Washington Post of April 28, 1959:

TRUMAN SEES NO CHANGE IN POLICY UNDER HERTER

(By Harry S. Truman)

The foreign policy of the United States is shaped and determined so largely by our needs for security and preservation of world peace that no abrupt change, even in the person of the occupant of the White House, could result in a significant change in that policy today.

I, therefore, do not foresee any material difference, with the appointment of Christian A. Herter to succeed John Foster Dulles, in what we must do.

Whatever special qualifications Secretary Herter brings to his office—and they are impressive—we must understand that he will be the instrument of the President, who alone has the responsibility for making foreign policy.

In these anxious and dangerous times, the responsibility and the role of the President in the conduct of foreign policy call, more than ever, for his constant personal vigilance and direction.

A President must know what he wants to do, and he is the only person in a position to get it done, no matter who is Secretary of State. The tragic illness of John Foster Dulles removed at a critical moment, a dynamic and influential instrument of the President.

The new Secretary of State is an experienced public servant and a capable diplomat. He is of a different temperament from that of his predecessor. In certain respects he will act more as the instrument of the President.

REMEMBERS HERTER WELL

Time alone, of course, will tell how effective he is in negotiations with the Communists and in dealing with our allies. I remember him well when, as a Member of the House of Representatives, he helped in the bipartisan efforts to bring about congressional approval of the Marshall plan.

The necessity and the circumstances of the new appointment, I hope, will help correct the notion that a Secretary of State, under our Constitution, can ever assume the role of the President in the making of foreign policy.

The President, himself, cannot properly delegate that responsibility, no matter how brilliant or distinguished a Secretary of State may be.

During my administration there were four Secretaries of State, but at no time was there any departure or deviation from the basic policy followed by this country. They were each in his own way highly individualistic, with pronounced gifts, qualities, and temperaments. But they all knew that final decision on high policy matters had to be made in the White House by the President.

The exercise of this responsibility cannot be a matter of discretion on the part of the President, no matter what his opinion or whatever regard or esteem he may have for his Secretary of State, or how much he may rely upon his skill and judgment.

PRESIDENT IS ARCHITECT

There should never be any doubt in the mind of the man in the Kremlin or among our allies that the President, himself, is exercising his full responsibility as the architect of our foreign policy.

There have been several critical moments in recent history where confusion has resulted because critics of this country claimed that our diplomatic spokesman did not speak with the final authority of the President.

I am inclined to believe that clamor for meetings at the summit has been in part due to the impression that negotiations with anyone other than the President are useless and inconclusive. Now that we have a conditional commitment for another meeting at the summit I hope that the coming meeting for the Foreign Ministers in Geneva, with the new Secretary of State participating, will make it clear that he is the direct instrument of the President and that useful decisions and understandings can be reached in dealing through him. And if there is to be a summit meeting, preparations by the Foreign Ministers are vital to any hope for progress and achievement there.

If all critical issues were to be deferred for discussion and final settlement at a meeting of the heads of state, we would find ourselves in a hopeless jam and in an impossible position.

GENEVA MEETING CRITICAL

In my opinion, in view of all that has transpired in the past weeks, the meeting at Geneva takes on special importance and should be more than a maneuver or just a technical procedure leading to a meeting of the heads of state. If the meeting at Geneva first faces up to the immediate critical issues and is conducted in good faith, it will have an important bearing on whether there can be any basis for success at the summit and on the prospects for peace. I hope that what happens at Geneva will enable us to continue talks with the Russians in our efforts to save the peace.

If the forthcoming visit of the Vice President to Moscow can help in some way, and if it provides the Kremlin with an opportunity to clear some of the air, then I am all for it. The Vice President not only will carry with him the prestige of his office, but will go as a special instrument of the President.

Should Premier Khrushchev indicate that he himself, would like to visit Washington, it might be well to encourage him. I think Khrushchev needs first-hand exposure to the United States and a good look at it to balance off his overassessment of what his missiles and industrial might can do to frighten us.

INVITED STALIN HERE

I tried to persuade Stalin to visit the United States on several occasions, but I was led to understand that he could not risk the trip because of the situation at home.

But after my own trip to Potsdam and the previous trips of Roosevelt to meet Stalin, I felt that there was no longer any sense for an American President to meet the Russian dictators at their convenience and thought it was high time they came to meet with us here.

We traveled great distances to show that even as a leading power we did not insist upon anyone coming to see us on our own grounds. Dictators have a way of summoning spokesmen of other nations to bully or beguile them into surrender or false security.

Moscow, as the capital of the Communist world, has staged meetings of satellites, neighbors, and so-called neutrals intended to propagandize the notion that all roads lead to Moscow.

From time to time some members of the Kremlin have traveled to Peiping to placate the Red Chinese dictators in recognition of that country's rapidly developing power and its position as a possible rival. But the seat of the Communist and satellite world continues to be physically in Moscow and in the Kremlin.

FOLLY OF INDIAN NEUTRALISM

I often wondered why Nehru, whom I regard as one of the most intelligent of our

modern world leaders, failed to sense the folly of his neutralism in the face of such overwhelming evidence of Communist intentions to dominate the free world.

I could understand the plight of India geographically and economically, and, when President, I did everything I could to extend assistance to India. But when the free world was confronted with brutal attacks by the Communists in several critical areas, I found little understanding and no support and even open criticism from Nehru in our actions to defend ourselves against aggression.

Though sorely tried, we never lost patience with India even when our pleas for cooperation were steadily rejected. This situation was exploited by the Russians with serious damage to the free world.

Today Nehru is confronted right on his own doorstep, with the most blatant act of Communist imperialism, Red China's attack in Tibet. I know the dilemma and the dangers that face Nehru, but I suggest that the time has come for him to add his weight and influence against the international Communist aggressors.

The Communists have shown that they have utter contempt for the weak and the neutrals, and no lasting peace is possible if we forget this.

International communism is forever probing for weak spots. It is constantly seeking to drive a wedge between the free nations. It is now trying to split the allies on several issues, and we must not permit this to happen.

I regret that recently in Britain voices were raised in petulant criticism of American policy which might better have been conveyed through official channels and which served no purpose except to provide the Kremlin with propaganda material.

As allies, we must keep each other fully informed and never give the false impression that we are drifting apart. If we should, in fact, permit anything, however provoking, to separate any of the allies, it would expose us all to great harm.

And here at home I would counsel that we act as united people in the serious days ahead of us.

Address by Lee Todd, National Vice President, Future Farmers of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. EVERETT

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 6, 1959

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, Lee Todd, national vice president of the Future Farmers of America, of Bells, Tenn., which is in my congressional district, made an outstanding address before the Tennessee Association of Future Farmers of America in Memphis, Tenn., on April 25.

Lee Todd is the 20-year-old son of Mr. and Mrs. Robert Lee Todd. He operates a 100-acre farm in partnership with his father, and owns 32 Aberdeen Angus cattle outright.

Lee was secretary for the Tennessee association during 1955 and 1956, and was second place winner in the 1955 national FFA public speaking contest. He was valedictorian of his Bells High School class, most outstanding student, editor of the high school annual, and vice president of the senior class. Other honors included Beta Club president, Boys State delegate, and participation in several FFA judging teams.

Todd is a general agriculture student at the Martin branch of the University of Tennessee. Because of the extensive travel done by national FFA officers, Lee will drop out of college at the end of the current semester. His college honors have included the presidency of both the sophomore and junior class, and membership in the All-Students Club.

Todd's farming operations have already earned for him a labor income in excess of $10,000. In addition to his Angus herd, he farmed 18.6 acres of cotton with his dad this year. Other enterprises included 7 acres of oats, 7 acres of soybeans, and 39 hogs.

Under unanimous consent, I include his address along with my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD. The address follows:

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, FFA officials, and fellow future farmers, it is indeed a delightful pleasure to have this opportunity of attending the 31st annual meeting of the Tennessee Association Future Farmers of America and to participate in our program again this year. It has been my privilege to attend each of our State conventions since I was a sophomore in high school, and I assure you that the FFA will continue to receive my interest and support even after I am no longer eligible to hold membership as an active member.

It gives me great pleasure to bring you greetings from the national organization of the Future Farmers of America with its more than 383,000 members in some 10,000 local chapters in all of our United States and Puerto Rico. I have been kept rather busy since being elected your national vice president. I have already attended meetings in Oklahoma and Texas, and before many more weeks have passed I will have been also in Texas again and in Arkansas, Mississippi, Florida, North Carolina, South Carolina, Alabama, and perhaps some of the other Southern States. On these visits into the States, I really have the opportunity of seeing FFA members in action as we visit and speak at local, district, and State meetings, livestock shows, high school assemblies, rodeos, sweetheart contests, banquets, and just about every kind of meeting where you will find farm youth.

When I was a somewhat younger boy than I am now, I remember that on a very special occasion, I was allowed to buy the toy of my choosing. I picked out an intriguing toy. Someone suggested that the toy looked somewhat complicated for a boy of my age. The clerk assured us that it was an educational toy which was designed to adjust a child to live in the world of today. The clerk explained that any way the boy puts it together, it is certain to be wrong. I have thought of that statement many times during the years, and I am convinced that the great future farmer organization is affording the farm youth of America one of the best possible opportunities of education and training, and it will enable future farmers to learn how to put things together in such a way that as we work cooperatively our world will not be all wrong.

I have just recently returned from a 7-week national good will tour for the Future Farmers of America, and I appreciate this opportunity to tell you that this tour carried the five other national officers and myself to some 20 cities located in 10 northeastern States. We toured more than 50 plants and visited with topflight executives and industrialists. These outstandingly successful men recognize the qualities of leadership which are the outgrowth of the future farmer organization, the fact that these men, who are some of the greatest business executives in America today, were willing to greet us personally, entertain us in their homes, and contribute thousands of dollars to the future farmer foundations award program is sufficient evidence that they have a firm belief in the vital role that FFA is playing in the agricultural economy of our Nation. They realize that the foundations award program provides incentives for boys studying vocational agriculture to exert their best efforts toward reaching the aim of our FFA and that is the development of agricultural leadership, citizenship, and cooperation.

I would like for you to think with me briefly concerning these three important qualities. Let us consider how we may further improve them and how we can try to be better able to carry out this primary aim of FFA.

In the foundation upon which the FFA organization is built, the cornerstone was carefully selected. A simple inscription of a single word appears on its polished face. That word is leadership.

What is leadership? Why is it important? Who may expect to become leaders? How can leadership be developed? These are important questions with which we are all concerned. There are probably as many definitions of leadership as there are people. Everyone has his own ideas, but running through them all we find certain common elements. I believe that leadership is that combination of qualities in an individual which inspires confidence, draws others toward him and causes them to follow him. He has the earmarks of a guide, a coordinator, a chief, and a commander. Someone has said that leaders are people who can accomplish that which others have not the heart to attempt. A truly good leader is a director of constructive activity. He is a good leader because he has the welfare of his followers in his dealings. He spends his energies in trying to see that right prevails. Intelligent, thinking people follow good leaders.

Never in the history of our country was the need for good leadership greater than it is today. It is especially true in agriculture. However, as we look around us we see on every hand baffling problems not only in farming, but in Government, education, finance, industry, commerce, foreign relations, and other fields. Even our plain everyday living is complicated. Today's problems must be solved in some manner. FFA has a definite responsibility in this tremendously important undertaking.

Every person is not capable of becoming an outstanding leader, but there are many who possess certain leadership qualities. Our problem then is to find our talent, develop it, and put it to work. We must develop and use the leadership abilities we may have along the lines to which we are best suited. By doing so, we will lead fuller, richer, and more productive lives.

Good leaders realize that they must learn how to make friends, keep friends, and avoid making enemies. They must be able to interest, inspire, and convince. They must be able to work and win against opposition, and they must have a word of praise for those who do their work well. Good leaders know how to follow as well as lead, and they must be aware that it is only through others that they succeed. No organization can exist long without a continuous supply of good capable leadership. If the FFA organization is to continue to hold its "place in the sun," we members must make definite provision for developing that supply of adequate leadership from within our own ranks.

We must recognize that each office in the organization involves specific duties and responsibilities. Officers to fill these places should have some traits and abilities which help to fit them for the job. The FFA is an agency for the development of rural and agricultural leadership. Is it accomplishing

this purpose? I wonder if each one of us is developing and using our leadership abilities to the best advantage? Is your chapter exerting an influence for good in your community? Are your officers carefully selected? Are your members gradually taking their places in adult civic and farm organizations? In order to develop these essential leadership qualities, we would do well to carefully consider these lines from Edgar A. Guest and to apply them to ourselves:

"You are the fellow who has to decide
Whether you'll do it or toss it aside
You are the fellow who makes up your mind
Whether you'll lead or linger behind.
Whether you'll try for a goal that is far
Or be content to stay where you are.
Take it or leave it, here's something to do
Just think it over—it's all up to you."

Next to leadership on the FFA Foundation is the important stone bearing in bold letters the inscription "cooperation." Because of their close relationship, they were so placed. Their position adds strength to the entire FFA organizational structure. Most of us are aware that cooperation means to act jointly with others—working together for a common good and that it also involves the principle of the greatest good to the greatest number.

Individualism is a traditional characteristic of the American people and especially the American farmer. It is a heritage which must be preserved. But in the dawning of that new day when all farmers are well trained for their vocation, it appears that they will surely have to learn to practice that individualism within a framework of cooperation. Farmers who plan to get the most out of a farm business must be sound financial managers, wise buyers of things they need, efficient in growing crops and raising livestock, and capable salesmen in marketing satisfactorily the products of their toil. Farmers work hard, giving close attention to skill and production details, but if along with it they do a poor job of buying and selling, much of their labor will be lost. This may be either because they pay too much for what they have to buy or because they secure too little for what they must sell or it may be both.

It is encouraging to note the increasing number of FFA chapters cooperating in operation in all parts of the United States. Through these subsidiaries, developed as a part of a definite program of work, we members are receiving invaluable, firsthand experience and training. They also contribute to a better home and community life.

The third primary aim of FFA is citizenship. To become a good citizen should be the sincere desire of every American youth. Citizenship does not fall upon us as a magic cloak. It is more than merely attaining an age designated by law in order to enjoy specified rights and privileges. In reality, good citizenship is the result of growth and development in body, mind, and spirit extending from the earliest days of home training on to the end of life.

Within comparatively few years, farm families have been brought closer together than ever before. We are aware of the many inventions and improvements that have made this possible. We are certain that the automobile, good roads, the telephone, electricity, the radio, and television have played important roles in this change. Being brought closer together, farm communities are in a position to acomplish more as a unit. With more emphasis on citizenship and the development of a better community spirit, many splendid things can be accomplished in the future.

By carrying out our program of work, FFA members are contributing materially to the upbuilding of their respective communities all over the country. FFA experience is practical training in citizenship of the highest order. It is more than mere study about the subject in school because there is actual participation all along the line in doing something about some of the community problems.

Many of the changes brought about in localities where FFA chapters operate are far beyond what might be expected of just any group of farm boys. The long lists of activities include items contributing to the educational, recreational, social, and religious life as well as to the safety and economic betterment in the community of which the school and chapter are a part. Through FFA experience, useful farmer citizens are being developed.

You can readily see why these qualities are so important and why the development of agricultural leadership, cooperation, and citizenship is the primary aim of the FFA. As future farmers of today, we must endeavor to develop these qualities so that, as the farmers of tomorrow, we shall be better able to live and deal with other men and so that the American farmer will be better able to take his rightful place in the economy of our Nation. It is my sincere belief that membership and purposeful participation in the FFA often means the first step toward becoming a farm specialist.

As we peer into the dim and nebulous future of a space age, we have good reason to set worthy goals and aim high to reach them. Just as the hunter does when he aims at a distant target. We must not let our aim fall short or fail to shoot far enough ahead. We must look up and ahead and aim high at distant targets.

Amendment to Postal Regulations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 6, 1959

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced an amendment to the Postal Regulations which will affect thousands of clerks and distributors in the U.S. Post Office. This amendment would reduce the minimum passing grade for scheme examinations of postal field service employees to 90 percent. The Post Office Department last year issued a directive on case examinations for post office clerks advancing the requirements from 95 percent correct to a new requirement of 97 percent.

This decision by the Post Office Department has created an unbearable situation among the thousands of hard working and loyal postal employees who are trying to do a good job for our Government, for the people they serve, and for the Post Office Department itself.

It is inconceivable to me that these new requirements of 97 percent efficiency, so to speak, would be required of any human being. Many of the clerks who have to score this very high percentage have told me in private conversations that this new directive is virtually cruel and inhuman.

The Chicago Post Office Clerks Union No. 1 has recently adopted a resolution protesting these new standards because they allow virtually no room for error and because they follow on the heels of previous directives which have already tightened scheme examinations. There is no question in my mind that we in Congress are greatly concerned with maintaining peak efficiency among all of those who would serve the public. I believe that the Post Office Department is trying to do a sincere job in its effort to serve the public, but I believe just as strongly that this particular new requirement tries to exact from human beings efficiency which no industry would require, even from its most carefully designed machines.

This new directive, with its very stringent requirements, creates a climate of such unbearable fear that I think the efficiency and morale of our underpaid postal workers is seriously impaired, and I suggest that, well meaning as this directive may be, it is defeating the very purpose for which it was created.

I hope that the Congress will act very swiftly in approving my proposal so that we can again restore the dedicated workers of our postal system to a more sound and logical position. This, I am certain, can be accomplished by requiring a minimum passing grade for scheme examinations of postal employees to 90 percent.

I have always been very much impressed with the great pride which the overwhelming majority of postal employees demonstrate toward their work. There are few, if any, postal employees who fail to recognize the profound responsibility which their respective assignments call for. I cannot help but feel that if this new rigid standard calling for virtually 100 percent efficiency is permitted to remain in the postal regulations, thousands of dedicated employees, many of them with long years of loyal service to the Government, would have to be discharged for failing to meet these exacting standards, seldom, if ever, required in private industry. It is my understanding that many field service employees are already faced with dismissal because they have failed to score a 97 percent performance on their scheme examinations.

Resolution Adopted at Annual Observance of Polish Constitution Day, Buffalo, N.Y., May 3, 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 6, 1959

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following resolution which was unanimously adopted at the annual observance commemorating the adoption of the Polish Constitution of the 3d of May, held at the Polish Union Hall, 761 Fillmore Avenue, in the city of Buffalo, N.Y., on May 3, 1959:

Whereas the year 1959 marks the 168th anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791, which documented for all time the respect of the Polish

people for the dignity of the individual and their lofty aspirations for freedom; and

Whereas today the ideals and the objectives of the Polish people the world over are to restore freedom to their brethren in Poland and to free them from the subjugation and influences of the forces of communism; and

Whereas at the current and forthcoming conferences on the Berlin problem, attempts are being made to bring about a revision of Poland's western boundaries on the Oder and Niese Rivers, under the ostensible design of strengthening Germany as a buffer state between the zone of Russian influence and the West; and

Whereas these lands recently acquired by Poland have traditionally been in the past Polish lands except for periods of German expansion in its "drang nach osten"; and

Whereas we feel that a lack of a positive and affirmative position of our American State Department in support of retention of Poland's western boundary at the Oder and Niese Rivers places the people of Poland in the untenable position of reliance upon the Soviets as the sole guarantor of its western boundary, thus stifling the spirit and determination of those people in the direction of further independence from the influence of communism; and

Whereas Poland is in grave need of economic aid to return its economy to a sound financial position and to reduce its reliance on Communist Russia; and

Whereas John Foster Dulles, as Secretary of State, has guided the destiny of our Nation and sponsored the cause of peace in the world, and is now forced by reasons of health to terminate his great endeavors for humanity and all nations: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That as Americans dedicated to the cause of freedom in all nations, we feel dutybound in the name of justice, equity, and international morality to take a firm stand in the defense and maintenance of the territorial integrity and lawful rights of our ally, the Republic of Poland; and be it further

Resolved, That we support the efforts of the Polish-American Congress in its appeal to President Dwight D. Eisenhower and our State Department for a pronouncement of a favorable position of American diplomacy regarding maintenance of Poland's western boundary on the Oder and Niese Rivers; that a firm position of our State Department in this respect will indicate leadership of the United States of America in the forum of world opinion and will tend to curb the present unrest and uncertainty in Central Europe; and be it further

Resolved, That we commend John Foster Dulles, our former Secretary of State, for his untiring efforts toward a just peace in the world and for his condemnation of the double standard of Communist Russia in the United Nations, which position of said nation strikes at the very foundation of man's promising effort to abolish resort to force and replace it by the processes of justice and law; and be it further

Resolved, That we appeal to our President, Dwight D. Eisenhower, and our Representatives in Congress to take a favorable stand on proposed loans to be extended to Poland in order to bring a firmer economy in that nation and to encourage the people of Poland in the direction of greater independence from the influence and reliance upon Soviet Russia; and be it further

Resolved, That we commend our President, Dwight D. Eisenhower, on the firm and courageous stand that the United States of America has taken in the current Berlin crisis; and we petition and appeal to him to continue all necessary military preparedness on land, on the sea and in the air to keep our land strong and able to properly defend our homes and our loved ones against any totalitarian aggression from without; and be it further

Resolved, That we, as loyal citizens of the United States of America, hereby pledge our loyalty and allegiance to our great and beloved country; and be it finally

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President, Dwight D. Eisenhower; the Secretary of State, Christian A. Herter; the former Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles; our New York State Senators, Hon. Jacob Javits and Hon. Kenneth Keating; our Representatives in Congress, Hon. Thaddeus Dulski, Hon. John Pillion, and Hon. William E. Miller.

Law and the New Horizons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. HEALEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 6, 1959

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to insert in the RECORD a speech delivered by the Honorable Sidney A. Fine, justice of the New York State Supreme Court, and my predecessor as U.S. Representative for New York's 22d Congressional District. Judge Fine's excellent address, which was delivered at a luncheon of the Service Clubs of the Bronx on Law Day, May 1, 1959, is as follows:

LAW AND THE NEW HORIZONS

On January 6, 1959, President Eisenhower issued a proclamation designating today, Friday, May 1, as Law Day, U.S.A.

The largest national association of lawyers in America, the American Bar Association, inaugurated the idea and has actively sponsored and promoted it. Their intent in establishing this observance is:

First, to strengthen the Nation's dedication to the rule of law as the foundation of our free society; and second, to freshen every American citizen's awareness of the rights and privileges he enjoys by reason of our system of laws and courts.

Our Founding Fathers rightly said, "We hold these truths to be self-evident; that all men are created equal." In that word "equal," the Founders of our country implied the meaning embodied in the motto which adorns our Supreme Court, "Equal justice under law."

We see then that our equality is founded in and through the law as a legal concept. What is this thing called law? What does it do for us?

So long as man exists as both an individual and a member of a social complex, there will be divergencies between his individual and his social needs and responsibilities. These differences stem from variations in personality, in abilities, in possessions. Left to ourselves, these differences could cause endless clashes, resulting in chaos. These differences could make the future even more unpredictable than it is.

The law steps in at this point, not to pretend the differences do not exist, but to cushion the inevitable collisions which they evoke. It both protects us in the development of our own individuality and assures stability in the social order—protecting children by conferring the legal status of marriage on their parents; protecting our households by making unlawful certain rapacious types of acquisition; protecting our right to advance in life by giving legal existence to educational institutions; protecting the gains our labor has brought us by defining property rights; protecting our participation in the political life of our Nation by defining and safeguarding our right to vote, and finally assuring us that even after death those who follow after us will share in the patrimony of worldly goods, national culture, and political traditions we leave behind us.

These ends are only accomplished by means of fixed legal institutions. These legal institutions in our country are threefold. They are the bar, the courts, and the laws.

The courts are forums in which, through procedures going back now nearly a thousand years to the commencement of the English common law, justice is made manifest. Their high duty to the body politic demands the reverence which we pay them. In the United States of America, due to our Federal structure, there the two complete sets of courts: State and Federal. Each operates in the same geographical territory, but the jurisdiction of the Federal court is restricted by the terms of the U.S. Constitution. At the apex of this system, the ultimate arbiter of our constitutional rights, as you know, is the Supreme Court of the United States.

A review of its decisions shows that in each instance the Supreme Court, even in the face of unpopularity in some quarters, has protected either the substantive or the procedural right of some person. Not to accord him these protections, not to grant him every safeguard of individual liberty written into the law after so many difficult but glorious centuries of endeavor and attainment, would be to tear down the very fabric of the law which protects us all.

What is this fabric of the law which we revere? In America it is the great traditions of the English common law, setting up marriage rights, property rights, rights to reimbursement for personal injuries, and the safeguards, for both the guilty and the innocent, of the precise definitions and procedures of the criminal law. Many of these protections have been placed in the Constitution of the United States, a document of strength and limitation; strength for the Nation, for it gives organic body to all our cherished beliefs. If it fails, our Nation fails. And it is a limitation on the power of government to interfere with the inalienable rights of man. It is a document of incomparable value in the heritage of liberty. These are the legal truisms of today. What of tomorrow?

Chief Justice Warren has said: "The history of law is as old as human nature. By the same token, its proper scope is the world. In fact there is no tribe on the face of the earth however primitive, and no nation, however tyrannical, that is without some customary or formal code of crime and punishment. The problem of law in the next 25 years, therefore, is not so much to introduce law anywhere as it is to improve, strengthen, and civilize law everywhere. Especially must we broaden the scope of that youngest and most fragile of legal systems, the law of nations."

What problems have we to face in this new age? The closer interconnection of nations, due to increasing swiftness of transportation, has placed a twofold responsibility on our shoulders; first, to accommodate our present law to any new types of liability that may arise; and, secondly, to refine and modernize our law, taking away the medieval trappings, serviceable to an insular and isolated mind, and having reached the bedrock of rights to make them comprehensible to people once far distant from us but now neighbors of but several hours' journey. Other advances of modern life require reconsideration. Atomic energy has its peaceful and its warlike uses. How shall we promote the one and control the other? The vast interstellar spaces around us will soon be peopled in the truest sense of the word. What legal problems of

discovery rights, control, and ownership will arise? How shall we step forward now to meet these challenges?

Our objective in conforming our own law to the new era, and in making more articulate the fragile character of the present law of nations will be, as has been said, to keep the rules of law in harmony with the enlightened sense of the nation. Then we shall have strength; then we shall have the true basis of peace; and as the Psalmist once sang: "Justice and peace will greet each other." The human heart, hungry for peace and justice, has no greater desire.

In Moscow today May Day is being observed. There, people are obliged to parade before dictators who rule them by whim and caprice as distinguished from our Government founded on laws and established principles. The dictators often put on spectacular displays to impress the hearers with their might and power. As a contrast to these, we are assembled here in unspectacular proceedings dedicated to moral principles, to the rights of man embodied in the Magna Carta, the Bill of Rights, the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution. Pomp and splendor can never be an adequate substitute for truth and for freedom in serving the people.

It is fitting that on this occasion we note with pride the accomplishments of our legal representatives who, working in harmony with those of Russia, England, and France, brought to justice the German war criminals. To have a trial satisfactory to Russia, England, France, and the United States was not an easy task. Procedure in each country was different from that of other countries. Differences arose that might have completely thwarted the trial of the criminals involved, but intelligence, patience, understanding, and learning on the part of great lawyers and great jurists of the world powers involved overcame all obstacles and justice ultimately triumphed.

Through negotiations between the United Kingdom, the Soviet Union, France, and the United States, the agreement of London signed on August 8, 1945, adopting a charter for an International Military Tribunal, the legal profession established the groundwork for the Nuremberg trial, which was an accomplishment without precedent or equal. The charter of the International Military Tribunal condemned wars of aggression, mistreatment of civilians, crime against humanity—murder, extermination, enslavement, deportation and other inhumane acts committed against any civilian population before or during war; or persecution on political, racial, or religious grounds in execution of or in connection with any crime within the jurisdiction of the tribunal, whether or not in violation of domestic law of the country where perpetrated. This is now international law accepted by the world powers.

Now, if the lawyers of the four countries involved can work side by side in solving this world problem, then there is great hope that lawyers using the same skill, understanding, and intelligence can persevere and ultimately save the world from a conflict involving the use of destructive nuclear weapons. Fair and logical reasoning and understanding must and shall supersede nuclear weapons.

When the time for decision arrives, I am personally convinced that lawyers and judges should make decisions affecting mankind and not ambitious dictators or power-hungry military men.

The world must survive in law and order or perish in stupidity and greed. Only the future can tell which course will be pursued. In America the choice is clear and unequivocal. May God give the other nations comparable wisdom!

If the pen is still mightier than the sword, then in this dangerous jet age of nuclear weapons which can kill or maim a million people immediately and affect genetically generations yet unborn, it becomes even more important to see that the pen is wielded by capable hands. It is not a pleasant thing to contemplate that future generations will pay for our present inability to avoid armed conflict in settling our differences with other people who share this earth with us.

The Nuremberg trial established the principle that the extermination and enslavement of civilian populations are international crimes and that individuals can be prosecuted and punished for such crimes. Mr. Justice Cardozo once said: "The power of precedent is the power of the beaten path," and the precedent has now been established in this jet age by these courageous, learned, and devoted men of the legal profession. Furthermore, this same case established the precedent that Russia, England, France, and the United States can work together in peace and harmony in applying sound legal principles.

It seems almost inevitable to conclude that the future of the world will be decided either by the bullets of regimented soldiers or the briefs of competent lawyers. Let us be mindful that God gave His children the Ten Commandments before He gave them jet planes and nuclear weapons. Supremacy of the rule of law within nations has created freedom for man. Supremacy of the rule of law among nations can assure the survival of man. Let us hope and pray and work for the arrival of a law day for the entire world—a day when law will replace weapons in the control of the fate of humanity and man will flourish in freedom.

Credit Union Growth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 6, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the House Banking and Currency Committee will soon commence hearings on legislation to amend the Federal Credit Union Act. My bill on the subject is H.R. 3674.

In connection with this proposed legislation I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article which appeared in the American Banker of March 19, 1959:

CREDIT UNION GROWTH IN TEXAS 1947–57 EXCEEDED NATIONAL RATE OF EXPANSION

AUSTIN.—The growth of credit unions in Texas 1947–57 has been even more pronounced than their rapid development in the United States, it is pointed out in a recent issue of Texas Business News, published by the Bureau of Business Research of the University of Texas.

Credit union membership in Texas (from 100,000 to 500,000) and loans rose over 1,800 percent (from $9.4 million to $172.6 million). Number of Texas credit unions increased 300 percent to near 1,000.

The 500 percent increase in members, contrasts with a national credit union membership growth of only 300 percent. Texas' 1,800 rise in the credit union's loans compares with a national credit union loan rise of 1,000 percent and the gain of 300 percent in number of credit unions contrasts with a national percentage of increase of only 200 percent.

MORE STATE CHARTERED

While more than 60 percent of all credit unions in Texas have Federal charters, State-chartered credit unions experienced the greatest increase in number during this 10-year period the review observed. Nationally, State-chartered credit unions increased at a slower rate than those with Federal charters. The membership in Texas credit unions increased from approximately 100,000 in 1947 to more than 500,000, again, the greatest increase in Texas membership was experienced by the credit unions with State charters.

The bulk of loans made by Texas credit unions are short-term consumer loans to members, but occasionally loans are made to finance real estate purchases and other credit unions, according to the review. Of the short-term consumer loans made in recent years, consolidation of personal debts has been the most frequent reason given for borrowing on the part of members. Among the more specific reasons for borrowing, automobile purchases stands out as the most important in all but the smallest-size credit unions. Lack of capital among the smaller and newer credit unions is perhaps the principal deterrent to making automobile loans, it observes.

Even though there has been an upward trend in loans to finance purchases of consumer durables in recent years, particularly of automobiles, the review says, the majority of loans made by credit unions are still relatively small in amount, ranging between $200 and $500. Most of these smaller loans are remedial loans rather than luxury loans. In most credit unions, the large loan is the exception rather than the rule.

RATES ON LOANS VERY COMPETITIVE

Discussing rates on loans, the review states:

"The fact that short-term consumer loans customarily carry a higher effective interest rate than long-term real estate loans does not imply that the rates charged by credit unions are excessive. On the contrary, the rates charged on consumer loans by most credit unions are very competitive with other consumer financial institutions, and in many cases are lower.

"The maximum rate of interest that a credit union can charge is 1 percent per month on the unpaid principal balance after each month's payment. That is the equivalent of an actual annual interest rate of 12 percent. In many credit unions, the interest rate is lower.

"For example, the University Federal Credit Union of Austin, charges three-quarters percent per month on the unpaid balance to finance a new car, which is the equivalent of an actual annual rate of 9 percent. This should be compared to a stated annual rate of 6 percent levied on the original balance for the whole credit period as charged by many other financial institutions. This is equivalent to about 12 percent on an actual annual interest rate basis. Most credit unions also provide, without charge to the borrower, credit insurance which pays off the loan balance of a borrower who dies or becomes totally and permanently disabled."

Some credit unions, it is noted, pay higher rates on savings than do saving and loan associations and banks. A few do not.

SHARE SAVINGS RISE

The largest item in the total liabilities of credit unions has usually been savings shares, the review notes. This item in the last few years has hovered around 90 percent of total liabilities in Texas credit unions. The dollar amount of shares increased from $16.2 million in 1947 to $191.3 million in 1957, an increase of nearly 1,200 percent. This compares to the national increase of about 700 percent.

Summarizing its report the review says: "In summary, credit unions over the last decade have generally been able to achieve the purpose for which they have been chartered, that is, to lend money at relatively low rates to their members and at the same

time to pay relatively liberal dividends on the savings shares of members while at the same time accumulating necessary reserves."

U.S GROWTH COMPARED

As background for the discussion of credit union growth in Texas, the "Texas Business Review" article presents data on the national role of the credit union. "The credit union today is one of the most rapidly growing financial institutions in the United States," the review remarks. "In the 10-year period ending December 31, 1957, the total assets of all credit unions increased from $600 million to more than $4 billion, a rise of nearly 700 percent. In the same period, total assets of savings and loan associations increased only 412 percent, while assets of mutual savings banks and commercial banks rose 178 percent and 143 percent, respectively. (See tables).

"In comparing the amount of savings of individuals in selected types of financial institutions in the United States, the proportion of savings in credit unions at the end of 1957 is admittedly quite small (2.7 percent).

"However, if the trend in the proportion of savings held by commercial banks, savings and loan associations, mutual savings banks, and credit unions continues in the next 10 years as it has in the past 10 years, the proportion of savings held by credit unions should approximate 9 percent at the end of 1967.

"It should be noted, however, that many factors affect the growth of financial institutions, and there is no guarantee that the same rate of growth will continue.

The total assets of all credit unions in Texas increased from $18.0 million in 1947 to $215.7 million in 1957, an increase of nearly 1,200 percent. The national increase was only 700 percent. Again the greatest increase in Texas credit union assets was realized by the State-chartered organizations.

"Credit unions are chartered as mutual nonprofit institutions by both Federal and State governments. About half of the approximately 18,000 credit unions in the United States are chartered and supervised by the various States, and the other half obtain Federal charters and are supervised by the Bureau of Federal Credit Unions of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

"Legislation permitting the Federal chartering of credit unions was first passed by Congress in 1934. The legislature of Massachusetts, in 1909, is credited with enacting the first State law permitting the State chartering of credit unions. The legislature of Texas passed its credit union law in 1913. Currently, the chartering and supervision of State-chartered credit unions in Texas are the responsibility of the Department of Banking of the State of Texas.

Selected data on credit unions in Texas

[Dollar amounts in millions of dollars]

	Number of credit unions	Number of members	Total assets	Shares	Loans outstanding
Federal charter:					
1947	245	73,200	[1] $12.4	$11.4	[1] $6.4
1957	641	355,708	$137.2	$121.8	$106.2
% increase	262	486	1,105	1,070	1,659
State charter:					
1947	[1] 88	26,204	$5.6	$4.8	$3.0
1957	388	186,795	$78.5	$69.5	$66.4
% increase	441	713	1,398	1,440	2,227
All credit unions:					
1947	333	99,404	$18.0	$16.2	$9.4
1957	1,029	542,503	$215.7	$191.3	$172.6
% increase	309	546	1,196	1,180	1,839

[1] Estimated.

Sources: Annual reports on operations of Federal credit unions, Texas State Department of Banking, Monthly Labor Review, and CUNA's 1958 Credit Union Yearbook.

Growth in total assets of selected financial institutions in the United States

[In millions of dollars]

	1947	1957	Percent increase
Credit unions	$591	$4,094	693
Savings and loan associations	11,687	48,200	412
Mutual savings banks	19,714	35,168	178
Commercial banks	155,377	222,696	143

Sources: Federal Reserve Bulletin, 1958 Savings and Loan Fact Book, annual reports on operations of Federal credit unions, Texas State Department of Banking, Monthly Labor Review, and CUNA's 1958 Credit Union Yearbook.

Savings of individuals in selected types of financial institutions in the United States

[Dollar amounts in billions of dollars]

	1947 savings		1957 savings	
	Dollars	Percent of total savings	Dollars	Percent of total savings
Commercial banks	34.7	55.3	53.7	41.0
Savings and loan associations	9.8	15.6	42.1	32.1
Mutual savings banks	17.7	28.2	31.7	24.2
Credit unions	.5	.8	3.5	2.7
Total	62.7	100.0	131.0	100.0

Source: Savings and Loan Fact Book.

We Send Too Much Military Aid to Countries Needing Food

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD G. WOLF

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 6, 1959

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, our military-aid program is coming under close scrutiny by this Congress—and for good reason. First of all, military aid is given to a number of authoritarian governments who use the aid to further entrench themselves in power. American military aid becomes identified in the minds of the people of these countries as a symbol of Yankee imperialism which keeps their country from having a more democratic government.

Our military aid is used to aggravate regional and local tensions, between traditional rivals. This has occurred, for example, in the Middle East and in Asia. In such instances Soviet imperialism is successful without any kind of active aid or internal subversion on their part. They are able to benefit from our blind insistence on following the old ways without looking at the results of these old ways.

Finally, our military aid, when sent to underdeveloped countries, puts an intolerable burden on the economy of the country thus stunting normal economic growth. We must come to grips with the problem of foreign aid soon or, indeed, it may be too late.

Under unanimous consent, I include an article on military aid that appeared in the Cedar Rapids Gazette on April 25, by the distinguished columnist, Marquis Childs:

WE SEND TOO MUCH MILITARY AID

(By Marquis Childs)

WASHINGTON.—In the House of Representatives, which often suffers from a sense of neglect as attention centers on the Senate, Representative CHESTER BOWLES, of Connecticut, is demonstrating that you do not have to surrender your identity in that large and closely disciplined body.

He has made a series of speeches dealing with the principal problems of the day that have been full of constructive criticism and even some ideas on how to approach those problems. His latest—on foreign aid—takes the responsible view that Democrats must support the President's full request for $3.9 billion. But they also have an obligation try to bring about some major changes in that program.

Above all, what BOWLES said about the need to examine the military side of the aid program comes at a moment when there are growing doubts of the wisdom of so much stress on military help. Too often when military hardware—much of it obsolete—is sent to underdeveloped countries it puts an intolerable burden on the economy of the country and entrenches a military caste eager to get more tanks and planes.

The simple answer of the American military to this criticism is that these countries demand squadrons of jets for prestige value. If the United States does not provide them someone else will. That answer begs the question that BOWLES and others put as to the added burden imposed on countries barely staggering along under a load of poverty, disease, and ignorance.

APPLIES TO LATIN AMERICA

This applies with particular force to Latin America where the prestige value of planes and tanks is carried on the back of a peasantry that is often hungry. Dictators and their rivals are inspired to all kinds of intrigue by these same prestige symbols.

The International Bank has figures showing the extent to which military spending absorbs public revenue in countries south of the border where poverty is a constant invitation to revolt and Communist subversion. An ever-larger share of the national budget goes to sustain a military apparatus that gladdens the hearts of the colonels but has little or no real worth in the age of nuclear war.

Nearly 20 percent of Haiti's budget goes to the military, including the islandwide police force. The percentage of Brazil is 29, for Chile 24, for Paraguay 28, Peru 20, Colombia 21, and Honduras 18. In some instances the cost of a constabulary is included.

A recent visitor to Haiti called on President Francois Duvalier to discuss the urgency of Haiti's problems as inflation and hunger stalk the land. The visitor was astonished to have Duvalier say that one of his urgent needs was for more modern fighter planes. This seemed to an outside observer the very last thing that would contribute to economic recovery and political stability.

The problem in Haiti, as in other areas in Latin Amreica, is internal security. For this purpose a half dozen helicopters properly manned would be more effective than any number of squadrons of jet fighter planes. The poverty and illiteracy that are the root cause of insecurity—the breeding ground of communism—cannot be solved with fighter planes.

OPPORTUNITY IN CUBA

Cuba is an example of a country that under Batista distatorship bristled with guns. In his many talks in Washington Fidel Castro gave evidence of wanting to build the economy of his country on a sound basis with a rising living standard. Especially in his 2½-hour conversation with Vice President NIXON,

who talked to him like a friendly Dutch uncle, Castro stressed his plans for land reform and more industry.

There is an opportunity in Cuba if, as NIXON stressed, Castro will recognize the seriousness of current Communist infiltration and if he wil shut down on the revolutionary groups threatening other Caribbean nations. It is an opportunity to help build strength on a broad popular basis.

That same opoprtunity exists, as CHESTER BOWLES pointed out, in every underdeveloped country. To build up an almost useless military apparatus is to risk the waste of the little economic help that does go in.

Readjustment Assistance to Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD G. WOLF
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 6, 1959

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, today I had the opportunity to appear before Yarborough Subcommittee on Veteran's Assistance in support of Senator YARBOROUGH's bill S. 1138. This bill provides for readjustment assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces between January 31, 1955, to July 1, 1963.

I am so impressed with the need for such legislation, and the worth of this bill, that I am introducing my own bill today.

Under unanimous consent, I am placing into the RECORD my support of S. 1138:

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity to appear before this subcommittee today to urge you to act favorably on S. 1138.

I have a special interest in such a bill for, I dare say, if the granddaddy of this bill had not ben signed into law by President Roosevelt back in 1944, I would not have had a chance to go to college. I would not have been able to participate to my fullest abilities as a ciitzen. I would not have become as useful a citizen as I think I have become.

Now, multiply my case by 7,800,000 or over 51 percent of those attended schools of all kinds from the period of 1944 to 1956. The bill turned out 440,000 engineers, 43,000 doctors, 23,000 nurses, 113,000 scientists, 237,000 teachers, 42,000 machinists, and 36,000 ministers. I am sure that over 50 percent of these people would never have gone back to school if it were not for the GI bill.

America would have been a cultural and scientific desert without that bill. America could well have ben a place where bitter young veterans with no opportunity offered to them by the society would have formed and joined violent and totalitarian groups to vent their embittered feelings against our democratic society.

America within 10 years after the Second World War would have become a second-rate power because we would not have had the necessary educated manpower to go forward in every field of scientific, cultural, and business endeavor.

Let me give you a particular individual example of the kind of person this program has helped and, consequently, how the society was helped. Floyd Gould came home after 3 years overseas with no idea of what he wanted to do. He took a menial job in a laundry, then switched to selling soap. He tried, then quit, a typing course on the GI bill.

By 1948, disgusted, he went to the VA for vocational counseling. When the tests showed he had an outstanding IQ and a natural tendency for sciences, he was enrolled in college as a GI physics student.

Now, 8 years later, exlaundryman Floyd Gould has three degrees, including a doctor of philosophy degree. Dr. Gould is now an atomic physicist at the Brook Haven National Laboratory.

Many of you will remember the honest fears of those who were against the GI bill. They feared that our college campuses would be taken over by the Federal Government, that the intellectual level of students would be lowered, that educational standards would be destroyed. Well, none of these things happened. The Federal Government did not take over our universities, the intellectual level of all students was improved, for the returning GI's were serious about their studies. They set a tone of importance and meaning to college education which, in the past, was not present. Their purpose was getting an education, not participating in many activities that detracted from education.

Educators generally agree, as the distinguished educator, Dr. Herold Hunt, has said, that "many veterans came to college with a deeper sense of values than those who came directly from high schools. Their seriousness brought good scholarship and a high level of achievement."

Professors themselves were forced to revise their conception of teaching and their lecture notes because of the inquiring minds of these war veterans. These students knew too much about life to be satisfied by a rehash of old lecture notes of lazy professors. This, too, was one of the important results of the GI bill and it cannot be underestimated; for the return of the GI shook out the intellectual and social cobwebs that gripped our institutions of higher learning for scores of years.

Many times, Mr. Chairman, we concentrate on those activities with which we are unsuccessful. We are pessimistic about the decisions we make and the results of many of our programs for which we vote, but this is one program which America can point to with pride and say that it was an unqualified success.

The GI bill took many of these young men, their minds half-formed, who knew only the hard discipline of the military, who know only ways of killing, and educated these men to the point where they became vitally useful human beings to themselves and society.

But somehow this program was allowed to die. Despite our pious pronouncements on education and the lift the GI bill gave to our society, and despite the fact that millions continued to serve and be drafted into the Armed Forces, the program ended. I have always felt that this was a dreadful mistake and for that reason I am going to support and introduce legislation similar to S. 1138. I would like to outline the following reasons as to why I think we should reinstitute the GI bill as it pertains to education.

Our national security requires more educational training for our citizens and a greater number of young men educated in technical and scientific skills. As Senator NEUBERGER stated in January 1956, "What better way, than to overhaul the Soviet Union in the preparation of scientists, and to assure us of the other skills our civilization must have, than to revive the program which once increased enormously the technical and cultural training of millions of young men and women?" We have been bombarded since the advent of sputnik about the need for skilled and trained personnel. What better group is there to train than that mature group of young people who have served their Nation honorably? Here is a program where qualification and service can be rewarded to the benefit of all concerned. I might also suggest, Mr. Chairman, that in Russia today any person demonstrating ability is given free education no matter how far they want to go. No question is asked in Russia what the financial position of a potential student is. They are only asked what is your ability?

We must return to the notion of equality of sacrifice when we approach the problem of service on the part of individuals for national defense. We draft people into the armed services; we send these men to far off places—from Okinawa to West Berlin to Vietnam. We ask these men to serve for 2 years. We enforce long reserve obligations; we ask from these men great sacrifices.

Yet there are others who have benefited from this cold war crisis without any sacrifice. The great corporations have made billions of dollars in profits because of Government defense expenditures. This week's issue of U.S. News & World Report dramatizes this very well. These corporations have had tax advantage after tax advantage—such as removal of the excise profits tax—without anyone seriously questioning the profit levels of these corporations. We have heaped advantage on one group in our society—the large corporations—a group that already has great advantages, and demanded great sacrifices from a group that because of age, experience, and material status are naturally in an inferior position as to the hearing they get from their Government. I submit that we must help those who are sacrificing most in this crucial period in our history. That group is the young enlistee or draftee who leaves his community, in fact, to defend the United States. Advantage must not accrue only to the powerful, but it must be given as a right to the weak in influence. This program will accomplish this for men formerly denied educational opportunities will have a chance to enjoy education, skill, and higher income.

As you can see, I do not agree with some in the administration who state that military service since January 31, 1955, has no longer been a sacrifice: To say that military service is now free from risks is a very questionable assumption. I am sure that this is not really the assumption of the Defense Department, nor do I think it is the assumption of a Congress that will spend $40 billion for defense this year. With treaty obligations and military personnel throughout the world who may be involved in military crisis at any time and any day, I am sure that no one can say that safety is to be found in the military service. Let me conclude my remarks by listing some of the following achievements which will result from passage of the Yarborough bill:

1. The Nation will be able to repay those who sacrifice the most in a way which will be beneficial to both the indvidual and the society.

2. The defense of our Nation will be strengthened because this bill would provide training for potential scientists, engineers, technicians, and other professional people thus raising the technical and skilled levels in America up to or surpassing the ratio of such personnel now enjoyed only by Russia.

3. Those who benefit under this program will not only aid the society because of their increased educational training, but will materially aid the coffers of the Treasury. For example, the costs of all aspects of the GI bill was $14½ billion, yet this entire amount will be repaid in full through extra income tax that these veterans pay as a result of their educational training. One Veterans' Administration spokesman has stated that because of the extra educational training veterans pay a billion dollars a year more than they ordinarily would have paid. By 1968, the old program will be paid off in full.

and after that the return is pure profit. Hence, we can say that the GI bill is a smart business investment.

4. Enlistments in the military service will increase. Many bright young men in lower economic brackets would enter the military service if they were shown that the Government intended to help them later on in getting an education. We know from past experience that incentives aid enlistment—and this bill will be a truly appealing incentive. Passage of this bill will show our young men that we appreciate and recognize the great service they are doing for us.

5. Finally, besides raising the standard of living and preparing our young people for automation by developing their technical, scientific, and educational skills and reducing the number of unskilled, we are providing for an enlightened and educated citizenry. This is a responsibility of Congress.

6. Before closing my testimony, I would like to at least mention another part of this bill which is of great importance to those of us who are concerned about the problem of the American farm.

As you are well aware, the tendency toward managerial farming and oligopoly in farming grows greater with each succeeding day.

Consequently, young men who are interested in farming do not feel that there is any reason for them to stay on the farm. They feel that capital is not available for them if they want to enter the life of farming on a small but scientific and efficient level. Hence, they retreat to the cities, to a life that they consider second best. On my trip to Iowa at Eastertime many farmers came by my mobile office to ask the question: Who will run our farms, young men from the farms, or great corporations? Mr. Chairman, in Iowa today only 2 percent of our farmers are under 30 years of age, while almost 50 percent are over 50 years of age.

Section 4 of title 38 of the Code will help young people stay in farming. It will assist eligible veterans in purchasing farmlands, livestock, and machinery. This is an important aspect of this program, and I hope it will be strongly supported.

In S. 1138 we are providing for a citizenry trained for freedom, dignity, and democracy. This, I submit, is our best weapon against totalitarianism—an educated and enlightened citizenry able to increase the future with increase of knowledge, understanding, and skill. And, this, I submit, was the result of the GI bill, and will be the result of the Yarborough bill.

I thank the chairman for listening so intently and again say I'm happy to support his bill by introducing my own bill which is substantially his bill.

Railroad Retirement Bill

SPEECH
OF
HON. TOBY MORRIS
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 29, 1959

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5610) to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, so as to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORRIS].

(Mr. MORRIS of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MORRIS of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I first wish to say that I have a very high regard and sincere respect for the great committee handling this bill, including of course its great chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS], but I believe that the Staggers substitute which in substance is H.R. 1012, is preferable to the committee bill, H.R. 5610, for the reason that although both bills provide for certain benefits for railroad employees and retirees, yet the committee bill would, as I view it, deprive them of certain other benefits that are protected in the Staggers amendment or substitute.

The arguments that have been made that these benefits that are retained for them in the Staggers bill will put too great a burden on the railroads I believe is not good reasoning to justify passage of the committee bill in preference to the Staggers bill.

I realize fully that the railroads are essential to the welfare of our Nation, and I certainly am willing and anxious to do every proper and reasonable thing I can as a Member of Congress to help pass legislation that will give the railroads a fair and reasonable opportunity to operate efficiently and enjoy just and fair profits, and I am perfectly willing to help pass further sound and reasonable legislation if necessary toward this end. But I do not believe that the railroads should be helped at the expense and burden of the employees and retirees alone as provided in the committee bill, but that such burden if justified should fall on all the public and not just on this comparatively small group. I therefore will vote for the Staggers amendment.

Federal Fair Trade Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 6, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the RECORD a guest editorial appearing in the Statesville, N.C., Record on March 27, 1959, reprinted from an earlier comment in the Montgomery Advertiser. This editorial, like all others, sets forth many reasons why the Federal fair trade legislation, H.R. 1253, and other similar measures, should be defeated:

A FEDERAL "FAIR TRADE" BILL

When a Federal fair trade law was first proposed by price fixers intent on plugging the gaping holes left by recent court decisions, it was considered unlikely that such a bill would pass. After all, it was aimed at the consumer, wasn't it? And Congressmen would scarcely be willing to go on record in favor of a measure which would immediately raise the prices of many things their constitutents buy.

But now the failure of the proposal seems far less certain. This because consumers aren't organized the way manufacturers and retailers are. The National Association of Retail Druggists, for example, has raised a war chest to finance lobbying for the bill. And with good reason: Many fair traded drugstore items sell for profit margins ranging from 100 to 1,000 percent.

A 1956 survey by the Government revealed that in areas where fair trade prices were enforced, consumers paid prices averaging 28 percent higher than did consumers in areas where free enterprise and supply and demand established the price.

Although the Justice Department has gone on record as being opposed to fair trade laws, along with the Departments of Commerce and Agriculture, the Federal Trade Commission, the American Farm Bureau, and the General Federation of Women's Clubs, the opposition is nowhere near as militant as the powerful fair trade lobby. And lobbies, it has been clearly demonstrated too often, can by pressure and guile overcome the wishes and interests of the public.

Doctors in a Changing World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 6, 1959

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address given by me on April 6, 1959, before the Scientific Assembly of the American Academy of General Practice, meeting at San Francisco, Calif.:

DOCTORS IN A CHANGING WORLD

(Address by WALTER H. JUDD, M.D., Member of Congress from Minnesota)

It is a great honor and privilege to appear before this group of distinguished men and women from the main body of the medical profession in this country—the general practitioners. You will understand why it is a unique personal pleasure for me to be meeting again with the profession in which I spent 19 years of my life. I enjoyed the deep and abiding satisfactions that always come from the conviction that one is being useful to persons in need.

Formerly, almost the sole reason for your attending meetings like this was to learn new techniques and procedures that would enable you to practice medicine more skillfully and successfully. You came in order to learn more about diseases and how better to diagnose them and to treat your patients.

But medical meetings have changed—because times have changed. The doctor's job is bigger than it was. The inclusion on your program of a discussion on so broad and nontechnical a subject as "Doctors in a Changing World" is striking evidence of that fact.

I

First of all, the actual practice of medicine has changed at an astonishing rate. Some time ago I read that considerably more than half of the drugs most widely used nowadays had not even been heard of only two decades ago.

The remarkable advancements in anesthesia and the wide use of vastly improved methods of preventing fluid loss and surgical shock have transformed surgery into almost a different science from that of 30, even 20 years ago.

When I look through the list of titles of papers to be read and discussed at an assembly like this, I confess that I don't even know what some of them are about.

The rapid and sweeping changes in the science of taking care of the sick have doubtless been all to the good. No question can be raised as to your professional competence and up to dateness with respect to them. I am not so sure that all doctors are as alert to the other changes that are taking place in our world—changes that can have the greatest influence on how long and how well you may be able to use with satisfaction and success the professional knowledge and skills you have worked so long and hard to acquire in the past, and will work so diligently and interestedly to improve at this scientific assembly.

II

Great changes are taking place in the economics of medical practice. The costs of good medical care continue steadily to rise. More and more lay people are paying attention to that fact and are determined to do something about it, even though they may not have too clear an idea of just what to do or how to do it.

Despite widespread opinion to the contrary, the fees of doctors have not risen as rapidly in the last two decades as have the charges of most other groups providing personal services for people. During the same period when the general level of prices, including the costs of food and clothing, has more than doubled, the fees of general practitioners have risen only 73 percent. The fees of some specialists, such as obstetricians, have risen more; while those of others, such as general surgeons, have risen less.

But other medical costs have risen more steeply than doctors' fees. Hospital costs are up sharply, partly because of the belated increase in wages paid to labor in hospitals generally; partly because of the more extensive use of drugs and of expensive laboratory, X-ray, and other specialized examinations; partly because, under the various insurance plans, there has been a marked increase in use of hospitals for diagnosis as well as for treatment.

Our very success in inventing new cures and perfecting old ones has also increased the number of years during which people need medical care. It is doctors who are responsible for giving people 20 years more to live than was the case half a century ago. If those extra 20 years could just be squeezed in somewhere between the ages of 20 and 60, wouldn't that be wonderful? Unfortunately the additional years have to be added at the end, most of them after retirement. Even if the elderly are able to work where can they get jobs? How are they to make a living? What are they to do to keep their minds and bodies active and healthy? How can they avoid increasing anxiety as they see the value of their savings, their insurance, their pensions, their social security benefits gradually shrinking becaues their own Government has not succeeded in keeping stable the value of the dollars on which they were counting to live in deserved security and serenity during their declining years?

Again, they often have more illnesses, and longer ones, in these additional decades.

All these factors and others add up to steadily increasing total costs of medical care for our people. How are the costs to be met?

There are still many who do it by the old-fashioned methods of self-reliance and thrift. They save systematically for possible illnesses, just as they save for purchases of a home, or a piece of land, or an automobile.

More of our people are doing it by private voluntary health insurance than ever before.

But there is a large, perhaps growing percentage of our population that is not making plans for the future through savings or their own insurance, partly because during the depresison a philosophy was widely promoted that it is an economic crime to save. People should spend as fast as they can everything that they earn, can borrow, or otherwise acquire. The Government will somehow provide needed medical care if and when illnesses come along.

So there is an increasing drive to have the Federal Government, under one scheme or another, take over the financing of medical care. Many people have been skillfully led to believe that Government-financed medical care will give them more and better care for less. Most doctors oppose that because they are certain most people will get less and poorer medical care for more. For one thing, under that system, the doctors are kept so busy taking care of those who need it least, or only think they need it, that the doctors are prevented from giving the best care to those who need it most.

The public has been led to believe also that they can get Government financing without Government control, and ultimately Government operation of medical care. It is naive for anyone to believe that Congress will take the people's money away from them through taxes and then allow it to be spent by anyone else without its maintaining firm control. Congress would be completely irresponsible if it did not so control—and it is not and will not be that irresponsible.

Doctors tend to concentrate on improving the quality of medical care; those who don't understand the essentials of good medical practice take high quality for granted and concentrate their attention on trying to get more equitable distribution. They don't realize that a main result of the supposedly better distribution under Government management is a deterioration of the quality of the medical care until it is hardly worth distributing more equitably.

For when the Government finances and operates medical services, three things that are essential to good care are inevitably compromised.

First, the wholly voluntary relationship between the doctor and the patient. If the relationship is not completely voluntary on the part of the patient, he is not going to have full confidence in the doctor. If it is not completely voluntary on the part of the doctor, his heart is not fully in it. Under Government management the relationship cannot be wholly voluntary. The result will be injury to the patient's interests far more than to the doctor's.

A second requirement is that there be complete privacy with no intermediary between the patient and the physician. When the doctor gets paid by the patient, the doctor works for the patient. When the doctor gets paid in part or whole by the Government, little by little he comes to work for the Government. Again, the average doctor may be better off, but not the patient.

Under Government-financed medicine, the Government becomes an intermediary in another sense. Since public money is involved, a succession of clerks has to go through the records to see if the doctor performed all the tests for which he submitted charges, or did any unnecessary tests to run up the bill. Somebody in a Government bureau has to decide whether the doctor's diagnosis and treatment, and therefore his charges, were proper. In order to do that, Government employees have to read the patient's history, and record. Many patients are not going to be too eager to tell their doctor all the personal and private details that he needs to know in order to treat them properly, if they know some bureaucrats are also going to be reading those details.

What kind of care will the patient get with both his doctor and the Government managing his case?

A third essential for good medical practice is that there be maximum incentives for the doctor to do his best work and constantly to improve himself. One such incentive is financial reward in accordance with his ability and his effort. In every profession there are some individuals who are self-starters. Regardless of financial compensation or any other considerations (except the urge to satisfy their intellectual curiosity or their consciences) they give everything they have. But such persons are probably in the minority in our profession as in others. Most people work harder and do better if they believe such effort will get them ahead financially.

Another major incentive is professional recognition and advancement. The doctor wants the respect and confidence of his patients—and he will work hard to win it. But even more to be coveted is the respect of his colleagues. The most rewarding thing that can come to any physician is to be known as a doctor's doctor. A doctor may be able to fool his patients with a high-powered personality and a smooth bedside manner; but he can't fool his colleagues. Other doctors will bring themselves or their relatives to him only if he is really good.

Both of these powerful incentives—financial reward and professional recognition and advancement—are largely killed under governmental management where promotions are made on the basis of seniority—or, as it is sometimes called in Washington, senility.

What is necessary to get ahead under the bureaucratic system? The first essential is merely to live long enough. The second is to make no enemies. And what is necessary to make no enemies? The main requirement is never to have any new ideas. For if you have a good idea, it makes your superior resentful—why didn't he think of it first? And he holds up your promotion. If it is a bad idea, that also reflects on him as your superior, and he holds up your promotion. So don't do your best to get ahead by hard work and creative effort—just conform. That is fatal in our profession as it is in every other.

All these things that as doctors we know about the essentials of good medical care, make us oppose Government financing and operation of medical services. But it is not enough for us to be right. We must tell and sell our reasons to the public far better than we have. We can't do that by just talking to each other at medical meetings. We don't need to convince each other. We have to reach the public and the politicians, not to put something over on them, but to help them understand the situation so that no one else can put something over on them.

But because we oppose this particular change in the economics of medical practice does not mean we should or can successfully oppose all change. On the contrary, we must pioneer in finding sound ways whereby better medical care can be made available for all needing it, without the disadvantages outlined above.

For while our present system of medical service gives better average medical care than any other, that does not permit us to ignore the fact that under it many of those with incomes below the average do not get adequate medical care. Sometimes it is their own fault. Perhaps they are just lazy and don't try very hard to support themselves. Or they prefer to spend their earnings on liquor or the races. Or they do not plan ahead for illness or accidents. But their needs and those of their families are, nevertheless, a responsibility that a good society must find sound ways to meet.

We medical people tend to focus our attention on the good; our present system is all right, because most people have good care. Those who would turn to Government financing focus on the bad; they would scrap the system, because some don't have good care.

It is like the old philosophical problem of the glass of water that is three-fourths full. The reformer says it is bad, because it is not completely full; he would throw out everything and start with nothing. On the other hand, we are inclined to be a little neglectful of the quarter that is empty, because we are busy with the three-quarters that is full.

But where we ought to be is between those two—neither the radical who would destroy what we have because it isn't perfect; nor the reactionary who says it's good enough, because it's at least better than anybody else has. What we ought to be is progressive-conservatives. There need be no conflict between the two.

Conserve the essentials which enabled us to get good care for the 75 percent, or whatever the percentage is, but don't stop there. Move on; progress. Don't abandon principles proved sound, but find means to apply them in changing ways to changing situations, so as to reduce steadily the part of the glass that is empty. Much headway is already being made in this direction. Witness the widespread extension of voluntary insurance systems endeavoring to achieve on a sound actuarial basis, the advantages of better distribution of medical services without deterioration of quality.

The American Medical Association is exercising constructive leadership in promoting an overall program to improve the situation for the neediest group, the elderly:

(1) More extensive and noncancellable insurance policies by private companies.

(2) Reduction by doctors of their fees to such patients. I compliment the general practitioners because more than any other group in our profession they continue to think of medical practice as a ministry rather than as just a business.

(3) Reduction of medical costs by improving nursing homes and expanding home care programs as alternatives to more expensive hospital care.

(4) Better education in health maintenance by doctors, nurses, and employees, of those approaching or already in retirement.

It is essential also that we distinguish between two kinds of Government aid. One is nonrecurring Federal grants on a matching basis to States or localities for construction of facilities. With such grants goes no continuing control. This is the Hill-Burton pattern and is helpful, not dangerous.

The other is annually recurring grants for operation of facilities, including payment of salaries. This is the kind of Government program that must be resisted, for with such subsidies goes inevitable Federal control and the loss of real independence.

To summarize this point, doctors and dentists, hospitals, and health insurance companies all exist for the benefit of the sick, not the reverse. They must take a more active lead in making better care possible for the minority in our population that does not have it, while retaining the essentials of the system which has done so well for the majority, or else action will be taken by political groups which in the long run will not be good either for the sick or for those who provide medical services.

III

This leads to a third area where we face new situations. Government itself is changing—in response to the pressures of those who want it to adopt a concept quite different from that on which our Nation was established, the Jeffersonian concept that the American system functions best when government manages least.

For what main purpose did our forefathers originally come to this country more than three centuries ago? To establish a government that would look after them? No, they came here to get a chance to provide for themselves. The system worked, but it is under assault today here and everywhere around the world.

Adhering to that philosophy of government, they built a society which released as had never been done before in any time or place, the creative capacities that are in ordinary people everywhere. There took place here the greatest outburst of creative effort, imagination, invention, energy, production, and progress that the world has ever seen. It rushed ahead to the point where today the 6 percent of the people of the world who live in these United States have created almost as much wealth and have distributed it more widely than all the other 94 percent put together.

Why did that happen? Because of some good fortune or chance? No.

Was it because we in America had some superior ability that the other 94 percent do not have? Of course not.

Was it because we had greater resources? No. Theirs in toto were and are greater than ours.

The basic reason was an economic system based primarily on the right of the individual, and on opportunity and incentive for him to get ahead.

What the world needs most from us is not our wealth, which is a result, but the secret of our wealth. Wealth comes from only one thing—production of goods and services. Therefore, what the rest of the world needs most from us is the secret of our production. How can they get their own countries on a more productive basis? Their best hope is to understand and to apply the political and economic philosophy which brought our forefathers here. Many in America need to restudy it also.

In essence, the political struggle going on today both in our own country and throughout the world, is a struggle between two philosophies of government—between those who believe in government from the top down and those who believe in government from the bottom up.

Is it better to have more power in the hands of the few? Or of the many?

One group believes that the more complex a society becomes, the more its control and management must be concentrated in an increasingly powerful central government. The other begins with the same premise and comes to the opposite conclusion: namely, the more complex a society becomes and the more difficult its problems, the more impossible it is for anyone at the seat of central government, no matter how sincere and able he or his associates may be, even to grasp all the details of the country's varied problems, let alone manage them successfully as a unit.

When confronted with a new or tough problem, one group goes to the government first; the other goes to the government last—only if and when their own efforts and all local remedies have been exhausted.

One believes a government should provide equal rewards to its citizens; the other believes the main function of a good government is to provide equal opportunities—not because it does not want the fullest possible rewards for all its citizens, but just because it does want such rewards, and believes this is the way to get them.

Which kind of government is best? The kind that does most for its citizens directly? Or the kind that makes it possible for most citizens to do most for themselves—and then assists with those who for whatever reason cannot provide the basic necessities for themselves?

One group believes that speed in solving a problem is in direct proportion to the amount of money the government provides. The other believes that the greater shortage is not money, but trained and dedicated personnel. As a Harvard medical student recently commented on this very point, "It is still not possible to get a baby in 1 month by getting nine women pregnant."

Some sincere persons, because of their preoccupation with those who are inadequate or unfortunate—and there will always be such—become so concerned about helping the unfortunate that they think this is the primary, almost the sole, function of a good society. Others, equally sincere, believe that the primary concern of a good government is not handouts for the relatively few, but solvency for the many. For only as a society provides opportunity for the many to become solvent will there long be anything with which to help the unfortunate.

Some of us believe that to work for ever-increasing Government regimentation of the lives and affairs of our people is a thoroughly reactionary policy. It is moving backward, not forward. Yet, on every hand these days those who call themselves liberals are generally the ones who are asking for the greatest amount of Government management and control.

Some of us believe that the first function of a good government is to protect the liberty of the individual citizen—not to take it away. We believe this, not because we don't care about society as a whole, but because we do care about it—and believe this is the best way to serve it.

Woodrow Wilson was a genuine political philosopher and a great student of government. In a speech in New York in 1912 he said that the history of man's struggle for liberty is the history of his struggle to hold down the powers of government. Yet many are now insisting that the way to increase liberty is on every occasion to expand the power of government, including the taking over of medical care, which would give it a direct relationship with and corresponding influence over every man, woman, and child in the land.

Doubtless Hitler was convinced he was working only for the well-being of the German people. What wonderful things he did for them. He made the trains run on time. He modernized the factories. The restrooms were clean and sanitary. The streets were clean. There were no beggars. There was no unemployment. The Germans had higher living standards than almost anyone else in Europe. He gave the people free medical care. He gave them summer vacations at public expense. He gave the women maternity benefits. Weren't those good? No, not when to get them meant loss of their freedom—and then of the benefits also.

A good government will provide a floor below which no citizen is allowed to fall in hunger, disease, ignorance, squalor. But it will not try to build a bed on which citizens can just rest without further needs to struggle.

Security is not the chief end of government; it is an essential and a useful crutch for the misfortunes of life. But if one uses a crutch unnecessarily or too long, one forgets how to walk.

I think it can be stated as a law that whenever a government does for its citizens that which they have the capacity to do for themselves, it begins to destroy both their capacity and their incentive to do for themselves. It weakens rather than strengthens the foundations of freedom and the means of genuine progress. What we need to do with our system is not to scrap it, but to believe in it and use it.

How can doctors best influence their Government's actions? On matters affecting medical services, by all odds the most potent weapon is not resolutions and floods of letters or telegrams; it is personal explanation of the issue to the Representative or Senator by his own general practitioner. You already command his confidence, or you would not be his doctor. He knows that you are not a selfish person with some ulterior motive to promote. He also knows that you know what you are talking about in this field, and he trusts you.

On the matters that affect the public as a whole, you can have greatest influence by working along with other patriotic citizens

in politics—and politics means elections. Associate yourself with the party that you think is nearest right on the most important issues, work in and through it to select and then to elect good men and women to public office at every level of government.

Don't imagine you can do much to change the views or votes of persons who were elected by those in opposition to your position. Your job is to elect to office those who already hold the same general position as you, and will work for it.

The self-styled independent cuts himself out of the most effective action he might exert. The political parties which he disdains choose the candidates whom he then has a chance to be independent of, or between—which is not much independence.

As both citizens and doctors we can develop sound ways, private and governmental to handle the mounting costs of modern medical services, if we will work.

There is one more area in which the patterns of thought and life that doctors have known are changing—the most fundamental area of all. Our basic assumptions as to the nature of man are being challenged. We must consider this change because it involves the future of every person in our land. And before we are doctors or nurses, we are citizens of this Republic.

Some years ago I heard the eminent Lebanese philosopher, Dr. Charles Malik, now President of the United Nations General Assembly, say that when the Conference on Human Rights convened in Paris after World War II, the delegates spent several months trying, in vain, to agree on what man is. For how could they declare what the rights are to which a human being is entitled until they decided what a human being is?

Our society was founded by men who wrote, "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created * * *." They believed that there is a Creator; that man is His child and therefore a part of the Creator. That is, man has in him qualities and capabilities different from those possessed by any animal; he has something of the Divine in him. He has the capacity to make moral judgments and independent decisions based on those judgments.

The philosophy and faith of the Communists deny all this. They deny that there is a Creator, that there are such things as moral laws, such things as right and wrong, good and evil; or that man is, by nature, a moral being. They insist that he is merely the smartest of the animals, the animal with the largest brain—period.

They believe, therefore, that just as their eminent physiologist, Pavlov, demonstrated that young dogs can, by consistent control of their environmental stimuli, be conditioned to make predictable, unvarying, automatic responses, so with young human beings. They believe that you and I think that we have consciences and the capacity to make moral judgments and independent decisions, only because we have been taught that we have such qualities.

Therefore, it is their mission to liberate us from our errors. To do that they must first conquer the whole world, so that they can then abolish the institution of private property. It is private property, they believe, that gives man the notion that he is a distinct individual with inalienable rights as a person. They must remove the human infant from his parents—as is being done in Red China now—before the parents can communicate to him the false ideas regarding man's nature which in their childhood they received from their parents. The state will then, by controlling the child's environment and what goes into his mind, condition the child to seek nothing for himself, to be cooperative, and to desire only to serve the masses. Because no one will then need or want anything from anyone else, policemen will not be needed. The state will wither away and the perfect society be established everywhere.

Some in the free world will fiercely object that they can't change human nature. They reply that they are not trying to change human nature; they are merely using it. After centuries of false doctrines regarding man's nature, they have discovered what it really is. To them it is like Newton's "discovery" of the law of gravity. He did not invent the law; he merely perceived and announced what it had been all along.

You and I believe that man is more than a physical and a physiological organism. We believe he has in him as an inherent part of his nature something intangible called spirit or soul. We believe this intangible is as real as the tangible and that it has very great influence on the state of his health, and on the success of our efforts to cure his diseases and relieve his suffering. Is the practice of medicine to be reduced to mechanical adjustments of physical organs, as a garage mechanic adjusts the carburetors of automobiles? Bad as we believe medical services operated by our type of government would be, what would it be like under the Communist philosophy?

We believe that to be good medical practitioners, we must treat every single one of our patients, not as just a physical mechanism with heart, lungs, and liver needing to be put back in order periodically, but as a distinct person, a whole person—body, mind, and spirit. And the unique, the most precious, the most vital thing about the human being is the human spirit.

This world conflict is not an old-fashioned struggle for control of land; it is for control of man—the mind of man, the soul of man, the whole of man. It is total conflict. No one of us has a right to ignore it. No one of us dares fail to play his full role in this conflict—as a doctor, as a citizen, as a human being.

Never did doctors face more changes—in our medical practice, in the economics by which it is to be supported, in the Government by which we seek to order well our corporate life in this Nation, and in the basic philosophy of life itself. Never did we face such a fundamental challenge to the ultimate values of life. Never did we have to think so deeply and work so hard as we shall have to in the years just ahead if we are to live in dignity and usefulness—or even to live at all.

Our generation cannot escape the call to great dedication and heroic effort, if we are to secure the blessings of liberty for ourselves and our posterity. All other blessings depend on that.

International Banker 1959 Model

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 6, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following editorial which appeared in the American Banker of April 22, 1959:

INTERNATIONAL BANKER 1959 MODEL

We used to hear a good deal about international bankers back in the 1920's and 1930's. Radio and other speakers regaled us with how these mysterious international figures, always identified as bankers, went about getting rich by fulminating wars for the purpose of selling munitions. They even were supposed to have started World War I, and to have fostered the Communist revolution in Russia.

The argument ran that if these supposed profiteers of warmaking did not exist, there would be no wars. And since they never could be identified, and personally brought to the bar of public opinion, it was impossible to prove that they did not exist.

Today we have a new kind of international banker. Peace is his work. Unlike the "warmongering international bankers" of demagogic fiction of a generation ago, they go about the world forging plowshares, as it were, not swords.

Over the weekend, these international bankers, 1959 model, were in the news again.

In far away Asia, India, and Pakistan have been at virtual bayonet points over the division of the waters of the Indus River. Its headwaters are in India, but it flows through Pakistan. Both countries need all the water they can get for irrigation purposes. In another age and time, a controversy such as this could have led to bloody warfare. The already tense situation between Pakistan and India needed only more heat to burst into a renewal of the slaughter which attended their first years of separation into two nations.

Fortunately for the peace of the Far East—and possibly of the entire world—there was hope, sometimes dim, that the practical problem of diversion of the Indus waters could be solved peacefully—a hope patiently nourished by the new style international banker, and now apparently brought to a successful consummation.

Our international banker, 1959 model, is no man of mystery working deviously. He does his work openly, though quietly. Sometimes his failures make news, as when a petulant dictator refuses to bow to the realities which must be faced in financing an Aswan Dam. Sometimes his successes are told in a few lines, which fail to underscore the fact that he has won another victory for peace.

India and Pakistan have worked out a 1-year agreement for amicable division of the Indus River flow. Hope, cautiously expressed, is that this 1-year agreement is foundation for permanent settlement of the controversy.

Mentioned in the news is that the good offices of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development aided in arriving at the agreement. For a decade its engineers, its financial experts and its exponents of internation good will of the bank have been quietly at work with their counterparts in India and Pakistan.

Time, and the facts of life of World War II, virtually have erased from memory the fiction of the bad international bankers which was part of the folk lore of a generation ago. In their place are men of peace, not war, the international bankers of our postwar world.

End of the Game

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 6, 1959

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following article appeared in the Wall Street Journal of May 5. If we cannot learn from our own experience, maybe we can learn from the experience of our sister republic, France.

One thing that the article debunks is the notion, and that is all it is, that a 5 percent expansion of the economy in a year will take care of all the problems

of inflation. France had better than a 5 percent expansion and it took care of nothing of the kind. France learned her lesson, and under the leadership of President de Gaulle is taking the necessary measures to put her house in order.

Let us hope that we, too, will put our financial house in order before it is necessary to adopt drastic and painful measures. As is well said in the article:

The point is not a balanced budget for its own sake, whatever that may mean; the point is to make a small (too small as yet) attempt at reform before we, too, face financial collapse.

The entire article follows:

END OF THE GAME

Despite America's own experience in the past 20 years, many people apparently find it difficult to regard inflation as a serious threat; either that, or they think it useless to discuss inflation because they fear nothing is going to stop it anyway.

So sometimes it is a good idea to look at the experience of others—both as to what unchecked inflation actually does and what can be done to check it—for clues to our own situation. The recent experience of France was ably summed up in a New York speech the other night by Jacques Rueff, a judge in the Court of Justice of the European Economic Community and author of the report on which the current French financial reform is based.

Without going back into the history of French inflation since World War I, Mr. Rueff remarked that from 1953 into last year the country had been enjoying an unprecedented wave of expansion which had increased domestic production at a rate of more than 5 percent a year. "But this economic prosperity was accompanied by a rapid inflation which, between January 1956 and June 1958, had been reflected in a price rise of 25 percent."

Inflation not only wrecked the fiscal structure, distorted the economy, and drained foreign exchange reserves; it had grave social and political consequences, as it customarily does. For example, Mr. Rueff noted that by the feeling of frustration it "arouses in the largest section of the population—and the one that should be best protected—inflation, far more than Marxism, gives rise to a desire for social upheaval and revolution. Almost everywhere, the number of Communists is in proportion to the pace of the inflation."

In any event, on June 1, 1958, when DeGaulle took over in France, the game was up. However popular the expansion had been, no government, whatever its aspirations or its political complexion, could any longer escape the necessity of changing the policies which had made the expansion possible. A thoroughgoing reform of the public finances was indispensable.

In his report on financial reform Mr. Rueff told the French Government: "The idea that France, alone in the world, should be characterized by a kind of congenital inability to earn her daily bread by her own labors is simply absurd. It is sufficient to state the problem to realize that the crisis in the balance of payments arises neither from the nature of things, nor from the behavior of the people, but from a particular feature of the conduct of French finances; namely, inflation. * * * To restore the equilibrium in the French balance of payments, only one effective measure exists: to suppress the inflation."

The details of the reform are complex, its essence simple; the urgent need was drastically to reduce the borrowing required to cover the deficit. This was done, along with numerous supporting moves; in Mr. Rueff's words, the reform differed from preceding attempts "by its breadth and by its systematic and coherent character." Since it is a program of austerity for government, it is arousing political opposition, but so far its economic results are encouraging. It shows that inflation can be suppressed.

There are a number of interesting points here for comparison with the U.S. note, for instance, the 5 percent a year by which the French economy had been expanding. That is the same percentage by which liberals in Congress and elsewhere insist the U.S. economy must expand. And they want it to be done by Government stimulus.

That means inflation, for that is the only way government, as distinct from private initiative, can reach such a rate. But even if the rate is temporarily achieved by inflation, the Government—in the United States no less than France—before long faces financial collapse.

It is also instructive that the French, facing ruin, had no real doubt about what had to be done. When responsible people saw the Nation had been pushed to the end, they indulged in no shilly-shallying or outright deceit, as in the case of the American liberals who try to find the causes of inflation anywhere but in inflationary Government deficits. Instead the French did something about the deficits that were the true cause.

This is the point the Eisenhower administration is trying to make in its appeal for a balanced budget next fiscal year—a proposition attacked at times with an almost insane bitterness. The point is not a balanced budget for its own sake, whatever that may mean; the point is to make a small (too small as yet) attempt at reform before we, too, face financial collapse.

Now we are not trying to say that inflation in the United States has as yet gone as far as it had in France by last June. Indeed we are saying there is no earthly reason why it should. The only reason it may undo the United States is that there are so many inflationists at work. If such lawmakers lack the commonsense to figure things out for themselves, they ought at least be able to learn something from others.

And before the American people permit any more of this dangerous playing with the Nation's financial structure, they had better take a hard look at the end of the game.

The Water Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 15, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article issued by the Agricultural Experiment Station, University of Massachusetts, at Amherst, which contains some very interesting information on the subject of water supply:

THE WATER PROBLEM

"Congress is finally showing signs of doing something about dwindling water resources.

"At least, the first step has been taken in the proposal of western Senators for a special committee to study the problem.

"The Nation now consumes about 240 billion gallons of water a day. By 1975, it will be using about 350 billion a day.

"But there are no water-resources development projects under construction, or even planned, to meet future needs.

"With the western bloc showing the way, Congress is now leaning to the belief that a broad new program by Federal, State, and private agencies is needed." (Newsweek, Feb. 23, 1959.)

THE WEST WORRIES ABOUT WATER, BUT THE NORTHEAST NEEDS IT EVEN MORE

That the West has good reason to worry about its water supply is understandable, but the Northeast—the great industrial complex of the Nation which contains half of our total population—has even more reason to be concerned, and more urgent reason to act.

The Northeast, with its huge centers of water-consuming heavy industry, its crowded metropolitan areas, and its intensely cultivated medium-sized farms producing for local consumption, must have more and more water each year—and this in the face of falling water tables and diminishing watersheds.

With a population density of 284 per square mile—6½ times the national average—the Northeast's water problem is even further aggravated by unscientific lumbering operations which weaken the moisture-holding ability of the soil.

MASSACHUSETTS WATER RESOURCES COMMISSION REPORT

The Massachusetts Water Resources Commission conducted a drought study during 1958 which pointed up the vital need for further intensive research into this increasingly serious problem. "During the course of its study, the commission held regional meetings * * * and nearly 300 municipal and water supply officials were invited to take part. * * *

"The results of the * * * study * * * bear sober and reflective reading. They should be examined carefully not only by water supply officials, but by individuals and groups seriously concerned about water in their own communities.

"Improved standards of living have resulted in a steadily increasing per capita water consumption. In the metropolitan district, for example, average daily water consumption has risen 63 percent since 1930.

"Coupled with this rapid increase in total demand has been a noticeable shift in population from urban to suburban areas.

"Of the 99 instances of municipal water shortage experienced during the period 1953–57, all but 6 reflected the inability of the communities to meet consumer demand either at the source or in the distribution system."

NEED FOR A RESEARCH CENTER

"Soil and Water Conservation Research Facility Needs in the Northeast," a report prepared by a committee authorized by the Northeastern Agricultural Experiment Station directors, has emphasized the need for establishing a Northeast Regional Research Center. Only this kind of research facility can effectively meet the serious problems arising from a rapid increase in water consumption and soil cultivation at a time when water supplies and soil erosion are becoming critical.

This report stresses that, for maximum economy and efficiency, this research center should be located on a land-grant college campus, where State, Federal, local authorities, and representatives of industry could avail themselves of the specialized facilities and research talent.

JUSTIFICATION AND COST

Research at the selected location should be expanded upon the establishment of needed facilities. This expanded laboratory would then become headquarters for investigating erosion, the watershed hydrology, runoff, and the soil management problems that need urgent attention not only in New England but throughout the related problem areas of the Northeast.

The cost of this facility would not be excessive—in the neighborhood of $2 million—and in light of the immediate need for an

interstate organization which would help the Northeast maintain its industrial and agricultural strength, and considering that this vital area pays about 40 percent of all Federal taxes (as compared with the less than 10 percent paid by western States) the cost would represent only a fair return for the strength that the remainder of the United States now draws, and will continue to draw from the Northeast.

THE UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS

In attempting to determine the proper location for a Northeast Regional Research Center, two elements must be taken into account: geographic location and potential facilities. On both these counts, the University of Massachusetts is well qualified as a site for establishment of such a research center.

The university, the fastest-growing institution of higher education in the Northeast, possesses the trained personnel in related scientific disciplines which would serve to support the staff of a soil and water research facility in a broad attack upon the problems. Its location at Amherst, on the alluvial plain of the Connecticut Valley, and its accessibility to the major geological/geographic variations, offer excellent advantages for the establishment of a soil and water research laboratory. This location also encompasses the numerous watersheds to the west and north, as well as the diverse forms of agriculture characteristic of the Northeast region. Another valuable asset is the university's proximity to the vast industrial concentration of the Northeast, where water supply problems center around manufacturing, dense population, and expanding suburbanization.

SUMMARY

1. The problem of diminishing water supplies is far more critical in the Northeast than anywhere else in the Nation.

2. The solution to the problem is urgent because this relatively small region not only supports half our Nation's population, but is also the backbone of an economy from which almost half our taxes are derived.

3. Expanded soil and water research facilities to attack the problem are of overriding importance.

4. The University of Massachusetts is extremely well equipped to form the nucleus of a greatly expanded soil and water research center. It has the basic requirements plus qualified supporting personnel. Its geographic location is eminently suited for assisting other Northeastern States with their soil and water problems because it has so many of them at its own fingertips.

Amendment of the Renegotiation Act of 1951

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 6, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on April 27, 1959, I introduced H.R. 6670 to amend the Renegotiation Act of 1951. On April 30, 1959, I presented the following statement to the House Ways and Means Committee in support of my bill:

STATEMENT OF HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER, OF NEW YORK, BEFORE THE HOUSE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE IN RE H.R. 6670, APRIL 30, 1959

Mr. Chairman, I am grateful for the opportunity you have granted me to submit to your committee my views on amendments to the Renegotiation Act of 1951. As an aid to small business, I have introduced H.R. 6670, to amend the Renegotiation Act of 1951.

As a member of the House Small Business Committee and chairman of its subcommittee on small business and Government procurement, I have had close contact with the problems and difficulties that small business has encountered under the Renegotiation Act. It is, therefore, the purpose of my bill to attempt to remedy some of these difficulties.

In the 84th Congress, the Renegotiation Act of 1951 was amended to increase the minimum amount subject to renegotiation from $500,000 to $1,000,000. With the rise in the cost of labor and material, it should definitely be increased again. It should be obvious that with the increased cost of production the beneficial effect of the $1 million exemption granted by the amendments in the 84th Congress has been nullified.

An evaluation of the most recent statistics published by the Department of Defense on procurement clearly indicates that the percentage in dollar value of procurement business going to small business is on the decline—in fact, from a figure of approximately 25 percent in 1954, it has now dwindled to approximately 16 percent. Consequently, it becomes apparent that the remaining "place in the procurement sun" for small business under the present Department of Defense policies is in the subcontracting program.

I am not asking for, and have never requested, any special subsidies for small business. All that I have asked for small business is an equal opportunity to compete for Government procurement. There is no doubt that the technical skills of small business are a necessary element in our national defense.

It is my opinion that the present operation of the Renegotiation Act of 1951 as amended is a deterrent to responsible and capable small business concerns active in defense work. In amending the Renegotiation Act of 1951, my bill proposes to provide definite assistance to small business. One of its major factors is to encourage subcontracting in Government procurement to provide incentives for small business concerns and to encourage prime contractors and upper-tier subcontractors to subcontract the maximum proportion of their contracts and subcontracts with small business concerns. In so doing and in adopting the amendments I offer, Congress again would reaffirm its long-standing policy of assuring small business concerns a fair share of contract awards for goods and services which are needed by the various Government procurement agencies.

My bill proposes that a fair profit allowance should be given as a reward to contractors who achieve economies through their small business contracting program.

It is my opinion that one of the reasons why small business concerns engaged in defense work find it increasingly difficult to continue profitable operations is because of handicaps which are embodied in our procurement system. Among some of the handicaps encountered by small business are free plants and equipment available to large prime contractors. These are encountered in military cancellations or stretchout programs where the large prime contractors have a habit of not only canceling out every possible subcontract but where they engage directly in competition with their former subcontractors. Apparently this is done by the prime contractors on the theory that for every dollar's worth of work done in their own plant they are afforded an opportunity for more favorable profits in the renegotiation allowances. This practice has occurred in many instances in the past and is not restricted to periods of stretchouts or cancellations but to periods when the large prime contractors are lacking in defense work. This shortsighted policy of the large prime contractors aided by the opportunities under the Renegotiation Act are responsible for hundreds of small manufacturing concerns either curtailing operations or going out of business entirely. The skills, ability, and initiative are completely lost when small business concerns are driven out of defense work. This elimination of small business from the defense potential narrows the buying base and the Government becomes dependent upon fewer and fewer firms. In view of the absolute necessity for the maintenance of small business in our defense effort and the narrowing down of subcontracting, it becomes ever more important that the impediments of the Renegotiation Act must be eliminated or so modified as to encourage subcontracting. The failure to do this will cause more and more independent business firms to disappear from the defense production picture.

It is the intent of my amendments to the Renegotiation Act of 1951 to remedy this evil. My amendments to the act attempt to do the following:

Section 1 declares the policy of Congress to be: (1) to encourage subcontracting in Government procurement in order to provide incentives for small and independent business concerns, (2) to encourage prime contractors and subcontractors to subcontract the maximum proportion of their contracts and subcontracts to provide the proper profit motives for small and independent business concerns, and (3) to expand the Government procurement base by providing incentives and encouragement to small and independent business concerns.

This section reaffirms the long-standing policy of Congress which assures small business a maximum proportion of the contracts for goods and services awarded by the procurement agencies of the Government

Section 2 of my bill is designed to encourage large prime contractors to attain the maximum in subcontracting to smaller concerns. By its language the section includes the Department of Defense and all other procurement agencies. The amendment in section 2 also provides that a fair profit allowance should be given as a reward to a contractor who achieves economies through a small business subcontracting program.

Section 3 increases the minimum dollar amount subject to renegotiation from $1 million to $2 million. In this connection, I would like to indicate to the committee that an examination of the records of the renegotiation board would reveal that the bulk of the dollars recaptured by the board come from the top 100 defense contracting firms and that only meager sums are recovered from the smaller defense contractors.

Section 3 also provides for exclusion of subcontracts from renegotiation of those contracts awarded to the lowest acceptable bidder as a result of competitive bidding in which three or more responsible and competitive bidders have taken part, provided that the subcontractor is not owned, controlled, affiliated with, or a subsidiary of the prime contractor.

Section 4 is designed to help the small manufacturer who caters to defense needs. There are many concerns which make standard items peculiar to industry but do not have the facilities or opportunity to create a demand in another industry or from the consuming public.

I firmly believe that the adoption of my amendments to the Renegotiation Act of 1951 as amended would widen the defense purchasing base and aid small business.

Thank you for granting me this opportunity to be heard.

The Significance of Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 6, 1959

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, in March of this year, Mr. Al S. Waxman, editor-publisher of six newspapers in the Los Angeles area, directed his editorial comment to certain points regarding "The Significance of Israel."

The editorial, which appeared in the Los Angeles Reporter, the Beverly Hills Reporter, the Pico Reporter, the Park LaBrea Reporter, the Wilshire Reporter, and the California Jewish Press, has been brought to my attention by a goodly number of my constituents urging that this timely editorial be given wide readership.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I insert the text of this editorial from the March 20 issue of the California Jewish Press:

THE EDITOR'S OPINIONS
(By Al S. Waxman)
THE SIGNIFICANCE OF ISRAEL

Outside of the United States of America there is probably only one other nation which has nerve centers in every corner of the globe and in every nation of the world. This contemporary of the United States of America is the State of Israel.

Only in its 10th year, the State of Israel has made an international name for itself by having fought its way to freedom, worked its way to success, used diplomacy to gain position, succeeded to gain stature.

There are Jews in every corner of the world, in every nation, in all walks of life. Through the centuries the Jew has been caricatured as a shrewd, cunning person who doesn't work with his hands to achieve his successes. We have seen that the State of Israel belies this.

Jews, almost wholly and totally, have taken barren deserts and created green valleys which produce the finest of fruits, vegetables and foods. On their greenery they have raised food-supplying cattle. In the midst of arid deserts they have produced water and have built industry. Their coastal lands have become important harbors for importing and exporting.

Most of this was done with a tool or implement in one hand and a self-protecting gun or weapon in the other. Without trying to do so they have shown the world that Jews can—and do—toil in the sun with their hands. Israel is a living example that the Jew can succeed as a farmer, laborer, menial worker, artisan.

Jews throughout the world have kept their eyes on the State of Israel because it has meant much to them. To some it was a nationalistic feeling and to others it was a religious achievement. But to all Jews, whatever their national origin or citizenship, Israel means something important. For one thing, it knocks down every lie upon which Adolph Hitler built his strength and following. If the State of Israel had been in existence when Hitler began his maniacal ravings there might have been only a few willing to accept his lies. Even at that time Tel Aviv was being described as the "most modern city" in the world.

True, today there is a divided opinion among the Jews on the subject of Israel. There are the religionists who accept Israel as their Promised Land, even though they still prefer to remain living in the United States and other free countries; and there are the assimilationists who look upon the State of Israel as a very friendly nation which deserves their support—but as American citizens. Whichever group the Jewish people selects, they still recognize that the State of Israel has made a tremendous contribution to the welfare of Jews wherever they are.

Jewish people behind the Iron Curtain who have not been able to get out of there because there were no havens of refuge, now bless the soil of Israel. Thousands upon thousands of them have grasped the current opportunity to leave Soviet rule and enjoy freedom in the State of Israel.

We who enjoy freedom are contributing in every way possible for these refugees from communism to start life anew in a free country on free soil.

Not only the Jews have been affected by the birth of the State of Israel. Western powers have a feeling of comfort that there is a democracy in the Middle East which will preserve their bulwark against communism. Even some of the Arab nations surrounding Israel are happy that this tiny nation is standing in the way of Soviet threats. Yes, Israel means many things to many people.

H.R. 5778: A Bill To Require the Labeling of Decorative and Imitation Hardwood Products

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 6, 1959

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct the attention of the House to my bill H.R. 5778, which would require the labeling of decorative and imitation hardwood products. This is similar to a bill which I introduced last July, which was not acted on prior to adjournment of the 85th Congress.

This bill is for the protection of the consumer. At the present time imitation, machine-stamped veneers resembling genuine grain finishes are being applied on solid lumber, hardboard, metal, and plastics, and sold as the genuine article. The public is rarely aware of this deception—in many cases even the retailer does not know the actual composition of a wood product.

The legislation I seek would protect the legitimate hardwood and veneer manufacturers because those producing quality merchandise have been hurt by this unfair competition of second-rate, ersatz products. They do not fear the competition of the substitutes and synthetics as such, for the quality and beauty of their merchandise makes it clearly preferable. But the average person is not always aware of the imitation until it is to late and there are no labels to aid his powers of discrimination. They do not care what materials are used to manufacture furniture or television cabinets if it is properly identified and advertised.

That is not the case today when preposterious imitations and false advertising are victimizing the public and have imposed an unnecessary hardship on the industry. It could be the case in the future if we adopt H.R. 5778, which would make it unlawful to introduce or manufacture for introduction into commerce, or to invoice, sell or offer for sale any decorative hardwood products which are misbranded or falsely or deceptively advertised. It provides that all hardwood and/or imitation hardwood products must be labeled. These labels, as well as advertisements and invoices, must name the wood species actually used, and, in the case of artificial printed grains, must reveal the name of the material, such as fiberboard or plastic, actually used, and the fact that the grain is an imitation.

Authority for the establishment of proper codes, rules, and regulations and their enforcement would be vested in the Federal Trade Commission. Of course the only ones who would have anything to fear under this law would be those who are attempting to delude and deceive the public and undercut the legitimate hardwood and veneer industry.

Some of the finest veneers are made in the Seventh District of Indiana and elsewhere in the Hoosier State. It is an important industry, the leaders of which are striving earnestly to do a good job. They ask no protection from fair competition of clearly identified and correctly advertised substitute products. The protection they seek is as much in the public interest as in their own. I hope the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will favorably report this bill in the near future.

Showman Slams NAACP

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 6, 1959

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Jackson (Miss.) State Times, dated May 1, 1959:

SHOWMAN SLAMS NAACP
(By George Whittington)

The first interest being served at Poplarville is that of communism, a Negro comedian whose name became a byword 30 years ago declared here Thursday.

Stepin Fetchit, who parlayed a shuffling gait and a lazy whine into a million dollars and a name synonymous with laziness, made that declaration, adding that in any such situation, "Communist participation, Communist interest, and Communist interference might be found."

Fetchit stopped in Jackson today on his way to the gulf coast, on a booking tour for "Little Richard," noted bop-singing Negro evangelist. He went to the office of the State Sovereignty Commission, where he met the press, voluntarily lumping a barrage at both the Poplarville mob and the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

Fetchit—real name Lincoln Theodore Monroe Andrew Perry in honor of four U.S. Presidents—made his observations in com-

menting on the mob kidnaping of Negro M. C. Parker in Poplarville.

He said he sees Communist influence within the NAACP, even if the Communists don't dominate the organization—and he issued a warning to all Negroes against those who would pretend to serve their purposes through force.

"You can't destroy the rights of one person or one race without endangering the rights of all," Perry asserted. "You can't give power to one big group without having the ever-present danger of that group to use its rights against you," he said.

He added that he is flatly opposed to the program of the NAACP in the South, "although I once gave benefits in its behalf."

He said that since the time he worked in behalf of the then-fledgling organization, he is convinced its aims have changed. "I knew Walter White personally," he said, "and I don't think the NAACP today is what he wanted it to be."

As for the possible use of the NAACP by the Communists in furthering its own program, Fetchit declared, "The Communists use the organization—anybody. I've seen the influence even in the pulpit.

"And if they're using the NAACP, you can only say that the people in that organization are human."

But, he went on, he doesn't think the current program of the organization—whether Communist-inspired or not—is the right program for the South. "You can't force integration," he said. "If it came as a natural order, that would be right."

Fetchit denied sharply that his characterization of the Negro ever belittled his fellow man.

"I think I was admired by everybody, Negro and white, for what I was," he said. "I was a human being with a talent, and respected as such. I don't think I ever belittled the Negro race.

"On the other hand, as the first Negro to become famous in movies, I think I helped to lift the Negro a little higher than he was."

Fetchit said he hasn't appeared in a movie since 1950, when he made "Bend of the River" with James Stewart. And he only made that, he said, because Hollywood had begun to pick up untalented actors and casting them as Stepin Fetchit types.

He said he resented the casting of such types as much as did the NAACP in denouncing the type as such.

And just to prove that the old Stepin Fetchit isn't dead—in spite of his soon-to-be 66 years—Fetchit donned his rubber baldy cap, to make him appear bald, put on a floppy, moth-eaten felt hat, and went into a comedy routine.

It doubled his small audience with laughter.

"Laughter," he observed as it ended, "still is one of the best tonics in the world. And a humorist is the greatest ambassador any race or nation can claim."

TVA Through the Eyes of an Engineer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 6, 1959

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, the subject of electric power has been debated through the years. The Tennessee Valley Authority legislation will cause a great deal of comment. The benefits of electrification are manifest throughout the Tennessee Valley and through the adjoining areas.

The Wilson Dam is an engineering feat of which America can be proud. However, America must not be smugly complacent in its accomplishments. There is much room for improvement, especially in the field of engineering, and in today's struggle for survival, engineers must play an important role and engineers must do better.

A penetrating analysis of the problems which beset us today and a fresh approach was made by Brig. Gen. Herbert D. Vogel, U.S. Army, retired, who is presently Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority. General Vogel has held this position since September 1, 1954. He attended the University of Michigan in 1918 and 1920 and the U.S. Military Academy of West Point in 1920 and 1924. He has received advanced degrees in master of science, in civil engineering, from the University of California; doctor of engineering from Berlin Technical University and civil engineering from the University of Michigan.

His military service has been with the Corps of Engineers, U.S. Army, with the rank of second lieutenant in 1924 to brigadier general in 1954; while in the Army he served in the Southwest Pacific from 1944 to 1945 as chief of staff, Intermediate Section of Oro Bay, New Guinea; and was commanding officer of base M, Phillipines. He was Lieutenant Governor of the Panama Canal from 1950 to 1952. He has worked on several boards which include Beach Erosion, Mississippi River Commission, Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, and chairman, Arkansas-White-Red Basins Interagency Committee.

I believe that in view of the timeliness of the legislation dealing with the Tennessee Valley Authority that the remarks of the Chairman of the Board of Directors will prove illuminating, interesting, and helpful. The remarks made by Brigadier General Vogel at an all engineers dinner at the American power conference in Chicago, Ill., on April 1, 1959, follow:

When I selected the topic of my remarks this evening—"Engineers Must Do Better"—I had no idea that it would be my honor to follow at the dais so eminent a person, and so eminent an engineer, as Philip Sporn. I refer to you, Mr. Sporn, in a double context because in all my contacts with the electric industry since I have been with TVA I have found nothing but universal admiration for you, both as a person and as an engineer.

And before this audience I know it is quite unnecessary to describe in detail the pioneering you have done over the last two decades to increase efficiency and lower costs in large electric power systems. The advanced accomplishments of the American Electric Power Co., especially in the utilization of high temperatures and high pressures and in extra high voltage transmission, puts you and your company in the forefront of the industry not only in the United States but in the world. Any company that can place five of its plants among the six most efficient in the country, as your company did in 1957, is indeed worthy of all the honors that have been conferred upon you and your associates. In fact, when I say, as I am about to say, that "engineers must do better," I have in mind standards such as you have set.

I

We must look to our engineering standards, clearly and carefully, because the world in which we live and work is a puzzling complex of currents and countercurrents. The burdens which will be carried by trained engineers in the years to come will be far greater than anything we have experienced in the past. To prepare for that burden I might begin by examining our own moment of time in the perspective of history, in the atmosphere of our culture and heritage, and with the urgency of our common peril.

In these last hours of the second Christian millenium, the forces of freedom have only just arisen and with a titanic effort defeated the threat of world domination from the wracked and twisted evil of Nazi Germany. Some of the more gaping wounds of this war have been closed, the festers bandaged, the scars covered. But already a new threat has taken shape. History has scarcely been able to blink its eyes in the moments which have seen the destruction of the isolated oligarchy of Russia and the swift rise of its regimented peasantry to industrial and military power.

Since the end of the Second World War we have felt the fury of the winds of conflict as they have blown from this new quarter, swept through Eastern Europe, isolated Berlin and all but destroyed Korea and parts of southeast Asia. Through it all, the free world and the Communist world have held each other psychologically at bay, each fearful of atomic destruction from the other—a situation which Winston Churchill has poetically described as the melancholy paradox.

Yet in the midst of this relative stillness, the swirling clouds seem to have passed on. The sun shines. The winds are calm. It is as though we are centered in the eye of a hurricane. Economically we are prosperous. Our huge military expenditures prime the business pump. Profits are satisfactory and stock prices rise to record levels. Wages climb step by step, and industry is expanding. Automobiles are packed with power and designed to a fare-ye-well with knick-knacks and gadgets. We spend billions of dollars to gouge away mountains and fill in the valleys to make way for high-speed traffic. Church membership grows and their temples of beauty multiply. Life is good and Christian righteousness seems to fall like a mantle upon our people.

We only delude ourselves, however, if we believe that because we possess the most enlightened democracy known to man, it must inevitably prevail. We only fool ourselves if we argue with foggy logic that because our system of free private enterprise has summoned the industrial might to overcome every past threat to our national existence, it must inevitably do the same again. We cannot camouflage our own weaknesses with the notion that right makes might and that righteousness cannot suffer defeat. We may not, as in Judah of old, cry "peace, peace" when there is no peace.

Now, in this period of stalemate, in this ominous calm in the eye of the hurricane, we as a nation must think and act. Dreadful though the military impasse may be, it nonetheless gives us a period of preparation for the winds to come. Now is the time to attend to the essentials of our national existence. Now is the time for hard work and selfless sacrifice. Now is the time when we as engineers must take the measure of what is demanded of us in this moment of history, and respond with our utmost.

As a military engineer, one of the men I honor most is that remarkable officer whom President Monroe named in 1817 to become superintendent and father of the U.S. Military Academy at West Point—Col. Sylvanus Thayer. Founded in 1802 as a school for engineers and artillerists, West Point became

in effect the first engineering school of our Nation. But its first years were marked by disorganized effort, lack of funds, and inexperience. Following the War of 1812, which so dramatically demonstrated the country's dire need of trained military leadership, Thayer was sent to France to study the military schools which had been so effective and useful to Napoleon Bonaparte. The system of training and education which he instigated at West Point upon his return has been continued in principle for nearly a century and a half.

Sylvanus Thayer built West Point on the foundation of three cardinal tenets, and I should like to borrow these as the foundation of my message this evening. The first principle is probity. The second is education. The third is discipline.

On this base, Thayer erected the courses of training which turned out men capable of planning for the long pull or improvising in an emergency. His graduates became the professors who pioneered in formal engineering education in a score of colleges and universities in the mid-19th century. His proteges planned and executed many of the canals which laced the country in that day. They pushed the national road through the mountains from Baltimore to Vandalia, Ill. They improved the safe harboring of our oceans commerce, and laid out railroads as they crossed the plains, fighting Indians in the process. They pioneered in making scientific instruments such as the zenith telescope and in creating industries such as the famous Cold Spring foundry, opposite West Point, which produced our first locomotive and some of the most advanced ordnance of that day. For these reasons, and because of his personal imprint on other institutions of technical learning, Sylvanus Thayer has been dubbed the father of American technology, as well as the father of the Military Academy.

Probity—synonym for truth. Probity—whose content is fact, not conjecture; reality, not fantasy. Probity demands that we pursue the truth and act accordingly. It demands conviction and steadfast purpose.

When the security of the Nation is concerned, the pursuit of truth and fact becomes not only a matter of importance but a matter of urgency. In the context of these meetings of the American Power Conference, one of the most critical fields for inquiry is the field of natural resources. A check down the list of topics scheduled for discussion here shows that the distinctive purpose of this conference is to discover improved methods of converting raw energy resources into electric power. Steam turbines, fuels, water technology, nuclear power plants, computers and network analyzers, and a score of other subjects are listed in the program. Important as they are, these topics are but parts of a whole picture and it is crucial that today's engineer grasp that whole picture. Engineers have the knowledge and the skills to use our energy resources for the maximum military and economic benefit, but if they are to do so, they must combine vision with their technical talents.

Let me illustrate, using the Tennessee Valley Authority, because I know TVA best. At the Widows Creek steam plant in northeastern Alabama we are in the process of installing a new generating unit with a capacity of 500,000 kilowatts. It will stand beside generators with only one-fourth the capacity, all installed in the present decade. Its performance, however, is what interests me most. Compared with its companion generators at the same plant, this new 500-megawatt unit will turn out in a year an equivalent amount of electricity with 150,000 fewer tons of coal, resulting in a saving of about three-quarters of a million dollars. This technological advance is a tribute to the design and research work of both TVA and General Electric Corp., which is building the generator. It is conservation affecting both resources and money.

But the Widows Creek 500 unit is only a link in a whole chain of engineering achievements. Foremost, perhaps, is the development over many years by many men of the multipurpose dam, the tool which enabled man to harness the full capacities of entire river systems. TVA's 9 structures on the main stream of the Tennessee River and 22 other dams on the tributaries keep the abundant waters of the region under sustained control, providing assured supplies of cooling water for steamplants and industries, a waterway to lower the cost of transportation and flood regulation providing safety for riverbank sites. The dams themselves produce large amounts of electric power, using the same water in as many as 14 sets of turbines as it flows to its confluence with the Ohio near Paducah. Thus, the attention engineers paid to resource development more than a quarter century ago is contributing to economical electric power production today in a strategic defense region.

Between northern and southern Rhodesia, at the Kariba Gorge of the Zambezi River in south central Africa, Italian engineers have been building one of the world's great dams in one of the most primitive areas on our globe. The natives had no dread of leaving their lands to make way for the reservoir. They were laughingly confident that the white man could never tame the great Zambezi. Resettlement plans for these people were complicated by the arid surroundings, and wild animals are still being evacuated from islands formed by the rising waters. Yet the principal purpose of this dam is to supply low-cost power for industrial purposes. The main industry is copper mining, but the electricity will also serve a growing industrial area in southern Rhodesia. With power costs reduced an estimated 25 percent, economical copper production can go forward, and with increased output copper prices for consumers can be kept down. Since the United States uses over half the copper of the free world, it is plain that the Kariba Dam has something to do with the price of teakettles and turbogenerators in the United States.

This utilization of a great natural resource to reduce operating costs and consumer costs is accepted as commonsense. And if it makes sense in the primitive conditions of southern Africa, how much more applicable is the same kind of commonsense in our own complex industrialized economy. According to Roger M. Blough, chairman of the United States Steel Corp., 99 percent of all useful work in this country is performed by machines, and we must add that a great proportion of them are utterly dependent upon electricity. Before this audience, it is unnecessary to spell out the critical importance of electric power to the continued improvement of productivity in this country. I do emphasize, however, the importance of the fullest and most economical use of our natural resources to contribute to that end. Our rivers can be developed not only for power but for the prevention of floods which endanger valuable industrial sites, for the storage and sustained use of water for processing, and for low-cost transportation.

Mr. Blough, in his admirable Newcomen lecture of last December, centered in a few sentences the challenge facing America and its material and human resources. "We are only in the first skirmishes," he said, "of a worldwide battle of production that is destined, I believe, to rage for many decades to come. America's resources in this economic contest include, and must include, the use of its first team both at home and abroad. And that first team as a strong, well-equipped American industry. A moment's reflection is enough to demonstrate that whether or not America will emerge triumphant from that contest depends in large measure on the virility of American industry."

My own contact with engineers and technicians from other parts of the world who come to visit TVA and examine its facilities has dispelled any illusions I may have had as to their lack of ability to compete with us on equal terms. These men are learned in their professions, alert to their opportunities, and aware of the worldwide implications of their activities. In many fields they are beginning to regard us as a bit old-fashioned and too adherent to tried and proven methods of the past. The Italian engineers who built the Kariba Dam experienced two recordbreaking floods in the course of their work, but they achieved success nevertheless. The Germans are making remarkable advances in the design and construction of lightweight, slender steel bridges. A casual view of the great industrial complex rising from the rubble of Hamburg gives one a feeling of apprehension.

When I was a student of hydraulics in Germany 30 years ago I was fascinated by the extent to which Europeans seemed to make simple things the hard way. Their hook gages were beautiful instruments equipped with many hand-knurled knobs and adjusting devices. Both micrometers and verniers, accurately calibrated, were used to obtain accuracy beyond any practical need. On the other hand, our own hook gages were simple and utilitarian. They cost much less and served the same purpose.

Today the roles of the two continents seem to have become reversed in places and we see many points of evidence to make us wonder whether American industry is losing sight of cost control. Our automobiles, once noted for their simplicity and economy, now are world renowned for their frills and gadgetry, for their elaborate styling and their unnecessarily powerful engines. Germany, with other European nations, now is manufacturing the simplest, most economical automobiles in the world.

Trends of this sort in engineering will do little to improve the competitive capabilities of American industry in the markets of the free world. They are even less realistic in the light of the growing industrial versatility of the Soviet Union with its probable impact on world trade in the very near future. For years after World War II, when the iron curtain was tight and unyielding, we stood aside with amused skepticism when the Russians made their sweeping claims of technological progress. We set our eyes on their system of tyranny and told ourselves that science could not long survive in an atmosphere of such repression. In the democratic climate of freedom, we said, science takes root firmly, we reap an abundance of strength, and it cannot fail. We acted as though we had peace when there was no peace. The Russian sputnik rudely interrupted our dreams.

Today and in the future we are faced with an economic sputnik. Khrushchev proclaims: "We declare war upon the United States in the peaceful field of trade. The threat to the United States is not the ICBM, but in the field of peaceful production." Mikoyan declares that the aim of Soviet trade is "no longer to defend the Soviet economy but to bind others to it." Plainly, the power of Russian technology is being mobilized for the aggressive purposes of communism. We can now anticipate all the tricks of disruption to world commerce which we encountered from Hitler and his blackjack traders.

Are these boasts to be taken seriously? Dr. Neil H. Jacoby, dean of the Graduate School of Business Administration at the University of California, who has faced the Russians in international economic conferences, says emphatically, "Yes * * * all of the expert studies on Soviet economic growth

converge on the conclusion that since the second World War, the real Soviet gross national production has been growing at a rate of about 7 percent a year. This is a rate approximately twice the rate of growth in the real output of the U.S. economy since World War II."

How extensive is the Soviet penetration into world trade? She is now one of the major world exporters of machinery and equipment. The State Department reports that one of her main tactics is to move into vulnerable areas where local products are having difficulty being marketed. Iceland must sell fish. The Soviets buy it, and send oil in return. Wherever commodities are in surplus—wheat in Argentina, rice in Burma, cotton in Egypt—the Soviet bloc is moving in to trade, supplying in return goods that range from Polish coal to East German typewriters. Business Week forecasts a Russian invasion of western markets for jet and turboprop airliners. In the last year, the Soviets have been exporting aluminum and tin, stirring up problems in the free markets for those products, and its purchases of copper have affected the price of that commodity.

Particularly ominous is the Soviet economic move toward underdeveloped areas where the urge of the people for higher standards of living is one of the main ingredients of nationalism. Soviet credits to such countries now are estimated in the billions of dollars and affect at least 14 countries in Asia and the Middle East. Dr. Jacoby reports that the Soviets can offer a larger variety of goods suited to underdeveloped countries than we can. Our equipment is of advanced design, suited to our conditions, while Soviet exports such as automotive equipment, trucks, and cars, are more rugged, more easily kept in operation, and better suited to a primitive country. Moreover, the Soviets send technicians with their goods, trained not only in their expert fields but in the language of the country to which they go. And thousands of students and trainees go in return to the Soviet Union.

The challenge of world competition facing this generation of industrial managers is more complex and more fateful than any set of conditions in our history, and the role of the engineer increases in importance. He holds his traditional place as the scientist and the builder, but as management decisions require technical knowledge on an increasing scale, he must be able to move into executive positions. The engineer by training perceives the fundamental role of resources in our competitive effort. He has the insight to realize why they must be developed fully and used efficiently. His goal as a highly technical trained individual is identical with the interests of the Nation—the effective use of resources to promote a strong economy, lithe and trim, working with its sleeves rolled up.

III

America demands much of its engineers in this period. Freedom demands much. And to bring engineering performance up to these demands, engineers must think clearly about the processes of education by which this country is training its future engineering leaders. Sylvanus Thayer had as his second tenet, education, and in his methods he was far ahead of his day. A recent biographer called his curriculum "a most unusual and comprehensive blending of liberal arts and scientific education." Because the best military textbooks at that time were those of the French, the French language was given an emphasis equal to the study of mathematics. English grammar included the study of Latin and Greek authors. Geography and history took their place beside military instruction and sword exercise.

The cry is heard often in this postsputnik period that we must train more engineers. Not only are the Russians turning out more than we are but our own industries and scientific projects are feeling the shortage. The situation will become more critical as time goes on, unless we act. These are serious matters. But this evening I would rather give emphasis to another aspect of engineering education and that is what I call the development of a broad engineering personality.

It is no longer sufficient to be just a ramblin' wreck from Georgia Tech. As Sylvanus Thayer foresaw the broad demands that would be placed upon the country's military leaders, today we can predict that the demands of this period on the trained engineers will require breadth of understanding as well as intensive knowledge in a particular field. They must possess wisdom as well as knowledge, and our engineering colleges must arrange their courses to provide it.

My reasons for this emphasis are both practical and human. On the practical side, I might illustrate by citing a survey by the Esso Research & Engineering Co. not long ago in which the company asked its supervisors to ascertain what recent college graduates actually do, how they spend their time. The result showed that 60 percent of their time was devoted to collecting, correlating, calculating, and interpreting data. But 30 percent of the time was devoted to writing reports or letters. The point is that most of the information developed in an engineering occupation is used not by the engineer himself but by others. Communication is an essential part. Engineers, just as lawyers and accountants and economists, tend to develop a manner of speech which too often is understood only by themselves, erecting what someone has appropriately called a wall of esoteric jargon between themselves and the nonengineering world.

It reminds me of the New York plumber who wrote to a scientific agency in Washington that he had found hydrochloric acid fine for cleaning out drains, and did they agree. The agency wrote back, "The efficacy of hydrochloric acid is indisputable, but chlorine residue is incompatible with metallic permanence." The plumber responded, delighted that the Government seemed to agree with him. Washington became alarmed and again wrote the plumber, saying, "We cannot assume responsibility for the production of toxic and noxious residues with hydrochloric acid, and suggest you use an alternate procedure." The plumber was somewhat mystified but doubly happy to have this apparent confirmation of his discovery. He wrote back accordingly. With this, some practical person in the Bureau took the case in hand with these words: "Don't use hydrochloric acid; it eats hell out of the pipes."

Engineering, more and more, is a team proposition requiring not only clear communications but a solid knowledge of human relations. We have to fit in, and this requirement applies whether the team consists of a surveying party or an organization planning a great international enterprise. In my own field of public works, how thoroughly was I compelled to learn that the design of a dam was only the beginning of its construction. The project has to be explained and sold, over and over again, to fellow engineers, to members of Congress, to the people affected by the construction. Far more man-hours are required for the economic and financial aspects of estimating costs and justifying expenditures, thinking through the economic results and their impact on the people of the area, and ironing out differences among people, than are required for construction itself.

When the American Society of Civil Engineers completed its recent survey of engineering education, the first point in its summary included the following: "* * * (the engineer) must * * * have an understanding of the society he lives in and of his fellow man. He must be able to envisage and plan the whole of a project in consideration of its economic structure and utility, its sociological impact, and its technical details. He must be able to present his ideas effectively and to defend them. It is essential, therefore, that he have a good understanding of the social sciences and humanities, and a facility in the arts of communication of ideas."

Demands for broad engineering education are not new, and they have raised fears in the minds of many educators that attempts to crowd the engineering curriculum will dilute the content of technical courses, resulting in a deterioration of the quality of the graduates. The American Society for Engineering Education recognized these fears in its penetrating examination of engineering education a few years ago. It called them groundless and found that 30 or more leading engineering schools had developed "carefully planned programs that provide a sound introduction to the humanities and social sciences while simultaneously reinforcing the student's engineering training."

Experimentation with curricula is essential. Much, of course, already has been done. We also must encourage men to go into graduate work; in this connection industry must watch carefully that it does not stifle the flow of men into postgraduate study by overtempting promising students with high-paying jobs. Industry can do a great deal—and I do not overlook what it is now doing—to widen the horizons of today's graduating engineers through scholarships and fellowships, and through in-service training. Some companies even provide a sabbatical year for the sole purpose of permitting their best young men to soak up the literature and history, the psychology and theology, the political science and the economics which have been bypassed in a busy life.

Basically, however, I think that engineering societies and engineering schools must recognize that the broad learning required simply cannot be obtained in 4 college years, or probably even in five. We must reach the decision that an individual cannot rightfully be called an engineer until he has partaken of the table of knowledge in the broad fields we call liberal arts and the humanities. As a man cannot be called a doctor or a lawyer or, in some denominations, a minister, without completing a general as well as a specialized curriculum, leaders in the education of engineers must recognize that the destiny of the profession involves much more than cold science and technology.

What I have been trying to build up to is the idea that engineers in the days to come will inevitably face increased demands and opportunities for leadership.

To qualify for that leadership engineers must acquire that broad base of learning which gives them a sensitive understanding of the widest range of human problems. The great books open to us the intellectual forces which have shaped the human mind. To know modern democracy, one must know something of Jefferson and Lincoln. As these many strands are woven together they produce what Dr. Ernst Weber called the maturing process of mankind. In his fine address upon his inauguration as president of Brooklyn Polytechnic Institute last year, Dr. Weber eloquently pointed out how startling it is to the nonphilosophical mind to discover "that mankind on earth is in the process of mental evolution which makes someone ready, somewhere, at some specific time to see a new relation, to discover a new experimental fact, to stumble upon a new process."

All the elements in the observation of the falling apple had been present before mankind for centuries, until Newton, in the fresh, inquisitive atmosphere stimulated by the Renaissance and the Reformation, seized

upon the principles it demonstrated and embodied them in the heritage of civilization. Thus, only among those men and women who live and work with an awareness of the cultural sweep of the centuries will we find the Newtons of future generations. Our age demands that with our works we have purpose. We must not merely run well; we must have goals. We must discern between the false and the true, between the values that are transient and those that are everlasting.

IV

The final point in Sylvanus Thayer's system of education was discipline, and in a way it was a most unexpected form of discipline. Certainly it was not entirely the dress ranks, squads right discipline usually associated with military schools, though there was plenty of drill mixed into the curriculum. Rather, it was an intellectual and moral discipline that forced his graduates to face the facts of existence. Thayer refused to accept the easy-going practices of the colleges of that day, permitting some reading, attendance at some lectures, passing a light examination, and then moving on. Thayer prescribed the bounds of his courses and determined that they should implant in the cadet a given body of knowledge. Each student had to be ready to recite every day. Examinations were tough. The unqualified were sent home.

But the severest discipline of Thayer was the self-discipline of the honor system. It may be argued that the honor system is a matter of morals, of personal integrity and honesty, and with that I agree. But it is also, basically and fundamentally, a recognition of man's necessity to find his greatest resources within himself. In battle, the regimental commander cannot look over somebody's shoulder for the answer to his problem. It must be within him. His leadership in mortal combat depends upon his intrinsic qualities. It is evidenced by that ancient adage of Army life, "You can't kid the troops." They can sense the real fibre of your being. It is one of the facts of life.

In every sense, barring actual military conflict, the United States today is in the position in which it must prove its metal. It must demonstrate once again the true fiber of its inner being. We have a fine record of past performance. We have elevated our living standards above all the world. We have established and secured a maximum of democratic freedom. We have risen in war to triumphant might. But today we stand on the threshold of a new age. We can't get by on our reputation. We must deliver the goods. We must discipline ourselves to face facts.

TVA several weeks ago became the center of a national debate because it purchased a large new turbogenerator from a British manufacturer. In spite of all the barriers against foreign imports imposed by import duties, the Buy American Act, and additional margins designed to protect employment in American industry, the bids from domestic concerns were nearly 50 percent higher than the British. The difference amounted to more than $6 million, a tidy sum. Some of the most interesting reactions to this award came from the workers of the General Electric Co. in Schenectady. Their employee newspaper carried two full pages of interviews, and I would like to quote some typical reactions:

"Our best answer to this price competition," said one, "is to cut costs and try to improve our manufacturing methods."

Another said, "Cannot we as individuals work for the same wages and produce more? Cannot we take less for our services?"

Still another said, "I think we're smart enough to beat this foreign competition if we all work together."

The emphasis of all comments, taken together, was on the need for greater selflessness, increased efficiency, and better teamwork.

These workers are realists. They know that they and their employers are up against stiff competitors and they all must call upon their utmost skill and ingenuity to meet the challenge. They are willing to face the facts. Management, under engineering leadership and guidance, can do no less.

In the years immediately upon us, American industry and enterprise must make an all-out effort to maintain world supremacy. Selflessness, efficiency and cooperation will be required of all contributing elements and all various factions.

The electric power industry in America has allowed itself for years the luxury of a running fight on the question public power versus private power. It is a wasteful issue, for it diverts the attention of the public and of our own officers from essential tasks. The prime function of the industry is to convert energy resources into usable electricity at the lowest possible cost. It is an unnecessary issue because in another atmosphere—in a climate of cooperation rather than antagonism—there is plenty for both to do.

Since my tenure in TVA I have reiterated the theme that TVA as a public power enterprise can live in America and grow in service side by side with private power systems without threat or danger either to their financial future or to the institutions of freedom. There is room in our economic system and in our philosophy of enterprise for both. Capitalism rose to greatness in the United States under a free competitive enterprise system, and the word "competitive" is as important as the word "free." The two are inseparable. Without freedom we have dictatorship. But without competition we have monopoly under which we know from experience true freedom soon fades. A vigorous competition—competition by comparison—between private and public power can be healthy for America, but each must recognize the rightful and enduring place of the other.

In the light of the task we jointly face—supplying power to improve the strength and efficiency of all America—we can impose on ourselves the self-discipline of facing facts, of attending to our basic jobs, and avoiding the diversionary squabbles that weaken and undermine our efforts.

Returning from a presidential commission studying U.S. trade policy and its effects abroad, Clarence B. Randall, president of Inland Steel Corp. and one of President Eisenhower's chief advisers on foreign economic policy, made this statement:

"The greatest roadblock of all to the creation by the United States of a foreign economic policy that bodily suits the responsibility that our country bears in the modern world is the inability of our business community to place the national interest above self-interest. Rare indeed is the company or the trade association that asks first the question of what is best for all of the people, and only secondarily what will help the marketing of a particular product. In the abstract, businessmen by an overwhelmingly majority favor the rising volume of world trade that liberalization would bring but they want it applied to some industry other than their own.

"Our foreign economic policy must be reformulated boldly to achieve two ends: One, the implementing of our program for national security, and the other, the creation of a steadily developing volume of world trade for the support of our own economy."

Mr. RANDALL's advice indicates that there is another product of American business that deserves more attention than it is getting. It is as old as business itself. Though intangible, it has a market value. It can be bought and sold. And it may be the most strategic product made in America in this period of intensified competition. It is good will.

Good will is fashioned out of the Golden Rule. It takes time to fabricate, and patience in understanding the problems and interests of others. It takes self-discipline in curbing our own self-centered instincts. Its greatest significance probably will lie in our trade with the underdeveloped areas of the globe where people emerging from primitive isolation are trying to take their place in a complex world. They are learning democracy from seeing how it works. They will learn free, competitive enterprise from its impact on their own affairs.

Move To Upset Hoover Commission Reforms Beaten

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE MEADER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 6, 1959

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Ann Arbor, Mich., News of May 2, 1959:

MOVE TO UPSET HOOVER COMMISSION REFORMS BEATEN

President Eisenhower's record of never having had a veto overridden remains unbroken and, more important, a strictly politically inspired attempt to embarrass the administration and overturn a Hoover Commission reform has been beaten back.

Those were some of the implications of a little noticed bit of action in Congress this week, climaxed when the House, by a margin of four votes, failed to override a presidential veto of a rural electrification bill. The measure would have taken authority to veto loans made to cooperatives for rural electrification service away from the Secretary of Agriculture and given it to the Rural Electrification Administration.

The issue was close. After the President vetoed the bill, the Senate mustered more than the necessary two-thirds majority necessary to override. In the House, the balloting was 280 to pass the measure despite the veto and 146 to sustain the veto. A total of 284 votes was needed for passage.

The REA formerly was an independent agency but in 1953 was brought under Agriculture Department control in line with a recommendation of the Hoover Commission on Government reform. The change was part of an attempt to bring the chaotic Federal structure of bureaus and agencies into some sort of sensemaking pattern, with clear lines of authority established.

The move to turn the clock back had its origin in an Indiana political fight, which was climaxed when an Agriculture Department official denied an REA group permission to build a powerplant, which private power companies maintained was not needed. The bill which subsequently was vetoed was a politically inspired move to "get even."

Undoubtedly, much of the support for the original measure—and for the attempt to override the veto—stemmed from Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson's unpopularity with a large segment of Congress, including some Republicans. This seemed like an excellent chance to slap Benson in the face, and there were many Congressmen who took delight in the opportunity.

Among those leading the fight against the bill was Representative GEORGE MEADER, of Ann Arbor, who based his opposistion on ad-

herence to Hoover Commission reforms. He called the proposal a step toward bringing back an unmanageable hodgepodge of sovereign autonomous bureaucracies in the Federal Government, and battled vigorously to defeat it both in committee and on the House Floor.

Although it is disturbing in a way that only a minority of Congress supported the Meader viewpoint, the victory is a welcome one nevertheless.

Unemployment Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 6, 1959

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution adopted by the Trade Union Council of the Liberal Party of New York State and which was sent to me by my good friend, William Weiss, executive member of the Brownsville-East New York Club of the Liberal Party and vice chairman for Kings County. Mr. Weiss is also a member of the Trade Union Council. The resolution was adopted at a meeting of the council attended by 400 members representing 225 local unions with an aggregate membership of half a million. The resolution stresses the concern of the members of the council with the growing problem of unemployment:

RESOLUTION OF THE TRADE UNION COUNCIL OF THE LIBERAL PARTY

The country finds itself in an economic situation that has no precedent. Business is improving, profits are rising, yet high unemployment persists, and shows signs of becoming permanent. Growing productivity and growing disemployment are moving together.

At a time that calls for bold and far-reaching action, the policies of the Eisenhower administration and the measures taken by Congress actually constitute a retreat from the serious problem with which the Nation is confronted. In New York State, the Rockefeller administration and the legislature are likewise marked by an unwillingness or inability to meet the economic realities.

The extension of the temporary unemployment insurance program for only 3 months reveals, in itself, the tragic inadequacy of our national government to cope with this blight on the country's economic health. This is especially evident when it is realized that fully one-third of the $665 million appropriated for the emergency program still lies undistributed while the jobless go hungry. Furthermore, the extension will afford even this limited assistance to less than one-tenth of the country's unemployed.

Despite all the smooth assurances from the President and his economists that the recession is over, the Trade Union Council of the Liberal Party declares that the recession will not be over until unemployment disappears, and that our country can have no full economic strength without full employment.

We call for action. We call on the National Government and on the State government to put into immediate effect such measures that will give jobs to the unemployed, such provisions that will make American families economically self-sufficient, and such long-range plans which will overcome the contradictions that plague our economic growth.

We call for the immediate institution of the 35-hour week on a national basis.

We call for the immediate establishment of a minimum wage of $1.25 per hour extended to all workers.

We call for immediate passage of a depressed areas law, seeking to abolish pockets of unemployment, as well as economically blighted areas.

We call for increased unemployment insurance benefits, extended duration periods, more reasonable eligibility requirements, and broader coverage—on both National and State levels.

We call for tax relief for low-income and middle-income families. We believe, with organized labor, there must be an increase in the income-tax exemptions.

We call for the plugging of loopholes through which large corporations and combines escape their fair tax obligations.

We call for substantial reduction of the depreciation allowances in the extractive industries.

We call for the inclusion on the Federal Reserve Board of a member representing labor.

Finally, we call for the establishment of a National Economic Council composed of labor, management, farmers, scientists, technicians, the professions and consumers, charged with planning and executing a democratic program for achieving economic security, prosperity and ever-improving standards of living.

Soil Bank Versus Social Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 6, 1959

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to call attention to an editorial which recently appeared in Wallaces Farmer concerning a ruling which classifies soil bank payments as rental income in many instances and causes some farmers to lose a portion of their social security payments. This is a ruling which should be changed. I trust that full study can be given to this quirk in the law, so that proper steps can be taken to make this change.

The editorial follows:

SOIL BANK VERSUS SOCIAL SECURITY

The most realistic program we have to bring about needed adjustments in agriculture is the conservation reserve. The whole-farm provision begun this year expanded its value and effectiveness.

The social security program could work hand in hand with the soil bank. Land retirement payments should supplement social security payments, permitting more farmers to retire at 65.

A quirk in the social security law is a stumbling block, however. It looks on soil bank payments as rental income only when the owner lives away from the farm, and has taken no part in its operation and management.

Thus, an owner-operator who wants to retire with his land loses his social security payments in all months in which he does any substantial amount of work on his farm, such as clipping weeds. In other words, his soil bank payments are considered to be wages if he looks after his retired farm.

This ruling should be changed. The fine line drawn in classifying soil bank payments is ridiculous.

Altoona (Pa.) Mirror Editorial Awarded Second Place in Statewide Contest on the Subject: "Employment of the Physically Handicapped"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 6, 1959

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial by J. E. Holtzinger, president of the Altoona, Pa., Mirror, which appeared in the March 14, 1959, issue, was awarded second prize in the editorial division of the annual Pennsylvania Statewide editorial and feature story contest on "Employment of the Physically Handicapped." Mr. Holtzinger will receive as an award a U.S. savings bond valued at $75.

The editorial follows:

JOBS WANTED

Every year at about this time we get a reminder from our friend Kermit Martz of the Pennsylvania State Employment Service that there are some very capable people who are physically handicapped and who are looking for jobs. The excellent experience that employers have had with these people over a number of years is one of the best recommendations we can think of in reminding prospective employers to give new ones a chance to prove their worth.

In most instances physically handicapped people have been given special training to help them overcome their handicap and to make them more valuable as employees. Nature herself comes to their aid, as many skilled observers report that the loss of one faculty is quite often counterbalanced by more acute functioning of the remaining faculties.

State and local programs to help train the physically handicapped for new types of work have been very successful. Outstanding capabilities have been developed by many of the jobseekers who suffer from some form of handicap and quite often these capabilities far outweigh their handicaps.

If everything works out as planned there will be hundreds of new job opportunities available in this area in the months just ahead. In planning for this brighter future employers of the area should not overlook the special training and adaptability of the men and women who have been trained by the rehabilitation department.

Physically-handicapped people themselves should not forget the many fine examples that have been set for them by others suffering from the same handicaps. This city and others like it across the Nation have had some of their finest businesses started and built by those who have overcome their obstacles.

Many who have been jarred from their original fields of endeavor by some accident which made it imperative for them to seek some other line of activity, have become outstanding in the new fields of activity. They have been leaders in all the creative fields. The mind is far superior to the hand, the foot, the leg or the arm; in fact, it surpasses all the individual members of the body.

Most successful ventures are launched by the people who are capable of creative thinking. Sometimes it takes the loss of some body faculty to slow down physical activity enough to give the mind an opportunity to indulge in creative thinking.

The world in which we live is constantly changing. One hundred years ago the United States was primarily an agricultural nation. About 50 percent of the manpower of the Nation was engaged in producing food and another 15 percent was engaged in harvesting the natural crops of nature.

Next in importance so far as numbers were concerned was the group which provided transportation for the products of the farms and woods. The manufacturing group was in a close race for second place and the various groups that were engaged in commerce were a poor fourth. Those who performed services for people otherwise engaged were in last place numerically.

Fifty years ago agriculture was fighting a losing race and those who were engaged in manufacturing things were taking over first place. The industrial towns and cities of the Nation were experiencing a great boom and transportation also was reaching new horizons. The goods and services industries still were trailing.

Twenty years ago manufacturing had a definite hold on first place. Good gains had been registered by the service industries and agriculture still was losing ground in number of people employed.

Today as people demand more and more services, manufacturing and the services industries are practically tied for first place in our economy. Farmers employing production techniques still are losing out in numbers, but gaining in efficiency. The people who wash the vegetables, cook some of them, can others, cold process still others, and wrap the lowly carrot and the red-cheeked apple in cellophane are on the increase.

Services in all other lines also have been increased and slowly but surely this new field of endeavor is gaining first place in the employment derby. It provides a whole new field for the enterprising, thinking worker. Ideas are replacing gadgets as America's best sellers. It took an idea to create the gadget in the first place.

Industries that have made the greatest advances in the past two decades have been those industries where research has been most employed. Employers seeking good men and women for research will find some mighty rich talent in the physically handicapped people. Physically handicapped people will find some new fields of endeavor for themselves in this new and expanding economy.

Some windy March day the postman is going to bring us a letter from our friend Martz bearing this caption: "Wanted—Physically Handicapped People for Important Jobs in Industry and Business." Better call him while there are still some people available for those jobs requiring thinking, skilled and loyal workers.

Indiana Flood-Control Construction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED WAMPLER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 8, 1959

Mr. WAMPLER. Mr. Speaker, the Public Works Subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations has been working long and diligently on the public works money measure for the fiscal year 1960. With the bill in the final legislative stages, I would like to set forth for the information and consideration of all the detailed flood-control problems and needs of the Sixth District of Indiana, the district which I have the honor to represent.

On March 5, 1959, I appeared before the House Appropriations Special Subcommittee on Deficiencies, headed by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], which was then conducting hearings relative to the second supplemental appropriations bill for fiscal 1959.

At that time, I had just returned from an inspection trip in and around my flood-stricken home area, Terre Haute, Ind. The degree of total waste, devastation, and privation was literally heartrending. The annual human, agricultural and property damage, loss and tragedy resulting from Wabash River floodings is incredible.

During the February 1959 flood, to which I have just referred, the small town of Clinton, Ind., with a population slightly in excess of 5,000 was fighting the floodwaters heroically, with some 8,000 sandbags purchased by the local citizenry for 14 cents apiece. As I told Mr. THOMAS' subcommittee, those sandbags were not purchased this year, they were bought several years ago during a previous flood, and when the danger was past they were emptied and stored so they could be used again, when the Wabash would inevitably threaten the area's people and their homes.

West Terre Haute has been flooded out for 3 consecutive years. Flood crestings are so frequent and so severe that Terre Haute no longer records flood levels at the 14-foot mark; the 20-foot mark now is the only recorded level.

In February of this year, floods along the Wabash caused 60 Indiana major highways to be actually impassable, thereby totally isolating many entire communities. Waterworks in the cities of Huntington, Wabash and Peru were so acutely threatened that if the floodwaters had risen 6 inches to 1 foot more, the local water would have become thoroughly contaminated, thus setting off a serious health hazard, conceivably to the epidemic stage.

I have obtained from the adjutant general of the State of Indiana a tally sheet of the expenses and losses incurred during the February 1959 flood. The totals I think are slightly less than astounding. It cost the people of the State of Indiana in expenses and losses—agricultural and property—a computed total of $1,663,211.77; of that total $567,105.46 was spent and lost in the immediate area in and around west Terre Haute.

To fight the floods, not only local volunteers were and are used, the Army and Air National Guard, the Adjutant General's Department, the State highway department, State penal farm labor, the Civil Defense Department, the American Red Cross, the Indiana State Police, the Vigo County Commission, the Terre Haute Street Department and the Army and Navy Reserves were employed. Two hundred and thirty-six State and Federal vehicles were used to fight back the floodwaters for a total of 17,833 hours.

And I am informed by the Indiana State adjutant general that the $1.6 million total is very conservative because it does not include extensive damage to private and personal property. In addition, President Eisenhower, within the last 2 months, has declared the general area a disaster region two times to the extent of emergency disaster Federal funds totaling $500,000.

Note, Mr. Speaker, that this rather staggering tally of expenses and losses is only for the February 1959 flood. The February 1959 flood has been preceded by 22 major Wabash River floodings; 9 within the past 12 years.

Flood damages in 1913 amounted to $11 million; the 1943 flood damage was $10,660,000, and the loss of 6 lives; the 1950 flood resulted in 4 deaths and damage of $1,662,000.

The 1957 and 1958 agricultural losses of acreage along the Wabash tributaries, including the White River, amounted to 487,200 acres, and total crop value losses amounted to $19,064,000.

Indiana highway losses due to floods in 1958 cost the counties and the State $602,770 in road repairs and $912,754 in bridge repairs. The 1957 State flood loss figures were $502,187 for roads and $113,417 to replace washed out or damaged bridges.

All these figures have been compiled by Indiana State officials and are a matter of published record.

And now, for the fifth time during the 4-months-old-year of 1959 the Wabash River again is just about to spill over its banks bringing death and destruction. The Lafayette Journal and Courier newspaper for April 28, 1959, just 3 days ago, carried the headline "Wabash Flooding Again."

The accompanying story states, in part:

> The Weather Bureau said the Wabash should go about 3 feet over the 12-foot stage at the city of Wabash sometime Tuesday, then roll downstream and gain in depth.
>
> The river should hit 5 or 6 feet above the 14-foot flooding stage at Montezuma Friday and about 3 feet over banktop at Terre Haute Saturday.

Mr. Speaker, these appalling losses and expenses, not to mention the consequent Wabash Valley population and economic drainage, must be arrested and hopefully stopped. I am not asking for construction that has as one of its multiple purposes recreation. I want flood control project construction that will keep flood-driven, filth-laden waters from washing away homes, stores, factories, schools, and churches, and driving sincere, honest, hard-working people out of the area in which they were born and in which they would like to live and rear their families.

I have asked for, and the Army Corps of Engineers has informed me they have the engineering capabilities to utilize during the fiscal year 1960, the following funds for already authorized projects:

West Terre Haute local protection project: $30,000, to complete preconstruction planning.

Sugar Creek levee: $15,000, to initiate preconstruction planning and bring the planning to 50 percent of completion.

Wabash River Basin study, above the White River: $40,000. The President's budget for fiscal year 1960 asks only $25,000 for this study. General Person, Assistant Chief of the Army engineers, tells me the Corps has the capability to utilize $40,000 during fiscal 1960. The additional $15,000, Mr. Speaker, will allow the Army Corps of Engineers to continue working on Sugar Creek, Wild Cat Creek, and Big Pine Creek.

Clinton levee,: $5,000, to enable the Army engineers to restudy the project.

Conover levee, which is a Terre Haute local protection project: $2,000, also to enable the Army engineers to restudy the project.

I understand that because the Adams Levee, Parke County, group's charter is expiring, a new document is needed. And since there is no Raccoon Levee, Parke County, organization, one will have to be established under State-authorized charter. In the case of the Greenfield Bayou levee, the group must reorganize because its current charter is not sufficiently inclusive. For these reasons, I am making no money requests for the Adams, Raccoon, and Greenfield Bayou levees.

I have, however, asked the Indiana Flood Control and Water Resources Commission and the local levee representatives to expedite their reorganizational activity.

The following charts compiled by the adjutant general of the State of Indiana constitute, I think, self-explanatory evidence of the desperate need for flood control construction in Indiana's Sixth District:

Indiana flood costs, by departments, February 1959

TERRE HAUTE AREA, IMMEDIATE AREA IN AND AROUND WEST TERRE HAUTE

	Army and Air National Guard	USPFO, Federal	Adjutant General Department	State highway department	Penal farm	Civil Defense Department	American Red Cross	Indiana State Police	Vigo County Commission	Terre Haute Street Department	Naval Reserve	Army Reserve	All Indiana, grand total
Man-days	1,479	170											1,649
Man-hours				720	920	3,340		1,042	1,137	40	561	440	8,200
Personal services cost	$11,830.66	$1,512.30		$1,080	$135.78			$4,000	$1,906.30	$292			$20,757.04
Transportation					23.10								23.10
Food	1,033.90		$34.60									$64	1,132.50
Motor oil									30.16			4	34.16
Gasoline	177.24								302.15		$357.00	80	816.99
Sandbags	12,438.00												12,438.00
Steel cable		85.00											85.00
Wire		264.00											264.00
Sand									205.80				205.80
Gravel					349.80				420.00				769.80
Shovels									139.32				139.32
Personal injury	30.75												30.75
Motor vehicles		20,160.00		8,640		333							21,357.00
Heavy equipment										792	2,016.00	3,744	6,552.00
Bridge and road equipment				225,000									225,000.00
Agriculture damage						177,500							177,500.00
Small business damage						100,000							100,000.00
Families affected													
Homes damaged/destroyed													
Personal property loss													
Total	25,510.55	22,021.30	34.60	226,944	508.68	227,833		4,000	3,003.73	1,084	2,273.60	3,892	567,105.46

BALANCE OF THE WABASH RIVER VALLEY, BEGINNING AT CITY OF WABASH AND EXTENDING SOUTH TO VINCENNES[1]

Man-days	709												709
Man-hours				5,000		7,000		700					12,700
Personal service cost	$5,453.62			$7,500				$2,800					$15,753.62
Food	588.55												588.55
Motor oil													
Gasoline	212.84												212.84
Sandbags	2,622.30												2,622.30
Personal injury	29.00												29.00
Motor vehicles		$10,800.00		22,400									33,200.00
Heavy equipment				20,100									20,100.00
Bridge/road damage				225,000									225,000.00
Agricultural damage						$221,600							221,600.00
Small business damage						500,000							500,000.00
Families affected							2,220						2,220.00
Homes damaged/destroyed							539						539.00
Personal property loss							$77,000						77,000.00
Totals	8,906.31	10,800.00		275,000		721,600	$77,000	2,800					1,096,106.31

STATEWIDE GRAND TOTAL

Immediate area in and around West Terre Haute	$25,510.55	$22,021.30	$34.60	$226,944	$508.68	$277,833		$4,000	$3,003.73	$1,084	$2,273.60	$3,892	$567,105.46
All other areas in State	8,906.31	10,800.00		275,000		721,000	$77,000	2,800					1,096,106.31
Grand total	34,416.86	32,821.30	34.60	501,944	508.68	999,433	77,000	6,800	3,003.73	1,084	2,273.60	3,892	1,663,211.77

[1] See table below:

Vehicles used	Type	Number	Hours each	Total hours	Vehicles used	Type	Number	Hours each	Total hours
Army	Regular	78	72	5,616	Navy	Pumpers	4	40	160
Air	do	8	72	576	Do	Heavy duty	2	40	80
Highway	Heavy duty	30	67	2,010	Army Reserve	Regular	3	72	216
Do	Regular	55	141	7,760	Do	Heavy duty	10	72	720
Civil defense	do	37	3	111	State police	Regular			
Vigo County	Heavy duty	4	96	384					
Terre Haute	do	5	40	200	Total		236	715	17,833

Wabash River Basin projects, Indiana

Project	Estimated cost			Fiscal year 1960 engineering capability to utilize funds [1]		Remarks
	Federal	Non-Federal	Total	Planning	Construction	
Active authorized projects:						
West Terre Haute local protection project.	$473,000	$95,000	$568,000	$30,000	0	Funds would be utilized to complete preconstruction planning.
Sugar Creek levee	355,000	27,000	382,000	15,000	0	Funds would be utilized to initiate preconstruction planning work and bring that planning to 50 percent of completion.
Adams levee	262,000	13,200	275,200	0	0	Time limit on existing levee district charter is about to expire and the district will have to be reorganized.
Greenfield Bayou levee	1,890,000	270,000	2,160,000	0	0	The existing levee district will have to be reorganized as it now encompasses only the northern half of the project area.
Raccoon Creek levee	300,000	33,000	393,000	0	0	Levee district will have to be reformed. Original district charter has expired.
Projects deferred for restudy:						
Clinton levee	[2] 93,000	[2] 9,000	[2] 102,000	5,000	0	The fiscal year 1960 capability is for restudy work only.
Terre Haute local protection project (Conover levee).	[2] 199,000	(3)	0	2,000	0	Do.

[1] Fiscal year 1960 capability to utilize funds based on premise that no funds will be made available to these projects during the remainder of fiscal year 1959. The amounts shown have been determined strictly from an engineering standpoint, considering each project by itself without reference to our overall capability, or fiscal considerations. Since no funds were included in the President's budget for fiscal year 1960 for any of these projects, no funds can be utilized in view of overall budgetary considerations.

[2] Estimates last revised in 1954.

[3] Not available.

The Role of International Marketing Communications

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 6, 1959

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Hon. James A. Farley, chairman of the board of the Coca-Cola Export Corp., at the 1959 convention of the International Advertising Association held at the Hotel Roosevelt, New York City, on April 29, 1959:

THE ROLE OF INTERNATIONAL MARKETING COMMUNICATIONS

(Address by Hon. James A. Farley, chairman of the board, the Coca-Cola Export Corp., 1959 Convention of International Advertising Association, Hotel Roosevelt, New York City, April 29, 1959)

As a businessman concerned with international marketing, it has given me great pleasure to have merited your choice as the speaker to open the 11th convention of the International Advertising Association.

You already know from your program that the theme that has been set for this convention is "Operation Opportunity—the Booming 1960's." Many illustrious speakers will follow me to expand on this theme. But, as the opening speaker it is my privilege to set the tone of the convention which I propose to do by leaving you with a message. I hope my choice is one that will become more meaningful to you as we enter the exciting times that lie ahead of us.

A few days ago, as I was assembling my thoughts for this address, I overheard a remark which I will phrase as a question because some of you may have had the same feeling when you read the program of this convention. The remark went somewhat like this:

"This International Advertising Association should really make up its mind. With speakers like Senator Javits, Ambassador Lodge, and Jim Farley, what are these guys? Are they businessmen or are they politicians?"

Well, maybe we are a bit of both. As international businessmen our responsibilities are pretty broad. We represent the business interests we work for but we also represent the interest of the peoples that we work with in many countries throughout the world. This means that to become successful we have to be good businessmen and we have to be good politicians, too. If this is true, and I believe it is, I think that the interests of the people for whom we work and the interests of the peoples we work with around the world will best be served in this coming decade if we remember one very simple precept; that this is: To let the truth shine through in all things that we do.

Truth is the most powerful force that we have to build with in the years ahead, and, if need be, it is the ultimate weapon with which we will safeguard that which we will build.

Now, let's take a look at marketing communications and the business of advertising as a standard bearer of truth throughout the world. Let's take a look at it from the businessman's point of view as well as from the politician's point of view.

Politics and advertising have this in common, that they thrive best in a free society where both are subjected to the continual harsh light of publicity, claim and counterclaim, criticism, and opposition. About the only difference I see between the two is that a politician is a little bit like a banker. A banker draws up a statement at the end of his fiscal year—a politician subjects himself to the approval of the public every 2 or 4 years, as the case may be. But with a piece of merchandise and with advertising every day is election day, and every product and every advertisement is continually and completely subject to the verdict of public opinion. In both cases it is truth and character that stand out.

If we look over the field of famous trade names, the ones that are permanent are the ones that have been truthful and honest, that year in and year out have given full value for the dollar. If you stop to think of the amount of faith the average buyer puts in the merchandise he buys in the American market today it is the finest possible tribute to the veracity of the American printed advertising word. If you look at the politicians the world remembers, from Washington, Jefferson, Jackson, Lincoln, and Cleveland down to our own day, it is not the clever and expedient whom we remember but those who were known in their day for their stubborn addiction to the truth.

I do not know what your concept of a politician is. Perhaps it is as erroneous as my own idea of an advertising man used to be. I used to think that advertising men were long-haired artists who dreamed up ideas. Perhaps you think a politician is an adroit character who spends his time glad handing; in a smoke-filled room. But just as in advertising the harsh reality of sales results weeds out the opportunist in favor of the statesman who renders a public service.

Let me give you a definition of politics that I have carried with me for a quarter of a century, written by Andrew Oliver in Boston more than 150 years ago. It goes like this: "Politics is the most hazardous of all professions. There is no other in which a man can hope to do so much good to his fellow creatures—and neither is there any in which, by a mere loss of nerve, he may do as widespread harm. There is not another in which he may so easily lose his own soul, nor is there another in which a positive and strict veracity is so difficult. But danger is the inseparable companion of honor. With all its temptations and degredations that beset it, politics is still the noblest career any man can choose."

With the change of a few words that would be an equally good definition of advertising.

To carry the parallel still further, let me give you a list of 10 rules for the making of a successful politician, which I have set down for my own guidance. A politician must have a good personality. He must have what we call character. He must be a substantial human being. He must work hard. He must be able to get other people to work for him and with him. He must have native ability and must be able to see and use ability in others. He must be aggressive but not to the point of being offensive. He must have a feeling for what people want. He must be able to make decisions. He must understand the meaning of the practical compromise without loss of principle. Above all, he must be truthful. The man or the advertisement that does not tell the truth is distrusted and shunned, and rightfully so. The dog of untrammeled ambition is usually pursued by the rabbit of conscience. In short, I find little difference in the rules for success, whether in advertising or politics or any other field.

But whether we be businessmen or politicians devoted to the communication of truth about our business, our profession or our country, we each have our detractors, those who misguidedly (and sometimes wantonly) go out of their way to muddy the waters.

You would think that we have enough trouble today with the Soviets stirring up strife in Europe and in the Middle East and

with their counterparts the Red Chinese working for the envelopment of southeast Asia. Well, we don't seem to be satisfied with these problems and so, as we always have done, we manage to grow some of them in our own backyard.

As businessmen we deal with something called economics. And, the people who deal with economics are called economists; that is, some of them are. So, a businessman is an economist, too, although he may not have a Harvard degree.

Now I want to be understood to say that I have the greatest respect for professional economists. They can, and most of them do, help us who are on the practical end of things with the many problems which we must meet. Every sizable company employs them and profits by their advice.

But, there are a few economists who are not content to advise business and government and then let the responsible managers make the decisions. They want to make the decisions themselves. Above all they want to tell the President and Congress what to do with and to business.

I have met a good many of these economists, not only in business but in Government, for I was, for nearly 8 years, doing my bit in Government myself. And, in the Post Office Department I had a pretty big business to direct. I met a good many of the economists who were in Washington in those years. Most of them I respected. I liked almost all of them. But, the thing that struck me was not only their lack of practical knowledge of the problems of business but the fact that they never were able to agree with each other. Some of us had to make the practical decisions and when we got to that we had to brush away all of the technical language and the four-, five-, and six-syllable words and apply that commonsense that experience had provided for us in our years in business before we ever went into Government.

Of course I was also in politics. And, in a way politics is a busines, too. The only thing about politics as a business that is distinctive is that if you are honest there is no monetary profit in it. But, in business honesty is not just the best policy but the only real policy. In politics the profit is not in material things but in the satisfaction of serving your country and your fellowman so that he will have a better way of life.

We hear a good deal of talk these days about the need for advertising censorship and regulation. I know of no field that needs regulation less or that has disciplined itself more. There is no governmental body whose wisdom could be as great or whose discipline could be as harsh as that of the open competitive market. If we stop to think about it, competition functions in much the same way as his majesty's loyal opposition or as a minority party. State an untruth, be it ever so small, and your competitor is quick to point it out and to force you to correct it. Here and there a fly-by-night may publish an exaggeration and before competition and the public have time to catch up with him he will be gone. But the permanent manufacturer who represents 98 percent of the products we live by has long since learned that truth and honesty in advertising are the only policy that enable him permanently to live with his public.

To return to the economists who have been in Government in past years, some of whom are still around, they are still writing books and articles. And they still cannot agree among themselves. I am thinking now of several examples. One of these has written a book which has had a lot of attention. In it he concludes that the American people are much too well off. They have not only all that they need but all that they want. And also that they have a lot of things that they not only don't need, but that they should not really want at all. They are just too darned prosperous.

Of course this is a long, long cry from the days when they were saying that one-third of the people were ill clothed, ill fed, and ill housed. But a lot of water has gone over the dam since then. And a lot of economists have gone over the dam too. But some of them still survive. One of them goes on to say that the people are buying too many nice big automobiles while the Government is not building enough roadways and highways to accommodate them.

Well, we do have our traffic problems, we must admit. But it is also true that we are spending, through Government, billions of dollars a year to solve these problems. And that volume of construction, along with the big Federal program passed by Congress a few years ago, is going about as fast as it is humanly possible to go. But you cannot build highways with money alone. It takes engineering and planning and the mobilization of workers and machinery. And above all, it takes time.

But this economist is in a hurry, and so he would slow down the building of cars in two ways. He would take the money away from consumers by heavier taxes. The economists' term for taking the other fellow's money is "drain it off." Then he would have workers and producers work fewer days in the year and fewer hours in the week, and also have them work with less energy while they are working. He is not talking about fewer cars alone. He would have fewer refrigerators, and cosmetics, and baby food, and television sets, and telephones. He doesn't mention Coca-Cola, but I imagine he thinks we consume too much of that, too. Probably he believes that the refreshment people get from Coca-Cola makes them work harder. And in his book that is bad, very bad indeed. For most of this overconsumption and overproduction he blames advertising. He sees in advertising a sinister plot to make people want more than they need. And in his catechism it is a sin to want more than you need.

We have heard a lot from people who call advertising waste. There are some who would have Government tell every businessman how much he should spend and not spend on advertising. These people would have a Government bureau determine in every individual case what percentage of its gross receipts should be spent for advertising. Thus they would have an army of bureaucrats going over your books and making your business judgments. Of course, this would take more Government money—and employ many people who would otherwise be making things people could use.

But, I have seen enough of Government to know that there is waste in Government, too. I have served with the Hoover Commission and I have participated in many reports of the Commission, reports which point out specifically where those wastes are and how they can be eliminated.

We are not stingy with Government services. As a nation we are spending very considerably more than $100 billion a year at the Federal, State, and local levels. This is a very big part of our national production. It is, I believe, big enough. What we need is to get our money's worth for what we are giving in taxes.

But, I am at a loss to know a simple fact. How does this economist expect to get the taxes to pay for more and more public spending if at the same time we are producing less and spending less and working fewer days and hours? Sometimes the expert misses the simple point of commonsense. In his theories he forgets his arithmetic.

Thus, there is a continual need for keeping the record straight, not only in our own country but throughout the world. And the best suggestion that I have to offer to keep the record straight is to recommend that you, as marketing communicators keep constantly in mind the need to let the truth shine through.

This coming decade will produce pressures such as we have not yet felt or even envisioned in our conduct of world trade. Therefore, unless we do stick to certain fundamental principles and communicate these to other people adequately, we will lose the privilege of leadership that the world has grown to look to us for.

Marketing communications, the practice of which is in your hands, is an invaluable part of this privilege leadership. You, as its practitioners must use it wisely. It is for you to communicate the truths of sound business practice that we as a nation have learned and have pioneered, as well, over the years. It is for you to communicate that business must be allowed to make its own unfettered judgments. It is for you to communicate that the individual must have right to make his own free choice.

These are the freedoms that have made us what we are as a nation. We are by no means perfect. But this system of ours has produced more for all, more of what makes for happiness, and culture, and peace, and order, than any nation has in all history.

This is liberty, the last best value given to man on earth. This is the truth that is ours—mine and yours. Value it, cherish it, protect it and let it shine through in everything you do.

Could Canada Be Neutral?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. DENT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 6, 1959

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, as time marches to its inevitable climax with this, our generation, one wonders how well we have accomplished our dedicated mission of the past generation.

We wonder how many friends we have made and how stanch our allies are.

We wonder, too, how many will march with us and how many will stand and cheer from the sidelines.

If any American feels overly secure in his smugness of sloganized security perhaps the challenging article written by J. B. McGeachy, which appeared in the Financial Post, Toronto, Canada, will cause him to stop and look at the clock.

Time can and will run out on all of us if we do not check and doublecheck on so-called foreign policy or better still, our lack of it.

When a nation, like an individual, starts to buy friendship, loyalty, honor, or respectability, it heads for the rocks and shoals of a troubled future. Today is as good a time as any to read the attached article:

COULD CANADA BE NEUTRAL?
(By J. B. McGeachy)

Should Canada abandon defense spending? Should we consider adopting a policy of neutrality, like India or Austria, in the cold war?

The mere fact that these questions can be asked—and they are indeed being asked by intelligent Canadians—suggests a revolution in our national thinking. It's evident that many of us are deeply disturbed by the per-

lious situation to which 12 years of cold war have brought us.

This is not surprising. The experts tell us, with harrowing diagrams to illustrate our plight, that Canadian cities could be pulverized by H-bombs hurled over the Arctic in ICBM's or lobbed from submarines submerged in Atlantic or Pacific waters.

Why is the Canadian population in this danger of being wiped off the map? It's a fair question. Since Canadians threaten nobody, how can any other nation feel unfriendly toward us?

True, it could be replied, we are not strong enough by ourselves to threaten anyone; but we are firmly allied to one of the two superpowers. Indeed, "allied" is much too feeble an expression.

To all intents and purposes Canada is now (let us candidly use the accurate if painful word) a military satellite of the United States. And by consenting, without a murmur, to the use of our soil to facilitate nuclear assault on the Soviet Union, we make Canada a wholly legitimate target for the Russians in the event of trouble.

This analysis leaves out some of the relevant facts, but it is accurate so far as it goes; and it leads naturally to the question: Would we be safer if we were defenseless or neutral or both? In that posture, with neither arms nor allies, could we work more effectively for peace?

I seriously doubt if either unilateral disarmament or neutrality is practical politics for Canada in the world of 1959. By this I simply mean that, even if we had the desire and the will to bring about so dramatic a change in our policy, I am not sure if we could get away with it. We are a small power caught in the middle of a big power struggle which many seem to regard as a life-and-death contest for survival. Sovereignty, protocol and even ordinary manners, if they get in the way, may be brushed aside.

Still, it doesn't seem to be treason to discuss the issue; for it is in fact being discussed in spite of the prevailing opinion that Canada has lost all freedom of choice.

As one writer recently summed up orthodoxy, we are "inescapably bound to the American chariot" and the best we can do is "try to stay in the front seat." Maybe so: but at least it's legitimate to examine the basis of this assumption. There is nothing to be said for numb, dumb acceptance of the existing situation as permanent.

Let it be noted that once a war has started, as many of us remember very well, it's too late for debate on the rights and wrongs of the national policy; public morale won't stand it. But there's no war going on now; and I think Canadian morale is steady enough for an argument on the wisdom or unwisdom of the policy of armament and alliance we embarked upon when we joined, and indeed helped to found, NATO in 1949.

One might begin by remarking that in the 1930's Canada, just like the United States, was both neutral and defenseless. Quite as isolationist as the Americans, we had no armed forces to speak of and we refused all commitments abroad.

Let us agree that Canadians would rejoice and sing hosannas if, with safety, we could revert to that blissful situation. Ideally, all the nations would be disarmed and a court would settle their disputes. Armed forces, alliances and commitments are not noble and virtuous in themselves but a second-best expedient, justified only if they serve their intended purpose.

But why is it thought impossible for Canada to return to the disarmed neutrality of two decades ago? One reason, I strongly suggest, is the change that has taken place in the American position; and here I refer to recent history.

In September 1939, when Britain and France declared war on Hitler, we abandoned our "no commitments" slogan and got into the fight. But our neighbors, though they had been the loudest scoffers at appeasement in 1938, showed no inclination to join us in this enterprise. In a war that affected us, they were prepared to abstain indefinitely.

Indeed in October 1939 the 21 American Republics, including the United States, proclaimed their neutrality in a document called the Declaration of Panama at the same time announcing that there must be no hostilities on the high seas within 300 miles of their shoreline.

So seriously did they take this requirement that they protested jointly at the end of 1939 when British warships chased the German *Graf Spee* to its demise off Montevideo, Uruguay. To the protest Winston Churchill replied that if the Royal Navy weakened in its job of patrolling the Atlantic, the Republics "would soon have many worse worries than the sound of one day's distant cannonade."

The Americans, then, were far from accepting the notion of collective security during either of the wars against Germany. in these combats they were belligerents for just 1,835 days out of 3,633 or 50.6 percent of the time; they were neutral (though not impartial) for the remaining 49.4 percent.

I recall these facts only to make the point that Canadians are under no obligation whatever, merely out of neighborly good feeling, to commit themselves to take part in U.S. wars.

It may be replied that goodwill has nothing to do with the case; but I would disagree. "Goodwill" may not be precisely the right word; but certainly a desire to keep in step with Washington, to consider American feelings, and to avoid a collision with the United States in foreign affairs (take, for example, the case of China) is a factor in determining Canadian policy.

And I suggest, without fear of contradiction, that this is one reason why we are in our present pickle and that one very serious obstacle to defenseless neutrality for Canada is that it would distress the Americans and cause a marked diminution in their love for us.

Indeed, as everyone knows, that is understatement carried to the point of absurdity. If Canada should suddenly decide to withdraw from its military commitments and to expel all American military personnel and equipment from this country (as a neutral would be obliiged to do), our neighbors would be far more than merely upset. They might regard our action as so unfriendly as to justify invasion and forcible occupation of our terrain.

But they might not. Without doubt, hostile, warlike action against Canada would cause intense pain at Washington and do immense damage to the reputation and prestige of the United States. Thus the question to be explored is whether anything would be gained for Canadian security or the cause of peace generally, by confronting the United States with this dilemma.

If the Americans simply took over and operated military installations here against our will, obviously there would be a very serious net loss to the western alliance—a loss of repute that would injure us all in the remotest corners of Africa and Asia.

But if, as seems more likely, the Americans responded to the Canadian threat by bringing all possible economic and diplomatic pressure to bear upon us, as they would be fully entitled to do in their national interest, beneficial results might ensue.

The Americans might be shocked into awareness of the Canadian position; and the Canadians might be inspired by their own boldness to engage in some overdue bargaining and debate with the neighbors.

Up to date, in our defense arrangements with them, we have been far too sentimental (hands across the border and that sort of thing) and not nearly cold-blooded and hard-boiled enough. That was the whole point of my argument that emotion based on past military association does not, or should not, enter into this discussion.

What are the Canadian realities of which the Americans should be made conscious if possible? One reality is that we are not, and could not possibly be, morally or philosophically neutral in any scrap between Washington and Moscow. We are definitely on Washington's side.

But this argument is about military commitments in advance of hostilities; and we might reasonably claim the same right to stay out of a fight as the United States, thought never pro-Hitler, claimed and exercised in 1939–41. True, we signed away this right by joining NATO; but treaty obligations can be renegotiated when they lead to a wrong result.

NATO has apparently been effective in checking the expansion of Russian power in Europe; but the Canadian-American entanglement has led, by slow degrees, to a situation in the Arctic that doesn't strike Canadians as an example of reasonable collective security. It looks to them more like organized collective insecurity. Being threatened with nuclear bombs from our own Arctic frontier was not what we bargained for when NATO was negotiated 10 years ago.

It may be replied that this risk is one of the facts of present-day life, not to be blamed on the Americans, and that the advance of technology has made neutralism impossible for a country in Canada's geographical position. A North American nation might stay out of European squabbles, it may be argued, when the severest attack anyone could launch was by medium-range bombers carrying old-fashioned knickknacks like 5-ton bombs; but how could Canada, placed between the two combatants, be neutral in a war that may be fought with H-bombs propelled over oceans and continents, scattering fallout in their wake?

This argument, though formidable, is not wholly convincing. It is one thing to be exposed accidentally to fallout and the dropping of bombs in the wrong country; it is quite another thing to invite deliberate attack by close-knit alliance with a nuclear power. Switzerland, Austria, and India (to mention only three) would all be vulnerable, in greater or less degree, to the accidents of a nuclear war. They are all neutral.

But surely, it will be objected at this point, Canadians would be vitally interested in American victory and survival in a Russo-American atomic war. Certainly we would; but there's a widespread belief that if the Russians and Americans ever start pasting one another with thermonuclear weapons there will be no survivors in either camp. Would it not be a good idea to arrange that a few Candians, anywhere from Aklavik to Windsor, should have maybe a 1-percent chance of living on and restarting the human race in the northern hemisphere?

In short, the case for Canadian neutralism, if you put your mind to it, turns out to be quite persuasive—even though it may be academic. And I have not even mentioned the argument that a neutral North American nation might expect to be useful, and perhaps influential, in composing Russo-American differences. This may be the best reason of all for Canada to set itself up as a one-country "third power."

For the present, however, my only suggestion is that the Canadian ambassador to the United States should pick the largest American audience he can find and state the case for Canadian neutrality hypothetically. He could then point out that Canada has sacrificed a position of relative safety and probable usefulness for the sake of American security. He could explain that Canadians are reasonably alarmed by the results of this sacrifice and may have to consider a change

of policy—a kind of Canadian disengagement—if the American Government does not speedily negotiate some relief of current tensions—in the Arctic, to mention one danger zone only.

I think it can be positively guaranteed that this speech by our ambassador would get attention at Washington.

But whether it is ever delivered or not, the point is that we are in a strong position to bring pressure upon the Americans. Unless this country is merely a "territory" of the United States as subservient as any African or Asian colony ever was to a European master, we should be able to fix the terms on which Canada serves the ends of U.S. security.

At the very least these terms should include a due share of defense contracts for Canadian makers, which brings me to a recent proposal that looks like a variant of the one here discussed. This proposal, prompted by the collapse of the Avro-Arrow program, is that Canada should abandon all defense spending and disburse the money as "economic aid," not being in the big power league of countries that can afford a modern arsenal.

If this proposal means simply that the United States should take over 100 percent of the cost and manning of Canadian defense, I don't see that it gets us anywhere. This would be merely a fiscal arrangement with no moral significance; and the effect of it would be to accentuate Canadian subservience. Indeed Canada cannot afford a defense program like the American or the Russian; but 17 million Canadians can produce approximately as much as 17 million Americans—or about twice the population of New England. A division of labor on that basis could be arranged or obtained under pressure.

But if the proposal to abandon defense spending means that Canada should be defenseless and neutral, why, then there's room for an argument. I hope such a debate will take place soon and vehemently. I regard this piece as a preliminary contribution.

A Mothers' Day Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN JARMAN
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 6, 1959

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following Mother's Day message by A. W. Kopke, of Oklahoma City:

MOTHER'S DAY

(By A. W. Kopke, Oklahoma Paper Co., Oklahoma City, U.S.A.)

Sunday, May 10, is Mother's Day. It should be for all a day of tender significance and happy memories. Time has perhaps scattered the snowy flakes on her brow and made furrows on her cheeks, but is she not beautiful now? The lips are thin, but these are the lips that have kissed many a hot tear from childish cheeks. The eye is dim, yet it glows with the soft radiance of holy love which can never fade. She will go farther and reach down lower for you than anyone else on earth.

She is an empty well into which you can pour all your heartaches and sorrows. Her arms are warmest when you are sad or hurt, and her hands are coolest on a fevered brow, when you are ill. She is that miracle God has created, who can make the whole world right, and peace descend upon your troubled soul. You cannot walk in a midnight haunt where she cannot see you; you cannot enter a prison whose bars will keep her out, you cannot mount a scaffold too high for her to reach, that she may kiss you and bless you in evidence of her deathless love. When the world shall despise and forsake you; when it leaves you by the wayside unnoticed, she will gather you up in her feeble arms and take you home.

For:

"The greatest battles ever fought,
Need I tell you where and when?
In history books you'll find them not,
For they are fought by the mothers of men."

So, if she lives, go and see her, or send her a telegram, a greeting card, or a litle gift. She will love you for your thoughtfulness and it will bring tears of joy to her faded cheeks. If she has gone to her eternal reward, then may the chimes of memory bring back to you, soft peals of the sweet, tender melodies of her lullaby, in those happy bygone days, when as a little child, you were cradled to sleep on her loving breast.

All honor then to the mothers of America on this day so fittingly set aside as Mother's Day.

Berlin: Brandt Versus Ulbricht

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JEFFERY COHELAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1959

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, in seeking to further understand the nature of the situation in Berlin, we can view the problem in terms of the two key men on the scene, Walter Ulbricht, boss of the East German Communist Party, and Willy Brandt, mayor of West Berlin, as C. L. Sulzberger has done in his article in the May 4 edition of the New York Times. I request that Mr. Sulzberger's analysis of what he describes as an "uncomfortable contest" be included in the RECORD for the consideration of all Members of Congress:

THE COCKS IN THE BERLIN COCKPIT

(By C. L. Sulzberger)

EAST BERLIN, May 3.—Divided Berlin must remain the world's most dangerous cockpit as long as Germany stays divided and, since reunification still lies far off, this former capital has accustomed itself to permanent cold war. Here the power blocs clash head on and each side recognizes that if one or the other yields, the global strategic balance will be changed.

Nobody is better aware of this than the two cocks in the cockpit who symbolize the East-West conflict. These two cocks are Walter Ulbricht, boss of the East German Communist Party and therefore of East Germany and East Berlin, and Willy Brandt, mayor of beleaguered West Berlin.

AN INTERESTING PAIR

The pair are interesting representatives of their respective systems. Brandt, a burly, 45-year-old Social Democrat from a Baltic worker's family, with open face and frank way of talking, seems to typify the new democracy established in the West and hoping one day to govern all Germany up to the Polish border.

He is a realist and a fighter. He knows that for the present his is but a holding operation; that the political existence of the 2 million Berliners for whom he speaks is protected only by a tripwire allied garrison and the determination of those Allies to fight if their forces are interfered with. Brandt, a refugee from Hitler, was a Norwegian citizen when he returned to Berlin after the war. He gave up this protection to live in the cockpit and join the fight in which he is now a leader.

THE CONTENDER IN EAST

Ulbricht, the eastern code, is in appearance a bantam: short, a generation older, with wagging beard and rimless glasses slightly masking his expression; given to oratory and a bumptious manner even in informal conversation. He appears less reposed and more overconfident than Brandt, relying, it would seem, upon his Soviet masters and the geographical advantages of his situation.

Like Brandt, Ulbricht is from a workingman's family. For decades a party functionary, he too lived out the Hitler years abroad, in Russia. He too returned to Berlin with a foreign passport—Soviet.

Ulbricht is skillfully pressing for what would superficially appear to be perhaps relatively minor gains. But he is shrewd enough to know that if any of these is achieved, all Berlin and eventually all Germany may fall to communism. He makes a great show of reasonableness. He wants Western diplomatic recognition of his government just as Moscow has recognized Bonn. He wants nuclear weapons banned from both Germanys and a peace treaty between them and the big-four powers. And he wants to demilitarize East and West Berlin.

THE MEANING OF DEMANDS

Such demilitarization means, of course, withdrawal of all allied token forces. Ulbricht pledges that West Berlin's security and independence would be honored and could be insured either by the big four, by the U.N. or by both. But Ulbricht knows that if these concessions are allowed the heart will go out of Brandt's resistance.

Ulbricht's cockfighting tactic is to peck about slyly looking for small practical triumphs any of which would bring an ultimate strategic victory. Brandt is aware of this. He is adamant and unyielding. He knows there can, in fact, be no retreat for hemmed-in West Berlin. He knows if the allies agree even to reduce their minimal garrisons, every German will interpret this as the beginning of the end.

BRANDT'S STAND IN WEST

Brandt said he is not opposed to all changes in the uncomfortable administration of his Berlin. But if, for example, the U.N. is brought into the picture, its agents must supervise both sectors of the city. And they can never replace the Western garrison. For West Berlin lives only under the umbrella of fear—communism's fear that if it acts against the Allied battalions, world war III will come.

This is an uncomfortable contest. Here in the East, Ulbricht has masses of room for maneuver. He can strut all around the restricted circle in which Brandt is perforce confined. But Brandt has behind him the astounding resolute support of the people who freely elected him. He is armed by an inner conviction of justice. And he knows that as long as the West is with him, Ulbricht dare not try for a mortal blow.

Poland, Its Constitution, and the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 6, 1959

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, Sunday I had the honor to meet a member

of the Lublin Polish Government who was imprisoned by the Russians at the end of World War II for an extended period of time. After meeting this gentleman, Mr. Zbigniew Stypulkowski, I was given the opportunity to address a group of Americans of Polish descent as they assembled to celebrate the 168th anniversary of the Polish Constitution of May 3.

Since the ideas promulgated in the address were well received, I feel they represent some of the deep-seated feelings which Polish people hold in regard to the United States and its role in alleviating the situation in which Poland finds itself today. Furthermore, the address expresses a view on this pertinent question of U.S. foreign aid, and more specifically on the mutual security program. As a result, I feel it proper to bring these ideas to the attention of my colleagues.

The Council of the Polish Societies in the State of Delaware, and the Delaware Division of the Polish American Congress passed, last evening at their celebration, a resolution treating certain immediate problems of foreign policy. These groups have requested me to put their resolution before the Congress as an extension of remarks.

Therefore, I, under unanimous consent, introduce the following material to be printed as an extension of remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

ADDRESS BY HON. HARRIS B. MCDOWELL, JR., ON THE OCCASION OF POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY

I suppose that you people get tired of listening to speeches which start with "good evening ladies and gentlemen, I am very happy to have this opportunity to"—and so on. But the fact is, I am happy to be here, and more than a little proud that you did me the honor of inviting me.

I know that today is a special kind of day for you and that it must be a day which you meet with mixed emotions, for you are celebrating the establishment of great freedom in Poland, yet Poland is without that freedom today.

And, for the rest of us who are not Polish or of Polish extraction, this 16th anniversary of the Polish Constitution of May 3 has special significance too, for it very pointedly brings to our attention the struggle of the Polish people to maintain a degree of independence.

Poland is today waging a desperate fight to establish a nation embodying the principles of democracy, the principles put forth in the May 3 Constitution.

In that document, the Polish nation, like the United States, sees not only the text of the constitution articles, but the realization of certain fundamental concepts governing the relationship between man and his state.

The May 3 Constitution accepted the principle of the sovereignty of nations, that nations, simply because they are nations have certain rights, rights to conduct their own internal affairs, rights to be free from being trampled by other countries which are land hungry and power hungry.

And on the other side of these rights, Poland realized that there were duties to treat each country with respect, to accept the principles of international law, and to infringe upon none of the rights of other countries.

That document was based upon a fundamental belief in the dignity of each human being. "All power in civil society," states the constitution, "is derived from the will of the people." Religious freedom was but one of the basic rights of man which that constitution respected. It even encouraged a system of national education so that the population could be trained and informed enough to continue Poland's reforming Government. In fact, the 4-year congress, from 1788–1792, devoted itself almost entirely to educational and other reforms for the purpose of making the lives of the peasantry and the urban and middle classes a better life to lead—a life more in line with man's inherent dignity.

Prominent representatives of the democratic states praised the May 3 Constitution. It meant true freedom for Polish peoples, they said, and showed that Poland was far ahead of many European countries in understanding democracy and the ways to establish a truly free system.

But, Poland was not in a geographical position in which she could quietly finish the work which the constitution had started. Her neighbors, Germany on the west, Russia on the east, were determined that Poland would not live in peaceful independence. When the Molotov-Ribbentrop agreement was signed, making allies of Germany and Russia, and the Western Powers watched, expressing their concern but doing nothing else, a shadow of fear crept over Poland, fear which was changed to horror when the armies of Adolph Hitler began their devastating march in 1939.

There are no people who paid more dearly for the Second World War, and, when the war was over, when the West was sure that at last the peoples of Europe could be free in peaceful independence, Poland continued to pay and is paying now. Only the names of whom they pay are different—now it is Khrushchev instead of Hitler.

The political and moral oppression and the economic misrule and exploitation by the regime, obviously subservient to Moscow resulted in the Poznan revolt of June 1956, and that revolt forced the Communists to make concessions and to liberalize the regime headed by Gomulka, the first secretary of the party.

Moscow, fearing repercussions in the other captive nations, protested against making any concessions to Poland, but in the showdown in Warsaw in October 1956 Khrushchev, who had personally flown to quench the fire, had to give way lest an attempt at his usual brutal oppression lead to disastrous results for himself and the Russians. Poland had challenged Khrushchev, and Khrushchev's position and policies. He, of course, was afraid for no one but himself and the threat to his leadership.

Among the gains won by the Polish people was the regime's new policy toward the church, which again permitted religious teaching in schools. There were other concessions too, which led to the liquidation of the collective farms so detested by the farmers. There was some relaxation of censorship which permitted greater freedom of the press, although criticism has been tempered by the common knowledge that Soviet Russia would not permit the installation of a non-Communist regime. Then too there was cessation of terror by the security police. Although these achievements by no means restored the full enjoyment of human rights, they were none the less, important.

But, as the Communist Party regained control of the situation, the improvements were one by one taken away. Developments in the course of 1958 have been marked by intensified repression of the people, a moving backward to the completely totalitarian state which existed at the time of the revolt. This retreat from the gains of October is particularly evident in regard to worker's rights and church state relations. Even worse, there are many signs that the gains of October are to be further reduced. For several months, a ruthless press campaign was conducted against the church and against any type of religion in general. The minister of education of August 4, 1958, forbade religious instruction in state school by members of religious orders and congregations. On August 9, 1958, the Catholic hierarchy lodged a protest, calling the order an unconstitutional violation of the basic church state agreement. Russia and its Communist Parties everywhere, however, do not know what unconstitutional means. Most everything Russia has done since its own revolution in 1917 is unconstitutional.

Recent statements by leading party members indicate that collective farms are to be reinstated. Gomulka himself stated on September 7, 1958; "the only correct road must in the long run lead to the collectivisation of Polish agriculture."

There has been no genuine freedom of opinion in Poland since the loss of independence, and even the freedom of criticism which Gomulka announced at the eighth plenum in 1956 lasted less than a year. Censorship has been reestablished. Many papers have been banned, including the outspoken organ of the young Communist intellectuals, Pro Prostu; party control was increased over newspapers and the campaign against the more independent newspapermen and writers was proclaimed by the head of the party propaganda machine. Today the press and other media of information are again becoming as subservient to the party and the regime as before October 1956. They, of course, have no choice. And underlying this censorship, this total inability to speak, think and say what one wants, is the fact that increasingly, the regime in Poland is resuming the traditional Communist pattern of violating and denying the basic human rights.

I know it is not a pretty picture which I have painted, and you probably know more about how ugly that picture is, than I. But I firmly believe that the situation is not without hope. I believe that we can contribute to the formation of a free Poland based on the principles of the May 3 constitution. I refuse to believe that Russia, a nation born of hatred, based upon an impossible economic system, and dedicated to defiling the dignity of man, can long continue to spread its wickedness throughout the world. I paraphrase the words of Lincoln, though he was talking of something altogether different, and say: "A nation, so conceived and so dedicated cannot long endure." It cannot be forever the power ruling half the world—it cannot because we will not let it.

You may be thinking, that the U.S. Government is a little late in its concern for Poland—in its concern for all of Eastern Europe, and you very well may resent the fact that this country and the Western democracies have been so slow in meeting the Russian challenge. If you do resent this, you do so justifiably for the United States must hang its head in shame for some of the mistakes it has made in Eastern Europe.

I know these mistakes were not deliberate. They resulted from misunderstanding and ignorance. First of all, the United States grew up faster than it realized. This country was so naive at the end of the First World War, that it did not even realize that it was the world's greatest power, and that the Treaty of Versailles could not be workable without its signature. At the end of the Second World War, the United States trusted Russia, to a certain extent. History has proven that trusting Russia was a mistake, but who at that time knew it was a mistake? Who had a choice to do anything other than trust Russia? Hindsight makes analysis extremely easy; foresight is another thing altogether.

Admittedly, though, this country, when it saw what was happening east of the Oder-Neisse, should have done more to help these oppressed peoples. More aid should have gone to Poland; and to Hungary. But we

must remember one thing: the United States is a democracy. It can't maneuver quickly as some would have it do. Many groups have influence and representation in the Congress and in electing the President, and unfortunnately, some of those groups have felt very strongly that this country should not give foreign aid to countries under Communist influence. These will give aid only with strings attached to it.

Happily, the United States is moving away from this philosophy. The people in this country are slowly beginning to realize that the only way to keep the Communist satellites from eternally being in Russia's orbit, is to aid them financially and technically. Gradually, through such assistance, these countries become more sound and stable economically, and less dependent upon Russia, economically and politically. This is what happened in Yugoslavia and the well-being of the free world depends upon many more of the same instance.

So, slowly, the traditional opposition to extending aid to Communist countries has been, and is being, whittled down. On June 7, 1957, an economic agreement was concluded with Poland. The agreement consisted of two parts, the first of which extended $30 million credit to Poland from funds made available under the Mutual Security Act. This loan will be paid back over a 20-year period. The second part of the agreement provided for the sale of $18.9 million agricultural commodities under Public Law 480. On August 14, 1957, an amended agreement was signed providing for an additional $46.1 million of surplus agricultural commodities under Public Law 480. Thus, the total dollar value for surplus agricultural goods sold to Poland by the United States was $65 million.

On February 15, 1958, the Department of State announced the conclusion of another economic agreement with Poland. The first part of that agreement made available to Poland $25 million in credit in order that Poland might buy machinery and equipment for food processing, and for the leather, textile, and metal industries, medical equipment, and other essentials. The second part of this agreement provided for the sale to Poland of $73 million worth of surplus agricultural commodities. This means Poland under the 1957 and 1958 agreements has received $57.7 million worth of wheat, $53.1 million in cotton, $6 million in soybeans, $9.9 million worth of soybean oil, and cottonseed oil, fats, and oils amounting to $3.6 million, a total of $10.6 million in barley, corn, and grain sorghum, and $3.3 million worth of nonfat dry milk. Then, too, in 1958 an amount up to $200,000 for ocean freight charges on shipment of voluntary contribution for relief in Poland was made available under the Mutual Security Act.

To recapitulate then, in 1957 the United States loaned in dollars or made available to Poland in the form of surplus agricultural commodities, the total of $95 million. In 1958 the total was $98 million. Furthermore, under the June 1957 agreement, the United States took the following actions:

1. The Treasury Department removed the prohibitions on the transmittal of Treasury checks and remittance in payment of social security, veterans, and other benefits under U.S. laws to Polish residents.

2. The Department of Agriculture announced that the Commodity Credit Corporation is prepared to consider applications for credit arrangements in connection with export sales of Commodity Credit Corporation commodities for shipment or transportation to Poland.

3. The Department of Commerce will amend export control regulations designed to simplify licensing procedures for U.S. exports to Poland.

Essentially, this is what the United States has done in the way of offering assistance to the oppressed people of Poland.

We have not done enough but I have great hopes, that we may adopt a more realistic policy toward our foreign aid, which in my mind, is the most feasible way by which we can defeat the Red menace. In my work on the Foreign Affairs Committee, it has been heartening to see that there is a real attempt on the part of some Government officials, Senators and Congressmen, to break down the traditional barrier against giving foreign aid to Communist influenced countries.

The people of Poland always have manifested strong attachment to the Western World and to the democratic way of life which we in the West enjoy. It is so important that this flame of freedom burning in the hearts of the freedom loving Polish people not be extinguished. There is no freedom in Poland today, but the spirit of freedom is not dead. Hitler could not defeat the Polish spirit, neither can Khrushchev.

We of the United States can aid Poland. We can help her to stand on her own feet, separate and independent from Russia. But just as we must give material aid, we can and must encourage, nourish that spark of freedom which still burns within the Polish people. They are looking to us for encouragement and reassurance that they are not forgotten by the free world. We must assure them that they are not abandoned, and that we will assist them in keeping their famed Constitution from being appropriated as an instrument for Communist exploitation. The Constitution of May 3 is a source of noble pride to all Polish peoples; in these hours of difficulty and sorrow it is a consolation—a signpost pointing to the future.

The world owes Poland that freedom which the Constitution embodies. There is no nation, no group of people, which has paid more dearly for a chance to be free.

It is therefore very important that the United States give economic aid and moral support to the Polish nation; the future of the whole Western World depends greatly upon the establishment of freedom in Poland and the other eastern European countries.

We, Americans of Polish descent, assembled at Modjeska Hall, Wilmington, Del., this 3d day of May, A.D. 1959, under the auspices of the Council of the Polish Societies and Clubs in the State of Delaware, and of the Delaware division of the Polish American Congress, to commemorate on this 168th anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution of May 3, to pay homage to the memory of Polish patriots who wrote the Polish Constitution of May 3, and who were responsible for its adoption; and

Whereas the world lives today under the threat of war for Berlin, and enslavement of central Europe by Soviet Russia, and the fear or revival of German territorial appetites; and

Whereas the enslavement of central European nations by Soviet Russia, perpetually fosters cold war paralyzing the will and strength of the Western nations; and

Whereas, while the rights of nations are taken for granted, all over the world nations and empires collapse or are transformed, and the West still accept the subjection of the nations of central Europe; and

Whereas the lasting disengagements between East and West will only be achieved by bringing into being a wide wall of free central European nations between Germany and Russia; and

Whereas, until the nations of central Europe are able to live their independent lives in accordance with their desires and traditions, the threat of war will hang over the world; and

Whereas no half measures reducing the forces in Germany or creating corridors on either side of Berlin will remove the main sources of disturbance. On the contrary, they might increase them by creating artificial boundaries and new points of friction bringing about a very doubtful contribution to peace; and

Whereas the Soviets who have broken every agreement and treaty they have ever made, who have violated their pledges for free elections in Poland and in other enslaved nations, their sole aim now being is to get American recognition for the status quo of those enslaved nations;

Resolved, That we, assembled at this meeting commemorating the 168th anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution of May 3, express that before the proposed conference of the Foreign Ministers of Great Britain, France, Soviet Union, and the United States, the West must establish what it is going to require of Russia and not merely what it will defend, otherwise the negotiations will end at least in the maintenance of the status quo; further

Resolved, The question of Berlin should be considered only as a part of the wider question of the future of Germany and of European security as a whole, which is bound up with the liberation of central Europe; further

Resolved, The main real guarantee against Germany is the definite recognition by the Western Powers of her present eastern frontier on the Oder and Western Neisse, depriving her of her assault gate to the east and averting the rebirth of Prussia, which drew its aggressive strength largely from lands taken from Poland over the centuries, regaining of this land is not regarded as a compensation for the loss of the eastern Poland's territories, but as a return on the old part of Poland enabled by the defeat of Germany in the World War II to which Germany launched the world in association with Russia in 1939; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, Department of State, Representatives and both Senators representing the State of Delaware in the U.S. Congress.

CHARLES L. PARUSZEWSKI,
Chairman.

Attest:

VINCENT J. KOWALEWSKI,
Secretary.

On Dealing With Russia—An Inside View

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 6, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in my extension of remarks I am pleased to include an excerpt from an article by the Honorable Dean Acheson, former Secretary of State, that appeared in the New York Times magazine of April 12, 1959, and which excerpt appears in the April 27, 1959, issue of U.S. News & World Report. There is no one better qualified to discuss foreign affairs, based upon his knowledge and experience, than former Secretary of State Acheson. The excerpt of his New York Times magazine article of April 12 is very timely and appropriate at this time, and worthy of profound consideration by all persons interested in our foreign affairs, and par-

ticularly those charged with the responsibility of forming our foreign policy and carrying the same out:

ON DEALING WITH RUSSIA—AN INSIDE VIEW

(By Dean Acheson, former Secretary of State)

There is a good deal of folklore about on the subject of negotiating with the Russians. At the moment, the British, with the authority of those who have just been there, are giving currency to some of its more dubious maxims.

It may be wise to pause and examine some of the observations being put out. All in all, they cover a pretty broad field. We are told, for instance, that, since only Mr. Khrushchev can make decisions for the Russian Government, meetings at lower levels are foredoomed to failure; therefore, on to the summit.

Again, that the tragic experience of Geneva in 1955 came from a grandstand conference, and that this summer's meeting should be held in private.

Another suggestion is to hold a series of summit conferences at which the heads of government take up one matter after another, decide them, and let the lower echelons work out the details.

So far as substance is concerned, Mr. Drew Middleton of the Times has expressed the British view in somewhat euphemistic terms. The British would seek, he says, stronger guarantees for Berlin in exchange for a move gradually to meet the Soviet desire for a stabilization of the situation in Eastern Europe. One of the steps in this move, so the London Observer reports, is to be a freezing of East and West forces or a ceiling on them in a zone exending either side of the Iron Curtain and beyond Germany.

Is it true that the only way to work anything out with the Soviet Government is by conference with the top man and his staff?

The answer is that it depends on what one is trying to work out. Matters as complex as the concerting of military and supply operations on a vast scale during a world war did require this method. Yet the method, as method, contributed nothing to real agreement on the solution of eastern European questions.

On the other hand, in 1949, arrangements for the ending of the blockade of Berlin were agreed to without meetings at any level. It depends on what the Russians find it in their interests to do.

Let us have a closer look at the events of 1949. After the coup of Czechoslovakia, Stalin had decided, in Khrushchev's later phrase, to cut out the "cancer" of Berlin. So, following the reform of West German currency, a serious problem for East Germany, the blockade of Berlin began in 1948. The United States responded with the airlift—which probably would not work today—and by a counterblockade of East Germany. The Russians became the losers both in Germany and in their general propaganda position.

Then, at the end of January 1949 the Soviet Government published answers by Stalin to questions submitted by a newspaper correspondent.

One of these questions and its answer were most interesting. The question was whether the Soviet Government would raise the blockade if the Western Powers agreed to postpone the formation of a West German state pending a meeting of foreign ministers to consider the problem of Germany as a whole. The answer given to this is worth quoting in full:

"Provided the United States of America, Great Britain, and France observe the conditions set forth in the third question, the Soviet Government sees no obstacles to lifting the transport restrictions on the understanding, however, that transport and trade restrictions introduced by the three powers should be lifted simultaneously."

Officers in the State Department believe that this might be a signal that the Soviet Government was ready to discuss an end to the blockade and counterblockade. It was decided that the Secretary of State, in a press conference, should give a signal back.

This took the form of a bland discussion of the questions and answers in the Stalin interview. No great importance was attributed to them. It was pointed out that the formation of a West German Government could hardly be a cause of the blockade since it had not been thought of when the blockade was imposed and was not imminent at the time. Certainly the measures taken in response to the blockade would end when it did. Finally, there were these two paragraphs:

"There are many ways in which a serious proposal by the Soviet Government to restore normal interzonal communications and communications with and within Berlin could be made. All channels are open for any suggestions to that end. The United States, together with the other Western occupying powers, would, of course, consider carefully any proposal made to solve the Berlin problem consistent with their rights, their duties, their obligations as occupying powers.

"As I say, all of the normal channels are open. I hope you will not take it amiss if I point out that if I on my part were seeking to give assurance of seriousness of purpose, I would choose some other channel than the channel of a press interview."

At the same time, a senior diplomatic officer attending a United Nations meeting was instructed to say quite casually to a senior Russian officer at the same meeting that he had been interested in the answers recently in the press and wondered whether they suggested anything more than the strict words of the text. The Russian officer had no information; but if he learned anything he would pass it on. In a week he did, equally casually. The answer had been very carefully prepared in Moscow. If the American officer had any specific question the Russian would do his best to get an answer.

WHEN SECRECY PAID OFF

Thus began a protracted and highly secret negotiation. The very fact that secrecy was preserved was to each of the parties a sign of the good faith of the other. In the end it was agreed that the blockade measures on both sides would be ended, a Foreign Ministers' meeting convened on the German problem, and no obligation incurred to postpone action on a West German Government, since there was plenty of time for the meeting to be held before, in the normal course of events, any further steps would be taken. As the negotiations finished, other parties were brought in; they approved the plan and joined in the announcement.

The conference of Foreign Ministers which followed took weeks and accomplished almost nothing. It was an exercise in propaganda over Germany. The Russians had exhausted their capacity for adjustment, and further progress must await the development of new realities.

Now, let us bring all this into focus on today's problems.

If the Russians believe, which I do not think they do, that their interests would be served by liquidating their offensive against Berlin, they are capable of doing this without a conference at the summit or elsewhere. They might demand, as a price, a conference of some sort to put the limelight of propaganda on what they might think was a new soft spot. But this would follow their decision and not be its cause.

Today, however, they do not wish to end their offensive against Berlin; they want to push it to success. The conference which they seek is designed not to be a cover for their yielding but for the yielding of the West.

PRIVATE CONFERENCES: IMPOSSIBLE

This brings us to the second of the illusions we have mentioned about negotiating with the Russians. This is contained within the belief that it is possible to have "private" and not "grandstand" conferences of heads of governments.

President Eisenhower does not share this illusion. "It is rather difficult," he said recently, "to visualize such a thing. If you meet with a group of world leaders, it is rather hard to keep the spotlight off of it." And how does one talk informally with batteries of interpreters and recorders and all that sort of thing? It would almost inevitably change, I think, into something rather formal.

The illusion, however, goes deeper than the belief that it is possible to keep these meetings private and out of the spotlight. It goes to a misconception of the role of these meetings in the Russians' strategy of negotiations.

The purpose of these meetings to them is not, through discussion of a subject, to reach a resolution of it or an accommodation regarding it. These meetings are acts in themselves which are intended to affect the relative positions of the parties.

The Soviets negotiate by acts and not by debate, offer, and counteroffer. Their purpose may be to separate allies, or to undermine governments with their people, or to win over uncommitted peoples. Or it may be, as in the tragic experience of Geneva in 1955, to bring a sense of relaxation, good will and security, before some energetic offensive such as Soviet intervention in the Middle East.

Publicity is the lifeblood of such an operation. It is not merely, as President Eisenhower thinks, that a meeting of world leaders attracts the spotlight. It is that the purposes of the Russian leaders demand the spotlight, for the spotlight makes an act out of a speech.

Here, too, the Soviet leaders have built-in advantage, for the spotlight shines brilliantly throughout the free world and stops at the Iron Curtain which rings their own. Their opponents and all who may support or sympathize with them are open and eager to be worked upon. But the Communist people are immune from any counteroffensive, and hear only what their rulers wish them to hear. The dice are loaded in this game.

The conclusion is not, of course, that the Western Powers must not go to these conferences. But it is an illusion to expect much from them, or to identify them with the process of negotiation, in the usual sense of the word. They should be recognized for what they are: dangerous and highly mobile adversary operations in which a cumbersome four-party control, matched against the fingertip variety, will do pretty well to score a tie.

The most elementary precautions require that the four pilots have a pretty concerted view of the hazards of the operation, the objective of their opponent, and both the strategy and tactics they may jointly have to follow.

As things are, one is not so sure that some bad collisions are not inevitable. Take, particularly, the idea of a move gradually to meet the Soviet desire for a stabilization of the situation in Eastern Europe and a freezing of East and West forces * * * in a zone extending either side of the Iron Curtain and beyond Germany.

This combination of words would not win a prize for clarity. But, if one might hazard an interpretation, they seem to mean that the West would accept indefinite Soviet domination of Eastern Europe and insure it by agreeing to the status quo of military

power from eastern Poland to—and, perhaps, including France.

This status quo would give preponderant power to the Soviet bloc. Doubtless there are some who would defend such a policy as a realistic evaluation of, and adjustment to, the ratio of power in Europe. They would do well to pause and think back.

Just 22 years ago another British Prime Minister made a very careful, well thought-out, not unintelligent appraisal of these factors and acted upon it quite coolly, and deliberately. Let us turn to Mr. Sebastian Haffner's description of the 1937 situation in the London Observer of September 28, 1958:

"Now Germany had, without meeting serious opposition, rearmed again and was making territorial demands backed by real power. Dealing with these demands was no longer a question of calling Hitler's bluff The question to be faced was whether to resist Germany at the very real risk of another war or whether to accept the new balance of power and adjust European frontiers and alliances accordingly, in favor of Germany and an agreement with her.

"Mr. Chamberlain, the new British Prime Minister, faced this question squarely and took his decision in favor of the second alternative.

"This scheme amounted, in effect, to the renegotiation, among the four great powers, of a new European peace settlement without a preceding renewal of war. The new settlement was to be based on the existing true balance of power, which meant a revision of the 1919 treaties in favor of Germany and, to a lesser extent, of Italy. Germany and Italy were to be made, by territorial concessions and extensions of their spheres of influence, contented and saturated powers like France and Britain; the new territorial settlement was to be underwritten and guaranteed by all four powers; and it was then to be capped by the establishment of a new four-power concert of Europe, permanent mutual consultation, reentry of Germany and Italy into the League of Nations, and disarmament.

"If this scheme—which, incidentally, was the last essay in world leadership on the part of Britain—succeeded, it meant peace for at least a generation, and also, for the same time, the preservation of Europe's global preponderance and the postponement of the world revolution which the Second World War was to unleash."

HITLER AND KHRUSHCHEV—A PARALLEL

The essence of the scheme was "to anticipate public German demands by private offers and to take and maintain the initiative." And this is where it failed. In the first place, Hitler did not want to be given what he demanded; he wanted to take it. In the second place, his demands came too fast to be satisfied by orderly processes of negotiation. The pace became more and more breathless until Hitler tired of the farce and moved against Poland.

The proposals mentioned above strike one as substantially similar to Mr. Chamberlain's scheme, but the parallel is not wholly complete. Khrushchev has no prejudice against being given what he wants. He is also willing to move in a more dignified way in receiving what Hitler before him had wanted—the domination of Europe—just so long as the West does not dillydally about it. He knows, or believes he does, the direction in which power ratios are moving and wants European relations to the Soviet Union and the United States adjusted accordingly.

One of the morals of this is that, while dealings with the Soviet Union are in some respects unique, in their fundamentals they are not. Another moral is that, in dealing with the Soviet Union, the prime requisite is to be honest with ourselves. Negotiation and flexibility are very fine words, but if we really mean retreat, if we mean a move gradually to meet the Soviet desire for the stabilization of the situation in Eastern Europe and a freeze of forces in Central Europe, it would be much better to be frank with ourselves.

For then we would all know that what we are proposing to do is to neutralize Western Germany, and to make impossible any defensive force in Western Europe except the threat of nuclear retaliation from America. With the growth of Russian nuclear power to a position of practical equality, this threat loses its credibility.

THE FACTS TO BE FACED

But the chief moral of all is that we should realize the facts and act upon them. One such fact is that, whether we like it or not, we are on a moving belt which is going to the summit. The question is no longer whether to go, but when, and what to do when we get there.

Another such fact is that at this conference what transpires—the proposals and counterproposals, the moves and countermoves—will be, like the shadows on the wall of Plato's cave, reflections from the real world outside.

If, as is the fact, we are failing to keep pace, as we could, with the rapid developments in the field of nuclear power, and have actually discarded all the increase in our conventional power created during the Korean crisis, our shadow on the conference table becomes pallid and emaciated.

If, with determined energy, we reverse these catastrophic tendencies; if, in addition, we increase our strength in Europe as—so we are told—the supreme commander has urged, then our shadow becomes more solid, because the strength of our position has become so.

We can and should be ready, as we have been on occasions in the past, to use ingenuity in devising ways to give the Soviet Union reasonable assurance of its own security and demonstrate our willingness to remove causes of anxiety, if any there really are. The negotiations at Geneva over the past years have had this purpose.

But one thing we should never do. That is to undermine the security of Western Europe—and with it the best hope we have for avoiding resort to nuclear war—by destroying the possibility of developing such a strong defensive position on the ground in Europe that any aggressor contemplating a move against it must contemplate an attack on so large a scale that nuclear war would almost certainly result. Only such a situation makes strategic nuclear power a credible threat and an effective deterrent.

It is because the Russian purpose in disturbing the status quo in Berlin seems—as already pointed out—clearly directed to making any military strength in Europe impossible, that one can hardly hope for much more from the conference than a return to the negotiations interrupted by the move against Berlin, and an end to that move. But one not given to pessimism may with reason fear that the Russian purpose and some of the proposals of our ally discussed here could bring disaster.

The CBR Threat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 27, 1959

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to call to the attention of my colleagues the column by Monte Bourjaily, Jr., appearing in the May 2, 1959, issue of Army Times entitled "The CBR Threat." I feel that the information contained in this article is of utmost importance and I am sure that the subject of Mr. Bourjaily's column will be of interest to the Congress. I take pleasure in having it printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

THE CBR THREAT

(By Monte Bourjaily, Jr.)

A favorite target of those opposed to spending money on defenses, passive, and active, has been civil defense. They argue that the purpose of civil defense is to give one-time protection of a civilian community against thermonuclear attack. This they say would cost tens of billions of dollars which would be better spent building retaliatory striking power, able to react in counterpunching style, at the first threat of attack against us.

Such a counterattack, they say, would knock out any enemy ability to further destroy civilian communities, thus making useless the vast systems of bunkers, radars, antimissile missile launching sites, and so forth, that passive and active defenses are made of.

But is it true that the only threat to civilian communities is a thermonuclear attack in which planes or missiles carry the warhead?

Maj. Gen. Marshall Stubbs, the Army's chief chemical officer, doesn't think so.

The Russians, he says, are fully aware of the capabilities of chemical, bacteriological, and radiological (CBR) weapons. Against civilian communities they make an ideal weapon system. They destroy or enervate the civilian population without destroying the plants and equipment that would be essential to (1) support a long ground war and (2) produce the things that are essential to life after the war is over.

For this reasons, says General Stubbs, "We must maintain a strong civil defense."

Against CBR attack, such a civil defense system need not be the expensive, bunker (or deep shelter) construction that critics of passive defense say it is. In fact, a program of information and education is the most effective method of building such a defense.

Certainly some equipment is needed. Impermeable clothing, gas masks, stocks of medicines, immunizations against the most likely diseases, increased public health activities, cleanliness in homes and industrial plants and offices, all costing money, are a part of any defense effort against CBR.

But to make people conscious of the potentials and possibilities of CBR attack and defense requires publicity. People must know what to expect and how to defend against it.

This creates a major problem. Because, for some reason, high officials in the Defense Department and the State Department have made it a national policy to prevent discussion of CBR.

CBR warfare has been painted as so horrible that it has become uncivilized to discuss it. Admission that we have CBR weapons is almost forbidden. Claims that defenses against CBR exist are also taboo.

But to defend against CBR, people must know what it is, how individual agents work, what the specific steps are that can be taken against them.

Equally important, because there are documents in which some defenses are described, men who are respected must be able to discuss CBR freely before most people will listen to them.

Big bangs, high-speed planes, giant battleships, the mysteries of submarines and missiles—all these have more "sex appeal" than an aerosol cloud, mixed with normal cloud formation, secretly released at a point where weather science says it will drift over a target and start disease.

Against the attack at its initiation there is little defense. Even the attack itself might never be recognized. It would appear as an epidemic of unknown source. Until a series of such epidemics developed and the statistics showed that they were not of national origin, there would be no way to know that the Nation was under attack.

Bacteriological and chemical attack is cheap, easy to deliver, hard to defend against. And neither the attacker nor the defense, except for the fear of their mystery, makes good copy.

The greatest enemy of fear is knowledge. In the CBR field, secrecy is the defender of ignorance, the producer of fear. It may not conform to the publicity consciousness of certain people, but it apepars to me that the Nation's defenses would be strengthened if this secrecy were removed and if some of the headline hunters would put self-advancement aside to advance knowledge in this unspectacular area.

What Is Wrong With Unions?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 6, 1959

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include a most interesting letter I received from a union member from my home State. This man, quite understandably, wishes to remain anonymous:

DEAR SIRS: In submitting this my first contribution to your publication may I say that in being a member of the U.A.W. myself I am not antiunion but antiloafer in a sense that after seeing this type of behavior through the years I can only come to the conclusion that management and labor have slipped somewhere. Naturally I have to request that you do not disclose my identity should you decide to use my article.

Respectfully,

P.S.—The above remarks could also be used as you see fit and to conclude I can only say this. Where could a person go today and get paid for doing nothing?

WHAT IS WRONG WITH UNIONS?

DEAR SIRS: I have chosen the above title because of the fact that recently there has been a growing concern in this land of ours, and particularly in this State, of the recent recession and its accompanying unemployment.

Being employed in one of the largest automobile factories in Michigan for over 25 years I should like to reminisce a little and go back to the time of the last wartime period.

I can well remember assembly lines being so loaded with personnel, people were falling over each other to get out of each other's way. Restrooms were loaded at all hours, and one could witness any kind of pastime from playing cards to reading the daily newspapers.

Today it is different. Uncle Sam is not footing the bill, and there is a distinct show of retrenchment in the overall reduction of employees in all departments. Also there is a growing demand for more productivity. All of this is very difficult to accomplish after the bars have been let down too long.

The net result is we find union stewards and plant committeemen who have not worked in years resenting the implication that they should take off their coats and show a little interest in what they were hired for.

All of which brings me to this conclusion: Does management operate under a set of double standards in that they close their eyes to what the UAW stewards and plant committeemen do with their time and expect the rank-and-file to make up for this discrepancy?

Mr. Reuther and those who are so want to get America back to work would do well to think this over. If unionism is to continue its gains then it should commence to rid itself of the parasites from within. By this I mean the type of man when elected to office considers this as a free ticket to quit working. This man is no good to the company, to the union, or its members.

As a direct result of the union setup today we find skilled men looking for work, or otherwise doing work unsuited to them; in other words, round pegs in square holes. The big cry is seniority. Well, this is how it works: The more seniority you have the better it is for you, except (and here is where the rub comes in, viz, if you are an elected steward of the union it does not matter if you have a lot of seniority or a little, you can, if there should be a layoff, keep your job in preference to a worker with much more seniority).

What is wrong here? It means that a man who never saw the place until years after you have worked for the company can remain for years employed while you are thrown out on the street.

Election to office has meant nothing more than a free pass to get out of working, the excuse being that they are too busy with grievances to take care of the work assigned to them. This has worked a hardship, especially where a steward is a member of a small group and in his absence the others have to carry the load.

Mr. Reuther should be asked, and very bluntly, the following questions:

How long would he tolerate a condition of this kind in his own organization if he had to pay for it from his own payroll?

Why should a man with many years more seniority than his steward be out on the street in preference to a steward or plant committeeman who has less?

These things, and many more, are why more than one supervisory employee has said to me in the recent past that to try to enforce an order is folly and that they wish that they were of eligible retirement age so that they could get away from it all.

The Cold War: Facts, Myths, Consequences, and Cure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BYRON L. JOHNSON
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 16, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, few men are better qualified to speak on international relations than Brig. Gen. Hugh B. Hester, who speaks on "The Cold War: Fact, Myths, Consequences, and Cure."

Not only has General Hester 34 years of military experience, preceding his retirement in 1951, but he has continued his part in public affairs by graduate study of international relations at the University of Pennsylvania. He has written numerous articles for many journals of comment and literature.

Under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD his comments on the cold war delivered last September to the United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America:

THE COLD WAR: FACTS, MYTHS, CONSEQUENCES, AND CURE

(An address delivered by Gen. Hugh B. Hester, retired, Wednesday, September 3, 1958, before the 23d international convention, United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America)

I work for peace, and I am delighted to be here because I think this is an audience that needs to hear the message that I have to give. While I realize that the subject that has been announced is "The Cold War: Facts, Myths, Consequences, and Cure," I am really going to talk about peace.

And while talking about peace I recognize that in many circles the word itself has become somewhat suspect. I deplore this but I recognize it. Nevertheless, I am going to talk about peace. And I am going to use one of the techniques that has been, in my opinion, used very much to the disadvantage of America.

It shouldn't be necessary for an officer that has spent more than 34 years in the Regular Army of his Nation, serving in every rank from that of second lieutenant to that of general officer, to have to come before any audience and to defend his patriotism. But that is one of the consequences of this cold war. And I am going to prove not only by my record but by association that I am entitled to talk to you as a patriotic American.

The President of the United States on April 19, 1953, shortly after he took office, said that: "Every gun that is made, every warship launched, every rocket fired signifies, in the final sense, a theft from those who hunger and are not fed, those who are cold and are not clothed. We pay for a single fighter plane with a half billion bushels of wheat. We pay for a single destroyer with new homes that could have housed more than 8,000 people * * * is there no other way this world can live?"

That was Dwight D. Eisenhower on April 19, 1953.

MacArthur—and I would like to read this directly from his speech on his 75th birthday in Los Angeles under the sponsorship of the American Legion; this is General MacArthur who had command of our forces in Australia and later in the Philippines and then took command of our occupation in Japan. I served under him for 3 years—he said, and I quote:

"But this very triumph of scientific annihilation—this very success of invention—has destroyed the possibility of war being a medium of practical settlement of international differences. The enormous destruction to both sides of closely matched opponents makes it impossible for the winner to translate it into anything but his own disaster."

I would like to underscore the word "disaster." He continued:

"War has become a Frankenstein to destroy both sides. No longer is it the weapon of adventure whereby a shortcut to international power and wealth—a place in the sun—can be gained. If you lose, you are annihilated. If you win, you stand only to lose. No longer does it possess the chance of the winner of the duel—it contains, rather, the germs of double suicide. Science has clearly outmoded it as feasible arbiter."

Perhaps the most distinguished field soldier that America has had in its long history is General of the Armies, Omar N. Bradley. I had the pleasure of serving with him in the Pentagon. At a Memorial Day exercise in Massachusetts in 1948 he said this and I quote:

"It is easy for those of us who are living to honor those who are dead for in doing so we can assuage our feeling of guilt for the dead.

"Wars can be prevented just as surely as they can be provoked, and we who fail to prevent them must share in the guilt for the dead."

He continued some years later at St. Albans Assembly in Washington (November 5, 1957) before the St. Albans Episcopal School, and he said the following which I shall read:

"The central problem of our time, as I view it, is how to employ human intelligence for the salvation of mankind. It is a problem we have put upon ourselves. For we have defiled our intellect by the creation of such scientific instruments of destruction that we are now in great danger of destroying ourselves."

Then he continued, "This irony can probably be compounded a few more years or perhaps even a few decades. Missiles will bring anti-missiles, and anti-missiles will bring anti-anti-missiles. But inevitably this whole electronic house of cards will reach a point where it can be constructed no higher."

And he concludes: "If we are going to save ourselves from the instruments of our own intellect, we had better soon get ourselves under control and begin making the world safe for living."

I submit, ladies and gentlemen, that puts me in pretty good company—the President of the United States, one of the distinguished soldiers of the World War MacArthur, and that great distinguished field soldier, Omar N. Bradley.

I cite these distinguished officers in connection with a story, if I may digress for a moment, of a young lawyer from my section of the country. And you may have recognized from my accent it is the South, but certainly not the Deep South; the Deep South that doesn't believe in the equality and the dignity of all men before all other men. I believe very deeply that all men are created equal in the eyes of God. This ought to be repeated again and again in America today.

He was the first lawyer in Granville County to graduate from Harvard Law School and he was pleading his case before the circuit court. He said some things that were pretty smart and some not so smart. It happened to be a matter of contract law under discussion and the judge said, "Mr. Ingram, you ought to assume that the court knows at least the elements of the law of contract. We know it must have consideration, legal purpose, and so forth." The young fellow smiled at the judge and said, "Your Honor, I made that assumption at the last court and lost my case." [Laughter and applause.] I no longer assume all will accept defense of peace as patriotic.

Since your president asumes that all of us belong to a kind of bureaucracy, unions and the army and all the rest, I feel somewhat at home. When I was invited up here by the president through one of his representatives and yours, I accepted with great pleasure and alacrity. The chap that asked me was Russ Nixon, with whom I had the pleasure of serving in Berlin in the early days of the Armistice.

But since that invitation was extended to me, the United States and the world have been brought twice to the brink of war. In the last 10 years we have been apparently moving from brink to brink to brink, to a point where a great many people refer to our Secretary of State as the Secretary of Brink of War.

Now, I promised to unload this wagon and I will do so promptly and let you ask some questions if the chairman will permit.

What are the facts about this cold war that you hear so much about in the press, over the radio and on the television? The fact is, ladies and gentlemen, there is nothing new about it.

This war, either hot or cold, between the United States and the U.S.S.R., has been going on since 1917, and it was a hot war from 1918 to 1920. We invaded Russia from three sides, Archangel, Vladivostok, and another point up near Archangel. Twelve other nations, former allies of Imperial Russia, did likewise. These powers, including the United States, then an associate power—we had not decided, at that time, that we wanted to belong to every conceivable alliance—so we were an associate power—but we participated in a complete blockade of what was then the Soviet Union, very greatly reduced from Czarist Russia as you may recall, for 1 year.

I am not prepared to say how many people's lives were lost because of that blockade. We do know that millions starved, but I am not prepared to say that they would have lived, all of them certainly, if there had been no blockade, I doubt that they would have because of the poor distribution system.

But when people tell you this is something new, I want to tell you it isn't and the cold war idea, ladies and gentlemen, is not a new idea: it started long, long before 1917. A cold war has been a part of every ideological struggle: The Crusades, the invasions of the Mohammedans; the struggle between the Catholics and Protestants. It has been an integral part of all religious wars and all imperial wars. And everything the Russians are saying about us today and everything that we are saying about the Russians, the Athenians said about the Spartans, the Romans about the Carthaginians, and if you want to go back further in history, 5,000 years ago, they were saying the same things about each other in China.

So there is nothing new about it. It is just another one of the instruments of conflict, including the present cold war.

But what has it cost you and me and every other American citizen? Since World War II we have spent approximately $500 billion for security. And I might add that in the opinion of the people with whom I talk in Washington and around the country, the United States today, after that expenditure, has less security than at any other time in her history.

It has reduced the purchasing power of the dollar that you are paid by 50 percent.

The great powers alone are spending over $100 billion annually. It is probably close to $120 billion, and that is estimated to be more than the annual income of two-thirds of the human race.

And I ask you, in all seriousness, how are you going to build schools, how are you going to build playgrounds, how are you going to build hospitals, and provide adequate medical care not only for these two-thirds of the human race but for your children and my children and our grandchildren?

I submit, ladies and gentlemen, even if it were possible to keep this enormous expenditure going without the catastrophe of war, it would not be possible for you to adequately educate, house, and clothe your children and it would be impossible to combat successfully this horrible thing that we call juvenile delinquency.

Down in Washington some pundit said, in discussing the subject of juvenile delinquency, when an adult acts like a child we call him silly; but when a child acts like an adult, we call him a juvenile delinquent.

And I submit that as we look at the facts that I have just presented to you about this cold war, that there is a great deal of substance in that pundit's statement.

One of the basic myths that we hear about this cold war is that the United States and the West were perfectly willing to cooperate at the end of the Second World War, but for Stalin intransigence.

Gentlemen, I submit from all the facts I have presented that this is not true. There has been no real effort on either side to reach a detenté, to make a cooperative effort—and I repeat either side. I want to make this very clear because most of the things I am going to say are going to be said about our side, not because I think it is any worse or as bad as the other, but I am talking to Americans who have an opportunity to take action. If I were making this speech in Russia, I would talk to the Russians about what they are doing and what they ought to do. So the press and you will recognize, I hope, that I am talking to an American audience and I am telling you about some of the things that we are doing, you will understand it for that reason.

It doesn't do me any good or you any good to get up and repeat David Lawrence's and Constantine Brown's harangues about what all the terrible things the Russians have done; the many, many dozens of contracts and international agreements they have broken. Why should I compete with them? They have a column and parrot all the evils of the Russian people and leaders daily and they get plenty of help from radio and television commentators and newspaper columnists. I don't need to compete with them. I am going to tell you some things that you ought to know about what we are doing

It simply is a myth that the capitalist world and the Communist world have at any time in the last 40 years been willing really to sit down to discuss their problems and resolve their differences. So when people tell you it was Russian intransigence, that was part of it, but only a part of it.

The second myth is that the Russians were going to move across Western Euorpe to the English Channel and the only thing that stopped them was NATO. Ladies and gentlemen, that is also not true. That's a great myth. If the Russians had any intention of moving to the channel, NATO had nothing to do with stopping them. To this day it is not capable of stopping the Russians from moving to the channel if they intended to do so. If they intended to move, which I doubt, the only thing that has stopped them has been the fear of a third world war. And I can tell you, after making a 12,000-mile trip a year ago through 8 of their 15 republics, neither the Russian people nor the Russian leaders want war with the United States. They have had it. They want peaceful coexistence and want it badly.

Why? Not because they are any more peace-loving than anybody else, but because they lost between fifteen and twenty million people during World War II. That's 10 percent of the population, ladies and gentlemen. They lost in farms and factories the equivalent of all the farms and factories of the United States east of the Mississippi River. I mean a comparable loss because they didn't have that many factories.

Ladies and gentlemen, they don't want war. They've had it.

Another great myth is that only our opponents are subversive; that this is an instrument or weapon of welfare that we don't deal in.

If you will permit me, I would like to quote from Walter Lippmann.

In his August 5 column of the Washington Post, Walter Lippmann said:

"Someone to whom the President will listen should warn him that he will make a great mistake if he thinks that he can dominate the summit conference with

charges of indirect aggression. For the truth is that indirect agression—that is to say, propaganda, infiltration, bribery, subversion—is an old instrument of power politics, and in our time it is the way the cold war is fought. Both sides use it when they think they can do so to their own advantage. It would impair, not enhance, the President's moral credit if he were to become blindly self-righteous, and were to tell a knowing and skeptical world that we do not resort to what he calls indirect aggression and that only our adversaries do.

"Panama will be sitting on the Security Council, a living reminder of how the United States obtained the Canal Zone in order to build the canal. Guatemala was only recently the scene of a successful coup, publicly applauded by Mr. Eisenhower himself, to oust an anti-American and fellow-traveling government. The President will be reminded of what happened in Iran when Mossadegh was pushed out. Over the whole of the President's denunciation of external interference against existing governments will hang the Dulles theory of the liberation of Eastern Europe, and the obvious fact that if we knew a way to overturn the existing governments without the enormous risks of war, we should be only too happy to use that way."

What I am trying to point out is that every nation has used every one of the weapons in its arsenals in a total war. And you might be interested to know that this principle was actually enunciated during our American Revolution. Up to that time most of the wars of the world had been fought by professional armies, privately owned armies of the kings and the emperors.

But we did not like standing armies, so we said every citizen must serve in the defense of his country.

What did that do? I am not pointing these things out critically. Not at all. I am merely pointing out how these things developed.

Well, if everybody owes service to his Government in wartime—at least that is the way it has been for nearly two centuries now—it means that your technician, your scientist, your businessman, your munitions makers, all owe service to the Government.

Under this concept your technicians, industrialists, scientists, all of you people come into the picture. There isn't a member in this audience that isn't a part of our war efforts.

That was introduced for the first time, ladies and gentlemen, during the American Revolution, and it was perfected by the French in the French Revolution that followed. And this makes a myth again out of the contention of those who say that limited war is still permissible but that unlimited war is not. Limited war between the polar powers is a great myth.

Limited war between the United States and Russia is completely impossible. Once Americans and Russians begin to shoot each other, you are going to trigger your thermonuclear war.

That doesn't mean that some Chinese can't shoot some other Chinese, or some Arabs can't be shot by some Jews. It means that Russian and United States soldiers, sailors, marines, and airmen must not start shooting each other.

I would like to pass briefly now to the consequences. The most outstanding consequence, it seems to me, is the modern propaganda machines. We are in a propaganda war now and have been for years. The shooting part comes later, but it always comes unless the leaders are willing to sit around the conference table to discuss their differences and resolve their disputes.

That is why I have proposed again and again meetings at the summit, regularly scheduled, so that the people who control the thermonuclear weapons, the men who have to give the signal for the start of a war, can become acquainted and understand one another.

But this propaganda machine is building up in the minds of you and me and everybody on both sides of the Iron Curtain a mental state that will tolerate human incineration.

I have heard a Representative of Congress say that he would rather see the human race, the whole human race, incinerated than to see the Communists dominate the world.

Well, I am going to beg out of that commitment because I don't want to be incinerated, and I know that no nation can dominate the world for anything except a brief period of time, and I do know that many nations have been conquered only to rise very soon thereafter to challenge their conquerors.

It has happened to most of you as well as to me. I have participated in two occupations in Germany, and the Germans, as far as I can discover, are getting along pretty well today. They are telling us off more often than not.

I remember a Britisher, when Russ Nixon and I were stationed together in Berlin, at one of our quasi-partite meetings, giving a toast to the United States in which he said: "You won't have any allies in the next war." That was rather astonishing coming from a Britisher. So we asked: "Why?" and he replied: "Well, for the simple reason that you treat your enemies after you conquer them so damn much better than you do your allies that everybody will want to be conquered by you next time." [Laughter.]

That leads to another point. All of this tragic nonsense about the inevitability of war simply is not true. It is a pure fabrication. You don't really have permanent enemies and you don't have permanent allies.

What you actually have are opponents, and they change with such rapidity that it is almost impossible to tell from one decade to the next who is your friend and who is going to be your opponent or enemy. Nations have permanent interests, but they certainly do not have permanent allies or permanent friends.

Please don't quote me as saying that I think the United States should never have any allies. I feel about this alliance thing a good deal like the cowhand felt about the sermon. Just because we didn't have any alliances for more than 150 years it should not follow that in 10 years we should make an alliance with everybody who is willing to state for a consideration that he is opposed to communism. And yet this is exactly what we have done.

We have more than 40 allies today, and there is only one single unifying factor in any one of them. They don't speak the same language, they don't have the same interests, and they don't have the some concept of freedom and justice. But they do have a common interest in U.S. dollars, and that is all.

Ladies and gentlemen, when the showdown comes—and God forbid that it should ever come—we won't have any allies, as that Englishman said in his toast. Why? Because the alliance system itself is not reciprocal. It has not mutuality. Why do I say this? Because it is the same distance from England to Poland and vice versa, since the English have bases only in their own country and the Poles have bases only in their own country. But the distance between Russia and the United States is not the same both ways. Why? Because the United States and Russia both have alliances which permit them to have bases on other people's territory.

Repeatedly, in my trip to Europe Members of Parliament and Members of the Chamber of Deputies of France kept pointing out the nonreciprocality of the relationship in these alliances. They recognized that in any thermonuclear war between the polar powers all of Europe would be destroyed, whatever might happen to the United States and the U.S.S.R. And we can't deny that.

If you cannot protect your allies, you cannot depend upon them. Every competent student of international relations knows this. And just as soon as U.S. dollars are cut off, it will be, in my considered judgment, to the interests of these countries to become neutral. The same will happen to the Russian allies.

There should be a neutral belt throughout Europe. There should be military disengagement of the capitalist forces of the world from the Communist forces of the world—complete disengagement right around the globe in order to avoid a thermonuclear war.

Now let us take a look—Mr. Chairman, you have got a gavel here, I saw you use it once, so just use it on me when these people's seats can't take it any longer.

Let's look around the globe. You've got a divided Germany. Does anybody really believe that you can unify Germany inside NATO? Does anybody believe that you can unify Germany inside of the Warsaw Pact?

No. Even Mr. Dulles doesn't believe that. You cannot liberate Eastern Europe from the Soviet domination unless you have a European settlement which makes Europe safe for Russia, safe for Europe.

What you need is a simple declaration on both sides, after you have reached an agreement to neutralize the area and to get both the Russians and the United States out of Europe—back home, both of them—a simple declaration that any violent modification of the territorial status of any European state by external means will constitute a cause for a third world war. This is all that is required to preserve the peace of Europe.

Let's take a look at one of our many brink-of-war situations. Does any informed person really believe that peace in the Middle East is possible so long as the Russians and the United States will not cooperate. Just as long as the little boys can play the big boys off against each other conflict is inevitable.

Do you suppose that Russia will permit the United States to exclude her from the Middle East without stirring up all possible trouble? The answer to that is, would the United States permit any great power to exclude her from her own backyard? Do you suppose we would permit Russia to say you can't come into Mexico, that's our concern? Or Canada? The answer, ladies and gentlemen, is pretty obvious. The only way that you can get a solution in the Middle East is to have a detentê between the U.S.S.R. and the United States.

Isn't it completely irrational for the American Government to chide the Arab Government for not recognizing Israel when the United States refuses to recognize one-fourth of the human race, China, and insists on maintaining islands that are almost within rifle range of her coast.

The people who insist that a settlement of the Middle Eastern problem is possible without a settlement of the major problem between the United States and U.S.S.R. are either ignorant themselves or think that you are completely so.

The Russians are not going to permit the United States to dominate the Middle East in its backyard any more than we are going to permit the Russians to dominate an area in our backyard.

So, I repeat, what you need here is disengagement. The United States and the U.S.S.R. must agree to work together in this area before any real peace or stability can be achieved.

Let the Arabs federate. They have got just as much right to unite—they speak a common language, they have a common culture, they have had a historical background

that antedates the United States by thousands of years—they have just as much right to unite as the United States had. Just as much right as England had to make Scotland, England, and Wales a United Kingdom. Just as Russia had the right to unite its various colonies. Just the same right that Italy had in the first part of the 19th century, and Germany had in the second.

All the statements about guaranteeing oil for the west is pure malarkey. Who would they sell their oil to if not the west? Mossadegh didn't refuse to sell oil to the west when he nationalized the oil companies in Iran. England refused with the concurrence of the United States to let him sell it. But it was not a case of the Iranians refusing. They wanted to sell the oil to the west. Where else could they sell it?

I know that these observations will not gain the approval of the hundred percent American. But I am talking to the thousand percent Americans, those who believe you must do unto others as you would have them do unto you.

I am talking about and to people that belong to the human race, and if you do not belong to that today, ladies and gentlemen, you are not going to exist very long, because the world is growing and changing in very vital respects. Nationalism alone is not enough. My country may it always be right is correct but my Government right or wrong is quite a different matter.

The Arabs are going to unite with or without our consent.

You cannot expect to ever unite Korea, or Vietnam under a government that is completely hostile to China. You haven't the power to do so. And no Chinese leader is so ignorant as to permit the establishment of a beachhead on his own continent by an implacable enemy, allied to a Polar power enemy, unless he is forced to do it, and the United States has not the power to force it.

Even if the Communists don't last on the mainland, neither Chiang Kai-shek nor any of his descendants will return to occupy mainland China. They have lost the "call or favor of heaven." They were evicted after they had once occupied it and there isn't a case in the 5,000 years of Chinese history in which someone who had been ejected, who had lost the favor of heaven, has been returned to power.

So all of this talk about Chiang Kai-shek returning to the mainland of China is the bunk.

There can be no peace with China so long as the United States inside on maintaining these bases in her mainland harbor and supports a pretender to power, Chiang Kai-shek. They may not expel Chiang Kai-shek from Matsu or Quemoy this year, they may not do it next year, but ladies and gentlemen, it will be done, and if we do not change our attitude and make it possible for peaceful evacuation, it is my prediction that it will trigger world war III—unless it starts in Germany or in the Middle East prior thereto.

There is not a case in history in which any great power permitted a pretender, supported by another great power, to remain at peace any longer than it was powerless to challenge him.

Walter Lippmann says that Germany will be united with or without war. And it is within our province along with the Russians to permit its unification without war.

Dorothy Thompson says that there will be an Arab nation with or without our consent. With our consent we can arrange it peacefully, but without our consent, it will be arranged anyway.

Nathaniel Peffer, head of international relations at Columbia University, one ofthe great experts of that area, says that China is no peril to the United States. China has no Navy. China cannot invade any portion of the globe that is of peril to us without a Navy. She can expand on the mainland, and if continually refused the fredom against attack from Formosa Straits, it is very likely she will use her vast Army for that purpose just as she did in Korea.

Many people that have studied the subject carefully believe that Chinese intervention in the Korean war might have been avoided had we recognized Red China as Mr. Truman planned in March 1950.

The whole matter of recognition had been cleared, I am told, when a distinguished U.S. Senator, Senator KNOWLAND, went on a nationwide television and radio hookup opposing it. After this, Mr. Truman cancelled the planned recognition.

We actually went to war with China when Mr. Truman put the 7th Fleet in the Formosa Straits, and since she had no fleet to challenge the 7th Fleet, she challenged the United States later in Korea where she had land forces.

And I ask you here who is capable of saying that Mr. Truman's putting the 7th Fleet into the Korean civil war was any less of a violation of the United Nations' Charter than Chinese intervention in Korea who had no obligation under the Charter since China was not allowed to become a member because of the opposition of the United States?

Who is to make that moral judgment? I know that I can't, and I doubt if anybody that is informed can.

The United States cannot have it both ways. Either Formosa is a part of China and interference in her civil war constitutes a violation of our obligation under the Charter, or it is not a part of China and it is a fraud to insist that Formosa instead of China be seated in the United Nations.

Nations and people do not have allies in any meaningful sense, they have associates; they do not have enemies in any permanent sense; they have opponents. And the associates and opponents reverse their position with remarkable rapidity—as an example, Germany and Japan and the United States before Pearl Harbor and Germany and Japan and the United States in 1950. A second illustration, United States, the Soviet Union and China in 1941 and again the Soviet Union and China in 1950. Does it look like we have permanent allies or permanent enemies?

The enemies of nations and peoples are not Fascists, Nazis, Communists, Nasserists or any of these "ists" or "isms." The real enemies of man are abject poverty, abysmal ignorance and arrant bigotry. Any war, hot or cold immeasurably increases the three of these monsters.

And the first victim of any war is truth. Truth is truly the Unknown Soldier of any war. It does not lie buried in some richly decorated sarcophagus or magnificent mausoleum at Arlington with a military guard in attendance or at the Arc de Triomphe or anywhere else in the world. Truth lies rotting in the shrunken mind and shriveled heart of the ignorant, the prejudiced and the bigoted everywhere.

Those who would rather incinerate the human race through thermonuclear war than sit around the conference table with their ideological opponents to resolve their disputes and reconcile their differences, they are the familiar "100 percent patriots," are the old Crusaders, the religious inquisitionists; the two-dimensional minded; those who see all color as black and white; all conduct as good or evil; and all the world as God or Devil.

Undess we realize the real enemies and apply therapeutic treatment to the causes rather than to the symptoms, we are bound to fail and this time we shall probably pull down all the pillars of civilization instead of merely those of the Temple as was the case of Sampson of old. In closing I would like to read the final paragraph of my guest editorial which appeared in the Saturday Review, November 16, 1957:

"It no longer serves any useful purpose to debate who or what started the cold war; or why, when, or where it was initiated. It is an evil thing and must be liquidated. It should be permissible, also, to declare that expressions such as 'balance of power,' 'positions of strength,' and 'power politics' have lost all rational meaning. They are anachronisms in the A- and H-age and must be discarded.

"As possible useful contributions to a new approach, the following suggestions are presented. First, the President should resume discussions with the top leaders of the great powers. The United Nations headquarters offers the proper place for such a meeting, with the President of the United States in the role of host.

"Second, the United States should promote instead of oppose the universalization of the United Nations. At this great forum all voices should be heard, not just those nations we or any other people may temporarily approve.

"Third, the U.S. Government should discard its pious attitude about recognition of those regimes actually in control of the instruments of power in other countries. Whether the leaders of any nation, great or small, meet or fail to meet in their official conduct high standards of personal probity is largely a matter of who keeps the scorecards.

"Fourth, the United States should sponsor and support a vast economic development program under the auspices of the United Nations in order to eliminate the worst features of poverty now smothering freedom in many lands. It is believed this could be accomplished at much less cost than with unilateral aid, now largely military in character.

"Finally, the United States should assume leadership of negotiations designed to remove restrictions on international trade and travel. There is certainly no longer any valid evidence to support the thesis that restrictions on trade with Communist countries have retarded, or will in the future delay, their scientific and technical progress. But there is ample evidence to support the belief that these restrictions have increased the poverty of the world's masses and the burdens of those nations we would convince of the superiority of the capitalist system.

"It is worth repeating over and over again, I believe, that the real enemies of man are poverty, ignorance, and bigotry; that wars and preparations for war increase these; and that totalitarianism in whatever form is more often than not the symptom rather than the cause of man's maladies. The persistent sputtering of sputnik merely reemphasizes the importance of and necessity for man's continuous search for permanent peace, the grand design of which must ever remain a federation of the world and a parliament of man."

Those Quotation Marks, Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 6, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial appearing in the Greenville (S.C.) News on March 27, 1959.

That editorial shows how States like South Carolina, which through their

supreme courts have held fair trade laws unconstitutional, will find a fair trade law to be the law within their States regardless of their own wishes or regardless of their public policy as expressed by their courts or legislatures.

If the so-called fair trade bills, H.R. 1253 and other similar legislation, become law the rights of the State of South Carolina and other States will be trampled roughshod underfoot and retail sales within their States will be made subject to price fixing by persons as far away as the other side of the continent.

The article follows:

THOSE QUOTATION MARKS, AGAIN

Proponents of the "fair trade" laws, having lost fights in many State courts, including South Carolina's Supreme Court, have now redoubled their efforts in Congress.

On the opening day of the session, Representative OREN HARRIS, of Arkansas, introduced a "fair trade" bill. Because he is chairman of the House Commerce Committee which will consider the proposal, the odds are heavily in favor of its receiving the best of treatment.

"Fair trade" laws are not fair. They hurt the retailer by refusing him the privilege of selling goods at a price he chooses rather than one chosen for him by a manufacturer. And they hurt consumers by increasing the prices of the goods sold.

Those who favor "fair trade" laws say they protect small merchants. This is a dubious theory at best. Most successful small merchants are successful because they offer something more than price, for it is an observable truism that most inveterate price-cutters cut more than prices.

"Fair trade" laws won't stop the trend in some fields toward larger retail units any more than the failure to adopt those laws will accelerate it. But there will always be a demand for the personal services and friendly atmosphere offered by smaller stores.

The bad theory behind "fair trade" is compounded by the way it was put into practice. The minimum prices established by manufacturers did not have to be accepted by all sellers, nor even a majority of them. A minority could agree and thus force all sellers to follow suit whether they wanted to or not.

This was the reason why most State courts threw out the laws. Beaten in the States, the "fair traders" are now going to Washington for help in complete disregard for States rights.

We feel about "fair trade" as the Wall Street Journal recently expressed itself about "liberal" politicians. The words don't mean what they imply to most people That's why we put quotation marks around them, just as newspapers do in the case of "Prince" Mike Romanoff.

Physical Fitness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 5, 1959

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Louis B. Wright, of the Folger Shakespeare Library here in Washington, recently made a speech in South Carolina in which he lambasted intercollegiate football. He referred to college alumni as "thick-headed" for promoting football. This is most shocking to me as it came at a time when we are all becoming aware of the physical unfitness of our youth. It is alarming to note that, at the present time, 52.8 percent of the young men of America eligible for military service are rejected because of physical deficiencies.

This physical softness is of great concern to the President of the United States, to many Members of Congress, and to our military leaders. The President has called several conferences in order to promote a campaign for better physical preparedness. American youth today are far below the physical standards of the youth of Western Europe. There must be an incentive for our young men to become physically fit and rugged. The greatest incentive that I know of in America today is college football. Hundreds of thousands of young boys play football on sandlot teams, on midget teams, and in high school in the hope that some day in college they, too, can participate in this great intercollegiate sport. Without the emphasis in college, I doubt if there would be the incentive earlier in life; thus, untold thousands of American youth would be deprived of participating in this great sport.

The military defense of America and conquest of space will require courage, physical fitness, mental alertness, and moral character. I know of no place where all of these traits of character are better learned than on the gridirons of America. In this cold war, we need as never before discipline, mental alertness, leadership, and sportsmanship. If space is to be conquered ahead of the Russians, it is going to require strong bodies and strong minds. Football is excellent training for our youth. It will help them meet the challenges of space and the Communistic ideology.

The training I received in football is most helpful to me here in this Congress during debate and in exercising our Democratic processes. It has been my observation that in those schools where intercollegiate football has been attacked and discontinued, there you will find a trend toward conformity, socialism, so-called intellectualism, and extreme liberalism. They howl about academic freedom, yet exponents of the free enterprise system and States rights and men who believe in individual liberty are scarcely welcome on the campus. Alger Hiss has made a number of appearances where footbal lhas been deemphasized.

We need more football and less sex education. We need more "Yes, sir" and "No, sir" and less child psychology. I only wish the weeping mothers and fathers in homes broken by juvenile delinquency could again be proud as they watch their sons participate in high school and college football games. We need education, we need brains, we need spiritual faith and, yes, muscle, to survive.

Mr. Speaker, the following article is from the column of Jim Anderson, sports editor of the Greenville (S.C.) News.

ANTISPORT SPEECH POPULAR

(By Jim Anderson)

Speaks apparently have learned that the best way to be quoted in the press is to lambast college athletics.

Not much notice is given to criticism of lack of better chemistry labs, or if the speaker says Latin as a language isn't needed.

Favorite quote in the high school Latin class used to be: "Latin is a dead language; as dead as it can be. It first killed the Romans; and now it's killing me."

Experts on Shakespeare such as Dr. Louis B. Wright of Washington, D.C., appear to know as much about the college athletic programs as we know about Shakespeare. Maybe it's unfair to Dr. Wright to say that if he had confined his remarks to the Bard of Avon the other day at Wofford the press reports wouldn't have made page one.

The address at Wofford was harsh towards sports. Dr. Wright has not kept himself informed on the trend in athletics when he says football is as obsolete as the tail of the dinosaur and that athletics has nothing whatsoever to do with education.

His contention is that many athletes are in college who shouldn't be there. Therefore, he thinks varsity sports should be eliminated and athletics be confined to intramurals.

But if there are nonathlete students in college who shouldn't be there, certainly psychology III isn't going to be dropped as a subject.

MUCH THOUGHT TO ATHLETICS

While the charge was being made at Wofford that only thick-headed alumni were keeping intercollegiate football, men of brains from the foremost colleges in a five-State area were in meetings where their thoughts were directed towards athletics.

The Southern Conference and Atlantic Coast Conference meetings at Williamsburg and Greensboro brought together faculty members, athletic directors and coaches of 17 outstanding schools. If Dr. Wright could have been at either meeting he would have been enlightened to a tremendous difference in the operation of sports programs today compared with 25 years ago.

The majority of educators believe that properly controlled intercollegiate athletics make a worthwhile and healthy contribution to the total educational program.

No longer are there double standards for the nonathlete and athlete. As Joe Sherman, of Clemson, points out, "the same degree of academic accomplishment" is required for all.

The athlete is most fortunate in getting extra education in sports that is not received in any other field. This extra education includes instilling of desire, teamwork, attempt to overcome overwhelming opposition, overriding fear, learning to discipline self, recognition of authority.

Athletics develop better citizens, soldiers, and men.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the following editorial is from the Washington Star:

ARE WE GETTING SOFT?

As National Youth Fitness Week begins, it is well to take stock of ourselves with respect to physical fitness. Those of us who are leading the sedentary lives of average city or suburban residents could profit from a bit of self-appraisal. We would find that we are creatures of automation in an age of labor-saving devices designed to make life easier—and softer for all. Instead of chopping wood or shoveling coal to heat our homes, we set the thermostat and let an automatic furnace do the rest. We drive to the corner for groceries or medicines. Our children ride in schoolbuses to classrooms only a few blocks away. We cut the grass with self-

propelled power lawnmowers—some of them with riding seats. Even farmers no longer follow the plow; they ride in relative comfort on tractors.

Some of us get a bit of exercise on weekends by driving to a country club and playing a round of golf—usually with caddies or carts to take care of the bag of clubs. Or we do some gardening, with the aid of a rototiller or garden tractor if possible. All of which, and much more, prompted Shane MacCarthy, head of the President's Council on Youth Fitness, to make this apt observation: "As the human being moves up the rungs of the ladder of material progress, he is prone to measure the advance by the amount of ease, comfort, and leisure he has acquired." Yet ease and luxury are not true measures of the strength of a people or a nation. The President has done well, therefore, to bring to the attention of American youth this week the national, as well as the personal importance of keeping one's self physically fit.

The Space Age—Challenge to America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER THORNBERRY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 6, 1959

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, the Austin, Tex., chapter of the Veterans of Foreign Wars recently sponsored an essay contest among the junior high school students on the subject, "The Space Age—Challenge to America."

Kenneth Smith, of the University Junior High School, took first place honors; Miss Peggy Lyda, of Lamar Junior High School, won second place; and third place honors went to Miss Mildred Washington, of Kealing Junior High School.

It is greatly encouraging to me to know that the citizens which I am privileged to represent have an awareness and keen interest in this vast new subject. Because of the timely nature of the subject and because I think that the winning essay is exceptional in that it stresses the great challenge to mankind, I respectfully request that along with the letter of transmittal from this young man the essay be inserted in the RECORD. The letter and essay are as follows:

AUSTIN, TEX., *April 25, 1959.*

The Honorable HOMER THORNBERRY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. THORNBERRY: I am only too glad to enclose a copy of my "Space Age" essay, and hope that the work contains as much enjoyment and enlightenment for the reader including it as it did for the author in writing it. I hope, too, that if it ever sees print it may influence us all toward a healthier outlook on the subject. The next step in man's development won't have much immediate significance, but if it is to have any significance at all we must rid ourselves of many a harmfully provincial frame of mind.

This was my second essay to win citywide recognition—the first being on the subject of "Youth Appreciation," for which you also sent me a letter of congratulations—and I felt as if the subject were right up my alley, for the coming of the space age (like many other imaginative but impending concepts) is one well dealt with by science fiction. I am an avid collector and connoisseur, so to speak, in this field because of the frontiers and vantage points it has to offer in relation to writing. As always, the important thing is not that progress is about to be made, or changes effected, but it is rather that human beings are going to be affected, and are going to react. Coupled with scientific interest which is, I suppose, natural in all of us but too often squelched, my love for writing has sparked my appreciation for this genre of fiction beyond all proportion.

Unlike the hunter who must kill a form of beauty in order to capture it, and unlike the possession-obsessed persons who believe that they own beauty merely because they found incomplete bits here and there, the writer needs only add maturity to the ever-strange mixture within him and he is master of those fleetest and shortest lived of all beauties, thoughts, and what is more important, he can express something he loves, share it, and preserve it from being lost or confined to his solitary self. This is, beyond a doubt, the driving force behind artists in any field; the various things they have to say only prove the wide range of things a man can love, or hate (both emotions are intense enough to drive one to action). The fact that he knows how best to channel his feelings probably marks the major difference between a writer and an artist or a composer. While all three must win their appeal through the faulty system of the senses, the writer works, I feel, with the most personal medium. Nonetheless, it all boils down to Donne's statement that no man is an island; that is, the human being is not built to contain emotion but to channel it to either expression or control.

I very much appreciate your writing in the midst of your congressional duties which must be very demanding. Again I hope that the essay proves to be of some use, even though it is little but opinion. I would like not only to thank you for, but encourage you in your interest.

Cordially,

KENNETH SMITH.

THE SPACE AGE—CHALLENGE TO AMERICA

The space age presents more than just a challenge to America. It challenges all mankind. For man is a tiny and powerless entity, subject to the whims and great strength of wind and wave; he suffers from the attack of the smallest germs; and he cannot even affect the inertia of mountains nor the immutability of time. Yet this "poor microbe," man, has been armed with nature's most complex and effective animal weapon—a mind. Without this awareness of environment and the ability to record and correlate thoughts, man would indeed have been an easy prey for those ruled only by the law of the jungle. Perhaps necessity accentuated and developed the spark of consciousness that makes man and animal incomparable. Nonetheless this quality of intelligence has lessened the odds against man; it has enabled him to use steel appendages for his failing muscles; to protect himself from the elements by use of concrete, steel, and glass; to protect himself from the invisible, internal attack of germs by means of antibiotics; to use the laws of nature to his own advantages; and to cheat the corrosive forces of invincible time by adding years to his life through the application of medical research.

Thus, in terms of himself, man has improved and cannot but continue to do so. That he actually has succeeded only in coming to the edge of his cradle does not dwarf his accomplishments; it merely makes more significant the heights reached by this peculiar social mite. Guided by much more than impulsive instinct, man has striven out of necessity and has learned that the only survival is progress, for life is a process of change that admits to no such condition as stability. Man is more fully the master of his fate when he realizes that as long as he is going to change, he should control this change and make it beneficial.

It is this very principle that now urges man on, and he stands today on the shore of an ocean so deep and so vast that it totally defies his complete comprehension. Man's determined mind has almost enabled him to grasp the very stars which evoked such wonder and yearning from the ancient minds. Present man cannot discredit the tradition of genius which has preceded him; he cannot ignore the genius which now will not lie dormant; nor can he coerce the genius which is yet to come. Man has been slowly entering the space age ever since the concept of interplanetary flight was born. In the year of 1957 such a concept passed from the realms of fantasy into reality; the last vestige of an eternally earthbound man has passed away. Now we must adapt ourselves to the realization that space travel is coming as surely and inevitably as tomorrow's weather, and possibly with even less fanfare.

There is a challenge involved, one not unfamiliar to the human race. Essentially it is the same challenge that our pelt-clad ancestors faced; yet man has basically changed since Neanderthal faced the cheerless prospect of venturing forth into the dark. The challenge is no longer whether man can condition himself to the innovation, but how long it will take him to do it.

There are many things to be learned before we rush into the dark. We cannot expect to produce any great change in the universe; as usual, the only thing noticeably affected by man's progress will be man himself. Physical progress is useless but for its effect upon the human soul. In his thirst for superiority, we can only hope that man has fully learned that the control requires a greater effort than the unleashing.

Man must mature in an incredibly short time; for when he finally succeeds in separating himself from the earth, he will need a maturity akin to the maturity which was evident in the actions of those who in the past faced frontiers equally unknown. Man will need his maturity then because he will have nothing else upon which to depend. The beginning will be slow; but, given time, man may establish an empire that would link the stars, ultimately benefiting each individual human being. The accomplishments of America and of all mankind hinge upon the mental attitudes in effect today. We must tread cautiously.

Poison in Your Water—No. 72

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 6, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the RECORD an article appearing in the New York Times of September 18, 1958, entitled "New Jersey Held Lax on Pollution":

NEW JERSEY HELD LAX ON POLLUTION—ZURMUHLEN SAYS INDUSTRY THERE FAILS TO DO PART TO KEEP HARBOR CLEAN

(By Murray Illson)

New Jersey industry is failing to do its share to lessen water pollution in New York Harbor, Frederick H. Zurmuhlen, this city's commissioner of public works charged yesterday.

He made the charge after the department of public works had made its last harbor water survey of the year. The department conducts surveys 4 days a week from mid-June to mid-September.

In this period a laboratory crew analyzes samples of water from waterways around Manhattan, the upper East River, Jamaica Bay, and in the Staten Island area.

Commissioner Zurmuhlen said that although the citizens of New Jersey were required to contribute to the control of water pollution in the Arthur Kill between their State and Staten Island, industrial organizations in New Jersey were not meeting their responsibilities. Industry in New York, he declared is subjected to regulations controlling the pollution of waterways.

In making its survey yesterday, the department's laboratory crew cruised for 7 hours in the harbor aboard the *Robin*, a chartered 55-foot diesel-powered boat.

The area of greatest pollution yesterday was reported to be in the Arthur Kill between Rahway, N.J., and the northwest corner of Staten Island. Near the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad bridge that spans the waterway there, the saturated oxygen content of the water was found to be zero.

The New Jersey coastline in that area has a dense concentration of industrial plants.

Cross Country With the On to Oregon Cavalcade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 4, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, the On to Oregon Cavalcade is making its way across country successfully. Members of the wagon train have been greeted enthusiastically. Schoolchildren and adults have gotten firsthand information about Oregon, its historic past, busy present and wonderful future. One of the caravan members is Robert R. (Rudy) Roudebaugh, of Drain, Oreg. He is keeping a diary of the journey. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following story from the April 30, 1959, Drain Enterprise which covers the first 8 days on the trail:

DRAIN DRIVER MAILS REPORTS HOME ON COVERED WAGON

The On to Oregon Cavalcade wagon train has been steadily retracing the historic route of early-day pioneers on their way to new homes in the Oregon Territory after leaving Independence, Mo., April 19. The seven wagons are on schedule, and have been attracting crowds and national interest beyond anticipation of the sponsoring groups.

Special banquets, prepared celebrations, mock Indian raids, police escorts, and swarms of sightseers have greeted the seven wagons every day the past week on their 2,000-mile trek to Oregon as part of Oregon's centennial year celebration.

Robert R. (Rudy) Roudebaugh, Drain wagon driver, has been jotting down notes while herding the Drain covered wagon across the Kansas plains and mailing them back to Drain. Concern for Dan and Daze, the two horses pulling the Drain wagon, is evident in the notes. Following is a summary of the notes made by Rudy:

April 19 (first day on trail): Made it to Red Bridge. Averaged better than 4 miles per hour. Dan would not eat.

April 20: Dan did not drink or eat. We left Red Bridge camp at 8:15 a.m. Stopped at last blacksmith shop on Oregon Trail at 9:09 a.m. Arrived at Lake Olathe, Kan., 2:50 p.m. It seemed the whole town turned out to greet us. School was dismissed to see wagon train. Made 20 miles today.

April 21: Dan is eating better. Gave him a handful of oats every half hour while on watch from 11 p.m. to 2 a.m. Pulled out of camp at 8:14 a.m. Dan is feeling better. Arrived in Gardiner 10:45 where Santa Fe and Oregon Trail divide. The chamber of commerce served coffee and gave kids milk. School was left out and there were children all over the wagon train. There was green grass for the horses. Made camp at 3:27 p.m. at the Herbert Kncibe farm.

April 22: Sun is out bright and everyone in good spirits. Left camp at 8:15. Came into Eudora at 9:48. Dan is feeling better and eating his feed. School dismissed to see wagons.

While I was passing out the invitations to Drain and talking with Eudora mayor the horses started to go with Janell at the reins. She tried to stop them, but Dan and Daze didn't stop until I was able to reach them.

At 10:08 we passed the Kaw Valley country school where all the pupils were waiting with a sign reading "good luck." Stopped for lunch at 10:59 just east of Lawrence. Have new feed for horses, and they are eating better. If I had a penny for every picture taken of the Drain wagon I could retire. At 12:14 p.m. passed Indian school of about 50 pupils (Haskell Indian Institute). Left school at 12:35 with Indian girl dressed in colorful costume riding in Drain wagon to Lawrence where the Indians performed a war dance.

Camped 4½ miles west of Lawrence at 3:42 p.m. Made 22½ miles today. Dan and Daze are tired, but ate their grain. Both horses have their hind shoes on now. Had to tie Dan to get shoes on. (The horses were so frisky at Independence, Mo., that horseshoes could not be put on the hind feet.)

Am just about out of letters from Drain's mayor inviting people to Drain this summer. Over 2,000 people at wagon train tonight. Bigger crowds expected when we hit Nebraska. (Drain Chamber of Commerce started Rudy out with 9,500 invitational letters. An additional 15,000 letters will reach the wagon train between May 8 and 13.)

April 23: Hard wind coming out of southwest as we left camp at 8:04 this morning. Schoolbus from Cottonwood Falls (100 miles away) came to see wagon train at 9:49. Schoolchildren came to buy wagon train envelopes. We are following fence made out of a pretty rock which lines both sides of the road. Entering Shawnee County at 10:20. Arrive at State fairgrounds at Topeka to camp at 3:59.

April 24: Dan and Daze are eating their grain. At Topeka, Kans., State fairgrounds. Got smaller collar for Dan. Ready to roll at 8:20 a.m. Going over Kansas River at 9:45. Original Oregon Trail wagon trails stopped for supplies at the place we reach at 11:57 for lunch. At 12:44 p.m. ready to roll. This is the hottest day yet. At Silver Lake we had a Indian raid starting at 1:42 p.m. We all survived. At 3:20 we reached Rossville to camp. Dan and Daze made it better today than any time on the trail so far. Made 22 miles today.

April 25: Left Rossville at 7:48 a.m. In Pottawatomie County at 9:49. At St. Marys at 10:48. Seven more miles and will camp. Horses will rest tomorrow (Sunday).

April 26: Over 5,000 people from a 80-mile radius came to the wagon train encampment at St. Marys on Sunday. Town itself is about the size of Drain. The St. Marys mayor was given a ride in the Drain wagon.

Freedom of the Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 6, 1959

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, John F. Tims, Jr., president of the Times-Picayune Publishing Co., of New Orleans, La., which organization publishes the Times-Picayune and the New Orleans States-Item, is a newspaperman's newspaperman.

If there is any newspaper publisher in America who knows more about the newspaper business from every phase and angle than Jack Tims I have not met the man.

The newspaper business is Jack Tim's life. It is his very existence. He grew up in the business and made it the hard way up the ladder of success. He is well qualified to speak with authority on any segment or facet of the newspaper business. Through the years he has earned the respect and admiration of the entire newspaper craft because of his knowledge and integrity in the field of journalism. This is especially true of those people in his own organization from presman to editor.

Anything that Jack Tims says of or about the newspaper business is worthy of repetition and for that reason I am taking this opportunity to direct to your attention and the Members of this House the address which Jack Tims recently made at the International House in New Orleans during the Caribbean area press seminar.

He said with emphasis that the free press has never before been under such disastrous attacks as at the present time. He gave plenty food for thought not only to his immediate audience but to anybody afforded the opportunity of reading his address.

Here is the complete text of his address and I urgently suggest that each of you take advantage and read it:

I consider it my privilege now to address you from the vantage point of the publisher where the entire operation of a newspaper and of the community which it serves must be closely observed and constantly checked.

DYNAMIC COMMUNITY

First of all I want to say we have the privilege in our newspapers to serve a dynamic, growing, vital community that has made tremendous economic and political advances in recent years, and which is destined to continue its role in international leadership in our country.

New Orleans today is a city of approximately 850,000 population, which includes our rapidly growing suburbs. It is the second port in the United States; it is advancing rapidly as a cultural, medical, industrial, and shipping center. It is one of the older cities of the United States, being almost 2½ centuries in age; yet it is dynamic and vibrant with new-found and developed energy.

The papers I am privileged to serve as publisher began well over a century ago, and throughout their long history have been a credit to this community. Last year we merged the Item with the States in the after-

noon field in the interest of better economic production, and this has proved an eminently successful advance. I have personally worked on the Times-Picayune Publishing Co. for a half century and have served in almost every capacity there is, on the business side of the newspaper.

LATIN BACKGROUND

Our papers have always had an international viewpoint and we have, therefore, been among the first to hail and encourage the international movement which began here 15 years ago, and which has produced International House, the International Trade Mart, the international relations department of the city, the port, and numerous other manifestations of international interest which you will note as you move about this delightful and beloved old city.

Actually our internationalism began the day this city was founded by the French in 1721, for we have always been close to Spain, France, and to the Latin American countries. This city has a Latin background and history that brings us especially close to your countries, and we have, therefore, watched the growth of this seminar with much interest.

JOURNALISTIC FACTS

Its purpose is the lively and profitable study and discussion of journalistic affairs of mutual interest, and in this category there is nothing so important or vital as the meaning of our profession itself, and the opportunities it presents and its chances for long-range survival. I know you will agree with me that newspaper work is, to those who practice it the world's most interesting and stimulating profession.

I would like to discuss here today briefly some journalistic facts of life which we face today.

In the incalculable span of time since man began in his cave, a century or two is a moment, a fraction so small that it cannot be noticed. Yet it is wholly within the last two centuries and indeed mostly within the last century that we have seen the rise of the newspaper as an important factor in our lives, and freedom of the press as a dominant issue of human freedom.

PRESS SUPPRESSED

Although the newspaper business today appears at its zenith of influence, power, and prosperity, actually the decline and suppression of the free press as a major force in our lives is well advanced throughout the world. As we pass from country to country and continent to continent we can trace the decay everywhere, the only difference being in degree ranging from death and disappearance of press independence in some place to evidence the cancerous germs have attacked journalism everywhere else.

Since you are the frontline troops in this most important battle, I think you will not fail to accept the facts as they exist, so let us look at some of them:

1. The free press has disappeared entirely in all the Iron Curtain countries, and the state press has appeared; roughly one-third of the world.

2. The free press has been weakened throughout Europe by economic factors, aided here and there by political measures.

3. The staggering rise in production costs has killed off thousands of fine newspapers all over the world, and has hit heavily in the United States.

4. The rise of communism, socialism, and other forms of dictator governments has been the quick demise or attack of newspaper independence, wherever it existed in those controlled areas.

5. There is a dangerous tendency in the United States to weaken the independence of the press through governmental controls, punitive laws, suppression of the news at its source, and its distortion by Government agencies and officials who attempt publicly to discredit the press.

6. Closing, suppression, and burning of fine, fearless newspapers, and killing, incarceration, or exiling of their owners and editors is again on the rise.

7. The influence of the press as the great safeguard of human liberty is under fire by determined, disciplined forces all over the world. These are the same forces that in general seek to exterminate us.

The hard facts of news are threatened, moreover, even in the United States where we find increasing suppression of news on the national, State, and local levels; the sugar-coating of facts by the rise of press agentry, the decline of good old-fashioned legwork reporting, and Government domination, restrictions, secrecy, and censorships.

Apply these factors to your own country or to any other country with which you are familiar and you will see that many of them are on the target.

GOLDEN ERA

Only a little over a century ago ordinary reporting was regarded throughout the world as dangerous to the public liberty. The rise of press freedom and newspapers' importance was in exact proportion to the rise of political freedom and independence—democracy and the rights of the common people—throughout the world. The press spearheaded this blessed era.

The golden era of the newspaper business began around 1800. This was about the time that most of the new world shook itself loose from the old, and we saw the beginning of republics and democracies throughout the Americas. In 1825 Thomas Babington Macauley said that the gallery in which the reporters sat in Parliament had become the fourth estate—most important of the realm.

I wonder if the fourth estate today is the most important of the realm in very many other countries throughout the world. I believe that it is in the United States, and I think it is in some Latin American countries, but I wonder how long we can hold the ramparts against the forces that would destroy the press and enslave the people.

FREE PRESS DEFINED

Democracy rests upon a free press and never have democracy and the free press been under such disastrous attacks as now. The struggle of democratic government to survive is more than ever in our history a life and death one. It is of course accepted that the keystone of democratic government is a free press.

But when I say free press I do not mean this in the sense that some persons and indeed some publishers think. A free press is a press free and obliged to print the facts and to express itself on public matters, but not a press free of responsibility, obligation, and the primary and heavy duty of leadership in public service.

In 1910 when this country had 92 million population there were 2,600 daily newspapers. Today with about 180 million people in the United States we have around 1,600 daily newspapers; in only a relatively few cities today are there more than one newspaper. The press is declining, numerically, because of costs of production and serious inroads into advertising support.

PRESS INFLUENCE

Today the publishing of newspapers has to a considerable extent passed from the hands of one-man owners and operators, great editors and publishers, and individuals into corporations, and become big business with profit a very necessary motive. Newspapers sometimes feel they can no longer publish as fearlessly as they have in the past because it might hurt business and there are many stockholders who live upon the paper's earnings. I certainly do not think that this is typical, but the very fact that it exists at all is important. Nor can it be denied.

It is seriously to be doubted that press influence today is as strong as it was 25 years ago. Such leadership once lost may be gone forever.

There are many danger signals and there are problems, recognized by yourselves and others, which may one day destroy the free press as we know it. That would mean the destruction of the Americas. A strong, fearless, independent, alert, and aggressive press is our very foundation. It is the one indispensible freedom. We are all familiar with the pattern of dictatorship, and its operations.

Dictators are extreme realists who put first things first, and the first thing a dictator does in converting a nation to dictatorship is to kill off the free press, and convert it into an instrument, the chief instrument of his power. We have seen this happen with discouraging regularity for at least two generations. Today the pace of press murder has been accelerated.

PRESS AGENTRY

There are many ways of killing newspapers or weakening them until they lose their influence, and where political measures are insufficient we have seen economic sanctions used with terrible results.

We have as much trouble in the United States as many of you do in your countries, and it would be useless to deny that there are people in our Government who would like to control our press if they could possibly do so. They are making inroads, too, through the control or suppression of facts, and the closing of vital public records.

There is little doubt that many governmental officials would welcome the opportunity of governmental licensing of the press as has been done with radio and television. We have seen in recent years the rise of press agentry in Government until today it is a lucky and very diligent reporter who can cut through the Government handouts to get to the source of news and find out the truth. The statement of a Government official, duly and correctly reported by our press associations and newspapers, is not necessarily the truth, and it may in fact be anything but the truth.

GALLOPING DISEASE

More and more we see suppression, sugar coating, and corruption of the truth while Government officials, even at the very top, berate the press and blame it for all manner of problems and evils. When two Presidents of the United States criticize, misrepresent, and ridicule the press as they have in the last 20 years you may be sure that lesser Government officials regard it as their privilege to do likewise, and to attempt to deceive and destroy critical or opposition independent newspapers.

Where these people lack the power to effect their purposes they have other effective weapone. Some of these are ridicule, insinuation, misstatements, and lies, casting of doubt, doubletalk, and many other means of confusing and undermining public confidence, and few communities in the world today are free of these vices.

This, gentlemen, is a galloping disease, not a creeping one. It moves very rapidly. It moves from top to bottom, it moves into State and local governmental circles, and unfortunately it spreads from there into business levels.

FIRST LINE OF DEFENSE

Eternal vigilance is the price of freedom, but even if we had this, I wonder if it would be enough in the face of the worldwide trends. We are awakening. Everywhere we see moves to fight back against this galloping suppression of the facts and toward government control, but no newspaper or group of newspapers has succeeded, or will succeed,

in always standing up to the firing squad, the torch, terror, opposition papers, newsprint control, economic sanctions, or any of a hundred of the other endless measures at the command of dictatorships.

The people must be aroused to the facts that newspapers are the spearheads of independence, the one absolute esential of freedom, that newspapers hold the foremost barricades, when these fall the main redoubts are lost. Power-seeking governments know how to lull and cow the people, they know how to deceive and disarm them, they know how to intimidate and disperse opposition once the safeguards of the press have fallen.

HOPE FOR FUTURE

The moral fiber of the people is the only hope for the future, and it has been weakened. I believe that we may be well along in the golden era of journalism, and that the fight to tell the truth will be constant, bitter, and disheartening for many years to come. There will be many battles lost. God grant that we will not lose the war. Should we do so human liberties which we have struggled for through so many centuries will surely disappear and republican forms of government will be lost.

I think these facts can well be the subject for fruitful study by this Caribbean area press seminar, and I thank you.

What's Fair in Fair Trade Prices?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 6, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial appearing in the Buffalo, N.Y., Courier-Express on March 25, 1959, entitled "What's Fair in Fair Trade Prices?"

That editorial goes further to show that fair trade is not in the interest of the consumer and that fair trade is nothing more or less than price fixing, and is repugnant to the American people.

WHAT'S FAIR IN FAIR TRADE PRICES?

Proposals for Federal legislation to let manufacturers fix retail prices of brand merchandise have aroused the firm—and, we believe, proper—opposition of both the Federal Trade Commission and the Department of Justice.

The proposed legislation would enable any manufacturer of brand goods to fix the retail price of his products merely by serving notice to distributors. Any retailer who then sold for less would be violating Federal law.

It seems to us that a Justice Department spokesman, Robert A. Bicks, first assistant in the Antitrust Division, went to the heart of the matter when he told the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce that such Federal fair trade procedure "signals the abandonment of our time honored free-enterprise ideals for the distribution sector of our economy." He added that it would stifle competition, raise prices, and impose Federal restrictions on States which had rejected the same proposals.

As long as a manufacturer gets his price for a product, why should he have the right to set that product's retail price? If a retailer can afford to sell for less than a competitor, why shouldn't the hard-pressed consumer avail himself of the benefit? We believe price fixing is repugnant to the American people, and that goes for efforts to put it over through Federal legislation bypassing States' objections.

"Fidel Castro: Liberator or Dictator?"—The Critics Review Jules Dubois' New Book—II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 4, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following book reviews which appeared in the Chicago Sunday Tribune last month and in the New York Herald Tribune:

[From the Chicago Sunday Tribune]

FIDEL CASTRO: IS HE DICTATOR OR LIBERATOR?

(Reviewed by John H. Thompson)

The name of Fidel Castro has been a glowing star in the world's imagination since he came down from the Sierra Maestra with his bearded guerrilla fighters to liberate Cuba from the bloody dictatorship of Fulgencio Batista, who fled the country on New Year's day, 3 short months ago.

Since Castro's victory, and its train of executions of those deemed Batista's worst killers and torturers, many have been wondering about the bearded rebel, now Premier of Cuba. Liberator or dictator? What manner of man is this new powerhouse? What political philosophy moves him? What will happen to his lush homeland? Above all, how did he do it, starting with only 11 friends in the mountains in 1956?

One North American who was there and saw it all—the dictatorship, the wanton slaying, the rebellion, the political intrigues, the ineptitude of American Ambassadors—was the Tribune's chief Latin American correspondent, Jules Dubois, black-listed by every Latin American dictator, whether of the right or left.

Despite Batista's iron censorship, and the ever-present danger of death or injury, Dubois informed Tribune readers of the dictatorship and the rise of Castro. Now, working under pressure, Dubois has performed the almost incredible feat of putting the whole fascinating epic together in nearly 400 pages of drama, color, scholarship, and history. He has done this while retaining still another post, that of chairman of the freedom of the press committee of the Inter-American Press Association.

Within these pages is the story of modern Cuba, taken as a private preserve by men like Batista and other politicians. It is the story of a dictator resorting to widespread terror and assassination to retain power, of graft and corruption on a colossal scale, of unorganized political opposition, and of a young lawyer who refused to believe Cuba would remain enslaved.

It is the story of this young man, Castro, a sincere idealist who never overlooks an opportunity, as Dubois calls him; a figure of tremendous vitality, energy, and leadership; a man of paradoxes and contradictions; a leader who insisits that Communists have the same political rights as other political groups, but that he will never be taken over by the Communists; an intense nationalist who believes in wider share-the-wealth programs for a majority of his people; a lawyer who believes his postwar trials and executions of Cuban war criminals have much more legality than the Nuremberg trials of Nazi war criminals; a Castro, not anti-American, but touchily pro-Cuban, who bitterly resented apparent official American support of the dictator and the use of American weapons and bombs to kill Cubans.

Castro was not alone in opposition to Batista, the dictator. Others, in time, went into the hills to fight, or helped organize rebellion in the cities, or raised money for arms. But it was Castro who breathed life and fire into the whole movement. Inevitably, his personality came to dominate all of the rebel movements and became their fiery catalyst.

In 1953, captured with other young students after an unsuccessful effort to capture the army's Moncada Barracks in Santiago, Castro defended himself at his trial in words which came to have tremendous effect on the history of Cuba. In an eloquent defense—unsuccessful, for he was imprisoned—he outlined five basic reforms he demanded for modern Cuba.

Today this same program is incorporated in what the impetuous young man still demands for Cuba. To achieve this will he become a new dictator, as some of his friends hope? Dubois, in evaluating the Castro of 1959 and of the future, believes that Cuba's new premier and revolutionary chief can escape this fate.

Inevitably, because of the speed with which this manuscript was written—20 days—"Fidel Castro" was bound to suffer. Inevitably, too, the pace slows when Dubois prints in full the manifestos, letters, court briefs, and other documents which feature importantly in this violent period of Cuban history. These are minor criticisms. What Dubois has is an intensely vivid and discerning account of those years and the man who has reshaped Cuban history.

[From the New York Herald Tribune]

FIDEL CASTRO: REBEL

(Book reviews by John K. Hutchens)

When Fidel Castro comes up to Washington later this month as guest of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, and his hosts ask him the questions they are sure to ask, the Premier of Cuba can tell them where to go for a lot of the answers. They can go, if they have not then already gone, to this report by a highly respected colleague of theirs, the Chicago Tribune's veteran Latin-American correspondent, Jules Dubois, who has been keeping an eye on the Castro story for something like a dozen years.

ONE MORE DICTATOR?

Right there in the subtitle of Mr. Dubois' book—the first of what will surely be a swatch of Castro books—is the big question. Having been the leader of the 26th of July movement that rid Cuba of the Batista tyranny, will Castro go on to be a dictator himself?

Mr. Dubois, who wrote the last words of this book less than a month ago, believes Castro will not. He does qualify this opinion to the extent of observing that "the existence of a revolutionary de facto government without the checks and balances of representative, elective government, including a congress and a senate, lends itself to dictatorial measures." He adds, significantly: "Castro has a deep reverence for civilian, representative, constitutional government."

Is Castro a sincere idealist or an opportunist? Mr. Dubois' judgment: "He is a sincere idealist who never overlooks an opportunity. His goals are political, moral, and social revolution and election to the presidency by popular suffrage."

Were the Cuban people behind Castro in the struggle climaxed by Batista's flight on

the morning of January 1 last? "Solidly," says Mr. Dubois.

WHAT ABOUT THE REDS?

Did Cuban Communists play a role in Castro's triumph, and is Castro under Communist influence? Mr. Dubois sees no supporting evidence on either count. To be sure, the Communists, following their familiar practice, tried to climb onto the winner's bandwagon, but "they won't be able to capture him because the people of Cuba will not stomach communism and because they recall that the Communists made their greatest gains under Batista," Mr. Dubois asserts, noting Castro's denial that the 26th of July movement has favored even such socialistic measures as the nationalization of industries.

What then about those summary trials and executions of Batista followers that so offended world opinion? Castro's "rebel justice shocked almost everyone except the people of Cuba," Mr. Dubois declares, explaining if not condoning. "Castro had been telling them for months that the torturers and killers, and the informers who were responsible for the deaths of those they denounced, would be executed as quickly as possible after victory."

You are not to gather that this is a study in deification. Mr. Dubois, who saw Castro at close range during the war, and was the first to interview him after Batista's departure, sees the Premier as too impulsive and too easily exasperated. He thinks Castro erred in whipping up anti-American feeling in the flush of anger over American aid to Batista (though he sympathizes with Castro's resentment at the policies followed by U.S. Ambassadors Arthur Gardner and Earl E. T. Smith). The scorched-earth policy that resulted in the burning of sugarcane fields was a major blunder that Castro, himself, recognized.

But on balance, as Mr. Dubois goes back over the story that began with Castro's first and unsuccessful attempt at insurrection on July 26, 1953, at Santiago, he finds Castro a bold, intelligent and (within the framework of revolutionary violence) humane chieftain.

REPORTER AT WORK

To the dramatic saga of the man who in December 1956, was holed up in the mountains with a band of 11 men, and 2 years later defeated a standing army of 30,000, he adds valuable and revealing documentation: manifestos, magazine articles, excerpts from Castro's 5-hour speech before the court that condemned him after the Santiago fiasco. With names, dates, places, he cites the Batista atrocities that swung popular support to Castro. He writes with the prestige of one honored by his colleagues with regular reelection as chairman of the committee on freedom of the press of the Inter-American Press Association. But first of all he writes as a hardworking reporter who in his time has been beaten, jailed and shot at, but who never gave up, as he went about his business of getting the facts of a story. It is something to remember as you read the story he tells here.

Soaring Railroad Profits: Net Earnings Near Peak of Whole Postwar Period

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1959

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, in view of the discussion of the economic position of the railroad industry in connection with the debate on the railroad retirement and railroad unemployment insurance bill, I would like to call attention to a recent statement of the Railway Labor Executives' Association on the rail profits picture.

The railroad industry is vital to the economic well-being of the Nation. Congress recognized this fact by enacting the Transportation Act of 1958, which had my full support. I am pleased that American railroads have recovered from the 1957 and 1958 recession and their financial position is continuing to improve.

The text of the statement follows:

SOARING RAILROAD PROFITS: NET EARNINGS NEAR PEAK OF WHOLE POSTWAR PERIOD

The railroads of the Nation today, as always, are crying poverty, but are their cries justified? Not at all when you check into the facts and figures which reveal that railroad profits are nosed upward and nearing the peak of the entire postwar period.

Truth of the matter is that U.S. railroads have snapped back from the recession of 1957–58 and their basic financial position is excellent today.

In the last 4 months of 1958, the railroads were chalking up earnings at the rate of more than $1 billion per year in net railway operating profits.

That figure represents a higher mark in profits than in most of the postwar years; in fact, it is close to the peak earnings during that period.

Meanwhile, profits in 1959 are showing a further upward trend with carloadings on the rise. In the first 3 months of this year, carloadings registered a 6-percent gain over the similar period of 1958.

Rail labor's contention that the rail profit picture is far better than the carriers would have the public believe is confirmed by information released by the railroads.

For instance, the estimated net railway operating income of Class I roads in February of this year amounted to $39,793,000—that compared with $9,067,000 in the same month of 1958. And in the first 2 months of 1959 the estimated net railway operating income was $75,963,000 compared with a net of $40,982,000 in the corresponding 1958 period.

Other figures stemming from the Bureau of Railway Economics of Association of American Railroads reveal that total operating revenues showed a 4.1-percent increase in the first 2 months of this year—$1,532,496,964 compared with $1,472,791,123 in the corresponding period of 1958 while operating expenses increased less than one-half of 1 percent.

The railroads are and have been recovering very well from the recession that hit most industries, carloadingswise and profitswise.

In the week ended April 4, 1959, the railroads loaded 590,133 cars, representing a boost of 73,886 cars, or 14.3 percent over the corresponding week in 1958.

The Wall Street Journal recently conducted a survey which unearthed some interesting information that disproved the gloom and doom cries of the Nation's railroads.

The survey showed that the railroads have been doing much better in the profit column, in making a return from the economic slump, than have the big corporations of the country in general.

Profits of the major firms in the fourth quarter of 1958 were approximately 2 percent above those of a year earlier. Class I railroads, however, had registered a whopping 23 percent increase in that period. They earned $248 million compared with $202 million in the last quarter of 1957.

As did many industries of the Nation, the 1957–58 recession hit some railroads severely, but no serious damage was caused. No new railroads found themselves in a state of receivership or bankruptcy.

Dividends of some carriers were reduced or abolished for the year of 1958, but total dividends for the rail industry as a whole were reduced only moderately.

Total net railway operating income for all railways from September through December 1958, was $368,932,000—20 percent higher than for the similar period of 1957 and only 6 percent below the corresponding period of 1956, a year when net railway operating income surpasssed $1 billion.

After all charges, net income during the last 4 months of 1958 was $323,774,000. That was a 25-percent increase over the 1957 level; only 6 percent under 1956.

The net railway operating income, which is the operating profit of the railroads, has continued to be $1 billion or near it during most of the postwar years. Before World War II, the net operating income frequently slumped well below $500 million and even below $200 million during the depression years of the 1930's.

It has not dropped below $750 million since 1949.

Net income—the final corporate profit of the railroads—has remained very stable.

The carriers as a whole reported net deficits in some years prior to the war. This has not occurred since the war's end and in recent years the net income has been well over $500 million.

The same has held true for the individual railroads as for the rail industry as a whole—nearly all carriers have maintained net income in each postwar year. The number of roads which have failed now and then to register corporate profits has been small, even in times of temporary recession.

Following the 1949 recession, with recovery in 1950, the railroads of the United States moved ahead to attain new earnings' records. They amassed the largest net income in history, up to that time, in 1953, when they bettered the best of the lucrative 1920's and the peak years of World War II.

They endured another recession in late 1953 and throughout most of 1954, but hit a new peak level in 1955 when the 1953 record was smashed.

The U.S. railroads are making an impressive recovery from the 1957–58 recession and nearly all individual roads have shared in the industrywide return to better days.

Most carriers have increased their earnings well above the closing months of 1957 and near to the high peaks of 1956.

Some railroads have made higher profits then in 1956.

The outlook for 1959 is excellent.

Predictions for carloadings, stemming from shippers' advisory boards and other authoritative groups, are that a substantial traffic increase above last year's level will be registered in 1959.

Profits are looking up.

Polish Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 6, 1959

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday, May 3, was Polish Constitution Day, the 168th anniversary of the signing of a great charter in the history of human freedom.

In Elizabeth, N.J., a large number of my constituents of Polish birth or descent gathered with their friends of other nationalities to commemorate this important occasion. The program was an impressive and inspiring one, in keeping with the spirit of the anniversary.

As one who was privileged to attend, I can report that everything about the program was of an extremely high order; the music, the songs and dances, the speeches and recitations. It gave evidence of careful planning, great effort, and willing cooperation on the part of people devoted to the cause of freedom and national independence.

The committee for the Polish Constitution Day program, the sponsoring Federation of Polish Organizations, and all those who participated in making this day a great success deserve thanks and appreciation.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the text of the program, together with a brief address which I was honored to give:

FEDERATION OF POLISH ORGANIZATIONS, ELIZABETH, N.J.

Polish Constitution Day was held Sunday, May 3, 1959, at the Polish National Home, 111-113 First Street, Elizabeth, N.J., commencing at 4 o'clock in the afternoon.

COLORGUARD—PRESENTATION OF COLORS

Polish Legion of American Veterans, Post No. 91, and the Ladies Auxiliary.

Polish Army Veterans Club, Post No. 57, and the Ladies Auxiliary.

Polish American Army Veterans Club of Joseph Pilsudski Polish Combatants, Circle No. 6.

PROGRAM

1. Opening address: Commissioner Jacob W. Krowicki, president of the Federation of Polish Organizations.

2. Master of ceremonies: Mr. Albert Sieratowicz, vice chairman of the Polish Constitution Day Committee.

3. National anthems—American and Polish: Johnny Lenard's Orchestra. Soloist: Mrs. Emilia Wozniak.

4. Invocation and remarks: Rev. John Pietrzkowski, assistant, St. Adalbert's Church.

5. Polish songs: St. Cecilia's Choir under the direction of Prof. Albert Wozniak.

6. Recitation: Entiled "Our Lady, Queen of Poland," by Miss Christine Skora, a pupil of St. Adalbert's School.

7. Address: Mr. Stanley Dworecki, captain of Polish Army in exile, World War II.

8. Polish folk dance: Wianek Group No. 408, of St. Elizabeth's Society, Group No. 793, Z. P. of A., under the direction of Mrs. Antoinette Balkowska.

9. Address: Hon. Thaddeus Gora, president, Elizabeth Board of Works, in behalf of Hon. Steven J. Bercik, mayor of the city of Elizabeth.

10. Address: Mr. Thomas G. Dunn, freeholder of Union County.

11. Recitation: Pupils of St. Hedwig's School of Bayway.

12. Address: Congresswoman FLORENCE P. DWYER, House of Representatives.

13. Recitation: Miss Barbara-Wanda Dworecka.

14. Address: Mr. Leon L. Krzyzak, of New York, general secretary of the Polish Army Veterans of America.

15. Musical selections: Johnny Lenard's Orchestra, under direction of Mr. John Lenard.

16. Address: Mr. Stanley Pelkowski, "My Recent Trip to Poland."

17. Benediction: Rev. Joseph Sapeta, St. Hedwig's Church, Bayway.

18. Words of appreciation and thank you: Mr. Albert Sieratowicz, chairman of the committee.

19. Closing: Everyone singing the Polish hymn, "Nie Rzucim Ziemi."

COMMITTEE

Rev. Joseph Smolen, pastor of St. Adalbert's Church, honorary chairman.

Rev. Joseph Amlicki, pastor of St. Hedwig's Church, honorary chairman.

Rev. Edward Kozlowski, pastor of St. Theresa's Church, honorary chairman.

Mr. Joseph Cichowski, chairman.

Mr. Albert Sieratowicz, vice chairman.

Mr. Stanley Pelkowski, vice chairman.

Mrs. Marion Wedzilowicz, secretary.

Mr. Jacob W. Krowicki, Mr. Adam Zbikowski, Mrs. Mary Machos, Mrs. Josephine Ciuba, Mrs. Ludmila Raczynska, Mr. Victor Dawidowicz, Mrs. Jean Krok, Mrs. Anna Tabor, Mr. Joseph Rzepka, Miss Mary Ciuba, Mrs. Mary Siemientkowska, Mrs. Clara Jablonska, Mrs. Helen Pomykalo, Mrs. Antoinette Bialkowska, Mrs. Stella Zajack, Mrs. Angela Cop.

PARTIAL TEXT OF MRS. DWYER'S REMARKS

Today is a day for reflection, for hope, for dedication.

The 168th anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution should be an occasion for freedom-loving people everywhere to reflect upon the meaning of freedom and independence, to hope for its restoration in those lands and for those people from whom it has been taken away, and to dedicate themselves to protecting the heritage of freedom here and encouraging it throughout the world.

This is the meaning of that day in 1791, which we commemorate today. The Polish Constitution was a landmark in the history of freedom and self-government. As an inspired statement of the nature of people, the origin of authority, the role of law, and the proper function of government, this document is and will remain a classic.

But it is a living classic—forever holding before the people of Poland and the people of Polish descent the ideal, the goal, the vision of justice and opportunity, and the right to live in peace and freedom.

This is a goal that Poland and America long have shared. Polish craftsmen were among the first settlers at Jamestown in 1608. Polish officers and men fought alongside Americans in our struggle for liberty in the Revolutionary War. And the framers of the Polish Constitution were inspired by the spirit of the American Constitution which they had helped make possible.

The people of Poland and America are united, too, by another bond—by an unyielding opposition to the inhuman tyranny and oppression of world communism, in particular the Russian variety.

It was an earlier kind of Russian tyranny against which the Polish people rebelled late in the 18th century, out of which grew the constitution we celebrate today. The period of Polish freedom after World War I was again stifled by Soviet armies in World War II. And the brief relaxation from Communist oppression which was won by the courage of the Poznan revolt in 1956 has once more given way before the relentless force of the Communist regime.

In recent months, the world has watched as intensified Soviet-inspired pressures have eaten away what little freedom was left in agriculture, education, religion and daily life in general.

Yet, the world also watches in admiration and awe the continued resistance of the Polish people, the courageous display of independent minds and unbroken spirits.

We in America are free to celebrate Constitution Day, as Poland is not. In their place, we must pledge ourselves never to forget that freedom is the right of every man, never to abandon those who are fighting to preserve their independence, never to give up hope that Poland some day will be free again.

Polish Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 6, 1959

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the May 2 issue of the Chicago American written by Stanley Pieza:

POLES PUT HERO ON PEDESTAL AND GENERATED A MYSTERY

(By Stanley Pieza)

"And freedom shrieked as Kosciuszko fell."—Campbell.

On October 10, 1794, when 17,000 Russians defeated his army of 7,000 heroic Polish soldiers at Maciejowice, Poland, Gen. Thaddeus Kosciuszko was wounded and his fall was interpreted in the above words of Poet Campbell.

Inspired by the patriotic spirit of the hero revered by both Poland and America, Chicago's Americans of Polish ancestry gather each year at the General Kosciuszko shrine in Humboldt Park.

Since its erection in 1904, Chicago's Polish citizens have been parading to the equestrian statue of the general in the northwest side park to observe the adoption of Poland's constitution on May 3, 1791.

Located on a grassy expanse beside Humboldt Boulevard, the heroic statue of Kosciuszko, with sword swung up in a commanding gesture and his horse's head proudly lifted, surveys the river of automobiles from a massive pedestal.

The statue—one of the most beautiful and imposing in the city's park system—was erected by the American Poles to honor the memory of the great general who helped this country's fight for freedom in the Revolutionary War.

It is the work of a Polish sculptor, Kazimir Chodzinski. Unveiled January 11, 1904, the sculpture has been visited by millions.

MOVED BY WPA

The statue was moved to its present location by WPA workers in 1936—and thereby hangs a mystery unsolved to this day.

General Kosciuszko and his horse were hoisted off the pedestal and moved 200 feet from the center of the park drive. Then the workmen started moving the pedestal in the presence of Chicago's Polish leaders who came to supervise the removal of two memorial boxes supposedly placed under the pedestal in 1904.

They found one rusted box, containing documents, old newspapers, and coins. Then a search was made for the other box that was thought to be there—but no other box was found.

The missing box contained a bottle of rare vintage champagne.

The late John Romaszkiewicz, then president of the Polish National Alliance, was present and was one of those who sought to find the other memorial box with the champagne. He said:

"I remember, plain as day, that the late Kazimir Zychlinski, my predecessor, told me that at the time of the erection of the General Kosciuszko statue he personally placed two memorial boxes under the pedestal. Where is the other box?"

The other box still has not been found.

LEADERS PRESENT

Others who witnessed the opening of the one memorial box and were chagrined at the loss of the other were the late Joseph L. Kania, then president of the Polish Roman

Catholic Union, and the late Mrs. Honorata Wolowska, who was president of the Polish Women's Alliance.

Tomorrow will mark the 168th anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution of May 3. It was Poland's Magna Carta, and through it the Polish people hoped to live in freedom without the interference of their enemies.

The Poles throughout the world hail May 3 as Poland's national holiday—similar to our July Fourth. Polish leaders—aided by Americans—are working for a free Poland today. They say they want a Poland that will be free of Communist domination.

Polish history is replete with brave deeds of a people fighting for their freedom. For more than a century Poland was partitioned and governed by three nations—Czarist Russia, Austria and Germany. In the aftermath of World War I Poland was resurrected. In World War II she fell into the hands first of the Nazis and then of the Soviets.

UPRISING IN 1793

It was one of Poland's struggles to regain freedom that was led by General Kosciuszko, who summoned the Polish patriots to arms in 1793.

The call went to the cities and villages. The men, young and old, but lacking gunpowder and cannons, came prepared to battle with scythes, pitchforks, and knives. The first battle took place at Raclawice on April 29, 1794, when the Russian artillery was routed.

Crafty Catherine II then dispatched an army of 17,000 of her best soldiers which annihiliated the Polish army of 7,000—and when Kosciuszko was wounded Poland lost her fight for freedom.

Kosciuszko came to America before his final fight for Poland's freedom. He reported to Gen. George Washington in 1776. His ability as an engineer was of invaluable use to the Continental Army.

WEST POINT IDEA

It was General Kosciuszko who first suggested West Point as the spot for the U.S. Military Academy. The monument erected to his memory at West Point by American youth remains as a grateful nation's tribute. Kosciuszko had fought for 6 years in the American Army. Nathaniel Greene best sums up what Kosciuszko had done for America and what he had been to his brother-soldiers. Wrote Greene:

"Colonel Kosciuszko belonged to the number of my most useful and dearest comrades in arms. I can liken him to nothing in his zeal in the public service, and in the solution of important problems, nothing could have been more helpful than his judgment, vigilance and diligence. He was fearless of every danger. He never manifested desires or claims to himself, and never let opportunity pass of calling attention to and recommending the merits of others."

ACTION BY CONGRESS

In 1783, Congress belatedly conferred upon Kosciuszko the rank of brigadier general with an acknowledgment of its high sense of his long, faithful, and meritorius service.

Kosciuszko revisited America in 1797. Before returning to Poland, he received from Congress a grant of 500 acres of land in recognition of his military services. This property was located in the extreme western border of the U.S. Military Lands, on the site of the present city of Columbus, Ohio.

Before embarking at Baltimore, Kosciuszko gave Thomas Jefferson his power of attorney and wrote out the will authorizing Jefferson to use the money of his estate to purchase Negroes * * * and give them liberty in my name. Thus Kosciuszko advanced the cause of emancipation more than a half century before the Civil War.

Kosciuszko died in Switzerland October 15, 1817, far from his motherland.

RESTS WITH KINGS

His body rests in the Wavel Cathedral at Cracow, Poland, where lie Poland's kings and her most honored dead.

The spirit of Kosciuszko still remains in the hearts of freedom-loving Poles throughout the world.

And tomorrow at the monument in Humboldt Park, Chicago's Polish Americans will rededicate themselves to the United States, the country Kosciuszko helped to create.

The first Polish Constitution Day in 1904 attracted thousands of members of the various Polish-American organizations and parishes of the city and suburbs

Among the most prominent speakers to appear at one of the celebrations of Polish Constitution Day was Ignace Jan Paderewski, Poland's great statesman and wizard of the piano. He spoke there in 1915.

SIKORSKI SPEAKER

Another famous son of Poland to speak at the Kosciuszko statue during the annual celebration was Gen. Wladyslaw Sikorski, World War II hero. This was in 1940.

Poland's hero of World War I, Gen. Jozef Haller, spoke at the annual observance in 1945.

Gen. Bor-Komorowski, leader of the Polish underground during the Nazi occupation, addressed crowds at the 1946 celebration.

The late Vice President Alben Barkley paid tribute to Americans of Polish ancestry at the ceremonies in 1952.

In 1956, the speaker at the Constitution Day event was Gen. Wladyslaw Anders, who led Polish troops at the victory of Monte Cassino, Italy, in World War II.

Gaylord Container Corp., a Division of Crown Zellerbach Corp., Is Doing a Magnificent Job in Forestry Research and Development Which Greatly Enhances the Value of Louisiana Timberlands, Thereby Aiding Every Man, Woman, and Child in This Great Timber Area in Louisiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 6, 1959

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, recently I had the unusual opportunity of attending the second annual southwide Pulp and Paper Day celebration, and thereby have a part in the launching of a typical pilot forest project on the land owned by one of my constituents, Joe Kelly Coburn, in Livingston Parish, La.

Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to describe and explain just how important this Gaylord operation in making paper products at their Bogalusa plant is to the development of this section of Louisiana.

It affords better living conditions for each and every one of the citizens of this vast area, and it is the largest individual payroll in Livingston Parish. No longer does a farm or landowner, either small or large, have to only hope that oil will be discovered, because with the young growth of pine timber, he can have a definite money crop growing night and day, month in and month out, year in and year out, on his land, and still have potential oil possibilities.

Without the Crown Zellerbach organization, which owns the Gaylord Container Corp., there would be no market for much of this timber, and that is a perfect example of how the people need the Gaylord Container Corp. and the Gaylord Container Corp., likewise, needs the people, to grow the raw materials which they use in the manufacture of paper products, which, of course, is pulpwood.

Crown Zellerbach has certainly put out a warm hand of friendliness and has demonstrated their great confidence in the people who own this land and live in this area. No better example can be shown than by their act of establishing, which is in the process of completion, a paper mill costing approximately $20 million, which is located in this area at St. Francisville, La. With their present mill at Bogalusa and their new mill at St. Francisville, all of the landowners and inhabitants of this great area can with all confidence rest assured that they will derive tremendous benefits from this operation. The vast amounts of money that will be paid for the raw pulpwood materials, and the tremendous amounts that will be paid in payrolls, both directly and indirectly, in this vast operation has brought and will bring even more wealth to this section, and greatly improve our living conditions. We have much to look forward to in the future, and we have a lot to be thankful for that Crown Zellerbach had confidence in our people and our lands in this section of the United States.

As we all realize, this is one of the fastest growing timber sections in the entire United States, and for that reason, this land has a great potential production value in all kinds of timber products.

It is, therefore, most essential and necessary that we protect and preserve this great industry by protecting and preserving these timberlands, so that they will produce the maximum wealth in timber products that they are capable of.

That is why this pilot forest right here is so important, because it takes property belonging to an average citizen and clearly demonstrates how this land can be utilized to its fullest extent to produce a maximum of valuable timber products. This is an example of tremendous amounts of money that have been spent in research and development in bringing this pilot forest to a realization, so that everyone of us can see just exactly with our own eyes a concrete example of how to utilize our land to its fullest extent and advantage.

I firmly believe that in the years to come not only will our timberlands be utilized to the fullest extent, thanks to the beneficial cooperation of the Gaylord Container Corp., but that further cooperation of mutual benefit and under-

standing will even become greater between this company and the people that it serves. Without this source to purchase our pulpwood, many acres of our land would be without value and without revenue, and instead of going ahead with progress, we would stand still or even go backward economically. Therefore, it is certainly evident that with the continued use, and the vast future potential market for paper products, that we all have a great deal to look forward to in the years to come.

I only regret that all of the Members of this House were not able to be present and to have the opportunity that I had to see firsthand the great possibilities of the production of timber products from our land. It would give a much clearer and comprehensive understanding of the vast importance of the paper and paper products industry, and how much it means to the citizens of this great Nation of ours, both directly and indirectly.

Mr. Speaker, the following are the remarks which I made on this occasion:

THE PILOT FOREST POINTS THE WAY

I think it can be said without reservation that the program in which we are taking part here today is one of the most significant events to take place in our area in some time. The pilot forest project is truly an outstanding example of the benefits that can result from the close cooperation of agriculture and industry.

As you probably know, this pilot forest is one of more than 90 established this year for the first time in 12 southern States. It's a project of the Southern Pulpwood Conservation Association, sponsored locally by a pulp and papermill member of that association and by a progressive-minded owner of woodlands. Our hosts here in Livingston Parish are Joe Kelly Coburn, the owner of the property on which the pilot forest is located, and Gaylord Container Corp., division of Crown Zellerbach, which is carrying out the forest work on this property. To both, we offer our congratulations. The roles they are playing in the creation of the pilot forest here will mean much to this parish and this area in the near future.

This pilot forest and others like it are informational and educational projects. They are designed, as their name implies, to show the way, to show the owner of small woodland areas how to grow trees more profitably on his property. In setting up these pilot forests as guides to others with silmilar property in the parish and adjacent areas, the pulp and papermill has agreed to do a complete initial forestry job in order to bring the property into full production. Incidentally, all proceeds from the timber harvest go to the landowner.

You may ask why the pulp and paper industry is investing in such an undertaking. I'm told that there are many reasons, but the most obvious one, of course, is the need for a steady supply of that renewable raw material of the industry—wood. Since 74 percent of the woodlands of the South today belongs to the owners of small woodland tracts, it's natural that the industry would look to this group for much of the wood it needs.

Unfortunately, however, only 40 percent of the woodlands belonging to owners of small tracts is being managed to guarantee future high-level productivity. Although in recent years, important progress has been made in getting woodland owners to undertake improved forest practices, the pilot forest projects should give tremendous new impetus to substantial additional progress.

In this parish there are there are 105,000 acres of woodland similar to the wooded area on this farm. One of the primary considerations in the selection of this pilot forest site by a country committee of outstanding representatives of forestry, agriculture and others was the degree to which the property could serve as a demonstration to as many farmers as possible. This meant that in terms of size and existing forest conditions, it should be reasonably typical of most farm woodlands in the area.

I think you'll quickly understand the reason for this. The foresters who have planned the development of this woodland say that the measures which have been started here should increase the productivity of this area by three-fourth cord of wood per acre per year. If this increase of three-fourth cord per acre year were applied to all the 105,000 acres of farm woodland in this country, we would have an additional 80,000 cords produced here annually that are not being marketed today. In terms of dollars, at the rate of $15 per cord, f.o.b. car, this would mean an additional $1,200,000 in new business to Livingston Parish each year. It would be the same as the establishment of a substantial new industry here in terms of additional dollars created for the economy of the parish.

Think of that. Putting all the small woodland tracts of Livingston Parish into a high level of productivity would mean the equivalent of a new industry. To me, this is one of the most interesting and significant aspects of this whole program. And, this is newly created wealth which will benefit not only the landowner, but the whole community.

Let me give you a couple of other pertinent economic statistics. During 1956—the last year for which we have complete information—1,648,500 cords of pulpwood were produced in Louisiana at an f.o.b. car value of $24,727,500. In this parish, the value of pulpwood produced in that year was an estimated $1,155,750. Remember that one pulpwood truck represents an annual business of $22,500 to the community in which it operates.

These facts do not take into consideration the large economic contributions made directly by the pulp and paper mills. For example, the wood produced supports the paper mills, of which there are 8 located in Louisiana. These plants provided full-time employment for 13,218 persons, with a payroll of $57,869,100 in 1956. Wood harvesting provides the equivalent of 6,594 additional jobs in the State. The replacement value of the pulp and paper mills in Louisiana is $370,875,000.

These are just a few of the interesting economic facts about one of the South's largest industries. But I think they are indicative of the vital part the industry plays and will play in the future growth of the area. And they also point up the vital need for the closest kind of working relationship between industry and agriculture for the mutual benefit of all concerned.

An unusual feature of the pilot forest is its permanence. This tract will be developed to its fullest potential as an enduring example for years to come. It is to serve the broad purpose of illustrating as complete a forestry program on farm properties as is possible. It would point the way toward the fullest development of individually owned forest resources. The result will be maximum benefit for our communities from this balance of industry and agriculture.

It is expected that when the various harvests are made, they will be measured in terms of board feet, numbers of poles, lineal feet of piling, as well as in terms of cords of pulpwood.

The pulp and paper industry is undertaking this pilot forest program with full knowledge that much of the wood to be yielded will go to uses other than pulpwood. But the industry also knows that by improving total productivity, it improves the chances of increased pulpwood production.

It is my understanding that it was difficult to practice good forestry in many areas of our State only a few years ago because there was no market for trees of small size. When you chop cotton or thin corn to a stand, for example, you write it off purely as a cost item because there is no market for the excess plants. However, these operations may be carried out with no more elaborate equipment than a good hoe and a strong back.

Thinning trees to a stand employs the same principle of plant growth, but it takes a much broader back and more expensive equipment. Therefore, it is a much more costly process unless there is a market for the thinnings. The pulp and paper industry provides that market and the farmer now can thin his crowded woodland at a profit. You will notice that I did not say clear his woodland. I said thin it to a good stand.

When this has been done, the remaining trees have the space they need for maximum growth of all kinds of products. As higher valued trees are being grown, there will be times when another thinning or a combination harvest is desired. Here, again, the pulpwood market is a very valuable asset to the farmer.

Some trees will need to be thinned still again before they are large enough for saw timber, even though there may be many trees in the stand of saw timber size already. Some trees may not be straight enough for saw logs, yet they can be cut in such a way as to yield pulpwood. Others may be diseased and not be cut into sticks of pulpwood. Even the tops of saw timber trees, formerly wasted, may be worked into pulpwood. The same type of management will benefit trees that are to be used for even higher valued purposes such as poles or piling.

Right here on the property of Joe Kelly Coburn, a number of measures have been started to get the woodland into peak production. For example: (1) Planting of open areas, (2) prescribed burning for brush control, (3) girdling of cull hardwood trees, (4) timber stand improvement in pure hardwood stands, (5) selective cutting.

Farms are most successful when every acre is profitable. Making farm woodlands productive can add immeasurably to the stability and to the profitability of the farm operation. Like any crop, there are certain problems in growing wood that must be solved if the product is to be salable. The pilot forest program is designed to show the way to better woodland management by showing practical solutions to these problems.

Before concluding, I should like to summarize briefly:

First, the markets for paper and paper products are continually expanding in this Nation and throughout the world. New and fascinating uses for pulpwood and other wood products are continually being developed.

The warm climate of the South makes this region ideal for growing the raw materials to serve the dynamic paper industry. The industry itself is expanding in the South where it can be near that fast-growing renewable natural resource—trees.

The industry is making enormous contributions to the wealth of the region with its tax dollars, payrolls, investments and payments to those who supply it with wood.

Farmers and other owners of small woodland tracts can create new wealth for themselves and their fellow citizens through sound management of woodlands, resulting in higher productivity, not only of pulpwood, but of other forest products.

The pilot forest has been established as a means by which owners of small woodland

tracts can see firsthand the application of proper forest practices on property like their own.

The result of bringing all woodlands up to maximum productivity is comparable to the establishment of an important new industry in the parish.

I believe very strongly that the pilot forest in concept and in action is an example of one of the finest relationships between agriculture and industry in the Nation. It has been established on the principle of cooperation and mutual benefit for all concerned. It seems to me that the pilot forest is truly symbolic of the kind of working partnership between different segments of our economy that will assure the future of the South and the Nation. I would urge all interested persons, as well as forestry and agricultural agencies, to make full use of the excellent educational opportunities of the pilot forest.

Thank you for giving me this wonderful opportunity to be here and have a part on this second annual southwide Pulp and Paper Day in the launching of this pilot forest project.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer, plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Appendix

Deserved Honor Paid Walter C. Hornaday, Dallas News Washington Bureau Chief

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 7, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, it is always a delight to me when personal friends of mine are accorded honors which I know are due them. So I was highly pleased to learn that Walter C. Hornaday, longtime head of the Washington bureau of the Dallas Morning News, had been cited by his alma mater, the University of Wisconsin, for distinguished achievement in journalism.

I have known Walter Hornaday for many years, both as a loyal friend and as a news reporter of extraordinary competence. Walter brings an objective eye and a knowledgeable mind to the arduous and responsible task of covering the Washington scene for one of the great newspapers of the Nation. He is accurate; he is fair; he is thorough; and he has a facility with the written word that arouses my constant admiration.

No honor was ever more completely deserved than that paid Walter Hornaday by the University of Wisconsin.

I ask unanimous consent that the Dallas News story telling of the citation and giving a few highlights of this distinguished newsman's career be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOURNALISM CITATION—UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN HONORS NEWS' WALTER HORNADAY

MADISON, WIS.—Walter C. Hornaday, veteran correspondent of the Dallas News, Friday was cited for distinguished achievement in journalism by the University of Wisconsin.

Hornaday, chief of the News' Washington bureau, was one of three to receive such a citation at the annual journalism institute of the university's school of journalism.

The others were New York playwright Howard M. Teichmann, author of "The Solid Gold Cadillac," and Robert Fleming of the American Broadcasting Co.'s Washington staff.

Hornaday's citation described him as "part of the warp and woof of Texas journalism since 1914" and praised him for "journalistic performance as big as your native State."

The Texas newspaperman was graduated from the University of Wisconsin in 1913. During his college days he worked on the Daily Cardinal and on the Badger, the school yearbook; he also served as Madison correspondent for the Minneapolis Journal, where he was employed briefly after graduation.

Returning to his native Texas in 1914, Hornaday for a while assisted his father, the late W. D. Hornaday, a widely known Austin correspondent and journalism teacher.

Later, he was employed in the State capital by the San Antonio Express and the Austin American and became city editor of the latter.

In 1916 Hornaday received a telegram from the late E. B. Doran, managing editor of the old Dallas Journal, offering him a job. He took it.

He has been with the Dallas News organization ever since, except for 2 years of Army duty in World War I, in which he was twice wounded in combat as a member of the famous Rainbow Division. He had been commissioned in the First Officers Training Camp at Leon Springs.

Hornaday has covered virtually every beat in the newspaper business, including political campaign, State and National conventions, and the State and National capitals.

Since October 1, 1944, he has been head of the News' Washington bureau.

Tribute by Edward P. Morgan to Dr. Martin Vorhaus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 7, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, people who advance the cause of medical research are contributing to the enrichment and advancement of human life. One such person was Dr. Martin G. Vorhaus, a gifted physician, who died recently in New York City. An eloquent and moving tribute was paid to the distinguished career of Dr. Vorhaus in a broadcast by the distinguished commentator, Edward P. Morgan, over the American Broadcasting Co. network on May 1, 1959. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD this informative and thought-provoking broadcast by Mr. Edward P. Morgan in honor of the achievements and enlightenment of Dr. Martin G. Vorhaus.

There being no objection, the text was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EDWARD P. MORGAN AND THE NEWS, MAY 1, 1959

In some respects, I suppose, the life of a man is like a meteorite. On an orbit from somewhere to somewhere, it enters our human atmosphere, draws a fleeting incandescent mark across the sky of society and then goes out. Yet the trajectory of one life may arch higher and farther than that of another. And the meteoric light of such a man burns with a warm and steady flame which leaves behind it not just the twinkling stardust of fond memories but something permanently luminous.

Such a luminosity glows in the hearts of countless people tonight from the broad, healing act thrown with careful calculation across their horizons by a doctor named Martin G. Vorhaus who died unexpectdly in New York City day before yesterday.

Martin Vorhaus was one of my closest friends. There can be something gross and vulgar in sentimentalizing in public over the loss of a friend. But the purpose of this small tribute to him here is not a personal one but to share with you, if I may, some of the qualities in him that made him such a remarkable human being. It is good to remind ourselves, too, perhaps, that some of the greatest of men do not bear the outward label of world celebrity but spread their strength and love of life quietly, like a warm spring rain.

Martin Vorhaus was born a Jew, 62 years ago here in New York. His father was an atheist with a wonderful but provocative, challenging respect for the world and a penetrating mind. Martin married a lovely nurse who was a Lutheran and together, eventually, they became Quakers. To me this search and synthesis made a strong, refreshing thing. It must have been this breadth of experience in part that stretched this Park Avenue doctor's interests over broad human fields far beyond the usually lucrative confines of fashionable medicine to gently neurotic patients. He had a fertile inquisitive affinity for the whole human race. One of his friends has described him as a kind of a secular saint.

Dr. Vorhaus may not have invented the word "empathy" but he was the living meaning of it. In one of his books, "The Changing Patient-Doctor Relationship," he defined the term as an unusual human trait with a strange, eerie quality "not unlike the metaphysical characteristics of extrasensory perception. It presupposes the ability of one person to project himself inside another and, being there, to act first as a completely impartial observer: to observe and record what is going on; then, having done so, to return to home base with all of this information intact and to classify and to interpret all of it."

I have never known a man who so rewardingly combined the finest attributes of the old-fashioned country doctor and the sophistication, urbanity, and restless alertness of the modern physician, determined to continue to learn. Psychosomatic medicine, I believe they call the practice of probing the links between the emotional and the physical areas in human ailments. This man was the sensitive electrician who knew the intricate wiring that connects the heart and the stomach. He was familiar with the wavelengths linking the viscera and that apparatus we sometimes call the soul.

This rare perception made him the bane of some of his more pompous colleagues. He was the needle that pricked their balloons of pretense. He upheld and refined the American Medical Association's highest standard of professional ethics. But he chided the AMA unmercifully and with relish for its often hysterical insistence that any progress toward better health, hospitalization, and medical care was creeping socialism. He received signal recognition from the AMA, incidentally in the 1930's, for his pioneering in the clinical use of vitamin B–1 in the treatment of neuritis. Ironically, he was felled swiftly by a defiantly virulent

virus pneumonia which doctors have not yet learned how to combat. I can almost see Martin G. Vorhaus, M.D., shaking an admonitory finger at the AMA, the Congress, and indeed the rest of us, and saying, "You see, here is just one more proof of the urgent need for better preventative medicine and more and more medical research."

This is Edward Morgan saying good night from New York.

Journalistic Legacy of Thomas L. Stokes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 7, 1959

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, a number of friends of the late and courageous Thomas L. Stokes attended the first award dinner in his honor at the National Press Club on May 5, 1959.

David Lilienthal delivered the principal address and the journalistic legacy of Tom Stokes was given by Richard Strout of the Christian Science Monitor, who was a contemporary and close friend of Thomas L. Stokes.

I know that friends and admirers of Tom Stokes will enjoy reading Mr. Strout's address.

I ask unanimous consent that the principal part of it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOM STOKES MEMORIAL

(By Richard L. Strout)

Every now and then some exceptional new reporter joins the Washington press corps, some crusader, some hellraiser, and it's funny how, after the years, the experienced newspaperman can generally spot him. He may be aggressive, like the late Paul Y. Anderson, or Bob Allen, or he may start out relatively young and shy and mild as Tom Stokes did. These men are a little different from their fellows. Journalism to them isn't just a business. They would shudder at the word but it's a kind of lifetime crusade. It's a way of tilting at the smug and mighty, and of somehow yanking out the truth against obstacles. That kind of reporter, when he hits Washington, is likely to stay, and die in harness. You can't somehow imagine a Nate Robertson or an Ed Lahey or a Ray Clapper or a Clark Mollenhoff ending up in a fat-cat public relations job for General Motors or United States Steel. They don't necessarily have to be radicals though a lot of them are. Joe Alsop is a good Republican but it's hard trying to imagine him toeing some chamber of commerce line or passing out handouts for some corporation.

These men have a purpose in life, a goal, a fire in their bellies; they are not using journalism as a stepladder to something else; they are generally here to stay. That's what Tom Stokes was when he came to Washington way back in 1921, 38 years ago.

He was 23 years old. Outwardly, I am told, he looked mild and shy and amiable. He was bright; he had got a Phi Beta Kappa key at the dreamy old Confederate university town at Athens, Ga. I arrived in Washington 3 or 4 years later and ultimately came to know Tom. He liked to tell how he was in the SATC camp at college and one day was told to report to the 6-foot Regular Army officer. Tom presented himself with a snappy salute. "What's your name?" demanded the officer crisply.

For the life of him Tom couldn't remember. It was part of Tom's personality both that this incident actually happened and that later he could look back on it without mortification. The officer dismissed Tom kindly and told him to come back sometime when he could remember his name.

Once as a youngster Tom volunteered in church to go as a missionary to China and though he didn't go he remained a bit of a missionary all his life. His mother died when he was 13 and his world seemed to crash about his ears. He came to Washington from a smalltown newspaper in Georgia where a hideous lynching had occurred. He was a sensitive, imaginative person and I think the sickening affair haunted him. There was that element in Tom under his gaiety. I guess that most of us, whether we admit it or not, feel some degree of guilt over the state of the world and some go their quiet way, as well as they can, trying to expiate it.

Ruminating over what I should say tonight I invented a kind of game; I asked some of Tom's old friends what was the single characteristic that they thought differentiated him from anybody else.

He was a liberal, of course; not a namby-pamby liberal but rather a fierce liberal when he discovered what he considered to be injustice. But there are a lot of liberals. He was also cheerful, and intelligent, and good company. Granted all that, there are other people like that, too (not enough, but some).

It got to be funny, the way I constantly got the same answer to my question, expressed in different ways but meaning the same thing.

"It was the way he managed to hold his strong views and yet managed to retain the liking—no, it was stronger than that, the affection—of people whose views were harshly antagonistic to his." In my lifetime I have never seen anyone who had this attribute to a stronger degree than Tom Stokes.

Most of us are not like that. I know I am not. More than likely if I don't like a man's views I don't like him—and he probably doesn't like me. We probably each get a little vindictive satisfaction out of this arrangement. This wasn't true of Tom.

I don't mean that Tom didn't have critics—or perhaps even enemies. But consider the fact that Tom never hesitated to lecture the South on civil rights and that he yet remained one of the few columnists the South would listen to on that subject. It was the same with most people of all shades of opinion. I have seen it many and many a time. When he sat down at the press table in the Senate restaurant, or at his favorite place in the National Press Club, others would always crowd in. They would sit down and not go away.

People who weren't on speaking terms with one another would drop down if Tom were there, chat amiably and then go off and perhaps not be on speaking terms again. It was really something to analyze. He was a warm, comfortable stove; he was a walking truce, and yet he would not yield his liberalism an inch in the festive atmosphere. I really can't explain it: I suppose part of it was that he had no malice at all, and no arrogance at all.

Tom liked people. And he was gay and companionable. Just to give you an idea, let me interject one personal reminiscence. It was during Harry Truman's famous 1948 whistle-stop trip to California. We all knew Truman didn't have a chance to win and for that reason were perhaps relaxed, and rather sorry for the little man. After all, he was putting up a game fight though of course the odds were quite hopeless. Who could beat Dewey? The further west Truman got the more colloquial he got, and the more relatives he seemed to have scattered about the country. (I have always meant to go back some time and count those relatives: It did sometimes seem that Harry had had more than his fair quota of grandparents.)

Well, Tom and a party of us were sitting in one of the press drawing rooms of the campaign special one day between whistle stops, laughing at Truman's folksy phrases. He kept repeating that he was going out to California "fur to get me a degree." Simultaneously the doughty little warrier was disclaiming charges of corruption and was telling audiences that the Republicans had nothing on him—"they couldn't prove a thing."

Suddenly Tom, if I remember aright, began drumming with his hand. "Why, it's poetry," he exclaimed. And then he uttered in a kind of sing-song voice what I shall always consider to be a positive example of simple inspiration—the actual Truman phrases put together:

"They can't prove nothing. They ain't got a thing on me;
I'm going down to Berkley fur to get me a degree."

Of course Tom put it to the tune "Oh, Susanna," and it quickly blossomed into the theme song of the trip. The stanzas grew and grew and I must say Truman proved to be an inexhaustible quarry of high grade material. The Truman phrases needed no depletion allowance.

Like every old-time newsman I have a metal file cabinet of clippings by my desk. How often when I turn to it I still find some first-rate clipped item from the Stokes' column. (It is odd—using material from a man who is no longer here.) These columns remind me that Tom was one of the few who kept his balance of objectivity in the otherwise all-but-universal paeans from the press after the 1953 election.

(I suppose I am in a minority but I have always felt that the American press—or a good part of it—deprived the administration for several years of something to which it was legitimately entitled, a virile opposition. Every President needs this unending, critical press scrutiny. The administration and the country loses them at their peril.)

Tom's normal style in these columns was simple, direct, and unpretentious. He had a grim concern with many matters which other columnists found too humdrum to explore. I think he was the one who first brought to my attention the role of the regulatory agencies in Washington—the great "fourth branch" of the American Government. It was something that back in 1953–55 hardly any other writer seemed interested in.

* * * * *

"I suppose a posthumous prize is out of the question."

Well, I seem to be wrong.

Here we are tonight.

So often I run across a story that I think Tom ought to be handling—if he were here. There was such a story last week: the Commerce Department's 3-year check of "distribution of national income." It sounds terribly dull, doesn't it? But what it shows is a terrible disparity of income in America between the rich families and the poor. It's an easy statistic to remember. The 20 percent of American families with the lowest income are getting, after taxes, only 5 percent of the total income. And then if you reverse that, the 5 percent of the American families on top—that is the richest 5 percent—are getting 20 percent of the national income. It's easy to remember, for the poor-

est ratio is 20 to 5; for the richest the ratio is 5 to 20.

That's the kind of story Tom, almost alone, could present to his big syndicated audience with great effect. And it's a story that ought to be told for it represents the real basis of the Soviet challenge. The Soviets are already cutting into our lead in shere bulk of goods produced, but suppose they come abreast of us and make the distribution more equitable than we do—as the Scandinavian countries are now doing, for example. That is the challenge to the American way of life; that is the real threat of Soviet competition.

Before I end I should like to mention Tom's autobiographical book of Washington life, "Chip Off My Shoulder." I think it is about the best panoramic color story of Washington, from Harding down to Roosevelt in 1940, until Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., came along. If you can get a copy you might like to read it alongside Schlesinger.

There are many phrases I should like to quote. For example, Tom is describing (p. 298) the great depression of Hoover's days:

"Into our financial vocabulary in those Hoover days, too, came the phrase 'balance the budget.' * * * A 'balance the budget' fetish was created. It was hailed as the cure for all our economic ills, then, and down to our day. Men still use the incantation 'balance the budget.' It is the mumbo-jumbo of the conservative economist, the businessman, the banker. It is a magic wand. It is also a refuge from serious and constructive thinking about what is wrong with America. It has its importance but it is far from being all important."

Lest there be any suspicion that I am intruding a partisan note into this nonpolitical meeting let me repeat that this was written in 1940 about a situation that occurred in 1929.

I think many of us here consider ourselves liberals. I hope we have sense of humor enough to relish this other quotation from the book:

"While I sympathize with the aims of many liberal groups, I am occasionally rebuffed by their intensity, which occasionally becomes arrogant, and by their assumption frequently of self-righteousness. If they would smile occasionally and not take themselves too seriously I would feel more comfortable with them."

Tom richly deserved the Pulitzer prize which he won. But it is ironic that he got the award not for exposing reaction, as he did all his life, but for his equally fair and determined crusade against the political use of WPA relief funds in Kentucky in behalf of the New Deal Democrats, in the 1938 midterm election. Tom was right in his exposé, and it represented a splendid bit of reporting though it made some of the liberals mad at the time. But it is a chance which the progressive reporter must take. Stay on your own side of the fence and things will tend to remain quiet and you probably won't get many prizes. But stray out briefly and attack fellow liberals and you run the risk of being tagged with a Pulitzer.

Well—I have not come to the end of my material but I have come to the end of my time.

I was struck the other day by something I heard at another service. It was for Barrow Lyons, a man who helped organize this meeting in honor of Tom Stokes but who did not live to be with us here tonight.

At the memorial service for Barrow Lyons something was said which I would like to repeat now.

It was by a friend of Barrow's who told how the two of them one summer day had tramped through the woods and stopped at a lovely spot by a stream, and there discussed a mutual friend who had passed away. The two of them laughed at old memories and brought back old times. They seemed to commune with their absent friend.

When it was time to go one of them stooped for a minute and picked a flower by the stream—it was a rare blossom, a cardinal flower—and he flicked it across the stream.

"Just to let you know we were here, Tom, old chap," he said.

Blind Justice—The Prince Edward County, Va., School Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 7, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the trend away from local self-government is evidenced each day in decisions handed down and actions taken by all three branches of the Government. One of the most recent examples of this trend is a case of judicial high handedness. The fourth circuit court has overruled a Federal district court in Virginia in the name of justice; however, as ably presented by the Washington Evening Star in an editorial appearing Wednesday afternoon, May 6, this justice is blind.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial entitled "Blind Justice," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BLIND JUSTICE

The fourth circuit court's ruling in the Prince Edward County school case does two things which, we think, are unwise and which in the end will prove harmful to both white and colored children.

This ruling strips Federal District Judge Hutcheson, the man closest to the scene and to the people of Prince Edward, of all discretion. Judge Hutcheson, foreseeing closed schools and serious injury to the education of children of both races, had postponed the beginning of integration until 1965. But the circuit court, at the request of lawyers for the NAACP, has said that this will not do. Instead, the local authorities now face a command to start desegregation in September of this year. And of Judge Hutcheson's time extension, the appellate court said: "No argument is needed to show that the last delaying order of the district judge cannot be approved, and that it has become necessary for this court to give specific directions as to what must be done." In short, a court of appeals, which has no firsthand knowledge of the local situation, has taken over. Henceforth, it will tell Judge Hutcheson what he must do.

The second unwise aspect of this ruling is that it undertakes to require desegregation in a county which has insisted that it will not integrate its schools. Perhaps this is not properly a matter of concern to an appellate court. But it should—and it will—concern all the people of Prince Edward County.

Prince Edward is a small rural county lying some 60 miles southwest of Richmond. Its school population is 54 percent colored and 46 percent white. White parents have made the necessary preparations to establish private schools for their children. Nothing has been done to provide any schooling for colored children if the public schools are closed down, as most probably will be the case if a specific demand for enrollment of colored children in white schools is made.

This is a dismal prospect. Judge Hutcheson had found that Prince Edward's schools for colored, in terms of curriculum and physical plant, are equal to if not better than the white schools. The appellate court does not dispute this. Now, however, in keeping with the Supreme Court's holding that segregated schools are inherently unequal, the issue is pushed to a point at which the colored children are facing the prospect of no schools as the alternative to segregated schools.

It may be said, and it may be true, that the Prince Edward authorities would be no more ready to accept integration in 1965 than they are today. It may also be true that some kind of schooling for colored children, privately or perhaps federally operated, eventually will be provided in Prince Edward. In the short run, however, the education of the children will suffer severely. And even in the long run the desegregation problem will not be solved. This may be justice—but in the Prince Edward situation it is a form of justice which is singularly blind to the consequences that are being visited upon those whom it is supposed to help.

The Jamestown Church Tower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 7, 1959

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, last February, Gov. J. Lindsay Almond, Jr., of Virginia, issued a proclamation designating May 17, 1959, as an anniversary of the day the English common law was brought to Jamestown in 1607. Those who visited the Jamestown Exposition will recall that one of the few remaining structures built by the first settlers on Jamestown Island is the Jamestown church tower.

In connection with the celebration to be held at Williamsburg and Jamestown on Sunday, May 17, it is pertinent for us to recall the tribute paid to the Jamestown church tower some years ago by the late Honorable George C. Peery, former Governor of Virginia. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the tribute by Governor Peery.

There being no objection, the tribute was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE JAMESTOWN CHURCH TOWER

(By the late Honorable George C. Peery, former Governor of Virginia)

Three hundred and fifty years ago the first permanent English settlement in the United States was founded at Jamestown. Here was set up the first seat of government of the Virginia colony; here the hearthstone of the liberties of our mighty Nation was laid.

It is here that, in reality, we gaze upon the very cradle of our great Republic. Here the first Anglican Church in America was created. And it is here that we go to pay reverent homage to the memory of those great spirits of the past who, in planting the English flag on unknown shores, placed the

real cornerstone for that democratic freedom which men enjoy under the protection of the Stars and Stripes.

Human thoughts, like the mighty tides of the sea, move strongest in deep waters. And so it is, upon this hallowed spot, our souls are silenced by memories, are hushed by a realization that we stand at the birthplace of the freedom of the Western World.

This shrine of national and world interest belongs to no individual division of this great country. Jamestown, with its inspiring traditions, is the property of a whole people. It is sacred to liberty and to the Nation.

In our National Capital at Washington is lifted a monument of marble which rears its lofty crest high above the ever-growing beauty of that great city. I never view that pile of stone without a glow of patriotic pride. It stands for the strength that was Washington, and it points in its majesty and stainless beauty to the God in whom alone lies our hope and help.

There is another monument, a monument clad with the leaves of the ivy and mantled in memories of a past so distant as to antedate our National Capital on the shores of the Potomac.

And while this old brick tower at Jamestown rises to no such height as the monument at Washington, it is clothed in a glory which will outlive the marble shaft and shine through the pages of the history of future ages like a beacon of hope to all the world.

Here, through far coming years, as to a Mecca, will journey the pilgrims of the earth. All such as love freedom will visit here. For from this watchtower of time, liberty will flash its rays into the dim distance of ages yet unborn.

Public Service Record of Hon. Fred Aandahl

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILTON R. YOUNG

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 7, 1959

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, on April 27 the Department of the Interior bestowed a well deserved honor on a distinguished citizen of North Dakota, the Honorable Fred Aandahl. He is a former Governor and Congressman from our State and for several years has been Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

Governor Aandahl is a fine, substantial, able, and unassuming person. I know of no one who is more devoted to public service than he. Throughout most of his life he has held many public offices, always serving with great honor and distinction. The most appreciated and treasured experience that has come to me has been my close association with him during much of his public service. We in North Dakota are very proud of Fred Aandahl.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have two editorials printed in the Appendix of the RECORD—one from the Bismarck Tribune and the other from the Minot Daily News.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Bismarck Tribune, May 1, 1959]

AANDAHL DESERVED THE HONOR

It was typical of Fred Aandahl that when Department of Interior officials and others gathered the other day he did not suspect that the purpose was to bestow honor upon him.

As Governor of North Dakota for three terms, and later as Congressman, Fred Aandahl demonstrated an admirable bent for going about his duties with a minimum of fanfare and self-exploitation.

As Assistant Secretary of the Interior, he has done his work efficiently and thoroughly, without seeking either the notoriety or the personal advancement which usually mark the activities of political figures.

The Interior Department is known in Washington as one of the best organized and best directed in Government, and undoubtedly Fred Aandahl's contribution has been an important factor in the writing of this record.

Aandahl was a fitting recipient of the highest award the Department can bestow, a just recognition of services which have been as distinguished in the Federal service as were those he rendered before to the State of North Dakota.

[From the Minot Daily News]

AANDAHL'S AWARD NOT SURPRISING

It must have been gratifying to Secretary of the Interior Fred A. Seaton to have succeeded in arranging a surprise award for his departmental right arm, Fred G. Aandahl, of North Dakota.

It is gratifying, though hardly surprising, to Assistant Secretary Aandahl's North Dakota friends that his work as a good and faithful servant of the United States should be rewarded with the Department's Distinguished Service Award.

We are sure that Fred Aandahl has set an example in Washington for devoted and conscientious adherence to duty.

As North Dakota's Governor for 6 years, Aandahl displayed a capacity and concern for good housekeeping in State administration. In his years as Governor he acquired a remarkably complete grasp of the details of North Dakota's multiphased water development program. With that preparation, he stepped into the Department of the Interior with an exceptionally good preparation for the work to which he was assigned.

More men of Fred Aandahl's conscientious consistency are always needed in Washington to keep the machinery of the great Government departments on an even keel.

Inflation—Who Speaks for the Consumer?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 7, 1959

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the Christian Science Monitor on April 27, printed an excellent editorial on a topic of most serious concern to us all.

With inflation creeping ever upward and driving the value of the consumer's dollar ever downward, I think this editorial is most timely when the big industries—Big Steel—stands on the brink of another round of price-wage boosts.

Let us all hope both labor and management will heed these words and put a halt to the spiral that is eating up the consumer's dollar.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHO SPEAKS FOR THE CONSUMER?

Apparently nobody—or almost nobody—wants the O'Mahoney bill that would require large corporations in concentrated lines of business to give 30 days' notice of increases in prices.

Spokesmen for the steel companies, such as Roger M. Blough, chairman of the United States Steel Corp., facing wage demands in contract negotiations which affect costs, clearly do not relish the idea.

David J. McDonald, president of the United Steelworkers of America, opposed the bill in a hearing before the Kefauver Antimonopoly Subcommittee of the Senate, while asserting that steel company management could afford higher wages without higher prices.

Members of the staff of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States pointed out practical difficulties in operating a price examination measure or even defining its terms.

And the Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, Raymond J. Saulnier, added a reluctance on the part of the executive department of the Government to undertake this method of checking price rises or inflation under current circumstances.

There is much room for doubt as to whether the O'Mahoney bill, with its provision for the Federal Trade Commission to hold hearings during the 30-day waiting period, is the best approach to the problems in administered prices. There would be still greater objection to a proposal that the Government should add a further layer of control over prices quoted by corporations.

Yet Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, presiding over the present hearings, says with good reason that if inflation in the costs of living continues there will be public demand for Congress to enact something much stronger, more drastic, than price notification.

Even through a business recession which raised unemployment to 7.7 percent of the working force in the United States, the Consumer Price Index rose about 4 percent in a year. It is true, as Mr. Saulnier says, that this index now has been roughly stable for about a year—thanks to lower food prices offsetting higher costs of automobile and other transportation.

In view of the fact that the consumer and the saver have seen their dollars lose nearly 17 percent of their purchasing power in the last 10 years, is it enough that there be mere price stability (till the next boost)? Or is there not in fact a case for some rollback of prices?

The American Can Co., itself a steel-using industry, thought so back in January and has added a second reduction of prices to food canners this month. When it is reported that the steel industry can make a profit while operating at 50 percent of capacity, when one company cleared nine times as much in the first quarter of this year as in the same period last year, and when the profit of another was over 8 percent of its sales, is there not some case for a dividend to the consumer in price reduction rather than increase?

It is far better for industry and organized labor to ask themselves these questions than to have them propounded by Government. But unless they are asked and reasonably answered they will be pressed by consumers—who are also voters—and by the competition of foreign producers.

Bloodless Marine Casualties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 7, 1959

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial in the San Diego Evening Tribune draws a striking parallel between the loss of combat-ready marines now underway to meet a strength level of 175,000 by June 30 and the losses suffered by the corps in combat.

It notes that just as in combat the corps is meeting the problems posed by casualties by deactivating units forced below acceptable strength and redistributing its manpower to bring remaining units up to strength.

It correctly pinpoints the fact that the actual reduction of the corps now underway is only part of the story. For if the considered intent of Congress had been honored the United States today would have a force-in-readiness of 200,000 combat-ready marines to serve as the first echelon of the Nation's limited war force.

Nothing which has happened in the months since Congress expressed its judgment that the Nation's security required a force of 200,000 marines has served in any way to lessen the validity of that decision.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include this editorial, reflecting a small part of the general, nationwide concurrence with our views, for publication in the RECORD.

[From the San Diego Evening Tribune, Apr. 23, 1959]

BLOODLESS MARINE CASUALTIES

During 37 months of fighting in Korea, the U.S. Marine Corps lost 4,267 men through battle deaths.

This is about 1 percent of the 424,000 Marines who served during the Korean war.

By June 30 of this year, the Marine Corps faces the loss of 9,000 battle-trained men under the military manpower cutback ordered by the Pentagon.

These bloodless casualties are about 4½ percent of the present 200,000-man strength of the corps.

The loss of combat forces is only part of the story. The total cutback is 25,000 Marines to a corps strength of 175,000.

Earlier reductions have been absorbed by cutting back the supporting establishment and the security forces, and by holding the combat forces at an average of about 87 percent of their full personnel strength, Gen. Randolph McC. Pate, Marine Corps commandant, has told Congress.

Now, a big chunk of the cut must come out of muscle.

It's not unfair to compare the scheduled losses to actual combat casualties. The effect is the same. The Marine Corps is now following standard combat procedure when personnel strength falls below a certain percentage of effectiveness. It is reorganizing and distributing personnel from deactivated units to remaining ones in order to keep those left up to strength.

America would be properly aroused to read a headline saying the Marines had lost 9,000 men in combat.

They should be equally concerned when this historic, ever-ready elite corps loses 9,000 battle-trained men to the paper bullets issuing from the Pentagon. The weakening effect is the same.

Floyd Dominy, New U.S. Commissioner of Reclamation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MILTON R. YOUNG
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 7, 1959

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, the people of the United States are fortunate that the Department of Interior has been headed by several very able and outstanding men. Its vast and far-reaching operations have been conducted in such an admirable way as to win the approval and acclaim of the general public.

Recently, Mr. Floyd Dominy was appointed to fill the vacancy for the U.S. Commissioner of Reclamation. I know of no one who is more able, devoted, and dedicated to the task before him than this fine and respected gentleman. He will be a credit to the Interior Department and to all concerned.

Mr. President, John Hjelle, editor of the Bismarck Tribune, published at Bismarck, N. Dak., recently wrote an article which I believe pays a well-deserved tribute to Mr. Dominy.

I ask unanimous consent that this article written by Mr. Hjelle be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Bismarck (N. Dak.) Tribune, Apr. 17, 1959]

NORTH DAKOTA TO SEE MORE OF HIM—RECLAMATION'S CHIEF-TO-BE BLENDS FARMING WITH CAREER

(By John O. Hjelle)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Floyd Dominy, soon to be U.S. Commissioner of Reclamation, is a country boy who wouldn't be taken out of the country even when the Government pulled him into Washington.

Dominy's name is well known already in North Dakota water development circles, for he has been with the Bureau of Reclamation for almost 13 years, most recently as Assistant and Associate Commissioner.

This reporter called on him because, with the development of Garrison diversion, Dominy will be an individual as important to North Dakota as any other in Federal circles. North Dakota will be seeing more of him, and he more of North Dakota.

Strong built, his hair tousled, Dominy grew up on a Nebraska farm, later moved into agricultural work in Wyoming.

When he came to Washington in August of 1938, he bought an abandoned farm in Virginia, 20 miles west of Washington. He built a house on it and has lived there ever since.

He's proud of a son, now attending the Military Academy at West Point, because of his accomplishments in 4–H work and as a livestock expert.

The son, Charles, was a Virginia championship livestock judge when in high school. In 1956, he was on the Virginia judging team at the international livestock show in Chicago. One year, he raised and showed the Virginia champion Angus steer.

The Dominy farm covers 380 Virginia acres—enough to support about 100 cows, says Dominy. With Charles off to school, Dominy hires one full-time man to help him do the farm work.

But Charles and his dad aren't the only farmers in the family. Daughter Ruth Ellen, 12 years old, and in the seventh grade, is an active 4–H'er, too, working with Angus calves and training her own riding horses.

Another daughter, Mrs. Jack DeBolt, lives now in Torrington, Wyo., where her husband is in the farm machinery business. There are three grandchildren.

Mrs. Dominy, the former Alice Criswell, was Floyd's high school sweetheart.

Dominy's start in agricultural work came at a time when conditions were so bad in the West that he learned a lasting lesson as to the importance of good land management and soil and water conservation practices.

He became the agricultural extension agent in Campbell County, Wyo., in February of 1934, right in the middle of the mean old dust bowl days.

He taught vocational agriculture part of 1 year, too. "All I had to do was teach all the farm classes—including farm shop—instruct kids in the 7th and 8th grade and some high school arithmetic, coach basketball, and a few other things. It was a full life," he recalls.

As county agent, he got the job of instituting drought-year emergency farm programs.

"I bought 55,000 head of drought cattle, and 200,000 head of sheep in Campbell County," he remembers. "I saw farmers lose their entire foundation herds, and get little or nothing for them. It wasn't the drought alone that hurt. Even if the farmers had gotten crops, and feed for their cattle, the things they grew could bring nothing on the market. They couldn't even get the shipping costs back."

In 1936 Dominy started the Federal range improvement program going. This included the development of stock water ponds, grazing rotation plans, and other improved land management practices. Here he made a mark that won national note.

"We did more work along these lines in Campbell County than in several States put together," he says. "We put the farmers to work and got a job done."

The young Wyoming worker caught the eye of big shots in Washington, and Dominy was invited here to work on the agricultural adjustment program of the late thirties, specializing on conservation phases.

He traveled the 17 Western States which are his special province now, and got to know them and their problems and their people.

When World War II broke out, Nelson D. Rockefeller—now Governor of New York—was made coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, Dominy joined Rockefeller's forces as assistant director of the food supply division. He worked with governmental leaders of Central and South American countries on food supply programs incidental to their war supplies programs.

"Some of those cooperative programs we started then, in 1942–43, are still going," he notes with a degree of pride.

In May of 1944, Dominy went into the Navy—but he found himself still in agricultural work, though the setting was new and so were the problems. As a member of Adm. John Hoover's staff in the Pacific, he worked with the native population to rehabilitate agricultural production as Americans recaptured islands from Japanese invaders.

On April 1, 1946, Dominy joined the Bureau of Reclamation as a land development specialist, later becoming Chief of the Branch of Cost Allocation and Repayment, then Assistant Director of the Irrigation Division, and finally Director of the Irrigation Division.

He was named Assistant Commissioner in August 1957, and Associate Commissioner in March 1958—the first ever to hold that office. He will take over as Commissioner on May 1, replacing Wilbur A. Dexheimer, another career man who will retire at age 58 after 30 years in the service.

Dominy talks like a practical man who believes in the work he is doing. He gives the appearance of one who won't be pushed

around, but who is willing to listen and to learn.

Irrigation—as a part of proper land management and resource conservation—is a part of the answer to development of the Great Plains, Dominy believes.

"In recent years," he points out, "while the Nation has been increasing in population by leaps and bounds, the Great Plains have barely held their own, populationwise. To me, that signifies that without the development and control of water resources, so as to carry over water supplies from plentiful years and thus be able to irrigate and protect the economy in the lean years, the area cannot have the stable economy it needs to hold young people at home. Youth is the greatest export of the Great Plains—youth and education."

Dominy points to North Dakota as an example.

"Outside of its limited oil production," he says, "North Dakota is pretty well limited now to its agricultural potential. Any program that will bring growth and stability to the State's agriculture is bound to be of economic significance to the long-range development and prosperity of the State."

Dominy is hopeful but cautious in what he has to say about Garrison diversion, a project which he has had a hand in developing and which he is convinced is eminently desirable.

"Garrison diversion," he says, "is a tremendous undertaking, and very expensive. It is proper that it be constructed in a partnership arrangement between the State, the wateruser, the irrigation districts, and the Federal Government, with the former repaying the money that will be expended from the Federal Treasury to build it."

He adds:

"There is no question at all in my mind but what Garrison diversion is economically feasible and engineeringly and physically feasible, and that when it is constructed it will take its place as one of the great Federal-State-local cooperative enterprises, such as the North Platte project in Nebraska, the Central Valley project in California, and many more. And anyone who has lived and works in the West, and has observed the stable economic communities of prosperous farms and business enterprises that have grown up around enterprises like this, can't help but believe it is in the national interest.

But Dominy refuses to get out on a limb when it comes to the construction timetable, which North Dakotans hope will get construction started in fiscal year 1963.

"We have to recognize," he says, "that no matter how desirable the project may be, and no matter how thoroughly we may have demonstrated its value to the Nation, we still don't have an unlimited access to the Federal Treasury. Like everything else the Government does, it has to be programed with an eye to the overall budget requirements of the times, and fitted into the overall Federal program. And some of the things that are being forced on us today are very costly."

Dominy mentioned the current efforts in the realm of outer-space exploration as an example, citing also the costs of national defense, neither of which may be put off.

All of which would seem to indicate that in Floyd Dominy, the Nebraska farm boy and Dust Bowl days Wyoming county agent, the Garrison diversion project has a good and stanch friend. It will need many such friends in high places to surmount all the hurdles that confront it before the first contract can be let and the first dirt moved for its building—perhaps 4 years hence, North Dakotans hope.

Federal Communications Bar Association Recommendations To Amend Communications Act

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. OREN HARRIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 7, 1959

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced a bill, enactment of which has been recommended by the Federal Communications Bar Association. The bill proposes to substitute for the protest procedure provided for in section 309 of the Communications Act a new pregrant procedure. The bill would further amend section 405 of the Communications Act with respect to rehearings.

The Federal Communications Bar Association submitted with the draft bill an explanatory statement describing the difficulties with the present provisions of the Communications Act relating to the protest procedure and rehearings, and setting forth the reasons for the recommendations of the Federal Communications Bar Association.

I am asking leave to have printed at this point the letter of transmittal from Mr. Leonard H. Marks, president of the Federal Communications Bar Association, and the explanatory statement of the association with regard to this legislation:

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS
BAR ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D.C., April 28, 1959.

Hon. OREN HARRIS,
Chairman, House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HARRIS: I am transmitting at this time the recommendation adopted by the executive committee of the Federal Communications Bar Association for amendment of sections 309 and 405 of the Communications Act of 1934. There is also attached a report explaining the basis of the recommended action.

This matter has received considerable attention by our association. The enclosures represent the views of the committee on practice and procedure, and the executive committee, and the views expressed by many of the members at the last annual meeting of the association.

In the event that a bill is introduced embodying these recommendations, the association will be glad to appear and present testimony in explanation of its position.

Sincerely,

LEONARD H. MARKS, *President.*

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS BAR ASSOCIATION PROPOSAL FOR AMENDMENTS TO SECTIONS 309 AND 405, COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934, AS AMENDED

INTRODUCTION

For several years there has been exhaustive consideration by the Federal Communications Bar Association of possible changes in the Communications Act to modify or find a more satisfactory substitute for the so-called protest procedure embodied in section 309(c) which provides for hearings or oral arguments on the demand of parties in interest after the Federal Communications Commission has granted without a hearing an application for a construction permit for a radio facility.

At the annual meeting of the association in January 1959, the members gave strong support to the substitution of a carefully defined pregrant hearing procedure for the postgrant protest hearing procedure. Further intensive consideration of the proposed legislation has been given this matter by the association's executive committee and its practice and procedure committee. On April 14, 1959, the executive committee voted to recommend the enactment of amendments to sections 309 and 405 in the form attached.

Under the proposed amendment to section 309 the pregrant hearing procedure would be made applicable to the broadcast and common carrier services and also to certain limited categories of applications in the safety and special services. The amendment to section 405 would require the Commission to take action within a specified period of time after filing on petitions for rehearing of grants made initially without hearing.

I. DIFFICULTIES WITH PRESENT STATUTORY SCHEME WHICH OCCASIONED RECOMMENDED AMENDMENTS

Without attempting to list all of the problems inherent in the existing protest procedure, we shall briefly sumarize the principal ones.

In its present form section 309(c) can place a heavy burden on the Commission and on successful applicants by requiring unnecessary and lengthy proceedings, after grants are made, to vindicate the grants in situations where there is no substantial basis for attacking them. At the same time the protest procedure fails to give real assurance to protesting parties in interest that legitimate objections to a grant will be given timely and adequate consideration by the Commission.

The original enactment of section 309(c) as a part of the Communications Act Amendments, 1952 (the so-called McFarland Act), stemmed from a feeling of dissatisfaction with the treatment by the Commission of objections to grants. Unfortunately, the existing mandatory protest procedures leave the Commission little discretion to dispense with useless or even frivolous proceedings. While protests must be filed under oath, the factual allegations may be based upon information and belief, which unfortunately encourages the filing of ill-founded protests with allegations based not on known facts, but on suspicion or less. Protest hearings have created immeasurable delays in bringing service to the public, but have resulted in few final reversals of grants. From the protestant's point of view the protest procedure has the fatal drawback that it comes into operation after the Commission has made its determination that a grant is in the public interest. It is difficult for a protestant to meet the burden of persuading the Commission that its original grant was mistaken.

II. THE PREGRANT PROCEDURE

It is the view of the association that the inherent inadequacies of the protest procedure can best be remedied by providing for institution of a pregrant procedure which will limit hearings to instances where material and substantial questions of fact are presented, and which will require explicit and reasoned resolution by the Commission, prior to grant, of questions of law or policy

which do not warrant a hearing. The proposed pregrant procedure is more nearly consistent with normal administrative procedures. It provides a method for reducing the possibility that the Commission will act erroneously by providing for consideration of objections before rather than after the Commission acts, but eliminates the power of protestants to compel hearings or oral arguments in situations where no useful purpose would be served thereby. In short, the proposed procedure will give the Commission ample discretion to dispose summarily of frivolous objections to a grant, but will require appropriate consideration of substantial objections before it makes a grant.

The effectiveness of a pregrant procedure clearly depends upon an adequate system of notice which will permit interested parties to be apprised of the pendency of an application, and give them an opportunity to invoke the procedure. In the safety and special services the many thousands of applications handled cannot, as a practical matter, be made the subject of public notice. Moreover, as to the great majority of such authorizations, grants are taken subject to interference; and other bases for objection by interested parties are rare or nonexistent. Thus, after a careful study of the problems of the safety and special services it was decided to make subject to the proposed pregrant procedure limited categories of applications as to which legally valid objections by interested parties would appear to be most likely. These relate to authorizations which are made on a nonduplicating basis or which are entitled under the Commission's rules to protection against interference.

III. TIME LIMIT FOR ACTION ON PETITIONS FOR REHEARING UNDER SECTION 405

One of the problems which led to the original enactment of section 309(c) was the extended period of time elapsing between filing of and action upon petitions for rehearing of Commission decisions without hearing. A grant might remain in effect for a year or more without action on a petition which raises substantial questions as to its validity. It also unconscionably delays the seeking of judicial review in those situations where the filing of a petition for rehearing is a statutory prerequisite to seeking review by the courts of Commission action. In light of the proposed elimination of the postgrant hearing procedure (which has a requirement that the Commission act on protests within 30 days), the association believes this to be an appropriate time to recommend strengthening of the section 405 remedy by providing a time limit (90 days) for passing on petitions for rehearing of grants made without hearing.

IV. ANALYSIS OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

A. Section 309

Section 309 is proposed to be revised as follows: A new section 309(a) sets forth the terms of the pregrant procedure. Existing section 309(a) becomes section 309(b), and is modified in minor, but not in substantive, detail for purposes of consistency. Existing section 309(b) becomes section 309(c). The existing procedure for notifying applicants of the necessity for hearing and for designation of applications for hearing is left unchanged where no petition to deny an application has been filed or where the Commission questions an application on grounds not set forth in any such petition. If a meritorious petition has been filed, the case is set for hearing. Language changes are made in the new section 309(c) to integrate the pregrant procedure with the existing procedures and to avoid inconsistencies and procedural duplications. Existing section 309(c) (the postgrant protest procedure) is eliminated entirely. A new section 309(d) lists the safety and special services applications subject to the pregrant procedure. A new section 309(e) gives the Commission the power by rule to make reasonable classifications in order to effectuate section 309.

The pregrant procedure assures that interested parties receive adequate notice of applications subject to the procedure by requiring the Commission to withhold action for 30 days after public notice of acceptance of applications for filing. If an interested party files a petition to deny the application prior to grant, the Commission must dispose of the petition before making a grant. Unlike the present protest procedure, the pregrant procedure does not compel the Commission to hold automatic evidentiary hearings or oral arguments in cases where such proceedings may be futile. Moreover, the petition must contain specific allegations of fact supported by affidavit. The applicant is given an opportunity to reply.

If no substantial and material question of fact is raised, the Commission may deny the petition with a concise statement of its reasons. The holding of oral argument in such a situation is left to the Commission's discretion. If questions requiring a hearing are presented, the Commission has full authority to specify the issues and assign the burden of proof to be borne by the parties to the hearing. Thus the pregrant procedure gives the Commission reasonable control of the proceedings before it, a control lacking under the existing protest procedure. At the same time, where the Commission denies a pregrant petition, the concise statement of reasons required will furnish an adequate basis for immediate judicial review and will give interested parties the opportunity to seek judicial stay of Commission action. The Commission will not be able to deny pregrant requests for hearing without explanation.

The pre-grant procedure would apply to all applications in the broadcast and common carrier services with six classes of exceptions. The exceptions generally cover emergency authorizations, authorizations involving operation of facilities substantially in the manner for which construction previously was authorized, authorizations involving involuntary or minor changes in existing authorizations and certain broadcast authorizations of a character such that the need for prompt Commission action is felt to outweigh the need for an opportunity to file objections prior to grant.

The pre-grant procedure would not apply to the great bulk of applications in the safety and special services. Many thousands of these applications are handled each year. It is impractical to give prior public notice of their filing. In the overwhelming majority of situations there is no party in interest who may legitimately complain of such applications. Limited categories of safety and special service applications, grant of which may adversely affect rights of other licenses or applicants, would be made subject to the pre-grant procedure. The Commission would also be given specific authority by rule to make additional categories of applications in safety and special services subject to the pre-grant procedure.

B. Section 405

The right of any party in interest to petition for rehearing under section 405, regardless of what proceedings may have been had before the Commission prior to grant would continue to be available under section 405.

Two amendments are proposed to section 405. The first would correct a typographical error in the most recent reenactment of that section. The second, which involves a change of substance, would provide a cutoff date for action on petitions for rehearing of Commission grants made without hearing. Under section 405 the filing of a petition for rehearing does not require a stay of the Commission action of which complaint is made. Under these circumstances it is important for the Commission to dispose with reasonable promptness of the petition, especially in those cases in which no hearing has been held. The 90-day limit proposed is believed to be long enough so as not to place an undue burden on the Commission, but short enough to assure that a questionable authorization will not be allowed to remain in effect for a prolonged period without Commission consideration of a pending petition for rehearing.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that the amendments here proposed to sections 309 and 405 of the Communications Act will go a long way toward eliminating the unjustifiable burdens upon the Commission's processes which have existed since the enactment of section 309(c) in 1952, and will at the same time result in improving the remedies available to interested parties in cases where substantial questions are presented.

For the first time since 1952 the Commission will no longer be compelled to hold an evidentiary hearing or oral argument in situations where the allegations of the objecting parties in interest fail to raise material questions suitably supported by affidavits as to facts. At the same time, objecting parties in interest will for the first time be assured that the Commission will give adequate consideration to the objections raised before a decision to make a grant has been reached, and the Commission will be required to give reasons for its actions in denying pre-grant petitions which will permit a prompt court test of the validity of Commission decisions.

Thus under the proposed amendment to section 309, the Commission and Commission permittees will be relieved of the oppressive burdens of unnecessary hearings (which, in turn, may create inducements for financial settlements that may be contrary to the public interest). The incentive to protestants to wait until after a grant to invoke mandatory delaying procedures will be destroyed. On the other hand, objecting parties will have the benefit of having their views given full consideration by the Commission in the processing of an application before the view of the Commission has been crystallized into a decision, and will have an opportunity for prompt court review.

Finally, the amendment to section 405 eliminates a defect which has existed in that section since the original enactment of the Communications Act in 1934. For procedural reasons a petition for rehearing under section 405 is frequently required as a condition precedent to obtaining judicial review. For the Commission to have the power to delay action on the petition for an indefinite period, and at the same time to allow the questioned grant to remain in effect, is a classic example of the power to deny justice by delaying justice. This loophole in the law should be closed.

The Kennedy-Ervin Labor Reform Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 7, 1959

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, there has been a great deal written recently about the Kennedy-Ervin labor reform bill. Most of what I have seen

concedes that, while the bill is not a perfect one, it is a step forward, and should be approved by the House of Representatives and by the President.

One of the leading newspapers in my State, the Montgomery Advertiser, contained an editorial in the May 3, 1959, issue that takes a similar point of view and makes other comments which, I believe, will be of interest to the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KENNEDY BILL OR NOTHING

President Eisenhower's disappointment in the Kennedy labor bill is understandable. A compromise measure put together by a man fearful of antagonizing anybody before 1960, it leaves much to be desired.

But the President risks losing all if he condemns too harshly or pushes too vigorously for a tougher bill.

It is politically unrealistic to expect that the House will write into labor legislation those things which the President cites as omissions in the Senate bill—specifically, adequate provisions to deal with secondary boycotts, blackmail picketing and the jurisdictional question of "no man's land" labor cases.

That these are vitally needed provisions—particularly the first two—was vividly established by Senator McClellan's committee over a period of many months. But their incorporation into the Senate labor bill was not to be.

It would require a miracle to expect the House to do a better job than the Senate. The fact is, the Congressmen have been far less enthusiastic about any labor legislation. Last year, they ignored a bill passed overwhelmingly by the Senate. Similarly confronted this year, they will do likewise given half a chance.

The President's criticism, however justified, could well provide them with the chance they seek. Like it or not, the administration and the public should reflect that as for this year's labor legislation, it is the Senate bill, something worse, or nothing.

"Top Secret," but Should It Be?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 7, 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in these days of international peril, it is imperative that a great Nation like the United States take every reasonable precaution to protect its security. It is right that certain programs of our Government be classified. The public's right to know does not mean that all our defense secrets should be revealed. On the other hand, the public does have a right to know some things which are at present withheld by the administration.

In a recent article, Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, points to certain inconsistencies in the area of Government secrecy, especially as it relates to our atomic energy program. He maintains that preoccupation with classification sometimes violates the public's right to basic information and sometimes slows up scientific advance.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "'Top Secret,' But Should It Be?" by Hon. CLINTON P. ANDERSON, which appeared in the May 3, 1959, number of the New York Times Magazine, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"TOP SECRET," BUT SHOULD IT BE?

(By CLINTON P. ANDERSON)

WASHINGTON.—How secret is the color of a bird's feathers?

Is the American public entitled to the facts about fallout?

Does it make sense for defense information to be labeled "top secret" and yet released in full to the newspapers?

Why are questions about the Nation's atomic energy programs met again and again with the reply, "It's classified"?

Is the secrecy surrounding the atom justified? Or is the secret stamp perhaps being used as a convenient shield behind which to hide information which someone somewhere happens not to like or not to agree with?

Concern has been expressed in many quarters about the secrecy problem. The Atomic Energy Commission holds that secrecy is essential to national defense. The press and other segments of the public fear that unnecessary secrecy is hampering scientific progress and obscuring the defense picture.

What are the facts? Where should secrecy end and freedom of information begin?

I had scarcely warmed my chair as a new member of the Congressional Joint Committee on Atomic Energy when I ran head on into the secrecy problem.

It began with the announcement of a series of tests to be conducted in Nevada—the first tests of this size within the United States. I was invited to observe them, and was told a special party would leave from my home city, Albuquerque I flew there to await instructions, having been specifically warned in advance that I could not tell my wife where I was going or what I was going to see.

In Albuquerque, I had a full day's briefing at the Atomic Energy Commission's offices on what we would see in Nevada. I watched the assembly of one of the bombs which was to be dropped. Then I went to a hotel and waited. I was told that I would be picked up about 9 or 10 p.m. and taken to the AEC offices for another short briefing before departing for Las Vegas around midnight.

At 9 p.m. I telephoned my wife in Washington and told her I would be gone from Albuquerque for a few days and would not be able to communicate with her, that I could not tell her where I was going or why, but that I would telephone her on my return.

In an hour or two, a man in uniform called for me, told me to leave my bag in the room, escorted me downstairs to a car, and had me driven around the city streets while he explained to me that the weather in Las Vegas was unfavorable and therefore we would not be leaving Albuquerque until the next night.

The next morning, I telephoned Mrs. Anderson and told her we had not left Albuquerque, that we would be leaving one of these days although I couldn't tell her when, and that she should rest easy.

Her reply startled me. She said: "Maybe I can help you out. I'll read you a story from this morning's Washington Times Herald."

The story she read reported that the weather over the target in Nevada had made it impossible for the test group to leave Washington the previous day, but that it was expected to leave on the day in question, that it would be joined in Albuquerque by the sole representative of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Senator ANDERSON, of New Mexico, and that the group would then fly to Nevada to witness the test of an atomic weapon.

That was how I learned about secrecy. I couldn't tell my wife something which she could read in her morning newspaper.

In many instances, secrecy is undeniably justified. But in other cases it takes a vivid imagination to determine any valid reason for the "restricted data" tag on information. And the situation becomes ridiculous when one has only to pick up a newspaper to learn extensive details about classified projects.

Let me cite a few more examples to illustrate the problem:

(1) Project Argus. This is the code name of the three high-altitude nuclear explosions in the South Atlantic which have been described as "the most significant scientific experiment of the age." The Argus shots, according to published reports, spread a band of radiation along the earth's magnetic field, disrupted communications, created artificial auroras, and provided data of vital importance to the national defense.

Project Argus was described in cursory fashion to the Joint Committee before it took place and again afterward. Great emphasis was placed on its defense implications and the necessity for its very existence to remain secret.

Then, last March 19, full details of Argus appeared in the New York Times. This important subject became public not through a Defense Department announcement, but through the enterprise of two Times reporters.

On April 3, 2 weeks after the appearance of the Times story, the AEC sent the Joint Committee a letter advising which portions of Argus were declassified. These included the fact that the tests were held, the dates and location, the approximate altitude of the explosions, the delivery vehicles, and the Christofilos theory of electron entrapment.

As far as the Joint Committee is concerned, all other Argus data remain classified, despite the fact that effects of the experiment have been widely discussed in the press. Between March 19 and April 3, the Joint Committee had to treat all information about Argus as classified.

When the Defense Department was asked to justify the fact that the Joint Committee was not completely informed about Argus, the answer was that premature disclosure might have stirred up diplomatic protests which would have caused cancellation of the experiment.

To me, this does not seem a proper reason for failing to comply with the law's requirements that the Joint Committee be advised in full of such matters. I think the committee is entitled to at least as much information as was obtained by the New York Times.

(2) The strontium 90 report: This report, which concerns strontium 90 production from weapons testing through 1956, was prepared by three Los Alamos scientists, George Cowan, Wright Langham, and E. C. Anderson, early in 1957. It was part of an attempt to provide a basis for determining a safe level of testing.

The report was received by the Atomic Energy Commission on October 21, 1957, and attempts began immediately to have it declassified. The report finally was declassified about 2 weeks ago, and was sent to me by Atomic Energy Commissioner Willard F. Libby with the notation that it was "somewhat out of date."

I understand that Dr. Langham and his colleagues are in the process of preparing an

updated version of their study. It will be interesting to see whether this paper, too, will hibernate for 3 years before it is turned loose.

(3) The case of the sooty terns: There reposes in the Joint Committee files a letter from the Atomic Energy Commission describing efforts to prevent the feathers of sooty terns and other dark colored birds from being scorched by radiation. This letter has borne a "secret" tag since it was written in July 1958.

Why should a bird's tail feathers be a subject of secrecy? Perhaps the AEC's reasoning is that if a scientist from another country should come across a scorched tern, he would in turn be able to deduce the level of radiation produced by a specific test and thus could decipher the secrets of our latest experiments.

So the sooty terns remain classified, scorched tail feathers or no. And the AEC wonders why the Joint Committee should be upset about secrecy.

(4) The scientist X affair: When research began into the use of nuclear propulsion for rockets, called Project Rover, Joint Committee members were prevented by a "restricted data" tag from discussing even the existence of the project on the floor of Congress.

Yet Los Alamos announced in the newspapers the hiring of "Scientist X" and released lengthy details of the work he would be doing on Project Rover. The Los Alamos announcement was billed as an attempt to recruit other promising scientists into the atomic energy program. And the Joint Committee once again found itself reading in the newspapers about matters which committee members could have gone to prison for discussing.

(5) The strange division of opinion: When Project Sherwood—controlled thermonuclear energy—was instituted, there was a good deal of dispute over whether the program should be publicized from the start in order to promote free exchange of scientific data, or whether it should be kept secret.

On June 28, 1952, the American Physical Society was holding a meeting in Denver. A number of the distinguished scientists in attendance were drawn to one side and were polled secretly on whether they thought Sherwood should be secret. The vote was 88–1 in favor of declassifying all research dealing with the use of thermonuclear forces to generate electric current.

The AEC decided that the one negative vote indicated a "division of opinion." Therefore, it ruled, Sherwood was classified. An interesting sidelight is that the AEC's classification expert, who participated in the poll, voted for nonsecrecy.

(6) Does "classified" mean "classified"? The Joint Committee last February 19 received from the Defense Department a report indicating that radioactivity in the stratosphere has a residence half-life of 2 years instead of the previously assumed time of 7 years. The report also indicated that fallout was heaviest in northern United States.

The Joint Committee felt this information was of great importance to the American people. It also felt there was no justification for the classification of confidential—restricted data on the report.

We questioned the reasons for the tag and requested an unclassified version. The Defense Department removed a portion of one sentence as containing confidential information but added, "We believe that until the results are more than preliminary, the confidential classification should remain on the letter."

After I protested strongly to Maj. Gen. Herbert Loper, retired, Assistant to the Secretary of Defense for Atomic Matters, the committee was finally notified on March 20 that the report could be made public with the deletion of the one classified sentence. And General Loper maintained during a subcommittee hearing that we had in actuality been free to release the report all the time—that the confidential classification did not necessitate its being kept secret. In addition, witnesses testified that the letter had never contained any restricted data, even in its original form, despite the restricted data tag.

As I commented in a press release at the time, "The process of making public the Argus and fall-out information is an example of how difficult it is to make available to the public the information it is entitled to have."

Attention has been called recently to another problem, that of unclassified information which fails to reach the public promptly because of a scientific proclivity for disseminating new data only through the medium of technical journals. Publishing bottlenecks result in reports containing information of vital public interest gathering dust for many months on the shelves of the prestige journals before they finally come to light.

Edward Gamarekian described the situation in the Washington Post a few weeks ago. He reported that in the United States it takes an average of 6 to 12 months for an article to reach print, while in the Soviet Union it is reported to take as little as 1 month.

One such article, which has now been released, concerns the quantity of strontium 90 concentrated in the bones of American children under 4 years of age. It indicates that the amount doubled in the 1-year period from July 1, 1957, to June 30, 1958. The article was written by Dr. J. Laurence Kulp of the Lamont Geological Observatory, and is the third report on a continuing study which he is conducting.

The Joint Committee learned of the existence of this report through a magazine article. At our specific request, a copy was finally made available to us. Apparently the AEC did not consider it of interest to the committee.

Such information is of vital interest to the American people, particularly in light of the current uproar over the hazards of fallout. The yardstick for its dissemination should be the public good, not the whim of a scientist.

Atomic energy and secrecy are virtually synonyms. The program was born in an atmosphere of utter, absolute secrecy, which at the beginning was an unquestioned necessity. The United States for a brief while was the sole possessor of the atom bomb. Had others learned its secrets in 1945, World War II might well have ended in a different manner.

Now secrecy has become a habit. The question is whether or not its use is being abused.

The law provides several pages of definitions of the types of information which can be classified. Defense information, for instance, is defined as "any information in any category determined by any Government agency authorized to classify information, as being information respecting, relating to, or affecting the national defense."

Another section defines "restricted data" thus: "All data concerning (1) design, manufacture, or utilization of atomic weapons; (2) the production of special nuclear material; or (3) the use of special nuclear material in the production of energy, but shall not include data declassified. * * *"

Armed with these statutes, those in charge of classification can justify a "secret" tag on just about anything, even sooty terns.

Because of the history of the atomic energy program, classification experts have often tended to be overconservative. Being in a "damned if you do and damned if you don't" situation, they have been inclined to play it safe whenever a question arose. No officer was ever denied promotion for saying nothing.

Under the law, all atomic energy information is born classified. The burden of proof rests on those seeking to remove the tags.

But the purpose of secrecy is to prevent our enemies from obtaining information which might help them realize their aims. Classification should not be used to keep from the public information vital to health and safety. It should not be employed to hide data which have no defense implications.

The preoccupation with secrecy in the atomic energy program not only violates the public's basic right to know, it has other, more concrete, effects. Suppression of information prevents discussion which might produce solutions to the problems at hand. It is impossible to say how many valuable scientific breakthroughs have perhaps been delayed, or even prevented, because scientists were not free to exchange information; how many Christofiloses have gone undiscovered because of secrecy. To a point, scientists are able to pursue various avenues of research independently. But often the absence of one piece prevents completion of the jigsaw puzzle.

Ignorance of a hazard, as in the case of fallout, for instance, could well prevent the discovery of methods for combating the hazard. Right now, there is a serious question about the adequacy of our systems for detecting underground nuclear explosions—a question which seems to be providing the biggest stumbling block in the current Geneva conferences. If scientists are not given access to all available information about present detection systems and their shortcomings, it will be a long time before they are able to improve the systems.

Another effect of secrecy is to prevent the formation of informed public opinion, an important force under our system of government. Aroused public opinion frequently exerts great influence on major policy decisions. And the force of misinformed public opinion could well lead to establishment of policies detrimental to the national security. In any case, the dissemination of half facts—which is now all too prevalent—can lead only to utter confusion.

The secrecy problem is not insoluble by any means. A genuine spirit of cooperation among the AEC, the Joint Committee, and the other agencies involved is the first step—and I am happy to say that this spirit is beginning to characterize the committee's relations with John McCone, the new chairman of the AEC.

Next, we must break the habit of secrecy and form new habit patterns. The burden of proof should be placed on those responsible for classification, rather than on those in quest of information. In other words, the Atomic Energy Commission should be required to provide a satisfactory justification for any tag placed on information before it is put there, and the tag should immediately be removed when it can no longer be justified. I personally would favor imposition of as severe a penalty on those placing a restricted tag on unrestricted information as is now provided for those revealing secret data.

I am hopeful that our fallout hearings this week may provide some answers. One matter which will receive close scrutiny during the hearings is the use of the present maximum permissible concentration (MPC) as a standard for determining the hazards of fallout. The maximum permissible concentration is a source of great confusion because of its implications of a line between danger and absence of danger. I think we are going to have to redefine our terms; per-

haps to think, instead, of a maximum acceptable concentration of radiation independent of actual hazard. The maximum permissible concentration and other problems of terminology are often more productive of confusion than is secrecy, and they need attention.

A solution to a portion of the secrecy problem might be for the AEC itself to publish summaries of all important unclassified reports, perhaps on a monthly basis—in other words, to establish its own technical journal. There seems to be little excuse for burying important information in publication bottlenecks. If significant reports contain no restricted information, they should be made available to the public immediately. If they cannot be published for 6 or 12 months by the present technical journals, the AEC itself should devise a means of publishing them.

We all agree, I think, that some secrecy is essential for our Nation's self-preservation. I do not feel, for example, that data on sizes of weapon yields or numbers of weapons in our stockpiles should be bandied over the garden fence.

But improper and indiscriminate use of the secret label will eventually weaken our entire security structure. Classification will come to have no meaning if it is not used with caution.

I think a new motto is in order as a guide for our atomic energy programs: "Is this secret tag really necessary?"

Immigrants Gave Us Our Strength

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1959

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, there is real reason for hope that this Congress will modify the ethnic and racial provisions of the discriminatory Immigration and Nationality Act.

Along with other Members of Congress I have consistently worked for revision of the McCarran-Walter Act. Such revision is not expected to open the country to a flood of immigrants, as opponents of revision say they believe, but it would extend the unused quotas to those peoples in southern Europe.

Harry Golden, an illustrious citizen of North Carolina, in a recent article syndicated by the Scripps-Howard Newspaper Alliance, wrote:

It may come as a surprise to many people to know that at the beginning of this century, one-half of our Nation could not go back further than one of their grandparents as a native American, and this, incidentally, was the beginning of America's tremendous intellectual vitality and expansion.

Mr. Golden was invited to address the annual student burgesses by the trustees of colonial Williamsburg. The New York Herald Tribune sponsors the student delegates from outside the United States, and colonial Williamsburg sponsors the American students. Several hundred young people from every nation in the world were addressed by the author of the best seller "Only in America," whose deep patriotism and ringing defense of America carries conviction.

The Charleston (S.C.) News and Courier wrote a lengthy editorial wanting to know why Mr. Golden was invited to speak at Williamsburg. The News and Courier said that Mr. Golden was, after all, only an immigrant from New York's garment district.

Seldom has the famed southern chivalry, graciousness, hospitality, and logic been worse betrayed by an authentic southern voice than by the Charleston News and Courier in this fit of editorial pique.

I include here for the information of my colleagues an article by Harry Golden from the Washington Daily News of May 1, 1959:

IMMIGRANTS GAVE US OUR STRENGTH
(By Harry Golden)

I am glad to see that so many Members of the 85th Congress of both major parties intend to do something about modifying the ethnic and racial provisions of the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act. Not that it is expected that any such modification would open the gates without restriction. Few people want that in these times of tension. Nor is it intended to allow a total of more immigrants per year than the law now provides. The whole idea behind this need for modification would be, perhaps, to extend the unused quotas to those peoples in the Mediterranean area and Eastern Europe who also dream of the land of promise, just as so many of us had done during the past century.

It may come as a surprise to many people to know that at the beginning of this century, one-half of our Nation could not go back further than one of their grandparents as a native American; and this, incidentally, was the beginning of America's tremendous intellectual vitality and expansion.

I hasten to add, however, that I do not mean that the immigrant was a better man than the native. On the contrary, it was precisely because he did not think himself as good as the native American that he had such a tremendous drive to make good. He had to go all out in this need to get ahead. The first thing he thought of when he got off the boat was: "When will I speak like an American?"—"When will I look like an American?" and he did not dare relax in his efforts to achieve this goal.

The early church fathers understood this principle very well. St. Augustine helped make Christianity a universal religion with two tremendous achievements. First, he married Christianity to the arts and thereby attracted most of the creative people of the civilized world; and, second, he recognized the tremendous value of the immigrant.

In those days it was impossible to go from one country to another, or from one city to another, without a body of troops to escort you for protection. St. Augustine understood, however, that a man would be able to cross all borders without danger to himself, if that man wore the black cloak of the missionary and carried a cross. It was at that moment that communication among peoples began. Without it we might still be living in darkness.

Later, on, Pope Hildebrand made it official church policy. He said that the Christian missionaries must be as different from the people to whom they preach as possible. He understood the tremendous intellectual vitality of the immigrant and his everlasting need to make good.

And all thru history we find that this principle has worked wonders for the country fortunate enough to have immigrants—because where the native can relax in the security of his familiar environment, the immigrant must keep going so that some day he, too, might become "a native." He must make good. He has no other choice.

Britain and America are good examples. When the first Elizabeth mounted the throne she opened the gates to men and women everywhere who honorably sought to make a new life for themselves. It was at that moment that England entered upon her period of Gloriana.

Each wave of immigration to our own country from 1850 to 1920 left its deposits which helped build the United States into the leading world power it is today, and descendents of the immigrants occupy some of the highest places in our society, in science, education, medicine, government, and all the arts.

President Woodrow Wilson put his finger on this basic truth after the passage of the first bill to restrict immigration to our country. The President was confronted with a document which showed that thousands of Italians had returned to the home country after having worked here for a few years, and had taken their American savings home with them. Mr. Wilson looked at this impressive list and replied: "They left us the subways and tunnels they built, didn't they?"

Necessity of Farm Support

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. EVERETT JORDAN
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 7, 1959

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled, "Farm Support: Without It Comes Anarchy," which appeared in the Fayetteville Observer Sunday, April 26, 1959. This editorial, Mr. President, gives an excellent account of the importance of price supports to not only agriculture, but the Nation's entire economy.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FARM SUPPORT: WITHOUT IT COMES ANARCHY

As we have said many times before in these columns there is no ideal solution for our farm surplus problem.

But we must take exception to the editorial idea of Life magazine that the whole farm support program "is a colossal failure" and that "the only thing to do about it is to get rid of it."

Life's statement that "today farming is big business, highly mechanized, performed mainly by large operators and enormously efficient" simply will not stand factual examination.

Nor will Life's statement stand up that "there is no more reason to give a subsidy to this successful big business than to General oMtors or any private enterprise."

Despite the fact that there are many very large farm operations in this country, the average farmer is not conducting a big business.

In net income we doubt seriously if the average farmer has as much take home pay as the average employee of General Motors.

But the average employee of General Motors is organized and the average farmer does not belong to a powerful labor union which will be his spokesman at the bargaining table.

Now we come fairly up against the question:

Is it best for all the American people to let the farmer struggle to find his own economic salvation through the law of supply and demand, laissez faire and the devil take the hindmost?

Life magazine seems to suggest that this is the best way. It says of what it calls "successful" agricultural "big business":

"When it is left to find its own way in a free market you'll get cheaper meat, bread and clothing. And the farm business will shake down to those efficient enough to survive."

But experience should teach us that efficiency in the mere production of a certain number of bushels of wheat and pounds of cotton and tobacco per acre will not guarantee survival to any farmer.

His unorganized efficiency without Government assistance does not extend to control of the total production of any given farm commodity.

But the total production of any given farm commodity in what Life magazine calls a "free market" controls the price of that commodity.

And the price controls the economic status of the farmer.

A growing season 2 weeks longer than average on a national level could ruin millions of farmers whose income depends on a strictly competitive free market.

Suppose for instance that when General Motors and all the other automobile manufacturers tooled up for the production of its 1960 line of motor cars, the number of cars produced depended on the weather—and the weather was unusually good.

General Motors would have automobiles running out of its efficient ears. So would the other manufacturers of cars.

All manufacturers would have to sell their cars at a loss and they would go broke.

But General Motors and the other automobile manufacturers can control the production of automobiles to fit the pattern of consumer demand.

So General Motors does not go broke.

We don't want to see General Motors go broke, because that would be bad for the Nation.

But it would not be a fraction as bad as all the farmers going broke.

And there are those of us today who remember when almost all the farmers did go broke.

And when they went broke they ruined almost everybody else in the country at every economic level.

Because farmers were forced to give away their cotton at 5 cents a pound, millionaires who owned yachts went into the bedrooms of their luxurious penthouses and blew out their interest counting brains.

And everybody in between the farmers and the bankers suffered.

The circulation of the newspapers fell off, church collections dropped, canned goods rusted on the shelves of the stores, and there was big business at the counters which sold fatback, meal, and molasses.

Incidence of pellagra and nutritional diseases skyrocketed. Mules pulled automobiles from which the motors had been extracted.

Farms were auctioned off under foreclosure proceedings for a fraction of their real value—and some farmers gathered with pitchforks and shotguns and chased off the auctioneers.

America, between 1929 and 1933, was perilously close to something approaching a radical revolution, which it forestalled only by the political revolution which gave it for weal or woe—the economic revolution of the New Deal.

We can reconstitute this condition in a few short years by retreating from the theory and practice of farm support.

Life magazine estimated that the "colossal failure" of "the whole farm support program" has cost the American taxpayers $18 billion over a period of 25 years, which is something less than a billion dollars a year, which we feel is something less than an exorbitant price to ask the taxpayers to pay to keep from having the whole economic rug jerked out from beneath tired and aching feet.

Just get this through your head: You can't break the farmers without breaking the Nation and a farm economy which is permitted to operate these days and times under a free market system is destined to go bankrupt.

And when it goes bankrupt the millions of ruined farmers are not going to submit to a process, suggested by Life magazine, whereunder "the farm business will shake down to those efficient enough to survive."

Our entire system of government would be shaken down and what would be established in its place might be efficient enough to survive only by the employment of police terror totalitarianism.

Now get us straight.

We are not cheering the entire farm support program. Undoubtedly there are areas in which it both sinks and stinks. Emphatically the general theory of farm support runs counter to our idea of American free enterprise.

But sometimes even free enterprise has to be curtailed and controlled in the interest of survival.

And we are absolutely certain that a sudden and immediate retreat from the theory of farm price supports would create a condition in the United States of America which would be first cousin to anarchy and which would be the finest thing that ever happened for the international Communist conspiracy.

Now there is just one other way out, and that would be for the Government deliberately to encourage the process suggested by Life magazine of shaking down the farm business to those efficient enough to survive.

This in effect would mean the establishment of gigantic corporations to administer and control the farm business of the United States like General Motors and two or three big corporations administer and control the production of automobiles in the United States.

Such corporations, however, could not be operated profitably without Federal laws forbidding anybody to go into competition with these cartels. Ford and General Motors can build an automobile more cheaply than a handful of mechanics can build one in a "jackleg" factory. But almost any farmer can grow as many pounds of tobacco on any given acre as any combination of billionaires can grow.

And when you tell the individual farmer that he cant grow tobacco in competition with a billion-dollar combine you have created a situation which is something less than freedom in these United States.

At least our current system of crop control is designed—even if it doesn't do it—to feed everybody out of the same spoon.

U.S. Arts Foundation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 7, 1959

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on April 7, I introduced for myself and the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the U.S. Arts Foundation Act, S. 1598, to establish a U.S. Arts Foundation designed to stimulate throughout the United States the study and advancement of the performing arts. The Foundation would assist and encourage productions of plays, concerts, ballets, and other performances by marshaling professional advice, compiling registers of theaters and personnel, and providing subventions to help with the difference between box office receipts and costs, both from its own appropirations and from contributions made by private sources. This U.S. Arts Foundation can enable us to look forward to the day when our Nation will be served by the best in our theater, opera, ballet, and music in all sections of the land, and the world will honor us for it. The cultural spirit of America will in this way be enabled to grow in keeping with the growth of our productive capabilities.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of a recent news broadcast by a highly regarded New York radio news analyst, Estelle N. Sternberger, discussing this bill, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YOU AND THE NEWS
(By Estelle M. Sternberger)

Good afternoon, my comments today deal with the question, Should the U.S. Government support the arts? and with the sectarian religious problem in the public schools.

Over this past weekend, President Eisenhower named an advisory committee of 34, to help plan a National Cultural Center in Washington. It is interesting to note that while Congress authorized the center, it is to be built with private funds. The Advisory Committee just named by the President will cooperate with a 15-member board appointed by the President in January, headed by the real estate man, Mr. Robert W. Dowling, chairman of the American National Theater and Academy.

On the preceding Sunday of April 5, the New York Times magazine contained an article by Senator JACOB K. JAVITS on the idea of a U.S. Arts Foundation, whereby our Government would give official recognition to the arts. He indicated in that article his plan to introduce in Congress, a bill calling for the establishment of such a Foundation.

Even though we have created symphony orchestras, dance groups, and a theater that the world regards with respect, Senator JAVITS holds that the total of our artistic accomplishment is not nearly what it should be. To use his own summing up of the situation, a "few great orchestras in a few great cities, with large sections of the country foreclosed to serious performances of music, dance and theater, do not make for cultural adequacy."

This plea rang in the ears of many Americans as they anticipated the arrival of the Bolshoi Theater Ballet company from Soviet Russia that gives its premier performance tonight at New York's Metropolitan Opera House. For the 27 performances to be given at the Metropolitan and the 5 at Madison Square Garden, offering a total of 165,000 seats, the total requests for tickets has exceeded 3 million. This evidence of the American public's interest in the arts seems to confirm the observation made by the New York Senator in his Times article, that "the cultural surge in America is too big and

private funds alone cannot keep up with all the needs of the national interest. For every city," continued Senator JAVITS, "that has a theater movement, there are 20 that need one. Opera, even on a semipermanent basis, is missing from all but six or seven cities in America (even the proud Metropoitan, our leading opera house, operates only about 6 months of the year, whereas most opera houses in Europe have much longer seasons, often 11 months)."

Even the ballet renaissance in our country finds even the three big touring countries operating on a shoestring, saved only by private funds that are mobilized with considerable effort. These funds are not sufficient to give the companies a sense of security or scope.

The Senator notes our young artists and creators must fight all kinds of obstacles to make careers, and many give up the fight. He quotes a New York Times correspondent on the lack of string players in this country, pointing especially to the string congress to be held this summer in Oklahoma by the American Federation of Musicians. That correspondent emphasized that while we have almost 180 million people, only 50 children will have scholarships to the congress. In the opinion of that correspondent, we should have 5,000.

As we read Charles Poore's review in the Times, of Abram Chasins' book, "The Van Cliburn Legend," we got a sense of what it means to be an artist and became aware of the thousands of our youth who could be lifted to that same inspiring experience that has come to the Texas pianist, Van Cliburn.

Senator JAVITS hurls at us the embarrassing reminder that the majority of Americans around the country face a meager cutural fare and are blacked out of professional cultural activities for a good part of the year. He urges that we are probably the only large nation in the world that does not have a government-sponsored opera, theater, or symphony. "England and Canada have their Arts Councils. Russia supports well over 30 full-time opera houses, not to mention orchestras, theaters and dance groups. Nearly every country in Latin America pitches in to help its cultural organizations, often with results that achieve worldwide fame. Because Mexico, for example, engaged in a large-scale program of commissioning murals for its public buildings, the Mexican school of mural painting was stimulated to a point where it developed into one of the most significant contemporary artistic achievements."

Senator JAVITS reads the governmental rollcall further by noting that virtually every city in Germany has it state opera, theater, and orchestra financed by grants from the federal, state, and local governments. In France, the Opera and Opera-Comique enjoy grants the size of which would make the director of our major opera house turn cartwheels of glee down Broadway. Last year Austria spent $5,800,000 on its four state theaters in Vienna and plans a slight increase for 1959. This was larger than the sum Austria paid to its entire foreign service.

As he presents his plea for the bill he plans to introduce, Senator JAVITS observes that, "while the bill for an Arts Foundation might be considered precedent shattering in the United States, it would be taken for granted nearly everywhere else in the world." It would help, he indicates, in creating a truly national establishment of theater, music, opera, and dance. It would give assistance to both professional and amateur segments of the performing arts. It would encourage widespread training and teaching of the arts so that more young people may receive encouragement and direction in realizing to the full their artistic potential. The bill would provide for Federal assistance to private nonprofit theater, opera, symphony, dance, and other arts groups; to accredited nonprofit colleges and universities and municipally sponsored arts councils and commissions for the presentation of and instruction in the living arts.

Senator JAVITS estimates the expenditures under his bill would not exceed $5 million annually, stimulating possibly the spending of $50 million in private activity over and above present expenditures, and it would all provide careers for thousands and free our increasing leisure from boredom.

Still Need Protection

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 7, 1959

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Peoria Journal Star of May 5, 1959:

STILL NEED PROTECTION
(By C. L. Dancey)

The need for antiracket picketing laws has now been recognized by some of labor's chief exponents in Government as the U.S. Senate voted 90 to 1 to include such a provision in the Kennedy-Ives labor bill.

This, however, affects only those under U.S. jurisdiction. Unless the State legislature shows some small glimmer of courage, small businesses in Illinois will still be left high and dry at the mercy of racketeering methods.

There does not appear to be any argument left at the national level but that simple justice and fairness demands this protection for workers and employers who can be and have been subjected to coercion.

Actually, the proposed antiracket picketing bill in Illinois would strengthen labor in its legitimate purposes by giving protection against arbitrary discharge of persons desiring union organization and by providing for elections to settle organizational disputes.

It is only fair that it should also prevent unions from unfairly picketing a business establishment when it does not represent the workers of that place.

It has been dramatically proven over and over, before the McClellan committee, that such a practice is common among paper unions and other run by former Capone gangsters for purposes of pure extortion as well as to coerce employers into signing their employees, against their will, into bondage to such racket unions.

The only defense ever made for unrestricted picketing is under a claim of free speech, but nobody else enjoys a free speech prerogative to inflict economic injury on anyone for solely selfish purposes. Further, if free speech is the legal basis for picketing, then there is no excuse under the sun for mass picketing, and any legislator who stands for free speech picketing consistently ought to stand for its restrictions to a number ample to serve that purpose and that purpose alone.

Any person who stands for unrestricted picketing, regardless of representation on the one hand as free speech, and unrestricted picketing as to the number of pickets on the other enabling picket lines not only to be heard but to obstruct and physically coerce is patently a hypocrit and and a stooge to labor—or a political coward.

If there aren't enough men in our legislature to even bring this question to the floor, it will be a sad commentary on the flabbiness of the Illinois lawmakers.

Where the question has been openly investigated, openly debated and openly faced, the most flaming liberals on the national scene have faced up to the need and admitted, the justice of antiracket picketing legislation.

It remains to see if State legislators are men enough to do the same.

H.R. 2729, a Bill To Amend the Federal Trade Commission Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 7, 1959

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, in further reference to my bill, H.R. 2729, which would be of great benefit to small businessmen in this country, I would like to insert in the RECORD the text of the Department of Commerce's report on this bill together with comments by Mr. George J. Burger, vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business:

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C., April 23, 1959.

Hon. OREN HARRIS,
Chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This letter is in reply to your request of February 9, 1959, for the views of this Department with respect to H.R. 2729, a bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act so as to prohibit certain practices in commerce by any manufacturer or producer who distributes his product in commerce through his own retail outlets, direct to consumers and also through other retail outlets.

The Department of Commerce recommends against enactment of this bill.

If enacted, H.R. 2729 would apply to any goods in commerce. It would be an unfair method of competition under the Federal Trade Commission Act for a manufacturer, who sells his product through his own as well as other retail stores, to price his product to his own stores at a consistently lower price than that which he charges other retail stores in the same general market. When he sells direct to consumers, it would be unlawful for him to do so at a delivered price which consistently is lower than the general level charged by his own or other retail outlets to consumers in the same general market.

The purpose of the bill appears to be to equalize prices charged the consumer for the same goods by the independent retail store, by the manufacturer-owned store, and by the manufacturer when he sells direct to the consumer.

This elimination of price competition between retailers horizontally would be attempted by legally requiring the manufacturer to adjust his prices at two different levels of trade (if necessary) to conform with some general level of prices in the same general market. Presumably both the price level and the market would be determined by the manufacturer, subject, however, to the scrutiny and control of the enforcing Federal agency.

We believe that, except for the provision requiring sales to his own retail outlet at the same price charged other retailers (which provision would probably of itself have little effect), the bill is diametrically opposed to the present antitrust and business practice laws and philosophy.

The Department sees no justification particular or general, for this proposed departure from our free enterprise system, which encourages the search for and use of more efficient systems of distribution and the selection of combinations of trade outlets to meet the changing requirements of marketing methods.

For these reasons we recommend against enactment of H.R. 2729.

We have been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that it would interpose no objection to the submission of this report to your committee.

Sincerely yours,

FREDERICK H. MUELLER,
Under Secretary of Commerce.

NATIONAL FEDERATION
OF INDEPENDENT BUSINESS,
Burlingame, Calif., May 5, 1959.

Hon. ALVIN M. BENTLEY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN BENTLEY: As I promised in my April 29 letter, I am giving you, herewith, my observations on the Department of Commerce report on H.R. 2729.

Frankly, I cannot understand the Department's reasoning, except from the standpoint that it represents a basic antagonism to the Clayton Act and its Robinson-Patman amendment, both of which aim to curb unfair price competition.

Contrary to the Department's position, H.R. 2729 does not aim to "equalize prices charged the consumer for the same goods by the independent retail store, by the manufacturer-owned store, and by the manufacturer when he sells direct to the consumer." Rather, it aims to make a first step toward eliminating unfair price competition by a manufacturer who sells in competition with his independent retailers by these means.

This being so, then the question becomes one of whether in seeking to eliminate these unfairnesses, the bill does in fact equalize prices to the extent that it, as the Department further charges, "eliminates price competition."

Now, as you know, the key word in this bill is "consistently." H.R. 2729 prohibits a manufacturer from (a) delivering his products to his factory-owned stores at prices that are "consistently" lower than those he charges competitive independently owned and operated outlets; and (b) delivering his products direct to consumer at prices that are "consistently" below those charged by his independently owned and operated retail outlets.

If a manufacturer is prohibited from delivering his products to his factory-owned stores at prices that are "consistently" lower than those he charges competitive independently owned and operated outlets, then this means he is permitted to deliver his products to his factory-owned stores, from time to time, at prices that are lower than those he charges his competitive independently owned and operated retail outlets. In short, the bill permits price flexibility, and therefore competition pricewise, at the retailer buying level. Of course, once delivered to factory-owned stores and dealers, then the problem of establishing retail prices on each and every sale is one that is handled by the managers of both type establishments. The bill leaves the managers of both type establishments free to establish their sales prices as they please.

Further, if a manufacturer is prohibited from delivering his products direct to consumer at prices that are "consistently" below those charged by his competitive independently owned and operated retail outlets, then this means he is permitted to sell direct, from time to time, at prices below those charged by his competitive independently owned and operated retail outlets. In short, price competition is permitted by the bill in this field of activity.

The foregoing being fact, then the Commerce Department's argument falls flat. The bill does permit price competition. It does not promote price fixing.

Actually, the point the Department tries to make about H.R. 2729 interfering with the "search for and use of more efficient systems of distribution" is a very curious one. I would assume the Department's concern is over the prices that consumers would be required to pay.

Let's look at it this way: if a manufacturer is able to sell consistently to his factory-owned outlets at prices below those he charges his competitive independently owned and operated outlets, then would it not seem that there might be something wrong with his entire pricing structure? Certainly, it would not seem that the factory-owned outlets are more efficient producers of greater volume than at least some of his competitive independently owned and operated retail outlets. Why, then, should not his prices be reduced to all his outlets, factory-owned and independents, too? Under the circumstances, by charging a consistently higher price to his independently owned outlets, is he not imposing a price penalty on those who buy from them?

Further, if a manufacturer is able to sell factory-direct to individual consumers, or to large buyers who take delivery on drop shipment basis, at prices consistently lower than those that his competitive independently owned and operated outlets are able to offer, then again might it not seem that there is something wrong with his pricing structure? Certainly, eliminating the element of "retailer profit" (which actually is small in all the industries that would be affected), the manufacturer's costs in selling direct should not be much smaller than those through efficient independent retailer systems. If, despite this, he is able profitably to make such factory direct sales, then perhaps his selling price to his independent dealers, the selling price which is the basis for their establishing their selling prices, is out of line, and should be lower. If this is the case, then where does the consuming public come out?

Finally, if, in fact, the Department of Commerce is not motivated by antagonism to such laws as the Robinson-Patman amendment to the Clayton Act, then possibly it is reading H.R. 2729 out of context. This bill is avowedly offered as an amendment to the Federal Trade Commission Act, which generally prohibits unfair methods of competition. In this case, we have a bill with one aim only: to specify as unfair a pricing practice which is unfair but which is presently beyond the law. The bill does not prohibit any manufacturer from operating factory-owned retail stores, or from selling direct to consumer, just so long as he does not through these consistently undersell his competitively owned and operated retail outlets. A manufacturer may experiment as he desires, so long as he is in fair price competition.

I do believe that the facts on record, before various committees of the House and Senate, show the need for this legislation. And I do hope that the members of the House Commerce Committee will see that H.R. 2729 is reported favorably.

With all best wishes.

Sincerely,

GEORGE J. BURGER,
Vice President.

New Industry Adds Half-Million-Dollar Payroll to Greater Wilkes-Barre, a Badly Distressed Economic Area

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 7, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news article from the Wilkes-Barre Record of Monday, May 4, 1959:

ONE HUNDRED NEW JOBS TO HAVE PAYS OF $500,000—SEA ISLE SPORTSWEAR WILL DEDICATE FACTORY TOMORROW

Another $500,000 payroll will be added to the economy of Greater Wilkes-Barre when the modern, $350,000 factory building of Sea Isle Sportswear, Inc., 170 Simpson Street, is dedicated tomorrow, affording initially jobs for 100 men. This marks the 28th project sponsored by Greater Wilkes-Barre Industrial Fund since it began its campaign to diversify and add industries to the area.

The official dedication will begin at the plant at 11 a.m. Officers of the company will welcome approximately 175 guests, comprising officers and members of the local fund, Committee of One Hundred, labor and industry. Seventy-five of these guests will come from New York for the occasion. A buffet lunch will be served at noon, after which visitors will be conducted through the plant which occupies 50,000 square feet of floor space, 2,000 feet of which is devoted to offices.

Sea Isle Sportswear, a New York manufacturer of children's dresses, on September 12, 1958, announced through William O. Sword, fund president, it would expand its operations by moving to Wilkes-Barre and erecting a new factory. Actually, Sea Isle has been represented here since 1955, according to Mrs. Min Matheson, district manager, ILGWU. Beginning in that year with one plant, today it has plants in Glen Lyon, Mocanaqua, and Hanover. The new plant to be dedicated tomorrow gives the company four plants.

Meeting in New York with officers of Sea Isle were Mr. Sword, Charles Weissman, and David Dubinsky, national president, ILGWU, and David Gingold, the union's vice president. At the conference, Mr. Dubinsky said: "I want to help Wilkes-Barre. We are vitally concerned with encouraging legitimate garment concerns to open shops and bring work into Wilkes-Barre and the surrounding anthracite area where there is a reservoir of skilled, willing, productive workers ready to work and who are not looking to depress labor standards or run away from unionized centers or to assist struck firms, but who are working toward proper expansion of production." At the same time, Mr. Dubinsky promised all-out cooperation insofar as the union is concerned and "whatever reasonable compromises are necessary * * * to bring work."

Ground was broken for the new Simpson Street factory November 10, 1958, by Sordoni Construction Co., general contractor. It is built upon 3¾ acres of land owned by Greater Wilkes-Barre Industrial Fund and will afford 50,000 square feet of space, 2,000 feet of which will accommodate offices. The building is a long span, steel joint building with metal deck and insulated roof. Floors are of concrete. The building is completely air conditioned with special lighting for

cutting tables. It is heated by anthracite stoker-fired heat. A paved parking lot and landscaping complete the picture.

Participating in financing arrangements is Pennsylvania Industrial Development Authority, with its $105,000. The fund's share is $70,000 with local banks taking the balance of $175,000 secured by first mortgage. First-Second National Bank & Trust Co. is trustee bank.

Manufacturing operations will begin immediately. The initial quota of 100 men as a labor force will be augmented eventually to 200 as production increases. According to Leo Friedland, company secretary, however, work produced in the Simpson Street plant will provide employment for 400–500 additional jobs in finishing plants through the area.

Sea Isle Sportswear manufactures childrens' sportswear, sizes 3–6; intermediate girls' sizes, 7–14; teen sizes, 10–16; suits, skirts, slacks, jackets, and jumpers.

The Wilkes-Barre plant will perform the following operations: stretching, cutting, packing, pressing, finishing, cleaning, examining, and draping. Other operations will be done by neighborhood dress plants, specializing in respective processes.

Officers of the company include Charles Beer, president; Leo Friedland, secretary, and Irving Friedland, treasurer. Harry Piken is general manager.

Imports of Fence, Barbed Wire, and Nails

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 7, 1959

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, with the big steel companies negotiating currently with the United Steel Workers on their new contracts, comes a timely editorial written by Mr. F. F. McNaughton, publisher of the Pekin Daily Times in my congresional district. Incidentally, Keystone Steel & Wire Co., referred to in the editorial, which did not raise prices after the last round of wage increases, has its own independent union and pays some of the highest scale of wages in the industry.

The editorial follows:

THE EDITOR'S LETTER
(By McNaughton)

This is a solemn column.

Sober because it touches Pekin area pocketbooks.

Concerns jobs, too.

I'm teeing off from a piece in the U.S. News & World Report.

It says Keystone sells for $9.80 nails which Germans (working for 90 cents) can deliver in Peoria for $8.35.

In 1956, 17 percent of nails used in the United States were imported. But the Japanese have come on with a rush. They buy scrap in America; haul it all the way to Japan; make excellent nails; ship them back to Peoria to sell for $8.52. So now every third nail used in the United States is imported. Japs work for 40 cents.

Equally sad is other fact: In 1939 we exported 29,000 tons. Last year we exported only 1,530 tons.

Now take barbed wire.

Barbed wire is as American as hot dogs, telephones, ice cream cones and Coca-Cola.

We had barbed wire monopoly.

By 1955 U.S. farmers and others were buying one-third of their barbed wire from Belgium, Luxembourg, Germany, Japan, etc.

Today Americans use more foreign than homemade barbed wire.

And the other fact:

In 1947 we exported 79,000 tons of barbed wire. Last year we exported a tiny 759. Our 1958 exports were only 1 percent of our 1947 exports.

Now let's talk jobs.

In the making of fence, barbed wire, wire and nails alone last year, the loss of exports and the hike of imports caused steelworkers to lose 3,188,000 man-hours of work.

That is 1,594 full time, all-year jobs; and that in fence, wire and nails alone.

In all steel operations the loss of work was far greater.

Then multiply that by the jobs lost in factories making autos, bicycles, sewing machines, typewriters, cameras, clocks, watches, tools, huge generating plants, woolens and cottons, tires, dinnerware, steel flatware, clothespins, printing presses, tractors, in fact everything from turbines to transistor radios—and is it hard to figure why we have unemployment?

Facing the competition (and the St. Lawrence Seaway) Keystone did not raise its price for fence, barbed wire and nails when it made its adjustment with labor last July 1. Even though that touched my pocketbook personally, I say "Amen!" to Keystone's decision.

Shriners Convention at Atlantic City During Week of July 5

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MILTON W. GLENN
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 7, 1959

Mr. GLENN. Mr. Speaker, Atlantic City, which is the largest municipality in my district, is host to many guests and conventions during the year. Nineteen hundred and fifty-nine is a banner year for scheduled conventions and one of the largest will be the 1959 Imperial Council Session of the Nobles of the Mystic Shrine—Shriners—to be held during the week of July 5. It is expected that delegations from 56 temples with their bands and various uniformed units will come from 28 States and Canada, bringing 50,000 persons to Atlantic City for the convention. It will be a week of healthful recreation, meetings, parties, parades, regattas, marine flotillas, tournaments, and the opportunity to enjoy the many and varied forms of entertainment and gracious living for which Atlantic City is famous. And yet there will be a serious side to this great meeting because the Shrine does have its obligations and high purpose for its existence and the greatest of these is the sponsorship and maintenance of the Shriners' hospitals for crippled children.

This is a program which is close to the heart of Imperial Potentate George E. Stringfellow, a fellow Jerseyman by adoption. He was born in Culpeper County, Va., descending from a prominent line of forebearers in that great State. Mr. Stringfellow was recognized by Thomas Alva Edison, the wizard of Menlo Park, early in his career and was made the manager of Mr. Edison's manufacturing firm in the Washington office and later was made general manager of the corporation's business in New Jersey. For more than a decade he was a daily associate of Mr. Edison and he is now vice president of Thomas A. Edison Industries of the McGraw-Edison Co. and a leader in the business life of New Jersey. He has received a number of honorary degrees from colleges and has received awards for outstanding achievement in the field of citizenship, industrial statesmanship, and leadership in various organizations for the betterment and understanding of mankind. With all these honors Mr. Stringfellow has had the greatest satisfaction in leading the Shrine and being connected with the program for the aid of crippled children throughout North America. I can best summarize how George E. Stringfellow feels on this subject by quoting an address which he recently made entitled "Shriners' Hospitals for Crippled Children," and under unanimous consent, I include the text of Mr. Stringfellow's address in the Appendix of the RECORD at this point:

It was my privilege to witness the Shrine Oyster Bowl football game last October in Norfolk, Va. The game was played by the stalwart young men of the Naval Academy and the equally stalwart young men of Tulane University.

The game is one of more than 80 played each year in various sections of the country for the benefit of the Shriners hospitals for crippled children.

The Oyster Bowl game has been promoted since its inception by Khedive Temple, A.A.O.N.M.S., Norfolk, Va. Last year's game produced a net profit of more than $80,000.

Incident to that game was a huge parade of high school bands, the Shrine temple organizations of Virginia and a number of beautiful floats from the territory surrounding Norfolk. The float of Khedive Temple was devoted to the Greenville Hospital unit. Riding on that float was a little 4-year-old boy, the son of a merchant seaman.

This little boy romped and played on the float, jumping, dancing, and even running. He was happy and so were the group of Shriners who watched and guarded over him. Eighteen months before the boy was admitted to a Shrine hospital. He could only crawl. He had never been able to walk, because he was born with club feet. His feet were so malformed that if he had been able to stand upright, he would have been walking on the tops of his feet instead of the soles.

This is not an unusual case. It happens all over North America and in Hawaii, where the Shriners have established 17 hospitals with more than a thousand beds to care for children with deformities they would carry with them throughout their lives, except for these hospitals. Instead, the little boy in Norfolk and thousands of others who have been patients in Shrine hospitals, today are leading normal lives, contributing their full share to our American way of life.

These hospitals have been called the world's greatest private philanthropy. The story of these hospitals is filled with romance. It is a story of men with reverend minds and merry hearts, a faith in God, and a desire to be of service to those who cannot help themselves.

In its 1919 session, the Imperial Council of the Ancient Arabic Order, Nobles of the Mystic Shrine elected W. Freeland Kendrick as its imperial potentate. At that time, Noble Kendrick was the tax collector of

Philadelphia, and was later to become that city's most distinguished mayor.

The Kendricks were childless and as a result devoted much of their time to entertaining friendless and orphaned children who were inmates of the various homes of the city. Among these institutions was one for incurables. On one occasion, Noble and Mrs. Kendrick took four of these deformed youngsters on an automobile ride through the city's parks.

Noble Kendrick never forgot that visit to the home for incurables and he resolved that when he should become imperial potentate of the Shrine, he would endeavor to have the organization care for as many of these crippled children as possible.

About that time—1918—a new hospital was established in Atlanta, Ga., owned and operated by the Scottish Rite Masons of that city. This hospital was for crippled children of that area who could not pay for treatment or correct their deformities. This hospital was the fulfillment of a dream of Dr. Michael Hoke, an orthopedic surgeon of Atlanta and Noble Forrest Adair, the head of the Scottish Rite bodies.

Noble Adair was also one of Atlanta's Yaarab Temple reprsentatives to the imperial council which met in Portland, Oreg., in 1920, at the end of Noble Kendrick's term as Imperial Potentate.

It was at the Portland session that Noble Kendrick sponsored the movement within the shrine to build a hospital for crippled children. His resolution would probably have failed had it not been for Noble Adair who delivered an inspiring message that has become known throughout shrinedom as the "bubbles" speech. Noble Adair spoke from first hand knowledge. He had built such a hospital in Atlanta, as Noble Kendrick proposed to have the Shrine build for North America. Noble Adair had seen the twisted bodies enter the Atlanta institution and leave it straightened. He had been inspired by the happy smiles and the discarded crutches of the crippled kids. He knew what could be done and he knew Shriners needed in their lives an objective above and beyond fun and frolic.

And so it was that the imperial council approved in Portland the policy to establish hospitals. The authority to establish these hospitals was handed to a committee of seven men, headed by Noble Sam Cochran of Dallas, Tex., and I doubt that in all history there have ever been seven more dedicated.

The basic rules and regulations they established were so sound they have never been changed. For admission to the hospital, a child must be under 14 years of age, and in the opinion of the doctors, one who can be improved or cured by orthopedic help. The children must come from families unable financially to pay for their treatment. They may come from all races, be of any color and have faith under any creed.

The first hospital was opened at Shreveport, La., on September 16, 1955, the second in Honolulu on January 1, 1923, and the third in St. Paul on March 12, 1923. The last to be opened was in Mexico City on March 10, 1945.

It cost close to $6 million a year to operate these hospitals. The money is provided by the 830,000 Shriners, each of whom contribute $5 per year, from the proceeds of football games and circuses conducted by the various temples and from an endowment fund to which anyone may contribute either as gifts or bequests.

In addition to regular work of the hospitals, each hospital treats thousands of youngsters as outpatients—children who may need posthospital care, or whose difficulties may be corrected without surgery.

May I remind you again that no patient has ever paid a penny for the care received, although there are former patients without number who have contributed to the endowment fund, or who at sepcial times contribute to the welfare of the patients, such as at Christmas.

The work of these hospitals has, for Shriners, been a labor of love, a labor which is above the call of duty. Shriners have enjoyed the privilege through the years and so have hundreds of others who are not members of our fraternity, for example, the players in many of the football games.

The first of these football games was the now famous East-West all-star game in San Francisco, which has been called football's finest hour, and which originated the slogan "Strong legs run that weak legs may walk".

It is needless to go into statistics or to tell you of the many crooked bodies that have been straightened. Your own imagination can give you the picture. We invite you to visit any one of our 17 Shrine hospitals. What you see may shock you for a moment, but the shock is only momentary. Then you see the smiling faces. You will hear the laughter. Then you will know why we Shriners are so very proud to remember Nobles Kendrick, Cochran, Adair, and Dr. Hoke, and all the others who have done so much, including the present head of our 17 hospitals—past imperial potentate the Honorable Galloway Calhoun, a symbol of civic virtue and illustrious son of the Lone Star State.

Steel and Statesmanship—Congratulations to President Eisenhower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 7, 1959

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I want to congratulate the President of the United States for his remarks this week on the steel negotiations. The President very properly warned that the U.S. Government cannot simply stand by and do nothing if the steel producers and the steel union do not use good sense and wisdom in drawing up a new contract.

I have stated a number of times that both management and labor, particularly in the steel industry, must show real statesmanship in regard to wage increases and price increases, or else our economy will be plunged into much more disastrous inflation.

A very fine editorial on this subject appeared in the Washington Daily News of May 6. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STEEL AND STATESMANSHIP

Out in Indianapolis or San Francisco a retired couple may have to find cheaper quarters or move in with the children.

Up in Detroit an auto worker may lose his job.

Down in Memphis a housewife may have to leave the care of the family to strangers and find work to meet the payments.

Through the valleys, farmers may have to hunt extra jobs in town, to eke out a living.

These and similar incidents, multiplied by the hundreds of thousands, are the results of price inflation which raises living costs and threatens unemployment.

Responsibility to some extent lies with Congress and the administration. By reducing spending, balancing the budget, paying off some of the debt, they can stop wearing away the value of wages.

Meeting in New York is another kind of "congress," never elected by the people but with tremendous power over all our lives. It is composed of representatives of the big steel corporations and the big steel union, negotiating a new wage contract.

Steel is a basic industry, employing, at peak, over 600,000. Steel goes into almost everything made in America. A steel price rise would almost certainly touch off a rise in other prices—a new round of inflation. A price cut could hold the cost-of-living line, might start a trend to more reasonable general prices and put some starch back in the dollar.

President Eisenhower probably had some such things in mind when he said yesterday that "the whole public, 175 million people are involved * * * we must look to them for some good sense and some wisdom, some real business-labor statesmanship or in the long run the United States cannot stand still and do nothing."

Steel profits are zooming. Steel wages, at an average of $3.03 an hour, are 84 cents above the average in all other manufacturing.

Productivity is improving constantly yet neither companies nor union mentions the idea of giving the public some of the benefit in form of lower prices. The companies speak only of protecting present costs. Union President David J. McDonald says the companies can raise wages without raising prices. If they can do that, they can cut prices at the present wages.

These steel negotiations have too great a power over the lives and expenses of the rest of the country. The union represents a virtual monopoly in labor. The companies exhibit increasingly the symptoms of monopoly.

If they cannot conduct their affairs with due regard for the public interest then, as President Eisenhower suggests, some form of wage-price regulation is inevitable.

For their own good, for the country's good, they would be well advised to heed the advice of the President and exhibit some "business-labor statesmanship."

Wisconsin Sets New Soil and Water Conservation Record in 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GARDNER R. WITHROW
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 7, 1959

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Speaker, I just received a communication from M. F. Schweers, Madison, Wis., State conservationist for the U.S. Soil Conservation Service, to which was attached a copy of his letter to soil conservation district supervisors acknowledging their 1958 annual reports.

Another new record has been established in Wisconsin in planning and applying soil conservation practices on the land. Mr. Schweers gave credit for this

fine accomplishment to the real conservationists—the farmers and their families who make the decisions and install the conservation work on their land.

The State conservationist pointed out that the excellent relationship between the agencies has been one of the principal factors in making Wisconsin's soil and water conservation program so successful. I personally know that this situation exists through contacts I have made in my home congressional district.

I came from the district that had the first soil and water conservation project in the Nation. It is only natural that I have followed the program of the Soil Erosion Service, the Soil Conservation Service, and soil conservation districts. I am proud of what has been accomplished in Wisconsin. And, I believe that the statement by Mr. Schweers is important enough to warrant its inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I so request it:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICT,
Madison, Wis., April 27, 1959.

To: Soil conservation district supervisors.

From: M. F. Schweers, State conservationist.

Subject: Acknowledgment of your 1958 soil conservation district annual reports.

At about this time each spring, I have the pleasure of reading your and the 70 other soil conservation district annual reports. As usual, I found them to be complete, interesting, and to the point.

A large number of the reports were enclosed in attractive covers. About a dozen included photographs, which brought to my mind the saying, "One picture is worth a thousand words."

Apparently a majority of the reports were distributed to soil conservation district cooperators, agency personnel, and agricultural leaders. Quite a number were sent to members of the Wisconsin congressional delegation to keep them informed on what is taking place in Wisconsin soil conservation districts, so we have been told.

Rather than acknowledge each report individually, I am doing what I have done in previous years and preparing a single summary letter to all supervisors in Wisconsin. This won't be quite as personalized as a separate communication. However, it will cover more phases of district activities.

Administrator D. A. Williams has asked me to convey his regards to you on this occasion. He too wishes that time would permit him to individually acknowledge each of your interesting and informative reports.

HIGHLIGHTS

Two points specifically mentioned in virtually every report were "excellent interagency cooperation" or "wonderful teamwork," and "satisfactory" or "outstanding accomplishments."

You praised the several agencies with which you are closely allied for their fine contributions in advancing the soil and water conservation program of your districts. They were cited for the unselfish and harmonious manner in which each carries out its assigned responsibilities. These roles are about as follows:

The State soil conservation committee provides leadership and counsel to soil conservation districts. The Agricultural Extension Service has the responsibility for educational activities. The Soil Conservation Service gives technical assistance to soil conservation district cooperators in developing and applying farm conservation plans. The Wisconsin Conservation Department provides technical help to farmers on forest management and improvement of wildlife habitat.

The Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, through the agricultural conservation program, provides cost-sharing aid to farmers in order to accelerate the installation of soil and water conservation measures. The SCS fulfills specified technical responsibilities under this program. The Farmers Home Administration is a source of credit for conservation practices.

Now, a bit on accomplishments for 1958. At the State level we feel that 1958 was the best year we have had to date in terms of overall production. See the table below. Accomplishments for 1957 were the best ever in soil conservation district history. But 1958 was even better. The third column, which shows the grand total to December 31 of last year, indicates the amount of work performed during the 21 years of SCD–SCS cooperative relationships. The last column indicates the percent that 1958 is of total production. These accomplishments were made by the key conservationists—our fine farm families—with technical assistance provided in planning for and applying needed soil and water conservation measures.

SCD accomplishments

Item	Unit	1957	1958	Total to Dec. 1958	1958 as percent of total
New cooperators	Number	2,004	1,990	39,695	5
Basic conservation plans	do	1,740	1,921	23,967	8
Soil surveys	Acres	557,882	549,841	12,457,381	4
Followup on farm plans	Number	6,739	6,870		
Contour strip cropping	Acres	52,128	58,082	956,964	6
Waterways	Miles	391	412	2,868	14
Terraces	do	283	244	3,919	6
Diversions	do	195	189	1,856	10
Land smoothing	Acres	2,005	2,266	7,054	32
Surface drains [1]	Miles	681	560	6,110	9
Closed drains [1]	do	356	370	4,289	9
Pasture renovation	Acres	29,980	31,782	240,531	13
Woodland protection	do	20,140	25,676	300,370	9
Woodland improvement	do	4,932	4,556	94,020	5
Tree planting	do	11,918	15,419	61,673	25
Field windbreaks	Miles	45	95	688	14
Wildlife area improvement	Acres	2,955	4,274	22,302	19
Drop inlets and spillways	Number	176	326	947	34
Farm ponds	do	163	350	854	41
SCS field personnel	Man-years.	175	189		

[1] No technical or cost sharing assistance is provided for in bringing new land into production.

NOTE.—In comparing 1958 accomplishments with those of 1957, note that the increases considerably offset limited decreases on some items. Of particular significance is heavy construction, including drop inlets and ponds. These practices require a considerably larger number of man days per unit of work than the others.

We were particularly pleased to note your comments concerning better program balance. Increases are being made in the engineering, forestry, and biology phases, so you state. We thoroughly agree with this analysis.

AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM

Much credit for the acceleration of the heavy construction program in Wisconsin must be given to cost-sharing assistance provided by the ACP. Many of these practices would have been financially prohibitive as far as individual farmers are concerned. Furthermore, gully control and water detention are practices that have high priority insofar as public benefits are concerned. The installation of other practices was also increased because of the cost sharing program.

County ASC committees made nearly $190,000 available to the Service under the 1958 ACP–SCS 5 percent agreements. This money was used in employing additional help to take care of the ACP cost sharing referrals. Nearly 20,000 referrals were handled by the SCS in 1958.

WATERSHEDS

About 70 informal type watershed associations in Wisconsin have been organized over a period of years for the purpose of developing community interest and stimulating more rapid adoption of planned soil and water conservation practices.

Public Law 566 added impetus to the organization of watersheds for the primary purpose of watershed protection and flood prevention.

As of April 15, 1959, five Public Law 566 watershed projects had been approved for operations. During the past year the first four major structures were installed under this program. These are of the water detention type. Another work plan should be completed by May 15. Two additional watersheds have been approved for planning assistance, and three applications for planning assistance will be acted upon by the State soil conservation committee within the next several weeks.

At least another dozen watershed organizations throughout the State have their applications in the formulative stage. Thus far all applications have come from an area within the two tiers of counties bordering the Mississippi River, from Ellsworth on the north to the Wisconsin River on the south.

CONSERVATION NEEDS

"The national inventory of soil and water conservation needs is the most comprehensive fact finding job of its kind ever undertaken," according to Administrator Williams. "When completed in 1960, we shall have the first reliable measure of the size of the conservation job remaining. This inventory should supply the basic information on which soil conservation districts, the Service, and the Department can more effectively carry out all soil and water conservation objectives."

Up to April 1, 1959, 35 counties have completed inventories, except for the water phase. SCD supervisors have participated in or will enter into deliberations leading to the development of these documents.

COOPERATION

Interagency cooperation has been mentioned previously. However, a number of other groups have contributed materially to advancing the SCD movement, according to your reports.

Quite a number of county boards have appropriated funds to soil conservation districts. The amounts range from $100 to several hundred dollars, averaging somewhat over $400.

Several county boards have purchased motor patrol graders to be rented to farmers for the installation of soil and water conservation measures. You commend county highway committees and commissioners for their fine cooperation in managing this equipment for maximum efficiency. Expert contractors have also been extremely co-

operative in the construction field, many of you say.

Among other groups who have done a nice job in promoting soil and water conservation have been county bankers' associations. At least three of these organizations are now sponsoring countywide recognition dinners for outstanding SCD cooperators. Attendance at these affairs runs from 150 to 200 people.

In many of your reports you indicate that your programs would not be nearly as successful if it weren't for the excellent cooperation you are receiving through many, many newspaper articles and radio and TV broadcasts. After all, soil and water conservation should be of interest to all people because it is everybody's business.

In regard to this subject, I recall a statement by Mr. Walter R. Humphrey, editor of the Fort Worth, Tex., Press., which is quite pertinent. "Soil conservation is people—people who love the land, people who will spend their fortunes and their lives to preserve the land, people who will fight to keep it green and fertile and useful and beautiful, just as a soldier will fight to keep it free."

EDUCATION

County superintendents of schools have done a marvelous job in Wisconsin in fostering and furthering the unmatched youth training in soil and water conservation education. We are fortunate in this State in having these capable educators as SCD supervisors.

The State soil conservation committee staff, under the direction of I. O. Hembre, has done a grand job in providing needed assistance in this activity. And other agencies have also contributed to this program, your reports indicate.

I was pleased to note that quite a number of governing bodies conducted tours for county boards and county ASC committees. No doubt these activities had some effect in getting county board assistance and ACP 5-percent assignments.

MEETINGS

In reading your reports, I would judge that at least half of the SCD governing bodies of the State hold regular monthly meetings. Others meet bimonthly, while a very few meet quarterly or semiannually. We in the SCS believe that in a going district there is ample business for supervisors to get together monthly.

I would judge that about a dozen SCD governing bodies are sponsoring cooperators' banquets. Most of these involve evening functions.

According to your reports you were extremely well pleased with the State meeting held at Stevens Point last year. Some of you went so far as to say that it was the best one that has been held to date.

The 2-day workshops for supervisors sponsored by the State soil conservation committee in eastern Wisconsin were very successful and extremely well accepted, so your reports indicated.

While mentioning the State committee, I should like to elaborate a bit on its membership and accomplishments. As advisory member, I feel at liberty to express my opinion on this subject since I am not directly involved. I periodically meet with other State conservationists from the Corn Belt and annually with all of them. From what I have gleaned at these conferences, I would say that the Wisconsin State Soil Conservation Committee is second to none in the country. This can be said of both the caliber of committee members as well as their activities in carrying out the SCD program in the State. I am merely passing a bouquet to a very deserving group of men whose contributions to district affairs may not be fully appreciated.

Most of the area associations hold semiannual meetings, usually in the early summer and late fall or early winter. The June or July meetings are generally devoted to a field trip of some kind, and include a short business session. The winter conferences include the annual business meeting and the election of officers. I was particularly pleased to note in several of your reports that these meetings have stimulated greater participation in district affairs at the local level.

Several district governing bodies attended the NASCD annual conference held in Minneapolis in 1958. Those who were present were impressed with the magnitude of the convention and the sincerity, knowledge, and enthusiasm of the participating supervisors.

SPECIAL STATE ASSOCIATION ACTIVITIES

As you know, the State association has organized five committees, assigning each the leadership for a specific statewide activity. These committees are made up of supervisors and agency personnel within an administrative area. They are chairmaned by the area association president who serves as a director of the State organization.

Chairman Lawrence Johnson, Algoma, and other members of his committee spearheading the State speaking contest, are to be commended for outstanding achievements in 1958. According to your reports and information we secured from our field officers, 29 districts conducted contests during the past calendar year. According to our figures there were 18 adult, 120 senior, and 192 junior participants. I am sure that all of you who attended the 1959 meeting of supervisors in Madison were inspired while listening to the first-place winners of each of the three contests. It was encouraging to learn that most entrants made a number of informal appearances before organized groups in behalf of soil and water conservation.

The dealer-district committee, headed by Lloyd Johnson, New Richmond, got off to a nice start last year. As we understand it, several district governing bodies have taken advantage of this fine method of molding friendship and securing the support of farm equipment dealers. This should not be a difficult activity to undertake because dealers are thoroughly familiar with the program and are just waiting for invitations from supervisors. They want to help. But, they have to be invited.

O. J. Sohrweide, Alma, is chairman of the Goodyear soil conservation awards' committee. We understand that about 20 district governing bodies entered the 1957–58 contest. However, only 10 submitted their final score cards to the judging committee. The Sauk County Soil Conservation District won first place and the Portage County District second in the past year's event. Any SCD governing body that enters this contest and keeps up to date on its scoring will develop an excellent understanding of the job of a supervisor. And, a supervisor and selected cooperator from the winning district of each State get a week's free trip to Arizona as guests of the Goodyear Co. Furthermore, the outstanding conservation farmer in each district entered in the contest gets an appropriate certificate.

The Soil Stewardship Week committee, headed up by William Nugent, Endeavor, provided leadership for this activity last year. Many of your reports point out that considerable work was done by you supervisors in promoting this activity. A number of governing bodies secured soil stewardship kits from our office and purchased soil stewardship materials from the NASCD. I was particularly pleased to note that many of you personally called upon members of the clergy to acquaint them with the scope and intent of this program.

Association President Oscar Laper, Rock Springs, was chairman of the farm progress days' committee. The 1958 event was held in the vicinity of Yellowstone Lake, Lafayette County SCD. This was by far the biggest and the best one of its kind held to date in the opinion of many people. It is estimated that more than 140,000 attended the 3-day event.

OUTLOOK

Looking back, 1958 was a year of great production in soil conservation district operations. And we must give major credit to the farm families who in the final analysis are the key to what is accomplished. They make the final decisions and install the planned practices.

Looking ahead, you say you have every reason to believe that 1959 will surpass 1958. In this we hopefully concur. Maximum conservation can be achieved only when everyone and every group plays its full part in getting this important job accomplished. The SCS will continue to emphasize the importance of all-out teamwork. And we will practice what we preach. We are confident that through a united effort increased accomplishments will be made in 1959.

THANK YOU

The many courtesies and fine cooperation you have extended to all of us in the Soil Conservation Service are deeply appreciated. We close this letter with a heartfelt "thank you."

Sincerely yours,

M. F. SCHWEERS,
State Conservationist.

Decisions by World Affairs Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 7, 1959

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on April 10 I obtained unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a tabulation of opinion ballots on the eight topics of "Decisions, 1959," prepared by the World Affairs Council of Boston. At the time, I did not realize that tabulation had been completed on only the first four topics in this important discussion series on American foreign policy, conducted by the Council. I have just received the opinion tabulations on the last four topics, and I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. Tabulations of the opinion ballots on the first four topics appear at page A2918 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 10 .

There being no objection, the tabulations were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WORLD AFFAIRS COUNCIL,
Boston, Mass.

DECISION 1959—RESULTS OF TABULATION OF OPINION BALLOTS

Decisions 1959, an 8 weeks' community discussion program on American foreign policy, has recently been concluded. Sponsored by the World Affairs Council, the decisions program provided an opportunity for Bostonians to express their opinions on foreign policy issues, and to have them forwarded to the State Department and the Massachusetts congressional delegation in Washington. The ballots from the concluding 4 weeks' topics revealed the following opinions:

Topic No. 5, "What U.S. Policies in the World Economic Revolution?"

Bostonians (77 percent) believe that a growing world economy is essential if long-term U.S. economic growth is to be assured. In this respect, it was felt that the U.S. economy can afford a larger-than-present Government investment in the economic growth of the rest of the world (65 percent).

Participants in the decisions program placed the greatest emphasis on the following proposals:

1. Expand U.S. technical assistance programs (skills and know-how) (81 percent).
2. Encourage and provide incentives for more U.S. private investment overseas (60 percent).
3. Reduce foreign grants but expand long-term, low interest loans (57 percent).
4. Channel more U.S. aid through the U.N. (57 percent).
5. Take the lead among industrialized democracies in a massive development program—economic and social—in the non-Communist underdeveloped world (47 percent).
6. Take the lead in a worldwide reduction of tariffs (47 percent).

Topic No. 6, "The New Technology: For destruction or Plenty?"

Despite rapid developments in military technology, decisions participants (53 percent) refuse to give up their rights as citizens and leave all decisions in this area to Government experts. In this respect, the nearly unanimous opinion of 98 percent agrees that there is a clear need for more information to be made available to and for more understanding by the general public of the problems and opportunities of the technological revolution. Bostonians do not want the United States to maintain unnecessary barriers against the exchange of technological information with the rest of the world (91 percent).

In addition to favoring the handling of technological problems through the U.N. International Atomic Energy Agency (90 percent), it was felt that greater efforts should be made in solution of technological problems by private industry (68 percent) and 63 percent think that the United States must continue some nuclear weapons research until an effective control system is installed. Concerning the American educational system: 70 percent think there should be increased Federal aid to public schools and universities, 34 percent think there should be public aid to private schools and universities, and 77 percent before that a greater State and community effort is necessary.

Topic No. 7, "What Kind of World Is Possible?"

Political stability in the underdeveloped world is considered to be of vital interest to the United States (61 percent), however, only 13 percent think that this stability can be achieved by the establishment of U.S.-style democratic institutions in these countries. Bostonians also feel there should be a greater U.S. understanding of foreign peoples and institutions (89 percent). Although 68 percent think that the United States should have sufficient military power to discourage aggression, 31 percent believe there should be world disarmament.

With respect to specific U.S. policies that will best service its vital interests, 84 percent favor the suggestion that we provide the kind of assistance (where it is wanted) that will help colonial peoples build stable institutions. Other policies supported by the majority are: greater efforts for strengthening the U.N. (87 percent), expand U.S. assistance to economic growth of underdeveloped world (72 percent), base colonial policy on careful appraisal of each situation (68 percent), and promote a worldwide reduction of tariffs (60 percent).

Topic No. 8, "Challenges to Diplomat and Citizen."

The following proposals are the ones Bostonians are most willing to support and, if necessary, help pay for: That the United States should place a greater emphasis on nonmilitary tools of foreign policy—economic development, cultural exchange, political cooperation, etc. (89 percent) and that the United States should make greater use of the U.N., wherever possible (95 percent). In respect to the foreign service of the United States, 75 percent feel that diplomatic pay and prerequisites should be increased to permit career, professional diplomats to serve in more posts (75 percent).

In the opinion of the decisions participants, the role of the citizen in U.S. foreign policy should be:

1. To take pains to keep himself informed on foreign policy and related problems and to take an active part in world affairs as individuals and through churches, schools, societies, and private organizations (92 percent).
2. To understand what policies are necessary and be willing to pay the price (82 percent).
3. To debate foreign policy freely at any time (76 percent).
4. To recognize that decisions sometimes have to be made, at the top, on the basis of information that cannot be made available to the general public (73 percent).

Relationship of the United States With Other Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDMUND S. MUSKIE

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 7, 1959

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, it is a source of encouragement to me, as we struggle with the problems involved in our relationships with the rest of the would, that thoughtful citizens are concerning themselves and expressing themselves on these same problems. They are disturbed that many people abroad misinterpret the motives behind our economic assistance programs. They are shocked that in many countries whose goodwill we seek and whose advancement we support there should be evidence of dislike and even hatred for America. It is regrettable that the impulse of many Americans, when confronted with such evidence, is to reject and oppose any further effort on the part of the United States to develop an economic climate throughout the world which is favorable to the growth of freedom. It is encouraging that other citizens, and I think a majority, choose instead to seek and suggest a means of improving our efforts.

Such a citizen is Reginald H. Sturtevant, president of the Livermore Falls Trust Co., in Maine. Mr. Sturtevant is a trustee of his alma mater, Colby College, and also a member of the Maine Governor's Advisory Committee on Education. A member of Phi Beta Kappa, he has also received the diplome of the Sorbonne. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a thoughtful plea for international understanding, entitled, "Get Understanding," recently written by Mr. Sturtevant.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GET UNDERSTANDING

(By Reginald H. Sturtevant)

Against an idea, it is said, there is no defense—except a better idea. Consciously or subconsciously, it is probably upon that assumption that rests much of our dangerous complacency in the current cold war. Convinced that, in the aggregate of ideas and ideals loosely grouped in "the American way of life," we have the best idea, we feel that it must, therefore, in the long run prevail.

Yet, an idea however good, if not presented or if incorrectly presented, can be as impotent as a missile with a faulty launching. If you have traveled recently abroad, and have talked much with common people there, it can hardly have escaped your notice that something is wrong with the presentation of the American idea, currently being conveyed principally through two channels—the American tourist and the American movie, with exceedingly unhappy results.

After driving into Paris, over the road reverently marked to commemorate the progress of the liberation army, I found it disconcerting to ride down the Seine and read, painted in black letters 5 feet high on the stone embankment, "Yankee Go Home." Priding ourselves on our benevolence in extending economic aid to our friends and allies, even to our former enemies, we find it an unpleasant surprise that it is quite generally regarded abroad as merely a form of bribery by which we hope to buy security for ourselves.

We consider ourselves a Christian nation, and it comes as a shock to find that in so many quarters this is considered a hypocritical pose adopted for preaching to others, while we, ourselves, wallow in lust, luxury, and delinquency—juvenile and adult.

Our material possessions and accomplishments, it is true, are widely envied and imitated; but how fragile a tie that is, has been demonstrated many times recently in countries, recipients of substantial economic aid, where young men in American-style dungarees have turned from operating American gas pumps and dispensing Coca-Cola to stoning our Embassies and reviling "U.S. imperialists and money-grabbers." As a rallying point for humanity, the golden eagle ranks with the golden calf. Morally and spiritually the American idea, as they understand it abroad, apparently has few real admirers. Yet, we are convinced that it is the best idea, if rightly understood.

Less than 2 years ago, a young man came from central Europe to the United States for study. He came with such preconceived anti-American ideas, such scorn for the crudeness and materialism of everything American, that one wondered why he was here. After living and studying among us less than 2 years, he has changed his attitude completely and has decided that an American is what he himself wishes to be.

His case is so typical of many foreign students that it suggests that our colleges and universities have at hand the best possible medium for presenting the American idea through a vastly expanded foreign exchange student program. It is, perhaps, too much to hope that every U.S. college student spend one of his college years in study in a foreign country; but certainly the exchanges now counted in the dozens, and centered mostly in a few cities, could be in the thousands and spread countrywide.

On a strictly exchange basis, the principal financial problem would be transportation costs. Here, perhaps, is one of the most justifiable areas for Federal aid to education. An international understanding is the most effective deterrent to war. It is a weapon

which never becomes obsolete, as do so many of those on which we now spend billions.

Increasingly we are forced to communicate with other peoples; but, as Dr. Milton Eisenhower points out, Americans are the world's worst linguists. We constitute only six percent of the world's population, yet our attitude seems to be that the language barrier should be overcome by having the other 94 percent learn English. The implication, by so many of our people that anyone too ignorant to speak English is not worth talking with, hardly is calculated to win friends.

Deeply disturbed because we are sending abroad numbers of technicians, experts, and even diplomats who cannot speak the language of the country to which they go, the U.S. Senate currently has a subcommittee studying that problem. Senator MUSKIE, of Maine, a member of that committee, believes that in the long run our language deficiency could prove to be as dangerous as a deficiency in weapons.

Certainly, if an American student expected to spend a year of study in Europe, South America, or Asia, he would take a most active and practical interest in the study of the language of the country to which he would go.

A third possible benefit can be seen in such a massive exchange of students. We are sure that foreign peoples do not see us clearly; but are we sure that we see ourselves clearly? Among our best philosophical and religious thinkers warning voices are already raised that we may be losing unwittingly the very basis of our "idea"—that bondage comes in many forms, some insidious. To understand foreign peoples and have them understand us is highly desirable; to understand ourselves is vital. To that end, one of the most desirable and salutary things is to see ourselves as others, in the keen, inquiring minds of young foreign students, see us. Our bread cast over the waters in this manner may well come back to us as the truth which again shall make us free.

Repeal of Excise Tax on Telephone Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. EVERETT JORDAN
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 7, 1959

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution adopted March 5, 1959, by the North Carolina Independent Telephone Association regarding the proposed repeal of the Federal excise tax on telephone service.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE NORTH CAROLINA INDEPENDENT TELEPHONE ASSOCIATION URGING THE REPEAL OF THE FEDERAL EXCISE TAX ON TELEPHONE SERVICE (ADOPTED MARCH 5, 1959)

Whereas the Federal excise tax on telephone and other services was levied for the first time during World War I as an emergency measure and was repealed a few years after the war ended; and

Whereas the Federal excise tax was revived as an emergency measure during the depression of 1932; and

Whereas during World War II Federal excise taxes were placed on public utility and transportation services for the dual purpose of providing additional revenue and discouraging unnecessary use of such services; and

Whereas Congress has acted to remove a substantial portion of this discriminatory tax burden on public utility and transportation services by elimination of excise taxes on the use of electrical energy and the shipment of goods and property; and

Whereas the tax on telephone service was reduced by congressional action to the present rate of 10 percent; and

Whereas, today, nearly 14 years after the end of World War II, the excise tax on communication services, introduced as a temporary tax, is still in effect; and

Whereas telephone service is the only one of the four essential household utilities subject to Federal excise tax; and

Whereas the national situation that prevails today is not the same as it was when the tax was imposed; and

Whereas there is no need to discourage the use of telephone service in order to make circuits available for essential defense calls; and

Whereas the telephone today is no longer a luxury but is a necessity in the home as well as in business: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the North Carolina Independent Telephone Association is of the opinion that the discriminatory excise tax on communication services is not in the public interest, that this tax should not continue to be levied by the Federal Government; and

Resolved further, That any similar tax on communications should not be levied by the individual States against the users of this essential service as a means of financing specific programs which bear no relation to the service taxed; and

Resolved further, That Congress is hereby petitioned to terminate the discriminatory excise tax on communication services at the earliest possible date.

W. S. BEDDINGFIELD,
President.
HYLTON WRIGHT,
Secretary.

Salute to Clare Boothe Luce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT R. BARRY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 7, 1959

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, Mr. J. Spencer Gray, editor and publisher of the Herald of Westchester, whom I regard with respect and admiration, has published an editorial in the April 30 edition of his paper, prior to Mrs. Clare Boothe Luce's withdrawal of her name as Ambassador to Brazil.

Because I feel that Mr. Gray's editorial says what the preponderance of the American people feel, I want to put it on record as a salute to Mrs. Luce and also as an expression of my deep regret for the loss—to Brazil and to us—of her brilliant services and her penchant for making friends for the United States all over the world.

Mr. Gray's editorial is headed "An Open Letter to Mrs. Clare Boothe Luce" and reads as follows:

AN OPEN LETTER TO MRS CLARE BOOTHE LUCE
(By J. Spencer Gray, editor and publisher, the Herald of Westchester)

DEAR CLARE: A great patriot like yourself once coined a wonderfully descriptive phrase—"These are the times that try men's souls." Those were to the words of Tom Paine, in whose honor and memory today still stands a homestead at 983 North Avenue in New Rochelle, N.Y.

These past few weeks must have been as trying an experience as you have ever had. Against the glaring and searing spotlight of worldwide publicity, you responded with characteristic zeal when the Chief Executive of our Nation called upon you for help.

Day after long day, you graciously and silently stood by and suffered the piercing shafts hurled at you.

When you responded with one brief paragraph, the rapacious wolves cried out all the more loudly. They bared their fangs and shrieked that your usefulness had come to an end.

Some of our best friends—including your esteemed husband—counseled you to step down. With all due respect to that great colleague and fellow editor, we urge you not to yield one iota before the slings and the slanders. Stay in their fighting, Clare, and all of the Americas—North, Central and South—will be behind you.

"These are the times that try men's souls," said Tom Paine, "but he who stands it now deserves the love and thanks of all his countrymen." And it will be not just the love and thanks of your countrymen, Clare, but our many good and dear friends in Brazil and our many good and dear friends throughout Latin America.

During the past few days I've had ample opportunity to sample the thinking of many of your Westchester neighbors, just across the Connecticut line from your Ridgefield home. Permit me to assure you that your neighbors in Westchester are with you, and so too, your neighbors in Connecticut.

I'm sure their thinking mirrors perfectly the sentiments of people throughout all of the Americas. You don't have to be told, Clare, that the U.S.A. is confronted today with the most perilous international crisis in its history—never before has the need for stronger ties with our present friends, and the need for making new friends, been more urgent.

Unfortunately, people with the skill and talent for diplomacy—masters in the art of making friends for Uncle Sam—are very rare indeed. You, Clare, are one of a very few truly skillful emissaries. You have proved yourself with rare distinction. Your exemplary service in Italy was a new kind of ambassadorship—a kind that carried with it great warmth, deep understanding and sincere friendship. The genuine affection demonstrated to you by the good people of Italy was dramatic proof of this.

You can do the same kind of job in Brazil, Clare, and we desperately need you to do it. My correspondents in Latin America—and they are knowledgeable—tell me they can't recall any ambassadorial nomination in modern history that has evoked such a genuinely warm response.

If you were to withdraw now, it would lead to deep disappointment and indignation in the people who have been waiting expectantly for you to embark on the new phase of your brilliant career.

Your resignation now, after winning overwhelming confidence by the Senate, would be a severe blow to our foreign relations and a setback to our Foreign Service. And there's still another reason that your withdrawal would be damaging and depressing to all of us:

Throughout the Nation, at all levels of government, there's a crying need for capable, conscientious people to serve on boards

and commissions and in countless other positions that all add up to making democracy work.

Most of these good people are the inevitable targets of the same kind of ordeal to which you have been subjected. They too, are frequently selected as the whipping boys and girls. But, they continue patiently and ceaselessly to serve their communities, because the voice of conscience tells them they've got to serve.

For you to remain at your post, despite the shouting and the pressure and the vitriol, will be a burning example to all these thousands of good people—an example of courage and dedication which will lend new strength to all of them. They're looking for you for inspiration.

Don't let them down, Clare.

Don't let down so many of the good people of the Americas.

They need you.

Good luck in your new assignment—away from home. * * * And

vaya Vd con Dios.

Better Balance Between Industry and Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. EVERETT JORDAN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 7, 1959

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. President, for many years North Carolina has been considered in many ways the leading State of the South. On repeated occasions North Carolina has pointed the way toward an economic revolution in the South to bring about a better balance between industry and agriculture, and thereby create a new era of development and progress.

In the May 4, 1959, issue of Time magazine the leadership North Carolina is offering in this and other areas was the subject of a penetrating and revealing article, and I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NORTH CAROLINA: THE SOUTH'S NEW LEADER

North Carolina, observed historian Arnold Toynbee in 1939, enjoys a springlike burgeoning of life because, unlike other Deep South States, it is not "a country living under a spell." The most important new fact about the U.S. South in the spring of 1959: burgeoning North Carolina, too busy in pursuit of 20th century economic development to be inhibited by diehard last stands against school integration, has quietly taken over the mantle of Southern leadership that Virginia wore so long, so proudly.

Springlike Tarheel vigor was at work last week from Kitty Hawk to Cherokee, from missile plant to church pulpit, reshaping a landscape once principally adorned by loblolly pine, flue-cured tobacco and two-room farm shacks. Near Laurinburg, Presbyterians broke ground for a new college, a few weeks behind the Methodist groundbreaking for a college at Rocky Mount and 3 years behind the brandnew $19 million campus of Baptist-affiliated Wake Forest College in Winston-Salem. All were additions to Dixie's best college complex, fed by Dixie's best public school system. In the center of the Piedmont, engineers mapped sites for nuclear, chemical, and industrial research labs in a new, 4,000-acre Research Triangle. East of Charlotte's booming suburbs, Alcoa let $40 million worth of contracts to expand its aluminum plant. Over the South's best highway net, semitrailers snorted day and night to serve a State economy so vigorous that it kept right on growing through the late recession.

UP FROM SEGREGATION

In the solid granite capitol in Raleigh, white-haired Gov. Luther Hartwell Hodges, 61, businessman turned politician, totted up some headline statistics that proved the vigor behind his fondest dream: from January to March, industry built some $25 million worth of new plants in North Carolina to add 5,600 new jobs (up 40 percent over 1958), paying $16 million a year (up 46 percent) to the state's payrolls. Showing its heels to its industry-hungry neighbors, North Carolina would almost certainly better its 1958 total of $253 million in new-plant investment, tops for the South.[1]

Behind the thriving economy lay an even greater achievement: a state of mind and spirit that recognized long ago that good schools, expanding culture and economic development were too vital to be stopped short by a fight over integration. Like all Southern States, North Carolina met its toughest test after the Supreme Court's 1954 decision. But guided by able leadership, it did not panic. Instead it plotted minimum but legal compliance, went on to more important business—and in so doing soon put the crisis in reasonable perspective. Part of the credit was due to Governor Hodges and his sharp eye for business; part of it was due to the special heritage of the State that produced both Hodges and the kind of climate that he could operate in.

STATEWIDE CAMPUS

Next to the last colony into the Union, North Carolina lacked good seaports for the cotton-slave boom that swept Virginia and South Carolina. "A vale of humility," the State was called, "between two mountains of conceit." In the Civil War it lost more soldiers than any other Confederate State; later it suffered its share of corrupt reconstruction government until 1901. Heading the new leaders that year: "Education Governor" Charles B. Aycock, whose fiery crusade for schools got a new one built every day for 10 years, gave education a permanent claim on a lion's share of State spending (76 percent of the 1959 budget).

Spreading to adults, Aycock's education drive produced the South's first great college extension service at the University of North Carolina in Chapel Hill. Its regular faculty members roamed far and wide, by World War I came near their dream of using the whole State for a campus. Sample of their work: roadplanning "institutes" at Chapel Hill (1914–19) kicked off the South's first big, well-planned highway system; statewide high school debates focused on the need for good school libraries, got them going; extension service teachers organized part-time refresher courses for country doctors, inspired three medical schools (North Carolina University, Duke and Wake Forest); a community drama bureau set up three permanent historical dramas, e.g. "The Lost Colony," on Roanoke Island, which yearly lure thousands of tourists for a night's pageantry. The community music bureau whipped up such interest that the North Carolina Symphony annually barnstorms the whole State; the Institute of Government became the adviser to every level of government.

Less obvious but more pervasive was the university's effect upon the State's business community, dominated by Chapel Hill alumni. Under the watchful eye of a benign oligarchy (R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co., Wachovia Bank & Trust Co., Duke Power Co., and the textile aristocracy), North Carolina has been developed with uncommon imagination. Business leaders have endowed well-paid professorial chairs, set up string-free foundations, protected professors back at the alma mater from the political censorship common to State-supported southern schools.

BUSINESS GOVERNOR

Chapel Hill beckoned early to Luther Hodges, born March 9, 1898, eighth among nine children of a poor tenant farmer who gave up and moved into the textile-mill town of Spray (1950 population: 5,500). Though Luther quit seventh grade to work in the mill (50 cents a day), he later saved $62.50, at 17 went off to work his way through Chapel Hill (class of 1919). After college, he resolved to go back home and make his mark in the mills, in 17 years worked his way up to production manager of Marshall Field & Co.'s textile empire.

The university had infected Hodges with an urge for public service. He took war leave to head the Office of Price Adiminstration's Textile Division, spent two postwar hitches (1948, 1950–51) supervising U.S. aid in Germany. In 1952, urged by a business friend, he surprised Tarheel politicians by jumping in, almost unknown, to win the Lieutenant Governor's race. He held office only 2 years before the Supreme Court handed down its desegregation decision, and soon after, incumbent Gov. William B. Umstead died of a heart attack. Suddenly the tenant farmer's son stood amidst the biggest crisis since Appomattox.

NO MASSIVE RESISTANCE

Working with legislative advisory commissions, new Governor Hodges sent to Chapel Hill for a bright young lawyer to spend full time on the complex school crisis. Result: clear understanding that the Court had not ordered immediate mass integration, as many a southerner feared, or left the States free to interpose their authority between the courts and specific schools, as Virginia's massive resisters began to preach. Hodges, himself a segregationist, pleaded with Negro leaders to maintain voluntary separatism of the races. But, never putting segregation before education, he pushed through laws (1955–56) which allowed local boards to accept Negro applicants, but gave local voters the ultimate escape-valve choice of locking their schools rather than accept court-ordered integration—a choice he was pretty sure they would not take.

Under these laws, without court pressure, three cities (Winston-Salem, Charlotte, Greensboro) integrated the Deep South's first 11 Negro pupils in the fall of 1957.

The integration crisis faced (though far from finished), Hodges could focus State effort on the grim economic problem brought on by the sharp cut in farm employment. Watching over the Nation's biggest farm population, Hodges knew that industrialization was an urgent necessity. But before he joined the platoon of southern Governors wooing Yankee companies, Businessman Hodges spent 3 years getting his State in shape.

BUSINESS OF GOVERNMENT

A new source of risk capital, Hodges knew, was needed to help Tarheels start new small enterprises of their own. He launched a privately financed Business Development Corporation, personally headed a campaign that sold $1 million worth of $10 shares (he bought $5,000 worth) for a kitty to back small business. Though Business Develop-

[1] Comparable 1938 figures from other States: Louisiana $197,242,387, Georgia $156,484,500, Virginia $152 million, South Carolina $122,625,000, Tennessee, 100 million, Florida $100 million (estimated), Alabama $49,101,500, Mississippi $38,688,000, Arkansas $25,400,000 (cut after Little Rock from $131,100,000 in 1956, $44,900,000 in 1957).

ment Corporation's fund represented only a small stick of capital, Hodges gave it leverage by signing up banks and loan associations to participate in Business Development Corporation risks. Run by a board of prominent citizens, Business Development Corporation took part in small loans totaling $5 million, created 8,000 new jobs, helped build a climate of confident risk-taking.

To get rid of a barrier to out-of-State corporations, Hodges took a long political risk in backing a bill to kill discriminatory corporate tax, lured in enough new plants to cut an anticipated $7 million loss to $2 million (Time, Oct. 20). Planning for industry's long-run research needs, he talked the business oligarchy into financing the nonprofit Research Triangle equidistant from the 900 scientists at Chapel Hill, Duke University and North Carolina State College. Hodges persuaded local capitalists to kick in $1,590,000 to buy the land, build and run the first labs for three years. While engineers last week rushed along the plans, three private companies had research staffs in Raleigh and Durham, waiting for Triangle space.

Equally vigorous at the regular business of the State, Hodges, tightened up cumbersome administrative machinery, started economy measures which in the current biennium, he estimates, will save about $13.5 million. One result: he sent this year's legislature a balanced budget, no proposals for new taxes. Although barred by law from succeeding himself, since he won his own term in 1956, Hodges refused to act like a lame duck. Out of 10 study commissions, he sent the legislature proposals for such basic reforms as abolition of the justices of the peace, a rewrite of the State's 1868 constitution, a zoning and planning law to cope with the onrush of urbanization.

DEVELOP THE BEST

Hodges' continued popularity stands as a remarkable phenomenon for a man who has made many hard decisions, a few of them bad, and stepped on many a political toe.[2] New enemies, finding hot-eyed support among the diehard segregationist minority, have begun to organize in the legislature against his programs.

But Luther Hodges, who will step down at the end of next year, can survey both his enemies and his State with considerable equanimity. When the future historians and educators put their heads together to find the South's most striking example of leadership during the segregation crisis, they will look long and hard before they surpass the business Governor. Hodges had the good sense to develop the best instead of the worst instincts of his State by turning its eyes toward the future rather than living under a spell of the past.

[2] One recent setback to the good-business climate: Henderson's Harriet-Henderson Cotton Mills tangled with the Textile Workers Union of America in a strife-ridden, five-month strike that Hodges tried to mediate, only to see the agreement blown apart last week by company intransigence and a new outburst of union-led riots.

Judicial Appointments in the Absence of the Senate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 7, 1959

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the discerning mind of Arthur Krock was on display in the New York Times this morning dissecting the issue of recess Supreme Court appointments discussed so competently Tuesday by the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART].

Mr. Krock's comments are not only wise as always. They emphasize the constructive solutions to this difficult problem offered by Mr. BRICKFIELD and Mr. LOEB of the Library of Congress.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this column be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD following these remarks.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUDICIAL APPOINTMENTS IN THE ABSENCE OF THE SENATE

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, May 6.—In the Senate debate that preceded the vote which confirmed the President's recess appointment last fall of Potter Stewart to the Supreme Court, in whose decisions, however, he has been participating as an unconfirmed judge, this administration's practice of creating such a dubious situation was critically reviewed. The prevailing judgment was expressed as follows by Senator HART of Michigan:

"Interim appointments to the Court are most unfortunate and should be avoided except in the most extreme cases. Certainly the participation of such an appointee in Court work prior to Senate confirmation is unwise."

The unwisdom, of course, is implicit in the fact that the Senate may terminate a recess appointment by rejection, or simply by not acting on it before adjournment. As the event demonstrated, there was never any probability the Senate would reject Justice Stewart or the other two Members of the Court to whom the President gave recess appointments: Chief Justice Warren and Justice Brennan. But there is always a possibility of rejection by either the positive or negative method. And if an unconfirmed judge has been participating in the work of the Court, the mental shadow of this possibility could impair the sense of total emancipation from worry over the effects of his decisions in the political community that life tenure for judges was intended to bestow.

And if ultimately he was rejected, his part in controversial decisions, particularly when he had been one of the five that made the opinions binding, would revive the public and legal controversy such rulings evoke.

A 5-TO-4 RULING

This week there was such a decision by a majority that included Justice Stewart and would have been a minority without him. It was the 5-to-4 holding, by Justice Frankfurt for the Court, that health inspectors may enter a private home without a warrant to search for sanitation conditions (suspected in this instance of violating a Baltimore city ordinance). The central issue was the fourth amendment, which forbids "unreasonable searches and seizures" by Federal officials and has been established by the Court as applicable to State and local officials as well.

The deep nature of the controversy among the Justices was revealed in this comment by Justice Douglas, writing for himself and three others: "The decision * * * greatly dilutes the right of privacy which every homeowner had the right to believe was part of our American heritage." And this protest was strengthened by the facts that a search warrant was readily available to the health officer, and that the householder lives in a community where, like others in the United States, there are police records that would justify the fear of admitting strangers into private houses, even in daylight, the time this inspector demanded admittance.

PROPOSED SOLUTION

Justice Stewart's confirmation removed from this particular decision the liability of its having been made possible by a Member of the Court whose brief tenure, and by recess appointment, the Senate had constitutionally terminated. But this liability is always present in decisions by unconfirmed judges. And that properly was concerning Senator Hart and others in a debate on a level worthy of the issue.

Hart realized, he said, that abstention by an unconfirmed Supreme Court appointee "may cause difficulties when the Court is evenly divided on many crucial cases," on undermanned for a crushing workload. He conceded this as a comprehensible reason for the President's recess appointments in the three instances. But he argued for a sounder practice in which this consideration would be obviated. So far as the Supreme Court is concerned several excellent suggestions to this purpose have been made to Chairman Celler of the House Judiciary Committee by Cyril F. Brickfield of his staff and Louis Loeb of the Library of Congress.

Among these suggestions are: special Senate sessions; Senate rules revisions to provide for committee action during recess, committee disapproval being tantamount to rejection; and a subsequent time limit for Senate action if the committee has approved the recess appointment. Meanwhile, the recess appointee would be barred from participation in the work of the Court.

Pageant Magazine Describes Career of Senator Gale McGee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 7, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, a very vivid and informative article about the duties and activities of a freshman Member of the U.S. Senate was published in the May 1959 issue of Pageant magazine. The subject of this profile, written by Mr. Al Toffler, is our popular and able new colleague from Wyoming, Senator GALE MCGEE. This article demonstrates not only the routine of a new Member of the Senate, but many of the difficulties involved in adjusting to the turmoil and hurly-burly of life here in Washington.

I ask unanimous consent that the Pageant article about the eminent junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], entitled "A Freshman's Washington Merry-Go-Round," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A FRESHMAN'S WASHINGTON MERRY-GO-ROUND

When the American voter cast his ballot last fall, he wrought a major change in the political fashion of the waning 1950's. The Democrats elected a bumper crop of 15 new U.S. Senators. But the national excitement was not confined to party labels. It concerned, even more, the formation of a "fresh" new Senate, young men whose promise lay ahead of them.

Among the Democratic "class of 1958," the average age is under 50—a striking 10 years younger than the average age in the Senate. Politically, many of these men are identified with Democratic liberalism. Moreover,

several are firmly fixed in the public eye as "eggheads"—educators, journalists and lawyers with a concern for "ideas."

What impact men like these will have on the upper Chamber of Congress still remains to be seen. In the meantime, each, like his Republican counterpart, is currently rounding out a period of dramatic individual adjustment to the fact of membership in the U.S. Senate. What follows is not so much the story of a freshman Democrat as it is the story of a new young Senator—GALE MCGEE, of Wyoming—and how he took his place in our highest legislative body.

At 5 a.m. last November 5, 43-year-old Prof. GALE MCGEE tossed sleeplessly in a Laramie, Wyo., hotel room. Hours before, he had fled his nearly home to escape the insane ringing of his telephone. After more than 20 years of teaching history, MCGEE was actually making it.

Shortly after 5, the hotel phone jangled MCGEE out of bed. From the office of the Wyoming Daily Eagle in Cheyenne, 50 miles away, he heard the tired voice of Joe Davis, his campaign manager: "You're in, GALE. Go to sleep."

At that moment Democrat MCGEE held a slim 14-vote lead over Republican Frank A. Barrett, incumbent U.S. Senator from Wyoming. As morning broke, the lead widened and MCGEE's victory was confirmed. Educator MCGEE became Freshman Senator MCGEE. He has been getting a hectic new education ever since.

For a new Senator, the weeks between election day and the opening of Congress are excitingly crammed with new faces, new demands, new challenges.

For MCGEE, in many ways typical of the other freshmen who trooped to Washington after last year's election, his introduction to office was a deluge of telegrams, phone calls and letters which poured into his Wyoming office.

"Within 24 hours," he recalls, "we received hundreds. The letters kept coming. It was the beginning of an avalanche."

The mail was a colorful mixture—from solid citizens and from crackpots, from people who had sound ideas as to legislation, and from individuals with personal problems they hoped the new Senator would solve for them. From lobbyists and from persons with pet ideas, hobby horses which they hoped to induce MCGEE to ride.

But the initial elation and shock of election to the Senate is quickly followed by pressing human problems. As with others newly elected to Congress all over the Nation, MCGEE had now to uproot his family from their home; find a new home in Washington; and settle into it before Congress opened in January. With MCGEE there was also the problem of shifting three of his children to new schools. (His fourth child is less than a year old.) In addition, the whole family budget had to be reorganized.

MCGEE, a trim 5 feet 11 inches, with a shock of brown hair, alert brown eyes, and a deep pool of nervous energy, had been a "full" professor of history at the University of Wyoming until last summer. "As 'full' as $7,300 a year makes you," he quips. Actually, he used to boost his salary to between $8,000 and $9,000 by teaching during the summers. But, because he took leave of absence to campaign, by the time election day rolled around it had been 5 months since the MCGEES had seen a paycheck.

Thus they were wholly unprepared for their first house-hunting experience in Washington about 2 weeks after election. They met a real estate agent at 10 a.m. For nearly 2 hours, she took them from one mansion to another. They ranged from $50,000 to $90,000 in price. Each one, she explained, had been vacated by a Republican.

"So I told the real estate agent," MCGEE recalls, "that (1) we are Democrats and (2) I had been a professor."

With the state of the MCGEE exchequer thus made plain, the rest was simple. The very next house turned out to be suitable. A seven-room Dutch colonial brick house with white trim and a big backyard for the four kids. It cost $27,250.

"I had to borrow the downpayment," MCGEE confesses. "It's probably the first time that a Senator came here so broke."

The MCGEES plunged further into "deficit spending" when they shelled out $1,176 to ship their furniture, $625 to transport the family.

The day after finding a house, MCGEE went to his office in room 262, Old Senate Building. He faced, again, a desk piled high with mail.

Once again the letters expressed both the interests and the idiosyncrasies of Americans. Some were addressed to "Nigger-lover, Commie-crat, Socialist-elect, pawn of the oil millionaires."

Many were "constituent requests." One mother wanted MCGEE to "remove" a master sergeant who was bothering her serviceman son. Another writer wanted MCGEE to get his uncle out of a mental institution. All were insistent.

He would return again to his mail—and again, and again. But today was to be a day of getting acquainted. Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, his Wyoming colleague, arrived to take him on a tour of the Senate buildings. Their first stop was the office of Felton "Skeeter" Johnston. As Secretary of the Senate, "Skeeter" is the man who makes the Senate gears mesh. It was "Skeeter" who reluctantly gave MCGEE the bad news that he couldn't get an advance on his senatorial salary. His first paycheck would be handed to him on the last Friday in January.

Sence then, MCGEE has received a gross pay of $1,875 a month ($22,500 a year), minus a big tax bite, a 7½ percent deduction for civil service retirement, and a chunk for the group insurance available to Senators. MCGEE estimates he takes home around $15,000 a year. His monthly check is automatically deposited for him, at his request, in a Washington bank.

"Skeeter" explained to MCGEE the privileges that go with Senate membership. For example, a Senator pays no postage. His envelopes bear, in place of a stamp, a facsimile of his signature—known as a frank. He gets a special allowance for airmail and special-delivery postage; another for long-distance telephoning; and still another for rental of an office in his home State. He also gets 20 cents a mile for use of his car and partial expenses for two Wyoming trips each year.

The biggest allowance is a lump sum doled out to each Senator for staff. Exactly how much each Senator gets is a secret, but the amount is based on the size of the State the Senator serves. Within this limit, MCGEE may do as he wishes. He can pay low salaries and have a large staff or pay high salaries and have a small staff. A wealthy Senator may supplement his staff at his own expense. In other words, how a Senator allots his payroll is his own business.

There are other privileges of office. For instance, MCGEE gets free haircuts in the Senate barbershop. Three doctors are on duty 24 hours a day to look after the health of the Senators while they are on Capitol Hill. (MCGEE appreciates this service. He is diabetic.)

The title "Senator" is, in MCGEE's words, "a magic charm." At the stores where he and Loraine shop the information that he is a Senator cuts short the usual credit inquisition. The power of this magic was brought home to MCGEE on New Year's Eve, when the oil heater in his new house ran dry. "It was 10:30 at night. The house began to get cold. But by midnight we had oil. On New Year's Eve," he says, "that's magic."

Along with the privileges, however, go the responsibilities of a nerve-racking and physically tiring job. On the very day he was sworn into office MCGEE was needled in a nationally syndicated column. He saw himself called "a friend-forgetter and a chin puller-in." The columnist felt that MCGEE was already "in the pocket" of LYNDON JOHNSON, Senate majority leader—even prior to the first session.

Part of a Senator's job is being polite to newsmen, no matter what time of day or night they show up and no matter what they may have written the day before. At the beginning of a new Congress, reporters stalk the freshmen. Unless the new legislators are carefully available, however, they may find themselves having to stalk the newspapermen. So they make themselves ever-accessible. Even a 2-minute ride on the Senate subway is often combined with an on-the-run interview.

Similarly, there are social pressures. Some Senators thrive on the rubber chicken circuit. But even if, secretly, they detest the dinner-and-cocktail rounds, freshmen know, or are soon taught, that to refuse is often to offend. And men who depend on votes will do much to avoid giving offense. From the moment of election, MCGEE, a handsome energetic man with an expressive face and an easily provoked smile, has been besieged with invitations.

Where the freshman goes, his wife goes. From the day MCGEE began his campaign, Loraine has been part of his political life. In Washington this has called for an overhaul of her wardrobe. MCGEE reluctantly spent several Saturdays in Connecticut Avenue dress shops. For budget reasons, they stuck to necessities.

Another chore was shopping for a staff. A Senator needs loyalty in his aids as much as competence. MCGEE insisted that each of his staff be a resident of Wyoming, cleared for party loyalty by the Democratic Party in the State. Once the staff was assembled, MCGEE began setting up shop. His office was bare when he called his first staff meeting. Sitting on desk tops, the group listened as MCGEE outlined the work.

Like most Senators, MCGEE has an "AA" or administrative assistant, as well as a legislative expert, a research man, a press relations man, and clerical help. Including a lawyer and secretary in Laramie, MCGEE's staff totals 10.

The Senate, like a club, is a place where who you know counts. For the freshman, constantly reminded of his junior status by the workings of the seniority system, the friendship of an oldtimer is invaluable. MCGEE was lucky. Senator O'MAHONEY, with nearly a quarter century of service in the Senate, ushered him through the long ornate corridors, introduced him to other Members, took him, one quiet evening before Congress convened to the deserted floor of the Senate Chamber. There he showed MCGEE the seat that was to be his.

O'MAHONEY also took MCGEE to the presidential suite of the Mayflower Hotel where the freshman was introduced to a former Member of the Senate, Harry S. Truman. "If you're like the rest of us," Truman told MCGEE, "for the first 6 weeks you'll walk around asking yourself, 'How did I get here?' After that, you'll walk around asking yourself, 'How did the rest of them get here?'"

MCGEE also met with Senate Majority Leader LYNDON JOHNSON in JOHNSON's plush new office, where so many photos are snapped that the majority leader has had a rheostat installed so he can reach behind his desk and control the room lighting. JOHN-

SON is the man who calls the all-important shots on committee assignments. After first conferring with O'MAHONEY, MCGEE asked JOHNSON for a seat on the powerful Appropriations Committee. He got it.

Asked when he first really felt himself a part of the Senate, MCGEE tells of the night he was first called upon to preside over the chamber in the absence of Vice President NIXON. This is an onerous chore shared by the newer Senators. MCGEE was the first of the present freshman class to be tapped for the job by Jessop "Jay" McDonell, one of JOHNSON'S assistants.

MCGEE was supposed to sit from 4:30 p.m. until about 6. Instead, he found himself stuck in the chair throughout a 5½-hour filibuster by Senator WAYNE MORSE—"a sitter-buster," as MCGEE recalls.

That night, as he left the chamber at 10:30, he was met by a group of lobbyists in the marble hall near the elevators. "If you don't vote our way on such-and-such a bill," MCGEE was warned, "you'll be sorry. We have ways, you know * * *."

After that, MCGEE says, he knew he was really a Member of the U.S. Senate.

Results of Opinion Poll—21st District of of California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, early this year I sent out my seventh annual questionnaire to the voters of the district I represent. Response this year was greater than ever before, indicating a healthy interest in national affairs. Along with the replies, I received several thousand letters from thoughtful citizens, expressing opinion or asking questions regarding legislation.

My colleagues will recognize the specific questions relating to specific bills or issues facing us at this session of Congress. Perhaps they will be interested in knowing how a representative cross-section of the 800,000 citizens of the 21st District of California feel about these issues:

	Percent yes	Percent no	Percent not sure
1. Shall we spend Federal money for municipal projects such as slum clearance, water supply, sewage disposal, etc.?	23	69	8
2. Should Congress spend Federal tax money to assist specific areas of the country suffering chronic unemployment?	36	50	14
3. Generally, do you favor Federal aid to education?	40	55	5
4. Should Congress continue farm price supports?	10	83	7
5. Shall we continue foreign economic aid?	47	38	15
6. Should foreign military aid be continued?	58	26	16
7. Is balancing the Federal budget important to you?	81	12	7
8. Should cooperatives be taxed the same as other businesses?	82	8	10
9. Should small business have more tax relief?	71	17	12
10. Should Red China be admitted to the U.N.?	14	76	10
11. Should we make an all-out effort to surpass the U.S.S.R. in the exploration of outer space, regardless of cost?	33	50	10
12. Do you favor stiff legislation requiring the secret ballot and control by the membership, in the internal affairs of unions?	95	3	2
13. Should labor unions have to comply with our antimonopoly laws?	90	6	4
14. Do you want Congress to revise the Taft-Hartley law so as to outlaw State right-to-work laws?	20	70	10

Senator Dodd's Principles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD J. IRWIN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 7, 1959

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the Congress to an editorial which appeared in the Stamford, Conn., Advocate on Tuesday, April 28, concerning my esteemed colleague, Senator THOMAS DODD.

The opinions expressed in the editorial, I feel, should be placed before the entire Congress through introduction of it into the RECORD:

[From the Stamford Advocate, Tuesday, Apr. 28, 1959]

SENATOR DODD'S PRINCIPLES

It is difficult for a freshman Senator to stand out from his fellows. He does not have position of influence on important committees, and tradition expects him to be a follower rather than a leader. This makes it noteworthy that Connecticut's TOM DODD emerges in his first session as a man of principle.

At the very outset he shocked some of his followers by voting for support of Senate traditions. That this made radical change in the filibuster rules impossible meant nothing to Senator DODD. He stood for responsible leadership.

When the Berlin situation first became critical, Senator DODD showed his knowledge of Communist methods by standing solidly in back of the administration policy of firmness and nonappeasement. Again, when fringe Senator MORSE indulged in a slaphappy attack on Mrs. Luce, Senator DODD increased his standing by jumping to the lady's support. In all of these instances, Senator DODD could have taken an easy course, and remained quiet. As a freshman Senator, his silence could not have been criticized. Apparently something called principle made him speak up.

This same devotion to principle led him to stand up for the McClellan amendment to the Kennedy "milk toast" labor bill. Senator DODD was counted as one of those "in the union leadership pocket." Union contribution to his campaign fund was heavy, and indirect contributions reached large sums. It took courage to vote to give union members the same rights in union affairs that other citizens have guaranteed by the Constitution. It took even greater courage to propose that union leadership give written notice of union elections to the membership, and, finally, to offer a bill putting the burden of throwing a local union into an international trusteeship on the international union, instead of making the local prove it was competent. Labor barons control international elections by control of locals in trusteeship. Yet Senator DODD proposed these amendments to the labor bill.

His amendments, according to Senator DODD, were resisted by union barons "mad with power." He told labor leaders, "I am on your side, but you had better change your philosophy. This isn't a private empire or a private club."

It is a certainty that those who think America is a private empire on which to prey, will attempt to punish Senator DODD. In this direct proportion, Senator DODD deserves the confidence and respect of the people he represents.

Address by the Honorable Carmine G. De Sapio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 7, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to commend to the attention of our colleagues the text of an address by the Honorable Carmine G. De Sapio before the New Democratic Club in New York City on April 27, 1959:

TEXT OF ADDRESS BY CARMINE G. DE SAPIO AT THE NEW DEMOCRATIC CLUB, APRIL 27, 1959.

Since the last time I had the opportunity to visit with you here at the New Democratic Club, the political scene—in our city and throughout New York State—has undergone some striking transformations. Some of these changes—or perhaps I might more accurately refer to them as developments, rather than as changes—some of these developments have been politically healthy and invigorating. Others have been more symptomatic of a kind of uncertainty and disillusionment which both puzzles and disturbs the citizens of many of our communities. As always, in politics, the manner in which any individual is affected by change depends, to a very great extent, upon the place which he or she occupies in the range of political philosophy.

Here in New York City—with the exception of a few isolated localities which have been successfully gerrymandered by the Republican legislators in Albany—we have a very great tradition of political liberalism. This tradition has been forged by our own Democratic Party out of the materials of civic need, public awareness, and political action, over a period of many decades, with the assistance of an overwhelming majority of the citizenry—and in accordance with a concept of social and political justice which recognizes that meaningful progress can spring only from a cohesive and dynamic spirit of cooperation.

Ours—our party's—is a tradition—call it a way of political life, if you will—that has attracted and enthused the people of our city and that has brought them into the ranks of active political workers, in ever-increasing numbers. This is a manifestation of healthy political change. It is good for our

party. It is good for the people whom we represent. And it is good for the development of flexible, responsive government. And perhaps the greatest and most significant reason for this phenomenon—for this development which has greatly accelerated during the past decade—is that we consistently have sought to broaden both the base of our activities and the philosophy which provides the motivating force for everything that we do. For in thus providing a comfortable and effective spectrum for the reception and display of a wide range of political shadings, we have succeeded, too, in embracing and in nourishing a full and varied sense of political responsibility.

Unlike our opponents in the Republican Party, we Democrats have learned—and the lesson has been an extraordinarily valuable one—that it is possible for men and women, who sometimes hold widely differing views, to work together toward the same political goals. Indeed, sometimes—as we have seen—it may be more difficult to determine what those goals are than it is to provide the means for their achievement. For the language of politics frequently offers a number of stumbling blocks to complete understanding.

Take the word "reform," for example. To some people—and to Republicans in particular—reform obviously connotes merely the opposite of what we Democrats happen to be doing at the moment, or what we have done in the recent past. The illustration which leaps immediately to mind is that of Governor Rockefeller's so-called tax reform program. To the Republican Governor and to the Republican-controlled State legislature, tax reform obviously has meant finding some way to ease the burdens of the rich by shifting them onto the poor and those of moderate means. Yet, to many of the people who helped to elect Rockefeller last November—and that number includes both so-called independent voters and some who, for reasons best known to themselves and vociferously regretted in recent weeks, bolted the Democratic Party to give their support to the Republican candidate—to the people, tax reform signifies something very different indeed.

To some people within our own party, reform has another meaning with which most thoughtful students of politics also will take issue. To these people, reform means, simply, change, any change. Evidently, the theory behind this concept of reform is that no matter how constructively things are being run it's a good idea to break the pattern every so often, even though that may mean a disruption of the steady course of progress.

Today, many Americans—and, again, their ranks include both independents and some Democrats—who voted for Dwight Eisenhower, bitterly regret their past subscription to that interpretation of reform. There is a third concept of reform, one which is based upon the desirability of meaningful change, and which derives its validity from its potential acceleration of progress and improvement. This is the kind of reform which we, here in New York County, consistently have fought for, both within the structure of the county Democratic organization and in the wider arena of city and State government.

Reform—as we understand and practice it—does not require as a condition for its achievement the scrapping of the established order. It does not demand, for its effectiveness, the abolition of tradition as a necessary element of progress. Nor does it presuppose that reckless experimentation can be justified as an excuse for change. On the other hand, reform—the kind of reform in which we believe, which we have initiated and which we have achieved in the conduct of our partisan affairs—this kind of reform does not by any means preclude a careful inquiry into the facts of political life or a sincere and genuine effort to make our party a more efficient and effective instrument of the will of the people.

My friends, I submit to you—in rebuttal to the claims of those who seem to have espoused the cause of reform, whether good or bad, for its own sake—that the New York County Democratic organization is wedded to a policy of reform which has made ours the most widely representative unit of its kind in New York City, in New York State, and, perhaps, in our entire Nation.

During the past decade—and in the course of our efforts to effect constructive change—we concluded that the numerical size of our county committee made it too heavy and too inflexible a unit. Accordingly, and not without difficulty, we instituted an important reform. We provided for the reduction of the size of the county committee, and we have thereby made it more reflective of and more responsive to the wishes of the enrolled Democrats of our county.

We realized—as many politicians still refuse to do—that the political rights of women lagged far behind their advancement in the social and economic areas of contemporary society. And, in conformity with this realization, we instituted another important reform. We provided equal representation for women within the structure of our party organization and we therefore have broadened the base of participation in the determination of party policy.

Even though, at the time, it seemed to many old-fashioned politicians that we were inviting internal strife and dissension, we—in the New York County Democratic organization—reached the inescapable conclusion that the people whom we were privileged to represent should have the right to choose their district leaders by direct election. And amid loud cries of anguish from some quarters, we instituted that reform which has proved to be a vitalizing and democratizing element in the selection of responsible policymakers.

Because we became aware of a significant degree of popular opposition to certain undemocratic features of our election laws, we pioneered still another unique political innovation when we worked to simplify the procedures to enable independent candidates to be placed on the ballot.

At a time when it had by no means become fashionable to do so, we encouraged wider participation in our party affairs by the various racial and nationality groups which contributed to the support and advancement of our political ideals. And we have proven by deeds—rather than by mere words—that the need for effective minority representation in our partisan councils and in Government is a problem which we are prepared and able to solve.

Beyond the sphere of purely partisan affairs, our organization has campaigned for—and won—many important political reforms.

In the past, the full force of our organizational strength was marshalled behind the drive to establish a system of permanent personal registration in New York. This year, for the first time, voting machines will be used in the local primary elections. Here again, our political organization was a major factor in documenting the desirability of constructive change.

Today, we are organizing a campaign designed to give the vote to 18-year-olds. We will fight for this innovation until we have secured it, not because it may prove to give us a valuable political advantage, but because we believe that these young people are—and ought to be recognized—as responsible citizens of our communities.

We are a party of reform and progress. And our organization is composed of men and women who believe that it is their duty, through active participation in the affairs of our organization, to work for the continued liberalization of politics.

We may disagree on matters of organizational structure. We may dispute among ourselves on matters of internal procedure and policy. We may sometimes quarrel over individual points of reference in the interpretation of political philosophy. But far more important than any disagreements which temporarily may impair or impede our progress is the common allegiance to our Democratic Party which all of us share.

All of us realize, too, I believe, that perhaps the saddest of all political phenomena today is the unaffiliated or—to use a term which seems somehow to be interpreted more kindly—the independent voter.

Who is the independent voter? In some political and intellectual circles, he has been glorified as the pivotal citizen upon whom politicians and office-seekers must ultimately depend for support. He has been described as the political conscience of America. He has been praised for his refusal to adhere to any set pattern of standards and principles.

Now these are all very complimentary things to say about anyone. And I say to you, my friends, that it would be very wonderful, very inspiring and very gratifying indeed, if these compliments—such as they are—gave an accurate picture of the so-called independent voter. Unfortunately, they do not.

To be sure, there are some eligible voters in every community who adopt a spirit of political independence from the highest possible motives and who, from their searching personal inquiry into the issues and problems of the day, base their own opinions and acts of citizenship on validly gained conclusions.

But a great many people who have accepted the standard definition of the independent voter as descriptive of their own political habits and behavior * * * have done so from a posture of political apathy and from a sluggish spirit of indolent citizenship.

And these—in many instances—not the alert or informed minority, are the so-called independents who decide elections on the basis of personalities and promises, rather than on the basis of experience and performance.

Certainly, no independent voter who deserves the accolades which have been so prodigally bestowed by incautious commentators cast his ballot for the head of the national administration in Washington in 1956. Assuredly, no voter who was motivated by the results of a vigorous and searching study of the most recent gubernatorial campaign in this State went to his polling place last November 4 and cast his vote for the present Governor of New York. Yet, we are told by the analysts, it was the independent voter who elected both Dwight Eisenhower and Nelson Rockefeller. Clearly, then, there is some great disparity between the public image of the independent voter and the real thing.

Let me ask the question again. Who is the independent voter? By and large, he is the man—or the woman—who actively rejects the responsibilities of citizenship, of political duty, and of participating in the strengthening of two-party politics as we know and revere it in America today. These are the people who actively contribute to their own partial disenfranchisement through their conscious failure to belong to—or to work for—a political party. These are the people who, quite candidly, have little or no voice in the selection of candidates for public office, because they make no effort to do so. These are the people who exercise little or no influence in the control of partisan affairs, because they cannot be bothered to make the necessary effort. And

these are also the people who—almost invariably—make the loudest outcries against all of their fellow citizens who engage actively in politics for the simple reason that it requires little or no effort, time or energy to engage in destructive criticism. These are the people who evidently expect politics to run itself without benefit of politicians and, certainly, without any help from themselves.

These are the people who, unwittingly and yet without hesitation, do themselves and our entire system of popular democracy an enormous and very dangerous disservice by refusing to accept the fundamental structure of our traditional and—yes—our very great political system. These, my friends, are the people who constitute the greatest single threat to the maintenance, the improvement, and perhaps the very survival of two-party politics in New York and wherever else in America they may be permitted or encouraged to flourish.

Just a step behind them are their near-colleagues, the people who, when registering as voters, capriciously indicate a partisan affiliation on the enrollment blank, without giving any thought to the significance of their haphazard choices and, certainly, without the slightest intention of giving force or direction to them by assuming an active role in party affairs.

But we do not have the right to take the independent voters entirely to task. For we in politics are not blameless. We confuse them. We befuddle them. We create doubts and fears in their minds which lead them to shun and avoid politics as they would a plague. And in so doing we do an irreparable disservice to our system of government and to our American heritage.

What is the independent voter to think when one party characterizes its political structure as an organization and alludes to the other party as a machine?

What is the independent voter to think when one party boasts of its statesmanlike leaders but characterizes its counterpart opponents as nefarious bosses?

What is the independent voter to think when the income and contributions of one party are for the legitimate purpose of defraying campaign expenses while the opposition invariably collects graft?

What is the independent voter to think when one party calls its workers volunteers and calls its opponent's supporters ward heelers and hacks?

My good friends, these semantics, this name-calling, this callous disregard for propriety, for decency, for ethics, and, yes, for political morality is undermining our political structure and when practiced within our own party gives more aid, more comfort, and more help to the cause of republicanism than anything else we can do.

Ours is a profound challenge. It is simply this. Let us get back to fighting republicanism and the vicious system of special privilege which it represents.

Let us build our party so that we can continue to achieve better housing, better education, better security, and better understanding for the people of our community.

I think it was Disraeli who said it is far easier to be critical than to be correct. But remember, if you will, that the Democratic Party—particularly in our county—is made up of men and women from the Lower East Side, from Harlem, from Washington Heights, from Greenwich Village, from Park Avenue, and from Yorkville—in short, from all walks of life. And unless our party represents all of these people and works for all of these people and has as its leaders those who stem from, those who were born of, and those who understand with their hearts as well as with their intellects the dreams, prayers, and the aspirations of all of these people—unless our party is this—it has no reason for being.

There are no supermen in the Democratic Party. There are no bosses in the Democratic Party whether elected or self-proclaimed. We are an organization of men and women who believe that our strength and our success can derive only from the people and that our leadership is forfeit the moment we fail honorably to represent the people.

There is no one in this room who would challenge the political integrity, the social conscience or the liberal dedication of Senator Herbert Lehman, of Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, and of Secretary Finletter. Neither they nor I are an issue in this discussion. For no person is above the party and no individual, no matter how he may otherwise fancy himself, is indispensable to our party. The only issue is: Shall we continue to grow and progress and build our party for the realization of a better city, a better State, and a better Nation through the heritage, the philosophy, and the program of the Democratic Party or shall we bicker among ourselves as to who should have the distinction of being vilified by our opponents with the characterization: Boss.

I say to you that this—and only this—is the problem.

And unless we do something about it, unless we accept the responsibility, the obligation—the duty—to work together toward the goal of instilling in our fellow citizens a sense of partisan spirit and participation that will enable them to be—in the fullest and most meaningful sense—our fellow Democrats, unless we do this, then let us not be surprised when, within our own life spans, we witness the collapse of politics as we know it in America.

This is the great challenge which confronts us—as Democrats, as politicians, and as Americans.

Instead of bickering among ourselves, let us concentrate all of our efforts upon the much more valid and much more important job of explaining our beliefs to the people—so that they may fully understand our position on all of the great issues of the day—so that they may be attracted into our ranks, and thus eliminate the elements of uncertainty and impulse which the unaffiliated voters necessarily inject into politics and government.

Let us subscribe to change where change is desirable, where it provides the opportunity for improvement, and let us seek to banish chance from politics.

Let us work in the days ahead to enroll every eligible liberal-thinking citizen of New York in our organization, for, in so doing, we will inevitably achieve greater unity, greater strength, better politics, and better government.

Dear Mr. Congressman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MILTON W. GLENN
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 7, 1959

Mr. GLENN. Mr. Speaker, I have a very fine and widely read weekly newspaper in my district, the Pleasantville Press. Its editor, John A. Hinman, is a man who is not only dedicated to living up to the high standards of journalism, but is also active in all community projects and, when deserved, he can be a severe critic as well as a giver of just praise to us in Government service. This is borne out by a recent editorial which was published in his newspaper. Under unanimous consent, I include the editorial in the Appendix of the RECORD:

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN

Do you know your Congressman?

Have you written him lately?

Indications are that more and more people in this Nation are writing their Congressmen. Why? Some are more than concerned as to inflation and its damage to the family's income or the senior citizen's pension. Many are urging a balanced budget—holding the line on expenditures.

Others, while for the honest laboring man, are writing that stronger legislation is needed to end the rackets in labor brought on by a few of the top brass.

If you don't know the names of your two U.S. Senators and your Congressman—you should. Your U.S. Senators are CLIFFORD P. CASE and HARRISON A. WILLIAMS. They may be addressed at the Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C. This district's Congressman is MILTON W. GLENN. Write him care of House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

If you disagree, write them. If they do something you like, laud them. But write them—that's how they can know what's in the minds of those back home. And that's what counts.

South Dakota National Guard Has Proud Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, Sunday, May 3, in an impressive parade and ceremony, the National Guard Association of the United States dedicated its new headquarters building in Washington, D.C. Giving the dedicatory address was a former National Guardsman and former President of the United States, Harry S. Truman.

With a consecutive history that dates back to the North Regiment of Massachusetts in 1636, America's citizen-soldiers have taken part in every war in which the Nation has been involved. In the words of the National Guardsman this new building "is a symbol of a will, a determination, and a pride born of accomplishment and performance, and of a spirit that will carry the National Guard from the minuteman's musket to the modern man's missiles."

We in South Dakota are proud of our guardsmen. Their is a proud history that dates back before statehood to Territorial days and the Indian wars. Units from the South Dakota Guard were the first troops into both the European and Asiatic theaters of war following the outbreak of World War II and distinguished themselves in battle action in both theaters. The South Dakota National Guard was one of the few called to active duty during the Korean conflict.

Sunday the battalion colors and battle streamers of the South Dakota Guard were carried by a chosen delegation of guardsmen representing their many comrades both living and dead who

volunteered their services in peace and war to serve our Nation.

Under unanimous consent I include in the RECORD the names of those men and their units.

Brig. Gen. Homer Jensen, adjutant general of South Dakota; Maj. John J. Steele, assistant adjutant general; Capt. Donald Holliday, 109th Engineer Battalion, Rapid City, S. Dak.; Capt. Douglas Wilson, 175th Fighter Squadron, Sioux Falls, S. Dak.; WO Richard V. Walker, State Headquarters and Headquarters Detachment, Rapid City, S. Dak.; M. Sgt. Malcolm D. Calhoun, Company A, 109th Engineer Battalion, Lead, S. Dak.; M. Sgt. Richard L. Christy, Headquarters Company, 109th Engineer Group, Rapid City, S. Dak.; M. Sgt. John C. Fleishacker, Headquarters Battery, 147th F.A. Group, Pierre, S. Dak.; M. Sgt. Kervyn I. Hagen, Battery A, 643rd F.A. Battalion, Sisseton, S. Dak.; M. Sgt. Wallace F. Hale, H&S Company, 109th Engineer Battalion, Sturgis, S. Dak.; M. Sgt. Harold E. Halsey, Company B, 137th Engineer Battalion, Springfield, S. Dak.; M. Sgt. W. W. Holgate, 114th Camron, Sioux Falls, S. Dak.; M. Sgt. Frank M. Hill, State Headquarters and Headquarters Detachment, Rapid City, S. Dak.; M. Sgt. Lyle Kenyon, 114th Camron, Sioux Falls, S. Dak.; M. Sgt. Verlyn B. Kickland, 200th Engineer Company, Chamberlain, S. Dak.; M. Sgt. Donald E. Loudner, 665th Ordnance Company, Mitchell, S. Dak.; M. Sgt. Clarence G. Lindahl, 740th Transportation Company, Milbank, S. Dak.; M. Sgt. Virgil G. Martin, Headquarters Battery, 128th AAA Battalion, Rapid City, S. Dak.; M. Sgt. Stanley M. Peterson, Headquarters Battery, 147th F.A. Battalion, Sioux Falls, S. Dak.; M. Sgt. William Walker, 147th Field Artillery Group, Pierre, S. Dak.; M. Sgt. George A. White, Headquarters Battery, 642d F.A. Battalion, Redfield, S. Dak.; SFC James H. Cooley, Company B, 109th Engineer Battalion, Hot Springs, S. Dak.; SFC Darwin E. Roti, Company A, 153d Engineer Battalion, Woonsocket, S. Dak.; SFC Wayne R. Uptagrafft, Headquarters Battery, 260th F.A. Battalion, Mitchell, S. Dak.; Sgt. John F. Doyle, H&S Company, 211th Engineer Battalion, Lemmon, S. Dak.; Sgt. Edward A. Herrick, Company B, 154th Engineer Battalion, Brookings, S. Dak.; A2C Jerry Kettwig, 114th Camron, Sioux Falls, S. Dak.

Sensible Proposal on Foreign Operations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial of timely and provocative interest.

Appearing in the Wall Street Journal of April 29, this article is recommended for those who are concerned over the scope and effectiveness of the U.S. foreign aid program:

One thing that makes U.S. foreign aid such a difficult issue to debate is that almost anything you say about it is true.

The U.S. aid program has done sensible things, and it has done foolish things. It has spent money efficiently, and it has spent wastefully. Among its administrators are men energetic and levelheaded, and men who are boondoggiers and dunderheads. It has been a boon to foreign countries, and it has been a bane to them. It has made us friends abroad, and it has lost them. It has thus advanced the interests of the United States, and it has done those interests injury.

We have lately had a close look at U.S. foreign aid ourselves, in places as varied as the advanced nations of Europe and the so-called backward nations of southeast Asia, and it would not be difficult to marshal evidence for any of these views.

This explains, we think, why it has been possible for reasonable men to argue that our present gigantic aid program must be preserved intact. Or to argue that all foreign aid is sheer nonsense better abandoned altogether.

Yet it seems to us that the truth is neither the one nor the other. And it also seems to us that the task of finding it begins with the separation of the general question of whether there is a point in any foreign aid and the question whether the U.S. foreign aid program as presently conceived and executed is a sensible one.

Foreign aid is not necessarily condemned by condemning the present program. Nor, conversely, is the present program—$5 billion a year in some 70 countries—justified simply by justifying some uses for foreign aid.

For what they may contribute to the present debate, we will set down our own views. They are:

First, that there are circumstances today in which realism suggests that the United States can use foreign aid, economic or military, to promote its own best interests.

Second, that the present foreign aid program has lost touch with those realities and should be abandoned.

And third, that to find a foreign aid program manageable in size and reasonable in concept it will first be necessary to abolish the International Cooperation Administration, in fact as well as in name.

Foreign aid is one of the oldest, and at times one of the most useful, instruments of foreign policy.

Its origins probably reach further back into history than history records, but it was certainly used extensively by the Romans in their day, by the British, French, and other European powers, by the Russians in the days of the czars and the Chinese in the days of the emperors. In every case the purpose and the objective has been straightforward: One country, by giving aid to another country, hoped to create or to preserve a state of affairs favorable to itself and saw some reasonable prospect that the aid would accomplish its purpose.

Today there are places in the world where this practical principle may apply to the United States. At least it is plain that without U.S. aid, military and economic, there would now be no such country as the Republic of Korea.

The critic of all foreign aid can argue whether the price paid was worth the gain. He would be hard put to argue that the aid in these cases did not have clear objectives against a measurable danger and a reasonable prospect of accomplishment—that is, that the aid could be disciplined by practical judgments.

It was on this principle that our foreign aid program was started and that, at the time of Greece and Turkey, it was supported by this newspaper.

But today our foreign aid program is something else again. From the premise that some foreign aid can be useful our Government has jumped to the conclusion that almost all foreign aid is justifiable. Foreign aid has ceased to be a precision tool of foreign policy and has become instead a program of uplift in all parts of the world. It is in this change that it has become unhinged from reason.

We no longer limit ourselves to giving some help, say, to Thailand that will strengthen its Government or its people in resisting the military and diplomatic threats of Red China. Even in extending self-interest to generosity we are not content with some modest aid that might attain some modest improvement in the Thai economy. We undertake to reshape the whole country, its agriculture, its industry, its public works, its schools, and even its customs and way of living.

In short, we no longer discipline ourselves in giving aid by hard, practical judgments on the point of danger, or on what we hope to accomplish or whether there is a reasonable prospect of accomplishing it. This gives our foreign aid program unattainable objectives, limitless costs, and accounts for practically all of its troubles.

Those troubles—the foolish spending, the waste, the graft, the irritation of the recipients with their benefactors—hardly need to be chronicled here. The point is that these are symptoms, not the real malady. The fundamental difficulty is in the concept of the foreign aid program, which makes all these things inevitable and buries what good there might be in foreign aid under an avalanche of errors.

The way back, it seems to us, must begin with a new sense of proportion on foreign aid, both as to the times and places where we will give aid and the manner in which we will give it.

This means abandoning the idea that the U.S. Treasury is a cornucopia for any country just because it is undeveloped, or backward or in financial troubles or "could use" some U.S. dollars. There's hardly any country in the non-Communist world that wouldn't fit such a loose standard; hardly any, in fact, that doesn't fit it now, and it is patently ridiculous for the United States to undertake to support some 70 countries.

It means, even when we do decide to aid some country, that we use some precision in what kind of aid we give for what purposes. Military aid to Korea, with a Red army across the border, is one thing; military aid to a South American country is something else again.

It means an insistence that the country can profitably use such aid as we do give and that it is willing to do its part.

And this means in practically every case that we turn from grants to loans, from the sweeping general program to consideration of specific projects, from sending hordes of American planners to sending a few technical advisers to help a country carry out its own plans in its own way, if we decide the plans are worth our helping at all.

We do not suppose that these will be easy decisions to make; in fact, the decisions will be harder than under the type of program we now have where many decisions are avoided by embracing nearly every kind of foreign aid almost any place.

But we are convinced that a program approached in this way will cost a fraction of what it now costs the U.S. taxpayer, that it will gain us flexibility in our foreign policy, and that in this fashion we may have a foreign aid program that works to our own best interest instead of being, as it now too often is in too many places, a monstrous liability.

We are also now convinced that this is an impractical hope unless we first abolish the ICA.

This seems to us a prerequisite for two reasons. First, what is needed here is a completely new beginning which would replace the whole concept on which ICA is based. Secondly, under the concept of foreign aid we are now discussing an organization like ICA would be unnecessary.

Once we turn from grants to loans, from U.S. planned projects to indigenous projects, from limitless to limited objectives, there will no longer be a need for a vast bureaucracy with swarms of overseas missions to

replan the economy of these foreign countries.

And once we restore foreign aid to its role as an instrument of foreign policy, rather than as a program for "uplift," there is not even need for a vast administrative machinery in Washington. The direction of it, and the primary policy decisions, could be made where other foreign policy is directed, in the State Department, with such military aid as may be necessary still handled by the Defense Department.

We recognize that even with this approach there will be some multiplication of offices. But it will help to correct what we are now persuaded was the fundamental error, the creation of a special organization to dispense foreign aid.

This is, indeed, the nub of the matter. An organization whose sole function is to give foreign aid is bound to proliferate plans and programs for spending because it has no other way to justify its existence. This is what has happened. A mission is sent to country X to "see what we can do for them" and by that process of bureaucratic cellular growth there sprout divisions to help on education, on roads, on public health, or whatever. These need other divisions for housekeeping and soon the whole needs an office manager, a manager to manage the car pool and the secretary pool, a manager to manage personnel living facilities and so on ad infinitum.

And it is simply not realistic to ask the education division, for example, to re-think itself out of existence. Or the mission as a whole to replan its program around a concept that will in effect liquidate its reason for being.

Ours is, perhaps, a drastic proposal. But we think too much of the debate on foreign aid has been on an all-or-nothing basis. The public is being asked to endorse all of what we are doing now, in exactly the way we are now doing it, or to abolish foreign aid altogether. Faced with that choice, it is very difficult to make any kind of reasonable case for continuing the foreign aid program at all.

Yet what we really need is a reappraisal of what foreign aid can do to serve our best interests—and what it cannot do—as an instrument of foreign policy. And we are not likely to succeed in that until we are willing to scrap the present setup and make a fresh beginning.

B'nai B'rith Salute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK KOWALSKI
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 5, 1959

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, I call attention of the House to the fact that perhaps the greatest airborne convention in history will take place later this month when more than 1,300 persons will travel by air to Jerusalem to attend the triennial convention of B'nai B'rith. More than 1,000 of these delegates and participants will fly from the United States.

I am proud of the fact that 14 constituents of mine, representing the B'nai B'rith organizations of Connecticut, will take part in this historic expedition. In this group will be Commissioner Sol Bernstein and Morris Winikoff, of Waterbury; Herbert D. Setlow and Benjamin Lavietes, of New Haven; Mr. and Mrs. Samuel Kellin, of Hartford; Mr. and Mrs. Irving Rubinstein, Jack R. Nowitz, and Mr. and Mrs. Philip Kaplan, of Bridgeport; Sol Robinson and Ted C. Gorman, of Danbury; and Miss Fannie Resnick, of Durham.

All of us who are familiar with the great work which B'nai B'rith has done to combat intolerance will join in wishing this great organization a most successful convention. And we wish it well in its continuing campaign to quench the fires of bigotry, discrimination, and racial hatred whenever they blaze. We are proud of this 116-year-old organization, the oldest and largest of the Jewish service organizations.

Why the Kremlin Will Not Disarm

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 7, 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed into the Appendix of the RECORD the text of a very interesting article on disarmament by Mr. CHESTER BOWLES, Representative from Connecticut, former Governor of that great State, and former Ambassador to India from the United States. The article appeared in the magazine section of the New York Times of April 19, 1959.

Mr. BOWLES discusses the reasons why it would be in the interest of the Soviet Union to enter into disarmament agreements with the United States and other nations. He also suggests the factors which, nevertheless, make it difficult for the Kremlin leaders to take precisely those steps which it is in their interest to take.

In view of the timeliness and the importance of the disarmament question, this analysis of "Why the Kremlin Will Not Disarm," should be of value to every Member of Congress, the administration, and the public as well.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY THE KREMLIN WILL NOT DISARM
(By CHESTER BOWLES)

WASHINGTON.—Negotiations on suspension of nuclear-bomb tests have been resumed at Geneva. Within a month, the Foreign Ministers Conference will convene in the same city. Presumably, it will be followed by a summit meeting.

All three conferences will be watched intently for any sign of a possible break in the nearly 15-year deadlock on disarmament. Discouraged and facing an apparent impasse, the world wonders whether anything effective can still be done to escape from the vicious circle of the arms race.

Clearly, an agreement on a test suspension alone would not reduce armaments. It could, however, be an invaluable precedent for further advances if agreement were reached on a control system. Yet the Soviet Union has insisted on a veto power over every operating phase of the complex control system needed to supervise a nuclear test ban. The Kremlin knows that no American Government could agree to such a veto. On its face, then, the Soviet position suggests that the Russian leaders do not want a workable agreement.

Why do they not press for a sweeping disarmament program? There are two potent reasons why they should do so: First, the Soviet Union could divert military expenditures to consumer production with immediate advantage at home and abroad. Second, according to Kremlin dogma, the capitalist West is largely dependent on its armament industries for continued prosperity.

As for the first reason, something like 22 percent of the Soviet Union's productive energies is now allocated to the military. With a gross national product of about $190 billion, this is equivalent to some $40 billion annually. A general disarmament agreement would enable the Kremlin planners to divert most of this vast sum to other activities that would enormously strengthen the Soviet position.

Inside the Soviet Union, massive attacks could be launched on the grave housing shortage. Within 10 or 15 years, urban and rural slums could be wiped out in much of the country.

The production of Soviet automobiles and other consumer goods could be expanded rapidly. Showplaces could be created to awe and impress foreign visitors with the accomplishments of communism.

Simultaneously, the Kremlin could launch a heavily subsidized export offensive to undercut the trading position of the capitalist powers in the underdeveloped continents and, indeed, in Europe itself. Typewriters, automobiles, trucks, and other equipment could be priced to undersell American, British, French, and German goods by 30, 40, or 50 percent. Communism, Mr. Khrushchev never ceases to tell us, would surely win any headon test in peaceful competition.

As for the second reason for Russia to press for disarmament, the Communists assert that as American armament industries closed down, unemployment would rise, and purchasing power would dry up. Rapidly spreading depression would lead to bankruptcies, privation and bitter political differences which would hasten the collapse of capitalism and the coming of the Communist triumph.

Although this Marxist analysis greatly overstates our problem, even the most confirmed of us capitalists must agree that a major reduction in armament spending would create substantial difficulties for American industry.

True, if Congress cut taxes drastically, billions of dollars could be diverted from Government armament purchases to the bank accounts of consumers and businessmen, most of whom would spend their windfalls on immediate family purchases or for job-creating expansion.

Substantial sums could also be appropriated to meet the needs of the neglected areas of domestic national interest—housing, roads, urban renewal, hospitals, schools, and many others. In addition, we could sharply expand our now inadequate economic aid programs to Asia, Africa, and Latin America and thereby lay the basis for an expanding export trade.

Yet the current political atmosphere in the United States makes it questionable whether these decisive steps would, in fact, be taken with the necessary swiftness. And even if they were, many months of difficult adjustment would have to pass before their effects were felt. In the meantime, our

Soviet competitors—with the speed available only to a totalitarian system—would be opening up new markets, pushing us out of old ones and impressing millions of visitors from all over the world with the physical accomplishments of communism.

On both these counts the Soviet Union appears to have every reason to work for a broad disarmament pact. The Russian leaders have issued broadsides, waved banners and released peace doves. Yet, on the negotiating level, they have failed consistently to come up with positive, workable proposals. Why?

The first answer is given by a group, consisting largely of professional military men (but by no means representing a cross-section of military opinion), that takes a narrow and cataclysmic view. Their argument holds that the Soviet refusal to come to grips with the disarmament issue is proof that the single, unalterable objective of the Soviet Union is to dominate the world by force.

Lenin, they remind us, put it coldly and clearly: "The prolonged existence of the Soviet Republic side by side with imperialist states is unthinkable. One or the other must triumph in the end. And before that end supervenes, a series of frightful collisions between the Soviet Republic and the bourgeois states is inevitable."

Once the Kremlin decides that it has a decisive advantage it will order an attack. Negotiations, in the meantime, are designed solely to soften us for the kill.

At the other extreme lies a group that gives a second answer. Idealistic to the point of being utopian, these people expect the best from all mankind, even from those who set Soviet policy. Sensitive to our genuine shortcomings, they find the answer to the disarmament impasse in the defects of American policy. The Kremlin has not accepted disarmament, they hold, because we have not tried hard enough.

I suspect, however, that the real explanation is far more complicated. The forces at work on disarmament policy within the Soviet Union are necessarily matters of guesswork, but war and peace may ultimately hang on the outcome of these guesses. I am convinced that an explanation of present Soviet behavior must also include these factors:

1. A genuine fear among the Soviet leaders of the very forces which they themselves have brought into being—a resurgent, armed Germany; NATO, and the worldwide American nuclear base system.

2. Their 650 million dynamic, land-hungry Chinese neighbors who seem likely sooner or later to bid for leadership of the Communist movement.

3. The extent to which the Soviet leaders themselves are victims of the Russian tradition of secrecy, and the relative advantages secrecy genuinely gives them in an armaments race with our more open society.

4. Policy hesitations and conflicting pressures—differences, for instances, within the Communist Party and between it and the armed forces—which may limit the Kremlin's freedom of action as similar differences limit our Government's.

Finally, I would add my personal guess that one of the primary factors that may be causing the Kremlin second thoughts about disarmament can be summed up in the one word "Hungary." Following the relaxation in tensions after the Big Four meeting in Geneva in 1955, a sense of possibility spread throughout the Communist empire, erupting in the upheaval in Poland and the revolt in Hungary.

As the Kremlin saw the raw temper of the suppressed people in Eastern Europe so furiously expressed, it must have been profoundly shaken by the possibility that in a more relaxed and disarming world its empire would disintegrate.

For the Soviet leaders, therefore, any genuine moderation of the cold war must be a terrifying thing, something that any totalitarian state would approach with supreme hesitation, for it would mean the abandonment of the unifying fears that have helped to hold the Soviet Union together, and the opening of the secret state.

Under the circumstances, what ought we to do? The answer is difficult. Since our estimates of Soviet intentions can be based only on guesswork, we must be prepared for any eventuality. To accomplish this, it seems to me, our policy must be threefold:

1. We must prepare for the worst—that Russia is determined not only to dominate the world but to do it by force.

As long as the Soviet Union refuses to negotiate a meaningful disarmament agreement, authoritative studies like the Gaither Committee and Rockefeller Brothers reports provide a persuasive case for an immediate strengthening of the American military position. They particularly emphasize the need for expanded ground forces, capable of fighting localized wars in any part of the world, with air transport that could bring troops swiftly into action.

In addition, Senator STUART SYMINGTON and others have convincingly underscored the need for a sharp acceleration in the development and production of missiles, in the light of dramatic new Soviet accomplishments in this field.

There are two reasons why the administration and Congress should consider these proposals. On the one hand, we are helpless to do otherwise. Those observers who assert that Soviet reluctance seriously to consider disarmament is proof that the Kremlin plans a war at a time and place of its own choosing may, in fact, be correct. In the absence of better evidence to the contrary, we cannot afford to take chances.

On the other hand, if Soviet reluctance to disarm is based on a wider variety of factors, there is an outside chance that our decision to match the Kremlin missile for missile might help to persuade the Russian leaders that the race has become too expensive and too dangerous, and that a major relaxation of the arms competition would be in their interest.

2. At the same time, we must call the Russians' bluff by demonstrating convincingly to the world that a step-up in our military programing is no more than a logical response to an impasse created by the Kremlin—that we are willing and anxious to negotiate large-scale disarmament.

This suggests the need for an immediate and searching reexamination of the uncertainties in our position. It is common knowledge that there are deep divisions within the administration on what we should do. Although the State Department recently has appeared anxious for genuine negotiations, the Pentagon and the Atomic Energy Commission have been allowed to snipe at this policy in public and to undercut it behind the scenes.

The White House could do much to persuade skeptics of our sincerity, both at home and abroad, by affirming its own vigorous support of our official position at Geneva, and by cracking down on those members of its administration who oppose it.

The Geneva negotiations, moreover, relate to only one small aspect of the arms race. Where would we be if the Soviet Union should suddenly follow the logic of taking an affirmative interest in arms control, and confront us with workable proposals to accomplish what we have said we wanted all along—that is, broad-scale disarmament affecting all weapons and strictly limiting military manpower?

If our Government has a clear, dependable, negotiable policy in regard to such disarmament, no one knows what it is. The fact that the Soviet Union is unlikely to present such proposals does not excuse our own failure to think through the admittedly difficult requirements and to develop a realistic, balanced peace program that we can press steadily and constructively before the world.

To what extent, for instance, has a rampant military technology modified the positions which Harold Stassen took at London in 1957? Is every element in our far-flung base system as important now as it was before the creation of the intercontinental ballistic missiles and nucelar submarines? The political, as well as budgetary, price which we are paying for many of these bases is high. Political pressures for us Yankees to go home are mounting in Morocco and even in Spain. They are certain to grow in Okinawa and elsewhere.

A realistic approach to disarmament must also consider the position of the swaggering Chinese Communist Government in Peiping. Let us refuse official recognition if we will, but let us not assume that we can substantially and permanently ease the danger of nuclear war while disregarding the presence on this planet of 650 million militant Chinese.

3. Finally, we must prepare for the best—the possibility of eventual Russian willingness to disarm.

This will call for a frank appraisal of the effect that any relaxation of the armament race might have on our own economy. It requires the hardest kind of study.

Such a survey might be undertaken by the Joint Economic Committee of the Congress, or by an agency or committee expressly set up for the purpose. Teams of economic experts might be drawn from industry, the labor movement and our universities.

The study should consider, region by region, the extent of unemployment that would result from a cut in arms production, the nature and magnitude of corporate and personal tax reductions that would be made possible, and the anticipated impact of these tax reductions on corporate investment and consumer buying. It should explore the extent to which expanded urban development, housing, hospital, school and roadbuilding programs and oversea investment programs could take up the slack, and the amount and type of unemployment compensation that would be required for the transition period.

Many Americans will recoil in dismay from an open discussion of the economic consequences of disarmament. But, Karl Marx to the contrary, I believe that their fears are grossly inflated. Although I do not suggest that the transition would be an easy one, I believe it could be made much more smoothly than many people think.

In 1945, as a member of the War Production Board, I participated in planning our economic transition from war to peace. Within 18 months, we switched some 45 percent of American industry from wartime production to that of peace, and absorbed nearly 10 million men from our armed services into our civilian economy.

To be sure, we had the advantage then of a heavy backlog of war-accumulated demands for housing, schools, and consumer durables. But today the percentage of our economy devoted to defense production is only one-fifth of what it was in 1945. As for our backlog of unfilled needs, every mayor, city planner, educator, highway engineer, hospital superintendent, and sociologist knows that they are enormous.

Once we decide the military and political steps that we are prepared to take to lessen the present danger of war, and consider frankly the economic implications of this program within our own society, our position before the world will be unassailable.

To what extent, if at all, the Kremlin would be swayed by a new American initiative

and a comprehensive American peace policy that considered the military, political, and economic aspects, no man can say. But this is a fast-moving age, and one of infinite possibilities. Changes within the Soviet Union have been considerable since Stalin's death. The creation of a sound, practical, imaginative American position on which we are prepared to stand is a national responsibility we cannot ignore or postpone.

At best, policymaking in our revolutionary century involves a delicate balancing of risks. Although there is no sure, no safe course, the policy of doing nothing as the arms race mounts in intensity may be the most dangerous of all.

The great powers are now caught up in an awesome, tragic circle. To break out requires both vision and vigor. But the price of running the arms race to its ultimate end is almost certain oblivion. Next time, there will be not one Rome, but two Carthages.

Public Roads Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 7, 1959

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the $31 billion Federal highway construction program is now over 3 years old. By reason of delay and indifference in our executive department, it has made slow progress and is now in danger of stagnation on account of lack of funds.

I include an editorial from the Gary (Ind.) Post-Tribune of May 5, 1959, as follows:

KEEP ROAD PROGRAM GOING

The House Public Works Committee is tackling this week the thorny problem of what to do about the Federal Highway Trust Fund. Unless more money is put into the fund, there won't be any cash for allotment to the States in fiscal 1961. That will mean a serious slowdown in the road construction program that is just getting up full speed.

The problem is a double one. The first part involves the amendment to the highway act sponsored by Senator HARRY F. BYRD, Democrat, of Virginia, which limits road spending to whatever is in the trust fund. Congress suspended operation of the amendment for fiscal 1959 and 1960 as an antirecession measure.

Allotments for fiscal 1961 ordinarily would be made this July, so the States will know how to plan their construction work. But unless some action again is taken to lift the ceiling set by the Byrd amendment, there won't be any money to allocate.

The interstate program should not be slowed. To interrupt what the States are now doing would be a serious blow to all road planning. It would leave many projects in a partly completed status. It is unthinkable that Congress will let that happen. So the Byrd amendment likely will be set aside again.

The next question is where Congress will find the extra cash needed to make the full 1961 allotments. President Eisenhower has asked another penny increase in the Federal gasoline tax. There is much opposition in Congress to doing that; a number of Governors, including Indiana's Harold W. Handley, are protesting such a move.

Motorists already are paying heavily for highway purposes. But all the money they pay in taxes doesn't go for roads. Until it is all used for that purpose, and the total is then found to be inadequate, they should not be asked to pay more.

The excise taxes on cars and trucks now stay in the Treasury's general fund. So one proposal for rescuing the construction program is to assign these to the trust fund. Representative JOSEPH W. BARR, Democrat, of Indiana, has introduced a bill to do it. It would add an estimated $1.5 billion a year and probably suffice to keep the program going for the present—at least until Congress has worked out long-term financing.

From the standpoint of highways, this is a reasonable solution. It would utilize money taken from the motorists; it would stop a major diversion of highway money to other purposes.

It would leave the general fund short $1.5 billion, of course. It would mean either deficit financing to that extent—or else an equivalent trimming down by Congress on its spending otherwise. If it makes an intelligent search for it, Congress can find that much water in the domestic spending requests.

How Reciprocal Is Reciprocal Trade?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 27, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a very interesting address on reciprocal trade which was given by Mr. Richard I. Goodrich, president of the Boston Wool Trade Association, on the occasion of the World Trade Day in Boston, April 16, 1959:

HOW RECIPROCAL IS RECIPROCAL TRADE?

In any discussion of foreign trade, we must take into consideration the affect of such trade on our own American industries. While reciprocal is much desired—nevertheless oftentimes it is not reciprocal from industry's point of view.

There are those who advocate an ever-increasing free-trade policy for the United States. Unfortunately, the economic experience of many of these advocates is more theoretical than practical. There is one very important factor the proponents of this theory overlook—that is the great disparity between the wage rates paid by American industry and those paid in foreign countries for similar work.

I am familiar with the problems of the woolen and worsted industry of the United States and the impact on this industry by imports from foreign countries. It is a fact that our domestic woolen and worsted mills manufacture as fine and as beautiful fabrics as can be made anywhere in the world. However, the factor which makes our mills less competitive with other countries is this great disparity between wages here and abroad. This difference in wages varies from about 15 cents an hour paid the Japanese textile worker to 35 to 50 cents an hour paid on the continent and in Great Britain, to our own average of about $1.65 an hour.

One might compare this situation to a group of runners of equal ability in a race in which one has to give substantial handicaps to the others. It is perfectly obvious that, running his best, he cannot overcome the handicaps against runners of equal ability.

The textile industry has a high ratio of labor to total cost, which gives a distinct advantage to any country having a low wage scale.

The economy of the United States is based upon a high wage scale; the highest in the world. If this standard is to be maintained and our workers to have full employment, we must protect our industries from excessive imports from low-wage scale countries.

Naturally, we do not wish to deprive any country of a market for their exportable products, but if we are to maintain a strong American industry, we must avoid an excess of these imports. The best way to do this is with country-by-country quotas—and these quotas applied against categories of products.

Japan, the lowest wage-scale country in this picture is equipped with the finest textile machinery obtainable and can produce as fine and as well-made fabrics as produced in our country. One element—wage rates, is heavily weighted in their favor—and if there were no restrictions they could flood this country with desirable and salable fabrics at extremely low prices. Therefore, the only protection is a quantity quota based on various categories of fabrics.

It is ironic that Great Britain, with about a 50 cent an hour wage scale, is complaining that Japan, with a 15 cent an hour wage scale, is taking over a large part of Great Britain's share of the American textile market. Where does this leave the American mills with $1.65 per hour wage scale?

The great foreign trade done by this country in days gone by is used as an example of American initiative and self-reliance. We must bear in mind that at that time our country was undeveloped, our manufacturing capacity was not capable of filling the demands of the people, and many things imported were not produced in this country. Today we have adequate manufacturing capacity for most of our requirements * * * many imports, therefore, are at the expense of our domestic products.

What is true of the textile industry is also being experienced by the steel, automobile, watch, bicycle, sewing machine, leather, and other industries. In a recent article, Edson B. Smith comments that up to within a year, or two, a foreign-made automobile was a curiosity. Last year some 375,000 of them were sold in the United States, and this year it is probable that at least 10 percent of the cars sold in this country will be of foreign manufacture.

The steel industry is also feeling the effect of this situation. While steel imports measured in dollars do not amount to much today relative to all the steel produced in the United States—the recent trend is that increasing amounts are coming into the country. There are many kinds of steel which can be bought in Germany, for example, and delivered to inland points in this country at prices below the cost of manufacture in these centers. There are very few articles of commerce today which cannot be produced more cheaply elsewhere in the world than in the United States.

Many successful business concerns make a survey from time to time to determine:

1. The internal position, effectiveness and efficiency of their operation.

2. If they are successfully meeting competition in their own industry.

3. The position of their industry in the national economy—and whether it is expanding or contracting.

Domestic industry is protected by the tariff act of 1930. At that time there was no great disparity between wage levels in

the United States and other countries throughout the world—at least not nearly as great a difference as exists today.

It is my suggestion that the Tariff Commission make a survey of the entire tariff structure, based on the economic realities of today. For American industry to be protected by a tariff put into effect nearly 30 years ago is completely unrealistic.

Since that time the world has gone through a Second World War, with the resultant upheavals in the economies of all the countries of the world. The entire world economic structure has been changed by American economy and military aid programs, costing billions of dollars of the taxpayers' money. We are spending our vast resources so that others of the free world may become economically sound and thus resist the onslaught of communistic pressure. To ask American industry to suffer from excessive competition from these same countries is inflicting a burden beyond their ability to carry for long.

It is my suggestion that since there is such a great disparity in wage rates between countries competing for our markets against our domestic mills, that the tariff be readjustde to take into consideration this disparity in wage rates. This would be a fair and equitable basis for assessing tariffs on imported products—and would enable our mills and workers to compete on a fair basis with the rest of the free world.

In recent years, Congress has turned over to the President more and more tariffmaking powers and privileges. The renewal of the reciprocal trade agreement of 1958 has given the President more power than ever before over the fixing of tariffs and the conduct of foreign trade.

Congress should reassure its authority, under the Constitution, to regulate foreign trade and to fix tariffs and duties. The Tariff Commission has also alocated to the President tariff matters which, properly, should be determined by the Commission itself.

Another unfair competitive practice faced by American industry in the matter of internal grants, or bounties, paid to an industry in a foreign country—which enables that industry to export products at below production costs and below competitive prices, thereby damaging the economy of the country to which these exports are made.

Section 303 of the Tariff Act of 1930 clearly states that if a grant, or bounty, by any means is paid to an industry in a foreign country, then a countervailing duty shall be assessed to the same amount of that product exported to this country. A case in point is the countervailing duty recently removed by the Treasury Department from wool tops manufactured in Uruguay for export to the United States. This, despite the fact that it was clearly demonstrated that a grant, or bounty, was being paid to he Uruguayan wool top manufacturers. It was also brought out that a grant, or bounty, was being paid on canned meats on which no countervailing duty has yet been assessed. This action by the Treasury Department could prove very damaging to the American industries concerned—and they should have the protection of the countervailing duty provided by law.

We are extremely sympathetic to the attempt of the Uruguayan government to industrialize its country—but there must be other legal means under the point 4 program to help this country without jeopardizing the condition of a domestic industry which is already suffering from severe foreign competition. On the other hand, this same country—and many others throughout the world—have very strict import control policies.

Imports of commodities and manufactured products are either barred altogether, or are closely controlled by import licenses, systems of multiple exchange rates, refusing of dollar credits and even restrictive lists of countries with whom an importer is permitted to trade—all designed to protect the industries and commodities of these countries from competition from other nations.

In the face of this, the foreign trade policy of the United States appears most liberal.

Mr. Khrushchev has stated that an economic war is being waged between communism and the free world, and it is his avowed intention to won this war. The United States, through its program of economic and military aid—paid for by American industry and American taxpayers—is carrying a heavy burden throughout the free world in order to circumvent this intention on the part of the Communists. In order to do this, we must maintain a strong internal economy.

The other day I asked a textile manufacturer what would happen to him if he posted a notice on his mill door saying that all of his present help were to be discharged at the end of the week, as he was importing an equal number of Japanese workers to operate his mill, and was paying them the same wages they received in Japan. He answered that not only the workers in his plant, but the bankers and businessmen of his town would probably string him up to the nearest telephone pole—and rightly so. This is in effect what is going on with the excessive importation of Japanese textiles, as every yard of cloth, every ton of steel and every foreign car imported represents hours of foreign labor employed and hours of domestic labor lost.

It is an often disregarded fact that adequate, realistic tariffs protect the jobs and wage scale of the American worker as well as the industries.

As I have said before, we should not bar any free country from the right to trade in the United States—as a healthy foreign trade is one of the best ways to maintain friendly relations with another country. However, this trade should not be so excessive as to be a detriment to American industry. Proper protection must be given American industry to prevent an excessive amount of destructive imports, from industry's point of view, from coming into the country. It is only by keeping American industry strong and ever growing that we can possibly hope to win the economic war so openly being waged by the Communist world.

An Inspiring Teacher

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 7, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Record of May 4, 1959, which comments on the passing of Marion Augusta Sturdevant, who was a member of the faculty of the Wilkes-Barre public schools and Wyoming Seminary for 40 years.

AN INSPIRING TEACHER

During her 40 years as a member of the faculty of Wilkes-Barre public schools and subsequently on the staff of Wyoming Seminary, Marion Augusta Sturdevant was held in high esteem as a teacher and counselor. Her service to several generations of pupils was far reaching. Her influence was deep and lasting in the educational world. Her service to the community was impressive and will be long remembered with appreciation and gratitude.

It would be difficult to find any area in Wilkes-Barre without former pupils of Miss Sturdevant and an attending conviction that she was an inspiring member of the faculties on which she served. She was a teacher par excellence.

When Miss Sturdevant was admitted to General Hospital last week it was a former pupil, Dr. Harold Harris, who had sent her there. The two policemen, Chester Klosowski and Joseph Zelinski, who lifted her into the waiting ambulance, are also former pupils. So it was with the girl who checked her into the hospital, and the occupant of the room next to hers. And so it was also throughout her daily living. Near her always were those to whom she had imparted learning.

Israel and Its Offer of Opportunity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. CARLTON LOSER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 7, 1959

Mr. LOSER. Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to place in the RECORD two very fine articles on Israel written by the eminent editor of the Nashville Tennessean, Mr. Coleman Harwell, during his recent trip to that country.

These articles on the conditions in Israel and the opportunities offered by that country will interest all Members of Congress. They follow:

CAN ISRAEL STAND ON ITS OWN FEET?

(By Coleman A. Harwell)

TEL AVIV, ISRAEL.—There was a popular advertising slogan a few years ago saying, "Even your best friends won't tell you."

That obviously does not apply in foreign relations. Especially in money matters.

Israel is without doubt one of America's best friends. You see and hear that on every hand. But when word reached here a few days ago via Israel News Service from Washington that U.S. grants-in-aid (gifts) to Israel were expected to be cut this year, a howl went up.

All the newspapers here and in Jerusalem protested. Their editorials varied, but all stressed the U.S. aid going their neighbor Arab States.

MIGHTILY RILED

A pleasing aspect was that most papers noted with gratitude the great assistance of the overall U.S. aid program and the trend now to loans in place of gifts, which some welcomed as a good sign. It was the Arab aid that riled them mightily.

A fairly typical comment follows:

"The State Department has an original method of bestowing compliments on Israel * * * It claims that Israel is strong and its army is among the best in the Middle East and therefore needs no additional arms. At the same time the State Department does not save arms from the Arab countries, which are filling their stores from all sides, both from the West and the East * * *

"We are grateful to the U.S. Government for the generous aid it has extended us * * * On the other hand, we insist the United States make no attempt to sacrifice Israel's vital interests, entertaining the illusion this is the way to appease the Arabs.

"Washington's stand at the time of the Sinai campaign * * * its refusal to supply arms to Israel while imploring the Arabs to receive arms; its approach in the U.N. to our complaints against the Arabs; its indifference to Nasser's violation of international law by refusing our ships passage through the Suez canal * * * All cannot be made good even if the United States decides, under pressure of public opinion, to continue the aid to Israel another year or two."—From Herut, spokesman for the conservative Herut (Party.)

Another editorial which gave a contrasting viewpoint appeared in Haboker, spokesman for the general Zionist organization. It thus may represent an external as well as internal view.

It said:

"Mr. Dulles said (3 years ago) that it was difficult for him to resist the constant Arab pressure * * * He took the first step by reducing the grant to Israel from $70 million to $15 million, and set it at $7.5 million for the current year (1959). It seems that Mr. Dulles' assistants have completely given in to the Arab pressure * * * Thus, the stoppage of the grant to Israel should be regarded as a purely political act, and it certainly constitutes a part of the U.S. appeasement policy toward the Arabs.

"Nevertheless, from an economic standpoint, one should not unduly regret the termination of the U.S. grant because all the foreign assistance and grants so lavishly extended have merely distorted the real picture of our situation, encouraged us to live beyond our means and to run our economy at the expense of others.

"The sooner we stand on our own feet, the sooner we shall make really satisfactory progress. If the termination of the U.S. grant-in-aid can remind us of this fact, its effect will have been positive indeed."

This reasonable analysis may reflect an American viewpoint to some extent but it also reflects an Israeli attitude often met. Those sharing this view know that Israel will always be a question mark until she stands on her own feet. They are confident that, with her delicious citrus, her potash and phosphate, alert tourism, increasing industry and development of the vast Negev (Moses wilderness), she can be independent.

U.S. EXPLANATION

It was gratifying to note the reception given by the Israeli press to an analysis of U.S. aid released by U.S. Information Service the day after these complaints. It was given solid news play. It contained these facts:

Grants-in-aid, from which Israel received big gifts earlier, have been steadily decreasing in favor of loans and assistance of technical experts. Now agricultural loans are a big item. In this, the United States sells food to the Israeli Government which pays with its own money in Israel. Then the United States loans this money for projects in Israel on very liberal terms. Thus Israel benefits doubly.

Assistance to Israel for 1959 and aid of all kind since it started in 1949 follow:

[In millions of dollars]

	For 1959	Total since 1949
Grants-in-aid	7.5	248.7
Mutual security (military)	None	42.5
Development loans	5.0	20.0
Agricultural loans	38.3	130.9
Export-Import Bank loans	None	[1] 152.9
Technical co-op aid	1.6	12.9
Total	52.4	614.2

[1] Israel has made substantial repayments on this.

It is thus apparent that U.S. aid does continue but on an increasingly business basis. This seems to me to make sense. We're better off making reasonable decisions, giving aid where essential, loans when justified, and relying on logic to prevail in the end.

ISRAEL TODAY OFFERS DARING OPPORTUNITY

(By Coleman Harwell)

TEL AVIV, ISRAEL.—Why should a brilliant young man with two college degrees go into the desert and train horses?

His family, who expected him to turn to a profession in the city, are disappointed. But they are proud of him, too.

Why wouldn't a young man in a land of pioneers be inspired by the example of his nation's chief official who is one of its great heroes? Every weekend and holiday when he can do so, determined bushy-haired David Ben-Gurion, Prime Minister of Israel, goes to a primitive settlement in the Negev and serves as a shepherd.

IT'S NO STUNT

This is no stunt. This is Ben-Gurion's home and his way of life. He is confident that his kibbutz (communal village) will help make this southern area bloom when irrigation reaches it. This is expected in 1961.

The Negev is the wilderness in which Moses and the children of Israel wandered for 40 years. It seems more desolate now than in the pages of the Bible. But Ben-Gurion has confidence, and the young man raising horses in his kibbutz is confident. So are the people in the far south city of Elat who say that irrigation added to the beaches of the Red Sea will combine to make Elat a great winter resort, and also a great port with trade flowing in from Africa and many other places.

When you see what has already been done in this land you hesitate to doubt any claims made for it. We visited a kibbutz near Nazareth. It is one of the most prosperous ones, mainly agricultural.

Eighty-five thousand of Israel's two million people live in such communities. They have played an important role in the country's development, but the modern cities and towns are attracting the majority of young people and newcomers today. There is a challenge and opportunity everywhere.

MEETING NICE PEOPLE

Notes on the go: Best part of traveling is always people, especially homefolks. First, in Greece, Dwight Freshley and wife. He's Vanderbilt speech professor on leave; has Fulbright fellowship to teach in American-financed Athens College * * * Here in Tel Aviv, Joseph Macpherson, Jr., Vandy M.A. in literature, teaching U.S. history and English at French College des Freres and Tabeetha School. His pupils (in U.S. history) include children of diplomats from Communist countries. He'll return home after summer European tour.

At Rotary in Larissa, in central Greece, first man I met was Ithan Papaioannon, agricultural extension man who attended Rotary in Nashville, Clarksville, Hopkinsville and Knoxville on 1957 tour * * * Dmitri Papaefstrotion, American Express Athens manager, among first people we met at press reception in Athens. Sent regards to the Ralph Owens, Nashville, and especially daughter Melinda, who visited there last summer * * * At Jerusalem Rotary sat next to physicist who visited Oak Ridge; at Tel Aviv Rotary sat next to man who spoke in Nashville on behalf of Israeli freedom army in 1949, sent regards to Mortimer May.

Pride stirred on visit to handsome, modern Zionist of America Building here on seeing names of Nashvillians Mortimer May and Joseph Werthan on appreciation plaque * * * At Tel Aviv Rotary met ex-president of Nazareth Club, Rev. Dwight L. Baker, who heads Southern Baptist Mission of 70 Arabs. Lives there with wife, four children. Sends regards to Dr. James L. Sullivan, at Nashville headquarters, who visited here 2 years ago * * * Participating in our seminar on legal problems of journalism at Tel Aviv University was District Judge Michael Harpazi, who sent regards to sister, Mrs. Gustav Dobrin, 160 Kenner Avenue, Nashville.

FRIENDS AND FOES

Israel is making an apparently smart move to do business, win friends in Africa. Has a ship leased to new Ghanda nation; is shipping manufactured products there and to other lands encircling Arabs in Dark Continent.

Meanwhile, hope continues—though not strong—that Arabs will one day soon make peace with Israel. What an economic boom that would be. America should do everything possible to push this. The results would be of tremendous value.

Organization and Operation of the Small Business Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 7, 1959

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

ORGANIZATION AND OPERATION OF THE SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Representative JOE L. EVINS, Democrat of Tennessee, chairman, Subcommittee No. 1, House Small Business Committee, announced today that hearings on the operations of the Small Business Administration will be held in room 304, House Office Building, Washington, D.C. The hearings will begin at 10 a.m. on Monday, May 11 and continue through May 13.

Hon. Wendell B. Barnes, Administrator of the Small Business Administration, will appear at 10 a.m. on Monday. Other SBA officials will testify subsequently during the hearings. The subcommittee also will receive testimony from representatives of companies that have formed or attempted to form small business investment companies. In addition, witnesses representing small business concerns that have sought financial assistance from the agency will be heard.

Representative EVINS stated that all of the operations and activities of the Small Business Administration will be reviewed during these hearings. Although emphasis will be placed upon the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, the subcommittee will inquire into the loan policies of the financial assistance programs as well as the procurement and technical assistance activities of the agency.

Representative EVINS added: "We have had called to our attention considerable criticism of certain aspects of the loan programs of SBA—criticisms concerning collateral requirements, concerning premature discouragement of applicants, and criticism concerning the refusal to make loans to certain classes of small business that need help under the act but, because of administration rulings or limitations appearing in the act itself, the help is not forthcoming. For instance, in the latter field it appears that producers of poultry, eggs, hogs, milk, etc., generally are not eligible for SBA loans; neither can they obtain financial assistance from the Farmers Home Administration, the Production Credit Association or other lending institutions because of the commercial aspects of their operations or for other rea-

sons. The subcommittee expects to go into these matters fully.

"On the other hand," Representative EVINS commented, "we have heard favorable reports concerning the activities of the Small Business Administration and these point out that the agency has been of great help to the small business community. The hearings are for the purpose of studying, with the cooperation of the Small Business Administration, various problems which have developed under the acts. The subcommittee is entering into these hearings with an intense desire to be of the greatest benefit possible to the small business economy of the Nation."

Other members of the subcommittee are the Honorable JAMES ROOSEVELT, Democrat, of California; Hon. CHARLES H. BROWN, Democrat, of Missouri; Hon. ARCH A. MOORE, JR., Republican, of West Virginia; and Hon. WILLIAM H. AVERY, Republican of Kansas.

List of witnesses tentatively scheduled to appear before Subcommittee No. 1 of the House Select Committee on Small Business at the hearings scheduled for May 11, 12, and 13:

Monday, May 11, 1959: Hon. Wendell B. Barnes, Administrator, Small Business Administration; Mr. Duncan H. Read, Deputy Administrator for the Industrial Division, Small Business Administration; Mr. Ralph Farnum, Acting Director of Investment Division, Small Business Administration; Mr. Hugh M. Fraser, president, The Citizens and Southern Small Business Investment Co., Atlanta, Ga.

Tuesday, May 12, 1959: Mr. Thomas Grant, Jr., president, National Association of Small Business Investment Companies; Mr. Thomas Graham, the Bankers Bond, Inc., Louisville, Ky.; Mr. Howard D. Williams, past president, Smaller Business Association of New England, Inc., North Grafton, Mass.; Mr. Alan K. Ruvelson, president, First Midwest Small Business Investment Co., Minneapolis, Minn. Open: SBA officials on call for Tuesday afternoon, if necessary. Also Mr. Kinne and Mr. Lilly, who are scheduled for Wednesday, will most probably be available for Tuesday afternoon if needed.

Wednesday, May 13, 1959 (10 a.m.): Hon. Edward H. Gadsby; Hon. Albert C. Kelly, Deputy Administrator, Finance Division of SBA, Small Business Administration; Mr. Gary E. Lilly, Des Moines, Iowa; Hon. Donald A. Hipkins, Deputy Administrator for Procurement and Technical Assistance, Small Business Administration; Dr. Milford L. White, Office of Management and Research, Assistance, Small Business Administration; Mr. Richard Kinne, industrial director, Missouri Resources and Development Commission, Jefferson City, Mo.

Stopping the "Anti-Benson" Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANCHER NELSEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 7, 1959

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the follow editorial from the Christian Science Monitor dated Saturday, May 2, 1959, and editorial from the Cincinnati Enquirer dated May 5, 1959, dealing with the Presidential veto of the rural electrification bill:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, May 2, 1959]

STOPPING THE "ANTI-BENSON" BILL

By the narrow margin of four votes the House refused to go along with the Senate and has upheld the President's 138th veto, only four of which have even been challenged in a congressional vote.

Considered in isolation, this bill to restore the loan-making authority of the Rural Electrification Administration to its independent status of 20 years ago might not seem so likely to provoke a presidential veto as some other measures he protested but signed. His disapproval can hardly have been merely on economy grounds. In his veto message he points with some pride to the fact that the REA in the last 6 years has loaned almost half as much money as it did in the previous 17½.

That the bill violated sound administrative practice in taking not just an agency but one selected function of an agency out of the direct line of authority and responsibility from the top to the bottom of a department, is a good reason for a veto. But in this instance it does not provide the whole explanation.

The Department within which the REA lies is the Department of Agriculture. And its head is Ezra Taft Benson whose policies have been under fire from the farm bloc ever since the change in administrations in 1953, and whom President Eisenhower has sturdily supported throughout. This bill conspicuously was intended to do more than simply move the REA position on the organizational chart.

These factors, it seems evident, explain not only the President's risking an overriding but also the diligence of both parties in Congress to rally every vote and to hold party lines.

Keeping the President's remarkable 6-year record unbroken is dramatic and interesting. Maintaining sound organizational practice and upholding Mr. Benson's general approach to the farm problem is, in our judgment, gratifying.

[From the Cincinnati Enquirer, May 5, 1959]

VETOES AND THE BUDGET

The President has preserved intact his 6-year record of never having had a veto overridden by Congress. That's a significant achievement for a Republican President who will probably have to veto many more bills, passed by an overwhelmingly Democratic Congress in his drive for a balanced budget.

True, the measure on which the House Democrats failed by four votes to override had nothing to do with spending or the budget. It was a partisan move to deprive Agriculture Secretary Ezra Taft Benson of his power to pass on rural electrification and telephone loans. Yet it was important for several reasons.

Secretary Benson is regarded as fair game not only by Democrats in both Houses but by a number of farmstate Republicans as well. The effort to override the veto caused a big ballot—426 votes. But when the showdown came, only 6 Republicans voted against the President, while 142 stood with him. On the other side of the House, 274 Democrats voted to override, but the 4 who sided with the administration were enough to sustain the veto.

In other words, when the showdown came Republican Party discipline in the House proved stronger than Democratic. In the weeks and months ahead, with a shower of spending measures in the congressional hopper and with fears of more inflation sweeping like a prairie wind over the land, the President will need that discipline—and the prestige of having behind him a 6-year total of 138 sustained vetoes.

Independent Bankers' Credo for 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 7, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, there was published in the American Banker of April 29, 1959, a credo for 1959 on behalf of more than 10,000 American independent banks.

I believe that few, if any, of our colleagues will dissent from the general principles enunciated in this fine statement. Obviously not all of us will agree with the methods by which laudable ends are sought.

For instance, their desire to attain equality of taxation is a fine and important goal to be sought. I hope that most of our colleagues will agree with me that you do not attain equality or equity by perpetuating inequity. I believe that the way to attack the inequity created by double taxation of earnings is to fight for the removal of the double taxation, not to imbed that bad principle in our law by urging double taxation of earnings on those who are now free from it.

What the independent bankers and so many others refer to as tax exemption of mutuals and cooperatives is not tax exemption but merely single taxation on earnings. That sound principle is what these people should stand and fight for. Our democratic way of life should not countenance taxing earnings before distribution and taxing them again upon distribution.

If the small business man of our country is the backbone of our free enterprise economy, then the independent banker is the backbone of our dual banking system. The Congress must be ever alert to maintaining that status.

I commend to the attention of our colleagues their credo, which follows:

INDEPENDENT BANKERS CREDO FOR 1959

As representatives of America's more than 10,000 independent banks:

We believe in the principle of independence, our most precious American heritage.

Independence of the Nation.

Independence of the State and of the community, within their proper spheres and in our American tradition of States' rights and home rule.

Independence of the individual within the law, to stand up for and to speak what he believes.

And in banking: We believe in the independent bank, an American institution, dedicated to the financial independence of its customers and their community

For these principles we stand together with all other independent bankers. We know that eternal vigilance is ever the price of liberty and in union there is strength. We view with alarm trends, which conflict with

independent banking, and we pledge resistance to every such trend.

Trends toward branch banking, subsidized competition by unfairly tax-exempted institutions, and toward holding company expansion are hurtful to the independent bank, and unhealthful to the independence of the American community. This we believe.

We point with pride to the fact that in thousands of American cities, towns, and villiages, from one end of the Nation to the other, independent banks serve and serve well.

By actual count, more than 10,000 purely local unit banks have survived wars, cycles of prosperity and depression, changes in economic climate and readjustments in management patterns. They have demonstrated the strength that is in the independent bank. They have earned the right to survive and to serve, in generations to come, American business, particularly small business, the American family, and the American community.

Home owned and home managed, directed by men of affairs of its own special area, the independent bank is responsive to local needs in a way that is impossible for a branch bank or holding company unit where the ownership is absentee and the central interest in some distant city.

Each independent bank plays a vital role, safeguarding, generating, and mobilizing local wealth, nurturing independent business and cultivating community development, community loyalty and community pride. Its own independence is a vital asset to the self-generating progress of its home area.

We recall that in the 1930's, when the strength of American banks was tested as never before, upward of 10,000 unit banks in their thousands of American towns and cities were not found wanting. They survived, a clear and unmistakable rebuttal of the wretched canard that "only big banks can be strong banks."

Let it be remembered also that the national banking structure did not topple into the bank holiday of 1933, bringing U.S. abandonment of the gold standard, until the occurrence of a series of big bank failures, many of them with branches, or holding company controlled.

Let it be recalled moreover the Federal and State banking authorities strained every resource to keep big banks open, while permitting hundreds of small banks to be closed by their directors for lack of any sort of aid. We note in passing that the Federal Deposit Insurance Corp. has changed all this. But we cannot forget that in the final toll of the depression, the record reveals that 33 banks, operating 700 branches, with some $2.2 billion in assets, had failed, never to be reopened.

If statistics show that there were more small bank closings, it was simply because there were more such banks. A bank can be strong or weak, regardless of size.

More than 10,000 independent local banks proved their inherent soundness in the 1930's. Today each such bank is a pillar of strength in its local community.

And let it be further remembered that a hundred years ago, it was the failure of branch banking systems in the panic of 1857 which caused our National and State banking systems thereafter to be set up on a unit banking basis.

Also that Britain's abandonment of the gold standard in 1931 followed the international run on her big branch banks and a failure of one of the English international banks.

We believe in States rights, the dual banking system, and in correspondent banking.

We believe that Federal power should never override State banking independence. The principle of restricting national bank branches to the limits set by State law for State banks must not be changed.

Group banking and holding company banking is branch banking, whatever its local guise. All such chain banking must, therefore, be restricted to the same limits as branch banking within each State.

We pledge our efforts for amendment of the Holding Company Act of 1956 to close this loophole.

We insist that every branch or holding company development be carefully scrutinized for strict adherence to the spirit of our branch banking restrictions. We hold to our long-standing conviction that the holding company device has usually served for evading restrictions placed by State and Federal law on branch banking, and insist that it should not be permitted to add to the complexity of our banking structure.

Generally, we admit, the exponents of multiple banking in the United States are bankers whose soundness and sincerity are above question.

However, branch bank expansion and holding company operations are tempting tools for ambitious men to use for financial self-aggrandizement. We must ever be alert against the splendid financiering about which our first Comptroller of the Currency warned in 1863, and which was so great a source of weakness in our banking system in the late 1920's and early 1930's. The administrators of our branch banking laws and of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 have a heavy responsibility to prevent this sort of abuse from recurring.

Finally we believe there must be no deviation from the cardinal banking principle that banks should be banks.

Neither by the holding company device, nor by any other circumvention, should an ownership or other interest in nonbanking businesses be permitted to impair or compromise the duty of the banker to be the impartial arbiter of the credit use and safekeeping of his community's funds.

We congratulate and compliment the Congress of the United States and the Governors of the Federal Reserve System on their faithful regard for this principle in the discharge of their administrative duties.

The matter of tax-exempted competition concerns every independent bank. It may have been good public policy once upon a time to foster small cooperatives and associations with tax exemption. But, as multi-million-dollar institutions and with multi-billion-dollar system totals, these competitors for the business and and savings of the public, which banks are chartered to serve, have outgrown the need for Federal paternalism. We believe tax exemptions represent an unwarranted and unfair subsidy. As tax-paying American enterprises, independent banks protest the continuation of such tax exemptions as a growing unhealthy situation, both for the U.S. Treasury and for private enterprise.

We believe that in independence there is national strength.

The strength and the solidarity of the independent banks of America was demonstrated in the long and finally successful fight for enactment of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956.

It has been demonstrated anew this year. Powerful branch banking expansion drives have been rebuffed in Missouri, Illinois, Georgia, New York, and other States. We pledge continuance of our defense of independent banking, and by our faith in the National fronts.

This is our credo.

By the faith that is in us in American independent unit banking on both the State and role which it plays in American economy, we look forward to the challenge of the future confidently.

As independent banks, standing together we defend that faith to our utmost.

Famed Ellis Island Should Be Kept as a Symbol and a Gateway as Proposed by the American Council of Learned Societies

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 7, 1959

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, businessmen and scholars have joined in an effort to turn historic Ellis Island into an international training center for Americans assigned abroad.

This proposal is backed by Dr. Frederick Burkhardt, president of the American Council of Learned Societies.

The Washington (D.C.) Post and Times Herald endorses the proposal in a fine editorial and urges that Ellis Island become a new gateway of opportunity for the world.

Why the haste in dismantling this great symbol of American's welcome to the peoples of all lands and all races?

The plan of the General Services Administration to put famed Ellis Island on the auction block smacks of the discriminatory and racist restrictions contained in the present Immigration and Nationality Act.

Ellis Island stands for freedom.

The General Services Administration should postpone for at least 60 days the sale which it has scheduled for May 8, 1959.

I include here an editorial and an article from the Washington Post and Times Herald on this subject for the information of my colleagues:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald, May 7, 1959]

A GATEWAY AGAIN

Wouldn't it be a splended idea to use Ellis Island as a training center for American executives who are going overseas to work? The suggestion is certainly arresting, but it will come to nothing unless Franklin G. Floete, chief of the General Services Administration, decides against selling the island to a private bidder. This Friday the place which served as a gateway for millions of immigrants may be sold to a Yonkers businessman who plans to turn the island into an amusement park. The reason why the island was placed on the auction block is that no public purpose was found for its use.

At the last minute, William M. Brennan, a New York management consultant, came up with the idea of establishing a nonprofit training center on the island for use by the thousands of businessmen who go abroad each year. Mr. Brennan's plan has so far won some respectable support, but he figures he needs about 60 more days to raise the needed money. The estimate is that only $500,000 will be required as an initial outlay because the condition of the buildings on the island is good. Surely this proposal deserves a fair hearing. Wouldn't it me possible to forestall the sale on Friday in the hopes that Ellis Island might become a new gateway of opportunity for the world?

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald, May 7, 1959]

ELLIS ISLAND SOUGHT AS TRAINING CENTER

(By Eve Edstrom)

Businessmen and scholars have joined in an effort to turn historic Ellis Island into an international training center for Americans assigned abroad.

But whether the project dies aborning hinges on a decision which General Services Administrator Franklin Floete must make by 5 p.m. Friday.

If GSA accepts the high bid for the 27-acre former immigration center, it will be developed commercially as a pleasure resort.

But if GSA rejects all bids, the island has an excellent chance of becoming a nonprofit international institute where Americans employees and their families would receive intensive training prior to leaving for foreign assignments.

Several American corporations have indicated their interest in the cultural institute plan as championed by William M. Brennan, New York management consultant and Dr. Frederick Burkhardt, president of the American Council of Learned Societies.

SCHOOL FOR 300

Under their proposals, Ellis Island would provide a school for about 300 students, hotel quarters for 600 to 800 people, apartments for faculty and staff families, and space for permanent trade and cultural exhibits.

The businessmen-students would study languages and foreign cultures. Instruction would be carried on 8 to 10 hours daily, 6 days a week for 2 to 4 months. The tuition fee of $50 a day would be paid by the company employing the students.

Wives would be urged to attend classes with their husbands as guests of the institute. Children would receive regular schooling as well as oversea orientation and language instruction.

The institute, it is emphasized, would be organized in such a way as to teach not just languages but total communication. This would be done on a 24-hour basis, with families living the life of the country of their assignment. Faculty members would be supplemented by tutors who are natives of the foreign country and who are familiar with its business practices.

None of the 35 buildings on the island would be demolished. They would be remodeled at an estimated cost of $500,000. Long-range plans call for a 5-year $6 million modernization program which would include a bridge to span the 900 yards between the island and the Jersey City shore.

Backers of the International Institute asked GSA to defer consideration of bids for 60 days so they could draft firm plans for its operation and financing. If such plans met with the approval of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Ellis Island then could be transferred on a conditional basis to the nonprofit group at no cost.

But when GSA offered the land for sale, HEW had received no applications for its use for health or education purposes. Ellis Island, therefore, was offered for sale, and bidders on the property, it is understood, do not want action on their bids deferred.

The highest bid of $671,000 was submitted by Atlas Buffalo, Inc., of Yonkers, N.Y., headed by Sol G. Atlas. His announced plans are to construct a resort area on the island.

APPRAISED AT $6 MILLION

Atlas previously had bid $201,000 for the island, but the bid was rejected as too low for the property, which, with its buildings, is appraised at more than $6 million.

Because the island has gone begging since it was closed 4½ years ago, GSA indicated last January it would accept in the neighborhood of $800,000 from the right buyer.

GSA's decision on disposal of the island will not be based entirely on the highest bid. Consideration also will be given to the proposed use of the island.

The proposal for turning the island into an international training institute currently is before HEW Secretary Arthur S. Flemming, who is expected to indicate his Department's interest in the project to GSA officials by Friday.

National Character of the Chinese People: It Is Easier To Conquer China Than To Govern It—Chinese Strength Resides in Their Weakness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 7, 1959

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a remarkable article on the character of the Chinese people, appearing in the New Leader of March 30, 1959. So often people who write about the Chinese don't understand them. Chinese who understand themselves do not easily write about themselves. To write too revealingly of deepest attitudes would be to depart from the attitudes being described. It is only very rarely that one finds a Chinese who is both sufficiently Chinese and sufficiently Western to see the importance of describing or explaining for the West the basic ideas and values of the Chinese as a race, and has the capacity to make the ideas and values understandable to westerners—insofar as they can be articulated in English.

The author of this article is Mr. Valentin Chu, born and educated in China. From V–J Day until 1949 he was a senior reporter for the China Press, an independent English-language daily in Shanghai. For the next 7 years he was Time-Life correspondent in Hong Kong where he specialized in analysis of Chinese Communist documents and publications and interviewed more than 500 refugees from the Communist mainland. Since 1956 Mr. Chu has served on Time's editorial staff in New York.

The article follows:

CHINESE NATIONAL CHARACTER

(By Valentin Chu)

We Chinese have for centuries been a source of unintentional bafflement to the rest of the world. Our bland looks and piquant epigrams, our disastrous famines and rich cultural heritage, our elegant cuisine and objets d'art, our strange tongues and stranger calligraphy, our sages, mandarins, war lords, peasants, rickshaw coolies, and slit-gowned women—all these and many other such aspects have conjured up for the Western eye an extraordinarily complex and mystifying picture. So much so that it has long been a popular sport in the West to try to describe, analyze, or just speculate about China and its enigmatic people.

This was fun for everyone concerned as long as it remained a parlor game. But since the Communist takeover in China the pastime has been taken up in earnest by pundits and politicians in quest of solutions to international problems—and the game has got out of hand.

The old smugness about China has disappeared from the Western consciousness. Its place has been taken by a growing awareness that what the inscrutable Chinese does behind his closed door may affect far more than the Westerner's laundry. This awareness, coupled with a misjudgment of the Chinese mind, has created such a political neurosis that every time someone in Peiping sneezes experts around the world stop short to analyze whether he has sneezed in a Chinese or a Russian accent.

Unhappily, eagerness to know is not identical with ability to understand. Nine years after Mao Tse-tung and his comrades seized power most of the world is still debating Peiping's Marxist orthodoxy, its strength, popularity, and even morality. It is said to note that this decade-old cataclysmic convulsion, involving a quarter of the world's population, should remain for the outside world a puzzle rather than a stark fact.

The key to the puzzle is what I should call "the Chinese in us." Whether we Chinese have a knack of misleading others or whether others have a knack of misreading Chinese behavior, the result is the same.

Years ago, many scoffed at a possible marriage between communism and the Chinese mind. Yet today we are faced with the reality of Red China. It would seem that the Chinese have, however reluctantly, accepted communism. And now some political seers have made a punditic turnabout and have discovered that, after all, the Chinese mind always had an affinity with regimentation.

The interplay of communism and the traditional Chinese cast of mind has reshaped the behavior of both the people and the Communists, but not their intrinsic elements. Herein lies the confusion for the outside world.

The Chinese Communists have combined traditional Chinese tactics and Communist ideology, making Chinese communism more palatable—and deadlier. On the other hand, the Communist regime has inexorably driven the Chinese people to their favorite sanctuary, philosophy. The result has been an apparent yielding by the people, under pressure.

These two groups, armed with contrary philosophies and similar tactics, have been staging one of the most bizarre struggles in human history. The subtle give-and-take, the intricate parries and thrusts, the fancy footwork of the opponents, are often incomprehensible and misleading to the rational West. This unprecedented byplay has stumped not only the non-Chinese who do not understand the Chinese, but even some Chinese who do not understand communism.

How is this struggle carried on? Have the Communists succeeded in tearing up the fabric of tradition and reweaving it into a Marxist pattern? Or will the yielding softness of the Chinese eventually prove to be the undoing of Mao's paradise? The correct answers can only be reached if one understands how the Chinese mind works.

Until a decade ago, a common Western image of China was that of a nation of laundrymen thriving on chop suey, lotus seeds, opium and concubines; between tong wars, the Chinese sauntered about in gaudy mandarin robes and conversed in Confucian analects. The picture, in short, was cuter than we could ever be.

The real Chinese way of life is less theatrical and more profound. It may be summed up in the traditional conception o fultimate contentment: "yu shih wu chen"—"no quarrel with the world." This is a succinct expression of Taoist philosophy, attributed to the ancient Chinese mystic,

Lao-tse, whose influence on Chinese life surpasses that of the better known Confucius.

No quarrel with the world means that the individual is oblivious of such incidentals as business, wealth or government. His desires are in abeyance and his grievances few. He merges with Nature.

An outgrowth of this philosophy is that most prominent of Chinese traits, resilience. In China, resilience has always been linked with survival and life, while rigidity has been associated with destruction and extinction. The only way to survive and eventually overcome an overwhelmingly stronger force is to be soft, penetratingly soft. By yielding elastically to brute force, one diverts the blow, conceals one's real strength and preserves the chance for a comeback. A whole system of self-defense, tai chi, has evolved from this thesis. A simplified version of it flourishes in Japan as judo.

The Chinese love of introspection produces reticence and unobtrusiveness. Compared to westerners, Chinese are introverts. In the Chinese, reticence may serve to conceal mediocrity, but it also may camouflage wisdom. As a classic Chinese proverb puts it, "Great wisdom resembles stupidity."

Forty centuries of trial and error have taught the Chinese that the shortest distance between two points is seldom a straight line; more often it is the line of least resistance. We are detour artists, in business, friendship, courtship or war—and it is just a question of one's point of view whether one calls this devious or worldly.

We Chinese are great tongue-in-cheek talkers and between-the-line readers. We put forward the obvious, about which we do not really care, alongside the obscure, which we want to convey. We do this as a matter of courtesy, or in order to bypass resistance or for the sheer love of double entendre.

The Chinese prefers intuition to logic. He dislikes to search for truth by analyzing the shapeless and classifying the indivisible. He would rather reach a solution by insight than by logical deduction.

One of the greatest techniques perfected by the Chinese is the art of bargaining. A typical Chinese bargaining bout usually begins with the seller quoting an exorbitant price and the buyer responding with a ridiculously low offer. The two may chat lackadaisically or argue belligerently about a host of seemingly irrelevant topics, from yesterday's weather to next year's rice harvest. At a certain point, the buyer will make as if to break off and leave, and the seller will display ostensible indifference.

When they have sufficiently indulged in histrionics and have probed each other's relative strengths, a bargain is struck. Then they part, both complaining of having received a raw deal—but both feeling victorious.

Bargaining is loved by the Chinese as much for the game as for the money saved, and everything is expected to be bargained for. Anyone who will not or cannot bargain is considered intellectually inferior.

These traits do not wholly comprehend the Chinese character. But by and large they orient our life and influence our behavior. They tend to make us patient, serene, self-sufficient; at times a little wise, but often unaggressive, diffident, disunited and hopelessly undisciplined. A highly developed Chinese personality is like aged wine, mellow but potent. It has "no quarrel with the world."

Communist ideology is diametrically opposed to Chinese philosophy. Communism in practice is an attempt to reach the beautiful via the ugly, peace through war, freedom through slavery, democracy through dictatorship. It is no mere political system, but an inverse religion replete with gods, confessions, taboos, dogmas and inquisitions. It is a way of life that brooks no heresy, and it can survive only by suppressing the dissident, individualistic and free wheeling.

If one abstracts Chinese tactics from Chinese philosophy and combines them with such an undeviating ideology, the product will be insidiously un-Chinese. Mao Tse-tung has done exactly this.

Mao's contribution to international communism has not been to revise it, but to flavor it with sweet-sour sauce. Many of his recipes were concocted during his early days of guerrilla warfare against the Nationalists. A favorite tactic of his in dealing with a much stronger force is derived from the dictum of Sun-tse, a fifth century military theorist: "Enemy advances, we retreat. Enemy retreats, we pursue. Enemy encamps, we agitate. Enemy tires out, we attack."

After his army had grown large enough for regular battles, Mao developed his most famous stratagem: "Ta ta, tan tan; tan tan, ta ta"—"Fight fight, talk talk; talk talk, fight fight." By skillfully interspersing battles and phony truces, Mao averted many military crises and grew in strength. This is how he has described his method of vanquishing imperialistic nations: "Our tactical principle is to exploit the contradictions among them in order to win over the majority, to oppose the minority and then to crush the enemies separately."

All good military leaders in Chinese history have loved ruses de guerre. They thought of war in terms of a chess game, and they much preferred to win wars by avoiding battles and using feints, traps, and similar tricks. The most famous stratagem in Chinese history was devised by Chuko Liang, a military genius of the Three Kingdoms era (3d century A.D.).

Chuko, commanding general of the army of the Kingdom of Shu, was trapped one day with only 2,500 of his troops at his advance base, Hsicheng, as an army of 150,000, under the command of General Ssuma Yi of the Kingdom of Wei, approached the city. In a desperate flash of brilliance, Chuko threw open the city gates of Hsicheng, furled all military banners and set some soldiers in civilian clothes to sweeping the street near the gates.

Chuko himself, dressed in his favorite crane-weather robe and silk scarf, sat atop the city wall, flanked by two page boys holding a sword and a ceremonial duster. When Ssuma rode near the city wall, he saw the unruffled Chuko calmly plucking way at a zither.

Chuko might have been shaking in his clogs, but his stance was so bold that Ssuma suspected an ambush and ordered the immediate withdraw of his army. Chuko dispatched small bands of noisy pursuers to harass the retreating enemy. The Wei troops, fleeing from an imaginary trap, stampeded themselves into a disastrous defeat.

This "Kung Cheng Chi," the "Stratagem of the Empty City," is familiar to every Chinese, including Mao Tse-tung, who once wrote a brief poetic version of it: "The stage of action of the military expert is provided by objective material conditions; but with the stage set, he can direct the performance of many lively dramas, full of sound and color, power and grandeur." How often Mao has directed such lively dramas on the military, political, and diplomatic stages.

It is just such dramatic ruses that are likely to confuse westerners who are trying to understand and cope with Communist China. The crux of the China puzzle is not the amount of information available, but the depth of misinterpretation.

This confusion is worsened by the language barrier, which often cannot be overcome by translation. The florid Chinese language, so delicate in nuances and rich in literary allusions, is unusually complex and extremely difficult to render adequately, let alone literally, in translation. So, for example, a typical Peiping policy statement is a mixture of Communist dialectics and Chinese linguistic floss, often made deliberately fuzzier for special effects.

Confusions and paradoxes like these are apt to mislead non-Chinese observers, especially the armchair pundits who think life can be understood via the reference library, or the tourist-inspector who believes that anything worthwhile has to be visible and anything he cannot see, nonexistent.

Now, both these types are certainly honest. But they overlook the fact that no amount of speculation and no amount of sightseeing will shed light on China unless they understand the emotions and cast of mind of the silent millions who must live and die under communism. Without this understanding, all the analysis only amounts to "scratching an itch from outside the shoe."

A typically capricious Western notion is that since the Chinese have known so little freedom historically, they will readily submit to communism. This view misconstrues the Chinese attitude to freedom. The traditional Chinese conception of freedom is not participation in government, but avoiding government. This kind of freedom is individualistic and personal, rather than political. It harmonizes with Lao-tse's idea of a perfect government; one that does nothing.

In China, even bad governments may last a long time, provided they remain inefficient. In their own way, the typical Chinese prefer a government that leaves them alone, rather than one that does everything to or for them. Regimentation, even in a good cause, is distasteful to the Chinese nature. And therein lies the long-range danger to the Communist regime.

It would be a mistake to believe that the effect of monolithic totalitarianism is as deadly for the Chinese as it is for westerners. For compared to the way of Chinese life, the way of Chinese communism is clumsy and inept.

A few years ago, for instance, the Communists tried to force Shanghai businessmen to subscribe to an onerous government bond drive. Relays of Communist speakers would harangue them with polite, persuasive speeches at meetings that lasted 8 to 10 hours at a time; the businessmen were forbidden to leave until the meetings ended. This technique was given a nickname by the laconic citizens of Shanghai: "Fatigue bombardment."

Soon the businessmen devised a typical Chinese countermove. They began attending these meetings enthusiastically—equipped with buns, thermos bottles full of tea, and even toothbrushes. The unspoken message of the camping paraphernalia so neutralized the fatigue bombardment that the Communists settled for much smaller bond subscriptions. Where else could so critical a battle be fought with such sophistication?

For the past decade, people in China have been using every trick of survival to cope with their ruthless regime, techniques reflecting the traditional proverb, "lip obedience, but not heart obedience." This trait is frequently mistaken by straight-shooting westerners as pure and simple submissiveness.

The Chinese have been virtually transformed into a nation of reluctant hypocrites. The Communists, being Chinese themselves, are quite aware that a great deal of tongue-in-cheek eulogies they receive from the people make them look silly, at least in Chinese eyes. One has to know the language to realize that the deadliest insults in Chinese are always couched in exquisitely polite words.

The common view in the West is that Mao's regime exercises an ever-tightening

control over the Chinese people, who are powerless to do other than submit. On this premise is built the thesis that if the United States ever antagonizes Peiping, a devastating war would ensue. This is a frightening prospect, but an unlikely one.

If one looks at the Communist regime with a Chinese eye, one realizes that Peiping is expert in the psychology of bargaining. It is a past master in "strategems of the empty city." It may act belligerently when it is weak, and one would be foolish to become either unduly alarmed or optimistic over some ambiguously worded Communist statement.

A Chinese observer would discern that the peasants and intellectuals, with whose acquiescence the Communists rose to power, are most restive. Mao's brutally ambitious economic juggernaut is all but submerged in the quagmire of Chinese resilience, for the overwhelming majority of the people opposes the regime and has its own roundabout way of resisting it. The secret of Peiping's eventual failure is held by the yielding, plastic, all-engulfing giant that is the Chinese people.

In light of this, it is tragicomic to hear the contention that United States refusal to recognize Communist China and United Nations failure to admit it to its ranks is tantamount to "ignoring a nation of 600 million people." Despite this cliche, the fact is that China is now the scene of an acute state of silent war: "people's government vs. the people." It will be a long time before Mao can marshal his 600 million rugged individualists into a solid phalanx which the United States and the United Nations cannot afford to ignore. Right now, Mao is too busy fighting his people.

A casual visitor to China today may be impressed by the sight of hasty reconstruction, Spartan discipline and anthill activity. These effects have been achieved at the expense of many other Chinas: the China of kaleidoscopic colors, sounds and smells; the China of ubiquitous smiles, mellow humor and ready hospitality; the China of carefree anglers beneath willow trees; the China of somnolent temple bells and misty lakes.

Our strength resides in our weakness. It is easy to extract a false confession from a Chinese, but it is hard to give him a genuine brainwashing. It is easier to conquer China than to govern it. The Chinese are usually weak as a nation, but tough as a race.

These statements are admittedly a series of paradoxes—but we are a paradoxical people. One day, surely, those other, more real Chinas will destroy the false image that prevails now. And that day may be nearer than many suspect.

Tobacco Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 7, 1959

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I hate to tell the tobacco boys "I told you so," but many of them would not listen last year during reciprocal-trade debate. Now here it is—another 15-percent increase in tobacco imports under this one-world reciprocal-trade concept. Our American tobacco farmers will be hornswoggled and gypped out of their tobacco acreage just as were the cotton farmers of the Southeast. We will be permitted to grow less and less while Yugoslavia and other countries will grow more and more.

The following is from the U.S. Department of Agriculture:

U.S. IMPORTS OF UNMANUFACTURED TOBACCO SET RECORD IN 1958

U.S. imports of unmanufactured tobacco for consumption reached a record total of 138.6 million pounds in 1958, compared with the previous high of 124.1 million pounds in 1957. Tobaccos imported into the United States consist largely of oriental-type cigarette leaf and cigar leaf for blending with domestic tobacco in cigarettes and cigars. U.S. imports in 1958 were valued at $105 million.

The United States is the world's third largest importer of unmanufactured tobacco, being exceeded only by the United Kingdom and West Germany. U.S. imports have risen steadily during the past decade, reflecting increasing amounts of oriental leaf being used in cigarettes and larger quantities of foreign-grown cigar filler and scrap going into cigars.

CIGARETTE LEAF IMPORTS RISE STEADILY

Cigarette leaf (largely oriental) now makes up about 75 percent of total U.S. imports of unmanufactured tobacco. Imports of cigarette leaf are steadily rising and reached a record 104.7 million pounds in 1958, compared with 91.2 million pounds in 1957 and with an average of 76.4 million for 1950–54. The value of 1958 imports of cigarette leaf, at $76.8 million, indicates that the average value per pound (market value in foreign country) was U.S. 73.4 cents.

Turkey and Greece are the largest shippers of cigarette leaf to the U.S. market. In 1958 they supplied a total of 93.6 million pounds. Imports from both countries set new records. Since the end of World War II, Turkey has been the most important supplier. But imports from Greece are rising more rapidly percentagewise than those from Turkey. In 1958, Greece furnished more than double the quantity it supplied in 1950–54.

NOTE.—"Imports" refers to imports for consumption. These include withdrawals from bond for consumption and releases from customs custody immediately upon arrival.)

Tobacco, unmanufactured: U.S. imports for consumption, by principal countries of origin average 1950–54, annual 1955–58

[In thousands of pounds]

Commodity and origin	Average, 1950–54	1955	1956	1957 [1]	1958 [1]
Cigarette leaf:					
Turkey	53,802	57,686	61,528	60,000	65,108
Greece	13,280	17,872	18,881	23,271	28,536
Syria	3,579	2,421	1,587	1,178	1,059
Italy	1,025	1,504	1,826	1,514	1,744
Cyprus	247	297	524	501	1,320
Yugoslavia	1,011	3,523	2,899	3,558	3,964
Other countries	3,491	373	702	1,176	2,964
Total	76,435	83,676	87,947	91,198	104,695
Cigar wrapper:					
Netherlands [2]	3	1		1	
Indonesia	664	326	137	124	79
Cuba	383	497	600	586	542
Other countries	10	1	2	4	
Total	1,060	825	739	715	621
Cigar filler:					
Unstemmed:					
Cuba	4,231	5,027	3,779	2,968	3,125
Philippines	182		474		92
Other countries	18	4	9	19	118
Stemmed:					
Cuba	10,190	8,804	9,229	8,814	8,993
Philippines	572		235	235	327
Other countries	5	6	4	123	72
Total	15,198	13,841	13,730	12,159	12,727
Scrap:					
Cuba	7,557	9,350	11,293	12,336	13,755
Philippines	1,017	2,455	5,788	6,060	5,479
Canada	26		37	46	109
Other countries	14	10	23	1	168
Total	8,614	11,815	17,141	18,443	19,451
Stems:					
Cuba	132	585	822	1,196	617
United Kingdom	393	473	540	392	345
Ireland				34	118
Other countries	74	18			
Total	599	1,076	1,362	1,622	1,080
Grand total	101,906	111,233	120,919	124,137	138,574

[1] Preliminary.
[2] Largely Indonesian tobacco reshipped from the Netherlands.

Source: Compiled in the Foreign Agricultural Service from records of the Bureau of the Census.

Other countries supplying cigarette leaf to the U.S. market include Italy, Yugoslavia, Cyprus, and Syria. Some oriental leaf also originates in Rhodesia-Nyasaland.

Annual imports for consumption generally are a fairly reliable indicator of manufacturers' usings of foreign-grown cigarette leaf during the year. With this assumption, it appears that the average percentage of imported tobacco used in U.S. cigarettes is slowly rising, and amounted to about 8 percent in 1958. This was still below the prewar percentage of about 10 percent. Due to much larger U.S. cigarette output, how-

ever, the absolute volume of imported cigarette leaf used in 1958 was more than twice that for the 1935–39 period.

Under the Tariff Act of 1930, the U.S. tariff on imports of cigarette leaf was originally 35 cents per pound. There has been a gradual reduction in the tariff over the years and the present rate, which became effective June 30, 1958, is 12¾ cents per pound. This rate applies to all countries except those in the Soviet bloc, for which the 1930 rates apply.

CIGAR LEAF IMPORTS UP

Imports for consumption of cigar leaf consist largely of cigar filler and scrap tobacco (used mainly as scrap filler). Together, these important categories accounted for 32.2 million pounds last year, compared with 30.6 million in 1957. The annual 1950–54 average was 23.8 million.

Imports of cigar wrapper have dropped in recent years and totaled only 0.6 million pounds in 1958, compared with an average of 1.1 million in 1950–54 and 2.1 million for 1935–39.

Cuba is the largest supplier of cigar filler, scrap and cigar wrapper. Imports from that country last year were 12.1 million pounds of cigar filler, 13.8 million of scrap, and 0.5 million of wrapper. Cigar tobacco imports from the Philippines amounted to 5.9 million pounds in 1958—largely scrap.

Imports from both Cuba and the Philippines enjoy favorable tariff treatment in the U.S. market. The present U.S. tariff rate on Cuban unstemed cigar filler is 12.6 cents per pound; on stemed filler, 18.0 cents, and on scrap, 12.6 cents. Corresponding rates applicable to other countries (except the Philippines) are 16.1 cents for unstemed cigar filler, 23.0 cents for stemmed filler, and 16.1 cents for scrap. Cuban unstemmed cigar wrapper enjoys a tariff rate of 81.9 cents per pound, compared with 90.9 cents for similar leaf from other areas. Significant gradual reductions have taken place during past years in the tariff rate on Cuban cigar leaf. Under the Tariff Act of 1930, rates per pound were established as follows: Unstemmed cigar filler, 28 cents; stemmed filler, 40 cents, and scrap, 28 cents.

The importation of Philippines tobacco is favored by a duty-free quota which now amounts to 5,850,000 pounds per year. This will be gradually reduced and there will be no duty-free quota after 1974. Quantities imported for consumption, in excess of the duty-free quota, are dutiable at the Cuban rates.

Nikolai Dorofeyevich Yarushevich

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 7, 1959

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I would like to include the following text of a special edition of News and Views, a monthly periodical published by the National Laymen's Council Church League of America. This is indeed a revealing article concerning the rise of Soviet Secret Police Agent, Metropolitan Nikolai, who was brought into the United States under the guise that he was a great Christian leader.

NIKOLAI DOROFEYEVICH YARUSHEVICH

"Mordre wol out, that we see day by day". (Chaucer, Canterbury Tales.)

Although written nearly 600 years ago Chaucer's observation that "murder will out" still holds good today. The New York Times for June 9, 1956, carried a news photo showing the Reverend Eugene Carson Blake, president of the National Council of Churches, escorting Metropolitan Nikolai of Russia to visit Independence Hall in Philadelphia. The picture shows a solid line of police holding back angry demonstrators shouting epithets at the Soviet clergyman. Some of them probably shouted "murderer" at the holy man from Russia. Millions of Americans no doubt were shocked at such rudeness and incivility.

Page 114 of Life for March 23, 1959, again shows Metropolitan Nikolai this time officially branded as a Soviet secret agent by a high ranking Soviet secret police official, Peter Deriabin, who recently defected to the West. Between these two pictures hangs a tale—a tale of consummate villainy and cynical fraud beyond all historical parallel.

In March 1956, nine prominent leaders of the N.C.C.C. headed by Eugene Carson Blake journeyed to Moscow at the invitation of the Soviet Government through Metropolitan Nikolai, second ranking Orthodox hierarch in all of the U.S.S.R. The N.C.C.C. leaders came back bursting with enthusiasm and praise for Metropolitan Nikolai. They did not have much to say on just who this Soviet clergyman was and what his background was. Soviet Russia is a land of mystery and secrecy and it is often very hard to dig out even the most elementary facts readily available to anyone in a non-Communist country.

News and Views has been doing a little research on the venerable Nikolai now that a former Soviet secret police official has identified him as a former colleague of his in the same sinister, murderous organization.

Metropolitan Nikolai of Krutitski and Kolomna, to give his full title, was born Boris Dorofeyevich Yarushevich, in Kovno in 1891. His father was an arch-priest in the old Russian Orthodox Church. Young Yarushevich became a monk in 1914. He was graduated from a theological seminary a year later.

On November 7, 1917, Lenin's Bolsheviki stormed the winter palace in Petrograd and overthrew the liberal democratic government of Kerensky. Within 3 months the Bolsheviks began the destruction of all religion in Russia. It is highly significant that the victorious Bolsheviks struck at religion long before they began their expropriation of all property and other assaults on human freedom and dignity. Mark well the date because this is highly important in our study of the rise of Metropolitan Nikolai.

Shuster in his very important and scholarly "Religion Behind the Iron Curtain" states:

"The Communists attacked with blind fury. Church property was taken away, priests were left without any means of subsistence. Houses of worship were profaned. A few excerpts from the pastoral letter issued by Patriarch Tikhon on January 18, 1918, summarize the situation at that time:

" 'Daily we are in receipt of letters reporting the horrible, bestial murders of quite innocent and bedridden people * * * There are no hearings, all rights and laws have been abrogated. The holy edifices are targets for gunfire, or are subjected to looting, ridicule, and degradation. Venerable persons residing in monasteries and honored by the faithful are seized by the dark, ungodly powers of this age. Schools supported by the orthodox church for the education of priests are turned into institutions of nonbelievers or are made into houses of prostitution.'

"The Metropolitan of St. Petersburg, the Metropolitan of Kiev, and the chief representative of the Roman Catholic church in Russia were tried and executed. How many others suffered a like fate, no one knows."

We now know that thousands of priests, monks, and other religious leaders were horribly murdered or exiled to slow death in Siberia. Churches were despoiled, robbed of their valuable ikons and other wealth and converted into granaries, barracks, or even stables.

And while all this was going on how fared our "dearly beloved brother" Metropolitan Nikolai, bosom pal of Eugene Carson Blake and other American modernist, ecumenical, left-wing clergymen?

In 1918 Boris Yarushevich, while churches were being closed and desecrated all over Russia, became head of the Peter and Paul Cathedral in Peterhof. The next year he became archimandrite and head of the Alexander Nevsky Monastery of Petrograd. In 1922 he became bishop of Peterhof and Petrograd diocese. That same year a priest named Vvedensky started the living church movement which enjoyed the official protection and approval of the Bolshevik regime. (See News and Views, May 1957, p. 4.)

The supreme head of the orthodox church, Patriarch Tikhon was arrested in July 1922. He died 3 years later. From 1925 to 1943 no election of a new patriarch was permitted by the Soviets. Indeed, the very title disappeared from all official documents and the press. It was forbidden to use any religious title in any publication. The death of Patriarch Tikhon was merely announced as that of "Citizen" Belavin.

Before his death Tikhon had designated Metropolitan Cyril as keeper of his office. Orthodox canon law empowered only a sobor or general council of top hierarchs as guarding the ecclesiastical succession. The Soviet Government immediateley arrested Cyril. Tikhon's second choice had been Metropolitan Agaphangel but he was already in exile. Patriarch Tikhon's third choice was Metropolitan Peter but he was arrested as soon as he assumed office and transported to Siberia where he died in 1936.

With the death of Metropolitan Peter the legitimate succession of ecclesiastical authority was wiped out forever. Out of 11 hierarchs appointed to act as keeper or deputy 10 died in exile or in prison. The present patriarch, like Metropolitan Nikolai, is nothing more than a secret police appointee and hence devoid of any bona fide ecclesiastical authority.

In 1936 Nikolai had advanced under the Soviet secret police to Archbishop of Peterhof and Novgorod diocese. In 1939 he was exarch of the Ukraine. While Khrushchev was busy purging the Communist Party of the Ukraine his henchman Nikolai directed a merciless campaign of persecution against the Ukrainian Orthodox Autocephalous Church as well as against the Greek Catholics and Ukrainian Roman Catholics. Hundreds of priests and thousands of laymen were deported to slave labor camps and a speedy death.

In 1942 Nikolai made the news in Russia by being the first religious leader since the 1917 revolution to be officially recognized by title in an official Soviet document. He was appointed a member of a Commission To Investigate German Atrocities. As this was fully a year before Stalin deigned to take official notice of Nikolai's superior, Patriarch Sergius, it must be quite obvious who was the favorite boy of the Bolsheviks. Sergius was also restored to some limited degree of authority and prestige as part of the Communists' use of religions to bolster sagging Soviet morale under the hammer blows of Hitler's onsweeping Reichswehr.

With the end of World War II Metropolitan Nikolai's real role in Soviet foreign policy began to unfold itself—that of an international Judas goat leading the innocent faithful into the Red abbatoir of nations and peoples. In 1945 he was the directing genius of the Moscow sobor which arbitrarily brought the Orthodox churches of newly conquered satellites under the Moscow patri-

archate. Metropolitan Nikolai began to travel extensively and frequently in western Europe building up contacts with various Protestant denominations. In 1948 he was busy in Stockholm with the phony Stockholm peace appeal.

On February 23, 1951, the Communist World Council of Peace met in East Berlin, Germany. A featured speaker at the Red gathering was Metropolitan Nikolai, of Moscow. This agent of KGB (Soviet Secret Police) launched a vitriolic attack against the United States. Here are some of the vicious charges made by the so-called "Christian" leader of the Soviet Orthodox Church who fraternizes with leaders of the National and World Councils of Churches, and who has been invited to join them in the World Council:

We all know how on June 25, 1950, the hordes of the Korean-American marionette—Li Sun Man, villianously fell upon the Peoples Democratic Korean Republic, at the direction of their American masters. The painstaking elaboration of this—horrible in its baseness—act is known.

It is known how the freedom-loving Korean people answered the bloody attack in one outburst. It is known how President Truman gave the order to the American Armed Forces in the Far East to come to the aid of his true ally—Li Sun Man.

It is known by what methods the United States of America influenced and [what methods it] uses to put through the U.N. resolutions it desires.

The demagogic wails of American propagandists are known, with which they try to cover up the bestial grin of imperialism revealed to the whole world.

The march of military actions on the fronts of this long-suffering land is known. The boundless courage and heroism, with which an ancient people defends its independence and life before the hordes of contemporary savages, is known. What sympathy and condolence are called forth by the sufferings of the Korean people from all freedom-loving humanity, are known.

And there is also known one circumstance of the Korean events, and it is to this circumstance that I want to draw your attention. I have in mind the conduct of the war in Korea by the American aggressors.

When we turn to the official statements of the governmental workers of the Korean Peoples Democratic Republic; when we listen to the evidence of war correspondents, journalists, up to now not known for the progressiveness of their opinions; when living people speak, who by some miracle have survived after the retreat of the army of occupation, or those who managed to escape from the leprous regions of the "new Americanized order"—we feel that which no document can transmit: We feel that depth of boundless, unassuageable grief into which modernized American monsters have plunged a noble people with its ancient culture.

And so we become convinced that the spirit and substance of fascism have not disappeared, that the delirious dreams of the fanatic Hitler have found their continuers, now trying to realize them.

Their followers do not lag behind their teachers.

From the first day of the lawless aggression the American neofascists began a systematic cannibalistic destruction of the "lower" Korean race.

What do we see?

Cynically violated standards not only of international rights, but of human morals. Executions without trial and inquisitions, secret and public. Dreadful tortures of victims: the cutting off of ears and noses, breasts, the putting out of eyes, the breaking of arms and legs, the crucifixion of patriots, the burial alive in communal graves of women with children at their breasts, etc. The rebirth of the customs of savages—the scalping of Korean patriots for "souvenirs."

For the purposes of annihilating the population, the American criminals first of all fanatically killed the political prisoners (from 200,000 to 400,000 persons), forcing them first to dig their own graves; they threw the bodies of patriots [who had been] hung, shot or who died from typhus into a precipice and, to conceal the traces, blew up a cliff above it.

The barbaric bombings of peaceful cities and centers of population were directed exclusively toward the annihilation of the civil population.

In the committees of inquiry of the American troops we see the reborn "technique" of Hitler, inhuman tortures of Korean patriots; hanging by the hands, binding [them] behind the back, which is impudently called "aeroplane"; welding handcuffs on the hands behind the back for 2 to 3 months; torture by electricity, including the electric bed, on which death follows the transmission of a strong current; a wet leather jacket which crushes the breast of the victim on drying; placing those ill of an epidemic sickness in cells filled to overflowing with prisoners.

These civilized savages arranged shooting matches with living targets, binding peasants to posts with barbed wire and shooting each of them over the heart of the target. Reviving the customs of the young-fascists, young-yankees photographed these scenes for their family albums and sent them home to their fiancees and wives.

These representatives of the higher race practiced and practice mass rape of the women and young girls of Korea, rounding them up from surrounding towns, making them drunk on gin and raping them. Not limited to outrages, the miserable victims were driven, in places, into tunnels, shot by machineguns, and buried under the debris of blown up cliffs.

Often one can see on the roads of Korea the still warm corpse of a mother and a crying child at her breast. Cases are known when children, born in prison, were trampled by the soldiers' boots in front of the mother, and then the mother was killed.

On retreating, this "flower of culture" destroyed or drove off with it all living things on the evacuated lands.

On attacking, their fury was also vented first of all on the peaceful people.

Thus, on landing on September 15 in the Bay of Inchon everything breathing in the region was annihilated by insane 48-hour fire. Upon attacking Seoul in September of 1950 the same tactics of general destruction were continued.

In September of 1950, the French journalist Charles Farvel visited the camp of death, located in the "valley of horror" in Southern Korea. More than 300,000 Koreans are doomed to death in that camp. At that time there were 10 such camps. The camps are surrounded by barbedwire, along which run high voltage electric currents. The people live on the ground, they have neither clothing nor shoes. They are not fed, they eat grass and the bark of trees and bushes. American scientists and doctors, under the guise of giving medical assistance, test the newest vaccines and chemical preparations on the prisoners. Every night there are executions in the ravines surrounding the camps. To be destroyed in the first order are the intelligentsia of the Korean people: doctors, teachers, engineers, technicians, agriculturists.

"I accuse!"—declared the Korean artist [a woman] Zoe Sin Hee—"The blood of thousands of infants destroyed by the Americans, the tens of thousands tortured in the camps of death, the hundreds of thousands killed at the front, call for justice. The American military criminals must be severely punished for their evil deeds. I accuse them. I believe that the hour of retribution will soon arrive."

In retreating in January of 1951, the occupation forcibly chased more than 2 million peaceful inhabitants to the south of Korea, who died in thousands on the road and the roadside ditches from hunger and cold, from the bullets of aggressors.

Those of the peaceful population of Northern Korea who remained alive or were dispersed among the camps expected hunger and epidemics. Even the notorious U.N. Commission on the Unification and Reestablishment of Korea in its letter to the U.N. of February 1, 1951, notes that 3,628 Koreans have been left without a roof in penury.

The Korean children are everywhere subject to the fury of the occupation. Everywhere, where the foot of the intervenors has stepped—in the province of Southern Pennyan, Northern Kengke, Southern Kengke, Kanko, Chang-Bong—the American bandits have destroyed the children.

And again one cannot dismiss the thought that the ideologists guiding the dreadful events in Korea consider themselves to be Christians, and not only Christians, but even leaders of Christian organizations. They know the Bible and often state so in the hearing of all.

And reason refuses to give an explanation of this nightmare, and the heart does not cease to tremble from feelings of holy hatred toward the cannibals, and the conscience of all simple people cries out against the evil deeds of the American aggressor.

Waves of protest and indignation against the American aggressor in Korea and the evil deeds of the occupation; against the attempts to loosen a new world war by means of blocs, pacts, the remilitarization of Germany and Japan; against the exploitation of the UN by the United States of America as a weapon of aggression—roll over the entire world. This indignation against the rulers who have lost their reason and will, dragging people toward the precipice, can be heard in numberless petitions, sent to parliaments and ministries. It is heard in the appearances of women and young people, going on in all the countries of the world. Protest and indignation is expressed by the many-thousand-strong crowds gathering in the town squares of Europe and demanding that the oversea world bandits and world colonizers in dress coats and generals' tunics return home.

And our holy duty, dear friends is to tighten our ranks in the fight for peace, for the cessation of the bloody aggression in Korea, in the fight against the remilitarization of Western Germany and Japan, as a step toward a new war, against weapons for the mass annihilation of people, for the progressive curtailing of armament.

Nikolai's atrocity story varies a bit from the official North Korean version which charged that American soldiers buried young Korean children alive with only their heads sticking above the ground and then used these live baby heads as targets for routine rifle practice.

In December that same year Nikolai charged that:

"American aggressors continue to wage a war of extermination in Korea * * * The ideas of hatred of humanity are inoculated in children and young people on a broad scale in the U.S.A. * * * It is thus that the American kindlers of war try to raise murderers from their tender years."

In 1952 Metropolitan Nikolai charged that U.S. airmen in Korea were waging germ warfare:

"Infected insects are being dropped from American aircraft on populated points, not

only in Korea but in China * * * The church cannot pass over in silence the sufferings of the Korean people, which is perishing from the brigandlike attack and demoniac malice of these human monsters * * * We shall hope that the Lord will put to shame the modern bloodthirsty Baal attempting to catch the entire world in his net, that the dread hand of providence will restore the truth that has been defiled."

Nikolai did not think much better of Pope Pius XII whom he regarded as a mere agent of American imperialism.

These are but a few brief excerpts from pages of similar slanders by Metropolitan Nikolai which have appeared in the Soviet press and journals.

At this point the sceptic will probably ask: "Why should the atheist Soviet regime build up religion when its own history and all its official pronouncements decree the death of all religions under the sickle and hammer?" News and Views for last November carried a long article "Treason or Dupery?" which fully explained the new line laid down by Stalin in and during the last war for exploiting the captive Orthodox Church of Russia to advance the interests of the Soviet regime. With a cynicism without parallel in history, the Communists use the Russian Orthodox Church as a weapon for world domination and the ultimate extinction of all religious belief.

By reestablishing and granting quasi-recognition to the church atheist and cynical Communists accomplished the following:

1. It enabled them to assimilate and bring under their control the Orthodox churches of the conquered satellites of East Europe.

2. It helped toward an old Russian objective—to make Moscow the "Third Rome".

3. It hampered the spread of the underground or catacomb church.

4. It gave the Soviets enormous world-wide prestige as many religious people, impressed by the apparent restoration of the Orthodox Church, lessened their suspicion of an animosity toward the Soviet Union. An apparently free functioning hierarchy and "packed churches" were witness to the liberality and tolerance of the Soviets toward organized religion.

5. With secret police agents posing as priests and listening to confessions, as well as penetrating every strata of the hierachy, it gave the Soviet police state another secret observation post inside the minds of the Russian enslaved people.

6. It enabled venal and treacherous Soviet clergymen to build bridges of contact and confidence with western clergymen and in turn rope them in on all manner of Soviet propaganda enterprises; viz, Stockholm Peace Appeal, World Congresses for Peace, etc., etc.

7. It enabled the Soviet government through its religious stooges to by-pass the Ecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople and the Roman Catholic Church and deal directly with other Christian denominations throughout the non-Communist world.

For example, in July, 1948, the Moscow conference of the heads and representatives of the Orthodox Autocephalous Churches announced that universal Christianity was not identified with western civilization; that most western Christian sects no longer followed the precepts of Christ and the True Faith and were sunken in materialism, greed, vice, and corruption. Only the Orthodox church represented the true faith and communism was nothing more than the Kingdom of God on this earth. Nine months later the First World Congress of Peace Partisans meeting in Paris issued a manifesto embracing much the same general line that the West had abandoned Christianity in its mad search for ever greater nuclear bombs and mass destruction weapons.

The Soviet hierarchy therefore have become an extremely valuable and important weapon in the arsenal of world communism as directed from Moscow. And, Metropolitan Nikolai of Krutitski and Kolomna is one of the most important front men in this international confidence game to bamboozle gullible Western clergymen into acting as dupes for all sorts of Communist propaganda swindles and confidence games.

If your church adheres to the National Council of Churches of Christ and the World Council you officially are associated with Boris Dorofeyevich Yarushevich, alias "Metropolitan Nikolai" in this most colossal and cynical hoax of all history. Take another look at page 114 of March 23 Life and read Mr. Deriabin's sensational article.

The N.C.C.C.'s Outlook for May 1956, in defending the Moscow visit of nine of its top leaders, commented, "Only a few seem to think it wrong for American Christians to talk with Russian Christians." The testimony of Soviet defector Deriabin can now leave no doubt that the Reverend Blake and his associates were not talking to "Russian Christians" at all but to murderous Soviet secret police agents and their stooges masquerading in clergymen's clothes.

Thus, official Soviet sources leave no doubt that Nikolai rose steadily to the second top ecclesiastical post in all of Russia while the Bolsheviks were exterminating the rest of the Orthodox clergy and extirpating all religions. As priests were murdered or deported to slow deaths in Siberia Nikolai stepped from one sacerdotal preference to the next. When Khrushchev went to the Ukraine to wipe out all anti-Soviets in blood purges, Metropolitan Nikolai was on hand to handle the purges of the clergy.

Metropolitan Nikolai's blood-strewn trail is a matter of open record in official Soviet documents. This record was available to the Rev. Eugene Carson Blake and his National Council of Churches' associates when they went to Russia in 1956 and invited Nikolai to this country. The Deriabin disclosure merely confirms and clinches the record. Blake now has little choice but to get down on his knees and ask God for forgiveness. Then he owes the American people a confession of grave error and an apology for having misled so many other clergymen into playing the fool in advancing Communist aims and objectives.

A Bill To Permit Weekly Newspapers To Suspend Publication for 2 Weeks a Year Without Loss of Second-Class Mailing Privileges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD G. WOLF
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 7, 1959

Mr. WOLF, Mr. Speaker, today, I introduced a bill to permit weekly newspapers to suspend publication for 2 weeks a year without loss of second-class mailing privileges.

The rural area of Iowa, and of America, is dotted with many small communities which are served by small weekly newspapers—often these newspapers are owned by one family and are manned by only one or two people.

These small publishers are literally chained to their jobs because of Federal regulations governing their mailing permits and because of State laws relating to legal advertising. These laws and regulations require publications week after week without interruption. These publishers do not have the trained personnel to permit them to enjoy an annual 1- or 2-week vacation.

Mr. Speaker, my proposed legislation merely gives the individual publisher the right to suspend publication for 2 weeks each year if he chooses.

The small weekly newspapers, which are very near to the thoughts of the people, have provided us with a medium of news and editorial opinion that cannot be replaced. It, therefore, seems to me that we should take every step possible to strengthen the small community press—not discourage it.

Centralization of the press and news media, in general, is a dangerous thing. Since the tendency has been toward more centralization and consolidation, it is time we did something to stimulate and encourage the small independent news outlet.

Hon. Andrew J. Sordoni, of Wilkes-Barre, Will Provide College Scholarships

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 7, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news stories from the Wilkes-Barre Sunday Independent of May 3, 1959, and the Wilkes-Barre Record of May 4, 1959:

[From the Wilkes-Barre Sunday Independent, May 3, 1959]

THREE SCHOLARSHIPS WILL BE GIVEN BY A. J. SORDONI—MAKES DISCLOSURE UPON GETTING AWARD FROM BACK MOUNTAIN GROUP

The Andrew J. Sordoni Foundation will provide three 4-year scholarships to Wilkes, King's, and Misericordia Colleges with the recipients to be selected by the directors of the Back Mountain Protective Association.

Mr. Sordoni made known this decision last night when he was honored guest at the annual dinner of the Back Mountain Protective Association at Irem Temple Country Club and received the group's Community Service Award.

The 250 persons who attended the event, the largest in the association's history, roundly applauded Mr. Sordoni's announcement.

Presentation of the award by Atty. James Lenahan Brown, association president, was made more significant as Attorney Brown traced the indelible imprints that the "Senator" had made in the development of the Back Mountain area. He emphasized the roles which Commonwealth Telephone Co. and the Harvey's Lake Light Co. had played in the industrial and residential growth within the region.

Attorney Brown noted that both of these utilities, under the leadership of Mr. Sordoni, had paced the area's development efforts. "The story of the growth of Commonwealth Telephone Co. is all the more dramatic for the part it has played in unlocking the final door to gracious suburban living. Then, too, the location of its general offices in Dallas and the stature the company has assumed as third largest independent telephone company in Pennsylvania has meant much to furthering the area. Truly, we honor this evening a man whose contributions to the Back Mountain area, and, indeed, with every area which has felt his dynamic leadership, know no bounds in their telling," he said.

Attorney Joseph L. O'Donnell was the toastmaster and, in his inimitable humor-our style coupled with forthright observations on the honored guest and association officers, set the pattern of an evening of both serious reflection and entertainment.

Judge J. Harold Flannery was principal speaker. In his address, he noted:

"This seems to be an age of conformity. Our social order is developing us in a pattern. If we do not dress as our neighbors dress, drive the same or similar car as he drives, have the same education and the same aims, ideals, and purposes, we are suspect, we are different. We do not fit.

FOLLOWED NO CROWDS

"At one time the symbol of America was rugged individualism. Today, thanks to advertising and social mores, it is abject conformity. You want to get on; don't you? Then don't be conspicuous, don't be different. What will people say? Wait for life to come to you.

"Give me the man who will challenge his destiny, who will go out to meet life and dare the slurs and arrows of outrageous fortune. If that man goes down he goes down gloriously, if he succeeds, he succeeds magnificently.

"That is one of the reasons we honor our distinguished guest tonight. He followed no crowd, anxious to fit, anxious to conform. He dared grandly, he strove mightily, and he has achieved magnificently."

Judge Flannery then went on to describe the qualities of head and heart and spirit which characterize Senator Sordoni and won him the place he has achieved wherever his interests and activities have touched.

Acknowledging the award, Mr. Sordoni said, "Everyone here has contributed in full measure to making the Back Mountain area a thriving, industrious community—a wonderful place in which to live and enjoy the fullness of life as it was meant to be.

"There are some of us here who remember back some 40 years and many of us then could visualize what this area could become. Working together, we've seen these visions realized. That is our greatest reward."

Former Senator Sordoni traced the early history of both the Harvey's Lake Light Co. and of Commonwealth Telephone Co. He noted that back in 1922 the Harvey's Lake Light Co. had 6 miles of line and 100 customers. Today, it has over 370 miles of line and 3,500 customers with a plant valuation approximating $1,250,000.

"Commonwealth Telephone Co.," he said, "in January 1928 had a total of 9,500 stations in its system. Today, its 73 exchanges has 68,395 stations and 90 percent are dial operated. Today in the Dallas district, there are 7,260 stations, almost equal to the number of subscribers in the entire company in 1928."

EMPLOYS 150 HERE

Commonwealth Telephone Co. in its general offices at Dallas alone has 150 employees and an annual payroll of over $500,000. Commonwealth's plant investment in the Back Mountain area exceeds $3 million. This year Commonwealth construction and service improvements in the Dallas area schedule an expenditure of $350,000 and of another $250,000 in 1960.

Note was also made of Sterling Farms at Harvey's Lake which, comprising 4,200 acres is noted as a model grassland dairy farm with its prize-winning herd of registered Guernseys. It has for many years been the scene of statewide Gressland Field Days and exhibited as a model of the industry.

Senator Sordoni concluded, "Our Sordoni interests will always help pace the growth of the Back Mountain area, a growth which I feel has just begun. I am humbly grateful for this honor you have given me this evening. My greatest reward, however, has and will continue to be the friendship you have extended and the knowledge that I am 'one' of you'."

Entertainment included vocal selections by Mrs. Sylvia Schooley, accompanied by Mrs. Robert W. Laux and selections by the Misericordia Ensemble.

Dinner chairman was Robert W. Laux and Mrs. Elizabeth Wallo, cochairman. Members of the reception committee included Rev. Robert DeWitt Yost, Joseph Palacky, Willard Garey, Mrs. James Lenahan Brown, Mrs. F. Budd Schooley, Mrs. Sam Davis, Mrs. David Lohmann, Mrs. Jean Kuehn, R. E. Neal and Mrs. Laux.

[From the Wilkes-Barre Record, May 4, 1959]

THREE SCHOLARSHIPS TO BE GIVEN—SORDONI ANNOUNCES FOUNDATION GIFTS

Highlighting the testimonial dinner tendered Andrew J. Sordoni by the Back Mountain Protective Association Saturday night at Irem Temple Country Club was the announcement by Senator Sordoni that the Andrew J. Sordoni Foundation will provide three 4-year scholarships—one each to Wilkes College, King's College and College Misericordia—with the recipients to be selected by the directors of the protective association.

"A man who challenged his destiny, who met life and dared the slurs and arrows of outrageous fortune. He dared greatly, strove mightly and achieved magnificently," Judge J. Harold Flannery said in paying tribute to Sordoni, who was presented the Back Mountain Protective Association's Community Service Award.

Judge Flannery noted, "This seems to be an age of conformity. Our social order is developing us in a pattern. If we do not do as our neighbors, we do not fit.

"At one time the symbol of America was rugged individualism. Give me the man who will challenge his destiny. If that man goes down, he goes down gloriously; if he succeeds, he succeeds magnificently. Our honored guest followed no crowd, anxious to fit, anxious to conform. He dared and achieved magnificently."

Judge Flannery described the qualities of "head and heart and spirit" which characterize Senator Sordoni and won him the place he has achieved wherever his interests and activities have touched.

In presenting the Community Service Award to Andrew Sordoni, Attorney James Lenahan Brown, association president, reviewed the imprints the "senator" had made in the development of the Black Mountain area. He emphasized roles played by Commonwealth Telephone Co., and the Harveys Lake Light Co. in the industrial and residential growth of the region. "The Commonwealth Telephone Co. story," he said, "is the more dramatic, for the part it has had in unlocking the final door to gracious suburban living. Then, too, the location of its general offices in Dallas and the stature the company has assumed as third largest independent telephone company in the State has meant much to furthering the area. Truly, we pay tribute to a man whose contributes to our Back Mountain area and, indeed, with every area which has felt his dynamic leadership know no bonds in their telling."

In accepting the award, Andrew Sordoni said, "It's not any segment here this evening but everyone who has contributed in full measure to making the Back Mountain area a thriving, industrious community and a wonderful place in which to live and enjoy the fullness of life as it was meant to be.

"There are some of us here who remember back some 40 years and many of us could then visualize what this area could become. The fact that, working together, we've seen these visions realized is our greatest reward."

Former State senator Sordoni traced the early history of both the Harveys Lake Light Co. and of Commonwealth Telephone Co. He noted that in 1922 the Harveys Lake Light Co. had 6 miles of line and 100 customers. It now has 370 miles of line and 3,500 customers with a plant valuation approximating $1,250,000.

Commonwealth Telephone Co. in its general offices at Dallas has 150 employees and an annual payroll of over $500,000. Its plant investment in the Back Mountain area exceeds $3 million. This year Commonwealth construction in the Dallas area schedules an expenditure of $350,000 and of another $250,000 in 1960.

Note was made of the Sterling Farms at Harveys Lake which, comprising 4,200 acres, is noted as a model grassland dairy farm with its registered herd of Guernseys. It has for many years been the scene of Grassland fields days attended by hundreds of agricultural experts from all over the East.

In concluding, Senator Sordoni said, "I am humbly grateful for this honor. My greatest reward continues to be the friendship you extend and the knowledge that I am one of you."

Vocal selections by Mrs. Sylvia Schooley accompanied by Mrs. Robert W. Laux and the Misericordia Ensemble provided entertainment through the dinner.

Dinner chairman was Robert W. Laux and Mrs. Elizabeth Wallo, cochairman. Members of the reception committee included Rev. R. D. Yost, Joseph Palacky, Willard Garey, Mrs. James Lenahan Brown, Mrs. F. Budd Schooley, Mrs. Sam Davis, Mrs. David Lohmann, Mrs. Jean Kuehn and Mrs. Robert Laux.

The Fallacy of Blaming Inflation on Wage Increases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 4, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, everybody is against inflation. We know the great harm it does to helpless people. The problem is complex. Companies who can purchase full page ads ought, in my opinion, to show more responsibility about the kind of facts they peddle. The correspondence set out here below, under a previous consent, shows that the Warner & Swasey Co. has selected wages as the cause of price increases, omitting completely any consideration of profits, administered prices, and other factors far more in the control of the employer than wages are in the control of the employee.

The correspondence follows:

MARCH 11, 1959.

Dr. HUGH ELSBREE,
Director, Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

DEAR DR. ELSBREE: Enclosed is an advertisement that appeared in the U.S. News & World Report for February 27. I think these figures are either wrong or misleading or both. Wages minus productivity doesn't equal a meaningful figure because there are two different bases, so how can they talk about the 2 percent difference?

I'd like to have one of your economists fill in the correct statistics and confirm or deny my feeling that this reasoning is highly fallacious.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES O. PORTER,
Member of Congress.

EARN YOUR WAGE INCREASE OR YOU'LL LOSE IT

All the labor contracts in the world can't beat arithmetic—either you earn your wage increase by enough increased production to pay it, or lose it by rising prices that you help cause. Since the war, wages have gone up 5 percent per year. Productivity has gone up only 3 percent. Where else could the 2 percent difference come from except higher prices? And that is exactly what has happened—prices up an average of 2 percent per year.

Why not enjoy your wage increase? Demand modern machines, use them to increase efficiency of your production, and you'll be worth more without costing more. Everybody benefits—you most of all.

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., March 30, 1959.

To: The Honorable CHARLES O. PORTER.
From: Sar A. Levitan.
Subject: Attached Warner and Swasey Advertisement.

This is in response to your recent request for comment on the Warner & Swasey ad which appeared in the U.S. News & World Report, February 27, 1959.

The ad states in part:

"Since the war, wages have gone up 5 percent per year. Productivity has gone up only 3 percent. Where else could the 2 percent difference come from except higher prices? And that is exactly what has happened—prices up an average of 2 percent per year."

An analysis of each of the assertions follows:

1. "Since the war wages have gone up 5 percent.":

It is assumed that the statement refers to World War II. There are no data for average hourly earnings for all American industry dating back to 1945. The U.S. Department of Labor publishes gross hourly earnings for production workers in manufacturing and other industries.

According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, gross average hourly earnings since World War II have more than doubled; consequently, the average hourly rate of manufacturing employees in current dollars has risen by more than the 5 percent claimed by Warner & Swasey.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics has published recently data for average hourly wages and salaries in nonagricultural employment going back to 1947. According to this series, the average hourly wages and salaries between 1947 and 1958 rose 73.3 percent. This would mean 6 percent a year, rather than the 5 percent claimed in the ad.

2. "Productivity has gone up only 3 percent."

Again, according to the U.S. Department of Labor real product per employee man-hour rose 29.2 percent between 1947 and 1958, or 2.5 percent per year.

3. "Prices up an average of 2 percent per year."

The Consumer Price Index rose between 1947 and 1958 a total of 28.2 percent, or about 2.4 percent per year. Between 1945 and 1958 the Consumer Price Index rose by 60.4 percent, or almost 5 percent a year.

It appears that whatever claim Warner & Swasey have as producers of precision machinery does not extend to the use of precise statistics. But while the data used in the ad may be questioned, there can be little disagreement with the conclusion that the source of increased real wages lies in rising productivity.

However, the implication left from the ad is that prices rise as a result of wage increases. Few economists would agree with this broad statement. Causes for price increases obviously are much more complicated. While wages are a major factor in costs—about two-thirds of total American income is paid in wages and salaries—one may still question the extent to which rise in prices brings about wage increases and the impact of rising wages upon prices.

This in a nutshell is, of course, the basic current debate about the causes of inflation. The Warner & Swasey ad disregards all other factors and leaves the impression that rising wages are the only cause of inflation.

APRIL 6, 1959.

WARNER & SWASEY,
Cleveland, Ohio.

GENTLEMEN: I refer you to your ad on page 1 of U.S. News & World Report for February 25, 1959. Your machinery may be precise but your statistics are not.

Of course, I agree with you that the source of increased real wages lies in rising productivity, but your cavalier use of percentages borders on the irresponsible. I assume this was unintentional and that you relied on your advertising agency. That is why I am taking the trouble to point out your errors.

Enclosed is a copy of an analysis I had prepared by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress. I would be glad to have your comments, especially an explanation as to how the persons who prepared that ad could be so far off base.

Sincerely,

CHARLES O. PORTER,
Member of Congress.

CLEVELAND, OHIO, *April 21, 1959.*

The Honorable CHARLES O. PORTER,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PORTER: Thank you very much for writing to us about our advertisement, "Earn your wage increase or you'll lose it," and for having had an analysis prepared by the Reference Library.

With regard to the preciseness of our statistics, I'm afraid that I must raise the question as to what statistics on these subjects are precise? Frankly, we were not trying to be particularly precise, and I admit asking our copywriter to modify his figures to eliminate as many arguments as possible.

As your report shows, we can get statistics that will show much higher increase in gross average hourly earnings, and we can get statistics that will show that productivity has gone up less than we stated. We can also get statistics to show that prices have gone up more than we stated. We were trying to paint a picture, and we felt that the figures we quoted were shocking enough so that we did not need to use extreme figures.

Actually, I am not sure that I would be willing to accept any set of statistical figures on these subjects as being accurate; but I am perfectly willing to accept what I believe to be fact, and that is that if costs of production go up faster than increases in productivity, we are going to have higher prices, and if we have higher prices, increased wages are of little avail.

Admittedly, the entire picture is confused. On many items, present day prices are less in terms of hours worked by the average person; but in other cases, prices are higher in terms of hours worked by the average person. This, in my opinion, does not change our major premise, namely, that management, government, and labor should strive to continually increase the amount of goods produced, and that if wages increase faster than the increase in production per worker, prices will rise and wage increases will, in effect, be lost.

Yours very truly,

(Signed) WALTER K. BAILEY,
President.

P.S.—I spent a day in Portland last week. The weather was beautiful, and I admired everything out there. I regret to say that I had not been there in a good many years.

Remarks by Vice President Nixon at Conference on India and the United States

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 15, 1959

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the opening remarks of Vice President RICHARD NIXON to the Conference on India and the United States, May 4, 1959, in Washington, D.C., which was sponsored by the Committee for International Economic Growth:

OPENING REMARKS OF VICE PRESIDENT RICHARD NIXON TO THE CONFERENCE ON INDIA AND THE UNITED STATES, 1959

Mr. Johnston, Mr. Ambassador, and distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, I am very honored to appear here at this program, opening this historic conference and I can only say that I always feel much overwhelmed in a position such as this, because I realize that I am speaking before a group of people who are primarily experts on the subject which I am asked to cover. Mr. Johnston suggested that I have traveled a bit in the past 6 years, and he is, of course, correct—but I will have to admit that my travels throughout the world left time for only 5 days in India—and as anyone who has visited that country would tell you, 5 days does not make you an expert. I do not speak today to you who are experts in this field as one myself, and I know that from reading your program, you are going to make studies in depth of the problems which you are considering, but I thought it might be useful if I were to touch upon three matters of concern that might come up for consideration during the course of this conference. I noted that the first item listed on your agenda is the relation of India and its importance in relation to the security and freedom of the free world. Now when we consider the importance of India and its relationship to the security and freedom of the free world I think that perhaps we can best put it in context by pointing out one of the great crisis which confronts us today and measuring the problems of India with that crisis.

If you picked up your morning newspapers you no doubt noted that most of the headlines internationally on the front page dealt

with the crisis in Berlin. I would not underestimate the importance of the Berlin crisis, but I will say today that in my own mind what happens to India insofar as its economic progress is concerned in the next few years could be as important, or could be even more important in the long run than what happens in the negotiations with regard to Berlin. Now, having made this statement, let me indicate why I believe that is the case. As we know, in the great struggle which is going on in the world today, primary emphasis at the present time is on the nonmilitary aspect of the struggle—in Asia, in Africa, in the Near East, and in parts of Latin America and the whole world—not only the Asian world, but the American world, this hemisphere, is watching that struggle in Asia. There are two great peoples in Asia. The peoples who live under the Communist government of China, and the people of India. These are the two greatest population centers of the world, and of course the two greatest in Asia. One of these people is attempting to achieve economic progress without freedom. The other, the people of India, are attempting to achieve economic progress with freedom. They are very different in many respects, but they are alike in this respect. They both need—they both want—economic progress and so the question which will be answered in the next 5 years—the next 10 years—will be this: Can a people who need economic progress to satisfy the wants of their greatly increasing populations, achieve it in a climate of freedom, or must they pay for progress by giving up freedom? And what happens in India will therefore have a tremendous impact on the decisions made in other countries in Asia, in the Near East, in Africa, and even in the Americas. So this indicates the tremendous stake that the free world has in the economic problems of India.

Now, a second point, that I would make, is with regard to the attitude of the Government of the United States—the attitude that our Government and our people should have insofar as any aid we are able to provide for the economic development of India, or any other country in a similar status. I have often heard it said during courses of debates on this subject, that there are times when countries which we have been able to assist through loans or other programs, should not receive such considerations in the future because their leaders do not always agree with our leaders in the United Nations, or in other world councils. And my answer is always this: The purpose of U.S. aid has been, is, and must always be, not to make any country dependent upon us, but to allow all countries to be independent of us, or of any other foreign domination. Now, how can we justify, my friends in the Congress might ask then, the allocation of Government funds when we agree at the outset that those funds may not, in some instances, obtain complete agreement with the policies of the United States, and my answer is this: Our stake, the free world's stake, in India and all the other countries which are in this category, is that they are able to get the economic stability which will enable them in turn to have political independence. How does this serve us? It serves us because international communism and national independence are completely incompatible. And so this, of course, is the answer to those who do raise questions when this matter is up for consideration, as it will be during the course of this conference.

Now, a third point that I would make, is this: We agree that India needs economic progress. There is, of course, considerable disagreement as to how other nations may assist and work with the people and Government of India in attaining that progress. The easy answer would be, as far as the United States is concerned, to suggest that we best could assist by expanding what government does, and I would certainly say here today that our technical assistance programs, the programs of loans to the Export-Import Bank and the Developmental Loan Fund, and other governmental programs, certainly should be approved in the minimum amounts which have been requested by the administration. But I would be less than realistic if I were not to point out that if you were to place exclusive or even primary reliance on government assistance from the United States in order to attain this economic progress, we would be most unrealistic. And so I was glad to note that in the course of this conference not only will you consider what government can do, but also how private capital may also be attracted to this area of the world. And I would mention just three advantages that private capital has over government capital, recognizing at the outset that both are necessary, and both have their place.

First—Private capital is expansible, almost to an unlimited extent, whereas Government capital, insofar as our country the United States, is concerned, is limited—limited by our own budget and by the considerations which always come up when budget problems are before a country.

The second point is that, where private capital is concerned, there is and can be no question of any political influence going with it, and on occasions there is, of course, a question where Government capital is concerned that there might be political implications involved, and the third point is that private capital brings with it the skilled technical assistance which is needed, and without which capital might be wasted. These three advantages, I think, are worth mentioning, and I emphasize again that both are necessary, but in your considerations develop to the full how private capital can come in, because its greatest advantage is the first one I mentioned, that it is expansible, whereas Government capital is definitely limited.

And now if I could go to one last point. It is related to my first—I noted that in your conference agenda you have pointed out that you would consider the importance of India in relation to the security and freedom of the free world. Speaking now as an official of the American Government, and as an American citizen, I would not like this great Conference to begin believing that this was our sole interest. As far as a government and a people were concerned, when we did provide governmental assistance, or other assistance to our friends in India. If there were no communism in the world—if there were not threat of communism to the United States and other free nations like India, there would still be poverty and misery and disease, and when the people of the United States and our Government would be concerned about that poverty and misery and disease, and I would not like the case for Government assistance, the case for the interest of the American people in our friends in India, to be rested at the outset of this Conference simply on the negative, defensive issue of helping India in order to save the United States from communism. I think the case can better be presented in terms of—not the defeat of communism, in which, of course, we are interested, because we realize that freedom can live only where dictators are defeated—but our primary interest must be the victory of plenty over want, of health over disease, of freedom over tyranny of any type, wherever it exists in the world, and as far as our friends in India are concerned, we can assure you, those who are here today, and those in that great land so far away, in which we have always had such a warm and friendly interest, we can assure you that we welcome the opportunity to work with you, to work with you in developing the economic progress which is yours, so that you can prove to all the world that it is possible to have progress with freedom. This is our aim, and we know also that it is yours.

Thank you very much.

German American Chamber of Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 7, 1959

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, I have previously referred to the uniting of the United States-German Chamber of Commerce and the German-American Trade Promotion Office into the German American Chamber of Commerce, Inc., on April 27, 1959. I have been fortunate enough to secure a copy of the speech delivered on this occasion by Mr. Fritz Berg, president, Federation of German Industries, president, Council of European Industrial Federation.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the above-mentioned speech:

ADDRESS BY FRITZ BERG, PRESIDENT, FEDERATION OF GERMAN INDUSTRIES, PRESIDENT, COUNCIL OF EUROPEAN INDUSTRIAL FEDERATIONS

Before I came here, some friends suggested that my task tonight was to make a speech on a newborn child. I had to tell them that they were wrong and that the event we are celebrating today was not the christening of a child but, rather, the logic conclusion, the happy-end of a relationship that led up to marriage.

To put it in less romantic terms, we are celebrating today the fusion of two organizations both of which had set themselves the same basic aims: the promotion of economic relations and the strengthening of economic ties between the United States and Germany. It was logic, therefore, that these two organizations—the United States-German Chamber of Commerce and the German-American Trade Promotion Office—should unite.

The United States-German Chamber of Commerce was formed in 1947, only 2 years after the war. It was formed at a time when relations between our two countries were not yet placed on the same basis of friendship and mutual confidence by which they are characterized today. It should be underlined that those who took the initiative to set up a German American Chamber of Commerce so little time after the war were United States citizens. Let me take this opportunity of expressing our gratitude to them. With small means at their disposal, they rendered invaluable assistance in reestablishing contacts that had been broken during the war.

The German-American Trade Promotion Office (GATPO) was established in 1950, as the U.S. branch of the Association for the Encouragement of German-American Trade. "Dollar-drive," as this organization was briefly referred to, was created by private business organizations and government with the encouragement of the U.S. Government. It has given invaluable service to German businessmen trying to sell in the American market which, as you know, has never been an easy market to tackle for European exporters. But it has also helped American businessmen find their partners in Germany. I wish to thank all those who worked with GATPO for the important contribution they

have made to the revival of trade relations between the United States and Germany.

At the end of the war and for some years afterwards, there were no genuine trade relations between our two countries at all. Then, from 1950 to 1958, German exports to the United States rose from $102 million to $629 million, while imports from the United States between 1950 and 1958 went up from $412 million to $998 million. Capital transactions also increased constantly; today American investments in Western Germany amount to about $500 million.

However, in this connection it is only fair to mention one name which cannot be repeated often enough when speaking of the reconstruction of the European economies after the war: the Marshall Plan—standing out in economic and political history as a symbol of generosity combined with wisdom. It provided the basis on which only our own work and initiative could bear fruit. And as far as Germany is concerned, there is a man who had an important share in the practical execution of this American policy and whom we are privileged to have among us tonight: Mr. John J. McCloy. I first met him in Frankfurt in 1950 when he represented the United States in Germany. When he left several years later, we had the feeling that a friend was parting, one that had always tried to understand the nature and the problems of our country. If relations between the United States and Germany have taken the course they did, if they are governed today by mutual respect, friendship and confidence, this is in great measure his merit.

The rapid increase in trade and economic interrelations during the past years convinced us that the time had come to create a new instrument of German-American cooperation, perhaps somewhat different in character from both the two predecessor organizations I mentioned a minute ago. The new organization, it is true, must perform the classical tasks normally attributed to a chamber of commerce: to assist businessmen in carrying on trade and establishing new contacts with business partners in the other country. But in doing that we hope it will be a platform for the exchange of ideas and opinions between business leaders on the essential questions of our economic relations—thus making a valuable contribution to the promotion of American-German cooperation within the wider framework of Western cooperation.

It is in this spirit that I would now like to touch upon some of the topical problems of the world economic scene.

As regards Germany's and Europe's commercial relations with the United States, there is one development which, of late, seems to be in the center of interest over here: the creation of a common market among six nations of Western Europe. The European Economic Community, as it is officially called, is part of the efforts to unite Europe (or, at least, part of Europe). Ever since the end of the last war, the United States followed a policy of encouraging European integration. For she believed that European unity would increase the strength and stability of the free economies in Europe and thus enhance our mutual security.

No doubt this official American policy is still valid. But now that the European Economic Community has come about, concern is sometimes expressed in America that the common market might develop into a protectionist bloc discriminating against the outside world and running counter to the efforts of freeing trade on a worldwide scale.

Let me briefly enumerate the reasons why I am convinced that this concern is completely unfounded.

First, the common external tariff which is to be established under the Rome Treaty will not be higher than the average of the previously existing national tariffs, and in many cases it will be lower. Nevertheless, it might be argued, the dismantling of internal tariffs within the Common Market will in some cases make it more advantageous for a country to buy from one of its Common Market partners what it previously bought from countries outside the community. But then it should be kept in mind that the common external tariff will not be created overnight, but within a long period of 12 or 15 years—giving plenty of time for such adaptations in trade and production programs as may appear expedient.

Secondly, while the six are an important market for the United States, about three-quarters of U.S. exports to the Common Market countries consist of foodstuffs, tobacco and raw materials, on the majority of which tariffs are low or nonexistent. The rest of American exports to these countries consists of finished goods, especially industrial equipment, machinery, and chemicals. In these fields, the United States should always be able to find a market, despite customs barriers, because it is generally further ahead in technological development. Thirdly, it should not be forgotten that by way of bilateral negotiations between third countries and the Common Market, as well as negotiations within GATT, there is much scope for progressive reduction of such protection as remains (and in fact the United States is about to take an initiative in this matter). Fourth, the creation of a great market in Europe has increased incentives for American business to establish branch factories in Europe, to conclude license agreements and to participate in European enterprises. In fact, many important American companies are already moving in this direction.

Fifth, and this to my mind is the most important reason and one of the main reasons why the Common Market was established at all: it will certainly lead to general economic expansion within the six countries. This means greater purchasing power and generally increased chances of selling in this market. The higher the income, the more "needs" people detect and the more they want to buy. Thus, as you all know, our best customers are the most highly industrialized countries.

For these reasons I do not believe that the establishment of the Common Market will involve for the United States a loss of markets in Europe. On the contrary, it will offer a chance for an expansion of trade in many fields.

I would add that the will not to create a protectionist bloc but to contribute progressively to the freeing of international trade in general is not only laid down in the Rome Treaty; it is also demonstrated by the fact that the majority of the Common Market partners support the idea of a European Economic Association (or free trade area, as it was formerly called), extending the benefits of tariff dismantling to all 17 OEEC countries in Europe.

If negotiations on this association between the Common Market countries and their partners within OEEC have proved difficult, I am confident that a solution will be possible. The introduction of currency convertibility by 11 European countries and the special measures taken by France at the end of last year have considerably improved the prospects for reaching agreement. Of course, it will not come about overnight. France, after the courageous steps she has taken to reform her economy and to stabilize her currency, now needs a little time to breathe. The solution will have to be a compromise, probably in the form of a multilateral commercial agreement.

Germany industry, in agreement with its government, has always supported such a compromise and tried to mediate between the divergent points of view.

While the subject of the proposed agreement is a purely economic one, the creation of a European Economic Association is nevertheless also of immense political importance. The statesmen should act correspondingly. Cleavages of opinion in the negotiations have been largely about matters of technical detail. These, to my mind, should not provide the basis for decisions on projects of such consequence—economically and politically.

We therefore sincerely hope that the European Economic Association will become a reality. But we should not stop attention there. Within the Western World as a whole we should adopt the regular habit of consulting each other on all important matters of economic policy. In the interest of a harmonious and expansive development of the economies of the free world and in the interest of an effective defense against Soviet expansion, we should coordinate all essential measures in the field of business cycle, monetary and foreign economic policy.

Perhaps we ought to give some thought to the question as to how this can best be achieved: if new organizational forms are required or if it can be done within existing organizational frameworks.

Let me next turn briefly to one of the central problems of international economic policy and one of the most important tasks for cooperation among all Western countries: the assistance to the less developed areas. We want to help these countries, for moral as well as for quite selfish reasons, to develop their economies, to raise the living standards of their populations and, thus, to become better partners in a worldwide mutually beneficial commercial exchange.

I said this was a common task of the West. But what we are lacking most so far is a coordination of policies and a common concept as to how we should assist these countries. All too often in the past Western assistance has proved economically worthless, because it was not used in the right way, while politically it produced the opposite effect than had been hoped for. Also very often we gave assistance against each other, guided by short-sighted commercial motives. Let those in government and business who bear responsibility in this matter get together, in order to find, and to agree upon, a common policy—in the interest of the countries to be developed, in our own long-term interest, and because Western assistance must be as effective as possible in comparison with Soviet activities in this field.

What we need is a policy inspired by a combination of generosity and wisdon—as was the Marshall plan.

Assistance to the less developed areas is closely connected with the question as to how a stabilization of international commodity markets can be achieved.

The main commodity producing countries aer identical with the countries in process of development. On average, about 80 percent of their foreign exchange earnings are derived from exports of raw materials. It is obvious what the continuous fall of prices in the world commodity markets since about mid-1957 means under these circumstances.

The purchasing power of these countries is drastically reduced. It is rather disillusioning for them to find that they lose again, due to the fall in commodity prices, what they receive in the form of foreign assistance. However, the reduction of purchasing power means at the same time fewer purchases of industrial goods and equipment from the industrialized countries of the West (which no doubt was one of the factors in recent recessionary movements). Due to the incapacity of buying required capital equipment abroad the development programs of these countries are retarded and often seriously jeopardized.

The personal incomes of millions of people, already extremely low, are further

reduced. The consequence often is political unrest making these populations more prone to Communist infiltration.

I am aware the problem is a most complex and difficult one. I am also aware that past attempts at stabilizing commodity markets, for example by international commodity agreement, have not always been a happy experience. I dare not claim that a solution will be possible. However, in view of the importance this problem assumes in the wider context of assistance to the development countries and our defense against the Soviets in the economic field, we should at least try, jointly, to find a satisfactory solution in some form or other.

I mentioned the need for defense in the economic field. In fact, people often tend to forget that we are involved today in a global struggle with world communism in all fields of our existence—and that the threat is not only a military one.

At the 21st Communist Party Congress in the Soviet Union Mr. Khrushchev declared that it was by success in economic competition that communism would triumph on the world scene. If we adopt this way of thinking, it means that success or failure in the economic field are battles won or lost in the free world's struggle for survival with the Soviet bloc. In our foreign economic policy it means that many economic facts assume quite a different character from what they would be in a world of global international cooperation and peaceful competition and exchange.

You know Soviet tactics in the economic field, and I would not further dwell upon this tonight. I would only say that the problems involved must be tackled by the governments of the free world and by free enterprise in common.

Of course, this does not mean that we should regard all our economic relations with the Soviet Union as part of an economic warfare. Where the Soviets are prepared to follow normal trade practices and adhere to fair rules of international exchange, we can, I believe, confidently accept the challenge of competition. However, let us be on our guard and, where necessary, prepared to defend our free economies and our free way of life.

We in Germany stand at the frontline between the two blocs. You will understand, therefore, that we see the danger most clearly.

With the practical demonstration of communism right in front of us, in the eastern half of our own country, we stand the more firmly by the West—where we belong by our tradition, by our common cultural heritage and because we are—and want to remain—a free nation.

Let me say this again quite clearly: German industry has from the beginning wholeheartedly supported the policy of integration and cooperation with the West followed by the Federal Chancellor, Dr. Adenauer. Speaking on behalf of German industry tonight, I can assure you that our attitude will not change in the future. What, then, about the rumors which are occasionally heard that German industry is wishfully turning its eyes to the East in the hope of profitable business with the Soviet bloc?

Let me first quote a few figures. During pre-war years, Germany's trade with Russia was between 12 and 18 percent of its total foreign trade. Since the end of the war our trade with all Soviet-bloc countries has never exceeded 4 percent. Experts agree that for a number of reasons (for example, the irregularity of Soviet supply and demand, the limited range of goods offered by the Soviet bloc) there is little prospect of an increase in the years to come. Nor is there any special effort made by Western Germany to intensify trade relations with the Soviets. If there should be more trade in the future, it will be only within a general expansion of foeign trade.

Germany will never increase its commercial relations with the Soviets at the expense of relations with the West. The determinate policy of promoting Western economic integration through the Common Market, the European Economic Association, and the various international economic organizations of the West is, I believe, sufficient proof of this.

We are convinced that dealings with the East at the expense of the West would be the beginning of the end of our free economic system and our free institutions. It is not always realized that free enterprise is not only completely exterminated in Soviet Russia, but also in Eastern Germany.

Surely, we shall not be so stupid to let ourselves be maneuvered in a situation where trade relations with the Soviet bloc could be exploited for political blackmail. The example of our Finnish friends shows how dangerous it is to deal with the Eastern bloc, if this bloc is at the same time in a position to exercise political pressure.

If German industry believes that it is irrevocably bound to the West, this is also true of the overwhelming majority of the German people. You can also be certain that the foreign policy of our Government will not change. While the decision by Dr. Adenauer to accept nomination for the office of Federal President may at first have caused a shock, it is now clear that this does not mean a turn in policy. On the contrary, it is a well-considered way of maintaining the continuity of German foreign policy for many years to come.

It cannot be my task to elaborate on the points at issue at the coming conferences at the summit. But you can be assured that our Government will have the full support of industry against any solution breaking Western Germany out of the community of free nations and isolating it politically from its present friends. For separated from the West, we would probably before long suffer the fate of Czechoslovakia in 1948.

At the same time, the balance of economic power would dangerously, if not decisively, shift in favor of the Soviets. Mr. Khrushchev, however, hopes to win the cold war through economic predominance. With the separation of Western Germany from the western community of nations he would be one step, a big step, closer to the goal of world domination.

Speaking of our attitude in the field of foreign policy, I wish to insert a few remarks about our relationship with France. Here again we have been convinced that the policy followed by our Government was right. This policy is based on the recognition that the essential core of economic and political cooperation in Western Europe is friendship between France and Germany. Time and again German industry has given proof of how much importance it attaches to this question. And I am happy to state that in this we are at one with the leading men of French industry.

Let me finally add a word about Berlin. Naturally the fate of this city is very close to the hearts of the Germans. However, as the advanced post of the West, Berlin is at the same time a concern of the whole free world. Let me express our gratitude to our American friends for the spirit of solidarity they have shown and for the firm attitude they have taken toward the Soviets in this question. Events have already proved that this firmness was right.

This brings me to the end. I could do no more tonight than briefly touch upon some of the outstanding problems our free world is faced with and in the solution of which we as representatives of free enterprises bear a great share of responsibility. Let us be aware of this responsibility and take the time—in spite of everyday business worries—to think about the problems which concern us all in common. As Mr. H. W. Prentis said at the first International Conference of Manufacturers in 1951, we should not only be businessmen but by our action give proof that we deserve the name of industrial statesmen.

Before I sit down let me express the hope that this German American Chamber of Commerce will be successful in fulfilling its tasks in the years to come, that it will make a contribution to United States-German cooperation and thus to Western cooperation in general.

Jazz: A Means of Direct Intercultural Communication No. 2

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1959

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, Ralph J. Gleason, columnist for the San Francisco Chronicle, has persistently argued that outstanding U.S. jazz musicians should be included in our various programs designed to communicate American life and culture to other peoples. I am in sympathy with his view that jazz is of "interest to the people of the rest of the world, the Soviet Union being no exception."

Mr. Gleason again makes his point in a recent article which, while outspoken and satirical in tone, nevertheless argues effectively for inclusion of jazz along with other cultural presentations in the American exhibition in Moscow this summer. I request that this article be reprinted in the RECORD for the attention of all Members of Congress:

(By Ralph J. Gleason)

Well, the State Department finally let the cat out of the bag.

They're not going to do anything about sending jazz to the American exhibition in Moscow this summer. In fact, the only performing arts to be presented will be, to quote Billboard magazine, "along the lines of symphony and/or ballet to balance with the Russian counterpart exhibiting in New York."

Billboard quotes Harold C. McClellan, director of the American National Exhibition in Moscow, as saying that it was intended to give "a complete picture of American life without reference either to political, military or other controversial matters, and with no propaganda."

McClellan doesn't come right out and say that there will be no jazz groups at the exhibition. He just says that the State Department isn't sending any. If, however, a jazz group happens to get to Moscow, perhaps as tourists, there will be facilities at the exhibition for performing artists. "Mikes will be set up all over the place," he says, and visiting artists will be allowed to perform if the directors think they're okay.

Think that one over. We can't send Count Basie to Moscow, but if he and his 15-piece band went over at their own expense, then maybe, maybe, they'd be al-

lowed to play at the cultural exhibition which is supposed to present "a complete picture of American life."

Do these people never learn? What is required to convince the U.S. State Department, all the way from Dulles down to McClellan, that jazz music is not just another aspect of U.S. life and culture, but a particularly vital one which is of paramount interest to the people of the rest of the world, the Soviet Union being no exception.

As this column has repeated time and again since the Moscow Exhibition was first announced, jazz music should be a major part of the plans with a full roster of the best jazz groups present. Jazz is our most effective ambassador, as every musician who gets overseas discovers PDQ. Obviously we don't have any musicians in the State Department.

However, we do have doughnut dunkers. What do you think we are going to set up in Moscow to help "give a complete picture of American life?"

We are going to set up a doughnut-making machine, so help me. "We will have a fascinating doughnut-making machine," McClellan says. "The accumulated doughnuts will be given away in batches twice a day," he adds, perfectly seriously.

Well, isn't that nice. No wonder the people of the world get an odd opinion of us with brilliant thinkers like this pastry fan handling things. "A fascinating doughnut machine." Is he kidding?

Construction Program for Medical, Dental, and Public Health Schools

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 6, 1959

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, the cold, hard fact of the matter is that we as a nation are not doing what we should today to make sure that the schools of medicine, dentistry, public health, and other centers for education and research in the health field are adequate to meet the challenges and responsibilities they face, and all of us face, tomorrow.

One hears a great deal about progress in the health field these days. It is true that we have made giant strides in some vitally important areas. We can be proud of what has been accomplished in the construction of hospital and other health facilities, in the improvements of medical and public health services, in medical research and the assurance of its future development. We can be pleased with the advances associated with the pharmaceutical and chemical industry, with the contributions of voluntary health agencies and foundations, and with the health-consciousness of the American people which finds expression in organization and action. We can be proud of these things, and pleased, but we cannot be content.

One of the great gaps in our present programs is in the absence of broad support for the health institutions as institutions, as contrasted with the support of some of their separate functions.

Specifically, I am concerned that we are at the breaking point in terms of the ability of these teaching institutions in the health field to keep up with our population growth and with the demands engendered by the rapid changes in medicine and public health.

This is not a new concern of mine, or of many people who are influential leaders in medicine and science today. A great many proposals have been made by Members of Congress, by the executive branch, and by interests outside of the Federal Government seeking ways to meet at least part of the all too evident need. There has been a great deal of discussion, but almost nothing in the way of action.

The legislation that I introduce today proposes that the Federal Government give greater assistance in the renovation and modernization of our present medical and related schools, and that at the same time we give encouragement and stimulus to the construction of new schools. It would build upon and extend the highly productive present program of matching grants to assist in the construction of health research facilities. Thus it sets no precedents and poses no philosophical problems, even among those who persist in the archaic belief that the use of Federal funds for the partial support of medical school activities is ipso facto a threat of Federal control and socialized medicine.

The thing my proposed legislation does is to give clear recognition to three things: First, that research and education are inseparable and often indistinguishable one from the other in a medical school environment; second, that adequate facilities are a basic requirement for medical, dental, and related research and education; and third, that the Federal Government shares in this responsibility to see that such facilities are provided commensurate with the national need.

In other construction programs, matching funds from Federal sources—such as the Hill-Burton hospital construction program and the health research facilities construction program—have been successful beyond all expectation in helping the States, communities, and institutions raise money from non-Federal sources. Such matching grants foster and encourage the putting of private and State money to effective use. Without such stimulus, the other funds might never be raised and the needed facilities might never be built.

It is proposed, therefore, that the Congress enact legislation which will modify and extend the Health Research Facilities Act, now in its third year and being very effectively administered by the Public Health Service, in the following major respects:

First. Changes the title of the Act to include facilities for education as well as research in the health field.

Second. Extend the authorized duration of the program to 5 years, beginning with the fiscal year 1960.

Third. Increase the annual authorized availability of funds from the $30 million now provided for research facilities only to a total of $50 million annually for both research and educational facilities, thus making $250 million available for presently established schools of medicine, dentistry, public health, and osteopathy over a 5-year period.

Fourth. In addition, provides $100 million with more favorable matching terms for the construction of new schools in the above fields, including an initial or starting grant of up to $25,000 for planning purposes.

Fifth. Expands by 50 percent the membership of the Council that reviews and makes final recommendations on these grants to include educational as well as research representation.

There is great urgency associated with the enactment of such legislation.

One reason lies in the population changes that will occur during the next decade. Our total population will grow from 175 million to 220 million by 1970. Nearly three-quarters of this increase will be among persons over 65 and under 20 years of age, when requirements for medical care—which means, primarily, more physicians—are most frequent.

Moreover, medical practice continues to be more complex and the task of educating physicians correspondingly so. It is a task that cannot be carried out effectively in the absence of a fully adequate physical plant.

Then, too, medical and related schools carry an increasing responsibility to pioneer in the provision of medical and community health services. They carry out the largest component of the Nation's research in the health field. And they produce and increasingly important segment of the Nation's total manpower for research in the health sciences.

For these and a host of other reasons that are self-evident, it is abundantly clear that these schools are a national resource. Their ability to meet the challenges of tomorrow is a matter of deep public concern. It is our responsibility to give voice and substance to that concern in a program of action—a program that will reflect the public interest.

The medical schools need for assistance in the construction of new and the renovation of existing facilities has been amply demonstrated and often reiterated in studies and reports by such eminent groups as the Association of American Medical Colleges, the Council on Medical Education of the American Medical Association, the Committee of Consultants to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, this House itself, and others whose interest, insight, and objectivity are beyond question. They do not pretend, nor do I, that matching grants for construction purposes will meet all of the future needs of the medical schools. Ultimately, of course, some way must be found to meet the needs of such institutions for general operating funds. The institutions themselves, the Congress, and the people are not able to see this issue clearly today. It will take time, and study, and debate for the issue to be clarified, and it must be clarified before it can be resolved. We do know, however, that the health institutions of today are inadequately housed and that we will need additional institutions in years to

come. Let us, then, move ahead one step further in our national effort to maintain and protect one of our most precious national resources, our health, by making it possible for the physical plants of the schools to be more adequate for tomorrow's needs.

The Real Story Behind Kidnap of Mississippi Negro

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 7, 1959

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the May 14 issue of Jet magazine:

THE REAL STORY BEHIND KIDNAP OF MISSISSIPPI NEGRO—SOME WHITES FEARED SUPREME

In his last jailhouse letter, Mississippi kidnap victim Mack Charles Parker denied the rape of a pregnant white woman, called his accusing exbuddies "liars," and wrote that "God has given me willpower to carry on." Two weeks after his abduction from the Poplarville jail, there was still the touch of the divine will in the gruesome case, and the possibility that the obscure 23-year-old pulpwood hauler might be remembered in history.

The attempt to solve his kidnaping (he was awaiting trial at the time) caused the largest manhunt in any civil rights case in the South—including 40 crack FBI agents and teams of State law enforcers. The drive marked the initial Federal effort to smash forever an age-old Dixie custom, and the first real test of the FBI's prowess in the thorny southern racial picture. But with the extensive mile-by-mile search of swamplands, there was great doubt that hardcore Mississippi suddenly would mend its brutal ways.

Scores of dazed Negroes in the area whispered: "It's been going on for years and nothing has been done." And the rabid and predominant racists in the wealthy hometown of the late Senator Theodore Bilbo still echoed white supremacy views. Even with the FBI in town, one white man told reporters: "Parker's a good nigger now. The only good nigger is a dead nigger."

Mississippi's Negroes figured Poplarville someday (but not this soon) would be caught up in the rising civil rights tide. For years, law enforcers barred (without dispute) Negroes from streets after 8 p.m. No Negro has ever voted, or served on a jury, not only in the town but in the entire Pearl River County. Humble and penitent, its Negroes live in quarters outside the city. Said a Hattiesburg mother: "We've never allowed our kids to go into town. We ride 15 miles out of the way. That town's a hell hole."

Even mother Eliza Parker gasped in fear last February when she learned that her boy—the sole support of a seven-member clan—was arrested and charged in the rape of a white woman in Poplarville. She tried to hire a white lawyer ("not to upset anybody") but was turned down. Finally, in desperation, she hired (for $1,500, but only $80 was paid) Vicksburg's Richard Jess Brown, one of the four full-time Negro lawyers in the entire State. And he realized the momentous task—he would become the first Negro ever to appear in the town courtroom.

As tension mounted, Parker (never fully identified by his alleged victim) was whisked to the Hinds County jail in Jackson—some 80 miles away—and even newspapers were not informed of his whereabouts. When he was returned in April for the grand jury session, worried officials promised Attorney Brown he would be given "extra protection" on the trip back to town. And Lawyer Brown argued for moving the trial to another town, but was opposed by Sheriff Osborne Moody, and even by Judge Sebe Dale, who implied that "the good people would stand for law and order."

Meanwhile, other storm clouds gathered. Agents of the Civil Rights Commission launched a probe of Negro vote denial in the area, got affidavits and readied the first case in the State's "swamp" section. Then, a Hattiesburg minister, the Rev. John M. Barnes, 62, went to Washington and aired the discrimination charges before the House civil rights hearing (he later received threatening phone calls that his house would be blown sky high). And finally, the Negro lawyer refused to sidestep the vote issue and insisted on motioning that the indictment against Parker be quashed because Negroes were barred from the jury.

As the trial date neared, hopes for a conviction and the death penalty began to wane. There was talk that "the nigger lawyer" might destroy the State's case, based on circumstantial evidence (there were no witnesses). And even if he didn't, Lawyer Brown still had an ace in the hole. Last year, a Federal circuit court upset a Mississippi case involving a Negro convicted of murdering a white woman. The reason: Negroes did not serve on the jury. (The clincher: Pearl River County also had no Negro voters.)

Investigating FBI agents noted curiously the legal preparations of the mob (gloves and stockings to hide fingerprints, masks on faces) and the scarcity of evidence pointing to a body—a necessity in any prosecution. Also, there were questions being asked as to how the mob quickly found the jail keys, opened two cell block locks.

Belatedly, one newspaper pointed out that many whites had the belief that "even if Parker had been convicted a Federal Court might have set him free."

But as the surviving Negro prisoners daily scrubbed the jailhouse steps, ugly bloodstains refused to be washed out, dramatizing the fact that the same blood yet remained on some hands somewhere, some place.

REA Suffers a Blow With Eisenhower Veto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BRADEMAS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 6, 1959

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, in the last few days Congress has twice voted on legislation of direct importance to all persons who depend on the Rural Electrification Administration program for their electricity.

Many of the farm people of Indiana, including thousands of the citizens I have the honor to represent in LaPorte and Marshall Counties, depend for their electric power on the Rural Electric Membership Corporations, the REMC's.

The Rural Electrification Administration program has for many years contributed enormously to American life by bringing the blessings of electricity to the farm families of our country and by stimulating the business and industry which produces and sells the appliances, machinery, and equipment needed by REA users.

Unfortunately, the rural electric systems of Indiana have been under severe attack by both the Handley administration in Indianapolis and the Eisenhower administration in Washington.

On April 15 the House of Representatives, by a margin of nearly 2 to 1, voted to uphold the integrity of the REA program by restoring to the Rural Electrification Administrator sole authority to pass on rural power and telephone loans. The bill, which was also passed by a similar margin in the Senate, would thus reaffirm the original intent of Congress that the Administrator of REA, who is appointed to office for a term of 10 years, should be free from political influence. Since 1953, however, the Secretary of Agriculture has had the last word on the approval or disapproval of loans over $500,000.

During the 1958 campaign I stated my conviction that the REMC's should be permitted to operate without having to engage constantly in political and legislative battles merely to defend their right to exist. REMC's are nonpartisan and should be permitted to remain that way. This is the reason I was glad to join with the great majority of my colleagues in Congress in voting to restore to the Administrator of REA the full authority to pass on loans independent of the control of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, with the passage of this legislation rural America could have again had confidence in the integrity of the loan procedures of the Rural Electrification Administration, and the farm families of Indiana and the Nation who use REA could have continued without the concern many now feel to enjoy the benefits of modern electric service.

REPUBLICANS KILL REA BILL

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, shortly after the House passed the REA bill, President Eisenhower vetoed it.

Then the U.S. Senate, by obtaining the necessary two-thirds margin, voted to override the veto.

A few days later, however, on April 30, nearly solid Republican opposition in the House of Representatives defeated a Democratic effort to override the veto. Voting to override were 274 Democrats and 6 Republicans; voting to uphold the veto were 142 Republicans and 4 Democrats.

I was among those who voted for the REA program and to override the veto. Although I regret that the supporters of REA were defeated on this vote, I am nonetheless proud to have been counted with the great majority of my colleagues in both the House of Representatives and the Senate for a program that means so much to so many of the people of rural America.

TVA Benefits Many

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD G. WOLF
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 7, 1959

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I would like to simply state that with all the debate we have heard on TVA I am still not certain that the greatest purpose to all the American people which the TVA has served, is as the conscience of the private power trust, not only in the region of the Tennessee River, but throughout the entire Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I visited the TVA back in its infancy and returned 20 years later. I was tremendously impressed by the great changes made during these years. The new industrial life which has come to this previously barren area has brought a fine new standard of living by creating many job opportunities. The new homes soon followed, along with the many demands which homebuilding creates. This again made more job opportunities, and so on.

Another aspect which is sometimes overlooked is the industry which has grown out of the many recreational advantages made available by the TVA lakes. For many years the country waited for the private power companies to develop fully our natural water resources. It is true that here and there they did purchase and develop a few sites. But in every case they had to be concerned with the question of whether the service they gave could be sold at a profit. They could not assume the responsibility for providing even electric service to all who wanted or needed it, much less for providing flood control, navigation ways and recreational areas for the benefit of all. Their resources were far too limited for this and they could never have justified full-scale river development to their stockholders had they made the attempt.

More than half the power generated by TVA is used by the Government at national defense installations. These atomic plants are serving our defense needs and providing medical and scientific progress for the entire country. We all benefit from it either directly or indirectly.

Instead of hampering the development of private power companies, the Federal power system is, in reality, promoting their development by selling a large block of power to them at wholesale rates. In 1956, private power interests served nearly eight-tenths—78.8 percent—of all consumers in the United States. In the same year they generated 67.2 percent of all power.

I would like to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that anything which tends to weaken the TVA ultimately affects these many factors made possible by the many great and forward thinking Congressmen who saw fit to establish the people's ownership of the water resources of this vital valley.

Previously I stated that the TVA has become the conscience of the private power industry. I would like to demonstrate my point by simply stating that prior to the coming of public power, electricity was costing nine times as much as it now costs in this area. This tremendous difference in cost dramatizes the need for the TVA. These are some of the reasons why I will always oppose any move to weaken this great project.

Poison in Your Water—No. 73

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 7, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the Seattle (Wash.) Times of August 24, 1958, entitled "Swimmers Found in Polluted Waters":

SWIMMERS FOUND IN POLLUTED WATERS

A Seattle-King County Health Department report recently issued on Puget Sound and lake bathing beaches is studded with "closed" and "not recommended" notations.

But only Green Lake remains posted and notably free of bathers.

At Lincoln Park, listed by the health department as closed because of sewage discharges in the immediate vicinity, three youngsters from Queen Anne Hill were bathing on a recent warm day.

Steven Goldsmith, 13, explained that he, his brother, Chris, and their pal, George Graham, usually swim at Green Lake.

"But that's closed now," Steven explained.

ARE YOU KIDDING?

They hadn't heard that Lincoln Beach was closed, too. "Are you kidding us?" Steven asked.

Paul V. Brown, park superintendent, said Lincoln Park had been posted—but signs have a way of disappearing.

At Green Lake "Beach Closed" signs are implanted on posts in the water several feet from shore. They stay put. But the ebb and flow of tides bars such posting in the water at Sound beaches, Brown explained.

Health Department officials said their experience with posting has been equally bad. The Health Department signs, carry a warning, "Penalty for defacing or removing this sign, $100 or 30 days in jail or both." But they just keep disappearing.

The health department says it depends upon newspapers to relay its reports on beaches "not recommended." Public response this year has been good, an official said.

LIFEGUARDS USED

At Vancouver, B.C., where a general closing of polluted beaches has been ordered, 48 lifeguards have been ordered on duty to prevent bathing by children and to warn adults.

Brown said Seattle doesn't have the personnel for such a program. He also said the Vancouver problem is worse than Seattle's because the Canadian city uses tidal pools which allow pollution to collect.

Adequate Appropriations Needed for New Jersey-New York Port Channels

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 7, 1959

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following testimony which I gave before the House Appropriations Committee, Subcommittee on Public Works, requesting adequate appropriations for the New Jersey-New York port channels:

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER, OF NEW JERSEY, IN SUPPORT OF ADEQUATE APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE NEW JERSEY-NEW YORK PORT CHANNELS, APRIL 27, 1959

The New Jersey district I represent is a peninsula with federally improved channels on its three sides. The appropriations being requested for an adequate improvement program for the Federal channels in New York harbor affect all three of these channels. As this committee can therefore readily see, the economic welfare of the district I represent is greatly affected by what happens on the waterfront.

On the east side of the Hudson County peninsula, which takes in my district, there is the New Jersey Pierhead Line channel. This particular channel is a shallow-draft channel which was authorized and constructed to relieve some of the congestion that is characteristic of Upper New York Bay in New York Harbor. The purpose of the channel was to draw off some of the harbor craft and other shallow-draft boats from the main ship channel and thereby eliminate danger of collision brought about by ship traffic congestion. Unfortunately, in the construction of this channel, the engineers underestimated the navigation requirements of flotilla tows—those towboats that have two or more barges in tow—and failed to provide sufficient maneuvering room to enter or leave the New Jersey Pierhead Line channel. As a result, this channel has not been playing its full role simply because boats have been unable to use it. With an ever-increasing amount of traffic in New York harbor, the need to provide this relief valve becomes more critical day by day. I therefore strongly urge this committee to allocate sufficient funds in the forthcoming fiscal year to permit this project to be fully completed and be made economically effective.

On the south side of the Hudson County Peninsula lies the Kill Van Kull section of the New York and New Jersey channels project. The completion of the work on the Arthur Kill section of this project is therefore of great concern and has my full support. The budget recommendation of $2,790,000 will, I understand, see the completion of this work in the next fiscal year.

To the west of the Hudson County Peninsula lies the Newark Bay-Passaic River channel. While this project does not immediately affect the Jersey City-Bayonne area, it, like all the other channel projects in the New York-New Jersey port district described in the Port of New York Authority presentation before this committee, is indirectly important to the people of my district. I therefore strongly support the need to allocate $30,000 to commence the study of im-

proving this channel, as well as the appropriations for the other essential channel projects in the New Jersey-New York port area.

I wish to express my thanks to you, Mr. Chairman, and to the other members of this committee for the opportunity and privilege to present my views concerning the economic welfare of the people I represent.

Jeanne d'Arc

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 6, 1959

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker—

I come from God to tell thee to become the greatest king in the world. The very clay of France will be holy: her soldiers will be the soldiers of God: The English will fall on their knees and beg thee let them return to their lawful homes in peace.

Such are the words that George Bernard Shaw puts in the mouth of the Maid of Orleans in his drama St. Joan.

Joan of Arc is assuredly one of the most famous women of the past. As a heroine of history as well as the Catholic Church she has few equals. There is a great deal to learn from a woman like Joan. She represents the epitome of martyrdom, for she gave her life for France as well as for her own spiritual beliefs.

Coming out of the fields of her homeland in Lorraine at the age of 17, Joan announced to France and the world that she would not only lift the English siege of Orleans, but would crown the young and not overly courageous Dauphin as Charles VII in Rheims Cathedral.

In a sense this sounds just as preposterous today as it unquestionably did in 1429. But she did it. Not only did the maid provide the spark of French courage and faith that was sorely needed to save the kingdom, she went further still and took the dangerous step of acting as the political and spiritual conscience of her day.

There are many versions of Joan's life, her battles and her martyrdom. Most all of us know at least one. The almost universal appeal of this peasant girl of 15th century France lies, I suspect, in the fact that she is representative of that guileless, intuitive truth that individuals possess all too infrequently. History has shown that throughout the civilizing process we have sought truth, justice and knowledge but never too much of any one of these at any given time or from any given person. The lessons in this have been bitter. From Socrates to Jeanne d'Arc, the martyrdom of men of truth and enlightenment has followed a familiar pattern. Perhaps the greatest example known is the crucifixion of Christ.

Joan of Arc was beatified in 1909 and canonized by Pope Benedict XV in 1920. The festival that we commemorate today is in observation of the capture of Tourelles. I am proud to mark this day here in the land that is the citadel of individual liberty. May the spirit of Jeanne d'Arc never die.

Essential That H.R. 3460 Be Passed as Reported

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER BOWLES
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 7, 1959

Mr. BOWLES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following comments on H.R. 3460, the bill now before the House.

I think it is highly important that this bill be passed by this body as reported from the Committee on Public Works.

The exhaustive study given to this proposal by the Public Works Committee fully supports the bill in its present form without amendments. To adopt restrictive amendments now to prevent TVA from issuing effective revenue bonds in the private money market for financing future power generation facilities would be highly obstructive.

There is no question in my mind, Mr. Speaker that TVA is known the world around as the single, most imaginative American contribution to resource development in the last quarter century. All over the world people are trying to emulate and adapt TVA for their own economic growth.

It is one of the supreme ironies of the day that this administration proclaims its enthusiasm for economic development projects abroad while it does everything in its power to undercut TVA here at home.

Not one cent has been appropriated to start new generation facilities for TVA in the last 6 years. We have been told from the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue that TVA should raise all the money it needs by issuing bonds. So now we have a second supreme irony. The bill before us would enable TVA to do just what the administration says it should do, but now spokesmen for the administration are trying to amend this bill out of existence.

Mr. Speaker, every power company in the United States knows that it must maintain new investment in plants on a continuing basis to keep its facilities in line with increasing demand for power. If TVA can obtain neither appropriations nor effective authority to raise money by selling bonds, the long term efforts of those who have always opposed TVA will finally be successful.

It takes at least 3 years to plan and construct a large generating facility for TVA. If the people of the Tennessee Valley and the United States at large are not to be deprived of the extraordinary range of benefits which TVA has given us over the years in terms of power, flood control, navigation and water supply, I believe it is essential that H.R. 3460 be passed as reported.

Is America Pricing Itself Out of Its Own Markets?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 30, 1959

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Punxsutawney (Pa.) Spirit of April 29, 1959:

IS AMERICA PRICING ITSELF OUT OF ITS OWN MARKETS?

(The following editorial appeared in the Saturday Evening Post of April 18, and is reproduced by permission of the Curtis Publishing Co.)

A lively controversy has been raging around the ability of foreign producers of gigantic turbines and electrical equipment to underbid their American competitors. A bid by the English Electric Co. for a set of turbines at the Greer's Ferry Dam in Arkansas was rejected by the Department of Defense in favor of a Philadelphia company, although the latter's bid was $300,000 higher than that of the British company. And TVA recently awarded a contract to a British company which underbid its American competitor by $5 million.

In both instances American producers have complained that considerations of national defense should restrict such installations to American corporations, although others suspect that unemployment in the area where turbines are produced was the basic reason for barring the foreigners.

Undoubtedly there is merit to the national-defense argument. Howecer, when security is a factor, outsiders should not be permitted to bid at all, instead of being invited to spend large sums working up plans and specifications, and then informed that the Buy American Act bars them from taking the job. On such clumsiness, good relations with our neighbors tend to founder.

As these episodes are repeated, people must surely begin to ask: "Why the American firms underbid in a field in which industry has long been preeminent?"

The clue to our difficulty as a competitor in the international field was indicated by President Eisenhower in a recent press conference. "I believe," said the President, "that above everything else the United States should keep its costs down and try to liberalize trade—our costs are just too high."

One factor in this unwieldy cost structure was brought out in a set of studies by the National Industrial Conference Board showing that wage costs represent an extraordinarily large portion of the national income. The Board's statisticians declare that after exclusion of all taxes, labor gets 83 cents out of every dollar generated in the national economy. This leaves a narrow margin for capital investment—the source of new equipment and expanded plants—to produce more jobs.

Undoubtedly some of this gap is explained by the low standard of living of foreign workers; their willingness—at least from necessity—to work longer and harder than we want to work; the effect of depreciated cur-

rencies and government subsidies. But there is, just the same, a lot of fat in our cost structure which can work to our serious disadvantage. For example, Daniel P. Loomis, president of the Association of American Railroads, in a recent speech declared that featherbedding rules and regulations cost the country's railroads an estimated $500 million a year.

According to Roger M. Blough, chairman of the board of United States Steel, from 1940 through 1957, hourly employment costs in the steel industry have gone up an average of 7.6 percent per year for 17 solid years. And, in contrast, the reports of the Department of Labor show that output per man-hour has risen by only 2.6 percent per year.

Featherbedding and shotgun wage increases in unionized industries are, of course, not the only offenders. There are undoubtedly considerable featherbedding and expense-account shenanigans in the front offices of many corporations. Government compounds the felony by saddling the economy with the insatiable demands of an expanding bureaucracy.

By and large, the excessive demands of producers are restrained by competition. As for the unions, although they are often able to force wages for their members beyond the point justified by productivity, they must face the possibility that by too drastic wage demands they could price themselves out of jobs.

In Observance of the Anniversary of Polish Independence Day

SPEECH
OF
HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 4, 1959

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, Polish genius has demonstrated its presence in nearly every phase of human attivity. The West is indebted to the Poles in innumerable ways. In the arts they have been superb; in literature they have been no second-raters; in science they have had more than their quota among the great immortals. Of course, they are also noted for their bravery and daring, and for their almost endless struggle for freedom and independence. But in certain fields they are not as well known as they should be.

The Constitution of 1791 is proof that Poles deserve to be known in governmental reforms as pioneers in central and eastern Europe. That historic document marks not only a decided advance in progressive reforms in governmental institutions in Poland, but it also stands as one of the earliest attempts at reform by peaceful and deliberative methods.

Unfortunately, all the liberal and democratic provisions of that Constitution, and all the good and noble intentions of its patriotic framers, could not forestall impending dangers that were threatening Poland. As one partition followed another, leading to the eventual extinction of Poland's independence, it was, of course, impossible to implement the Constitution. But all patriotic and liberty-loving Poles have always held sacred the ideas embodied in that memorable document, and to this day they commerate its promulgation as a national holiday.

I gladly join all American citizens of Polish descent on the observance of the 168th anniversary of that historic event.

German American Chamber of Commerce, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 7, 1959

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, on April 27, 1959, a very significant occasion was celebrated in New York, the establishment of the German American Chamber of Commerce, Inc. This came about when the United States-German Chamber of Commerce and the German-American Trade Promotion Office were united. The celebration was in the form of a reception and dinner.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a telegram to the chamber from President Dwight D. Eisenhower, a telegram from Hon. Theodor Heuss, President of the Federal Republic of Germany, a letter from Hon. Nelson A. Rockefeller, Governor of the State of New York, and a speech delivered at the dinner by John J. McCloy, chairman, the Chase Manhattan Bank:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D.C., April 24, 1959.

Mr. GORDON W. MICHLER,
Care of German American Chamber of Commerce, New York, N.Y.:

It is a pleasure to send greetings to the members and guests of the German American Chamber of Commerce. The spectacular advancement of the German economy in recent years has impressed us all. Two aspects of that development are particularly significant. First, it is a product of many individual efforts operating under a free economy—a system which both our nations held to be most productive for the material and social advancement of our peoples. On the other hand, on the national level, our citizens have accepted their responsibility to the broader needs of the free world community. I am delighted to add my congratulations and best wishes to those businessmen whose work contributes so much to the living bonds of friendship which unite the people of the United States with their neighbors in the Federal Republic of Germany.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

[Telegram sent by the President of the Federal Republic of Germany to the German American Chamber of Commerce, Inc.]
APRIL 27, 1959.

On this occasion marking the consolidation of the German American Trade promotion office and the United States-German Chamber of Commerce into the German American Chamber of Commerce, I extend my sincere good wishes for a close and prospering relationship in an enterprise of benefit to both our countries. May the Chamber flourish as an efficient instrument of cooperation between the United States and Germany.

THEODOR HEUSS,
President of the Federal Republic of Germany.

STATE OF NEW YORK,
EXECUTIVE CHAMBER,
Albany, April 24, 1959.

Mr. GORDON H. MICHLER,
Chairman, German American Chamber of Commerce Inc., New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. MICHLER: It is a great pleasure to have the opportunity to extend my cordial greetings to everyone present at the dinner tendered by the German American Chamber of Commerce to representatives of German industry attending the meeting of the International Chamber of Commerce.

I regret that the pressure of official duties precludes my being present. Your dinner, celebrating the first birthday of your combined and enlarged Chamber, is a significant occasion. It marks the growing ties of trade and friendship which your organization is steadily fostering between the West German Republic and this country.

To your guests representing West German government and industry, I should like to express my admiration for the impressive economic growth of West Germany. This sturdy new democracy stands as a notable symbol of progress and evidence of a free way of life that cannot be matched behind the Iron Curtain. Indeed, West Berlin has been called a golden thorn in the side of a ruthlessly regimented East German Communist economy.

My best wishes to your organization for all possible future success in its important role of strengthening the many commercial and cultural bonds now linking our two free nations.

Sincerely,

NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER,
Governor.

SPEECH GIVEN BY JOHN J. MCCLOY, CHAIRMAN, THE CHASE MANHATTAN BANK, ON APRIL 27, 1959, AT THE RECEPTION AND DINNER SPONSORED BY THE GERMAN AMERICAN CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, INC.

Ladies and gentlemen, it is a real honor to be asked to help in officiating at this marriage, christening, or consummation of marriage as this consolidation of the German American Chamber of Commerce might be called.

This comes at a particularly propitious time. In the first place, it occurs while the trade between the two countries is in real vigor. Secondly it comes at a time when the general relations between the United States and Germany, the new Germany, are in a particularly happy state. Thirdly, it comes at a time when serious issues are being tested—issues which will do much to determine the future of Germany, of Europe, and the relations of the United States to both. At such a time, it is well that we have an agency on a nongovernmental level, such as the German American Chamber, where German and American businessmen may advise each other and exchange ideas on the problems each face in their respective trade and business lives.

COMMON MARKET

With the establishment of the institution that we celebrate tonight, I also want to refer to this phenomenon which prior speakers have spoken of, the new movement, now definitely underway, the integration of Europe:

We have heard much of the rise of Soviet power. We are now beginning to hear also

of the rise of Chinese power. Both these developments have been unduly long in coming. But another postwar development quite comparable with the combination of these forces, if not even more significant, is the growth of European power through this trend toward integration.

Here we have an area of somewhere between 150 and 200 million people, over a million square miles and the center of most of the world's technical and managerial skills, not to mention its role as the great repository of western culture and art. A force in itself which, when integrated, is of such dimension and potential strength that continued insistence upon the weakness of Europe in relation to the strength of Russia, China, or the United States, is rapidly becoming quite artificial.

Here is a force with such power, moral, and material, that it need not bow to any accumulation of strength from any quarter of the globe. To speak of its function in the defense of the free world as no more than a trip wire, as some of our strategists have called it, is to me one of the most fantastic concepts which I have ever heard in connection with defense matters—and I have heard of a good many in the course of my experience. And at the core of this new strength is the new relationship which is developing between France and Germany. Both East and West are stirred by this new phenomenon, but without it, Europe would be incapable of integration and would remain an anachronistic example of divided peoples and nations as out of date as the old city states. When this combined strength and cultural leadership is meshed in with the strength and the moral power of the western Atlantic nations, there need be no fear, as I have said, of an imposed will from any quarter of the globe. On the contrary, with such strength of resources, we possess a full guarantee of both our liberties and our peace.

The days of desirable division on the European Continent, so long the object of astute diplomacy, have passed. New and broader forces are working. Newer concepts are demanded. Much of this has deep political implication, but at the heart of it are economic and business implications which throw a challenge to the commercial interests of Europe such as they have rarely faced in their long history. Nowhere does this challenge present itself more prominently than to the German businessman. Centrally located, the products of great industry and skill emanate from German industry, and the German businessmen are perhaps above all others in a position where they now have the responsibility of developing wisdom both in political and economic fields.

I doubt whether ever before in Europe there has been such a demand or such a need for business statesmanship. Old animosities have to be submerged. Goodness knows, we have done enough to each other to generate antagonisms and resentments that could last forever if we only allowed ourselves to dwell upon them. But if we cannot and should not entirely forget the past, we cannot now certainly afford to bear resentments based only on memories. I refer to one other thought and that is the great need—while we are in the process of putting together this great force which the new Europe represents—that business as well as political statesmanship should see to it that we avoid the creation of any new economic antagonisms. It will do us no good and the world no good, if we merely create within the Western World two or perhaps three economic areas with all the politicalisms, which could so readily flow from them, if we did that. Somehow, some way, must be found to achieve not the partial, but the full strength of the free world.

DULLES AND ADENAUER

The solution is not simple but I believe that the solution is one which business statesmanship and political statesmanship can find the answer to. I refer to the sharp issues which are facing us in the near future. It is unfortunate that at just this period we are compelled to rearrange our forces and our teams, so to speak, as we go forth to deal with these issues. The illness of Mr. Dulles means that we shall have lost at this critical juncture, a man whose intellect, force, and character have become almost a symbol of the firmness of the free world and of the capacity to deal with the maneuvers—whatever they may be—of the Communist offensive. But at the same time we find Chancellor Adenauer in the process of moving from his position where he has directed the day-to-day operations of German policy to the honored position of President of the Federal German Republic, where, no doubt, his influence will continue to be felt, but where his responsibilities will, of course, be less direct. Yet I do not see any change in the direction of American or German policy resulting from either of these events.

Secretary Herter I know long and well and his very selection together with the undisturbed continuity of those in the State Department, including Mr. Loy Henderson, who through the years have worked with Mr. Dulles and followed his leadership, is the best indication of the fact that the U.S. policy will be as steadfast as heretofore. Moreover, whoever will be the next Chancellor, I cannot believe that there will be any fundamental change in German policy. Knowing him fairly well, I am reminded of this Scottish adage: wherever MacGregor sits, is the head of the table. There may be something of this on the German scene.

ON BERLIN

I probably should not say anything about Berlin at this rather delicate period perhaps for fear of being called an interloper, but I see amongst this audience some of the former defenders of that city and I spent some time there myself during periods of some tension and I don't feel that I should sit down without paying my respects to the spirit and determination of the people of that city.

I visited Germany in the period between the wars on a number of occasions and never had much regard for the City of Berlin. Somehow it seemed to me a rather large sprawling sort of a city with nothing of the architectural beauty of a number of cities in Europe, but after being in Berlin in that beleaguered spot and sensing in these periods of tension something of the mood of the people, I came to feel, with all due loyalty to my German "Heimatstadt" Frankfurt, that Berlin had a greater appeal than any of the German cities. We always got a good bit of criticism down in the Zones, but we could rarely do any wrong in Berlin and that was perhaps one of the reasons why I became so fond of that city. You could be quite critical of the Americans down around Frankfurt, but you didn't get very far with it in Berlin. From somewhere out of the spirit of those people some new Lucius Clay will again strike the note, receive the response and take the action which will maintain not only the freedom of that city but the integrity of the whole Free World position.

May I say one thing more about Berlin. I do wish that we would stop vieing with each other in public in coming forward with compromise solutions in regard to how we should act in respect to Berlin. No sooner had the Russians stated their maximum position than the top columnists, and a number of Senators and others, including some interlopers, came forward with all manner of suggestions and sloganisms such as disengagement, getting off dead center, as contributions or supposed contributions to a proper settlement of the Berlin issue. One of our Allies seems already to have given away the Eastern frontiers and we seriously talk about confederation of the Soviet dominated DDR—whatever confederation such a circumstance means.

What I miss, is a statement of our maximum position. When the Soviets said they would occupy West Berlin, it seems to me we should have immediately said we wish to reoccupy Saxony and Thuringia. That is where our armies were when they were in West Berlin, and when some Senator says we must get off dead center in respect to our Berlin policy, it seems never to lie in his mind that the center might possibly be moved farther east. Not always farther west. There is not much space left in these days with the new speed tables in which to replace the center, if Europe is to remain free. Disengagement is a pleasant word to roll around the mouth but it's not so pleasant when we call it by its true name, withdrawal.

What disturbs me is that we strive to come forward with almost every conceivable position and suggest giving it away before we ever reach the negotiating table. There are a number of things, of course, that we could do at the table, but I don't like the idea of giving every intermediate position away before we even sit down. This is a technique which never commended itself to me in dealing with the Russians, though I think it is the experience of all those who have dealt with the Russians. To meet this Russian threat, and it is a threat, of course, from whatever angle you view it. It's a serious threat.

U.S. ECONOMY

Now let me leave politics. I come back to business. More particularly, I should say something about the economy of the United States. Bankers are always supposed to say something about the economy and look wise in regard to economic future. I'll try to go through that pose tonight. One think I would like to call your attention to is that one of the slogans that seems to have commended itself to our thinking in recent years, namely, that if the United States sneezes this induces pneumonia in Europe. Well, this has now proven not to be the case. We have had our sneeze and I don't see any fever in Europe. Europe seems to have been very able to have sustained our recession, a slight recession to be sure. I think this is another indication of the revised strength of Europe and it augurs well for the future.

So far as our own economy is concerned—by every index which one can judge these things—it seems strong and seems to be growing stronger. Of course, this is just the time when you had better look out, but I must say all the signs that I can see and read point to a vigorous future, at least as far as one can reasonably look into the future.

We have had some economic developments in this country which have caused some of our friends abroad a certain mixture of emotions, with some a certain sense of satisfaction, that the position of our currency is beginning to compare, let's say, somewhat less favorably with their own. In spite of the fact that the strength of the dollar had something to do in the not too remote past with the maintenance of some of those currencies. But on the other hand we have people that fear that the dollar might indeed grow weak. Of course, one can say if currencies have grown in strength in relation to the dollar, a great deal of energy, thought, time

and money was spent in just trying to bring that situation about. As for the future of our own currency, I cannot feel that our legislators and Government leaders will so ignore their responsibilities as to permit the dollar to assume a significant weakness. Perhaps we have been losing out in world markets, due to our prices. But in spite of the level of stock market prices, we are, in my judgment, not on the verge of a dangerous inflation. I don't mean to be too confident about this because we could readily slip. Our prices for the time being are relatively stable. There is a substantial amount of unused plant capacity still about. We have unemployment to an appreciable degree. More and more, as I see the clouds lifting, the prospect of a serious unbalanced budget seems to be disappearing.

In this country, I say to my German friends, we have really to excite ourselves to the need of a solid currency, particularly, when the rationalizers of little but persistent inflation urge it on as a wise Government policy. Fortunately or unfortunately we have not had the built-in fear of the experience of a real inflation, such as the Germans have undergone. This has given them an attitude which makes it unnecessary to argue about the ills of inflation. You, in the vernacular, have had it.

Over here we do have to argue, however, with some professors now and then—not all professors by any means—but it seems to me the only professors who can get the front page of the New York Times seem to be those who kick what is known as the sacred cow of sound money about. Now the President and the Secretary of the Treasury have struck the note of good financial sense and so has the Federal Reserve Board. They have been eloquent in what they have had to say regarding the need for a stable currency and a stable price system and I am sure they are determined. I have no doubt, however, that the most eloquent expression, that we could have, to top their resolution is the evidence of a balanced budget, but, as I say my guess is that we shall not be far from it in the ensuing year and I dare say that even with a balanced budget our economy will continue to grow, in spite of the professors.

Now I have rambled on, skipping from one subject to another. Perhaps I should return to my first thoughts which relate to businessmen and their responsibility to society and the public weal. Whether we be Germans or Americans, French, English, Italians—none of us can ignore that the great social and political forces that play around us in the modern world require statesmanship to deal with the problems of Europe and America and the underdeveloped countries in the world. Nor is all good to be found in the continuance of business prosperity. Statesmanship will frequently require the acceptance of harsh business sacrifices if we are to solve some of these problems.

May these two institutions which merge here tonight take the lead in accepting the great challenges and the heavy responsibilities which the making of a free world presents to all of us today.

Thank you very much.

The United States of America Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 7, 1959

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excellent editorial which appeared in the Jersey Journal, April 30, 1959, entitled "The United States of America Way":

THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA WAY

Tomorrow in Moscow, Red Square will reverberate to the tramping feet of thousands of soldiers on parade. Trucks, tanks, guns will thunder through the streets. Hundreds of planes will roar overhead. Tomorrow the Communists will show off their armed power to the world. Tomorrow they will rededicate their Government to the principle that might makes right. It will be May Day, U.S.S.R.

Tomorrow in Journal Square and on Bergenline Avenue and on every main street in America, children will get along to school, people will tend stores, housewives will fill their shopping carts, traffic will move with no more than normal difficulty. It will be May Day, United States of America, with business as usual.

Or almost as usuual. In the courthouses, the schools and at some service club luncheons there will be special programs on Law Day, devoted—in President Eisenhower's words, to "public reaffirmation of their dedication to our form of government and the supremacy of law in our lives."

It is symbolic that there will be business as usual tomorrow. This is the essence of America's way of life. Whatever the argument, no matter how outrageous the adversary's stand, we in America believe in telling it to the judge instead of shooting it out.

It's a peaceful way of life, based on respect for the individual—a live and let-live policy. It includes a passionate belief that no matter what the wrong, the courts can set it right.

Our belief in the law is no minor matter. It pervades our every day. When we wait on a corner for a green light, we're inhibited as much by fear of transgressing the law as by fear for our safety. When the children's baseball breaks a neighbor's window there is no thought of evading payment for the damage. When the carrier boy drops the newspaper on the front stoop he knows he'll be paid at week's end. The law stands always before us as recourse for wrongs.

It serves us to settle grievances between individuals, between the individual and society, between giant corporations, between States and, if we had our way, between nations.

Any nation of the world which doubts our peaceful intentions, any of the leftist citizens of this country who argue in Russia's defense that it acts as it does out of fear of us, only need look at our heritage of living with the law. Our whole creed is one of nonaggression against our fellow man.

That is our May Day, our Law Day. Business as usual, with just a few extra thoughts about the guiding principle of our lives.

New Jersey-New York Transportation Agency Compact

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 6, 1959

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, the unanimous and bipartisan action of the congressional delegations of New Jersey and New York in sponsoring legislation to grant the consent of Congress to the compact between the two States establishing a New York-New Jersey Transportation Agency is, I hope, an indication that prompt approval of the measure will be given by Congress and the President.

The extent of the seriousness of the present commuter crisis needs no further elaboration. This joint action reflects the degree to which the people of the metropolitan area are unanimous in demanding effective steps be taken to preserve adequate railroad commuter service.

The sooner Congress approves the compact, the sooner the interstate agency can begin its vital work.

Meanwhile, there are additional ways in which Congress can contribute toward a solution of the commuter problem—by amending the Interstate Commerce Act to require greater consideration of the public interest in passenger train discontinuance cases, by starting the process of constitutional amendment to prohibit nonresident income taxes, and by allowing income tax deductions for the necessary costs of transportation to and from work.

Redeveloping an efficient, low-cost mass transportation system in the New York metropolitan area—and in other highly urbanized areas in the United States—is an immensely complex job. It is an interstate and regional problem and responsibilities bear heavily on all levels of government in the area to do their part.

The Rural Electrification Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD G. WOLF

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 7, 1959

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, the President saw fit to veto the REA bill. I am happy to count myself among those who voted to override this veto.

I wish to make a brief statement of my views regarding the Rural Electrification Administration.

The REA is a Federal lending agency which loans funds to local nonprofit cooperative associations in 46 States. These cooperatives serve farms and other enterprises in rural areas which do not have electric service. By law they cannot serve anyone who already has central station service. In other words, they cannot take business away from anyone.

If serving these farms and other enterprises offered an opportunity to make a profit, the private companies would have brought their lines to them and thereby eliminate the need for REA service.

As you know, the rural electric cooperatives do repay their loans to the Government with interest, and their loan repayment record is unequalled. It is better than the record made by any other Federal lending agency.

It is true that the interest rate at 2 percent is low. Congress has seen fit to maintain that rate of interest to make

possible the serving of all people who require service. Many of them live in remote areas where costs of service run high. It is estimated that about half of the rural consumers do not pay their own way; the other half have to make up the difference.

The rural electric cooperatives do not provide unfair competition to the private companies. In fact, they provide a good market for privately generated power. In 1956, REA borrowers purchased 49 percent of their power from private power companies. In Iowa they purchased 82.4 percent of their energy from private power companies. This has meant good business for the power companies. The REA estimates that rural electric cooperatives will buy a billion dollars' worth of appliances and chore equipment in 1959. This means good business for the electrical industry.

If the 2-percent rate of interest to rural electric cooperatives is considered to be a preferential rate, I think it is only fair to consider certain benefits that the Federal Government grants to the private power companies.

Quick reference to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 19, 1957, shows that the Office of Defense Mobilization granted accelerated depreciation certificates to electric power companies in an amount that exceeded $3.3 billion during the period 1950 through May 1, 1957. In Iowa, the amount certified totaled $31.8 million, or nearly 10 percent of the U.S. total during the same time.

This, in effect, gives the companies interest free loans and results in enormous financial benefits. I do not believe anyone could deny that these benefits are subsidies.

An estimate of the subsidy benefits that will accrue to various companies for accelerated depreciation that was certified between 1950 and May 1957, has been made in Washington. According to this estimate, six Iowa companies will benefit in the amount of $47.8 million during the normal depreciation period of most of the utilities' facilities.

I am not attempting to make a point that one group is favored more or less than another, but I do want to emphasize that our Government is not helping one group to the exclusion of others. It attempts to treat all groups with fairness. We have a government, thank God, which is for all of the people, and in my small way I will help to keep it that way.

I believe that there is a place for both public and private power and I would not favor reducing the activities of either. I believe we have a stronger America because we have both forms of organization. For many years growth of private and public power has been parallel and one has not been reduced by the other.

What Law Day Is About

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 15, 1959

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Life magazine for May 11, 1959:

WHAT LAW DAY IS ABOUT

(Answers to primary questions about a great movement for world peace)

By Presidential proclamation Law Day U.S.A. had its second annual observance last week, with speeches, pageants, etc. across the land. Though sparked by lawyers, Law Day is not just another promotion to make more business for its sponsors. It is part of the very serious movement centering around the American Bar Association's Committee on World Peace Through Law. This committee's goal, according to Chairman Charles S. Rhyne, is nothing less than "to substitute the rule of law for the rule of terror among nations." Last week Mr. Rhyne released a question-and-answer statement of what his committee is up to. It contains so much sound argument and hopeful information that we here present a summary version.

Question. How do you plan to carry out the program?

Answer. The first step is to increase use of the World Court for the settlement of international disputes.

Question. To what extent is the World Court being used now?

Answer. In the 13 years since it was established the present Court has decided only 11 cases—less than one case a year. In comparison, the Supreme Court of the United States handles a thousand cases a year.

Question. What is the World Court's chief weakness?

Answer. Its chief weakness is that it does not have compulsory jurisdiction over disputes between the principal nations of the world. The United States, France and several other nations have gone through the form of accepting the Court's jurisdiction over legal disputes, but their acceptances are largely nullified by reservations of the right to determine whether each particular case is within the jurisdiction of the Court. The United States should assume leadership in creating respect and prestige for the Court by abandoning its insistence on being its own judge of this jurisdiction.

Question. But if this is done, how are we going to protect ourselves in some dispute that we honestly feel is domestic? Won't we be endangering our sovereignty?

Answer. The charter of the U.N. now expressly rules out the Court's jurisdiction over domestic matters. Specifically in the Iranian oil case the Court ruled against its own jurisdiction. Definitions of what constitutes an international case and a domestic case can be spelled out clearly and agreed to by the nations for the guidance of the Court.

Question. What other changes should be made in the Court?

Answer. It costs about $200,000 for a nation to take a case to the Court at The Hague—much too expensive for many of the smaller nations. We could start by having the present Court announce its willingness to sit all over the world in chambers of three judges. We could have intermediate courts of appeal on a regional basis. Such a world system would parallel the setup of the U.S. Federal court system.

Question. What kinds of cases would the World Court system handle?

Answer. The Suez controversy, the case of our fliers who wandered off their course behind the Iron Curtain, the Spanish-Morocco boundary dispute, many of the current Middle East disputes, and hundreds of similar incidents. In each case the courts could decide the truth or falsity of charges and countercharges which have so often brought the world to the brink of war.

Question. How would the World Court enforce its decisions?

Answer. Enforcement would depend in the first instance as it does now upon voluntary compliance. The pressure of public opinion is such that few nations want to stand before the world branded as outlaws for defying a World Court. A second step would be to have the courts of the member nations give full faith and credit to the decrees and judgments of the World Courts. This would mean that the national courts would use their machinery to enforce the World Court decisions.

Question. What is the opinion of U.S. leaders on this idea?

Answer. President Eisenhower, Vice President Nixon, John Fosther Dulles, Attorney General Rogers, and many leaders of the bar and others have expressed strong support.

Question. Isn't the idea of world peace through law utopian?

Answer. It is frankly idealistic—the same kind of idealism that inspired Washington, Jefferson, Madison, and our other great forefathers to found this Nation as a government under law.

Question. Will Russia be likely to go along with this idea?

Answer. Probably not, in the beginning.

Question. If she doesn't, won't that kill the whole thing?

Answer. The nations of the free world could not afford to let Russia's veto or refusal kill this new approach to world peace. The system can function without her. With all the nations of the free world using the system and abiding by its decisions, Russia would be put in a poor light with the neutral and uncommitted nations. As the court system develops its procedures and gains a reputation, tremendous pressure will be directed against Russia to join.

Question. Wouldn't world government offer more possibilities for peace?

Answer. Bitter experience has convinced us that we must build brick by brick—that we cannot expect a perfect superstate to come into being full-blown and solve all our problems.

Question. Wouldn't it be better to reorganize and improve the U.N. rather than to set up a World Court system outside the U.N.?

Answer. There is nothing contradictory in these two organizations. They can go forward hand in hand.

Question. Can't we rely on our military force to keep the peace? Our alliances?

Answer. Weapons of horror can neither guarantee the security of our own Nation nor form the foundation for peace. NATO

an other regional organizations have helped to stabilize peace. But the arms race, with its threats of universal doom, continues.

Question. Won't a new idea like this be difficult to sell to peoples and nations around the world?

Answer. No; because in a world sundered by differences of language, color, creed, and belief, the rule of law is the one concept understood as an ideal that nearly all men have in common. Today in all civilized nations, disputes between man and man are settled by law.

Question. Don't the intricacies of law offer obstacles?

Answer. The rule of law is not a new concept. There is no mystery about its principles. Throughout history the rule of law has meant the application of reason and fairness. Our Constitution is in fact a restatement of the principles of the rule of law as borrowed from the great lawgivers of the ages.

Question. Wouldn't it take a long time to draft a new code of international law—perhaps years?

Answer. Yes. But it is not necessary to wait until we perfect a written code. We could begin by using the well-known principles of law. These principles are applied daily by all lawyers.

Question. Is a world court system necessary to a rule of law between nations?

Answer. Yes. History teaches that a court system must precede disarmament within nations. Only after King's Courts proved their worth did the lords and barons of England dissolve their armies. Out in our own West, both the "good" and the "bad" men began to discard their six-shooters after the courts began to function.

Question. Why is the American Bar Association taking the lead in this movement?

Answer. The United States takes special pride in its form of government under law and because of its position has a special duty to foster this project.

Question. What is the American Bar Association doing about the U.S. reservation to acceptance of the Court's jurisdiction?

Answer. It has passed a resolution urging the Senate to repeal the part of the reservation that makes the United States the judge in its own cause.

Question. What are others doing?

Answer. Duke University, Durham, N.C., has established the World Rule of Law Center under the direction of Arthur Larson, former assistant to President Eisenhower. Harvard, Columbia, Chicago, Southern Methodist, and other law schools are doing extensive work in this field. Committees on World Peace Through Law have been established by numerous bar associations throughout the United States. The International Bar Association and the Inter-American Bar Association are cooperating closely. This spring our committee launched a series of five regional meetings of outstanding lawyers, in Boston, Charlotte, N.C., Chicago, San Francisco, and Dallas.

Question. What is the next step?

Answer. The committee contemplates a series of world regional meetings, culminating in the first world conference of lawyers in history.

Western Lore Is Venture for Haines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1959

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, we are all aware of the importance in preserving for the future the relics of the West's colorful past. For this reason I am most happy to say that one of the finest antique collections in Oregon is going to be on public display in Haines, Oreg., a historic little city located under the shadow of the majestic Elkhorn Mountain Range in the heart of Baker Valley. This fine collection has been gathered during the past half century by my friends, Mr. and Mrs. Charles Langrell of Baker. The following article about the Langrells and their project I am sure will be of interest to my colleagues.

WESTERN LORE IS VENTURE FOR HAINES—LANGRELL COLLECTION TO BE FEATURED IN BIG BUILDING ON MAIN STREET

A development which will place perhaps the largest accumulation of antiques anywhere in the West in the forefront as a tourist attraction in this valley was announced here today by the Langrell family who secured a large granite stone building on the main street of Haines and will redesign its entrance with a full western-style front.

Already known throughout the region, the Langrell collection will occupy the entire large ground floor of the old former garage structure secured from Glenn Duncan on the south end of the same block as occupied by the IOOF hall.

Work has already been launched and the collection of western lore will be open starting June 10, Charles Langrell, Etha and Grier Langrell and Miss Catherine Tyler, who are undertaking the project, told the Record-Courier today.

COLLECTION IMMENSE

The collection is the product of 25 years of work and is presently stored at the Langrell's Trading Post on Broadway, and warehoused elsewhere. The displays which have attracted so much attention at the Trading Post are only part of the accumulation of pioneer items.

Renovation of the Haines building will provide extensive case and shelf display. A full length tiered case will be required for the outstanding china and glass collection alone. Crockery, hanging lamps, frontier cooking utensils and brass and copper, churns, old clocks, phonographs, organs, tools, bells, and furniture antiques are only a partial list of the class of items to be segregated and displayed at the Haines showplace.

Oil paintings from early-day Baker County establishments, items from the mines, and ox yokes are other items.

In outlining the venture the owners pointed out that the collection items are not for sale. In fact the idea Mr. Langrell had a quarter century ago when he began to save the antiques out of his secondhand store was born of the fact that all too many even at that time were being bought up by California and other outside collectors and that his efforts would henceforth be directed to preserving the lore for his own locality.

One of the remarkable attractions of the collection is the innumerable assortment of antique guns, including powder horns.

As the project develops adjacent space will provide display for larger items of the collection. Among these are a fire hose cart, a pumper firetruck, a stagecoach, an old hearse and sleighs.

In renovating the building linoleum will be placed on the floor, lighting installed and wall finish suitable for the showplace applied. The special treatment on the front will probably feature a balcony-type distinctively western design, Mr. Langrell said.

The owners will arrange hours suitable for both local and tourist interest and it is planned to make a small admission charge as the only means of sustaining the venture which will be advertised both by reputation of those who see it and by advertising.

TO CONTINUE BUSINESS

The removal of the antiques from the Trading Post will in no way alter the business here which will be continued. It will permit roomier display of the furniture and used goods stocks of the local firm, however, the operator pointed out.

HAINES PLANS

The Langrell move of antiques to Haines was explained to be the culmination of a long study of where best to establish the collection. The decision was prompted by the inability to secure suitable purchase or rental property in Baker for such a venture and by the unique opportunity of featuring the western attraction in Haines, it was pointed out.

The town has indicated hearty cooperation with the venture. John Henner, one of a number of persons interested in antiques at Haines, said his present plans call for a display of his items in his garage building and for the display of a number of pioneer model cars outside during the Centennial tourist season.

In the Ray Pullen old barbershop property elsewhere on the street the town is already arranging to provide a basic community antique collection and stopping place for tourists in the business district.

The Northeast Oregon Museum group is currently completing plans to feature its growing list of collections at permanent museum facilities which may be set up using the former Haines school gym under lease from the city. Negotiations are already ununderway for the transfer from the school to the city.

Secretary of Agriculture or Secretary of Processors?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 6, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, upon checking over a list of the groups which Ezra T. Benson addressed during 1958, I am inclined to think maybe his title ought to be Secretary of Processors instead of Secretary of Agriculture. Over half of his speeches were made to business audiences, and only about one-seventh of the groups even pretended to be farm organizations. Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to place in the RECORD an article from the May 1959 National Farmers Union magazine which includes Secretary Benson's 1958 speaking schedule:

BENSON SHUNS FARMERS, TALKS TO PROCESSORS

One reason Ezra Taft Benson, the Secretary of Agriculture, is no help to farmers is that he is busy helping the food processors and others who make money from low or fluctuating farm prices.

For instance, a recent press release from the public relations firm hired by the Corn Products Co., one of the biggest food processors, reads in part as follows:

"Mr. Benson flew here today from Washington to appear as featured guest speaker before the International Executive Management Conference of Corn Products Co., now in weeklong session at the Seaview Country Club."

Incidentally, the press release featured Benson's attack on a congressional bill for direct payments to farmers, saying it would "eventually bring down upon agriculture a regimentation more rigorous by far than anything our farmers have known." It also pointed out that Corn Products Co. buys about 100 million bushels of corn a year.

The extent to which Benson courts the processors, instead of talking to farmers, is best documented by his official list of speech engagements. Last year, for example, half of Benson's dates were to business audiences. Only about one-seventh even pretended to be farm audiences, and half of those were Farm Bureau.

In reading the following list of Benson's 1958 speeches, it should be noted that no speeches to Republican Party meetings are included, although it was an election year.

ADDRESSES BY EZRA BENSON DURING 1958

Ruritan Nation, New Orleans, La.

Association of Cotton Textile Merchants of New York.

National Press Club, Washington, D.C.

National Farm Institute, Des Moines, Iowa.

National Food Conference, Washington, D.C. (Sponsored by Farm Bureau).

Annual Farm Forum, Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce, Minneapolis, Minn.

Farm and Home Week, Ohio State University.

National Conference of Organizations on International Trade policy.

Franklin County Farm Bureau and other cosponsoring organizations, Preston, Idaho.

National Orange Show, San Bernardino, Calif.

American-Israel Society, Washington, D.C.

National Institute of Animal Agriculture, Purdue University.

Bond Club, New York City.

Federal Plan Quarantine Inspectors' National Association.

Danforth Farm Youth Center (Ralston-Purina), Gray Summit, Mo.

Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce, Winnipeg, Manitoba.

Super Market Institute, Atlantic City, N.J.

Annual Harvard Milk Day, Harvard, Ill.

Washington Food Group, Washington, D.C. (Trade associations).

Dairy Luncheon (including processors), Washington, D.C.

Fourth of July Celebration, Washington, D.C.

National Plowing Contest, Hershey, Pa.

Fort Bedford Celebration, Fort Bedford, Pa.

American Institute of Cooperation, Pennsylvania State University.

Farmers and Livestock Day, Toronto, Canada.

Heart of America Tractorama, Colfax, Ill.

Kansas Free Fair, Topeka, Kansas.

All Ohio Swine Producers Pork Picnic, Xenia, Ohio.

Rotary Club of Seatle, Wash.

National Affairs Forum, Chamber of Commerce, Pittsburgh, Pa.

National Association of Food Chains, Chicago, Ill.

Nebraska Mechanical Corn Picking Contest, Tekemah, Nebr.

South Bend Knife and Fork Club, South Bend, Ind.

Kansas City Chamber of Commerce, Kansas City, Mo.

Executives' Club of Chicago, Ill.

Arizona Farm Bureau Federation and Maricopa County Farm Bureau, Phoeniz, Ariz.

Economic Club of Detroit, Detroit, Mich.

Greater Grand Rapids Chamber of Commerce. Grand Rapids, Mich.

Professional Workers in Agriculture, Wisconsin State College.

Las Vegas Junior Chamber of Commerce, Las Vegas, Nev.

Nevada State Farm Bureau, Reno, Nev.

Weber County Farm Bureau and other county farm organizations in northern Utah.

Rotary Club and other civic organizations, Pocatello, Idaho.

Idaho Falls Kiwanis Club and other organizations, Idaho Falls, Idaho.

California Farm Bureau and Agricultural Council, Fresno, Calif.

National Grange, Grand Rapids, Mich.

Commercial Chemical Development Association and the National Agricultural Chemical Association, Beltsville, Md.

Conference of Bank Correspondents, Chicago, Ill.

Chicago Farmers' Club and International Livestock Exposition, Chicago, Ill.

U.S. Fruit and Vegetable Products Laboratory dedication, Winter Haven, Fla.

Vegetable Growers Association of America, Cleveland, Ohio.

New England Trust Conference, Boston, Mass.

Sunkist Growers, Los Angeles, Calif.

Our Prize and Public

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER PIRNIE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 7, 1959

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial which appeared in the May 5, 1959, edition of the Utica Observer-Dispatch.

Recently the Utica Daily Press and Utica Observer-Dispatch were awarded the Pulitzer gold medal for disinterested and meritorious public service as a result of their successful campaign against corruption, gambling, and vice, and the achievement of sweeping civic reforms in the face of political pressure and threats of violence. Through this award the newspapers have brought honor and distinction to upstate New York, since this prize has long been recognized as symbolizing highest journalistic excellence. It is essential to the cause of good government that the citizens be kept informed. In exposing that which is corrupt and in encouraging that which is sound, the press can do much to assure the existence of an effective civic conscience.

OUR PRIZE AND PUBLIC

The people who work on the Observer-Dispatch and the Press are proud of the honor bestowed upon us by the Pulitzer Prize administrators for "disinterested and meritorious public service."

We hasten to add that the Utica newspapers accept this national recognition as a challenge to live up to the high standards the committee selection implies.

And that we appreciate sincerly the support of those who comforted us and aided us in what was not an easy year for the newspaper people involved.

The leadership of Mason Taylor, executive editor of the papers, was the outstanding factor in the achievement. He doubled as news director and Press editorial writer in turning over the stones in the local cobble patches.

The hard work of assembling facts centered here in O-D managing editor, Gilbert P. Smith; the Press managing editor, Neal A. Bintz; Reporter-Editor Tony Vella and Reporter William H. Lohden. The scope of the Gannett Newspaper organization made possible the services of Jack Germond of the newspaper group's Albany bureau and Paul Martin, chief of our Washington staff. The late J. David Hogue, then general manager of the papers, backed the project warmly.

These all share principally in the honor of the award.

The effort to show area residents what was happening to their community in unpunished vice law violations and costly administration of public business is not something a newspaper finds pleasant. Newspaper people, too, are citizens and taxpayers. The fair name of their community is dear to them. But when a malignant growth needs to be eradicated, the operations must go ahead, no matter what the risks or the discomfort.

Exposure of maladministration is not the type of "news" that sells more papers. In Utica, many people of some standing could not believe conditions had become so serious, frowned upon "stirring up a mess." At times, the plugging to get the story was onerous, frustrating, and even hazardous.

We knew, of course, that newspapers could not do the task without backing and help from the public. To those who aided by writing letters or otherwise, our thanks. To those who are coming to see the need for more citizen action, we say, "Welcome aboard."

Our staff cherishes the Pulitzer Prize, but we appeal to all to see that conditions which inspired our activities have no chance to recur in this community. Active, intelligent participation in public affairs by more people will best guarantee a greater Utica free from evils and political shenanigans.

WILLIAM J. WOODS.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer, plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

Appendix

Next Year and the Next 10 Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CHURCH
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 11, 1959

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss] addressed the Women's National Democratic Club here in Washington last Thursday night. He spoke discerningly and with clarity on the posture of this Nation as our Western civilization faces great dangers.

I was particularly interested in his discussion of the tasks we have assigned to the Select Committee on Water Resources by Senate Resolution 48, recently passed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this fine address delivered by Senator Moss be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEXT YEAR AND THE NEXT 10 YEARS

(Address by Senator FRANK E. MOSS before the Women's National Democratic Club, Washington, D.C., May 7, 1959)

For a new Senator, Washington has many surprises, most of them pleasant. My biggest surprise, however—and I think I can claim an exclusive on this one—was to be asked to address Lincoln Day dinners. One of the first pieces of mail I opened was from former Republican National Chairman Meade E. Alcorn, requesting my preferences as to places to deliver Lincoln Day speeches.

And actually I would welcome the opportunity of talking to a Lincoln Day audience. I would like to remind them of the needs of the present day, as Republican Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN, of Vermont, did when he said in his speech this year:

"It is a mistake to give the public the impression that a balanced budget to be achieved at any cost is the paramount aim of our Republican administration.

"Lincoln had to choose between conflicting values and he chose the greater ones," AIKEN said. "He could have balanced the budget and lost the Union. He could have held down the national debt and perpetuated slavery.

"Instead of 'scaring the daylights out of people' by putting budget balancing first," AIKEN said, "Republicans should make clear that national security and a stable progressive economy are our paramount interests.

"The United States is a growing nation. The progress we have made to date is only preliminary to what the future holds for us."

In addition I would remind Republicans that Lincoln said this: "The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate to the stormy present • • • as our case is new, so we must think anew and act anew." Surely the need to "think anew and act anew" was never greater than it is today.

For today we face new threats to our security, to our way of life, to Western civilization itself. The entire concept that was summed up in Woodrow Wilson's historic phrase, "To make the world safe for democracy," is in great danger.

This audience is thoroughly familiar with the nature and extent of that threat. We have seen the development of the fearsome weapons which, their creators tell us, are capable of blowing up civilization itself. We have heard the soothing statements of the administration prior to the launching of the first sputnik, and have seen revealed the rapidly increasing economic productivity of the Soviet Union.

We are aware that last year, for the first time, the Communist bloc, including the U.S.S.R., its East European satellites and China, produced more steel than did the United States. And of the even more sobering fact that half our capacity—an amount equal to the U.S.S.R. production—was idle. Put another way, the American furnaces that were idle last year could have produced as much steel as all the furnaces in the Soviet Union.

The totalitarian dictators know what kind of world they want it to be in the years ahead. They boldly plan for that world, and channel their productive capacity, their educational facilities, and their diplomatic maneuvers to making it that kind of world.

If we are to win in this kind of struggle, we must project our program ahead—we must decide what kind of world we want it to be twenty years from now. And within the framework of democratic individual liberty, we must devote the years ahead to the effort to create that kind of world.

And the competition of Russia is only one of the developments that make it necessary to take the long view, to plan ahead, to decide what kind of world we want it to be and set out consciously to make it that kind of world.

More basic than even that, are two other problems—the accelerating population of the world, and the increased use of Western industrial techniques.

The most famous of living English historians, Arnold Toynbee, has pointed out how the formerly backward nations of the world are beginning to use the mass-production methods developed by the West; and how—if they succeed in developing productive economic systems—their tremendous advantage in numbers is bound to tell against us.

There is no question as to the administration's program to meet these problems. As Senator AIKEN indicated, first, last, and all the time it is: balance the budget to stop inflation. And this administration policy is getting a free publicity ride on the tremendous "stop inflation" advertising program being conducted by American business.

Now, we Democrats want to see as much study of economic problems as possible, and it is a healthy thing for our citizens to take an interest in the budget, and to take the time and effort to study the problem and to make their views known. We are all aware of the tragic things that inflation can do to the economy of a country and to the people who live in it. We must also be aware of the complex nature of inflation, and of all those problems that have to do with our monetary system.

Many feel that deficit financing by the Federal Government is the sole cause of the rise in the price level that we call inflation. While it may be true that it is a contributing cause, a year-by-year examination of our Federal budgets and the rise in the cost-of-living figures clearly show that balancing the budget in one year does not necessarily mean stable prices that year. For example, the present Eisenhower budget is $13 billion out of balance, but there has been virtually no increase in the cost of living for the past 4 months.

No one seems to know precisely how to halt inflation, although we recognize many of the factors which contribute to it. For example, the tight-money policy was supposed to slow down borrowing and credit and thus to halt inflation, but this slowdown caused a business decline which resulted, in turn, in an increased Federal deficit due to loss of tax revenue. So we know that we must have a healthy and expanding economy to meet the fixed obligations of the Government with adequate tax income. If we do not, we are compelled to resort to deficit financing.

Let me say, however, that I am hopeful that we can balance the budget this year, and that this will contribute to stabilization of the value of the dollar. But in attempting to do this, we must not forget our primary needs of defense and of the economic well-being of our people. It is important to safeguard the incomes of those on fixed incomes. It is equally important to provide what is needed for education, for social security, for conservation of our natural resources, and for defense of the free world against the Soviet military and economic threat.

The administration is making the budget for this fiscal year an end in itself. Actually, it should be only a means to the greater ends—the needs for national security and necessary domestic programs.

With much of what I have said, many Republicans would agree, except that they would have a different definition of the word, "necessary." What do we mean by necessary domestic programs?

As an example, let's look at two domestic matters that I consider necessary: the solution of the unemployment problem and conservation of our natural resources.

As you know, we are in a period marked by rising output of our gross national product, and what has been described as a profit explosion. In these two fields, recovery is undoubtedly good. But in employment, we are witnessing a much slower increase.

Studies indicate that increasing productivity due to automation may make it impossible for many workers to ever get their jobs back.

Increasing productivity is what makes a high standard of living, and this is good news. It is only one side of the story, however. Unemployment is bad news, and this problem must be met. The areas most affected are finding it difficult to finance their local governments. Unemployment, the resulting lack of purchasing power and tax-paying power was one of the great contributing causes of the 13 billion deficit for this fiscal year.

If this problem will solve itself, so much the better. But a realistic look at our history for the last 30 years must show that unemployment is a symptom of more basic

economic problems which, if not met, will give us real trouble in many other areas including that of the budget.

The second question is how our irreplaceable resources upon which our prosperity has been built—land, water, minerals, forests, and the others—are to be handled to retain and enlarge their productive capacities.

One of the most necessary of these, and one that well illustrates the point, is water. Since my State of Utah has been a leader in water conservation, it is a subject that is very near to me.

Water was once a problem only to the West. But our water table is falling throughout the Nation, and there is grave concern on adequacy of resources. Almost the entire supply of water that is high quality, inexpensive, and readily available is in use already.

Our population increase, as well as our increase in standard of living, must be provided for by conservation. And our requirements per person are rapidly accelerating. What was good enough for our grandfathers is not good enough for us. We are becoming used to automatic washers and automatic dishwashers. The Saturday night bath has been replaced by almost daily showers. The small patch of lawn in front of the cottage has given way to many beautifully landscaped areas for home, schools, and churches. We are building newer and larger golf courses, parks, and recreation areas.

Our industry is geared to large production of thousands of items that require great quantities of water, for instance 200,000 gallons to produce 1 ton of rayon, 300,000 gallong to produce 1 ton of aluminum, and 600,000 gallons to produce 1 ton of synthetic rubber.

Today we are using about 240 billion gallons of water a day. By 1975, if our 175 million population grows to 225 million as expected, even our present rate of consumption would outstrip our resources. It is expected that by 1975 we will need 350 billion gallons a day, or more than a 90-percent increase over the amount used in 1950.

As an example of how we Democrats are attacking these problems of the future, the Senate has, by resolution, set up a Select Committee on Water Resources. The resolution was the result of action taken earlier in the session by the Western Conference of Democratic Senators. The committee consister of Members of the Senate from the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs, Public Works, Interstate Commerce, and Agriculture and Forestry.

Its task is to determine the water resource projects that will be needed between now and 1980 to supply the requirements of population, agriculture, and industry. The committee will report its findings and recommendations to the Senate not later than January of 1961.

In addition to conservation through storage and regulation of flows, the committee will study recent technical advances, including desalinization of brackish and saline waters, reduction of loss through evaporation, seepage control, and waste-water salvage.

Water development programs must be started well in advance of requirements. Relatively small projects take 10 to 15 years for the careful planning that must be done and for construction. Measures needed to meet 1980 requirements should be started as soon as possible.

A whole speech could easily be devoted to the history, features, and benefits of one of these great developments, the upper Colorado storage project, now underway in my State of Utah and surrounding States.

This project has been under consideration for more than 50 years. Some land withdrawals were made as early as 1904.

When completed, the project will develop an area of 100,000 square miles. It will consist of four large main-stream dams, one on the Green River on the Utah-Wyoming border, one on the Colorado on the Arizona-Utah border, one on the San Juan in New Mexico, and one on the Gunnison River in Colorado.

One million kilowatts will be added to upper basin power capacity, 132,000 acres of new land will come under irrigation, and 234,000 acres will receive supplemental water.

It will provide the water and power for full development of the more than 200 different minerals found in the Colorado Basin area, as well as open up great new recreation areas to boating, fishing, and refuges for ducks and other migratory birds.

One specialized but very important aspect of the conservation problem is the Federal-State conflict of Federal preemption of water rights. This, like all water problems, is most acute in the West, but will become more important to the entire country as conservation and allocated use becomes widespread.

The settlement of the West required cultivation of land which did not enjoy sufficient rainfall. This meant irrigation, which, in turn, meant storage of water during wet seasons for use in other places during dry seasons. As soon as water that originates one place is put to use somewhere else, the question arises as to ownership.

Since the first Utah settlements, water law has developed on the basis of beneficial use. Whoever first puts water to beneficial use owns it. And this property right is more valuable than the land itself. All existing water rights have been secured under State law and now the Federal Government refuses to recognize those State laws and the individual rights granted under them, as binding on itself.

This controversy has accelerated as more Federal projects have been built in the West, and court decisions have held against the States.

Legislation to establish Federal recognition of indivdual water rights has been introduced in the last several sessions of the Congress, and I am the author of a water rights law this year. All previous bills have failed, largely because of the opposition of the Federal departments that deal with western lands.

You will have a better idea of the scope of the problem if you realize that the Federal Bureau of Land Management administers 176 million acres in 26 States and 298 million acres in Alaska, and that 74 percent of Utah is federally owned.

We in the West, who have had the experience with this problem, believe that the orderly development and expansion of water conservation demands the recognition of State laws, and the willingness of the Federal Government to apply for water rights in the same way as other users do.

The Problem in Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 11, 1959

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech which I made on "The Problem in Germany" before the Bicentennial World Affairs Forum of the Foreign Policy Association of Pittsburgh on May 1, 1959.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH OF HON. MIKE MANSFIELD, OF MONTANA, BEFORE THE BICENTENNIAL WORLD AFFAIRS FORUM OF THE FOREIGN POLICY ASSOCIATION OF PITTSBURGH ON MAY 1, 1959

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

Thank you for your kind words of introduction. They are deeply appreciated though undeserved.

Ladies and gentlemen, your welcome has been warm and generous and I shall do my best not to wear it thin. As you know this is my second visit with the Foreign Policy Association of Pittsburgh. To have been asked to come again is both a pleasure and a reassurance. It is a little like being reelected to the Senate. I am honored and I am most grateful to you, as I am to the citizens of Montana, for giving me a second chance.

Before proceeding to my remarks for this evening, I want to express to you, to your hard working and able director, Mr. Higgins, and, in truth, to all the foreign policy associations throughout the country, my admiration for the very significant public service which you perform.

May I take this means to state publicly what I have said many times privately about one of your members present with us this evening.

He served outstandingly in the European theater in World War II. He assumed command and set up a command post for Americans in Bogota, Colombia, when a revolution broke out in that country during the Ninth Inter-American Conference in 1948. He commanded our troops in Korea at the most critical and difficult stage and from there, he went to Europe and became Supreme Commander of NATO. He rounded out his career as Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army and has retired here at Pittsburgh to become one of your outstanding citizens.

I refer, of course, to Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway, who was and is not only considered a soldier's soldier, but perhaps most important during his entire military career he was a statesman's soldier as well.

There was a time when the Nation faced the problem of getting adequate and prompt information on developments elsewhere in the world. That problem has largely been solved. Modern means of communication bring the people of the United States, just as soon as it is made, almost more news than they can handle.

A related problem, however, remains. It is illustrated by a New York Times nationwide survey of public attitudes on the Berlin situation. The survey, made several weeks ago, showed that while an overwhelming percentage of Americans favored "standing firm" in the Berlin situation almost 40 percent did not know that in standing firm in Berlin we were standing over a hundred miles inside Communist Germany. According to the Post-Gazette of today an even more startling show of public ignorance or apathy has come from Britain. A recent opinion poll there revealed that 3 Britons in every 10 had never heard there was a dispute over Berlin.

This suggests to me that while the problem of supplying the news from abroad in sufficient quantity is being met, the problem of filling in the background and of giving the news perspective in terms of the Nation's needs and interests has not yet been adequately met. It is precisely in this field that the work of the Foreign Policy Association is most useful. As a Member of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Relations, I applaud you for your contribution to public understanding of the vital international issues which confront the Nation. I express

the hope that you will go on doing even more in this connection.

I am here, tonight, to participate with you in a small way in your important work I am here to discuss one segment of the international situation—the question of Germany.

At this point in the unfolding of that question I believe it is reasonable to say that as a Nation, we know that there is such a thing as a problem in Germany. Further, that we realize that we must "stand firm" in Germany. More recently, we have heard too of the need for not only "firmness" but also "flexibility." Let me try, tonight, to go beyond those slogans, for, in truth, that is what they are. Let me try, tonight, not merely to reiterate the need of being firm or flexible or firmly flexible or flexibly firm. Rather, let me try to explore with you the problem which confronts us in Germany and the possibilities of dealing with in ways other than disastrous war or disastrous diplomatic retreat.

THE PROBLEM IN GERMANY

The problem which confronts us in Germany is a segment of the worldwide problem of establishing equitable, rational, and evolving, conditions of peace. Today the crisis looms in a divided Germany and a divided Berlin. Tomorrow the scene of principal danger may shift to the Middle East. The day after it could be in the Far East that the clouds of conflict gather.

Since the end of the second war we have lived with a succession of international crises in these and other regions of the globe. It is as though the world were a vast and dangerous mine. We have rushed from one point of imminent or actual cave-in to another in a never-ending struggle to shore up the sagging roof of peace. We have timbered with a Berlin airlift, with a military defense of South Korea, with vast aid programs in Europe, Asia, and elsewhere, with troops in Lebanon and with naval power and other measures in the Formosan Straits.

These costly and strenuous improvisations represent our efforts to prevent a complete collapse of peace. It is doubtful, however, that what these measures have produced in the principal zones of danger—in Germany and Central Europe, in the Middle East and in Asia—this patchwork of timbering on which the fate of civilization rests—would meet a minimum safety code. The fact is that a dangerous world, no less than a dangerous mine, is not made safer, in any permanent sense, by patchwork. Improvisations may be unavoidable, as interim measures, as desperate measures. They ought not to be confused, however, with peace. On the contrary, improvisations may conceal an encroaching danger to ourselves and to the rest of the world by creating the illusion of stability, by permitting the postponement of essential, fundamental changes until it becomes perilously late to make them.

Something of that sort, I believe, lies at the root of the present problem in Germany. For years now, there has existed in that nation a kind of surface stability.

This is the appearance of that stability. In Western Germany which houses about 50 million Germans, the responsible, representative government of the Federal Republic, its capital in the city of Bonn, functions with a high degree of effectiveness. West Germany has one of the most productive and dynamic industrial economies in the world. It also has the substantial beginnings of a powerful German military establishment. Beside this establishment, there are garrisoned over 275,000 other NATO troops—French, British, and American—many with their dependents.

To the east of the Federal Republic is a Communist-held German territory, much smaller in area and with a population of only 17 million. Many Germans regard this region not as East Germany but as Central Germany, having in mind the Polish-annexed territories beyond the Oder-Neisse as the true, the unredeemed east. For our purposes tonight, however, I shall speak of the region as East Germany or Communist Germany. In this sector of the divided nation, there is poverty, stagnation, and oppression from which vast numbers have fled to the west in recent years. Increasingly, however, we hear reports of plans, if not the beginning, of an economic revival in the east.

There is Communist rule in Eastern Germany. A German totalitarian regime exists there by virtue of its own and Soviet power and the acquiescence, however sullen, of the East German people. As in the west, a German military establishment has been reconstituted in the east, under Communist control. It is supplemented by many divisions of Soviet Russian troops.

This brief sketch of a divided Germany also fits in microcosm, with some variations, the present situation in a divided Berlin. A principal difference is that Allied and Soviet Russian forces still retain tangible, visible responsibility for what happens, respectively, in the western and eastern sectors of the city. Garrisons of both are present and the Russians control the routes through East Germany over which French, British, and American forces must pass, from their bases in West Germany to their outpost in Berlin.

Under the ultimate control of the Allies, West Berlin has its own municipal government with Willy Brandt as its able, outspoken mayor. Under Soviet control, a sector of East Berlin—Pankow—serves as the seat of the Communist East German regime.

Among Germans of the two zones of the divided nation and the two parts of Berlin there is considerable contact, official and unofficial, in trade and in other matters. There is no formal recognition, however, of the one by the other. In fact, of all the principal countries involved in the German situation, only the Soviet Union recognizes both the West and East German Governments.

That, in brief, is the look of stability in Germany. The arrangements which underpin this stability are those which evolved at the end of World War II. They were designed originally for the temporary occupation of a defeated Germany. But what began as an expedient took on a kind of permanence with the breakdown in relations between the Soviet Union and the Western nations.

All around the rim of Germany changes have taken place. Within West Germany and East Germany, respectively, changes have also taken place. But between the divisions, the arrangements for stability have not changed in essentials for years.

All of the nations involved have recognized at one time or another that these arrangements are inadequate. We and other Western nations have said, in effect, that they must be changed. The Soviet Union has admitted that they should be changed. The German leaders—East and West—know that sooner or later they will be changed. All involved have paid at least lip service to the basic requirements of change, that is, to the need for reunification of Germany and of its capital of Berlin and to the need for a final liquidation of World War II.

However, no nation has really moved from the position it assumed years ago on how these admittedly necessary changes should be brought about. The Western position has been based, at least until recently, on the contention that there should be free all-German elections as the prerequisite to reunification and a peace settlement. The Russians have been vague on this matter but it is apparent that even if they use the same language as we do, they do not mean the same things. They clearly do not accept a unification of Germany by free all-German elections, if it means, as it would at this time, the obliteration of German Communist political influence in East Germany. It may be that they are not really prepared to accept unification under any circumstances unless it means the domination of all of Germany by communism.

In the meantime, all have managed to live with the existing arrangements, with a divided Germany and Berlin, part free and part Communist, with a Germany no longer at war but not yet fully at peace. On only two occasions have these arrangements been seriously challenged. They were hit by the Stalin-imposed blockade of Berlin in 1948. Then, in 1953, the Communist political structure in East Germany was shaken by worker uprisings. Both attempts, as you know, failed. The Western nations committed enormous resources in the Berlin airlift and in the supply and reconstruction of West Berlin. Finally, Stalin was persuaded to abandon his attempt to force us from the city and to unify it under Communist control. The East German revolt which we supported with very articulate enthusiasm was suppressed by Soviet military power and the hope of a spontaneous unification of all Germany under freedom, in that fashion, was set back.

Since 1953, the status quo has not again been subjected to a major test anywhere in Germany. To be sure, there have been incidents which have sent tremors through the stability but they did not upset it. Just last November, for example, Mr. Khrushchev warned that he would change the status quo at Berlin. He did not schedule the execution of the change, however, until this month. Now, apparently, it has been postponed, pending the results of the coming conferences.

In short, the German situation is still held together by the same provisional, improvised arrangements which have held it together for years. These arrangements are tied to certain basic conditions, conditions which must prevail if the stability in Germany, in its present form, is to continue. We must see clearly what these conditions are if we are to measure the scope of the problem which confronts us. Let me, therefore, outline them at this point.

First, the present stability in Germany depends upon the absence of decisive accidents or provocations between the military forces of the West and the Soviet Union. It is conceivable that there may be hostile or threatening contact between these forces, as indeed there has been, without a collapse. This contact, however, cannot go too far. At some undetermined point, military accidents or provocations are likely to set off a chain reaction which will engage in a decisive fashion the prestige—the face, so to speak—of the principal powers. At that point the irrevocable slide or plunge into the abyss of war will have begun.

That, then, is one condition of the continuance of the status quo in Germany, of the present stability which is neither peace nor war. There must be an absence of hostile accidents or provocations between the military forces in Germany which go beyond the point of no return.

The second condition is German acquiescence, the acquiescence of the people of the East as well as the West in the systems under which they now live. Let me say, parenthetically at this point that I do not suggest that this is desirable. I merely say that it is one of the factors which underlie the existing stability.

As a part of acquiescence, Germans must be willing to accept the continued division of their country, the continued presence of foreign troops in great numbers in their land and the military arrangements which join one segment of the nation to NATO for pro-

tection and subordinate the other to the Warsaw Pact.

The third basic condition of the status quo is that the Western Powers and the Soviet Union must also tolerate the existing division of Germany and the present arrangements for occupation of a divided Berlin. In short, if the German people must accept the status quo, the Western Powers and the Soviet Union must not challenge it, at least they must not challenge it with anything much stronger than words. Further, the peoples of the West must be prepared, as must the people of the Communist bloc to pay the ever-increasing costs of defense establishments and the instruments of cold war which are made necessary in part by the existing arrangements for keeping the status quo in Germany.

In stating these conditions, I emphasize again that I do not advocate them or subscribe to their desirability. I merely note them as underlying the present situation in Germany, as the conditions precedent to its continuance. These conditions are not the foundations of an equitable, rational, and evolving peace in Germany and central Europe. They are the patchwork timbering of an improvised truce. Nevertheless, they are the conditions on which the lives of the German people, the people of Europe and, in a larger sense, the survival of a recognizable human civilization now depend.

If one of these conditions is changed in any significant fashion, I cannot see that the present situation in Germany is likely to persist. It seems to me that it must either evolve into something more durable or it will collapse in the chaos of war, limited, or unlimited.

Putting aside for a moment Mr. Khrushchev's announcement that the proposes to alter one of the conditions of the present stability, that is, the arrangement at Berlin, what of others? Can these others, in any event, be counted upon to support indefinitely the existing situation? I do not see how they can be. I believe that these other conditions have already changed markedly beneath the surface calm, that they are continuing to change and that they cannot change much more before the churning shall break through the surface.

In that sense, I am persuaded that the present stability in Germany was in the process of erosion long before Mr. Khrushchev's announcement last November. Indeed, I said so in the Senate many months prior to that time.

Let us look for a moment at the present state of these conditions of stability, these basic conditions which must prevail if there is to be no change in the German situation. Take the first—that there must be no military accident or provocation in Germany which goes beyond the point of no return. It is obvious that none, so far, has done so. But there have been grave near-misses. The Berlin blockade was a massive near-miss. Since that time there have been other incidents, provocations. I need not catalog them. You have seen reference to them time and again—to the buzzed transports, to the challenged convoys, to the downed planes and the detained soldiers. I do not know which of these incidents may have been prompted by higher Soviet headquarters and which may have come about by the whim of some local commander. Given a conducive set of circumstances, however, it is far from inconceivable that any incident of this kind might go out of control.

Apart from deliberate provocation, there still remains the very real danger of military accident, if not on our part, then on theirs. The chances of accident multiply when forces are poised—as they are in Germany—at swords-point and are keyed tight by the electrified atmosphere of cold war, of propaganda war. They multiply again as the countdowns of the new weapons quicken and their delivery times shorten. They multiply still again as these devices of incredible devastation find their way into more and more hands. In this sense, then, a basic precondition of the status quo in Germany has indeed changed, quite apart from any recent change in Soviet policy with respect to Berlin. It has changed in the sense that the margin for military error or provocation has narrowed. The prospects are, moreover, that the margin will narrow still further as time goes on.

I believe, too, that it is reasonable to suggest that the acquiescence of the Germans—East and West—the second basic condition on which the status quo rests, has also changed significantly and will continue to change. It is, of course, difficult to document the sentiment of a whole people. We are informed, however, that there is great unexpressed discontent in East Germany. We know, moreover, that there are movements for reunification and neutralization in Western Germany, even if we cannot measure their strength. We must assume that currents of a similar and probably stronger kind flow through East Germany even though Mr. Gallup has yet to conduct a poll in that region.

It is obvious that the defeated Germany, the disarmed Germany, the shattered, starving Germany for which the present improvised arrangements of stability were devised, no longer exists. As I noted earlier in my remarks, at least in one zone—in the West—there is a revitalized nation. Furthermore, in both zones, there now exist German military forces and political structures manned by Germans, even if, in the East, they may not be controlled ultimately by Germans. In both zones, finally, a new generation is coming into its own—a generation which was young in the days of defeat but which, now and in the years immediately ahead, will inevitably rise to leadership in Germany. In these circumstances, it would be unrealistic in the extreme to believe that the arrangements for stability which exist in Germany—devised in another hour and for another setting and modified only within each zone separately—will continue to serve for the indefinite future. In short, we must face the likelihood that the second condition of the status quo—the continued acquiescence of the German people in division and quasi-occupation may well be drawing to an end. We must reckon with the strong possibility that, increasingly, Germans will seek their unity and national equality by whatever means may be available if constructive machinery to facilitate it in peace and order does not exist.

As for the third basic condition on which the present stability in Germany rests, I have already noted that if we are to go on as we are, the Western nations and the Soviet Union must not challenge the existing arrangements with anything much stronger than words. In fact, except for occasional dangerous but limited military incidents and provocations, neither has challenged it, in any other fashion in recent years. Further I said that both the people of the Western nations and the Soviet Union must be willing to pay the ever-increasing costs of defense establishments and the instruments of cold war to keep a rough equilibrium of force not only in Germany but throughout the world. That, too, has been done until now, although I would be less than honest if I did not express my deep concern over continuing reports that the Soviet effort in this respect is greater than our own. I am not in a position to evaluate those reports. The official secrecy—necessary and unnecessary—which engulfs this question cannot be easily penetrated by Members of Congress. The disquieting reports, however, come from highly qualified and competent sources and they do not auger well for the future. They certainly raise doubts about the likelihood of maintaining the present stability in Germany or anywhere else for that matter.

Finally, the third condition of the status quo also depends upon the maintenance of the present arrangements at Berlin. We now know that these arrangements have been challenged. Mr. Khrushchev has assailed the Western position in Berlin and demanded that it change. He has done so, however, only in words and, in that respect, his challenge is not new.

What is new, what does threaten the status quo is the strange action by which Mr. Khrushchev proposes to bring about this change. He proposes to withdraw himself from Berlin, that is, he says that he will remove Soviet forces from the city and from the routes of access to it. Our official answer has been equally strange. We have said, in effect, that the Russians cannot leave the city and the routes of access, that they certainly cannot leave it in spirit and perhaps not even in body. After trying for many years to get the Russians out of the areas into which they sprawled after World War II, here is one place that we do not wish them to leave.

The reason for this is clear. If the Russians do quit Berlin, they will turn over the instruments of control to East German Communists. That opens, for the Soviet Union, a large field of maneuver in the war of nerves. But in a more fundamental sense, the action will also work a change in the underlying conditions of the status quo in Germany. It will increase the strains and stresses on the essential military restraints which are a part of the present stability. It will do the same to German acquiescence which is also a part of it. In short, the entire German situation will move into a period of grave instability out of which is likely to emerge either a new status quo or conflict.

There has been a great deal of speculation on why Mr. Khrushchev has threatened to take this step. One may assume, of course, that Mr. Khrushchev has been motivated by what he believes will be ultimately to the advantage of the Soviet Union and world communism. I would hope that we are equally motivated by what we believe to be to the advantage of the United States and to world freedom.

What is significant at this moment, is not so much the ultimate aims of Soviet communism. We know what they are and it is of little value to intone them again and again as though this litany will somehow protect us from them. More significant is the question of how Mr. Khrushchev proposes to serve Communist interests through Soviet policies at a moment in history when the transcendent interests of civilization, and of the human species itself, rest in delicate balance between survival and nuclear obliteration.

No one who is not privy to the operations of Mr. Khrushchev's mind and the inner working of the machinery of Soviet communism can be certain of what lies beneath the Soviet maneuver at Berlin. The move could have been motivated by a combination of any of a score of reasons, some logical, some illogical, some groping toward peace, some stumbling toward war.

The interpretation of the charades of Soviet policy may be a fascinating game. As I have already noted, however, this game is essentially speculative. What seems to me most important at this point is not to guess at the obscure contents of the Soviet mind but rather to get clearly in our own minds what it is that we—the western nations—seek in this situation. What is most important is to make certain that what we seek is reasonably related to the situation that exists in Germany today, not to one

which we would like to exist or one which may have existed years ago and no longer exists.

If the interests of this Nation, of freedom, and of human civilization lay only in maintaining existing arrangements in Germany, if Mr. Khrushchev's maneuver at Berlin were the only threat to these arrangements then, indeed, it would be sufficient to counter that maneuver merely by standing firm.

Is that, however, the case? I think it is clear that Mr. Khrushchev's maneuver at Berlin is not the only danger to the status quo in Germany. Further, I question whether an effort to maintain that status quo indefinitely is, in fact, in accord with the interests of this Nation, freeedom, and human civilization.

To be sure, we shall stand firm at Berlin and in Germany. I know of no responsible person in the Government of this Nation who holds otherwise. I certainly do not hold otherwise. Moreover, I know of no statesman in the Western World who holds otherwise. We shall stand firm because to permit the forces of freedom to be frightened, cajoled, or driven from Berlin—the future capital of all Germany—will be to remove one of the props of the present stability in that country before another firmer support is in place. Let us not, however, confuse the necessity for standing firm in that sense with a mere maintenance of present arrangements in Germany for the indefinite future.

I am not persuaded that the interests of this Nation, of freedom and of human civilization lies in an indefinite continuance of the present military situation in Berlin and in Germany, a situation which, increasingly, will permit an accident or an irresponsible local provocation to precipitate the suicide of civilization. I am not persuaded that these interests are served by perpetuating arrangements in Germany which offer little prospect of progress toward peaceful unification to the German people. I am not persuaded that these interests are served by the ever-mounting costs of the arms rivalry of the cold war, and the propaganda war—costs which are occasioned in great part by the existing situation in Germany.

What I am trying to suggest, in short, is that it is not enough, in our own interests, merely to stand fast in Germany, as an end in itself. It is not enough merely to seek to sustain an existing situation which is ceasing to be adequate for minimum stability in Germany and central Europe. Rather, we must stand fast in order to go forward, in order to establish more equitable, rational, and evolving conditions of peace.

That is the challenge of the impending conferences on Germany. We must strive in them, it seems to me, to create a less volatile situation in Berlin, not merely by changing the Western position in that city as the Russians have suggested but perhaps by altering the status of the entire city, by internationalizing all Berlin under United Nations or other satisfactory international auspices as an interim arrangement. We must seek a readjustment of the military situation in all of Germany and Central Europe in a fashion which promises to reduce the danger of war by accident of provocation. We must seek, finally, a beginning on the spread of full political freedom throughout Germany and on German unification and, to that end, we must enlist in far greater measure than heretofore, the participation of the Germans themselves—East and West.

I realize, fully, that we shall not get anywhere with negotiations to these ends if the Russians are not of a mind, in their own interest, to move in a similar direction. As I have said, I do not presume to know the contents of the Soviet mind at this time, nor do I know of anyone who does. I do know that regardless of Russian intentions we shall not begin to move toward these ends unless we ourselves are clear as to where it is we want to go. We require at this point in time, beyond all else, a frank recognition of the importance of a change in Germany, a change not in the manner expounded by the Russians and not necessarily in the manner first projected by ourselves years ago. Rather, we need a change which conforms to the realities of the present, a change brought about by concessions which match concessions. To this task, we—all the western nations—must bring a new dedication, a new determination to develop equitable, durable, and evolving conditions of peace.

Miss Diane Collins

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 7, 1959

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, this morning I had the pleasure of attending a meeting of the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped at which awards were made to the winners of its national essay contest. It is with a deep sense of pride that I am able to report to this House that a young lady from Coventry, R.I., tied for third place in that nationwide contest.

The young lady is Miss Diane Collins, of 11 Capewell Avenue, Anthony, R.I. Miss Collins is a senior at Coventry High School. She has long exhibited leadership qualities both in academic and extracurricular activities. All of us in Rhode Island are very proud of her accomplishments including the latest honor received from the President's Committee. We extend to her our most sincere congratulations and include in these congratulations her parents, Mr. and Mrs. Lloyd Greene, her teachers, and Coventry High School itself.

The subject of Miss Collins' essay was "Hiring the Handicapped in Our Town—Meet Stan Stockwell." She has developed well the proposition that the physically handicapped of this country constitute a large reservoir of skills, energies, and talents which must be tapped. We, who are so closely and intimately connected with the problems of the handicapped, realize the value of encouraging their employment. We are aware that the most promising aspect of the picture is that every year industry absorbs more and more of the severely disabled persons than they did the year before.

Much of the credit for this is due to programs such as that sponsored by the President's Committee under the able leadership of my good friend, Gen. Malvin J. Haas. Projects of the type of the national essay contest are valuable sources for making all the Nation aware of what is being done and what is hoped for in the future to give more of the handicapped people a chance at gainful occupations. For this, we all owe to Mel Haas a vote of sincere thanks.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the essay written by Miss Diane Collins entitled, "Meet Stan Stockwell." I also include a newspaper item written by John B. Lake, Jr., in the Providence Sunday Journal of April 26, 1959, which includes some details of Miss Collins' wide and varied activities:

COVENTRY GIRL PLACES HIGH IN NATIONAL CONTEST

(By John B. Lake, Jr.)

The pride of Coventry High School, Diane Joy Collins, 18, has done it again.

One of the top 10,000 high school seniors in the country and still a contender for a National Merit scholarship, she was disclosed yesterday to be one of five prizewinners in the national essay contest sponsored by the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped.

Blond, brown-eyed Miss Collins, whose elementary and high school record shows straight A's, tied for third place in the nationwide competition with Brian O'Leary of San Antonio, Tex.

When Miss Collins won first prize in the Rhode Island contest earlier this month, Governor Del Sesto recognized her outstanding ability and offered her a summer job in his office. She quickly accepted.

For her achievement in the national contest, her school will receive a wall plaque. She will receive $250 and a trip, expenses paid by the Disabled American Veterans to Washington, D.C., to receive her award on May 7 from Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON. All winners will be guests at the President's annual committee meeting there May 7-8.

Harold Stanzler, personnel manager at Collyer Insulated Wire Co., Pawtucket, chairman of the Rhode Island Governor's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped, will be at the Washington ceremony and will participate in a panel discussion on programs of local committees.

OTHER WINNERS

Other winners of the national contest were Barbara J. Zimmer, Glen Ridge, N.J., first prize, $1,000; Elizabeth O'Brien, Somerville, Mass., second, $400; Margaret O'Meara, Lake Charles, La., $100.

The five winners competed against thousands of public and parochial school juniors and seniors.

The daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Lloyd Greene of 11 Capwell Ave., Anthony, Miss Collins is editor of her high-school yearbook and a member of the art club. She is a member and former secretary of Quidnick Baptist Church Youth Fellowship and South County Youth Fellowship.

A member of the Future Teachers Club of Coventry High School, she plans to attend Gordon College in Beverly Farms, Mass., and major in English, then teach high school.

AN AVID READER

An avid reader, she had read "Little Women" and other books before she entered the first grade at Quidnick School, according to her mother. Principal Reuel Sheldon of Coventry High School says her scholastic success is the result of natural ability and hard work. Her trademark is a briefcase full of books, although she has varied interests.

In 1957, she won a State Lions' Club essay contest on safe driving. She didn't even drive then, although she has learned since. She has been a top student in the Voice of Democracy oratorical contest at her school.

For the past two summers, she has worked as a waitress at Rummey, N.H., Bible Conference, a summer camp for adults. When

at home she studies 2½ hours nightly, and no TV or radio until it's completed.

Besides Gordon College, Wheaton College in Wheaton, Ill., has accepted Diane. She may decide to study there, if she wins financial help through a national merit scholarship.

HIRING THE HANDICAPPED IN OUR TOWN—MEET STAN STOCKWELL

Jerusalem, A.D. 21. In the busiest section of the market place squats a thin, wrinkled old man known as Old Jonas, the blind beggar. In his youth he lived with his parents, but since their death many years ago, all that Jonas can do is sit in the marketplace and ask alms of passers-by. Children taunt him; adults avoid him. Because of his physical handicap, this is the most Jonas can expect from life.

London, 1550. Tom is a cripple, one of his legs hopelessly twisted from his having been run over by a carriage. Tom used to work for a tavern-keeper but was replaced after his accident. He has found no other work. Not that he has not tried—but wherever he goes, his ungainly limp makes him the object of fear and ridicule. Such cruel treatment has twisted Tom's mind almost as badly as his leg.

Our Town, 1959. Stan Stockwell, his wife Jane, and their little son Eddie live in a modest but nice duplex house here in Our Town, a pleasant suburban community similar to any you'd find in New England—or in the Midwest—or anywhere in America. Until recently Stan drove a delivery truck for Greenview Milk Co. He liked his job. The company was fair to its employees, the pay was good, and the work was pleasant.

Several months ago, however, Stan was in an automobile accident. He was on his way to catch a bus home from work. A car, apparently out of control, came speeding past. Stan was unable to get out of its path and was struck. As a result of the accident he lost his right leg.

Like Jonas in ancient Jerusalem and Tom in old England, Stan Stockwell has joined the ranks of the physically handicapped. Times have changed, however. Stan does not have to face the open ridicule and loathing which accompanied the physically handicapped in times past. Although he must be out of work for a time, Stan will not find it necessary to beg on the street corner, and his family will not have to face poverty. Social security benefits have made such a situation a thing of the past. Furthermore, Stan's one disability does not outweigh his many capabilities. Certainly he will be able to find work when he is well, or will he?

* * * * *

When Stan thought about returning to work, naturally his first idea was to see the firm which had employed him before the accident—Greenview milk Co. Greenview's reputation for fairness and reliability made Stan quite confident that, although unable to drive, he could obtain other work there. During Stan's absence, however, Greenview had come under new ownership.

Stan was not sure how this would affect him, but he knew that the new management was advertising for workers, and he had confidence in himself. So he went to see the personnel manager at Greenview.

Stan was totally unprepared for Mr. Burton's attitude. "I'm sorry, Mr. Stockwell," he said, "but I don't see how we can use you. In our business we can't afford to hire men who do not meet our company's physical requirements. I'm afraid we simply can't use you. Good day."

Stan was discouraged as he left Mr. Burton's office. "What am I up against?" he asked himself. "Does the fact that I've lost a leg mean that I'm to be branded as only half a man? There are positions open at Greenview that I could hold with the proper training. If it's like this everywhere I go, what what am I going to do? My sick benefits won't last forever. How can anyone be as biased as Burton, anyway? If it were his leg, and if he were looking for a job—but then, he's only abiding by company policy. Some policy."

Stan does not have problems as serious as those of the handicapped in A.D. 21 or 1550. But he has just had his first encounter with attitudes which are just as outmoded. Greenview Milk Co. is oldfashioned. First, its policy relating to physical standards for various positions is out of date. Greenview has a single minimum standard for all jobs, regardless of their nature. Secondly, Greenview holds to the old idea that handicapped employees are poor workers and bad business risks, in spite of statistics which show otherwise. Third, Greenview and companies like it are allowing the valuable abilities of men like Stan Stockwell to go unused. In many cases this results in poor mental attitudes and a deterioration of these abilities. Fourth, Greenview is weakening the Nation by rendering a portion of its manpower useless and adding the support of the physically handicapped to Government expenses. It is unfortunate that there is a firm like Greenview in Our Town.

Stan Stockwell was an intelligent, mature young man, and he did not remain discouraged for long. That evening he and Jane read the want ads carefully and made a list of available positions for which he was suited. The next day Stan began to make the rounds. After finding at several places that either the position had already been filled or he was not wanted, Stan came to the last firm on his list—Century Watch.

The attitude of Mr. Carroll, the personnel manager at Century, was quite different from that of Mr. Burton. "You seem to be the type of man we're looking for," Mr. Carroll said. "Your lack of experience is a hindrance, but we didn't advertise for experienced help. This work requires much manual dexterity. If tests show that you have it, there's a position for you."

Several days later Stan was at Mr. Carroll's office again. "Mr. Stockwell," said Mr. Carroll, "the aptitude tests indicate that there are two areas of work here for which you are well suited. We're going to start you in Department 7. Report for work tomorrow."

In the weeks that followed, Stan learned his new job quickly and thoroughly. Today he enjoys his work, has earned a promotion, has the respect of his coworkers, and is confident of his ability to support himself and his family.

Like thousands of other handicapped men and women in Our Towns all over America, Stan Stockwell, given a fair chance, has proved his ability as a worker. Modern, fair-minded employers like the people at Century have made this possible. They realize that a person physically unable to hold one position may fill another with ease. It depends on the person's abilities, not his disabilities. That is why Century considers the physical requirements of each particular job in the plant, and why its employees are placed according to their aptitudes.

The people at Century know that the records of the handicapped are just as favorable as those of the unimpaired in the areas of trainability, adjustment, observance of regulations, safety, attendance, and productivity. Century is building a better America by offering handicapped citizens a chance to be emotionally well-adjusted and economically independent, by cutting Government expense, and by increasing manpower and production. We are proud of firms like Century Watch which take a lead in hiring the handicapped in our Nation, in our State, and right here in Our Town.

Congratulations to Harry S. Truman on His 75th Birthday

SPEECH

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 7, 1959

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, in joining with Speaker RAYBURN and the majority leader [Mr. MCCORMACK] in congratulating former President Harry S. Truman on the most happy occasion of his 75th birthday, I know I join a goodly number of his friends not only across this country but around the circumference of the entire world. As the majority leader has said, I remember the occasion in San Diego, Calif., when I happened to be with my father at the time of the Democratic Convention which chose Harry S. Truman as Vice President of the United States. It was a happy thing for the country; it was a wise decision from which our Nation and the world have definitely benefited.

Here is a man who possesses those wonderfully endearing qualities which mark him an honest-to-goodness human being; and President Truman never stopped being human and natural from the time he was born, I daresay, up to his present birthday. He was his own salty, practical self as Senator and President, and certainly now as the elder statesman he is "big as life and twice as natural."

I have an honest admiration for President Truman, which is all the more honest perhaps for a certain skepticism I once entertained in my less discretionary years. That I have since come to regret deeply this momentary lapse is a fact that is well known to Mr. Truman. He assumed the responsibilities of the Presidency in the midst of one of the most crucial times our country and the world have ever faced and he made some of the most difficult decisions a President has ever been called upon to make.

Fortunately for us and for the rest of the world, Harry Truman came to high office so well grounded in the subject of history, so imbued with the principles and ideals of our Government, and so well equipped by practical experience to cope with both domestic and international politics that he was able to make far-reaching decisions with the greatest success.

I think that a remark made to me once by an eminent American is something that will always go down in the history books, when he said that Harry Truman had a greater understanding of the meaning of what the Presidency of the United States really meant than almost any other man who ever held the office. Mr. Truman understood the duties of the executive branch of the Government and his own duties as President.

Mr. Speaker, I could, of course, list as has already been listed, many of his contributions to world peace, such as Greek-Turkish aid, the Marshall plan, the point 4 program, the Berlin airlift, the fight against communism in Korea; and I

could also point to his courageous stand in the field of civil rights at a time when his humanitarian beliefs were more important to him than winning an election.

Somehow, though, I think the greatest tribute I can pay President Truman on his diamond jubilee celebration is to say that here is a man—a man with roots sunk so deeply in his country's soil, and with such devotion to his fellowman, that he has had the courage to be himself, to think independently, and to dedicate himself wholeheartedly to doing the very best job he knew how at all times.

May he enjoy many, many more birthdays and give us all the continued benefit of his commonsense approach to the problems facing us from day to day.

Congratulations to Harry S. Truman on His 75th Birthday

SPEECH
OF
HON. GERALD T. FLYNN
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 7, 1959

Mr. FLYNN. Mr. Speaker, I have no prepared text today, but listening, as I am, in these hallowed Halls to the wonderful eulogies that have been delivered to what I believe is one of the greatest men that this country and the Democratic Party has ever produced, I cannot restrain myself from adding a few words to what has been said.

Mr. Speaker, I had the distinct privilege of being a delegate to the Democratic Convention in Chicago in 1944 when this great man was nominated as Vice President on the Democratic ticket, and I had the privilege again of being a delegate in 1948 to the convention at Philadelphia when Harry Truman was nominated for the Office of President. And, I will never forget, as I know those other delegates will never forget, the Philadelphia convention. It was a convention of gloom, one where the delegates in convention assembled had a defeatist attitude such as I had never seen before; where the average delegate felt that he could not stop Harry Truman from seeking the nomination, but if he did win it, the effect would be that we would go down to defeat. And, that situation prevailed until the final night of the convention when, at about 3 a.m. in the morning, Harry Truman, nattily dressed in his white suit, with his wife and daughter, walked out on the veranda of that great convention hall with the doves released, flying in the rafters, and delivered a message to this assembly. He delivered an impassioned and forthright message. He ticked off in rapid succession what his administration had done in the last 2 years. He convinced all present of his sincerity, ability, and determination to improve the American way of life. He motivated everyone present to go out and work for his program of social justice. They were motivated to go out across the country and elect to the Presidency this great man with that set of ideals and principles. We all said then, "If Harry Truman can only talk to enough people, the way he talked to us tonight, Harry Truman will be the next President." And that feeling of gloom that pervaded the convention vanished into the morning air, about 4:30 in the morning, and the delegates left sparked with the spirit of victory.

Harry Truman inaugurated the whistle-stop campaign. He stopped at every corner in this country. I was at the meeting in Madison, Wis., which was attended by the gentleman from Iowa, and I can join him in everything he had to say about that meeting. I followed that delegation to Milwaukee, Wis., where he attracted the largest political crowd that has ever before or since attended any meeting in that city. And Harry Truman went on to the great and glorious administration that he had.

He was led by principle. He was motivated by a desire to do that which is right for the common and ordinary man. He was guided only by his conscience. There was no corporation, nor individual, that could buy his support or cause him to deviate from the right as he saw it. He acted in the interests of the little man. He acted in the interests of the underprivileged of this country. He raised their way of life. He improved the Nation as a whole, Republican and Democrat alike, not only in economic ways, but in social justice. This Nation is better for having had a man, an ordinary man such as you and I, who filled that presidency and stuck to the principles as he did, and who was never swayed from them; a man who was right not only in the little decisions but in the major decisions, both national and international.

I am proud to say that I am a Democrat and that my party has produced in my lifetime a leader such as Harry Truman. I want to join with my colleagues here this afternoon in saying, "Happy birthday, President Truman."

Congratulations to Harry S. Truman on His 75th Birthday

SPEECH
OF
HON. RICHARD BOLLING
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 7, 1959

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to be able to join in honoring former President Harry S. Truman on his 75th birthday. A man nearly all of whose adult life has been dedicated to public service and who at the age of 75 still continues to make a real contribution to the public good is rare in the history of any democracy. Mr. Truman's place in history is assured by the great decisions he made greatly. His courage never falters under fire of governments or men. His perception and understanding of the problems of the world as well as those of our country continues to be a very real public asset.

I know we all, regardless of party, join in wishing him good health and many more years of productive and happy life. May God bless and keep him.

Aluminum Marketing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VANCE HARTKE
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 11, 1959

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, during the Easter congressional recess I visited several countries in Europe as a representative of the U.S. Senate and the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. While in Germany I had the opportunity of discussing coal and aluminum marketing with officials of the Federal Economics Ministry in Bonn. The U.S. Minister for Economic Affairs in Bonn recently sent me memorandums outlining my conversations with officials of the Federal Economics Ministry and I ask unanimous consent that these memorandums be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the memorandums were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORANDUM OF CONVERSATION
APRIL 1, 1959.

Subject: Discussion of aluminum marketing.
Place: Federal Economics Ministry, Bonn.
Participants: The Honorable Vance Hartke, U.S. Senator; Mr. August Bourbon, staff member, U.S. Senate; Ministerialrat Dr. Heinrich Sennekamp, Mr. Storz, Dr. Pickard; economic counselor, Mr. William C. Ockey, U.S. Embassy, Bonn, Dr. Vaeth, Mr. Sommer; Mr. Thomas C. Stave, second secretary, U.S. Embassy, Bonn.

Senator HARTKE began his remarks by complimenting West Germany for the rapid economic progress it had made since the end of the war. He then described Soviet economic warfare in the world aluminum market since the war, particularly since 1957, when Soviet aluminum appeared on the British market on a cut price basis. He noted that Britain had been acquiring most of its aluminum from Canada, and that the Soviets then offered aluminum at a price of 2 cents below whatever price the Canadian producers were quoting. By the end of 1957, the proportion of Soviet aluminum in Britain had increased considerably while the Canadian proportion had decreased. Canada, in January 1958, petitioned the British Government to take antidumping action against the Soviets, but no action was taken, whereupon the Canadian producers, in April 1958, were forced to cut the free world price of aluminum 2 cents per pound, with a resultant decrease, during 1958, of both profits and tax revenues. Noting the erratic pattern of Soviet aluminum shipments, Senator HARTKE described the move as "sharpshooting" rather than "dumping."

Mr. Sennekamp thanked Senator HARTKE for his compliments, adding that much of the West German progress would not have been possible without U.S. Marshall plan aid. He then confirmed Senator HARTKE's opinion on the Soviet maneuver, stating the same effect on aluminum prices in Germany had been seen during the 1957–58 period. He indicated, however, that there was no longer

such a problem as far as the German market was concerned. He explained that in 1956 there was an aluminum shortage in Germany, which then entered into contracts for imports of limited amounts of Soviet aluminum. When the licenses for these shipments expired, however, new licenses were not granted. Furthermore, Mr. Sennekamp said, aluminum was not included in the recent West German-Soviet trade agreement, despite Soviet efforts to have the item included. He continued that in 1956 the Federal Republic entered into long-term contracts (up to 1961) for aluminum imports from Canada and Norway, which countries will supply most of its import needs. He estimated that West German production of primary aluminum in 1959 would be about 150,000 tons, with consumption about 190,000 to 200,000 tons. The difference of 40,000 to 50,000 tons would come through contracts with Canada and Norway. He predicted, however, that the Soviet Union would again enter the world aluminum market, since its processing industry cannot keep up with Soviet production of pig aluminum. He said this was also true with tin, zinc, and other nonferrous metals. Mr. Sennekamp also explained that the Federal Republic has a basic tariff of 7 percent on aluminum imports, but that imports of up to 40,000 tons are free of such duty, which covers practically the entire gap between domestic production and consumption. He expressed his opinion that 7 percent is not a high rate, since practically all other countries, including the United States, have a similar rate, while others, particularly France and Italy, have much higher rates. Senator HARTKE said the United States had no complaints with Germany on the question of tariffs, but that a problem had arisen on the Belgian tariff on semifinished aluminum products.

Senator HARTKE then expressed the interest of U.S. aluminum producers in developing new markets for aluminum, particularly in other areas of the world. Mr. Sennekamp commented that German producers had a like interest, and were cooperating with U.S. industry in hopes of developing new uses. He mentioned that within a few weeks a group of German architects would be visiting the United States to confer with representatives of the building industry here. Senator HARTKE said he would be glad to assist them in making contacts with U.S. firms, mentionning Alcoa, Harvey Aluminum, Reynolds Aluminum, and the institute, National Homes, which is developing a prefabricated house constructed almost entirely of aluminum. He said he would like to see an exchange of ideas, and suggested the possibility of using the United Nations as a clearing station.

Mr. Pickard then said he was an official of the Vereinigte Aluminumwerke (VAW) which represents 70 percent of West German aluminum producers. He described the problem of building up the industry after the war, and stated that although German per capita consumption was not as high as the United States, it was nevertheless going well, following U.S. pioneer work. He said the VAW had good contacts with U.S. producers, but would appreciate efforts to intensify what has been done so far, including the use of Senator HARTKE's good offices. The Senator said that by lending their brains, the Germans would be contributing to the economic welfare of the United States; that it was in the German interest to see a strong United States. He said that, due to apprehension over economic conditions, some U.S. producers were delaying planned expansion, mentioning specifically a contemplated new Alcoa plant at Evansville, Ind. Mr. Pickard agreed that cooperation was important, adding that he expected to be in the United States in June, and would like to meet with U.S. aluminum producers.

Mr. Sennekamp then said he would like to learn of expected future aluminum production in the United States. He noted that present U.S. annual production has increased to about 1.5 million tons, with consumption about the same, and that U.S. representatives have expressed interest in making sales to Europe, including Germany. Mr. Prichard interjected that the German gap between production and consumption is pretty well taken up by Canadian and Norwegian contracts. Senator HARTKE said that this was why a factual information exchange was necessary, in order that no country is hurt. He repeated that efforts should be made to increase consumption. He noted that the U.S. population is growing, and that there should be a growing need for aluminum. Mr. Pickard then commented favorably on U.S. efforts to develop a demand for aluminum in South American countries.

After a mutual exchange of good wishes, the meeting was ended.

MEMORANDUM OF CONVERSATION

APRIL 1, 1959.

Subject: Discussion of coal marketing.
Place: Federal Economics Ministry, Bonn.
Participants: The Honorable Vance Hartke, U.S. Senator; Mr. August Bourbon, staff member, U.S. Senate; Ministerialdirigent Richter, Ministerialrat Dr. Steinhaus, Ministerialrat Dr. Estner, Ministerialrat Dr. Prescher; Mr. Thomas C. Stave, second secretary, U.S. Embassy, Bonn.

Senator HARTKE said he wished to discuss the adverse effect on the U.S. coal industry and on U.S. public opinion caused by the recently imposed West German coal import restrictions, which he understood was based on German unilateral action. He said that unemployment in the United States was relatively high (6 percent in 1959 as compared to 2½ percent in Germany), particularly so in certain coal mining areas such as Kentucky (15 percent) and West Virginia (nearly 25 percent). He said that total coal production in the United States had been declining for some years, despite shipments to Europe, including West Germany. He said he understood the coal industry had expected to ship about 9 million tons to Germany in 1959. Mr. Richter interjected that in 1958 Germany had imported about 13 million tons, of which 11.2 million tons came from the United States.

Senator HARTKE stated he understood that, prior to 1958, German industrialists had signed long-term contracts with U.S. coal producers, covering a total of 40 million tons, and that the German industrialists had entered into such contracts upon the request of the Bonn Government for reasons of defense. He said he believed that a New York Times article in September 1958 was the first indication U.S. producers had of German contemplated controls, which was followed by the German tariff and quota imposition in January 1959. He indicated that U.S. coal producers believed this constituted a breach of contract.

Senator HARTKE stated that both countries have the capacity to produce more coal than they can consume or export, and thus have common economic problems. One such problem would be the difficulty of reopening a mine once it has been closed. Other problems are created for related industries, such as transportation. He said that political problems are also created, and that the relative importance of each of these problems must be considered. He mentioned a Joint Economic Council study earlier this year on the poor economic situation in the West Virginian coal mine area, which had received considerable U.S. newspaper publicity. He stated that, as a result of the U.S. economic recession and unemployment in the coal mining industry, Congress was disturbed over the effect the German import restrictions will have on future economic relations between the two countries. He said he was not there to say that the U.S. problems would be solved by raising the restrictions, but neither did he believe the German problems would be solved by imposing them. He thought that the net benefit to Germany of the import restrictions could be more than offset by damages which might be caused by U.S. policy. He asked if any of the Germans present had any comments to make before he continued.

Mr. Richter said he was especially interested to learn of the high unemployment in Kentucky and West Virginia. He said he had visited the United States and noted several differences between the United States and German coal industries. He said he had observed that U.S. mines were generally no deeper than 100 meters, while German mines average 750 meters in depth. He said U.S. mining is more highly mechanized, and that the rate of productivity is six times as high as in West Germany. German miners normally work a 5-day week; U.S. miners, 3 to 4. He noted also that German coal mining is concentrated in the Ruhr area, thus constituting greater potential political trouble than in the United States, where mining is more widespread. Mr. Estner commented that, with their greater depth, closed German coal mines would be more expensive to reopen than American mines.

Mr. Richter said he believed the Senator was misinformed in having stated that long-term contracts had been signed upon the Bonn Government's request. He explained that this was done on the initiative of the importers who found long-term contracts more profitable, since they could obtain better rates from shipowners. He said that, prior to September 1958, because of mounting surpluses, both at the pitheads and in the stocks of consumers, the Government suggested to importers that they reduce the number of new contracts. Since this measure was not adequate, the Government imposed an embargo in the form of permitting no new contracts, and finally the Economics Ministry had to take new steps, in the form of duty-free import quotas. Mr. Richter said the German authorities do not yet know what the result of these measures will be, and probably will not know until they expire on December 31, 1959.

Mr. Richter expressed a German belief that the American public is either misinformed or has misunderstood the German efforts, if it is really felt that the Germans treated their contracts as mere scraps of paper. He said reasonable compensation had been offered both to German importers and to U.S. exporters, and that German visitors to the United States reported they had found full understanding there on the matter of compensation. He said a heavy financial load had been placed on the German mining industry, and that he would be grateful if the Senator would explain to the U.S. public that the Germans were not considering the contracts as mere scraps of paper.

At this point, Mr. Richter was obliged to leave the discussion.

Dr. Steinhaus then described social problems in the Ruhr area, which he said were important to both Germany and the United States. He said the Ministry was forced to impose the import restrictions so that not too many minors would be laid off. He emphasized that the Ruhr is a small area with a great industrial potential. He mentioned the density of population, 1,152 persons per square kilometer. He said that even though the Government did not favor the idea of import restrictions in principle, it was concerned because of the radical elements in this densely populated area, which could result in an uncontrolled political development. He said that only 200 miles from the Soviet Zonal border, it constituted a hotbed

of political activity. He said he could not overemphasize this danger.

Senator HARTKE said he could appreciate the German problems, including the Berlin situation, and that the United States was aware of the necessity for cooperation in solving them. Nevertheless, he said, Germany should also appreciate that the German restrictions had the effect of aggravating serious economic problems in the United States, and could thus have an adverse psychological effect on Congress. He said that, for example, Congress was concerned about the effect of unemployment in the U.S. automobile industry, and that one of the States is in such a poor financial status that it is in danger of going bankrupt. He said that the United States had overextended itself financially in the past few years, and suggested that Congress might be inclined to cut down foreign aid as a result. He commented on the fact that West Germany had received considerable U.S. economic assistance, and likened the effect of the recent German restrictive measures, which was hurting the U.S. economy, to that of a "wet towel." He expressed his hope that the Federal Government would take steps to lift the coal import restrictions.

The 10th of May, a Rumanian National Holiday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 11, 1959

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address I recently prepared for radio broadcast on the occasion of the Rumanian national holiday which was celebrated on May 10.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The 10th of May is the Rumanian national holiday, the day on which the free Rumanian nation celebrated its independence. Since the present Communist regime has forbidden the people of Rumania to commemorate this day of national pride, it is fitting that we use the occasion to make clear that the free world has not forgotten the unhappy fate of the captive peoples behind the Iron Curtain.

For more than a decade the nations of Eastern Europe have lived under the grim shadow of Communist rule, enduring ceaseless and methodical oppression from regimes backed by the armed might of Soviet Russia. All of the terrors common to the modern police state have been used to integrate these nations into the Communist system, and to destroy, in the process, every desire for nationality and freedom.

That the Communists have largely failed in their efforts has been made abundantly clear in recent years by revolts in Hungary, Poland and East Germany. The revolt in Poland resulted, for a time, in some small measure of freedom for the people of that nation. But in Hungary, the rebellion was crushed with shameless brutality, despite the overwhelming censure of world opinion.

The role of the Russian army in suppressing these revolts revealed the extent to which force is the basis for Communist control in Eastern Europe. The Kremlin leadership knows that without an army and a vast police apparatus to underpin its rule the Iron Curtain would vanish overnight.

Today, thousands of Iron Curtain refugees still continue to flee into free Europe. Their flight from Communist tyranny testifies that the quest for freedom remains constant, despite relentless efforts by the Communists to seal off every avenue of escape.

For those who must remain behind, Communist domination will be endured with the hope that someday the light of freedom will penetrate the Iron Curtain, heralding the dawn of a better life. Their willingness and ability to resist the encroachments of communism shows that hope has not died among the captive peoples. It must be the earnest prayer of all Americans that this desire for independence will someday be fulfilled in Rumania, as in the other nations in Eastern Europe.

Honors Paid to Medical Alumni by George Washington University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS COTTON
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 11, 1959

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, it is appropriate that we pause occasionally to recognize and honor individuals who, in the practice of their profession, render outstanding and dedicated service to their fellow men. Among such persons are many members of the medical profession.

On April 30, 1959, the George Washington University paid a fitting tribute to five distinguished graduates of its school of medicine: Dr. Charles Stanley White, class of 1898; Dr. Edgar Copeland and Dr. Henry C. Macatee, class of 1900; Dr. A. B. Bennett, class of 1901, and Dr. William C. Clark, class of 1904. These men have been engaged in their profession for an aggregate total of more than 300 years and are still active in the practice of medicine in Washington, D.C.

As an alumnus of George Washington University, I join the university and its general alumni association in saluting these graduates for their long and great service to the community, for their sustained interest in the forward-looking development programs of the university, and for their cooperative efforts to improve medical education facilities.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of the scroll of appreciation presented each of these outstanding doctors by Otto W. Schoenfelder, president of George Washington University General Alumni Association.

There being no objection, the scroll was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Your distinguished achievements and services are in the highest tradition of the George Washington University School of Medicine and are known and honored by members of your profession everywhere. For more than 50 years you have served the people of the Nation's Capital with the utmost skills in times of sickness, accident, and disease. Your great gifts of healing have been a source of improved community health and well being through all these years. The George Washington University and all its alumni join in honoring you for the work which has meant so much to so many people and to express thanks for your long and untiring service on behalf of humanity.

Sanitary Regulations Relating to Milk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 11, 1959

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement entitled "National Milk Sanitation Act," prepared by myself, and dealing with the subject of legislation relating to sanitary regulations in connection with milk.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL MILK SANITATION ACT

I am pleased to be a sponsor of the bill called the National Milk Sanitation Act. Last year in the House of Representatives I joined Congressman LESTER JOHNSON, of Wisconsin, in sponsoring this legislation. This year, with Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY and other Senators, I am sponsoring it in the Senate while Congressman JOHNSON and some of his colleagues are again sponsoring it in the House.

The bill has been improved over the version of last year, and the climate for this necessary legislation has also improved.

SANITATION OFFICIALS' APPROVAL

Last year's bill faced the opposition of many of the State and local sanitation officials who feared that the legislation would interfere with the enforcement of their sanitary regulations. Hearings were held on the bill to study the recommendations and objections of these officials. The Association of State and Territorial Health Officers developed a set of principles which they wished to have embodied in this legislation, and the bill as it is written this year includes these principles.

Last year the bill provided that all milk moving in interstate commerce must meet the sanitary requirements of the United States Code.

The principal change in the bill this year is that it provides that no milk meeting the sanitary requirements of the United States Code can be excluded from interstate commerce. There are additional provisions for further inspection of milk shipped in interstate commerce to insure that the milk meets State and local sanitary regulations after shipment.

Milk not meeting the United States Code requirements may also be entered in interstate commerce, but it must meet any sanitary requirements imposed by State or local officials.

ELIMINATION OF INTERSTATE BARRIERS

There have grown up in the United States over the years many barriers to interstate commerce. Some of these barriers, like those now affecting the milk industry, have originated as legitimate sanitary protection but have later become economic barriers to free trade as changes in transportation and sanitation have made the original barriers obsolete.

This bill offers a solution to this problem, since it provides for the interstate shipment of milk and still affords adequate and modern sanitary protection for any milk in in-

terstate commerce. It continues the jurisdiction of State and local sanitary officials over milk coming into their areas.

MINNESOTA SUPPORT FOR LEGISLATION

There has long been concern in the State of Minnesota, as well as in other Midwestern States, for the free shipment of milk in interstate commerce. Gov. Orville Freeman and Attorney General Miles Lord of Minnesota have made many and various attempts to break through barriers to such free shipment of milk, and their efforts have been supported by the legislature.

The Congress should share such concern and support this one effort to eliminate barriers which have become obsolete so that free competition in the milk industry can be reestablished, while at the same time every sanitary protection is provided for milk shipped in both interstate and intrastate commerce.

Proposed Repeal of 22d Amendment to the Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 11, 1959

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, much has been said recently regarding attempts to repeal the 22d amendment to the Constitution.

I am definitely opposed to any move to lift the ban on a third term in the Presidency. When the amendment was adopted and ratified, I felt that it reflected the feelings of the American people as a whole. I believe it carries out the wishes of our Founding Fathers, and that it certainly should have a longer trial period.

The Washington Daily News published an editorial entitled "No Third Term" on Tuesday of this week in which the newspaper takes a firm stand against the repeal movement.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News, May 5, 1959]

NO THIRD TERM

Efforts to repeal the no-third-term amendment appear to be dying of boredom. Not even the spirited advocacy of ex-President Truman, before a congressional committee yesterday, has put much life into this crusade.

The amendment was, as Mr. Truman said, prompted by the extra terms of Franklin D. Roosevelt. But the repeal movement is bipartisan.

Nevertheless, we think it should have a far more extensive trial. One argument is that a President in his second term—if it is his final term—loses influence and can't get his legislative programs enacted. That isn't always such a bad idea.

Most of our Presidents come into office with the point of view, more or less, of the private citizen. They are intent upon economy and efficiency, want to cut expenses and ease tax burdens. But the job seems to do something to them. After months of dealing with a multitude of department heads, all wanting more, they tend to mistake the word of the bureaucrats for the voice of the people. They may come up with legislative programs that practically demand a fishy eye from Congress. Possibly that is why some of their laws don't get passed.

We've had 33 Presidents, all bound by tradition to retire after the second term until F.D.R. broke the mold. Despite this supposed handicap the country has been administered fairly well and the tradition—now the law—has effectively prevented anyone from usurping permanent political power.

We still think two terms is plenty, and that it ought to be kept in the Constitution.

Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 11, 1959

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, in our State of West Virginia we are intensely interested in practical programs of conservation. One of the leaders in this effort is Irving A. Cohen, of Charleston, who is an editor and speaker whose contributions to this important work are noteworthy. Members of the Izaak Walton Club, of Fairmont, had the privilege of listening to Mr. Cohen at a recent meeting. I ask unanimous consent that his splendid speech be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

If there is one place where I feel at home it is here in the city of Fairmont. It is too bad that somehow or other my headquarters were never established in your wonderful city. Here I have many loyal friends, and here in the city of Fairmont and Marion County reside some of the most wonderful sportsmen that it has ever been my pleasure of coming in contract with.

I have appeared here on several occasions and have talked on many subjects. Many of you are faithful readers of my outdoor column which appears in the West Virginian. I receive many letters from this area and each and every letter is answered as rapidly as I possibly can do so.

Again I want to thank you folks for inviting me back to this wonderful city.

Tonight I am going to dwell a little on the subject of conservation education. There are many matters of interest that I might have discussed with you but I have been convinced for a long time that nothing is more important nor more vital to wise management of natural resources both now and in the future.

At the outset, let us define conservation education. This is necessary because what is involved does not always have the same label in each agency and organization. As I am using it tonight, it means the broad effort to secure public understanding of the causes of resource problems and the means of solving them. It involves all communications media, it means use of information, extension and educational services. The last category specifically refers to technical advice and other cooperation needed by our educational systems to get conservation properly taught in our schools.

Thus, it is the complete effort across the range of all ages and all groups and I am not leaving out the important need to report to our various governmental administrations and legislatures so that they will have a clear appreciation of what is needed. Without their support, there never will be an adequate program of conservation education.

Even though I know it is not necessary to tell this wonderful audience why conservation education is so important, I am going to repeat the rensons for the benefit of others who may subsequently read these remarks. I do this because, unfortunately, only a relatively small percentage of sportsmen and other resources-minded people are in organized clubs and know the story. It is, therefore, the balance of the public and the legislators who reflect their thinking who must understand the importance of conservation education if adequate funds are to be available in all agencies to carry out this important approach to the problem of natural resource management.

One of the most compelling reasons for conservation education is that conservation education itself is misunderstood. I regret to say that far too many people think of it just as an activity of fish and game departments to get their particular programs activated, and as many of ous who are interested in conservation know nothing could be further from the truth.

Education in this field is needed so that there will be complete public recognition that conservation involves interrelated wise use of the basic resources of minerals, soil, water, plants, and wildlife. It is also necessary to make people realize that human survival and the American way of life are involved rather than the welfare of the resources management agencies.

Our scientists can develop methods and procedures to get the greatest possible use of resources for the most people for the longest possible time. To achieve such goals, however, people must implement these plans of resource scientists. That can be done only when people understand why the programs are needed, how they were developed and the necessity and manner of their participation in them.

In a nutshell, conservation is a favorable state of mind. Public information, education, and extension are thé tools required to reach that end.

I would like to deviate from the general terms for one moment that I am using and would like to refer to a specific problem which is seriously limiting public opportunity for hunting and fishing recreation and which needs educational treatment. This is the problem of bad hunting and fishing manners by a comparative few which are closing more and more rural areas for many good sportsmen. A few examples are hunters who descend on an unposted farm, cut fences, shoot cows and poultry, and shoot too close to a farmer's home. A hunter deliberately shoots a farmer's hog. I know one case where this was done. The next hunters who came along were told to leave the premises even though the farmer said he knew they were not that kind of fellows.

I am not talking about something which happens somewhere else; these are actual facts right here in our State, and the story is the same everywhere. The same kind of thing decreases the opportunity to go fishing. This is another of the many pressing reasons why we must expand the conservation education effort.

It was not many years after the first settlements were made in West Virginia that many of the citizens realized the need for some regulations of the natural resources on which their livelihood depended. Even though some laws were passed during those early days, many of these laws were not stringent enough; and as the years and decades passed our State conservation department was formed, at which time fishing and hunting regulations were made which even today form

the basis for many of our present laws. At first many of these laws were unpopular because it is just human nature to resist curbs on human activity, but today fish and game legislation is one of the accepted methods of managing these great resources.

In the evolution of fish and game management, most of which has actually taken place within the space of a few decades, there has been a tendency to place tremendous emphasis upon regulations; and, with the steady increase in the hunting and fishing activity throughout the country, the need for regulations to guard against depletion of game and fish supplies has certainly been justified to a great extent. However, we often lose sight of the fact that laws alone cannot always do the job. In fact, we sometimes have a tendency to overdo this phase of fish and game management by thinking up a new law every time a problem pops up. The job of streamlining fish and game regulations is not an easy one and probably never will be, but the need for great care in seeing to it that only the necessary and least complicated regulations are passed is becoming increasingly important.

One of the most effective ways that you sportsmen can help in the management of fish and game resources is to back your local sportsmen's organizations. With modern transportation and shorter work weeks enabling hunters and fishermen to cover the entire State, the idea that local regulations affect only a few is not always valid. In making fish and game management decisions we must take into consideration what is best for the entire State but they must not loose sight of the fact that there are local conditions which must be considered and some regulations may only apply to local situations. But in the interest of uniformity, it may be necessary to take a good long look at the statewide picture and base our decisions accordingly, whether it be laws or some other management technique, and here is where conservation education can do its part.

Hunting and fishing regulations, particularly those which apply to the entire State, are quite often controversial by their very nature. This is so because of the wide variation of opinions and preferences of sportsmen. Sometimes the decisions that the lawmakers and those in the conservation department have to make as to what is best for the State of West Virginia are difficult because of many factors involved in reaching a conclusion which would be fair to the majority. But underlying all of this is the democratic process which seeks the proper road after weighing all facts and arguments.

Coservation education, as I define it, is not a job that one single agency can do by itself, it is a responsibility to be discharged by all departments and organizations, both governmental, State and private, who are concerned with management of these resources. Each one must make certain that this part of the conservation program is understood. When you have this complete understanding, you also insure proper balance between the various individual segments of the total program.

All of us should make the task of securing public understanding of our programs the responsibility of all of our citizens, not just a job of management but the job of education.

The Federal and State Governments can share in this task through their recognized responsibilities to carry on programs for education of the public. However, most of this big conservation education job must be handled at local levels and through the representatives of the State of West Virginia. That is because our American system places most of the responsibility for administration of these resources with the States. This particularly applies in the matter of getting adequate conservation education in the schools. Also in this big conservation education task our Federal agencies have certain responsibilities by law and they must see to it there is public understanding and participation in each of these areas.

I am very happy to say that both of our U.S. Senators, the Honorable JENNINGS RANDOLPH and the Honorable ROBERT C. BYRD, and all of our Members of Congress from West Virginia, are in accord and are doing their utmost in Washington to help in lending their aid to conservation education.

I do not mean that our Federal agencies should attempt to dictate the pattern of educational efforts but I do mean they should take leadership in the expediting of cooperative approaches so that joint efforts by all of our agencies will be most effective.

Your local Izaak Walton Club, under the leadership of Corley Fleming, is doing a wonderful job, as is the Marion County Federated Association through Jimmy Allard, in conservation education.

Conservation education should be a very important item in the schools of every city and county in the State of West Virginia. That is why various organizations, State groups and interested individuals have to share some of the responsibility for bringing conservation education about.

In the meantime, let us keep plugging away, all of us, doing everything, anything, within our power with limited staff and funds, and get our people to keep pitching away at conservation education, because they, like you and me, are convinced that conservation education is the key to wise use of our natural resources now and in the future.

Thank you.

The Burden of Double Taxation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 11, 1959

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Bayonne (N.J.) Times commenting on a proposal I have made to help end the burden of double taxation on New Jersey residents working in New York or the city of Philadelphia.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW YORK'S AHEAD

We loved the revival of the Revolution's "Taxation without representative is tyranny" in the current debate about New York State's income taxes on New Jersey residents, but we don't expect it to prosper now as it did in 1776. It won't be long before New York blandly tells us that if we choose to live in New Jersey and work in New York, we make a free choice, without compulsion of any kind. It is a choice that New York is entitled to ask us to pay for, and we are left in perfect freedom to decide whether the price is too high. If it is not, well and good. If it is, no one compels us to work in New York or live in New Jersey.

We still like Senator CASE's plan of amiably levying an income tax on New Yorkers who work in New Jersey. It would be precisely parallel to what New York is doing to residents of New Jersey, and it would improve New Jersey's bargaining position quite dramatically. New Jersey residents who work in New York don't vote there. New Yorkers who work in New Jersey do. The fatal weakness of New Jersey's case is that we have nothing whatever to negotiate with; all the trumps are in Albany. Senator CASE offers a way to get a few trumps in Trenton, and it seems silly to turn down his plan without checking into its possibilities.

Excerpt of Address of Howard E. Simpson, President of Baltimore & Ohio Railroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 11, 1959

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, on Monday evening, April 27, it was my pleasure to be present when Howard E. Simpson, president of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad, spoke at the dinner sponsored by the National Coal Policy Conference at the Statler-Hilton Hotel, Washington, D.C. The very excellent speech was entered in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 28, 1959, by Hon. LEON H. GAVIN, Republican Representative representing the 23d Congressional District of Pennsylvania. The insertion in the RECORD appears on page A3497.

I recommend the reading of this speech. The B. & O. president, Mr. Simpson, has been in railroad business 47 years, and has been president of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co. for 5½ years.

I ask unanimous consent that an excerpt from the speech be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The fuels issue is not a simple fact of open competition for a market. * * * The issue, as I see it, is this: Is the present policy assuring this country a steady supply of fuels and transportation service susceptible of rapid growth and expansion and able to serve without interruption in a time of national emergency?

Certainly, the coal industry adequately passes these tests. It is a stable domestic enterprise, and is capable of immense expansion in time of need, provided it does not have to contend with further shrinking of its market. The railroads pass the same tests with a wide margin. Like coal, they are a realiable domestic industry. Furthermore, railroad charges are regulated by public authority. Granted fair and equitable Government policies for transportation, the railroads can absorb striking increases in traffic volume.

Continued shrinking in the market for solid fuels will seriously affect the ability of the railroads to move coal, and it will also force a contraction of the overall plant, thereby making the rail industry less able to serve the entire traffic needs of the country. For the prime characteristic of the American railroads is that they are volume carriers. Without volume they cannot exist—certainly not under private ownership and operation. Moreover, in terms of importance to the Nation, the railroads are the only true common carriers. They are the only form of transportation that can, and

will, haul anything, at any time, in any quantity, between any points on a continent-wide system.

The railroads have built-in flexibility enabling them to expand the use of their roadway, or fixed plant, capacity almost indefinitely and with a minimum drain on the country's resources in time of need. In World War II, the railroads were sufficiently flexible to increase and expand their facilities and operations, with the result that they handled 91 percent of the military freight and 97 percent of military passengers. This is one of the reasons why, in military logistics, the railroad is regarded as basic.

The issue before us, then, is whether this country is to have a steady, dependable—and expandable—supply of fuel, whatever the future may bring, and, secondly, whether we are to have a strong, reliable system of railroad transportation for all of our traffic.

The business interests of the coal industry, or of the railroads, or of the consumers of coal are really not the issue here. The real issue is our Nation's economic strength and security.

I emphasize that the railroads—the Nation's strong arm of security—face the future with confidence. An important reason for that confidence is our conviction that leaders in Government will promptly consider and adopt a fuels policy that will be sound and farsighted, and, in addition, protect its citizens in peacetime, as well as in times of national emergency.

Congress Costs Too Much

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 11, 1959

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Congress Costs Too Much," written by George Rothwell Brown.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS COSTS TOO MUCH
(By George Rothwell Brown)

WASHINGTON, April 16.—Are American taxpayers, who have just passed through their annual ordeal, getting their money's worth from the Congress itself? Is the legislative branch of the Government costing too much?

A strong case can be made out to support the conclusion that what should be the Nation's "watchdog of the Treasury" has become a reckless freeloader, at the expense of the public. The tab for running Congress has been going up in recent years at a most alarming rate.

The cost of the vast legislative mill on Capitol Hill in fiscal 1935, when the "spend, spend, spend" philosophy had just begun to take hold, was $18.3 million.

This was only 24 years ago. The present Congress is costing Mr. Taxpayer $125.1 million, and the end is not in sight.

The whole discouraging tendency at the Capitol is toward more and fancier spending. Congress has become one of our greatest luxuries, as well as a constitutional necessity.

It is difficult for the average citizen, with his nose to the tax grindstone, to believe that the institution of Congress today is worth to him $106.8 million a year more than it was worth to him just a little more than two decades ago. It performs the same functions; its workload is no heavier.

How did Congress fall into these extravagances?

The Senate has added a costly new office building for more than $30 million, and the House is now in process of erecting a third office building for its own use, which will cost the taxpayers around $70 million, and for which $22.5 million is carried in the current appropriation bill. Both of these expensive marble structures are unnecessary. They should never have been authorized.

But the biggest boost in the high cost of Congress has been in the salaries which the Senators and Representatives have voted themselves. They sure have been generous.

The total annual bill for the salaries for the 96 Senators, in fiscal 1935, was a rather modest $864,000. Today the total for Senators' salaries has soared to a whopping $2.3 million a year.

In the same period the salaries of the 435 House Members have increased from $3.9 million in 1935, to $10.6 million in fiscal 1959.

For many years the salary of Senators and Congressmen was $5,000 a year. By 1935 the figure had grown to $10,000. Today the salaries have skyrocketed to $22,500 annually.

In addition, every Congressman is allowed an average of $38,000 a year for office help, and if it hadn't been for the regular annual disclosure of nepotism at a critical juncture this year the House would have voted itself an additional $14,000 for each Congressman's staff.

Congress we must have, but it sure does come high.

Strategic Location of Portland, Oreg., on Worldwide Air Routes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 11, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, a glance at the surface of a globe will disclose why my home city of Portland, Oreg., has such a strategic location as a center of air transportation. The globe reveals that great circle routes charted from Portland are the shortest from the west coast to many points of the vast Western and North Pacific regions of the world.

Portland, under the able leadership of officials of the port of Portland, has developed this geographic asset by improvement of its airport and airport terminal facilities. I think no city in the Nation presently has aircraft facilities superior to those being developed in my hometown. One of the benefits of this progress was noted last week when direct air service was inaugurated between Portland and Kodiak, Alaska. Portland is an aerial gateway to our new State of Alaska—and to Hawaii, Tokyo, the Far East, and many points in Europe. I am pleased that Oregon is so situated that it is closely linked to the newest States of the Union. This good fortune will permit us to expand and progress together.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a news story by Mr. Rolla J. Crick, staff writer of the Oregon Journal, giving details of the historic ceremonies interconnecting Portland and Kodiak through the facilities of Pacific Northern Airlines. Inauguration of this service is another link for strengthening of our national ties. The article was published in the Journal of May 3, 1959.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PNA LINKS PORTLAND, KODIAK ON DIRECT RUN
(By Rolla J. Crick)

KODIAK, ALASKA, May 3.—Another corner of Portland's back yard has been made more conveniently accessible with inauguration by Pacific Northern Airlines of direct air service to Alaska's southwestern playground.

Kodiak, home of the gourmet's delight, the king crab, now is only an overnight flight from Portland via swift Constellation airliners.

The new PNA service cuts Portland-to-Kodiak time in half and reduces costs 12 percent.

Balmy 52-degree temperatures and the annual king crab festival greeted passengers from Oregon and Washington when the inaugural flight landed. The mildness was surprising, but probably should not have been. Kodiak is due north of Hawaii and spring is chasing snow in Alaska.

On hand for the ceremonies was Kodiak's mayor, Merrill Coon, Rear Adm. A. W. McKechnie, commandant of the Alaska sea frontier, and airline officials led by PNA President A. G. Wooley, former Alaska bush pilot.

A cake was cut, Portland roses were presented by Frank Womack of the Portland Chamber of Commerce, and the entire group breakfasted at the Elks club.

Kodiak hospitality was unbounded. Everything was free, from taxi trips around the city and the Air Force White Alice project to air tours over Kodiak Island and its neighbors.

This is a city of some 4,000 residents, exclusive of personnel stationed at the nearby headquarters of the 17th U.S. Naval District. Its rapidly developing economy is based primarily on an expanding fishing industry and secondly on tourism and big-game hunting.

Indicative of the latter, the nearly 11-foot hide of a Kodiak bear, fiercest and largest of the world's carnivorous animals, was being cleaned on the local docks.

Fish canneries are running at full steam processing clams and shrimp taken from nearby beds. The king crab season ended 2 weeks ago.

Shrimp-catching and processing promise a new source of wealth for Kodiak. The operation started last December and it appears that 200,000 cases will be processed this year. The going price is $8 a case.

Along with the addition of direct twice-weekly PNA service to Kodiak, the city is being linked to the Aleutian chain on the west by Reeves airways.

The PNA flight continued from Kodiak to Anchorage, where connections were made for the return to Portland.

Intrinsic Value of Summit Meetings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 11, 1959

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Houston Chronicle, dated April 12, 1959, entitled "Summit Part of Red Plot: Russians Seeking 'Status Quo,' O.K. To Keep European Loot," written by Gen. C. A. Willoughby, who is one of the outstanding leaders of World War II.

I think this article is worthy of the attention of the Senate and the public.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMMIT PART OF RED PLOT—RUSSIANS SEEKING "STATUS QUO" O.K. TO KEEP EUROPEAN LOOT

(By Gen. C. A. Willoughby)

Nikita Khrushchev's drive for a summit meeting has succeeded with Britain's Harold Macmillan acting as the honest broker. However, Russian declarations show no palpable concessions. They were more conciliatory in 1952.

The intrinsic value of summit meetings can be ascertained by simple, historical recollection.

3,400 MEETINGS

In the last 25 years, the United States has had 3,400 meetings with the Communists, including Teheran, Yalta, Potsdam, Panmunjom, and Geneva. The negotiators spoke 106 million words, or about 700 printed volumes.

This talkfest led to 52 major agreements. Soviet Russia has broken 50 of them. It is boring to quote Lenin: "Promises are like piecrusts, made to be broken."

The Communist philosophy of diplomatic negotiations was stated in 1931 by Dmitri Manuilski.

Manuilski later presided over the United Nations Security Council for a time, which should be a telltale index to the quality of that overrated body.

Manuilski's timetable is interesting: "War to the hilt between communism and capitalism is inevitable.

TIME TO COME

"Today we are not strong enough. Our time will come in 20 or 30 years. The bourgeoisie will have to be put to sleep. So we will launch the most spectacular peace movement on record.

"The capitalists, stupid and decadent, will rejoice to cooperate in their own destruction. They will leap at another chance to be friends."

The Russians precipitated the Berlin crisis for well-known, well-defined objectives in the framework of their ruthless but brilliant strategy. But conversely a study of cause and effect will place responsibility for a critical situation almost entirely on the West:

1. Panicky demobilization in 1945, while Russia armed to the teeth.

2. Fatuous reliance on a supposedly exclusive deterrent.

3. Failure of Western Europe to maintain even peacetime armaments.

4. Silence of NATO commanders on a visibly weakening shield.

WANT LOOT

Against this background of military fumbling the Russians seek to retain the loot acquired with the help of Hitler, plus the loot handed over to them at Yalta and Potsdam. They want acceptance of the status quo at the highest level, which is at the summit.

Behind this acquiescence, the Russians anticipate even more important gains: The resulting collapse of resistance by captive millions whose only hope has been the West. The smiling farce of hobnobbing with the Kremlin, as at Geneva, reverberates from Warsaw to Sing-Kiang.

England precipitated World War II over the Polish corridor (loot of Versailles) and acquiesced in the Russian seizure of eastern Poland, Russia, in turn, assuaged the Poles by throwing them East Germany from the Oder-Neisse line.

UNCHALLENGED CZECHS

The Czechs went unchallenged in the brutal expulsion of 3 million Sudeten Germans in 1948 and the confiscation of every stick and stone of Sudeten properties. Poles and Czechs are proposed as members of the meetings.

The division of Germany (and Korea) is expected to be legalized and become permanent.

The summit is expected to devise some face-saving formula.

(This article copyrighted by Maj. Gen. Charles A. Willoughby, 1959.)

Oil Import Restrictions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 11, 1959

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Berkshire Eagle, Pittsfield, Mass., dated April 30, 1959, which recognizes the very able job being done by freshman Congressman SILVIO O. CONTE, in representing the Massachusetts First Congressional District. I think that this editorial clearly summarizes the understanding and ability shown by Congressman CONTE in dealing with issues of both national and local importance. I wish to further point out that Congressman CONTE has also shown his competence in understanding the complex issues in the international field as evidenced by his recent speech in the House of Representatives in support of the Development Loan Fund. I believe that the people from his district can depend upon Mr. CONTE to continue his very commendable representation in the House of Representatives.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONTE FIGHTS FIRE WITH FIRE

From the start of his public career, one of Congressman CONTE'S prime assets has been a talent for focusing attention on limited and specific issues which serve to dramatize a larger and more general political problem. His current campaign against the oil import restrictions established by the President earlier this year is a good case in point.

The specific issue here is the phoniness of using "national security" as a pretext for fattening the bankrolls of domestic oil producers by arbitrarily curbing the importation of cheaper oil products from abroad. As Congressman CONTE pointed out on the floor of the House earlier this week, the inevitable effect of this will be to impose higher fuel prices on the public, to the particular economic detriment of New England.

This in itself is a valid issue. But it also has broader significance as an illustration of the sort of thing Congressman CONTE was talking about several weeks ago when he told the GE Foremen's Club here that Congressmen and Senators from New England and the Northeastern States should be more ready to forget their partisan differences when necessary to join forces as a regional bloc on issues where they have a common economic interest.

As Mr. CONTE points out, the Northeast has been rather outmaneuvered on this score. Congressmen from the South, the Midwest, and the Northwest have joined hands with great effect, and often at the expense of the Northeast. This area contributes heavily to the multi-billion-dollar farm program but receives a negligible proportion of farm subsidies in return. We help subsidize the competitive economic development of other areas through public power projects and similar Federal programs while getting exceedingly little of this largesse for ourselves. And we suffer from a tariff policy which (as illustrated by the oil import quotas) serves in large part to benefit other regions at our expense.

Ideally, of course, there would be no regional blocs on Captitol Hill, and no organized pattern of subordinating national to sectional interests. But the ideal and the reality are far apart. Sectionalism is one of the major facts of life in Washington, and if spokesmen for the Northeast continue to operate less effectively than those of other sections, they will continue to see most of their tax dollars going to bolster the interests of competing areas. As a practical matter it is hard to dispute Congressman CONTE'S contention that it is time of fight fire with fire.

Centennial of the War Between the States Emphasizes the Need for Acquisition of Battlefield Sites

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 11, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the owner of some land on which the two battles of Bull Run were fought, recently leveled with bulldozers some earthworks which were thrown up during the bloody fighting in the second battle. Breastworks the men built with spoons, cups, knives, the bare hands in 1862, were leveled in a few hours nearly a century later.

The National Park Service could not stop the bulldozer which leveled these historic breastworks, because they were on private property. This is just another illustration of why I believe the National Park Service should be supported in its desire to purchase the lands on which some of the War Between the States' most important battles were fought. These areas should be preserved for the students of history and the everyday Americans of tomorrow. Acts of heroism of past generations are acts of encouragement for future generations.

Putting off the acquisition of these precious lands means that other historic landmarks may be destroyed. And private ownership is claiming more and more of the land. At historic Gettysburg, for example, commercial businesses and housing developments

threaten to cover the land on which our forefathers fought and died in the turning point of the great struggle.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two editorials. The first appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald for Wednesday, April 29, 1959, entitled "What Price Glory?" The second is from the editorial sheet of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch for April 27 to May 3, 1959, under the title, "Custard Stands at Gettysburg."

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 19, 1959]

WHAT PRICE GLORY

It is shocking that battlefields like Manassas and Antietam should be open to commercial spoliation on the eve of the centennial of the War Between the States. At Manassas, where two great battles were fought, one resident who owns land on the battlefield even went so far as to level out the surviving breastworks with a bulldozer. Such desecration was possible because the National Park Service does not own the land on which this and other remnants of the battles of Bull Run stands. Surely the Park Service deserves the widest support in its request for some $900,000 to purchase privately owned land which lies within the Manassas Battlefield Park.

The fate of Antietam, site of the bloodiest 1-day battle of the Civil War, is no less dismaying. The Park Service is seeking to acquire about 1,800 acres of the original battlefield site at an estimated cost of $300,000.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Apr. 27–May 3, 1959]

CUSTARD STANDS AT GETTYSBURG

President Eisenhower's Representative in Congress, JAMES M. QUIGLEY of the 19th Pennsylvania District, has appealed to the White House to join in efforts to acquire ground which ought to be added to the National Park Service holdings in the Gettysburg battlefield area. Congressman QUIGLEY says that unless protective steps are taken, "custard stands and beer parlors" will soon outnumber the grave markers and the monuments to the men of both the Blue and the Gray who struggled there in early July 1863.

The Representative from the Gettysburg district does not want the land acquired for withdrawal from productive use. On the contrary, he and others who are concerned about the future of the Gettysburg area are eager for the National Park Service to own the land but to lease it for approved cultivation. This is true of much of the area now owned. The famous peach orchard of military history is again a peach orchard. But those who own privately adjacent battlefield areas cannot be expected to decline attractive offers from would be commercializers. That is why Park Service holdings should be increased.

In barely 2 years, the Nation will begin its 4-year observance of the 100th anniversary of the Civil War. Between now and then historic battlefields—Gettysburg, Antietam, Wilson's Creek, and others—ought to receive friendly interest and wherever possible, increased protection. It would be strange indeed for the centennial to find the foot of the commercial trespasser marring what Lincoln called hallowed ground.

Tributes to P. O. Davis, Director, Extension Service, Alabama Polytechnic Institute

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 11, 1959

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the last official letter of our beloved P. O. Davis, who recently retired as the director of the extension service at Auburn. This letter includes just a few hundreds of well deserved tributes to this wonderful man, with whom it has been my pleasure to work during my nearly 24 years service as a Member of Congress from the First Congressional District of Alabama. There is certainly little that I may add to these expressions of esteem and affection, but in placing them in the RECORD for all to see, I do want to wish P. O., as he is affectionately known by thousands of his friends and admirers and fellow workers, and I am including his sweet wife in this wish, many years of well deserved happiness in his retirement. I know he will give all of use in our delegation the benefit of his advice and counsel in the years to come, as he has in the past:

OFFICIAL LETTER NO. 953

ALABAMA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE,
EXTENSION SERVICE,
Auburn, Ala., April 30, 1959.

To All Extension Workers:

This is it, the last official letter by me, No. 953. The first was issued on October 26, 1940, 19 years ago.

Weekly thereafter the aim has been to inform, to suggest, to inspire, to encourage, to keep in touch with, all for the good of extension work and workers.

A major aim has been to keep "me" in the background, to see you and the service rather than self, because all achievements are due to you the workers at Auburn and in the counties, all working with and for farm people.

But this one is different. It's a series of quotes from letters recently received. Of course they are personal but they're about you, too. Therefore, modesty permits my sending them to you in this the last issue by me.

They are only a few from hundreds received for which I'm both humble and grateful, will ever be. Here they are, most of them without names, the first by the board of the Alabama Farm Bureau.

"On the eve of his retirement as Director of the Extension Service of Alabama Polytechnic Institute, we express the very sincere appreciation of ourselves and those we represent to Hon. P. O. Davis for the many years of excellent service he has rendered to agriculture and the public in general; and for the very splendid contribution he has made to organized agriculture in Alabama and the Nation.

"He has received many awards and honors for his achievements during the years, including the Distinguished Service Award of the American Farm Bureau Federation.

"His ability, efficiency, courage, and leadership throughout the years of his service have resulted in an enduring contribution to the welfare of the people he has served. This contribution is a foundation and inspiration to those who follow him.

"We wish for Mr. and Mrs. Davis many years of happiness.

"We appoint him an honorary member of this Executive Committee and invite and urge him to attend meetings and participate in discussions of such committee."

Inscription on a beautiful silver tray presented by the Alabama Cattlemen's Association:

"P. O. Davis in appreciation for outstanding service to Alabama Agriculture presented by Alabama Cattlemen's Association."

"Your retirement will perhaps enable you to look back a little, though I suspect that you will never overcome your impulse to keep eyes forward. Surely few men in the whole field of agricultural education have exercised so definite an influence in so large a specific area with such conspicuous gains. You have led your State's farmers from poverty to prosperity, and given Alabama agriculture an impetus and momentum which you may now watch as it goes on up." (Wheeler McMillen, Farm Journal, Philadelphia.)

"Not all of us know the ins and outs of your trials over the years. Those of us who know some of them appreciate you all the more. But there are few in the State who do not know the courage you have shown in the leadership of farm people through a period of years when that leadership was a vital factor to progress and—at times—to their very survival. You've been known outside the State as a dedicated leader—inside it as a devoted servant." (Bill Kennedy, Farm and Ranch, Washington.)

"The contribution that you have made to the progress of your native State will long be of benefit to your beloved Alabama. Your intelligent, determined, and selfless service in the field of agriculture will be the future yardstick for public servants. To have known you and your work as it progressed was a high privilege." (Ed Norton, Birmingham.)

"I would like to take this opportunity to expresse to you my very deep and sincere appreciation for the manifested interest you have shown in the social security program and its effect upon the Alabama farmer. Also, for the fine cooperation you and your staff have given us in getting the social security story to our friends, the farmers. Without this assistance we could not have accomplished the objectives already attained.

"I am just 1 of the more than 3 million of persons in Alabama who have benefited greatly from your leadership of the farmers in the State. The footprints you have made up and down and across Alabama in the interest of agriculture, and the improvement of the farm family's lot, will be lasting and permanently recorded in the memory of all of us."

"Samuel was a dedicated man. Like Samuel you have been truly dedicated to your responsibilities and opportunities. You, of course, have been dedicated to your church, State, and the country. You have always had service to the people as your ultimate goal.

"To you extension service has been a mission and not merely a means of a living. So you can have a lot of comfort in that you have been dedicated to a great mission and the results over the State are the proof.

"Your counsel on a national level has been of immeasurable value to the extension service over the country. You have sponsored progressive movements when courage and initiative were necessary. Many times you

have given extension on a regional and national basis leadership so badly needed."

"We all know that through the effective leadership that you have been able to provide, and the ground work that you have laid, the extension service will continue to be effective in helping people throughout the State."

"Your leadership has been an inspiration and the guidance you have given to extension service work will be long felt throughout Alabama.

"While you will be retiring from active duty as director of the Alabama Polytechnic Institute Extension Service, I know that you will not be retiring in spirit and that you will be pulling for all of us as we continue with the job in extension work that must be done to make Alabama a more prosperous agricultural State and a better place in which to live."

"The decision (made by you and Dr. Duncan) to let us remain as caretakers of the building enabled me to stay in college.

"From that day until now, I have observed your great concern for the welfare of Auburn, Auburn students, and as director of extension your unquestioned concern for the welfare of extension workers and farm people. * * * I know of no one that has worked harder to improve the lot of farm people than you."

"All of my dealings with you have been fair, honest, sincere, and there has always been that pleasant relationship so vital for all good work.

"Humanity has benefited from your efforts in getting the many fine programs started and accomplished over the 21 years as our director. We will miss you in the extension service."

"You have meant much to the rural people of Alabama and the entire south. Also, the urban people have profited greatly these years you have been associated with the farm program. Alabama is a much better State for having had you as a farm leader."

"You have over the years been an outstanding leader in extension work, and we are certainly going to miss seeing you at the regional and national meetings. Your philosophy and ability to recognize challenges and opportunities for extension have meant much in helping to strengthen the work throughout the country."

"You have made an especially fine contribution to the agricultural life of our State and your strong influence in the moral and spiritual life of our people, both young and old, will be long remembered. There must be great satisfaction in knowing that you have rendered a full measure of service to those with whom you were associated."

"Your many contributions to the betterment of rural living throughout the south will always stand as an outstanding tribute to your leadership."

"You have served well the position of director and at the same time you have served in a great way the farmers and all rural people throughout the State.

"We hope you will continue in your very capable manner to contribute to the upbuilding of our rural population through your newspaper writings and otherwise."

"Your leadership and guidance have caused extension work to have a tremendous impact on agriculture of the State and much of the progress made has been a result of your devotion and untiring efforts. I am sure your influence on the agriculture of the State will be felt for many years to come."

"I appreciate the many efforts you have made in making it possible for our extension service to serve better the people and in making it more pleasant to do the county program through your leadership in financing our county and State personnel and other needs of our organization, as well as your personal encouragement."

"You are the very best. You have made a great contribution to the agricultural economy in the State and the Nation. You have served your State well and rendered a great service to your fellow man."

"There are many words of praise for you which are yet unspoken. Many do not realize yet where credit is due for the benefits they have received—past, present, and future. The progress agriculture makes in the future will bring your reward."

"Your professional creed has included honesty of purpose; devotion to the job at hand; and hard work far beyond the call of duty.

"As director of the extension service you have striven to lead us to the end that the people whom we serve would be better informed and for that reason they would enjoy richer and better lives and that Alabama would be a better place to live.

"Personally, I know you as a good neighbor; a friend of whom anyone would be proud; and a citizen that has meant much to his community."

"Your leadership has meant much to the members of the extension service and to the farmers of Alabama. It has been through your guidance that the Alabama extension service has reached the highest level in the field of education."

"I shall never forget our first conversation concerning employment when you said: 'We in extension work for the people to promote better living conditions on the farm and in the home.' "

"You never lost sight of the masses of rural people. You also, as we observed, realized the value of higher education, scientific investigation, and experimentation. These principles have helped build our great agricultural school at Auburn and extend its influence into every area of our religious, agricultural, industrial, and economic life.

"Therefore it is with deepest gratitude that we thank you for the counsel given us, the inspiration brought to our church and community people, and for the faith you always expressed in our rural people, particularly the value of the church."

"The outstanding job you have done has left an indelible imprint on the progress of agriculture which can never be erased by any amount of time."

"Your many friends will remember always the unselfish devotion and tireless hard work with which you have filled your office. You can reflect back on the unexcelled contribution you have made to Alabama agriculture with a great deal of pride and with a sense of complete fulfillment and satisfaction, knowing you have left behind you a record no other man could have possibly achieved." (George Williamson, Montgomery.)

"You indeed served Alabama Polytechnic Institute and the people of Alabama faithfully and efficiently for many years. You have every reason to be proud of the fine record made in building up the excellent agricultural extension service for your State."

"I would like to say sincerely that you have done an outstanding job as the director of the extension service. You have so many friends, not only in our State but over the country, and you have helped so many people other than your own employees."

"I am sure it has been thrilling to you, as director, to see the extension service grow and expand and go forward in ever greater service to more and more people under your guidance. Surely there can be no deeper satisfaction than to strive and then see your dreams come true and your efforts through the years bear fruit."

"The farmers of Alabama will always love and admire you as being one of the greatest agricultural leaders of our time."

"You are widely known and respected in the field of agriculture. Your leadership and philosophy reaches far beyond the boundaries of this State.

"You have worked hard to make the extension service in Alabama a real service to the farm people of this State. You have also worked hard to improve the position and prestige of extension personnel. Your efforts have proven to be sound and effective."

"Yours is certainly a job well done as director of Alabama Polytechnic Institute's Extension Service. Your lifetime of devotion to the needs of the Alabama farmer has certainly paid off in many dividends for farm families, farm communities, and industry as well as throughout our State."

"I have looked to you for wisdom in connection with the affairs of the cooperative extension service over the years I have been connected with it. I know that your leadership has contributed greatly to the advancement of agriculture—not only in Alabama, but all through the Nation."

"You have been a real inspiration to extension workers throughout the South during the past two decades, and your influence has been felt much farther than the boundaries of the State of Alabama."

"My sincere thanks to you for your guidance, patience, and cooperation in helping me build a better extension program in the countries where I have worked. I shall not forget the principles of extension taught by you and shall use them often."

"Yours is a long and illustrious leadership with the extension service of the Alabama Polytechnic Institute. You have worked hard and unselfishly to help thousands of farm men, women, and youth of this State to live longer, healthier, and happier lives, and have succeeded well in your efforts. Proof of your success is found on every farm and in every home throughout Alabama."

"It has been a genuine pleasure to have known you as a student at Auburn and to be closely associated with you as a member of the Alabama extension service.

"Your fine leadership and guidance have been a real and lasting inspiration to me, which I shall always cherish."

"I take this opportunity to express my appreciation for the years of distinguished service rendered by you as director of the Alabama Extension Service. I am especially grateful for the progress, in the Negro extension division, which was made possible under your administration. Two, among many, things for which we are most grateful are the extension building at Tuskegee and a more adequate Negro advisory staff."

"To us our extension service and our Mr. P. O. Davis have been synonymous. Your retirement causes us to think back over the years and marvel at the great progress made by farm families during your years of service. * * * We, along with all of Alabama, are grateful."

Letter from southern directors at meeting at State College, Mississippi:

"As we come together for the spring conference of southern extension directors we find that we have no one to fill your usual and important role of 'Mr. Chairman, I so move'. Also, your appropriate jokes and terse, pointed comments are sorely missed. We had all looked forward to seeing you officially at least one more time.

"We hope that you will cherish the small gift from us, not for its intrinsic worth alone but also for the respect and admiration for you that we want it to convey. You have made a major contribution to the shaping of extension to its present state of development in this country.

"We shall miss your sound judgment and unfailing good humor. You will always have a place around our conference table and it is hoped that you will see fit to visit with us often.

"Our best wishes go to you and Mrs. Davis for many years of continued happiness and

for the enjoyment of a well earned rest. We are grateful for the privilege of having been associated with you."

"It was my privilege and good fortune to be able to participate with the group in the letter and small remembrance, which no doubt have been delivered to you by this time. This action does not in any way express the deep feeling of respect and admiration that we have for you. I just want you to know that I personally am going to miss you at our extension conferences. I can think of so many times in the past when your counsel and sound thinking prevented us from making some hasty and ill-considered decisions. You can be proud of the influence which you have exerted in shaping the extension service over the past 25 years. I hope that you will not completely forget us and that you will, in the future, honor us with your presence at some of our conferences." (Luther H. Brannon, director, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater.)

All good things must come to an end; and this is it. To each of you, for your splendid work and your excellent qualities I'll ever be grateful. You will enjoy working in the same way with Dr. York and he with you.

My continued best wishes are yours.

Sincerely yours,

P. O. DAVIS, *Director.*

Elements in the Berlin Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 11, 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it is commonplace to say that the Berlin crisis is incredibly complex. Every informed person knows this. It is precisely because of this complexity that we need a high quality western leadership. I think Secretary of State Herter has made an excellent beginning in his recent Paris conferences.

Dr. Kenneth W. Thompson, associate director, the social sciences, the Rockefeller Foundation, has written a brief but penetrating essay outlining five major elements in the present Berlin situation. He emphasizes the need for imaginative leadership.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article, "Elements in the Berlin Crisis," which appeared in the April 13, 1959, number of Christianity and Crisis, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ELEMENTS IN THE BERLIN CRISIS

(By Dr. Kenneth W. Thompson)

Five elements that make up the present state of the Berlin crisis are worthy of enumeration. First, Khrushchev, no less than the West, faces internal problems and plainly hopes for a dramatic political and economic victory. The Soviet leader has promised his people that the new 7-year plan will carry Russian production beyond American levels of output. While the present pace of Soviet economic development has been distressingly successful, stresses and strains have also been considerable.

British experts estimate that Soviet defense spending has stabilized at 14 percent of total budgetary expenditures, but this has been achieved through a substantial expansion of the budget and without appreciable improvement of the position of the ordinary Russian. With the continuing pressure that antiparty groups are exerting, Khrushchev may well hope for a spectacular political triumph at the summit that would more solidly assure promises of a better life.

Second, Khrushchev in his conversations with Walter Lippmann, Adlai Stevenson, and Senator Humphrey, and Mikoyan in his American visit, reflected undisguised anxiety over the rising power of China in the East, a nuclearized West Germany in the West, and restiveness in the satellite world. As the Economist observed: "Western statesmen, preoccupied as they are with the Communist * * * menace * * * often fail to understand that the Russians, too, fear attack." Although the ultimate aims of Soviet domination have not been altered in the least, the Russians appear genuinely concerned over the threat of encirclement by those who distrust them and oppose their aims.

Moreover, top Soviet experts tell us that we mislead ourselves by thinking that Soviet policy is monolithic, marked by unchangeable rigidity and united on questions of means, methods and tactics. Soviet aims are unquestionably fixed, but if history teaches anything it is that Soviet policy is not immutable. For them as for us, internal reforms and intraempire adjustments are dependent on moves on the diplomatic front. Prime Minister Macmillan has doubtless had much to say on this in his meetings with President Eisenhower.

Third, like it or not, the British have taken the diplomatic initiative at a point where Western leadership gave signs of falling into a state of paralysis. On balance, most informed observers believe that Macmillan's Moscow visit was a constructive move in the cold war. His firm position on Berlin may have reduced the chances of Soviet miscalculation. His warnings to Premier Khrushchev that the Western allies, including the reputedly most flexible partner, would not yield to Russian blackmail over Berlin may serve to check any Soviet adventure growing out of Khrushchev's blunt ultimatum. Furthermore, Macmillan's televised address to the Russian people reciting national achievements, aspirations, and intentions cannot help but add a sobering and instructive note for at least some of his Russian listeners. His visits to Bonn, Paris, and Washington are helpful in bringing firsthand impressions of the climate of Soviet thinking and of their policies and intentions.

Whether he will prove the architect of a negotiable program for talks at the summit remains to be seen. At the very least he has compelled his associates to consider a set of questions that are long overdue. One gains the impression that he has also established the principle, both east and west of the Elbe, that outstanding problems must be settled by "jaw-jaw," as Mr. Churchill put it, rather than with hydrogen bombs. Those Americans who saw Macmillan's visit to Moscow as little more than an election stunt have had to reconsider, for his toughness in the discussions undoubtedly led to Khrushchev's sharp and slightly desperate attack midway through the talks.

Fourth, the sprinkling of news from the private talks between the President and the Prime Minister foreshadows a slightly more hopeful approach to the techniques and methods of diplomacy. Macmillan, like Secretary-General Hammarskjold, has apparently made his point that grandstand diplomacy, with all its trappings of premature press releases and public speeches for domestic consumption, serves little purpose in dealing seriously with the Russians.

The search for more viable techniques, recognizing all the time that even the best will not assure success, in the major unfinished business in American foreign policy. It seems probable that Mr. Dulles himself might have contrived a more hopeful approach had he not been struck down by his tragic illness. In this connection Americans need to remind themselves that the Macmillan visit had the Secretary's approval and support. The point is well taken that who leads whom to the summit on the Western side does not matter at all, so long as it is done with open eyes.

All hands must recognize that while the Western case may be legally invulnerable, at the same time our political and military position is not impregnable. Even if we assume that Khrushchev means business and the chances of conflict are grave, this would hardly be an excuse for not searching out the most hopeful diplomatic avenues of approach.

Standing firm is only half a policy unless it is coupled with a negotiating position that is clear and understandable to western European opinion. This includes more clarification than the President has offered thus far on the relationship of types of Soviet provocation and the measures we are prepared to take. Verbal threats by the Russians call for one course of action, merely technical changes such as transferring authority to stamp documents to the East Germans call for another, and an all-out civilian blockade quite another set of measures. Such issues will be met not by counterultimatums but by careful preparations in the foreign ministries and at the conference table of the Allies.

Fifth, the need is now clear to discover as fully and carefully as possible Soviet intentions and the points on which accommodation is possible. A denuclearized zone at the heart of Europe might not be too high a price to pay. If a situation viable enough to last for 5 or 10 years could be created, both sides might gain in the process.

The Russians may be willing to wait for Socialist governments in Britain and Germany, whose concessions might go beyond those of any of the present governments. On the other hand, disturbances in the satellite countries and the failures of de-Stalinization may prompt them to nail down certain points at this stage in the cold war. Diplomatic probings are one way of discovering whether or not there is flexibility in the present situation. In any event, something more than text quoting from the writings of Lenin or Stalin seems called for if the West is to uncover Soviet aims and intentions.

No reasonable man would maintain that the diplomatic logjam has been broken or assert that the end of the cold war is in sight. On the contrary, some signs point to the insensification of the struggle. Yet evidence also is at hand that the Soviets characteristically make their sharpest and most belligerent moves at a point when they may be willing to accept new political arrangements.

In the present context Soviet fear of thermonuclear weapons, especially in the hands of their historic German foes harnessed to NATO, could conceivably be the issue on which they might bargain in kind. Whether or not the West has it in its power to package claims and grievances without reducing its power position in Europe seems to be an open question. At a time when the causes for confidence are pitifully few, it is reassuring that the charges and countercharges of appeasement are less strident and frequent.

A recent survey of American public opinion is illuminating. Thirty-nine percent of the people are so poorly informed that they are not aware that West Berlin is an enclave within Communist territory. They favor a policy of standing firm but also support negotiations. This should give heart to an administration not noted for its political

courage and should relieve troubled leaders from any illusion that they are prevented from taking diplomatic initiative by a suspicious and restraining public.

Past Secretaries of State have often been prisoners of the people, but the same can hardly be said today. The signs are clear to those who would see that if our leaders choose to lead, the people will follow. In the end, this is perhaps the most hopeful development on the present unhappy world scene.

Our Responsibilities in World Affairs—Address by Senator Fulbright

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 11, 1959

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, on the evening of May 7, 1959, the very learned and distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], delivered the Gabriel Silver lecture on international understanding at Columbia University in New York. His subject was "Our Responsibilities in World Affairs." It was a fine presentation and thought provoking. I ask unanimous consent, therefore, that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD:

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR RESPONSIBILITIES IN WORLD AFFAIRS

(Remarks of Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT, chairman, Senate Committee on Foreign Relations; Gabriel Silver Lecture on International Understanding, Columbia University, May 7, 1959)

In the Constitutional Convention, when it was proposed that each session be opened with prayer, Alexander Hamilton jumped to his feet with an objection. "I am opposed on principle," he said, "to calling on any foreign power for help."

As a new chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, this narrow view from a Founding Father is not at all to my liking. On the contrary, I seek help from various sources—and especially from the "foreign power" Alexander Hamilton tried to keep outside the 3-mile limit.

I have come to do this for many reasons. In the first place, I have had pointed reminders that a chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee is also a Senator from a single State—a State whose people have legitimate local interests which demand his attention in the Congress. If he fails to speak the local voice—while trying at the same time to serve the national interest—it seems safe to make one prediction about his future. The people of his State will see that he has time to write his memoirs, following the next election.

In the second place—and this is much more important where foreign affairs are concerned—the chairman and his committee colleagues often find themselves in a constitutional no man's land. We want to do our best to contribute to the energy, the strength of will, and the clarity of purpose which the effective conduct of our external relations demands. But the question constantly is: How can we make this contribution when the constitutional boundary line between the Senate and the Executive in this general area is so uncertain?

In times past, the rivalry between the Senate and the Executive, over the conduct of foreign affairs, found both too weak to advance, too strong to surrender—and may I add, too proud to ask for mercy. We want to avoid such a result today. But the practice of the matter is shot through with problems.

For example, if my committee colleagues and I tried to detail a solution to any crisis of the moment in our foreign affairs, the immediate effect would be an increase in the post office deficit. For there would follow a flood of mail charging us with a dangerous usurpation of the Executive's constitutional responsibility for the conduct of foreign relations. On the other hand, if we tried to lay down guidelines for the longer range problems of foreign policy, the same letterwriters would inform us that we have a special taste for the fuzzy and impractical, when America's real need is for specific solutions to the latest problem in the headlines.

Meanwhile, whether we deal with the problems of the here and the now, or with those of the day after tomorrow, my committee colleagues—indeed all the Members of the Senate—face a further complication. The professionally trained personnel, and the complex communication network that is involved in formulating and executing foreign policy, are not, and should not be, under the direct control of the Senate. They are, and should remain, under the direct control of the President—if for no other purpose than to read and answer Mr. Krushchev's latest note, but it is a complex system.

To all this, there is a more immediate reason why I feel the need of guidance from above. It is, quite simply, that you have asked me to speak this evening about "Our Responsibilities in World Affairs." The danger here takes the form of an analogy to a German professor who spent his life writing a three-volume treatise on the "Secret of Hegel." When the work was finally published, the reviewer observed that the "author should be congratulated for having written so much about the secret of Hegel yet managing just the same to keep the secret to himself."

Still, despite the danger that you will apply that same judgment to what I have to say, let me come to my theme by putting three questions. First, what are the issues of foreign policy which now face the Nation? Second, among those issues, which are as transient as the wind, and which are like the deep current of a river? And third, what is the proper role of the Senate with respect to those issues? Our responsibility in world affairs is to understand these three issues and then to take appropriate, effective action to meet them.

The issues of foreign policy that we face are born of three revolutions abroad in the world. One is the revolution of nationalism. The second revolution is in the will for improved living conditions. And the third is the technological revolution. Each of these has an inner connection with the other. All share the common word "revolution." All defy the attempt of any single nation to exercise a full control over the course the three revolutions take. All three would have occurred if Karl Marx and Joseph Stalin had never been born. And perhaps most ominous of all, few Americans seem yet to have grasped the full significance of these three worldwide revolutions.

Let me take them up in order.

First, nationalism: We must disabuse ourselves of the notion that the American War of Independence had anything in common with the spirit of nationalism that is now sweeping through the newly independent countries and through most colonial areas. Our own case was one where American Englishmen had demanded English rights from British Englishmen—including the right to be represented in the British Parliament. Indeed, had Benjamin Franklin's plan for representation been accepted by King George III, with a little stretch of the imagination one can conceive of a sequel, admirably suited to be scenario material for Hollywood.

Specifically, in the year 1860, the population of America for the first time exceeded that of Great Britain. Hence the American members of the English Parliament would have been in the majority and would promptly have voted to move the English Crown to this country. Whereupon there would have followed the spectacle of Queen Victoria sailing up the Potomac River, to be greeted at the Georgetown landing by her new Prime Minister—Abraham Lincoln.

Unfortunately for Hollywood, Benjamin Franklin's plan was rejected and we had our revolution. But unlike the general case nowadays in nationalist revolutions, the racial factor did not enter into the picture. The social factor did not enter either, since the chief revolutionaries in America were card-carrying English Whig gentlemen of the highest pedigree. Nor, for that matter, was the technological element a motive for revolution. The greater part of England, like the greater part of the United States, still lived off a barnyard economy in rural isolation.

Today, by marked contrast, the national revolutions going on all around us represent, only in part, a desire for political independence for its own sake. They also express a desire to erase the memory of racial subservience; a desire to be the author of one's own history, and a desire to stand in the sun with a distinctive national personality. For the latter reason, it is closely related to the demand for better living conditions, for the prestige and the respectability associated with industrialization and material prosperity.

In the maturity of our own industrial civilization, it is easy enough for us to sermonize the newly independent nation on the theme that the producer, not production, should be the object of social effort; that the human soul, and not the human body, should be the paramount good one ought to seek. But we can scarcely blame these people if, to our sermonizing, they answer: "It is true enough that man does not live by bread alone; but at least he lives if he has bread." Nor can we blame them if they go on to add: "Unless we can get bread-producing machines from the West, then we will get them from the Communist bloc, and, if necessary, in the Communist manner."

Meanwhile, the daily spectacle unfolding before our eyes is the way the Soviet Union has identified itself in many countries with the cause of nationalism while we are identified with that of imperialism. Why should this be so, in defiance of all logic and the history of our actual interests? The reason, I suspect, is that the Soviet Foreign Office and the Politburo are better at simple arithmetic than are the American State Department and the National Security Council. For the Soviets and their local Communist agents make it appear that they are on the side of the people; whereas we make it appear that we are on the side of the oligarchs who rule the people. Too often we find our friends and allies liquidated as a new group takes over.

To be sure, both we and the Soviets use the same words—peace, freedom, democracy, self-government, social justice, and independence. And I suppose that we ought to take a certain pride in the fact that these words, first taught in the West, express such universal hopes that the Soviets have seized upon them for their own purposes. Yet it is infuriating to see that in the Russian translation and application, these words are twisted into a caricature of the meaning we give them. It is all the more frustrating to observe that it is the Russian version, and

not our own, which so many other peoples of the world have adopted for their own usage—to their own eventual sorrow.

Still, we have to deal with the world, not as we would like it to be, but as it is. And as much of the world is, the Soviets, by parading themselves as the example of a peasant people made over swiftly into a giant industrial power, have become the merchants of hope. We, on our part, have been made out to seem the defenders of hopelessness, and the arch beneficiaries of a status quo outstripped by history.

What can we do about all this? It does not lie within our power to prevent the Communists from peddling hope; but it does lie within our own power to prevent ourselves from representing despair.

I turn now briefly to the second world force I mentioned—the demand for improved living standards.

The material wealth of this world is poorly distributed, to say the least. The United States, with 7 percent of the world's population, produces 50 percent of the world's wealth. At the other end of the scale, India, Pakistan, and Indonesia—to give but three examples—have more than 20 percent of the world's population, yet produce only 7 percent of its wealth.

The implications this has for us, as the greatest of all creditor nations, are plain enough, if only we would stop snoring with our eyes open. Our creditor position demands that we give our debtors a chance to buy in our markets by selling their own products here more readily. Our position also demands that we export more capital to underdeveloped countries so that they can increase their own industrial production to our mutual advantage. For it is a demonstrable fact that the greatest volume of foreign trade from which everyone stands to gain is carried on not between industrial and nonindustrial nations. It is carried on within the community of industrial nations—between the United States and Canada, the United States and Great Britain, the European Common Market, and so on.

We are in for serious trouble if we think that we are at liberty to get richer while most of the rest of the world gets poorer. In a poker game played with stacked cards, and where all the chips come to be concentrated in relatively few hands, the other players will be tempted to do one of three things: to change the rules, to quit, or to shoot from the hip. Leaving the economics of the matter out of account, the political imperatives of the universal demand for a rising standard of living are such that, unless we act sensibly to help meet it, the Soviets will appropriate that demand for their own purposes, in the same way that they have captured and distorted nationalism.

The technological revolution is the third force within whose context we must give form and focus to our foreign policy. My comments on this score, like those which have come before, will have the character of truisms. Yet they are worth reemphasis just the same.

Technology works in chain reactions. For example, the improvement in transportation and communication was in part responsible for the growth of nationalism. From the same cause, the poor nations of the world could better see how the rich nations lived. This in turn spurred the demands of the poor for economic development—even as those same technological advances made it feasible to meet the demand. And so on and on—up to the final step in the chain reaction, namely, the creation of military weapons that can destroy everything.

Now the key point in all this is, that technology is becoming progressively internationalized. No nation now has a clear monopoly over its secret. Nor can any nation fully control its social and political effects, with the precision of an experiment conducted in a laboratory. If the Soviet Union, for example, is quite different in an industrial sense from what it was less than a decade ago, the pressures of technological change have unleashed social and political pressures that the rulers of the Russian state have not fully subdued.

One thing, however, can be said in this general connection. If the Soviet Union did not start the worldwide technological revolution, any more than it started the other two revolutions I have mentioned, it is exploiting all three to its advantage in a degree to which we are not. And the reason, I suspect, is that they know more clearly what they want to do and work harder at it.

Consider, for example, our relative performance in the matter of economic growth. The figures are not so spectacular as the sputniks and missiles, but they are more alarming.

Briefly, even when we discount the U.S. recession year of 1958, Soviet industrial growth during the 1950's has been in excess of 2½ times the American growth rate—9.5 percent a year as against 3.6 percent. And the rate in Communist China is even greater than in the Soviet Union. I recognize the need for a qualification—that the percentages are computed from vastly different base points of reference. Still, despite this qualification, and despite the element of spread-eagle oratory in Khrushchev's promise that the Soviet Union will outstrip the United States per capita production by 1970, the threat is real enough. Whether it materializes in 1970 or later, it will surely come unless the disparity in present trends of growth is changed.

To be sure, the theoreticians in the U.S. Chamber of Commerce would have a rough time of it. For they have taught us that free enterprise is inherently and absolutely more productive than any other system; and moreover, that democracy and capitalism are one and the same thing. They would therefore be hard pressed to explain how it was that communism, based on State capital, outdistanced us in the production of things.

I also recognize that if we were no longer the richest nation in the world, we might suffer in the eyes of the underdeveloped nations—who would then look to communism and not to us as having the more promising method of economic advancement. Yet the Soviet growth has already been such as to impress many underdeveloped countries with this general idea.

What ought to count is not wealth per se, but what one does with it. Indeed, if we could be sure that the increased Russian production would be applied in full to an increase in Russian living standards, we ought to welcome the development. Paul Henri-Spaak, the wise and distinguished secretary general of NATO, has said that "a rich Communist is probably less to be feared than a poor Communist." We might even look forward to the day when the Soviets become as snug and complacent as we have become. In fact, when I lie in bed at night wondering what I can do to help the cause of peace in the world, my fancy starts to play with this idea that we should use some $20 billion of our $40 odd billion defense budget on the purchase of television sets, hi-fi phonographs, ankle-deep carpets, block-long automobiles—and give the lot of these annually to the Russian people as a free gift. The argument can be rather persuasively made that something of the sort will eventually happen through the growth of the Soviet Union's own economy.

But the fanciful elements to one side, what worries me about this argument is the emphasis on "eventually". Eventually can be a long time; and even then we would still be faced with the growing and ominous power of Communist China. In the meantime, we must deal with a set of variables that enter into the international politics of the present hour, and promise to continue to do so for the next decade or two.

It seems to me that within this time span, the growing Soviet wealth can be used by the Kremlin to meet the following objectives: (1) reinvestment to make possible still further expansion; (2) increased living standards; (3) greater arms production; (4) more loans and other investments in underdeveloped countries generally and perhaps also in Communist China and the East European satellites; (5) trade wars with the West.

We do not know, of course, in what proportion these purposes will be served. We do know that the Soviets can switch from one purpose an another as it suits their convenience. Khrushchev has bluntly and forthrightly declared economic war on us. We discount at our peril his seriousness of purpose and his ability to carry it out.

Indeed, in my judgment one of the most difficult problems we face is how to meet Soviet trade practices. For in a growing line of products, the Soviets are reaching a point where they can disrupt world markets and world trade patterns almost at will. This has happened already with tin, aluminum, and benzene. And the list is growing, while the practice itself finds the decentralized, private trading economies of the West poorly equipped to deal with this kind of competition from the Soviet Union.

Frankly, I do not know how to meet Soviet economic warfare. But I do know that we must start at once to think about the problem in a systematic way. I also know how not to meet the Soviet economic challenge. I know that it cannot be met so long as we make a balanced budget the sole and overriding aim of Government policy—as if Government itself were just a bookkeeping operation. If that is all there is to it, then we would be well advised to abolish the Presidency, the Congress, and the courts, and install some certified public accountants in their place.

I also know that Soviet economic warfare cannot be met so long as it is our national policy to pay a one-fifth higher price for generators to be used in an Arkansas dam, merely to give the order to a Philadelphia firm instead of to one in England. If American business cannot compete even with British business, which works in approximately the same kind of economic framework, how can we ever expect to compete with Russian buisness, which operates as a political arm of the state?

The question as to how we allocate our resources is certainly as important, and in many respects, more important than the rate of our economic growth. What counts is the uses to which the growth is put. Leaving the question of quality to one side, we ought to be sobered by one single representative fact. It is that the Soviet Union devotes 8 percent of its gross national product to education, while the United States devotes but 3 to 4 percent. Yet there is in the United States an enormous margin for luxury that could be drawn upon for purposes that are in the interest of the whole Nation, without depriving anyone of what would still remain the highest material standard of life in the world.

The question we have to decide is a question of priorities. It is not—or need not be—difficult to resolve. For it does not call for a choice between guns and butter, or between electronic computers and television sets. It may call for a choice between better schools and teachers, or more country club memberships. But this could hardly be called an austerity program. Moreover, the whole of the educational and other programs that we need for national strength—here at home and abroad—would bear all the more lightly on the Nation if we could

but cast off the anchor of economic shibboleths that keep up tied to a rate of economic growth of 2 to 3 percent a year. The Rockefeller Brothers Fund report last spring put the attainable minimum rate of growth at 5 percent a year.

I know that this figure was described as visionary by the apostles of economic standpattism. Yet I also recall that the same adjective was used in 1941 when Franklin Roosevelt called for the production of 50,000 airplanes a year. The standpatters did not begrudge him what they felt was just a propaganda gambit to frighten the enemy. Yet they were certain among themselves that such an actual production goal was unattainable. As the event proved, Roosevelt was guilty of a gross understatement of purpose. For we were producing 100,000 planes a year before long.

We could do much the same sort of thing for our current needs, if we had the leadership that could make its own vision and its own determination the source of the Nation's vision and determination.

Why do we keep kidding ourselves that we can get along with a little more when we know very well that we need a great deal more? Why do we congratulate ourselves that the shortage of classrooms, far from getting better, is simply not getting worse? Why do we think it is progress if we stand still?

In my judgment, we give too little attention to the long-range questions of national policy, and too much, relatively, to short-term tactical problems. Since last summer, our national attentions has been focused, in turn, on the Middle East, the Far East, and Europe. Jarred by a revolution in Iraq, we sent troops to Lebanon and vowed that we needed a long-term policy to bring peace and stability to the Middle East. Then we withdrew the troops from Lebanon, and the Middle East continues to fester like a running sore. It is without peace, without stability, and without much of a policy on our part.

Next we were confronted with the crisis last fall over Quemoy and Matsu. During that period, a few people pointed out that what was really needed was not so much a solution of the Quemoy-Matsu question, but a long-term policy which would take into account the realities in the Far East. Then the Chinese Communists turned off the heat as suddenly as they had turned it on, and today, several months later, we are no nearer a Far Eastern policy then we were before.

At the moment, our attention is centered on Berlin. I do not want to minimize the gravity of the Berlin crisis. It could supply the cause of world war III; just as the Middle East could have supplied it; and might yet; just as Quemoy and Matsu could have supplied it, and might yet.

The point is that we have to keep Berlin in perspective. It is illustrative of many of the long-term issues between us and the Soviets; but in itself it is only a short-term tactical move on their part.

I think the Berlin crisis will be settled. I hope it will be settled in a way which will lead to a broader settlement of at least some of the issues which divide Eastern and Western Europe. But the most ideal settlement one can imagine would still leave us with many serious problems in other parts of the world; and especially it would leave us in our same position vis-a-vis the Soviets in the economic competition which will determine whether or not the United States remains a first-class power.

And after the Berlin crisis is settled, we have to be prepared to meet another crisis somewhere else. So long as we stay on the defensive, it is folly to assume that the Soviets will not continue to probe and trust and keep us off balance.

Our Government ought to take to heart the sage advice of Demosthenes: "As a general marches at the head of his troops, so ought—politicians—to march at the head of affairs; insomuch that they ought not to wait the event, to know what measures to take, but the measures which they have taken, ought to produce, the event."

It would be rather satisfying, just once, we could get in the position where it is the Soviets who are reacting to our initiatives and not the other way around.

In order to get into such a position, a number of things are necessary.

We need a State Department that is hospitable to new suggestions instead of foreclosing all inquiry with an automatic "no".

We need more concentrated Executive energy instead of buckshot spray in the White House.

We need more broad international vision and less local politics in Congress.

We need a national resurgence of self-awareness about where we stand in history.

But above all, we need to learn how to talk to each other again—to reach a working agreement on what our paramount national interests really are.

THE ROLE OF THE SENATE

It is on this last point, which is central to all the others, that I think the Senate has its greatest role to play.

Despite the large measure of agreement on many of our foreign policy actions in recent years, we do not have in this country a national agreement on what our role in the world really is. We agree on the kind of world we want to live in—we agree that we want it to be peaceful, prosperous, secure, and preferably one in which the Communists have gone away some place else. But these are ideal objectives. The likelihood of attaining all of them is as improbable as the hope an elephant might have of turning itself into a ballet dancer. In any case, we have only the foggiest notions of how even to approach our prescription for an ideal world.

Here again, it is necessary to distinguish between short-term tactics and long-term policy. We do have a deep-seated national unity in regard to protecting our rights in Berlin. But we do not have anything like this same kind of unity in regard to meeting the Soviet economic threat. Indeed, we are not even united on the nature and magnitude of that threat.

The kind of national agreement on our world role which I have in mind is akin to the sort of natural consensus that has been present in support of British foreign policy for many generations. In many respects, it is an unspoken agreement which in large measure is taken for granted and which, in turn, takes a great deal for granted. It is the kind of agreement which develops over a period of years as a result of much public thought and discussion. But it is also the kind of agreement which creates a national confidence and assurance out of which come predictable public reactions to specific situations.

It is the lack of this sort of agreement that has made so much of our recent foreign policy both half-hearted and halfway. If Americans were thoroughly convinced that we were in the world to say and were well-settled in our own mind as to how we fit into the world, we would not go through our annual soul-searching debates over foreign aid. We would not go through our quadrennial wrangles over the reciprocal trade program. We would not be trying to fight change arcund the world. Instead, we would be trying to influence the direction the movement for change takes and we would be in tune with it. We would be exercising the world leadership role in which, in large part, we are defaulting.

Our defaults in world leadership are not exclusively faults of foreign policy. The image which we present to the world is based on many policies we think of as domestic in nature. This is one of our weaknesses. We have failed to relate domestic policies to foreign policies.

For the same reason, we have sacrificed the interests of the whole people to the demands of the few—the few who prefer high prices to full steel production, the few who prefer uneconomic protective tariffs to low prices, the few who oppose the use of our resources for education, housing, highways, and who, in effect, prefer that our resources go into the high profit luxury trades.

In short, our foreign policy has represented the lowest common denominator of national agreement because too many people and too many special interests have been given a practical veto over policy.

It is precisely at this point that I think the Congress as an educational institution—has its greatest opportunity. That is the opportunity of increasing the understanding of all Americans of the interaction of domestic and foreign policy, so that the parochial interests of the few may not thwart the Nation. Not until we agree in the very marrow of our bones that most of our domestic policies have foreign policy aspects and most foreign affairs affect our domestic life will we be able to discharge our world responsibilities.

As has often been said, there are limits on what the United States can do abroad—just as there are limits to what the Senate can do about the general conduct of foreign policy.

Constitutionally, our role is essentially negative. We can refuse to ratify treaties or to pass legislation which the President wants. We can attach reservations to treaties or we can amend bills to bring them more nearly in line with our own views. But these actions, too, are more likely to be effective if they are negative than if they are positive. We can, for example, keep the President from spending money by denying appropriations. But we cannot force the President to spend more money, simply by increasing appropriations. We can advise the President that he ought to enter negotiations for a given treaty. But we cannot force him to do so.

For both constitutional and practical reasons, the Senate should not concern itself obsessively with the day-to-day conduct of foreign policy. I repeat that this is the prerogative of the executive branch, and properly so. I also repeat that the Senate itself is very poorly equipped to engage in administrative matters.

But over and beyond this, the Senate can, I think, make a useful contribution through the public discussion of long-range, basic problems of foreign policy. I have touched on some of these problems today, and I have alluded briefly to others. In the months ahead, I intend to explore these further.

I have said many times that we in the United States operate under a most extraordinarily difficult system of government. Democracy may have reached its peak in our country, but it is an extremely complicated piece of machinery to operate. It requires of the people that extra measure of determination and ability often characteristic of a few individuals in a community, but seldom a characteristic of most of the people. It requires especially education and self-discipline.

I hope in the months ahead we may draw on the wealth of information, the ideas and professional ability that are to be found in academic communities such as this. Unfortunate experiences during the past decade have, I fear, seriously damaged good relations between government and the academic world. We have both suffered. Government misses the bold, astringent, pragmatic, inventive

ideas which flowed from the academic communities of the Nation in the early days of the Roosevelt Presidency. The social science faculties of the universities doubtless miss an interplay with the problem-oriented workings of the Government in its day-to-day affairs.

I am making a systematic endeavor, in my position as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, to promote a better two-way communications channel between Government and the universities especially at the policy level. The Committee on Foreign Relations has contracts with some 20 educational institutions (including the Russian Institute here at Columbia) in connection with an overall foreign policy review which we expect to have completed by early next year. This is an attempt to spur the rate at which ideas can flow directly from the universities to the practicing politician.

The Committee on Foreign Relations has also been promoting a series of informal exchanges between outstanding scholars in the field of foreign affairs and Members of the Senate. This is not an isolated phenomenon. Similar activties are underway in the House of Representatives and in fields other than foreign policy.

Perhaps out of this process and out of literally thousands of discussion and study groups throughout the country, there can be developed the kind of agreement on our foreign policy objectives which is based on a habit of the mind; the kind which will come only after we, as people, have steeled ourselves to look unpleasant facts in the face and to react rationally instead of trying to wish them away.

There is nothing inevitable about the survival of the United States. Survival is the reward of civilizations which meet the responsibilities history thrusts upon them. It is the job of you, of me, of every American to see to it that our country, in this age, meets those reponsibilities.

Every generation has what Franklin Roosevelt called a rendezvous with destiny. We Americans in 1959 have to determine—and soon—whether we are going to keep our rendezvous.

I hope it is not later than we think.

Truman Diamond Jubilee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VANCE HARTKE
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 11, 1959

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, last Friday Indiana Democrats celebrated the Truman diamond jubilee in Gary, Ind. I had the honor of speaking to this group, which was participating in the national celebration of President Truman's 75th birthday. I am very grateful that I was asked to participate in this celebration, since President Truman was good enough to open my campaign in Fort Wayne, Ind., last fall. I ask unanimous consent that my remarks in Gary at the Truman diamond jubilee celebration be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH OF SENATOR VANCE HARTKE, DEMOCRAT, OF INDIANA, AT TRUMAN DIAMOND JUBILEE, GARY, IND., MAY 8, 1959

Griff, Ray, mayors, friends, and fellow Democrats all, this is my first trip back to Gary since the eventful election of last November.

Many times since then I have been reminded of the day the people of Lake County were so patient that night and so wonderful to me on election day. I regret sincerely that Senate business has not permitted me as much time in Indiana as I would like to have. God willing, I shall tour the State again following the present session of Congress. Perhaps we can visit again then.

I am reminded also tonight of another election campaign, one that took place 10 years before the one in which I was privileged to head a statewide victory ticket. I refer, of course, to the 1948 election campaign.

Well we remember that Harry S. Truman stood almost alone at his nomination in Philadelphia. Among the few with him was the late Alben W. Barkley.

During the campaign that followed, we heard everywhere that everyone had deserted Harry Truman and the Democratic Party. Gone were the extreme conservatives of the day. Gone were the extreme liberals of the day. Down the path between these extremes went Harry S. Truman, a plain-speaking man who took his case directly to the people.

There were those then and since who thought of President Truman as a lightweight. And there were those of us who insisted all the time that history would record Harry S. Truman as one of the great Presidents of all time.

I remember Harry Truman, too, when the time came to open our campaign last fall. It was he who responded to our beckoning. And how he packed the galleries and the vast area floor of the Fort Wayne Coliseum.

"I don't give 'em hell," he declared. "I just tell the truth and it sounds like hell to some of the people."

I remember Harry Truman as a man who has principles and stands by them. I remember Harry Truman as a man who acted boldly and with great courage.

Tonight Harry Truman—a man warm of smile, hearty of handshake, practical as a Missouri farm boy, wise as a world renown statesman, political as only a real party man can be—turned 75 years old. Nobody in his right mind expects Harry Truman to collapse in his rocking chair, go back to Independence and retire. We would be disappointed if he did. America would be less rich if he did.

We need men like Harry Truman today.

I wonder sometimes when I hear of certain people high in our Government complain about dynamic leadership if we have gone so far in the few years since President Truman's occupancy of the White House that we have forgotten what real leadership is. One thing for sure: When H.S.T. was living in the White House, there was never any question about who was boss, where we were going or how we were going. Our allies knew where we stood. Our enemies knew where we stood. Above all, we ourselves knew where we stood.

Right or wrong—and over and over we are learning how overwhelmingly often he was right—Harry Truman made decisions and stuck by them. Yet, he was never arrogant.

Remember, he was not too big to visit Wake Island to see General MacArthur. Yet, when the general failed to heed orders from the President, Harry Truman fired him.

When the time came for a decision on dropping the atomic bomb, Harry Truman consulted and prayed. Then he ordered the bomb dropped. "I did not like the weapon," Mr. Truman said. "But I had no qualms if, in the long run, millions of lives could be saved."

This capacity to make decisions was brought to my mind again only yesterday. The day before I was privileged to have breakfast with Mr. Truman in the company of several other Senators. That was Wednesday. Then, on Thursday, I read in the Washington Post that President Eisenhower before leaving for a golfing holiday had decided that the 22d amendment to the Constitution was perhaps a good one. This is the amendment barring a President from serving more than two terms.

Over and over, President Eisenhower has told news conferences that he believes the amendment is bad. Suddenly, and without any apparent new information, he decides it is right.

I wonder if he is just trying to disagree with President Truman.

Of course, Mr. Truman made other decisions, but I believe a few—mostly in the field of foreign affairs—are sufficient to recount here tonight to prove the very greatness of the man.

Is there doubt in anyone's mind here tonight that the Truman doctrine, the Marshall plan and point 4 preserved the free world? Without them, I fear, the Middle East would have been lost, Europe would still be in the depths of postwar darkness and despair if not indeed wholly behind the Iron Curtain, Africa would be lost and Asia would be more Communist than it is.

The Truman doctrine rescued Greece and Turkey. Mr. Truman continued his efforts to rebuild these strife-torn lands so that now they are bulwarks guarding our interests in the Mediterranean and the Middle East. Turkey, for instance, is all that stands between Soviet Russia and the vast oil reserves of the Middle East. Turkey, for instance, has supplied proportionately more troops for U.N. actions than we have.

Then there was Italy. Communists had reached a pinnacle of success in that land. They were in position to take over peacefully and through the ballot. But Harry Truman's bold action aided the gallant fighters for democracy in that war-torn land.

In Berlin the Russians had moved to block our supply lines. Harry Truman did not sit idly at the White House or Burning Tree Country Club or Augusta Golf Club. He ordered the Berlin airlift. And thus we stopped effectively for the first time, Russian expansion.

From this, all our allies and the neutrals of the world were on notice that we had principles and that we would, above all, stick by these principles.

The Marshall plan has rebuilt Europe until today the Western countries of the continent are proud proof that our system works. I wish you all could see, as I have recently, the vast difference between East and West in Germany. And what has happened in West Germany has happened everywhere in Europe among our allies.

Mr. Truman's point 4 program is a bold, imaginative program to provide technical know-how to backward countries. It has taken the stigma of colonialism from us. It has helped countries help themselves. It has built new free countries loyal to us and our way of life—vital allies in a life and death struggle.

You know and I know that Harry Truman's most controversial decision was Korea. When he made it, Congress backed him to the hilt. The vote was virtually unanimous. But when the war dragged on, his critics called it Truman's war.

But Harry Truman, student of history, knew that we had taken such bold steps in 1931 when Japan invaded Manchuria we might have prevented World War II. Truman's war may, in turn, have prevented World War III. It has certainly delayed it. Historians agree on this.

President Truman also brought about unification of our Armed Forces, better social security, advances in civil rights, progress in slum clearance and housing, NATO.

But I think that we Americans remember Harry Truman best for his fighting campaign of 1948, when he made 356 speeches in 35 days. And what did Mr. Truman say later on of this? He said, "I am always glad to do anything I can to help the Democratic Party, whether in marbles, money, chalk, or time."

Happy birthday, Mr. President, for all the people of Indiana, for lovers of freedom everywhere. Thank you for your inspiration. May God keep you with us many more years.

Works for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. MOSS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 11, 1959

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] was in Salt Lake City on the 25th of April, and he delivered a speech there at the Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner.

As always, he treated his subject with insight and clarity. The address is extremely timely. I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Nearly 8 years ago—on May 24, 1951—President Truman said, "The only kind of war we seek is the good old fight against man's ancient enemies—poverty, disease, hunger, and illiteracy."

His words were drawn from the heart and the wisdom and the history of the American people. But he knew, as we know, that words, however eloquent, are not enough; nor do good intentions, however generous, suffice.

They must result in works for peace.

It is 10 years since President Truman enunciated what became known as the point 4 idea—the idea of aiding the peoples of the underdeveloped areas of the world.

That idea did not spring out of empty air. It was firmly grounded in the lifeblood and life experience of the missionaries our great churches have for generations sent out to all corners of the world.

The strength of our best missionaries is that they not only preached the faith to all peoples, but they also fed the hungry and healed the sick.

They have gone beyond charity. They have been willing to walk out into the fields and villages and show people how to grow more abundant crops—how to live better and more meaningful lives. They have trained them to be their own nurses and their own doctors.

In a day when we hear much of the ugly American it is well to remember these dedicated Americans. For they were the real progenitors of the point 4 idea.

There is much talk today of the need for Americans abroad to speak the language of the peoples among whom they work. I have joined in urging the importance of this.

But our missionaries needed no urging. They knew that they would save few souls speaking a language that nobody understood. They learned the languages—even the dialects—of those they sought to help. In fact, in some cases they ventured into such unexplored lands that it was they who compiled the first dictionaries. Often they had to invent a system of writing the language where none existed before.

In a very literal sense, they gave the great gift of literacy to the peoples among whom they lived.

Those who are suddenly concerned about the competition with communism in Asia, Africa, and the Middle East do not realize that we had a very long head start upon them. While the early Bolsheviks were wrangling over the cafe tables of Europe, our missionaries were at work helping people grow two blades of wheat where only one grew before—helping them to resist disease—helping them to lift the burden of illiteracy.

But despite this head start, we have dissipated much of our lead. In too many underdeveloped areas of the world, the Communists are making far more headway than we.

Why? Not because of the righteousness of their ultimate cause, for it is an oppressive and godless cause.

It is because of the Communists' total dedication to their goals—a total dedication which today the West is not equaling.

Too many Americans have lost the zeal and dedication that motivated the missionaries of the past.

Perhaps this is because we have lost the spirit that guided the missionaries: the desire to help people for no other reason than that they are our brothers; that they are God's children; that they are hungry and need food, or sick and need healing.

Today, our aid to poor nations springs not so much from love as from fear—fear that if we do not help others, they will be lost to the Communists.

Our efforts to help other countries too often seem determined by how many Communists they have in their midst. The country which is short of Communists must sometimes be tempted to import them.

But to our missionaries what was important was that these were people who needed help. Their actions were motivated by the appeal of the scriptures, not by the fear of the appeal of Karl Marx and Lenin.

It is the spirit of the missionaries from which point 4 drew its inspiration—and this is the spirit in which it got underway.

It is a measure of the soundness of the point 4 idea that it has survived under the present administration. It has even survived administrators who came to the job convinced it was a sort of operation rathole.

But, as with so many of the fine programs this spiritless administration inherited, the spirit has slipped from it.

It has been sold too often as something—against communism—rather than for humanity.

It has been pictured too often as a painful expedient—a necessary nuisance that we can wind up next year, or the year after.

Here is another lesson to be learned from the missionaries of our churches. Their dedication to the great work overseas was not for 1 year, or for 2 years, but for many.

So, too, we must recognize that the task of helping other nations to help themselves is a continuing task. It will not be finished next year or the year after.

To be effective, our foreign aid program should be established on a longer term basis, so that both we and those we seek to help can plan ahead, can rely on a sustained effort—and can be spared the annual agonizing reappraisal to which we subject the very existence of foreign aid.

This will not prevent modifying the program as conditions dictate. Congress will still have annual control over the moneys appropriated.

But if in fact it will be necessary to continue our aid programs over a longer period, why do we not recognize this just as we recognize it in countless domestic programs, which do not live on a year-to-year basis?

I like to talk to people who have spent their lifetimes in remote areas of the world, for there is a genuine nobility in this self-sacrifice.

But they recognized that there is a danger as well, the danger of paternalism.

There comes a time, painful to all of us parents, when our children grow up—when we must begin to work with them rather than for them.

Most of our missionaries are wise enough to recognize this, and to move forward to the higher challenge of partnership.

This is the great opportunity before us today—the opportunity we are so largely missing.

It does us no good to complain that the Communists are busy everywhere, preaching their own secular heresy.

It does just as little good to complain that, as "Ivans-come-lately" in the field of overseas aid, they are peddling their loans and their technicians in many crucial areas of the world.

It does no good to proclaim that point 4 began as an American idea that the Communists have appropriated for themselves.

The real trouble lies not in what they are doing. It is how much less we are doing than we could and should.

Today in Congress we are debating the details of a meager and unimaginative program.

While we debate, a new world is coming into existence around us. Most of Asia has achieved freedom since the war. New nations are being born every year out of Africa. Latin America is only now achieving the full fruits of freedom.

This new independence and liberty carries with it strong desires for self-help—desires we should strive to foster.

Here is what one of our point 4 workers reports from Chile:

"The United States has helped to establish an 'aided self-help housing program' in a Santiago slum. When the program was started, many had doubts that unskilled people could do the work. One night a Chilean official went out to inspect the job—the work was done after regular hours, often by floodlight. Here was a man using a trowel, and doing beautiful work. The official said to him:

" 'You must be a mason.'

" 'No, sir,' the man replied. 'I'm a tailor.'

"Surprised, the official said: 'But this is very good work.'

" 'Sir,' " the tailor replied, 'you perhaps do not understand. It is my own home that I'm building.' "

In a very real sense—in the largest sense—it is their own homes, their own nations, which millions of Asians and Africans are now building.

They do not expect miracles—the Asian peasant does not dream of driving in his Cadillac down a six-lane superhighway to does not want a tractor or a combine to work his fields. Rather than a fancy machine he does not understand, he needs to know how to care for his ox when it is afflicted by disease. He needs a simple pump for getting water out of the ground and onto his land.

In short, what he does want—and very deeply—is a better life for himself, and above all for his children.

The overriding fact is that mankind is on the move—and at least half of it in a hurry. We can seize the opportunity to move with them—or run the grave risk that they will move without us, or even against us.

I hope that there is enough of the missionary spirit in all of us that we will play our full part in this great chapter of the world's unfolding history. I hope that we will do this because it is the right thing to do, and not solely out of fear of our adversaries.

All Americans need is to be themselves. Why is it that so many feel embarrassed by the prospects of doing something noble and disinterested?

The mistakes made out of greatness of heart are forgiven—the mistakes of meanness, never.

I would much rather stand in the Senate and defend my Government against the charge of having spent generously to help India achieve the goals of her 5-year plan than to join in some future inquest, as to why we gave too little and too late.

Parenthetically, I may say that I am willing and anxious to stand in the Senate and defend the Republican administration's requests for funds to help other nations—though they too often reward Democratic Senators for their support of these overseas programs by calling us spenders when we propose doing something about schools, health, housing, social security in our own country.

I reject the word "spender" when I support the administration's foreign aid programs—they are an investment in the economic health of the world and in peace.

And I equally reject the word "spender" when I support domestic aid programs—they are an investment in the economic health and well-being of our own Nation.

As President Eisenhower said in a special message to Congress on foreign aid, "It is not the goal of the American people that the United States should be the richest nation in the graveyard of history."

Our aid to other nations should not be a partisan matter. To help our fellow man is a goal all Americans should share alike.

But the goal is not attained by words alone. Effort, action, enterprise, and dedication are required.

In this, I fear there has been a difference between Democratic and Republican administrations.

Under President Truman, the deeds more nearly matched the words. The point 4 idea did not end with Mr. Truman's second inaugural address. It was translated into action, a living program.

But what, I ask, has become of President Eisenhower's fine atoms-for-peace address before the United Nations in 1953? Have our deeds matched the President's eloquent words?

I fear not. In the atoms-for-peace field we are not leaders, we are laggards. Our promised contributions of nuclear materials to help in peaceful atomic research have not been forthcoming. We have allowed nations far smaller than we to take the lead.

Too often, it has seemed that the words are the words of Eisenhower, but the acts are the acts of the Old Guard.

What the world needs today is not massive retaliation, but massive doses of health, education, and food.

We must move on the offensive, and declare war against mankind's most ancient and terrible enemies of hunger, disease, poverty, and ignorance.

We need a bold new "food for peace" program, dedicating our God-given abundance to serving the need of humanity—rather than complaining about it.

We need a dramatic, worldwide "health for peace" program, with vastly expanded international medical research—and perhaps a white fleet of mercy ships carrying our medical know-how and wonder drugs to the disease-ridden and suffering in the far corners of the earth.

We need to launch a broad program of world educational development—a plan for education for peace.

These are truly the works of peace.

There is, in the affairs of nations as well as men, a tide which

"* * * taken at the flood, leads on to fortune;
Omitted, all the voyage of their life
Is bound in shallows and in miseries."

That tide is rising, is already lapping at our shores. Please God, we shall have the wisdom, the courage, and the vision to take it.

Canal To Connect Lake Winnipesaukee With the Sea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS COTTON
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 11, 1959

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, there is evidence of a new interest in the construction of canals in many areas of the Nation, particularly since attention has been focused on the opening of the St. Lawrence Seaway. Edward J. Gallagher writes an interesting editorial in the Laconia Evening Citizen, of which he is publisher, advocating one of these in my own State of New Hampshire. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the April 28, 1959, issue of the Laconia Evening Citizen be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CANAL TO SEA?

In New York last week at the publishers' meeting we heard much talk about the opening last Saturday of the St. Lawrence Canal, which will move ocean traffic more than 2,000 miles inland to Duluth, Minn. Everyone agreed that the expenditure of hundreds of millions on this long-contemplated project will pay off handsomely, and requirements of the people due to growth in population in the next three decades will easily offset temporary loss of business to communities on the eastern seaboard.

The St. Lawrence Canal, lifting vessels by the series of locks on the westward journey nearly 250 feet above the level at Montreal and Quebec, suggests the strong possibility that some day a canal will connect Lake Winnipesaukee with the sea, as John Goodhue has been advocating. Governor Powell in his program for developing greater commerce, for the State, recreationally, and otherwise, might propose action on the Goodhue canal.

It does no harm to keep the project in mind, and it could become a reality, as the St. Lawrence Canal now is, after a half century of dreaming, planning, and appropriating.

Mother's Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH SCOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 11, 1959

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, since the origins of Mother's Day are so closely associated with the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the program for the 11th annual memorial service at West Laurel Hill Cemetery in Philadelphia, and a brief article by Maude Olivia Hickman, historian of the Old Washington Tree Chapter of the DAR.

There being no objection, the program and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROGRAM FOR MOTHER'S DAY, MAY 10, 1959, 51ST ANNIVERSARY, 11TH MEMORIAL SERVICE, HELD BY MOTHER'S DAY, INC., MISS MAUDE O. HICKMAN, PRESIDENT, FOR ANNA JARVIS, FOUNDER, WEST LAUREL HILL CEMETERY, PHILADELPHIA, PA.

Fourth Naval District firing squad and buglers.

Invocation: Rev. Harry N. Johnson, pastor, Grace Lutheran Church, West Philadelphia.

Pledge of allegiance to the flag: Boy Scout Troop No. 113, leader, Mr. H. Talley.

The National Anthem: assemblage.

Welcome: Miss Maude O. Hickman.

Solo, "O Blessed Day of Motherhood" (by Carl F. Mueller): tenor, Mr. Samuel Smith, Grace Lutheran Church, West Philadelphia.

Address: Dr. Frederick E. Maser, pastor, Old St. George's Methodist Church, Philadelphia (1707–1959).

Chorus, "M-o-t-h-e-r" (by Howard Johnson): Pillar of Fire children's choir.

Wreath by Allied Florists of Greater Philadelphia, Inc., Mr. Emil C. Esslinger, secretary, placing wreath of 51 white carnations on grave.

Benediction: Rev. Harry N. Johnson.

Salute: firing squad, Fourth Naval District.

Taps: Fourth Naval District.

MOTHER'S DAY

The founder, Miss Anna Jarvis, born May 1, 1864, in Webster, W. Va., 1 of 11 children, only 4 living to maturity. The family moved to Grafton, W. Va., in 1865, where Miss Jarvis' early life was spent. After completing grade school, she entered Female Seminary in Wheeling in 1881, being graduated in 1884, and was immediately employed by the board of education as a teacher in the Grafton public schools where she taught for 7 years. The superintendent of schools said: "In all my wide experience as a teacher and superintendent, I have never known her equal as an efficient and capable teacher." Anna Jarvis was a woman of very keen intellect, broad vision, high ideals, and commanding personality, and was a fluent, logical, and convincing speaker.

The real origin of Mother's Day dates back to the period immediately following the Civil War when Mrs. Anna Reeves Jarvis, the honored mother, organized the mothers of her community. The new organization wondered how their families would ever be reunited after the war was over. Mrs. Jarvis met this problem of family hatred after the close of the conflict by announcing a

"Mother's Friendship Day." A special invitation was given to every Union and Confederate soldier and their families. It was truly a wonderful sight to see the boys in blue and the boys in gray shake hands and say, "God bless you, neighbor; let us be friends again." Mrs. Jarvis, for a period of 20 years expressed her desire that someone, sometime would establish a day for mothers, both living and dead. It was this kind of work and works of a similar character that impressed her daughter to establish Mother's Day to perpetuate her mother's idea and make the day a memorial for all mothers.

About 1896, Miss Anna Jarvis came to Philadelphia, where her brother Claude was located in business, and became secretary of the literary department of Fidelity Mutual Life Insurance Co. After the death of her father, Granville E. Jarvis, in December 1903, the mother came to Philadelphia to reside with her son and daughters at 2031 North 12th Street. It was there 3 years later that Mrs. Jarvis died, May 9, 1905, at the age of 72. The following year, Miss Anna Jarvis asked friends to come to church the first Sunday in May to commemorate the anniversary of her mother's death. By 1907, she had acquainted John Wanamaker, the great merchant, with her plans to establish a Mother's Day. He thought the idea a good one and urged her to start the movement. By her untiring efforts, writing ministers of churces, mayors of cities, Governors of States, the first official Mother's Day was founded on Sunday, May 10, 1908.

Anna Jarvis continued her zeal and efforts meeting Senators, Congressmen, and Governors. The first to issue a State proclamation was William M. Glasscock, Governor of West Virginia, on May 8, 1910. Miss Jarvis never ceased her efforts and in 1914, at her request, the second Sunday in May was named as Mother's Day. The resolution was passed by both Houses. President Woodrow Wilson approved and the Great Commoner, William Jennings Bryan, as Secretary of State, proclaimed it. In the President's proclamation which immediately followed, he ordered that, on the second Sunday in May, the flag should be displayed on all governmental buildings in the United States and in our foreign possessions. Later, Representative Heflin, of Alabama, author of the resolution said, "The flag was never used in a more beautiful and sacred cause than when flying above the tender, gentle army, the mothers of America."

Anna Jarvis traveled abroad extensively promoting Mother's Day until 46 foreign countries observe Mother's Day on the second Sunday in May. The dream of the mother had at last become a reality through the daughter, who always said her mother was the mother of Mother's Day and she the founder. She chose the white carnation as the emblem, being her mother's favorite flower and the emblem of purity and love. Then, too, she said, "Everyone would buy one" for they were selling for 10 cents per dozen. In a year or two, the prices for one started at 5 cents and continued to advance until now they sell for $1 and even more. She fought the commercialization always, for she founded the day as a religious and sacred day to remember and honor and revere our mothers, dead or alive. For this noble work, she was honored not only in America, but at the courts of foreign countries.

Miss Jarvis' last public appearance was in April 1943 at a church mothers' club, honoring a sailor who sacrificed his life, but saved his ship, all officers, and men in World War II. She was going blind and on November 3, 1943, she was placed by friends in a sanatarium in West Chester, Pa. Being totally blind, she died November 24, 1948, at the age of 84, the last of an illustrious family.

Miss Jarvis is buried beside her mother in West Laurel Hill Cemetery, Philadelphia. Upon her tombstone is a bronze plaque of her likeness, dedicated on Mother's Day, May 8, 1949.

Federal Projects in West Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT C. BYRD
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 11, 1959

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement which I submitted last Friday to the Committee on Appropriations, in behalf of certain projects in West Virginia.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR BYRD OF WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity to appear before the committee in behalf of certain projects in West Virginia. I shall try to be as brief as possible, knowing that the committee has much work to do, and desiring, as I do, to avoid imposing upon your generosity and courtesy in permitting me to present this statement.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to recommend and urge that the committee give careful consideration to the following projects, these being of the utmost importance to my State of West Virginia from the standpoint of flood control, regulation of waterflow, and, in some instances, growth of river traffic.

OHIO RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS

Project	Estimated cost	Amounts that could be used	Remarks
1. Racine	$51,700,000	[1] $50,000	Tentatively proposed replacement structure for locks 23, 22, and 21.
2. Belleville (authorized)	64,100,000	[1] 125,000	Replacement structure under study for locks 18, 19, and 20.
3. Opossum Creek	52,200,000	[1] 150,000	Replacement structure under study for locks 12, 13, and 14.
4. New Cumberland	41,500,000	[2] 6,800,000	Will replace existing locks and dams 7, 8, and 9 on Ohio River.
5. Pike Island	63,500,000	[2] 5,000,000	Replaces locks and dams 10 and 11.

MONONGAHELA RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS

6. Opekiska	21,900,000	[2] 1,000,000	Completes cost of construction.
7. Hildebrand	12,460,000	1,278,000	Do.
8. Dam No. 8	3,500,000	725,000	

FLOOD CONTROL

9. Williamson	640,000	[1] 71,000	
10. Princeton	1,000,000	[2] 500,000	$55,000 appropriated for planning in fiscal year 1959.
11. East Rainelle	775,000	[2] 500,000	$40,000 appropriated for planning in fiscal year 1959.
12. Summersville Reservoir, Gauley River.	46,800,000	[2] 2,000,000	

[1] Planning.
[2] Construction.

Mr. Chairman, item No. 1, Racine locks and dam, will replace obsolete and inadequate locks and dams Nos. 21, 22, and 23, which are 38 to 41 years old, with one modern structure to accommodate the increasing volume of Ohio River traffic. The engineers report a benefit-to-cost ratio of 2.8, and they indicate that the money requested can be efficiently utilized in fiscal 1960 for advance engineering and design work.

Item No. 2, Belleville locks and dam, contemplates the construction of a modern, nonnavigable dam and two locks of 110 feet by 1,200 feet and 110 feet by 600 feet usable dimensions on the Ohio River in the vicinity of Belleville, W. Va., about 285 miles below Pittsburgh, Pa., and located in Meigs County, Ohio, and Wood County, W. Va. Obsolete and inadequate locks and dams Nos. 18, 19, and 20 will be replaced with one modern structure to accommodate the increasing volume of Ohio River traffic. The engineers' benefit-to-cost ratio for this project is 2.7.

Item No. 3, Opossum Creek, locks and dam, contemplates the construction of a modern, nonnavigable dam and two locks of 110 feet by 1,200 feet and 110 feet by 600 feet usable dimensions on the Ohio River bordering Marshall County, W. Va. Existing obsolete and inadequate locks and dams Nos. 12, 13, and 14, will be replaced by a single modern structure to accommodate increasing Ohio River traffic. The Engineers report a benefit-to-cost ration of 2.2.

Item No. 4, New Cumberland locks and dam, will replace existing locks and dams Nos. 7, 8, and 9 on the Ohio River, some of which locks are in imminent danger of collapse. Traffic is presently moving through lock No. 7 in grave peril because a lateral movement of the hill and esplanade adjoining the locks is pushing this lock into the river. Facilities would be blocked for many months if collapse should occur. The Corps of Engineers has assigned a benefit-to-cost ratio of 2.7, but it is thought that this estimate may be far too conservative.

Item No. 5, Pike Island locks and dam, proposes construction of a dam and two locks to replace obsolete and inadequate locks and dams Nos. 10 and 11, which were constructed between 1904 and 1916. The engineers report a benefit-to-cost ratio of 1.8 to 1, an estimate which is thought to be very conservative.

Mr. Chairman, the Ohio River is one of the most important inland waterways of the world. It is the vital link between the northern industrial States, such as West Virginia, Pennsylvania, and Ohio, and the South and southern gulf ports. The prod-

ucts which it bears in vast quantities are iron and steel; coal and coke for the manufacture of iron and steel; fuel oil, gasoline and other petroleum products; sulphur; limestone, and iron and steel scrap. Tonnages of traffic are very large and have been constantly increasing. For example, in 1945 annual tonnage was about 34 million; in 1950 it approached 50 million tons and in 1957 it was over 81 million tons, of which over 13 million tons consisting mainly of coal, oil and gasoline, and iron and steel products, passed through the project area. Traffic shipments of steel on the Ohio River have increased 414 percent over what they were in 1945. Coal shipments have increased 225 percent. Petroleum shipments on the Ohio have increased 181 percent over 1945, and shipments of chemicals have increased 244 percent. Overall traffic on the Ohio River has increased, in the past 43 years, at a rate nearly three times the rate of growth of the gross national product. Tonnage shipments on this river are now one and one-half times those of the Panama Canal and they already exceed the expected ultimate capacity of the St. Lawrence Seaway by about 50 percent. It can easily be seen that the traffic on the Ohio River is undergoing a tremendous growth change.

The basic iron and steel industry is dependent upon river transportation via the Ohio River. Steel manufacturers at Pittsburgh, Pa., Weirton, W. Va., Steubenville, Ohio, Wheeling, W. Va., and points downstream use the river extensively to ship their finished products. The heavy concentration of steel production below Pittsburgh receives practically all of its requirements of coking coal in barges which traverse the Ohio, and much of its limestone and other important operating supplies are delivered in the same manner. Their dependence upon river transportation is not merely a matter of operating economy, but if river shipments were halted for any appreciable length of time their operations would be critically curtailed. Mr. Chairman, a failure to provide the funds I have requested will mean a costly delay in replacing the obsolete and inadequate facilities on this heavily traveled waterway.

Item No. 6, Opekiska locks and dams, will replace existing locks and dams Nos. 14 and 15 of the Monongahela River. This will complete the modernization of the upper Monongahela. Vast reserves of metallurgical coal lie in the area along this portion of the river, and completion of the project will make possible better access to these reserves.

Item No. 7, Hildegrand locks and dam, a replacement for existing locks and dams Nos. 12 and 13, is an integral unit in the comprehensive plan of improvement of the upper Monongahela River. Traffic from this area consists principally of coal, sand, and gravel while traffic from downriver points into the area consists of petroleum and steel products. Although the increase in traffic through this reach of the river has been substantial through the years, the lack of adequate navigation facilities on the upper river has hindered movement of much greater prospective tonnage of coal reserves from the continguous area. These reserves are ample to sustain for an indefinite period of time a much greater production rate than that currently being utilized. An improved waterway will provide a water outlet for a large part of the production of the Fairmont coal district similar to that now existing on the lower river. The increased channel width and depth along with increased lock sizes for the upper river will permit full loading of standard coal barges and the efficient movement of Monongahela River standard six-barge tows without breaking and reassembling the tows during lockage, resulting in appreciable transportation savings through reduced line haul costs, more efficient use of towing equipment, fewer lockages, and savings in operating time. It is anticipated that extension of a deeper channel will result in additional movement of petroleum products in the upper river. Bulk storage centers at the head of the existing deep draft navigation below Morgantown are actually on the fringe of the area to which distribution is now made by truck. Upon provision of adeqaute navigation facilities, Fairmont, which is the geographical hub of the service area, will probably develop as a storage and distribution center for gasoline. The life of existing locks and dams Nos. 12 and 13, which were constructed during the period 1901–3, cannot be extended to meet the burden of a greatly increased traffic. In addition more economical operation and maintenance for the Government will result from replacement of these old and obsolete structures with one modern lock and dam at the Hildegrand site.

Item No. 8, Dam No. 8. Completion of this project, together with the Hildegrand project, would give the steel industry better access to the rich coal reserves in the upper Monongahela River. Under existing conditions, barges navigating pool 8 must be loaded to less than 70 percent capacity due to the restricted depth of the upper reaches of pool 8.

Item No. 9, Williamson. The total cost of this project is estimated at $707,000, of which $665,000 is Federal and $42,000 is local. To date, $4,000 has been appropriated to cover costs of preauthorization studies. The project is located on the right bank of Tug Fork in Mingo County, W. Va., about 57 miles above the junction of Tug and Levisa Forks which form the Big Sandy River. The plan of improvement which contemplates construction of about 2,700 feet of concrete wall, 3 pumping stations and appurtenant work. The project will provide protection to almost the entire city of Williamson from floods equal to the maximum of record (January 1957). The Engineers' benefit-to-cost ratio for this project is 1.2 to 1.

Item No. 10, Princeton. The Engineers' benefit-to-cost ratio for this project is 1.8 to 1. The plan of improvement provides for enlarging, straightening and clearing Brush Creek, Christian and Glady Fork for a total distance of 21,000 feet together with necessary alterations of railroad and highway relocations. The plan of improvement will give protection from flows about 20 percent greater than that experienced in June 1924, the maximum for which there are reliable data.

Item No. 11, East Rainelle. The project is located on Meadow River in Greenbrier County, W. Va. The proposed plan of improvement provides for widening and deepening the channel of Meadow River for 2.47 miles below the mouth of Sewell Creek; improving the channel of Sewell Creek, a distance of 5,450 feet upstream from its mouth and improving Boggs Creek for a distance of 3,230 feet above its mouth. The plan of improvement will provide near complete protection to East Rainelle from floods equivalent to that of record and partial protection from greater floods. The engineers' benefit-to-cost ratio for this project is 2 to 1.

Item No. 12, Summersville Reservoir. Construction of this project will materially affect the well-being of a large segment of the population of the greater Kanawha Valley, in which Charleston, W. Va., is situated, and will be a major factor in attracting new industries because it will not only contribute to flood prevention but it will also insure an even and ample flow of water for industrial plants in the Charleston area during the dry season. An appropriation of $2 million would permit work to be initiated immediately toward the construction of the access roads, spillways, and other necessary preliminary operations. Completion of the Summersville project would considerably reduce a flood hazard that exists in the narrow and densely occupied industrial Kanawha River Valley. Extreme floods of record have inundated virtually the entire valley floor, and the occurrence of a great flood similar to that of 1861 under the present congested condition of the valley would result in stark tragedy. The flood of 1861 covered the area now occupied by the Charleston business district to depths ranging from 2 to 11 feet and residential areas were flooded to like depths. The Bluestone Reservoir, on New River, controls but 4,565 square miles of the drainage area above Charleston, which totals 10,420 square miles, and it is apparent that additional reservoir control is required to assure dependable protection from major floods. The industrial developments on the flood plain at and below Charleston, located at the confluence of the Elk and Kanawha Rivers, include great basic alcohol, ammonia and chlorine products plants which help to make the Kanawha Valley one of the greatest chemical centers of the world, a major U.S. naval ordnance plant, and large general manufacturing industries, all of which are of utmost importance to the national defense and economic welfare. A major portion of the processing and manufacturing works of the Carbide & Carbon Chemicals Corp. is located on a large island in the Kanawha River downstream from Charleston. The island is subject to inundation by major floods, and if flooded, damage to the property on this island alone would amount to over $6 million. The major industries located in the flood plain have a combined value of over $1 billion and an extreme flood, similar to that of 1861, would result in a major degree of destruction to most of the plants and force some of them out of operation for undetermined but long periods of time. This project will also make available a source of water which will be of general benefit to downstream areas as a result of low flow regulation.

Completion of the project at the earliest possible date is very desirable to furnish flood protection in the highly industrialized areas downstream. The Kanawha Valley has experienced rapid industrial expansion in recent years and many new industrial developments continue to locate in the flood plain. A high percentage of the industries crowded into the narrow valley are essential to the national economy of the country and the Kanawha Valley industrial center is considered to constitute one of the major flood risks in the Nation at this time.

Mr. Chairman, I thank you again for permitting me this opportunity to appear in behalf of the items I have covered. I trust that the committee will give favorable consideration to each and all of the projects mentioned.

I Wish a Tax Cut Could Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN L. HRUSKA

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 11, 1959

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, Mr. Melvin E. Rasdal of Ogallala, Nebr., a good and loyal friend of many years' standing, wrote me a few days ago:

You have undoubtedly seen the agriculture editorial in the April 20 issue of Life.

Our daughter Gerry, who lives on a farm—medium size for this area, 1,440 acres—has

written them a reply which I have had reproduced.

Am enclosing a copy of her letter to them and a couple of copies of her article, which may be of interest to you.

My friend Rasdal is a hardheaded businessman. He is an owner and farmer of land out in his area. He is an independent thinker. As such, I am sure he is justifiably proud of the letter written by his daughter, Geraldine, Mrs. E. E. Kleist; and I am sure that such pride is equally held by her mother.

She writes vigorously and realistically—as her parents and as her life in the West have taught her to do. Her thoughts make sense.

Just as an example, I quote one of the paragraphs which she composed:

You say the well-situated farmer can take care of himself and, therefore, needs no subsidy to stay in business. Please be more specific; if you can really tell us what to do, our ears are open and you have our rapt attention. It does not seem fair to me to snipe at the large holder, surely his investment is proportionately large. But if we do remove subsidies and controls, let us remove them all. Let us operate in a totally free economy, entirely dependent upon supply and demand. Among controls to be eliminated will be antitrust regulations, tariffs and import quotas, price agreements, collective bargaining, wage and hour laws. Let us omit subsidies in the form of tax-free depletion allowances on petroleum, natural gas and minerals, those inherent in the Government cost-plus contract, war reconversion payments to business after World War II, those paid direct to public carriers and in the form of reduced postal rates to magazines, newspapers and advertisers (and here goes your job, because then most of us can no longer afford our subscriptions). As a matter of fact, Congressman MARSHALL, in a recent study, found these figures as regards this situation: farm support losses from 1933–57 were $5.1 billion, but these mail subsidies from 1946–56 were $6 billion, and the reconversion payments mentioned totaled $43.3 billion. I'm not an economist, and I cannot name enough large business subsidies to make my case, but it is time to stop picturing the farmer as an ogre of American economy. When you are ready to "sock" that man for raising the price of your food and your shirt, take another look at the cost-of-living graphs. The minor decreases they show for the past few months have resulted largely from lower prices paid farmers for their produce. Any increases you find at your grocers must be credited to the processor or transporter.

Mr. President, the unfairness and inaccuracy of some of the city press and some representatives from urban districts in regard to the appropriations bill for the Department of Agriculture, totaling an amount approximating $7 billion, is very unfair.

Even a very casual analysis of this total will show that only a small portion of that $7 billion will ever reach the pockets of the farmers.

For example, about $3 billion of this budget will be earmarked for price support loans on commodities which the Government will eventually sell for about $2.5 billion, or give away under various foreign aid programs.

Another $1 billion will be paid to private firms for storage of surpluses.

About $1.5 billion will be used to finance sales abroad at cut-rate prices. This is not farm aid; it is foreign aid, and should be considered and referred to accordingly.

The school milk and lunch programs and food distribution to the needy, plus food label protection, pest and disease control, and improvement of food quality, take about one-half billion dollars.

Part of the agriculture budget is used to finance loans to the Rural Electrification and to the Farmers Home Administrations. These are gilt edge investments and will be repaid in full, with interest. These total about $650 million.

When the nonfarm items in the budget are removed, only a little more than $1 billion actually will reach the farmers, and that mostly for carrying out practices prescribed by the Government for conserving our soil, water, and other natural resources.

Mr. President, I highly commend the letter of Mrs. E. E. (Geraldine) Rasdal Kleist to my colleagues in the Senate, and to all readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, under the title, "I Wish a Tax Cut Could Aid."

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I WISH A TAX CUT COULD AID

TO EDITOR OF LIFE MAGAZINE:

Some Sundays ago a gentleman being interviewed on an NBC program, remarked we had not come far toward our goal of international peace because we could not really communicate, that we had developed no international language. Then he added that even in this country where we speak the same language and idiom, there were insurmountable barriers to communication, because of sectional and occupational differences in ideology.

A good share of the responsibility for this lack of understanding rests squarely upon the shoulders of our mass media publications, including Life magazine.

I am speaking specifically of your editorial "A Tax Cut You Can Aid," in the April 20, 1959, issue. To begin with, I do not follow the journalistic policy which counts it an honor to have a byline on a news story which purports to be factual, and, therefore, should be the same no matter who the author might be; and then presents, with all the courage of an anonymous letter, an unsigned editorial. I don't suppose this matters; I looked over your list of editors, and I don't know them. I did notice, however, you maintain a library and support a research staff. Are not editors, as well as reporters, required to check with them?

By now, I am sure, it is apparent I am a rural denizen. More than that, I am wife and partner, both by law and way of life to that anathema to the American economy, a wheat farmer.

I would like to have as my guest, for a few days, any of your editors or reporters. I would like to show them our operation and the operations of some of our friends and neighbors, people who farm big and people who farm small, as well as those, like us, who stand between.

Your editorial talks of farmers putting entire farms in the soil bank and doing nothing. I would like to know where such farmers live. In our area, the price of land, tax rates, etc., make this economically unfeasible; land cannot profitably be taken out of production.

The assertion as regards storage charges is accurate, but who set such a ridiculous fee? The farmer would gladly have binned surplus at a much lower rate. Yet, in print, it seems the farmer gluttonously milks the public funds therefor.

We have an intolerable surplus of wheat, and no one would rather see it disappear than the farmer. Yet the recommendations of a commission to explore the possibilities of research for extended industrial uses of grain (appointed by Eisenhower and headed by grainman LeRoy Welsh of Omaha, Nebr.) are ignored because the current Agriculture Department says they are already conducting such research. Have you heard of any such? The agricultural schools and stations in this vicinity are busy extending yields, not markets, and as they are currently set up, that is all they can do.

When the industrialist or businessman sets up shop, he sets the lowest price at which he can make an adequate profit and if people don't buy, he quits. The farmer plants, and after gambling on weather, bugs, and the unknown caprices of development, must sell for whatever price he is bid. He cannot control his selling price at all. Of course, like the business man, he can quit, but is this really what the public wants? Only an approximate 10 percent of our present population, I have read, is actively engaged in farming, but another 35 percent is in work directly connected with farming, that is, in the furnishing of farming supplies to the operator and in the marketing of his produce. Do you realize the segment of our population he takes with him when he goes down? Where are all of us to go?

You say the well-situated farmer can take care of himself and, therefore, needs no subsidy to stay in business. Please be more specific; if you can really tell us what to do, our ears are open and you have our rapt attention. It does not seem fair to me to snipe at the large holder, surely his investment is proportionately large. But if we do remove subsidies and controls, let us remove them all. Let us operate in a totally free economy, entirely dependent upon supply and demand. Among controls to be eliminated will be antitrust regulations, tariffs and import quotas, price agreements, collective bargaining, wage and hour laws. Let us omit subsidies in the form of tax-free depletion allowances on petroleum, natural gas and minerals, those inherent in the government cost-plus contract, war reconversion payments to business after World War II, those paid direct to public carriers and in the form of reduced postal rates to magazines, newspapers and advertisers (and here goes your job, because then most of us can no longer afford our subscriptions). As a matter of fact, Congressman MARSHALL, in a recent study, found these figures as regards this situation: Farm support losses from 1933–57 were $5.1 billion, but these mail subsidies from 1946–56 were $6 billion, and the reconversion payments mentioned totaled $43.3 billion. I'm not an economist, and I cannot name enough large business subsidies to make my case, but it is time to stop picturing the farmer as the ogre of American economy. When you are ready to sock that man for raising the price of your food and your shirt, take another look at the cost of living graphs. The minor decreases they show for the past few months have resulted largely from lower prices paid farmers for their produce. Any increases you find at your grocers must be credited to the processor or transporter.

You speak of the jolt to the small farmer on marginal land. How small? How marginal? This area where I live is wheat country. We've experimented with other crops, but it is a rare year when anything else can be made to show a profit. We raise good wheat, so high in gluten quality that millers send from far away to mix it with

wheat grown elsewhere for the gluten necessary for good baking. Therefore, after a period of adjustment, we would, perhaps, fare well on the open market since, currently, poor grades of wheat are supported on the same basis as our high-grade milling wheat. A leading factor in the loss of world wheat markets by the United States has arisen from this lack of standards which has extended to wheat offered for export. Wheatgrowers associations from several good wheat areas have had representatives at foreign trade fairs, have sent delegations abroad and received delegations from abroad, and have set up permanent bureaus with paid agents in various countries which buy wheat. Each time the story is the same; if we can guarantee delivery as per sample they want to buy at a good price, but to date difficulties have been placed in the way of such guarantees because they discriminate against other wheatgrowers. Worse, the potential customer tells us, they have received, in the past, not only poor grade wheat, but wheat that has been full of contaminating material. This is in spite of strict inspection of our wheat when it is received at our local elevators and its supposed protection and continued inspection as it proceeds upon its way.

But we wheatgrowers are not the only persons concerned with this price of wheat. The United States is also oversupplied with corn, sorghums, other small grains, and ensilage grasses. When the wheat price becomes low enough to compete with these as a feed grain, the price of meat tumbles too. And even in an industrial society, such as we have become, agriculture is still the foundation industry. Therefore, this one ghost, the supported wheat price, becomes an army of spectres to haunt us all.

Do I sound as if we do not want out? Or as if I do not think there is a way out? Every farmer I know wants out of this controlled situation, but he also likes to eat and to feed his family. He knows there is no quick reform; if you drop this bucket of water it will cause a flood. About the way out? The farmer is no longer a rube any more than the factory worker is a tenement dweller, but he still must be the individualist of fable. Differences of opinion in local discussion, differences of policy among farm organizations, differences in farming practices from area to area have so far made a united farm front with a strong lobby impossible. However, opposition to farmers and to any farm program such as one currently finds in the press does nothing to improve the situation and can only bring ruin to us all.

GERALDINE KLEIST.
(Mrs. E. E.)

The Current Methed of Paying Our Retired Servicemen Is Unfair

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 11, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, under the military pay bill passed in 1958, members of the Armed Forces who retire after May 31, 1958, receive pensions based upon a percentage of the current pay for persons on active duty. This is much higher than the percentage of those members of the Armed Forces already retired.

A straight 6-percent increase was granted to those who retired prior to May 31, 1958, and the new bill carries provisions which make persons with equal service and rank receive different allotments, depending on their retirement date.

It is unfair treatment for prior retirees who served their country honorably and well, both in combat and peacetime. It is discriminatory in favor of some military retirees, and against other military retirees.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two resolutions and two editorials.

The first resolution, by Texas State Senator Henry B. Gonzalez, was passed by the Texas Legislature in April 1959.

The second was passed March 19, 1959 by the San Antonio, Tex., chapter of the Military Order of the World Wars.

The first editorial appeared in the Saturday Evening Post for March 21, 1959, under the heading, "The Military Pay Act Does Injustice to Retired Servicemen."

The second is from the Austin (Tex.) Statesman for February 20, 1959, written by Mr. R. O. Zollinger, and entitled "Chiseling of the Retired."

There being no objection, the resolutions and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 41

"Whereas there is now pending before the Congress of the United States, legislation concerning the improvement of benefits for retired members of the U.S. Armed Forces who retired prior to June 1, 1958; and

"Whereas there apepars to be no basis for the gross discrimination against retired personnel who retired before June 1, 1958, as they are, by reason of past meritorious services, equally entitled to the increased benefits granted personnel who retire, or have retired after such date; and

"Whereas this false distinction violates the basic precepts of fair play, and the circumstances of retirement should not penalize these honorable members of our society, who must meet the present ever increasing cost of living the same as personnel that retired after June 1, 1958: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of Texas (the House of Representatives concurring), That the legislature of the State of Texas respectfully requests the Congress of the United States to enact legislation that will increase the retirement benefits of the retired personnel, who retired prior to June 1, 1958, so that they will be treated equally with personnel who retire, or have retired, after such date.

"BEN RAMSEY,
"President of the Senate.
"WAGGONER CARR,
"Speaker of the House."

I hereby certify that Senate Concurrent Resolution 41 was adopted by the senate on March 25, 1959.

CHARLES SCHNABEL,
Secretary of the Senate.

I hereby certify that Senate Concurrent Resolution 41 was adopted by the house on April 3, 1959.

DOROTHY HALLMAN,
Chief Clerk of the House.

RESOLUTION OF THE MILITARY ORDER OF THE WORLD WARS, SAN ANTONIO, TEX., CHAPTER

Whereas military retirement and its firm tie-in with active duty compensation is perhaps the most powerful long-term career incentive existing within the military compensation system; and

Whereas the Cordiner Committee said of this recommended feature now abandoned by Public Law 422 of the 85th Congress: "The Committee has therefore concluded that the incentive value of this existing military retirement program depends to a major degree upon its integral relationship with active duty compensation and the confidence which has been built up in the military body that no breach of faith or breach of retirement contract has ever been permitted by the Congress and the American people"; and

Whereas it is estimated that the cost to the Government of this amendatory legislation will not exceed the sum of $25 million for the first year, with an annual diminution of this amount because of attrition until no part of this sum is longer needed; and

Whereas this law should be amended to comply both with the recommendation and with the long standing tradition which has been, and remains, the major incentive to retention of military personnel, as well as being economically feasible to the Government: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the San Antonio, Tex., Chapter of the Military Order of the World Wars, at San Antonio, Tex., this 19th day of March 1959, That we urge upon the Congress the enactment of amendatory legislation to Public Law 422 of the 85th Congress to restore the incentive feature embodied in this historical relationship between active duty pay and retired pay, in order to insure the highest caliber of personnel for our national defense.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this 19th day of March 1959.

ROBERT E. JOSEPH,
Colonel, U.S. Army, Retired,
Commander.

[From the Saturday Evening Post, Mar. 21, 1959]

THE MILITARY PAY ACT DOES INJUSTICE TO RETIRED SERVICEMEN

The recommendation by a Committee, headed by Ralph J. Cordiner, which was assigned by the Defense Department to investigate service pay, was that pay for naval, military and airmen who have earned their retirement should be geared to the current pay which is received in active service. In other words, if the pay for an admiral or an Army sergeant on active duty is increased 10 percent, his pay after he retires will be increased by 10 percent. Up to this point, this is how service retirement has been handled for many years, and that is how it is treated in the Military Pay Act of 1958, as to those retired after its effective date, June 1, 1958.

However, in the bill passed at the last session of Congress, this relationship between active-duty pay and retired pay is, with certain exceptions, not applied to men already retired. They were given a flat 6-percent increase across the board. This results in all sorts of anomalies, including one mentioned by the Washington Star in which a major general who retired a few months before the bill became law received approximately $1,900 a year less than an officer of equal rank who retired after the effective date.

A difference between military retired pay and civilian retired pay, which stays put no matter what happens to the pay of active workers, is that the retired military man is not really retired at all. He is still subject to the Uniform Code of Military Justice; he is subject to recall in emergency or at the pleasure of the Defense Department. Thus it is logical that his pay on the retired list should be geared to his pay when on active duty. But the central reason is that pay in the armed services is generally less than for

the same grade of ability in civilian life, and some added compensation at retirement is fair and just.

It seems to us that restoration by the new Congress of the traditional relationship between the pay of active-service officers and men and the pay of retired military personnel would pay dividends in several respects. In the first place, of course, it would correct an injustice to the officers and enlisted men already retired, who are certainly hit as hard by inflationary prices as will be the men to be retired later. But the change could also have an important effect on the ability of the services to persuade men to make military service a permanent career.

[From the Austin (Tex.) Statesman, Feb. 20, 1959]

CHISELING OF THE RETIRED

The fairness of the retirement pay system for officers who have served their country faithfully and well is in question. Why should one group of officers get less than another of equal rank and attainment?

Yet that's the provision now operating. Simply because one group retired before what appears to be an arbitrarily set date, June 1, 1958, they get less retirement pay than had they retired after that date.

The case of two colonels provides an example which shows the lack of justice in two pay schedules for those of equal merit and service.

The first retired before June 1, 1958. Yet he gets $139 less per month retirement pay than the other colonel who retired after June 1, 1958, with even less service.

We will not here go into the complex details of kinds of service because to a layman they tend to confusion. But what is happening is discrimination of a distressing order. It means that one group of colonels, for instance, are drawing less pay because of retirement before June 1, 1958, than those retiring after that date.

The date has no significance either as to war or peace other than a cutoff point which favors one group retiring after that date and penalizes the other group, both having equal merit and service, because of retirement later. The colonel retiring after that date gets $139 per month more than the one retiring earlier.

These men in both classifications have given most of their lives to the service of their country, yet one group receives the due of recognition in retirement pay that is denied the other group simply because of a date marked on the calendar.

A number of bills in both Houses of Congress have been introduced to rectify this injustice and equalize the pay of retired officers of the uniformed services.

They provide that notwithstanding any other provision of law—the one setting up the arbitrary date of June 1, 1958—that retired pay of any officer entitled to retired pay under the terms of the Career Compensation Act and entitled to such pay on May 31, 1958, shall be based on the pay scales which became effective June 1, 1958, under the provisions of the law passed by the 85th Congress.

Stipulation is made in these bills that nothing in the proposed act shall operate to reduce the pay of any member of the uniformed services now on the retired list.

The House bills have been referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

Considerations of equity, fair play, and refusal to further discriminate in the amount of retirement pay dictates that this adjustment be made to rectify the injustice involved. It is to be hoped that Congress will act speedily.

The morale of those now serving their country, many in internationally sensitive posts, will be tremendously strengthened by abandonment of this arbitrary calendar measuring stick.

Middleburg, Fla., and Chicago, Ill., Have Much In Common When It Comes to Young Folk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 11, 1959

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, problems connected with growing up are not as different in different sections of our country and in various-sized communities as accounts sometimes would lead us to believe. I bring the attention of Congress to a "Study of the Chicago Board of Education Summer School Program" as prepared by Hirris C. Long, superintendent of public instruction of Clay County. Mr. Long has been particularly interested in the utilization of schools on a year-round basis and this has also been a strong interest of J. P. Tynes, principal of the Middleburg School, in Clay County. A national leader in the movement toward year-round schools with three-quarters of the school year compulsory, is S. B. Jennings, Middleburg, Fla., a son of one of the outstanding Governors of Florida. Mr. Jennings has sent me a statement entitled "What Leading Educators and Scientists Say About Our Schools." I include it at this point in the RECORD.

WHAT LEADING EDUCATORS AND SCIENTISTS SAY ABOUT OUR SCHOOLS

(By S. B. Jennings, Middleburg, Fla.)

Dr. Robert M. Hutchins warns: "An uncriticized culture cannot long endure." (Rickover.)

H. G. Wells remarked: "Civilization is a race between education and catastrophe."

Dr. Grayson Kirk, president of Columbia University, New York City, in the NEA Journal, March 1959, advocates dividing the academic year in higher education into three parts, one of which would, in effect, replace the present 6-week summer school. He calls this a trimester. Scores of millions of dollars in physical plants remain largely idle for several months.

Dr. Conant (Look magazine, Oct. 14, 1958) said: "The school year will be longer. In this time of classroom and teacher shortages, educators are worried about having their buildings stand empty for up to 3 months every year. The school year may be lengthened; regular summer schools will be put to better use."

On March 17, 1956, John K. Norton, of Teachers College, Columbia University, said: "It is generally recognized that one of the primary blocks to adequate local and State support of education is the more than $60 billion Federal budget."

President Grayson Kirk warned that the primary purpose of any school is education, not social adjustment. "The student becomes educated by hard work, not by entertainment."

From the Institute for Social Science Research: "There is nothing wrong with U.S. high schools today that the communities themselves cannot fix if they put their minds to it." (Dr. Conant, San Francisco, quoted in Florida Times Union, Jan. 28, 1959.)

"Item 17. Tuition-free summer school. Work should be available for the bright, as well as those repeating a subject." (Dr. Conant, San Francisco, quoted in Jacksonville Journal, Jan. 28, 1959.)

"Soviet schools run 10,742 hours; American 10,710 hours. But they get through in 10 years, we in 12. We pay $64.42 per capita for education, the Soviets $36.42. (From Institute for Social Science Research.)

Admiral Rickover said: "I believe we can win the race, but not on a 180-day school year. The future belongs to the best educated nations. Let it be ours."

It seems to me that we need better utilization of equipment, buildings, and teachers; and curriculum should be academic and not entertainment.

Mr. Speaker, now I would like to conclude with the inclusion in the RECORD of the study made by Mr. Long which is as follows:

A STUDY OF THE CHICAGO BOARD OF EDUCATION'S SUMMER SCHOOL PROGRAM

(By Hirris C. Long, superintendent of public instruction, Clay County, Fla.)

The history of public education in the United States presents a vivid picture of how the needs of our people have been served by our schools throughout the years. As our social structure has changed from a rural agricultural to an urban industrial economy the requirements of more education and more diversified offerings have been met by broadening the curriculum and extending the program. These additions have resulted, over the years, in the lengthening of both the school day and the school year. The quickened tempo of modern living has brought about even greater demands, and the schools have responded with summer programs providing courses which are designed to stimulate the more capable students to greater progress, as well as those offerings which serve to strengthen foundational areas for slower students enabling them to keep pace with their classmates.

The summer schools have been part of the program of the Chicago public schools for nearly 50 years. During this period several patterns of organizations have been used in providing this service for Chicago's pupils. As early as 1909, the Chicago board of education included appropriations for "vacation schools" in the budget. However, a nominal registration fee paid by the students helped to defray expenses. By 1931, the summer program included 20 elementary schools, 7 junior high schools, 12 high schools, and 2 public colleges, offering classes for the appropriate levels of students.

As a part of the retrenchment program during the depression years, the board of education deleted appropriations for summer schools from its 1932 budget. However, the public demand for summer school opportunities for children was such that programs were provided for students on a self-supporting-tuition basis beginning in the summer of 1932. The board of education granted the use of buildings and textbooks, while tuition fees were established to cover the salaries of principals, teachers, clerks, and janitors, and the cost of incidental supplies. This pattern continued for the next 22 years, and by 1954 the summer program was financed by a fee schedule as follows: High school—one major, $20; two majors, $35; and elementary schools, $20.

The fees received through this program were prorated among the staff in proportion to the normal salary levels of those participating. In the summer of 1954, 9,253 students enrolled for courses under this tuition arrangement.

Recognizing the importance of providing equal opportunities for all pupils regardless of their ability to pay tuition, the Chicago board of education included an appropriation for summer schools in its budget for 1955. This expanded program of services was enthusiastically received by the children of Chicago as it shown by the enrollment of 1955 of 12,732 and by 1958 the number had grown to 35,126. Of this 1958 enrollment, 26,530 were in the high schools, 8,596 in the elementary schools of which 4,440 were regular students and 4,156 remedial.

The importance of this educational opportunity for youngsters can be further appreciated when it is noted that 1,402 graduated in the 1958 summer school—691 from the elementary schools and 711 from the high schools. All evidence indicates an increasing interest in this program in the years to come.

Advantages accruing to pupils and to the school system as a result of tuition-free summer schools may be summarized as follows:

1. Pupils are enabled to complete the elementary and high school course of study in fewer than 12 years.

2. Gifted children are provided with special opportunities on the high level of their abilities.

3. Slow pupils are enabled to keep up with their normal grade.

4. Those entering military service at 18 years of age are helped by securing more schooling before being called to service.

5. Pupils with reading problems are afforded extra help.

6. Students are enabled to change from a February to a June graduation.

The cost of operating summer schools is moderate, with salaries of principals, teachers, and clerks constituting the major portion. The summer program uses existing facilities and the services of the assigned maintenance and operational staff. The cost of providing summer school opportunities in 1958 in both elementary and high school, was approximately $40 per pupil, as compared to $150 during the regular semester. This is direct evidence that the provision of a summer school program reflects wise stewardship of the public's resources.

More efficient use of the school plant is brought about as a result of the summer program. Both buildings and educational equipment are utilized for the full year instead of remaining idle during the entire summer.

This additional service to boys and girls is provided with no additional capital investment and actually helps reduce the need for more school buildings, by enabling pupils who have failed to be promoted with their class, thus eliminating the need for extra classrooms for this retained group. In 1958 the summer elementary school graduates alone made 691 seats available for additional students in September 1959. This is the equivalent of 1 average elementary school building; also the 711 students who graduated from high school were removed from the school rolls 1 semester early, and released approximately 23 classrooms.

This program is sought by youth on the basis of their individual needs. Reflecting the high level of motivation of those seeking this opportunity, the quality of work done in this program has made a significant contribution to the educational level of the student body served.

These students come because they wish to learn more about certain subjects for enrichment purposes, because they wish to remove academic deficiencies in fundamental skills and stay with their class and agemates, and because they wish to accelerate their program of education and graduate earlier than they would in the conventional pattern. Housed in the ample facilities available and using instructional materials which would otherwise lie idle, these boys and girls receive an outstanding program of education from experienced members of our teaching staff.

CHICAGO'S SUMMER-SCHOOL SESSION CONCENTRATES ON ACCREDITED ACADEMIC WORK

The Chicago Board of Education offers mostly academic subjects during this 8-week summer session. They offer very few recreational activities such as swimming, gym, softball, baseball, arts and crafts, story telling, library services, etc. This type of summer recreation is sponsored by the Chicago Park District, supported by a special tax levy.

The school system of Chicago has thus eliminated all exclusively recreational courses and offers only the recreation that can be normally found during the regular school term, and pupils wishing to participate must be enrolled for academic subjects.

TAX SUPPORTED BY THE CITY OF CHICAGO

The Chicago Board of Education supports the summer school entirely from local tax sources. No State aid is obtained for this program. A concerted legislative program is planned to obtain State aid for the summer-school session.

SUMMARY

In effect, the Chicago public schools have developed a pattern of summer-school organization which provides for a 12-month school opportunity for the youth of the city on a positive basis through the attractiveness of the program.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

In concluding this study of the summer-school system of the city of Chicago, I wish to express my appreciation to Mr. Benjamin C. Willis, superintendent of the Chicago City Schools, for arranging a meeting in Chicago for me and Mr. J. P. Tynes, principal of the Middleburg School, who assisted me in this study. I also express appreciation to Mr. David J. Heffernan, assistant superintendent, and to Dr. Burton Duffie, director of the summer-school program, for the data, information, and time given, and for the many courtesies extended to us.

I hope that this study will lead to an enlarged opportunity for all of our children—to keep busy, out of trouble, escape boredom, and have an expanded educational program in keeping with the ever-soaring horizon of the missile age.

State of Oregon Preparing 100th Birthday Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 11, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the principal event of Oregon's 1959 statehood centennial celebration—the Centennial Exposition and Trade Fair—will not open until June 10, but the State of Oregon is alive now with the excitement of its 100th birthday party.

Robert McBride, a talented young writer on the editorial staff of the Oregon Daily Journal in my hometown of Portland, has written an excellent story, which was published in the travel section of the New York Times of Sunday, May 10, 1959, describing current and coming centennial events, and natural attractions available to visitors who come to Oregon this year, to help us celebrate 100 years of statehood.

I ask unanimous consent that Robert McBride's article, entitled "Oregon's Jubilee Year is Under Way," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, together with a second article on Oregon's centennial which I wrote for the New York Times of Sunday, March 29, 1959. The title of my article is "Oregon Celebrates Its Centennial Year."

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Sunday, May 10, 1959.]

OREGON'S JUBILEE YEAR IS UNDERWAY

(By Robert McBride)

PORTLAND, OREG.—The residents of this State celebrate at the drop of a tree or a rose or a raspberry, and this centennial summer will be their biggest, wildest blowout in more than 50 years.

Among the things to see and do will be the largest exposition and international trade fair in the West in a decade. It opens June 10 in Portland, with dozens of rodeos, festivals, parades, symphony concerts, operas, frog-jumping contests, sham holdups, fistfights and national Indian games to follow.

The centennial is just now getting into its stride and the excitement will not ease until late September. Not since the Lewis and Clark Fair of 1905 has so much money been spent and so much time been given toward making Oregon attractive to the summer traveler.

The only way of traveling in which one can truly experience the sweep and throb of this land is on horseback. But the next best way is by automobile.

The old Oregon Trail begins at Independence, Mo. It is concrete and asphalt now, but much of the land on the other side of the ditch will look to today's travelers the way it did from the seat of a covered wagon in 1859.

Eastern Oregon is an area of rolling plains, deserts, mountains, and cool forests. It is ranch and farm country. They do not grow corn as high as an elephant's eye, but they grow real cowboys and straight-backed herefords, and they have some of the wildest scenery in America.

MESAS AND VALLEYS

In the Big Basin country of southeast Oregon, rimrock mesas reach into quiet valleys and meadowlands, deer and antelope roam undisturbed, and hundreds of other species of birds and animals live under the protection of the Malheur National Wildlife Refuge.

The eastern division of the refuge extends from the head of Malheur Lake to the southern extremity of the lake at French Glen, a distance of 53 miles. Both these points are marked by high, steel towers which carry the symbol of the refuge, the sign of the flying wild goose. Adjacent to the refuge are hundreds of thousands of acres of land ranged by great herds of cattle and sheep.

Malheur Lake, its 40,000-acre maze of marsh, and its bullrushes and cattails is the breeding, resting, and feeding place for more than 200 species of water birds, including bitterns, rails, ibis, avocets, willets and snipes of several varieties in the refuge. Here, also, is the habitat of the fabulous American egret.

To the south and east of the 160,000 acre refuge are the incomparably beautiful and lonely Steens Mountains and the Blitzen Valley. The setting here harks back to the time when the West was young. Cattle ranching goes on as it has since pioneer times. Stately sandhill cranes, Canada geese, fat mule deer and noisy terns mingle with the cattle in the great meadow lands of the Blitzen, which falls south from Malheur Lake.

COOL AREA

East of the valley the Steens rise to a cool 9,000 feet, offering pleasant relief in summer from the heat. An ideal camping spot in the Steens is Fish Lake, eighteen miles of graveled road from French Glen.

No camping is allowed in the refuge itself, because there are no developed campsites and the danger of an uncontrollable fire in the meadows is great.

In a setting of lingering snow banks, rustling, quaking aspens and mountain mahogany, 7,600-foot-high Fish Lake is the air-conditioned summer retreat of this entire area. Its 25 acres contain both brook and rainbow trout. Camping facilities are good.

The Steens Mountains are one of the United States' best examples of fault-block formation. The area has several great gorges half a mile deep, chiseled out by ancient glaciers of the Ice Age.

This wonderland of pristine charm has been largely missed by both the tourists and by Oregonians themselves, because the paved highways lead to the places where there is more manmade comfort, food and entertainment.

But those who can take dust in the eyes and the bumps of corduroy roads, the modest fare of a country hotel, or eating out with the cowboys, should steer off the well-traveled trail at Burns, and drive south to the Malheur Refuge. There one can obtain information and directions about where and how best to see and enjoy this wild land.

Just south of Ontario and Nyssa, near the Oregon-Idaho border, is another magnificent fishing and camping spot. This is in the lake behind Owyee Dam. It is 55 miles long and has 300 miles of shoreline, hemmed by a jumble of mountains and sheer cliffs.

Wildlife experts call Owyhee Lake the finest untapped piece of recreational water in eastern Oregon. One must see the lake to appreciate its fantastic desert rock formations. One sails past cliffs and pinnacles with all the colors of the Southwest's deserts. Leslie Gulch, on the upper lake, is comparable to Bryce Canyon National Park.

BIG BUCKS

Hunters get in their boats and fade away from civilization by going far up the lake to hunt the biggest bucks in Oregon. They camp on the shore and bring their bucks out by boat. Crappie are caught by the bucketful and bass reach 8 pounds.

Owyhee Lake is so big that it cannot be fished hard enough to even keep up with the bass and crappie production, according to fishing experts. Mallards by the thousands flock onto the reservoir in the fall, and decoy hunting along the shores is excellent.

The breaks of the Owyhee are the last stronghold of the wild horse of the West. Indian petroglyphs may be seen on the lake cliffs.

Also in eastern Oregon, the traveler will find special centennial events every week in nearly every county.

The Harney County Pioneers' Days will be held at Burns, June 13. The June parimutuel races are scheduled at Ontario, June 10–13.

One of the biggest rodeos and roundups of the West will be held at Pendleton, September 16–19. This is always a colorful and fast-moving show, and this year it is expected to be particularly exciting. One of the features of the roundup is a national Indian encampment. More than 2,000 representatives of American Indian tribes will be camped on the roundup grounds. The encampment will feature a series of races, authentic Indian games and dances.

No report of the natural grandeur of Oregon would be complete without mention of the back-country lakes of the Cascade and Wallowa Mountains. Between 700 and 1,000 of these lakes are found in the two ranges, many of which can be reached by road.

Most of the lakes are stocked with trout and many of them may be reached over well-maintained U.S. Forest Service trails. Others have never had a trail blazed to their shores.

In addition to the pleasure of fishing these lakes, pack trips into them gives one a chance to see some more of Oregon's rugged mountain scenery.

VARIED SCENERY

Here are great areas of uncut forests, sprinkled with flower-filled mountain meadows, deep canyons flanked by snow-laden peaks, and cascades of clear water rushing down the slopes. Here also are deer, bear, game birds, songbirds and small animals. Here are views of Jefferson Park from the Skyline Trail and the breathtaking granite peaks and mountain meadows of the high Wallowas.

Moving on to special centennial events in central Oregon, one might want to visit the Saturday afternoon horseshoe-pitching contests throughout June in Prineville. Those who like rocks, plain or fancy, will be able to see plenty of them at the All Rockhounds powwow in prineville, July 3–5.

The National Field Archers Association will holds its tournament at Bend, July 27–30. Redmond will celebrate the Oregon potato with a festival, September 26.

County fairs and rodeos will be held throughout the central Oregon area by the dozen. At these celebrations the visitor can experience the exhilaration of small-town life in a festival mood.

Albany, a town at the hub of a great timber-producing area, is the host each year to a World Championship Timber Carnival. Set for July 2, 3, and 4, and billed as spectacular, inexpensive and thrilling, the carnival will offer some of the best log chopping, bucking, speed climbing, topping, birling and jousting to be found anywhere.

The center of the centennial, of course, will be the Exposition and International Trade Fair in Portland. Opening with the exposition, June 10, will be the Portland Rose Festival, always an impressive show.

If the pompous, flower sweet pageantry of the Rose Festival's grand floral parade makes the spectator hungry or dries his throat, Portland has dozens of good bars and restaurants. A good steak costs anywhere from $3.50 to $6. Seafood here is among the best.

The exposition will, at the very least, be an entertainment-filled fair. A huge midway is to be set up and about $25 million will be spent on exhibits from atomic energy to Tillamook cheese. Daily and nightly water-ski shows will be staged on the Oregon estuary of the Columbia River, adjacent to the centennial grounds. The trade fair will be second only to that of New York.

The Garden of Tomorrow, 3½ acres of flowers, shrubs and floral displays, will feature a special Japanese garden with a teahouse and a floral clock 32 feet in diameter, planted with several thousand flowers. It will tell time.

Fist fights and gun duels will be features of the Frontier Town. Nightly shows have been booked for the arena of the 11-acre centennial building. Harry Belafonte, Roy Rogers, Japan's Kabuki Dancers, the Ice Capades, and the Aqua Follies already have been signed.

No visitor to Oregon, winter or summer, will want to miss seeing the thundering, sublime, lonely Oregon coast. It is 400 miles long, mostly paralleled by U.S. 101 and nearly every inch owned by the State of Oregon.

There are times when one can walk for miles on sandy beach, with the furious surf of the Pacific pounding in one's ears, without seeing another soul or even another footprint.

ON THE DUNES

Deep-sea fishing, sun bathing on the great Oregon Dunes, golfing, clam digging, surf fishing, overnight camping beside a driftwood fire on the beach, and any number of other possibilities await the traveler.

One of the famous sports of western Oregon is white-river boating on the McKenzie River. The visitor on a trip down the McKenzie may feel that he has never seen so much violent, cold water in so great a hurry. His light boat will pitch and toss in the deep troughs and powerful curlers formed by boulders strewn liberally in narrow channels running steeply downhill.

He will look back at these rocks, which the skilled guides have avoided, and he will swear that they seem to be settling resentfully back to the bed of the stream after leaping to clutch at the boat.

Much of Oregon stands on its 100th anniversary of statehood as it stood when the classic American settler, the pioneer-farmer, first unyoked his oxen in the Willamette Valley.

Barely a century separates the stone, steel, and glass skyline of Portland from the log cabin and the fur trade. The State's population is only 1,750,000, and nearly half of this is concentrated in the metropolitan Portland area.

OVERNIGHT CAMPS

However, since two or three times the average number of tourists are expected this year, hotel and motel reservations should be made early. There are scores of roadside camps and parks with tourist facilities along every major highway. It costs only $1 to stay overnight in most of the camps. All have water and other camping necessities.

One should write the Oregon Centennial Commission, 400 Jackson Tower, Portland, for help with obtaining accommodations in advance. Special tourist information and hospitality centers are being opened in nearly every town of any size in the State, particularly along major highways.

These centers will be staffed with volunteers who can help the traveler plan an entire vacation in Oregon or send him to the nearest historical marker with an armload of information about everything from wildflowers to salmon fishing. The hospitality and information program has been thoroughly planned.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 29, 1959]

OREGON CELEBRATES ITS CENTENNIAL YEAR

(By RICHARD L. NEUBERGER)

(Mr. NEUBERGER, junior U.S. Senator from Oregon, is a native son of that State and the author of many books and articles about its wonders.)

Oregon, always a bonanza for tourists because of its vast and verdant outdoors, is offering many additional inducements this year as part of the centennial observation of its admission to statehood in 1859. While Conestoga wagons still creaked on the Oregon Trail, the scenic realm which gave the troubled trail its name came into the Union on the eve of the Civil War.

Even Oregon's traditional and annual events of long standing, such as the Portland Rose Festival and the Pendleton Round-Up, will be far more elaborate than ever before in tribute to the fact that Oregon is now 100 years old and the first of all the States of

the Pacific Northwest to attain so lusty an age.

Yet, despite a long list of manmade spectacles which will be part of the centennial celebration, Oregon's dominant attraction continues to be the grandeur of its mountains, valleys, and timbered seacoast. It contains more fir and pine forests, more State parks, and more fish-filled rivers than any other State. Beyond each horizon are innumerable mountain meadows which invite the pitching of a tent. Oregon is an easy place to hook a trout and fry it in bacon fat over a crackling campfire.

The first Americans to explore Oregon were the great frontiersmen, Meriwether Lewis and William Clark. Even they, accustomed to cosmic and sweeping panoramas, were awed and impressed by the dimensions and majesty of the Oregon outdoors. So it has been with virtually all other visitors ever since. Oregon inspires its guests.

U.S. 101 clings to the Oregon seacoast for nearly 300 spectacular miles, looping like a hatband around sheer rock ramparts and then swooping down to wide beaches of glittering white sand. This is a shoreline which offers every possible sort of recreation—digging and raking for claims and crabs, ocean bathing, mountain climbing, hikes in dense evergreen "rain forests," trolling for salmon offshore and casting for steelhead in riffled streams that pour foamingly to the sea.

ROADSIDE SPOTS

The highway is dotted with modern motels and restaurants. Many of these will bake your salmon and fry your razor clams, while you wait at the table with a heaping cocktail of the Dungeness crab that you have brought from one of the crabholes dotting the beaches while the tide was out.

Although the National Park Service has warned of our "vanishing" shoreline elsewhere in the Nation, this stern admonition fortunately does not apply to Oregon. All the beaches, without exception, were reserved for the public by Gov. Oswald West back in 1909. Mr. West, who still lives in the State, recently saw a magnificent park beside the Pacific named in his honor. Many such parks offer forested campsites barely a mashie shot from the nippy surf, with its booming breakers.

Appropriately, in this centennial year, Oregon's first national historic shrine is under construction by the Federal Government near Astoria on the seacoast. It will be the Fort Clatsop National Memorial, marking the site where Lewis and Clark spent the winter of 1805–06 after the first overland crossing of this continent by Americans.

Their log stockade has been rebuilt and a modern museum building will be added. Legislation also is contemplated to give national-monument status to the "Oregon dunes," a picturesque stretch of shoreline where towering desertlike billows of sand form huge ramparts above the ocean.

MOUNTAINS AND SHORE

Oregon is both a mountain State and a seashore State. Besides having one of the country's most picturesque seacoasts, it is ribbed with four or five lofty mountain ranges. These offer the traveler a wide variety of opportunities.

Timberline Lodge, on the glacial slopes of Mount Hood, is one of the most unusual resorts in America. It contains notable examples of the native arts of the Northwest in drapes, blankets, mosaics, decorations and newel posts of Indian design. Ski lifts and ski runs dot the slopes near Timberline Lodge, and there also is a new steam-heated swimming pool amid Hood's eternal snows.

A comparatively short distance from the lodge, which is the only such inn anywhere in the 153 national forests of the United States, sprawl many campgrounds for the pilgrim who prefers somewhat more primitive or rustic quarters.

The Skyline Trail threads along the crest of the Cascade Mountains for 250 miles in Oregon. A wayfarer can spend weeks on this rugged path and never see another person. He can almost imagine himself in the solitudes with Lewis and Clark before the white man came—except, perhaps, for that airplane between Portland and San Francisco winging far overhead.

But this is the big wilderness. It is not a realm of wide open spaces like the Nevada or Arizona deserts. It is characterized by dense evergreen forests. From every knoll or pinnacle, the nomad can see an endless blanket of fir, spruce, and pine. He realizes why Oregon, with 434 billion board-feet of softwood timber, is the leading State so far as lumber production is concerned.

Oregon's people are profoundly conscious of their roads and highways. Indeed, Oregon was the first State to levy a tax on motor fuels to be used directly for the construction of roads. It also was the first to paint a white strip down the center of highways for guidance on foggy or rainy nights.

With the assistance of Federal funds, U.S. 30 and U.S. 99 are under conversion to four-lane express highways. These are the main roads bisecting the State from east to west and from north to south. Secondary paved roads also are receiving extensive improvements. Unless the motorist wants to take his car to the most remote fishing or hunting retreats, he can be certain his wheels will be on hard surface all during his sojourn in Oregon. Roads loom large in Oregon's State budget.

PROPOSED BRIDGE

The next such development may be still more spectacular. Plans are underway for a bridge 7 miles in length, to connect the States of Oregon and Washington at the mouth of the West's greatest river, the mighty Columbia. The span, to cost approximately $28 million, would be part of U.S. 101. This would eliminate the longest ferryboat voyage on the principal road paralleling the Pacific's shoreline from Canada to Mexico.

It also would be of great importance to the tourist trade generally, because this is one of the most popular areas on the entire Pacific coast for fishing, boating and surfbathing. And trolling for salmon in the Columbia has become a much more successful pastime since inundation of the Indian fishery behind the Dalles Dam began to permit larger numbers of migratory fish to escape to their spawning grounds in the distant solitudes.

But the pilgrim can travel comfortably to Oregon even if he decides not to bring his own sedan or convertible. United, Northwest, Western and West Coast are among the leading airlines which serve the State with daily flights. Pan American soars to Hawaii from Portland's recently refurnished international airport.

Several railroads operate streamliners into Oregon. These include the Southern Pacific, Great Northern, Northern Pacific and Union Pacific. The equipment features vista-dome cars and the latest pullmans. The Union Pacific even has a diner with a dome.

TICKET PLAN

The secondary passenger trains of the Northern Pacific and Great Northern—the Mainstreeter and Western Star, respectively—now offer travelers a bonus in that sleeping-car space can be purchased with only a coach ticket. These two systems enter Oregon over the route of the Spokane, Portland, and Seattle Railway.

Although plans were underway long before Oregon became 100 years old, it is significant that both the Sheraton and Hilton Hotel chains are invading Portland with impressive new structures in this centennial year. The Sheraton project is scheduled for completion next December. Target date for the Hilton Hotel is April 1961.

Furthermore, the city of Portland itself is constructing an elaborate exposition-recreation center, which will make Oregon's principal metropolitan community far more suitable for large conventions and meetings. In the past, such facilities have been lacking.

Portland also is building one of the West's most elaborate zoological gardens, with a miniature streamlined train which will wind through the wooded hills that are one of the city's most striking natural characteristics. This "zooliner" has been heralded as without counterpart anywhere in the Nation.

Principal event of Oregon's centennial celebration will be the Exposition and International Trade Fair, to run from June 10 until September 15. It will be on the shores of the Columbia River just north of Portland, with exhibits on hand from approximately 50 countries. Its inaugural will come a day after the opening of the Portland Rose Festival, which this year is scheduled from June 9 to 14. The famous grand floral parade will take place June 13, and the next day the golden rose ski tournament is slated for the white slopes near Timberline Lodge.

ROSES AND GLACIERS

Oregon is that kind of State—roses flourish within sight of eternal glaciers. Indeed, much impetus to make the rose the national flower of the United States always has come from public opinion in Oregon. Along with the Senators from the States of New York and Pennsylvania, I am sponsoring a bill to proclaim such a policy for the country.

Other events of importance scheduled for Oregon's centennial year are the annual canoe fete at the University of Oregon May 15, the McKenzie River White Water Parade at Blue River June 21, the Albany Timber Carnival July 3 and 4, the Bend Water Pageant July 3 to 5, the Oregon Fish Festival at Astoria August 26 to 31, and the famous Round-Up at Pendleton September 16 to 19.

Many of these events are quite extraordinary. The Timber Carnival specializes in contests of skill and brawn associated with the lumber industry, such as trying to stay on logs floating in a millpond. The McKenzie White Water Parade features rowboating through the rapids and riffles of a river that is the favorite trout stream of ex-President Herbert C. Hoover.

Officials of the Oregon State Centennial Commission anticipate at least 8 million people will visit the exposition and trade fair alone, which they herald as the greatest fair to be held in the West since the San Fancisco World's Fair of 1939. In addition to countless industrial and manufacturing exhibits, the fair will include dramatizations of significant occurrences out of Oregon's historic past.

THE WILD WEST

These will recreate jolting stagecoach rides with the Wells Fargo Express, frontier Indian villages and the robberies of pioneer railroads running on wooden rails. President Eisenhower has already signed an official proclamation passed by both branches of Congress urging the entire country to join in celebrating Oregon's 100th birthday.

But despite all these extensive plans the principal attraction to visitors still will be Oregon's plethora of magnificent scenery. The trade fair and the rodeos and even the rose festival will be long forgotten when the rock ramparts of the Columbia River Gorge, the stately white spire of Mount Jefferson and the timbered headlands of the Oregon seacost continue to be rich and vivid in countless memories.

Address by Paul M. Butler

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PHILIP A. HART

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 7, 1959

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from an address delivered by Paul M. Butler, chairman of the Democratic National Committee, before the Ford Hall Forum at Boston, Mass., on April 26, 1959.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY PAUL M. BUTLER, CHAIRMAN, DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE, BEFORE THE FORD HALL FORUM, BOSTON, MASS., APRIL 26, 1959

At the outset of this discussion, I consider it important to make clear what is meant by the term "human rights." I believe that the term "human rights" means those rights with which every man and woman has been endowed by virtue of his or her creation as a child of God. They are rights which are founded in the principles of religion and morality.

The recognition of these human rights by the individual and by the state is essential to freedom, justice, and peace in the world.

So said the General Assembly of the United Nations in December of 1948, when, in drawing upon the various religious, cultural and national backgrounds of its members, it adopted the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. And so thought Thomas Jefferson in 1776, when, in drawing on the various religious and cultural backgrounds of the American colonists, he authored the Declaration of Independence.

The human rights specified in these two great documents were not created out of thin air, for these two great declarations represent the proclamation or codification in different eras of those rights belonging to man for which the struggle for recognition has been going on since the dawn of history. Proclamations such as these are the noblest expressions of the demands which we in our better moments make upon ourselves in order to secure those rights of which men are inherently possessed. The recognition of these rights is the prerequisite of any form of community life in which the dignity of the human being and the sanctity of the human personality are respected.

In 1776 Thomas Jefferson declared in the Declaration of Independence: "Man is endowed by his Creator with certain inalienable rights. Among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. To secure these rights governments are instituted among men."

Thus Jefferson established the moral basis upon which our society was to be founded. The whole world watched to see whether American deeds would carry out his noble words.

The process of review and enlargement of what are considered to be fundamental human rights in America began almost immediately after the proclamation of the Declaration. In the next 15 years, the American people produced such documents as the Articles of Confederation, the Constitution and the Bill of Rights, in which were set forth more elaborately and specifically certain rights of citizens deemed appropriate for protection. Among these were included the rights of free speech, free press, free assembly, trial by jury, freedom of conscience, the right of petition, the prohibition of cruel and unusual punishment, etc.—all basic rights which were quite revolutionary in their day, but which most Americans today would include in any list of their concept of fundamental human rights.

Less than a quarter of a century after he had written the Declaration, Thomas Jefferson, ever mindful that the price of liberty is eternal vigilance, by those in public office as well as by the public itself, undertook to secure human rights and enlarge the freedom of the people by his action, among other things, of founding a political party. It was the first political party to concern itself with human rights as well as property rights. Jefferson knew that liberty would flourish best in a society where property, political participation and education were broadly based. He knew that each generation has the responsibility of reinterpreting the rights of man in the light of changing times. He knew that the best way to maintain the freedom of each was to enlarge the liberty of all. These were the purpose then for which Jefferson created the Democratic Party. Its moments of greatness have come when it has lived up fully to the beliefs of its founder.

When the opposition party upon occasion has embued itself with the spirit of Jefferson and his devotion to human rights, on those occasions when it has shown greater concern with people than with property, it has rendered its best service to our Nation.

Since Jefferson's time, the great forces of conscience molded by our Judaic-Christian tradition, the rising level of popular education, and the great proliferation and effectiveness of public and private groups dedicated to strengthening the forces of freedom, working ultimately through the mechanism of our political parties, have wrought changes in our concepts of the relationship between the citizens and the state and the relationships among citizens, which have extended our sights and improved the fabric of our democracy.

Thus over a little more than a century and a half, the American concept of human rights has grown as the Nation has grown and has been enlarged to include many other rights, some guaranteed by statute, others set forth as noble expressions of ideals to be achieved.

For example, we extended our concept of human rights to include: in the Jacksonian period such fundamental concepts as universal, white, manhood suffrage, universal and free public education, and the right of fuller access to participation in Government; in Lincoln's time, to include the abolition of human slavery and citizenship for newly freed men; in the time of Bryan, Theodore Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson, to include the concept of equality of economic opportunity, the dignity of labor, and the right of protection of employees and the public against the ravages of the factory system. Women's suffrage came to be considered a fundamental right in the time of Wilson, as well as the right to the creation of a social and international order in which other human rights could flourish.

The immortal era of Franklin D. Roosevelt provided us with the concept of the right to security against the hazards of old age and unemployment, the right to freedom from want and freedom from fear, the right of free collective bargaining, and the right to employment at decent wages, with provision for adequate leisure.

These concepts were extended under the farsighted administration of Harry S. Truman to include the right of every family to a decent home, the right of every individual to decent medical care, and the right to an education commensurate with one's abilities.

Many of these rights, especially the latter ones which I have enumerated, are more controversial than others, and many are still in the process of evolution. But this is natural, since we tend to forget that rights which were won by our fathers and their forefathers, while accepted as a matter of course by us, were, generally speaking, bitterly controversial when the battle for them was first waged. And we must remind ourselves once again, as Jefferson did always, that the concept of human rights is an evolving one, constantly establishing new frontiers. * * *

Under the vigorous moral leadership of Franklin Roosevelt, Eleanor Roosevelt, and Harry Truman, backed up by political energy and political skill, great strides were made in the field of human rights.

The first great stride was a facing up to the complexity of the problem and to the great areas of neglect which needed to be corrected. Closed consciences were opened to injustices long ignored.

The second great stride was really a series of steps—carried out by Executive orders—dealing with ending discrimination in housing, employment, in Government service, employment on Government contracts, and military service, and appointments made on the basis of ability regardless of color or racial origin.

President Truman was never one to rest on accomplishments until the job was finished. Thus in the report of his Committee on Civil Rights, he listed the defects which existed (some of which he was later able to correct) and charted a future course which is still a valid guide toward the realization of our highest human aspirations.

The most important accomplishment of the Roosevelt and Truman administrations in this field, however, was the creation of a climate of opinion and executive leadership which even without action on the part of Congress made possible later progress in these matters, both in and out of Government.

It would do violence to truth to imply that the Democratic Party was solely responsible for all the progress made during the period I have just mentioned.

It was the executive branch of the Federal Government which was showing the way to the other branches and rallying the political and moral support necessary to sustain such action and to break down age-old prejudices and barriers. There was no question in any citizen's mind about where the President of the United States, Mr. Roosevelt and later, Mr. Truman, stood on this issue.

This is what I feel is most lacking in the situation today. There has been steady, sustained and even monumental progress in the human rights field in the last 6 years, but virtually none of it is due to the actions or leadership of the President of the United States or the executive branch of the Government. In fact, much of it has been accomplished without the specific endorsement of the President and in spite of the failure of the President to provide leadership in meeting this problem.

For example, there have been the court decisions in 1953 which have led to the abolition of segregation in places of public accommodation in the District of Columbia, and the monumental decision of the Supreme Court in 1954, outlawing segregation in the public schools. Here historic progress was made with the Supreme Court showing the way. It had nothing to do with partisan politics in spite of the attempts of Mr. NIXON and many other leaders of the opposition party to present these decisions as Republican achievements because they were handed down while a Republican administration was in the White House. By the same logic, I suppose that Democrats could make the same partisan claims by pointing out that both

cases were initiated under Democratic administrations.

More recently, there has been the significant action of the Democratic 85th Congress dealing with the protection of voting rights. While this bill fell far short of reasonable objectives, it was the first civil rights bill enacted by Congress since the Reconstruction. It was passed not because of, but largely in spite of, the vacillating leadership of the President, who told a news conference while the bill was under consideration in Congress that he hadn't even read parts of the bill and didn't understand other parts. This bill also demonstrated conclusively that, once we can get the Republicans to support human rights rather than play politics with them, we can pass other bills which are needed.

So much for the past. It is much easier to be critical of the policies of others than to be constructive in proposing a course of future action. What ought we to do now and in the near future, if the course of human freedom is to be advanced with a minimum of difficulty?

First of all, it seems to me that we must recognize that the problem of prejudice and discrimination, of denial of human rights because of race, color, or creed, is not a problem which is limited to one section of our Nation. It is national in scope. Racial strife such as has occurred recently in several Northern States is no less a blot on the national conscience because it occurred in the North. The fact that discrimination in the North and West is more subtle than the codified prejudices which exist in the South, or that the shabby treatment arising from the vicious "gentlemen's agreements" in the North is less publicized than the sensationalized results of the actions taken by certain legislatures in the South, should in no way absolve the North of guilt.

Bigotry, hatred, and mob violence know no geographic boundaries.

The South is absolutely right when it says that the North and West have their own ghettoes and their own problems of prejudice in their own back yards.

But this in no way can be used to excuse the degrading practices of State-approved discriminations, the pitiful and irrational policies of massive resistance, the threats made and violence done to peace and order, and the attempted defiance of law which has been manifest in many Southern States in the past few years. Pointing the accusing finger at the other fellow in no way changes the ugly picture which certain unthinking southerners seem perfectly content, indeed zealous, to project to the rest of the Nation and the world as the image of the modern South. We must recognize, both in the North and in the South, that there is a tremendous job to be done in each section, as well as in the Nation as a whole.

Once we make it clear that we are dealing with a national problem, then it should not be deemed antisouthern or anti any other region to talk about how we can go about improving race relations and securing the full rights to which all Americans are entitled.

Secondly, we must stop thinking of the South as a monolithic region, where everybody has the same attitude and the same interests. Too often the image we see of the South is that drawn by the extremists and those who easily give way to the urgings and the pressures of those who are highly organized, extremely vocal, but least informed.

I am afraid that one of the tragic consequences of some of the more unfortunate incidents which have occurred in the South in the past few years has been the tendency of the rest of the Nation to forget the monumental contributions which the South has made to the enrichment of American life throughout its history and the many fine leaders it has produced and is producing today in so many walks of life. We are generally unmindful, for example, of the many examples of courage shown by a number of southern leaders who, although they face predominantly white electorates, have refused to join the hue and cry for massive resistance and other doctrines of desperation.

We pay little attention to the fine work which so many Southern Members of Congress are doing in such fields as health, education, foreign affairs and economic policy which is extending the areas of human rights in these fields to citizens generally. We all too easily forget that five Southern Senators with considerable courage voted for the Civil Rights Act of the 85th Congress and that a number of Southern Members of Congress refused to sign the "Southern Manifesto." We forget also that tremendous progress has been made toward school integration with the support of governors of a number of formerly segregated border States such as Missouri, Oklahoma, Kentucky, West Virginia, Delaware, and Maryland, and that token integration has taken place, upheld by gubernatorial action, in Tennessee, North Carolina, Texas, and Virginia, and will take place later this year in Florida.

We are often unmindful of the attitudes of a large body of southern white persons—I believe it to be a majority—who, while they do not approve of the Supreme Court decision of 1954, are willing to obey the law. We show an insufficient appreciation for many civic, religious, and youth groups in the South who are working on this problem with considerable skill and courage.

Having realized these things, having understood the necessity for patience, the time necessary for adjustment, and the variation in community feelings and differences, we must make it unmistakably clear that it is the intention of the Government, and the sentiment of the overwhelming majority of the people of the Nation, to see to it that the law is upheld and that the decisions of the courts are respected in the North and in the South, no matter which party controls the executive branch of the Government.

While there may be room for adjustment and accommodation in applying the law, there can be no compromise with ultimate compliance with the law by every citizen of the United States.

In order to accomplish this, I believe that the Persident of the United States should be asked once again to specifically approve and lend his moral force to the endorsement of the 1954 Supreme Court decision as morally right. I believe that he should be requested once again to use the great prestige of his office to call together the responsible political, religious, educational and other community leaders of both races for discussion as to how the Court's decision might be implemented on a gradual yet firm basis and as to how a climate of general acceptance of the legal principle can be created.

I believe that the Congress of the United States should pass appropriate human rights legislation which would include a specific endorsement of the Court's school ruling as the recognized law of the land.

I believe also that the Congress should recognize that the time has come to legislate on the implementation of the Court's school decision. Through our failure to act earlier, we have placed too heavy a burden on the courts and on the elected officials of Southern States, who, after all, must operate under frightful pressures to implement the 1954 decision.

While there is a great deal to be said for the conciliation idea emphasized in the proposal which Senator LYNDON JOHNSON has made dealing with this problem, his proposal, in my opinion, has the great demerit of offering nothing to back up conciliation. I am afraid that there really would be no inducement provided for conciliation, or nothing to conciliate about, if communities would choose to continue to ignore the Court rulings. One must conciliate towards an objective. That objective must be ultimate equal compliance with the law, with reasonable allowance for local adjustments as to time and methods in moving toward that objective.

Consequently, I believe that if the conciliation idea were to be given even greater emphasis and more specific provision in the general approach taken by the bill of Senator DOUGLAS and 16 other Senators to provide technical assistance, financial grants and other aids to communities willing to desegregate; and if this were backed up, as it is in the Douglas bill, with ultimate authority in the hands of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to draw up desegregation plans, seeking full advice and assistance of local groups; and if, as the Douglas bill once again provides, adequate authority were placed in the hands of the Attorney General to initiate action to carry out plans so drawn and to initiate proceedings on behalf of those whose rights under the 14th amendment have been infringed or denied, Congress would be meeting its responsibility to find constructive ways by which the law of the land could be carried out. * * *

In addition to these actions, it seems to me that we should extend the life of the Civil Rights Commission with its vital protections of voting rights, take appropriate Federal action to combat the disgraceful bombings of churches, synagogues, etc., and give consideration to taking appropriate action, both on the Federal and State levels, to eliminate the poll tax as a barrier to voting in those few States where it remains.

At the same time, we would realize that the greatest legislative progress against discrimination in housing, employment, etc., has been made on the local and State levels, so that we must redouble our efforts in those States where there are no such laws now on the statute books. * * *

Speaking for my own party, let me say that it is clearly and unmistakably in the finest traditions of the Democratic Party for the national leadership of our party to speak out clearly, humbly, yet very distinctly, in both North and South, on behalf of the cause of human rights whether they be in political, economic or other areas. It is our challenge and moral responsibility as the Nation's only truly national party, not only to heal wounds, but to right wrongs, not only to bring our Nation and our people closer together, but to give it a new birth of freedom.

Ohio Congratulates J. Edgar Hoover

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON H. SCHERER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 11, 1959

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, this week the entire Nation, with the exception of the criminal and subversive elements and some from the extreme left

wing, join in paying tribute to J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, on the completion of 35 years of outstanding and dedicated service as head of the most efficient and highly respected agency in the Government. I am proud that the senate of my State unanimously adopted a resolution congratulating and commending the Honorable J. Edgar Hoover on his 35th anniversary as Director of the FBI. The resolution follows:

SENATE RESOLUTION 51

Resolution to honor J. Edgar Hoover on his 35th anniversary as Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation

Whereas the members of the 103d general assembly have learned of the coming 35th anniversary of the Honorable J. Edgar Hoover, as Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation, May 10, 1959, and wish to honor the outstanding and dedicated service of this devoted public servant; and

Whereas the Honorable J. Edgar Hoover has for 35 years protected the people of the United States and the State of Ohio against spies, saboteurs, and those who seek the forceful overthrow of established government; and

Whereas as Director of the FBI, Mr. Hoover has rendered unparalleled service in the enforcement of Federal criminal laws and in cooperating, collaborating with, and rendering outstanding contributions and cooperation to the law-enforcement agencies of Ohio; and

Whereas his devotion to his country and to good government are remarkable examples of patriotism and those high principles so admired in the State of Ohio: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Senate of Ohio hereby expresses its hearty commendation, warmest congratulations, everlasting gratitude, and sincere good wishes to the Honorable J. Edgar Hoover; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be adopted and a copy be spread upon the journal and that the clerk of the senate transmit a duly authenticated copy of this resolution to the Honorable J. Edgar Hoover, to the Governor of Ohio, to the President of the United States, and to the Attorney General of the United States.

Congressmen Need To Be Told People Want Gasoline Tax Hike To Keep Road Program Moving

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD H. BAKER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 11, 1959

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Knoxville Journal of May 8, 1959, which relates to the proposal to increase the gasoline tax to expedite the road program:

CONGRESSMEN NEED TO BE TOLD PEOPLE WANT GASOLINE TAX HIKE TO KEEP ROAD PROGRAM MOVING

The Democrat-controlled Congress has made it very clear, despite certain speeches by Senator LYNDON JOHNSON in behalf of sweet economy, that it has very little regard indeed for the President's determination to hold to a minimum budget and to have that budget balanced. Numerous bills are in the hopper which, if passed, will overspend the President's proposals by billions of dollars.

But there are two ways to balance a budget. One is to reduce spending to the amount of revenue available and one is to increase revenues to the total needed. The majority in Congress is also dragging its feet on support of the tax increase proposals submitted by the White House, notably the one which would increase the Federal gas tax by a cent and a half.

This hike in gasoline taxes was not proposed by the President as a political measure, because nobody wants to pay more taxes, even a cent and a half more on each gallon of gas. He proposed it only because every competent authority in the country had concluded that, unless there is such an increase, the gigantic Federal-State highway construction program will in perhaps a year grind to a halt, simply because the money will not be available to carry it on.

Thus the public, and especially that overwhelming part of it that uses motor vehicles of any kind, has the choice of either paying this relatively small additional tax or of putting off indefinitely the completion of the kind of highway program they have been led to believe they would have.

Certainly there could be no fairer tax than this one which falls upon the very people who derive direct benefit from expenditure of the funds they produce. Congress would be in a bad light, indeed, if it chose the other alternative to levying an increased gasoline tax, namely, paying for the road program out of the general funds of the Treasury. Or it would appear in even worse light if it persisted in spending the needed funds as they resulted from more Treasury borrowing.

We think that Members of Congress should hear from the people on this issue, urging them to support the President's proposal to increase the gasoline tax. The citizen may be certain that if this method is not approved, the cost of the new highway program will come out of his hide in some other, and less just, form.

Inflation Robs Us All

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 11, 1959

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to have printed in the RECORD an editorial which appeared May 1 in the Park Forest (Ill.) Star, concerning inflation and entitled "Inflation Robs Us All."

The editorial reflects the opinion of many people in the Fouth Congressional District of Illinois, which I have the honor to represent. In the past few weeks I have received thousands of letters calling my attention to the problems of inflation as felt by the average citizen, particularly people on fixed incomes.

The editorial as it appeared follows:

[From the Park Forest Star, May 1, 1959]

INFLATION ROBS US ALL

People living on pensions or other forms of fixed income are already abundantly aware of inflation's heavy toll. So are those trying to get along on insurance payments, including those on which premiums were paid in sound, full-value, hard-earned American dollars.

At the present rate, many more people will learn the bitter lesson each year that "Inflation Robs Us All." This particular phase of inflation's inroads on much of our society is easy to explain effectively.

What of the man who has yet to reach retirement age? Generally speaking, he is inclined to think that more money in his pocket on pay day is a good thing, no matter what the circumstances.

But wage scales don't mean a thing to the unemployed, and continuing inflation is a disease which can kill off a great many jobs in the United States. It cannot be forecast with accuracy when it will be cheaper to import various products than to make them at home, but it can be said with dreadful certainty that inflation speeds the day.

All of us want a better standard of living—one which is achieved by normal economic growth and increased production efficiency. None of us, however, wants an illusion of greater wealth which is in fact only a mortgage on the days or years ahead.

It is inconsistent, for example, for a labor leader or anyone else to claim credit in one breath for obtaining a pension program and to claim in the next breath equal credit for supporting inflationary, spendthrift methods which will destroy the value of that very pension program.

For these and many other reasons, we are heartily in accord with the crescendo of opposition to the inflation spiral. We urge you to let our representatives in Congress know of your opposition.

Government by Formula

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK WESTLAND
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 11, 1959

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, more and more restrictions are being placed on the basic freedoms of the American people by the very Federal Government which, according to our Constitution, is dedicated to preserve these freedoms.

One word, I believe, summarizes the reason for this encroachment. The word is "bureaucracy," meaning government by bureau heads. This leads to rigid, formal administration according to their whims. It is government by formula. There are numerous cases to document this trend, but one which I am familiar with is the proposition that Snohomish County in my own State of Washington should become part of the Seattle Standard Metropolitan District.

This example of the loss of a basic freedom points out the present trend of rigid rule by formula. The Bureau of the Budget arbitrarily has created a criteria that says if a certain percentage of the labor force in Snohomish County works in Seattle, Snohomish County must become a part of Seattle. The percentage to which I referred is 15 percent. It so happens the Bureau estimates that 23 percent of the Snohomish County residents work in Seattle. Even if all of these workers wanted to be included in the Seattle Metropolitan District, they

would not represent the majority of people who reside in Everett and Snohomish County. I have serious doubts that even a minority of the estimated 23 percent want to be included in Seattle.

Every day we talk about human values, yet some are willing to subject us to rule by bureaucratic formula and statistics. It seems to me we need a new set of statistics to deal with the human element of our society. I think the people of Snohomish County have a right to choose for themselves whether or not they are to be included in the Seattle Metropolitan District.

Furthermore, I believe that further study by the Bureau of the Budget would prove their own statistics wrong, particularly if the Bureau of the Budget looked to the future. Planning directors from the Puget Sound Regional Planning Council have taken a look at the population expectations and have become amazed at what they have turned up. Snohomish County, they feel certain, is going to show the largest percentage gain of any county in the Puget Sound area. With a population of 112,000 in 1950, the count for 1957 was 135,000. The 1960 census is expected to show the county at 144,000 and the growth over succeeding 10-year counts will jump to 189,000, 251,000, 324,000, and 371,000.

The planners when they began comparing notes found that all of them were basing their compilations on a much slower rate of growth than the Federal Government was anticipating. They started again using U.S. Census estimates released November 1958, substantially higher than previous estimates and reflecting the unpredicted continuing high birth rate. The committee said that while the greatest share of growth in the region between 1960 and 2000 is expected to continue in King and Pierce Counties, the greatest rate of growth and the greatest growth in terms of percentage of the total region is expected in Kitsap and Snohomish Counties.

In the case of Snohomish County this rate of growth is already high and is expected to continue high during the projection period. With this growth in mind, it is hard to conceive that the vast part of the population in Snohomish County will find employment in the Seattle area.

The contrary is true. It is common knowledge that large cutbacks in employment are due at Boeing where the majority of the Snohomish workers in Seattle are employed. On the other hand, oil refineries moving into Snohomish County will mean increased employment opportunities for local residents. There are three oil refinery companies ready to open up these opportunities.

Fred Powell, vice president of Standard Oil Co., according to the Everett Daily Herald on April 30, 1959, said the proposed refinery at its site south of Mukilteo will be twice as large as the huge installation now under construction in Hawaii. While the Hawaii facility is considered a huge installation, the Snohomish County refinery will cover a 2,300-acre site. Meanwhile other industries continue to thrive and grow.

It is clear that the population of Snohomish County is growing, its industry is expanding and the employment for its workers in the Seattle area faces a decline. Common sense, therefore, indicates that the people of Snohomish County should be left alone and should be allowed to determine their own destiny. But the rule by formula continues.

I was advised last week that the Bureau of the Budget has made Snohomish County a part of the Seattle Metropolitan Standard area. I have been further advised that this designation will be reviewed following the completion of the 1960 census. This review probably will take place in June 1960. It seems foolish to me to include Snohomish County in a metropolitan area in May 1959 when there is a distinct possibility that in June 1960 it may be excluded.

Force in Readiness—Discouraging Red Nibbling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 7, 1959

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, one of the continuing issues before the Congress relates to what constitutes an adequate strength for the Nation's force in readiness, the U.S. Marine Corps.

The fact that Congress has strongly expressed its view that maintenance of the statutory 3 combat divisions and 3 air wings of Marines requires an absolute minimum of 200,000 combat-ready Marines is well known.

Just as well known is the Pentagon defiance of congressional intent expressed in the order of last November to reduce the corps by 12½ percent below appropriated strength to 175,000.

A recent editorial in the San Diego Union briefly, but impressively, cites cogent reasons for the growing concern with which our citizens watch the dissolution of combat-ready Marine units as the corps reduces its strength.

Many informed Americans regard the loss of these trained fighting men, occurring in one of the most dangerous periods in the Nation's history, as but one more example of the depth of Pentagon hostility toward the country's most professional, most combat-ready force in being.

I believe this editorial will be of interest to all our colleagues who have fought so long to provide the Nation with this incomparable force in readiness. I ask permission at this point to have it printed in the RECORD with the hope that it may serve as one more reminder to us all that congressional efforts to insure to the Nation a strong Marine Corps must continue unabated:

FORCE IN READINESS: DISCOURAGING RED NIBBLING

Communist aggression is a continuous threat that requires continuous readiness on our part. We must be as deeply concerned with containment by a flexible, hard-hitting and fast-moving force-in-readiness as we are with the massive deterrent to general war afforded by our nuclear might.

One of the Nation's leading military analysts, George Fielding Eliot, describes containment as being concerned "with a level of flexible power which can be applied in due measure wherever necessary to prevent Communist expansion at the expense of the free world."

The U.S. Marine Corps historically has been the Nation's force-in-readiness. The Marines, in conjunction with the Navy, have served as the fire brigade. Lebanon and the Formosa Straits are two recent examples in which the Navy and Marine Corps prevented the growth of potentially large conflagrations.

The cutback in Marine Corps strength from 200,000 men to 175,000 is disturbing militarily and psychologically. Militarily it constricts the flexible power which must operate behind our shield of nuclear deterrence. Psychologically it might well cause the Communists to intensify their nibbling away of free world perimeters.

Our naval leaders have pointed out that the all-out deterrent of our H-bombs and atomic bombers did not discourage the Soviets from digesting Iraq. It did not influence the Chinese Reds away from their naked aggression in Tibet.

There will be other situations. It is all important but not all inclusive to perfect weapons systems to equal or surpass those of a potential aggressor. The deterrent effect of these machines may cancel the possibility of total conflict. If so, aggression will turn in another direction: the perimeter or brush-type war in which huge rockets and mass destructive capability would not be employed.

We must have the forces-in-readiness available to put down, quickly and decisively, outbreaks which otherwise might spread until they are out of control. In our efforts to deter general nuclear war we cannot afford to neglect the capability for actions of more limited scope.

This is what Adm. Arleigh A. Burke, Chief of Naval Operations, means when he warns the United States to keep its guard up against lesser events. The Communists are not neglecting both types of warfare. They believe nuclear and limited warfare can be integrated into a single plan.

As aggression turns, we must turn with it. And the hub is a flexible force-in-readiness operating behind the great nuclear shield.

Daylight Saving Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANCHER NELSEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 11, 1959

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and petition from certain members of the Minnesota House of Representatives urging the passage of H.R. 1354, "A bill to amend the Standard Time Act of March 19, 1918, so as to provide that the standard time established thereunder shall be the measure of time for all purposes." Because of the confused state of daylight saving time in Minnesota, a number of State representatives from the Minnesota Legislature are pe-

titioning the Representatives in Congress to support H.R. 1354. Their letter to me and a copy of the signed petition are attached and I ask that they be inserted in the RECORD:

STATE OF MINNESOTA,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
May 4, 1959.

Hon. ANCHER NELSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. NELSEN: Enclosed is a message expressing our feelings about House Resolution 1354. All of the undersigned are duly elected State representatives of the State of Minnesota.

Our daylight saving time is in a confused state. It is, also, at the present time, before the Supreme Court and it is impossible to say what their decision will be. We are all very favorable to this bill and hope this petition will help you in its passage.

Again I would like to say, all of the undersigned are members of the Minnesota House of Representatives, both conservatives and liberals.

Sincerely yours,

ALVIN O. HOFSTAD,
State Representative.

To the House of Representatives in Congress assembled:

The undersigned citizens respectfully petition your honorable body in favor of the enactment of H.R. 1354, entitled "A bill to amend the Standard Time Act of March 19, 1918, so as to provide that the standard time established thereunder shall be the measure of time for all purposes," being a bill to make the Federal Standard Time Act nationally binding and effective for all governmental and business purposes the entire year, aganist State legislation or local action for daylight saving time, and to restore standard time to the Nation.

Graham Fuller, Ivanhoe, Minn.; Delbert F. Anderson, Starbuck, Minn.; George P. Grussing, Clara City, Minn.; Teman Thompson, Lanesboro, Minn.; Aubrey W. Dirlan, Redwood Falls, Minn.; Victor Johnson, Lake Bronson, Minn.; H. J. Henning, Pelican Rapids, Minn.; George W. Karvonen, Deer Creek, Minn.; Martin McGowan, Appleton, Minn.; J. J. Kelly, Marshall, Minn.; Marvin Schumann, Rice, Minn.; Fred H. Huebner, Donnelly, Minn.; George Krenik, Le Center, Minn.; Lawrence Cunningham, Pipestone, Minn.; Alvin O. Hofetad, Madison, Minn., 24th District; Cliff Graba, Sebeka, Minn., District 51; George Mann, Windon, Minn.; Harvey A. Wilder, Crookston, Minn.; B. J. Bergson, Twin Valley, Minn.; Peter X. Fugina, Virginia, Minn.; Birger Nurminen, Aitkin, Minn.; M. K. Hegstrom, St. James, 9th District; Howard Ottinger, Chaska, 21st District; L. B. Erdahl, Frost, Minn., 7th District; Earl W. Iverson, Ashby, Minn.; Dan Conroy, Dumont, Minn.

Bridge Across Mouth of Columbia River on U.S. Highway 101

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 11, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, U.S. Highway 101 is one of the greatest scenic highways of the North American continent. It parallels the magnificent Pacific seacoast, and it also serves the site of the new Fort Clatsop National Memorial, presently under construction near the mouth of the Columbia River.

The recent 1959 session of the Oregon State Legislature authorized $28 million in bonds, to be used in part for the construction of an epic bridge across the mouth of the West's greatest river, linking the States of Oregon and Washington via U.S. Highway 101. This legislative accomplishment is due in no small measure to the leadership of State Senator Dan Thiel and State Representative William Holmstrom, of Clatsop County.

On May 4, 1959, Gov. Mark O. Hatfield, of Oregon, formally signed the bond legislation for the Columbia River bridge in the city of Astoria, the historic community at the Columbia's mouth. A detailed article in the Astorian Daily Budget of May 5 has described this significant event. I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

I am particularly pleased, Mr. President, to make this request because, as a member of the subcommittee on Roads and Highways of the Committee on Public Works, I have long been a supporter of the proposed great bridge spanning the mouth of the vast Columbia River.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THREE PENS USED IN SIGNING

Gov. Mark Hatfield will invite the Washington Highway Commission and Toll Bridge Authority to Oregon within 2 weeks for a planning conference regarding the Astoria Bridge, he revealed Monday evening here.

Hatfield spoke briefly at a delayed ceremony in which he signed the bill providing for $28 million in bonds to finance construction of the bridge and improvement of Highway 42 in southern Oregon.

The ceremony was delayed a half hour to wait for arrival of Senator Dan Thiel and Representative William Holmstrom, who flew to Astoria from Salem in a plane piloted by Douglas Olds, city school superintendent, to participate in the ceremony.

PAIR DELAYED

The two legislators had been held up by press of legislative business.

Governor Hatfield told the audience of about 150 people in the circuit court room of the courthouse that he had called the State Highway Commission into all-day session Monday morning to discuss the bridge project with W. C. Williams, State highway engineer, also in attendance.

"I can assure you that the commission is fully in accord with this legislation," Hatfield said.

Hatfield added that he would send written invitations to members of the two Washington agencies as soon as he returned to Salem. He noted that Gov. Albert Rosellini is ex-officio chairman of both the highway commission and the Toll Bridge Authority.

"We hope to have serious discussions with the Washington agencies underway within 2 weeks," Hatfield said.

USES THREE PENS

The governor signed the bridge bill with three pens, giving one to Thiel, one to Holmstrom, and one to Mrs. Floyd Wright, widow of the former port commission president who was a leader in the bridge effort.

The governor signed the bill at a big table in front of the judge's bench. He was flanked by Thiel, Holmstrom, Mrs. Wright, and Mayor Harry Steinbock of Astoria. Circled behind the table were members of the Royal Chinooks drum and bugle corps, the governor's official corps, and Hatfield thanked them after the ceremony for their services.

After the signing, the Governor turned the printed act over to Officer Newell of the State police, driver of the State Cadillac in which he came to Astoria, for safekeeping.

Governor Hatfield paid tribute to Thiel and Holmstrom as the two most responsible for the bridge legislation, among many who had done much work for it.

SEES SYMBOL

He also said he hoped that this bridge would be a "material symbol" and lasting monument of Oregon's centennial year.

The Governor arrived at the court house steps promptly at 6 p.m., where he was greeted by Mayor Steinbock, Vice President Beryl Swails of the chamber, and other local officials.

The Royal Chinooks formed a guard of honor as the Governor entered the court house, then marched behind him up to the circuit court rooms.

William Manion, post commissioner and master of ceremonies for the event, noted that this was a historic occasion as it was the first time the Governor of Oregon had ever gone outside the State capital to sign a bill.

Manion called for abandonment of an insular attitude and development of a go-ahead spirit to make this area the greatest resort area in the United States, which he said it could become with the help of the bridge.

STRETCHES TALK

Manion, scheduled to talk for only 3 minutes, had to keep going for about 20 minutes more as the ceremony was delayed awaiting arrival of Thiel and Holmstrom.

Their plane was landing at the airport just after the ceremony began.

There Representative Holmstrom received the sad news of the death Monday afternoon of Mrs. Holmstrom's father, James Cutler of Gearhart, but he continued to the ceremony anyway. Holmstrom remained in Astoria Monday night while Thiel returned to Salem with the Governor.

Thiel and Holmstrom each spoke briefly after arriving in the court room and then the Governor spoke and signed the bill.

The Greatest Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK WESTLAND
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 11, 1959

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, among the great volume of correspondence I have received from people who support a balanced budget and realistic Government spending is a resolution from Delta Grange No. 760. This Whatcom County Grange is situated about 5 miles west of Lynden, Wash., in my district. Delta Grange has consistently throughout the years since its organization on September 23, 1920, taken an active interest in the welfare of the country and has supported the principles of government as stated in the American Constitution.

At this time I want to include in the RECORD the resolution to which I have referred. The resolution follows:

WHATCOM COUNTY, DELTA GRANGE NO. 760

BALANCED BUDGET

Whereas inflation is one of the greatest problems facing farmers as well as everyone else; and

Whereas Government spending for defense will remain with us for some time; and

Whereas the principal cause of inflation is Government spending in excess of income: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Delta Grange No. 760 urges our Congress to balance the budget; be it further

Resolved, That the budget be kept within the expected income and in case the expenditures prove greater than the income due to war or other great disaster, the following Congress must provide some source of revenue to bring the budget back in line; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to Washington State Grange, Senators JACKSON and MAGNUSON and Representative JACK WESTLAND.

AUDRAIN CHRONISTER,
Master.

MARY K. BURK,
Secretary.

U.S. Trade Deficit—What It Means

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. HENDERSON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 11, 1959

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, the economic position of the United States internationally has been deteriorating steadily for some time. Today evidence is mounting rapidly pointing to the development of an actual crisis.

Probably the most telling feature in the international scene is the greatly increased productivity achieved by other countries in recent years. This should come as no surprise, since in the past 10 years we have exported close to $30 billion worth of machinery.

While no detailed information is available to show precisely where all this machinery has been installed, it seems fair to say that many of our industries, including recently several of our mass production industries, have found imports increasing while their foreign markets have been shrinking.

Unemployment in this country threatens to become chronic because our capital is finding the investment climate here less attractive than formerly with the result that absorption of the unemployed is not taking place. Scores of companies in many lines of manufacture are studying the possibilities of making manufacturing arrangements overseas as a means of participating in foreign markets and, in some cases, shipping to this country. A substantial number of companies have already taken the step. Others are in the process while others are beginning to explore.

Until investment at home is made more attractive it will not come forward in the volume necessary to absorb the present unemployed and the added labor force coming on the market each year. A considerable part of our exports are already subsidized. Until we come into a more favorable competitive position more subsidization will be needed if we are to maintain our export position; but this will only aggravate our problem because it will mean a greater burden on the Treasury and that means higher rather than lower taxes.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD, I ask to insert an address on this subject by O. R. Strackbein, who has kept abreast of these developments. I believe that Members will find much food for reflection and concern in this address:

U.S. TRADE DEFICIT—WHAT IT MEANS

(Address of O. R. Strackbein, Chairman, the Nationwide Committee on Import-Export Policy, before the Compressed Air and Gas Institute, Hot Springs, Va., May 1, 1959)

An official report from the Department of Comemrce shows that in 1958 the United States had an adverse dollar balance of $3.4 billion in our total foreign account. This balance includes all transactions and not merely the physical products of commerce. Our exports of physical goods actually exceeded our imports by a little over $3 billion; but that alone is not what determines the direction of the flow of gold. To cover this it is necessary to look at all the transactions, such as tourist expenditures, investments abroad, foreign aid, etc.

When all movements are taken into consideration we find the United States nearly $3½ billion behind in 1958 in her foreign account.

This is a different picture from the one usually spread on the record. The information fed to the public is that we export more than we import and that we are draining the other countries of dollars and drying up their treasuries. This is true only in the case of physical goods; and would not be true then if we left out the foreign aid and subsidized agricultural shipments. The picture is false so far as draining of gold from other countries is concerned.

The fact is that in the past 4 or 5 years, with the exception of 1957, the tide has run against us. In 1958, of the total deficit of $3.4 billion, some $2.3 billion was accounted for by actual outflow of our gold. It is not we who are draining foreign treasuries but foreign countries that are draining our gold away.

There are those who continue to say that all the foreign aid money and all the dollars that otherwise go overseas always come back in the form of purchases of goods from us.

This is a fallacy of the first water. The 1958 experience plus the experiences of 1955 and 1956 thoroughly disprove the claim. We have lost some $7 or $8 billion in the past 5 or 6 years in our international transactions; and that means that these dollars have not come back.

How long will it be before the changed situation in our competitive standing before the rest of the world is recognized for what it is; and how long will it take before our trade policy is altered to fit the realities?

What we witness today, not only in the deficit in our foreign account, but in the decline in our exports and the high level of our imports, is not something that has mushroomed overnight. It is something toward which we have in fact been moving with both our domestic and foreign economic policies for years.

If what we see before us today had not happened we might well have been surprised, for it is the natural and logical consequence of our policies. What are these policies and what combination of them has been responsible for the present situation?

We began 25 years ago a set of policies that were calculated, if they were successful, to carry this country to the position in which it finds itself today. We sought to inflate the economy by various devices based on the principle of pump priming. We instituted farm price supports, crop curtailment, and purchase of surplus farm output; we enacted minimum wage laws, the 40-hour workweek and overtime provisions. We established by law a system of universal union recognition, including collective bargaining. We adopted social security policies, including unemployment compensation, old-age assistance and retirement benefits. We gave legislative support to many other interferences with the free market.

Altogether we provided all sorts of economic cushions to prevent any deflationary movement from developing into a depression. Public spending as a means of keeping the wheels of industry moving became a widely accepted policy. I do not here offer any comments on the merits of this domestic legislation. I am concerned with its effects on our international competitive standing.

The whole drive was aimed at increasing the purchasing power of the people and to keep it from slipping dangerously below the level attained at any time. To this end we passed the Full Employment Act of 1946; and have generally been guided by the resolve to prevent the development of a depression.

In 1941 we became involved in World War II. If the policies of the preceding decade had not succeeded on their own, they were given a tremendous boost by our war-spending and subsequently by our defense spending and thus were assured of success.

We have in any event, whether as the result of these policies or of the war and the cold war or both, enjoyed high prices for farm no less than industrial products, high and increasing wages, successive records in the height of our total national product, record exports and imports, and until 1958 very high employment, hovering around the 65 million mark, including millions more of women workers than had ever previously invaded our mills and plants and service trades.

Yes, we succeeded very well in pushing this country onto a high economic plateau; and that was our purpose or a byproduct thereof.

Since the war we have also helped a number of other countries economically. This outgo itself further stimulated our own industry. In recent years most of these other countries have also boomed and reached production heights never previously attained. England, Germany, and France offer outstanding examples. In Latin America prosperity also erupted here and there.

Underneath all this, far-reaching economic changes were at work. Quite aside from tremendous technological developments, the relative competitive standing of this country in relation to other countries underwent a very significant transformation.

How did this come about?

Before the war our lead over other countries in mechanization and technology, and particularly in mass production, was impressive. Our large mass production industries had little to fear from foreign competition. They thrived on exports. To some extent their position after the war in the enjoyment of record exports was a case of living on borrowed time. By this I mean to say that during the war the accustomed foreign markets of England, Germany, Japan, and other countries fell into our hands. The demand was so great in fact that we found it necessary to establish export controls. For several years after the war we held these foreign markets; and they were seller's mar-

kets still clamoring for goods. In fact, they looked to the United States as a source of supply because the war-torn countries could not meet the demand. The great exporting countries of Europe and Japan were not yet in a position to reassert their prewar position.

On top of the demand from the countries that we thus continued to supply, notably in Latin America and Asia, we also began to ship heavily to the war-wrecked countries under the Marshall plan. This combined demand helped swell our exports. We had not even met all the pent-up demand in this country after the war when the Marshall plan added foreign aid as a further demand on our production machine.

Then came the increased defense outlays, triggered by the Korean outbreak. Wages and prices moved up with our prosperity, and by the time the other countries were back on their feet and actively reentering world trade we had escalated high up the economic scale.

In the meantime, going back to 1934, we had also embarked on a trade policy that had exactly opposite economic principles at its base from those underlying our domestic programs. Our trade agreements program was aimed at freeing market forces while our domestic policies represented direct governmental interference with the free play of these forces. While inwardly, on the domestic scene, we moved rapidly away from the free market in favor of a regulated economy, outwardly we embraced Adam Smith's philosophy of 1775 and moved toward free trade. In fact we slashed our tariffs very drastically. The protection of our tariff has been reduced some 75 to 80 percent since 1934, most of it since 1947 when we signed the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

This sharp reduction of our tariff would of itself have made our already-exposed industries more vulnerable to import competition than before, and would have brought more and more of our industries previously immune to imports, such as the great mass production industries, including automobile and steel manufacturing, to a position of vulnerability.

But much more happened. Under the Marshall plan and under the steam of the growing purchasing power of other countries, innumerable new machines and great quantities of the latest equipment were shipped from this country overseas for installation in foreign plants, mills and factories.

What was the purpose of this machinery? Obviously its purpose was to improve efficiency of production, beyond simply rebuilding the bombed-out plants. Billions of dollars worth of such machinery and equipment was installed in a number of countries. In a matter of several years numerous foreign factories had machinery as modern as ours and in many instances more modern than that in many of our factories. Concurrently we received and conducted thousands of foreign productivity teams through our factories to teach them our production techniques.

However, the old wage-gap between this and other countries not only did not close; it remained wide apart. While foreign wages have risen in recent years they did not begin to rise as soon or as sharply after the war as did wages in this country. Consequently much foreign competition is now more difficult to meet than formerly.

That is why our present situation should offer no surprise. While we have become more vulnerable as our domestic policies bore fruit, we made ourselves doubly vulnerable by building up our competitors and tearing down our outward defenses. Our action took the form not only of tariff reductions but slack enforcement of our antidumping law and relaxation of the Buy American Act.

Thus after 25 years of hoisting our economy on stilts and tearing away our tariff while building up the productivity of other countries we find ourselves suddenly in an unenviable international competitive position.

It would be the utmost folly to continue our present exposure, especially when some slight modification of the Trade Agreements Act and some tightening of the Buy American Act and better enforcement of the antidumping law would assure us a reasonable economic defense. We simply cannot maintain the kind of economy we have built over the past decades if we leave it outwardly exposed as it now is and as many now acknowledge who long refused to recognize the ultimate outcome of our policies.

Our foreign trade policy is incompatible with our domestic economic program. It is contrary to our farm price support policy; it conflicts with our wage and hour law; it is at odds with our policy toward union recognition and collective bargaining; it runs counter to our restrictive immigration law; it promotes automation as a means of lowering labor costs and thus adds to unemployment; it promotes the flight of domestic industries to other countries thus bypassing potential jobs in this country, and at the same time attracts imports to this market while shrinking our exports.

Needless to say, the State Department interposes itself squarely across the path of revisions of our foreign trade policy. It knows nothing better than buying our way through with favors and supports, a process that in time will beach our economy as the tide flows out.

The Informational Media Guarantee Program of the USIA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 11, 1959

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, in yesterday's New York Times there appeared an article by Mr. J. Donald Adams, weekly literary columnist for the Times, expressing concern that very meager funds were being allotted for the informational media guarantee program of the USIA for fiscal 1960.

This program is intended to provide an incentive, particularly for American book publishers, to sell American books overseas through assuring conversion of foreign currencies received from such sales into dollars. In other words, under the program, an American book publisher, upon selling books in country X, can turn the local currency of country X over to the program administrators for dollars, thus encouraging him to expand his sales abroad. The administrator of the program then sells the local currencies to government departments and agencies which might need them and receives dollars in exchange. These dollars are used for the purpose of paying other American publishers for local currencies received by them from book sales, and so forth.

Thus, a revolving fund is established, but a gap must necessarily exist between the sales of local currencies for dollars to other Government agencies by the program, and the payment of dollars to American book publishers for the conversion of the local currencies which they receive. Congress recognized this fact last year by authorizing annual appropriations to restore in whole or in part the amount of impairment incurred against the fund up to the close of the last previous fiscal year.

What is the value of this conversion program? It is a potent weapon in the struggle against communism by providing in plentiful number copies of many of our greatest works on democracy to the peoples of the world. As Mr. Adams points out in his excellent article, without an awareness by the Members of Congress of the tremendous significance of the program, and without their support, "the battle for men's minds which lies at the heart of the cold war cannot be won."

Mr. Adams explains that we are being outsmarted in this ideological contest, partly because Russian publishing is a state enterprise, and thus is able to move quickly and freely, and partly because too many of our people's representatives in government fail to see that men's spoken and written words can be more powerful than the hydrogen bomb.

The program has been making great strides. Works like "The Federalist Papers," Judge Learned Hand's "The Spirit of Liberty," "The Life and Selected Writings of Thomas Jefferson," Carl Sandburg's biography of Lincoln, and many more which interpret the American experience, have been sent overseas, particularly to Africa and Asia, where the demand and the need are most acute.

The program cannot exist, however, without the help of Congress. As of July 1, 1958, the total impairment incurred in the program from its inception in 1948 to that date totaled $13,493,830. A request of $7.6 million for fiscal 1960 was made to the Bureau of the Budget. This was reduced to $3.5 million.

This is a basic minimum figure if the program is to continue on any effective basis. Because I am deeply disturbed that America keeps losing opportunities to combat the menace of communism on all levels overseas, and keeps failing to make the necessary effort, almost seeming at times to be willing to lose by default, it would be an extremely serious matter if this $3.5 million request were to be reduced any further.

The article by Mr. Adams is so eloquent on the problem and the need that I ask that it be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

SPEAKING OF BOOKS

(By J. Donald Adams)

Several weeks ago this column made a plea for the importance of exporting more American books which explain the American experience to those parts of the world where they are most needed—the continents of Asia and Africa. I pointed out that this must be done at prices which the peoples of Asia and Africa can afford; otherwise we would be making a futile gesture. That plea was addressed primarily to American publishers and to the U.S. Information Agency. More properly, it should have been addressed to Members of the Congress, for without their cooperation the battle for

men's minds which lies at the heart of the cold war cannot be won. I come back to this topic because the situation is a serious one the issue of which will be determined in the present session of Congress. If the necessary objective is to be reached, it can be done only with the aid of every American who will take the time to let the Senate and House Appropriations Committees know that he is concerned about our failure to meet Russian competition in this most vital area of the cold war.

American publishers, through the American Book Publishers Council, are doing their part, and so is the USIA. What both these agencies face is the reluctance of Congress to appropriate the money necessary to push such a program to an effective conclusion. As I remarked before, "this need demands as much, if not more thought, than the race over space satellites and intercontinental missiles." We are being outsmarted in this ideological contest, partly because Russian publishing is a state enterprise, and thus able to move quickly and freely, and partly because too many of our people's representatives in government fail to see that men's spoken and written words can be more powerful than the hydrogen bomb.

In the last few years we have made tremendous strides, as was recently pointed out by Congressman BARRATT O'HARA of Illinois. Five years ago (I quote from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD), there were no copies available anywhere in the world on a grassroot level of the books in which our forefathers found their inspiration. Not even the Constitution of the United States and the Declaration of Independence had been translated into foreign languages so that they could be read and understood by the peoples in awakening lands and as hungry for democratic inspiration as were our forefathers. * * * Meanwhile, in every bookstall and in every language and at prices within the reach of everyone were the works of the architects of the ideology of communism."

The picture has changed, but not nearly enough. The USIA has been sending abroad such books as these (and this is only a partial list): Emerson's "Essays, The Federalist Paper," Judge Learned Hand's "The Spirit of Liberty," "The Life and Selected Writings of Thomas Jefferson," Paul M. Angle's "Lincoln Reader," Carl Sandburg's biography of Lincoln, Thoreau's "Walden," De Tocqueville's "Democracy in America" and John Stuart Mill's "On Liberty." Not all of these were American books, but if they were not, they either interpret the American experience, like De Tocqueville, or explain, like Mill, the principles by which we, out of our English heritage, live, and pursue our objectives.

By such works as these we must counteract the impression made by motion pictures which misrepresent us abroad, by "ugly Americans," and by the comic books which are a travesty of the American experience.

Are these efforts effective? This is what Congressman O'HARA heard from Robert A. Lincoln, public affairs officer at Damascus last year, when Mill's "On Liberty" was published in Syria (its first edition in any Asiatic language): " 'On Liberty' was issued in Syria with some misgivings on the part of the publisher, who was uncertain whether an intellectual title of this nature would have much appeal. The translator, however, played a strong role in convincing him that both sales and reader interest would be high, and this proved to be correct. * * * The price of the book was 2½ Syrian pounds, or about 56 cents. In terms of Syrian purchasing power that will buy three packs of a good grade local cigarette or one locally manufactured undershirt. It is a moderate price for a locally manufactured book."

American publishers must rely on congressional help. As Curtis Benjamin, president of the American Book Publishers Council, points out in the council's campaign, our own book industry "faces two obstacles which it cannot overcome unaided. One is the comparatively high cost of producing a book in the United States; the other is the shortage of dollar exchange in many countries. The Russians have neither of these problems to solve. Soviet publishing is state subsidized, and exported books are sold for nominal sums paid in the currency of the importers."

Clearly, the issue is up to Congress. If we are to win in this area of the cold war, it must support financially the informational media guaranty program of the USIA, which guarantees that the exporting publisher receives in dollars the payments he collects from his customers in their currency. Yet this program was slashed for the fiscal year 1958–59 and now faces a further reduction. We must act, and fast.

Speech of Hon. Overton Brooks, of Louisiana, Chairman of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, Before the Controllable Satellites Conference, American Rocket Society-MIT, Boston, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 11, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a splendid and informative address made by our distinguished colleague, the chairman of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS], before the controllable satellites conference, American Rocket Society, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Boston, Mass. There is no one better qualified on the legislative level to discuss the technical subject mentioned in the within address than our friend from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS]. As chairman of the standing Committee on Science and Astronautics, Chairman BROOKS is making an outstanding record. Under his leadership the House committee is also making an outstanding record. Under the leadership of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS], the committee will make marked constructive contributions toward the use for peaceful purposes of present and future discoveries in the great area commonly known as outer space:

It is a source of great pleasure to me as chairman of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics to speak to the people assembled here tonight under the auspices of the American Rocket Society and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

While I am neither a scientist nor an engineer, I share your interest in this vital field of astronautical achievement. One aspect of space technology and exploration never ceases to impress me, and that is the number of years scientists and engineers have been giving serious attention to moving even farther into space. I doubt whether many people working directly in these areas realize that more than 50 years ago Robert H. Goddard was laying a firm foundation for the accomplishments that would be made beginning in 1957. Dr. Goddard, who rightfully deserves the name of father of American rocketry, was busy in 1909 and even before working out the difficult problems associated with the use of rockets to send payloads into space, to the moon, and to the planets.

I have long felt that the tremendously important contributions of Dr. Goddard deserve far greater national recognition than has transpired to date, and I have, therefore, been both delighted and gratified to learn from Dr. T. Keith Glennan, Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, that the new space flight center, now being constructed at Beltsville, Md., will be named the Goddard Space Flight Center.

The Goddard Space Flight Center will consist of specially designed laboratories and will be staffed by outstanding scientists and engineers working to solve new problems connected with space technology and exploration. There, too, will be located important data reduction devices which are tied in to the extraordinarily complicated tracking equipment used to follow the course of space vehicles.

Many years ago Dr. Goddard said, "It is difficult to say what is impossible, for the dream of yesterday is the hope of today and the reality of tomorrow." I hope that the people who work at the Goddard Space Flight Center in the years ahead will be inspired by his courageous thinking.

It is with pleasure that I note the presence at this gathering of the gracious Mrs. Goddard, who did so much to inspire her illustrious husband in his work.

I think it is particularly appropriate to take note of this latest honor accorded Dr. Goddard before this group and in this city, where he spent a considerable portion of his early life before returning to Worcester, where he was born and later attained success.

I was also gratified to learn this evening that the American Rocket Society has decided to erect a memorial to Dr. Goddard in Worcester.

The subject matter before this conference is one of great importance to the United States and the free world and one which is of great concern to me personally and to my committee. In addition to the obvious military implications of controlled satellites, there will also be innumerable peaceful uses of manned maneuverable satellites. Our imagination is inadequate to appreciate the many economic benefits that may arise from this.

In a recent speech at the University of Maryland, Prof. George P. Sutton, our new chief scientist at the Defense Department's Advanced Research Projects Agency, and past president of your society, predicted that special controlled satellites will be used for the development and testing of interplanetary rocket engines and other equipment.

The Science and Astronautics Committee follows developments in this field as well as in other areas of space research. We have realized that even true satellites will not remain indefinitely in fixed orbit. Perturbations resulting from the influence of the moon and the sun will necessitate means to kick them back into orbit by remote control, or change their orbit, or perhaps service them with a manned space vehicle. This will be especially important in the case of satellites whose functions require that they remain permanently in a given orbit, such as the communication relay satellites.

An important series of satellite launchings is now underway at the Pacific Missile Range which will do much to increase our mastery of control techniques. I refer, of course, to the Discoverer satellite program.

This program is being carried on by the Advanced Research Projects Agency of the Department of Defense. It is designed to overcome such tremendous satellite control challenges as command communication, stabilization in orbit, command change of attitude in orbit, capsule ejection from outer space, and recovery of the capsule at a predetermined time and place.

Discoverer II, which returned to earth a few days ago, is regarded as having substantially advanced the art of controlling satellites.

As you know, the capsule which was ejected from the satellite over Spitzbergen in the arctic regions was not recovered. Plans called for it to be ejected over the Hawaiian area where ships and planes were waiting to spot it. However, due to initial malfunction of a part of the timer mechanism in the satellite, ejection occurred prematurely. Timer control was achieved on the 22d pass, but, unfortunately, automatic ejection had already occurred due to the action of a so-called fail-safe device.

Discoverer III is expected to be launched in approximately a month. This time it is planned to have the capsule carry four white mice now undergoing testing at Sunnyvale, Calif.

We are hopeful that the capsule can be directed to a safe landing in the Hawaiian area and that the tiny passengers can be retrieved alive.

If so, this will be the first time any living thing has orbited the earth and been recovered. It will represent a significant step forward toward the day when man can venture into space.

The mice are now undergoing testing for emotional and physical stability by an Air Force biological team. Scientists are greatly interested in the biological reactions of the mice, including oxygen intake, heart respiration, and the physiological and psychological effects of weightlessness, such as the effect on their digestive processes and upon their nervous systems.

As a preclude to ejection of the capsule from Discoverer III, the satellite's attitude will be changed in orbit. It will be turned initially into a tail first position and then turned 60 degrees down from the horizontal by means of compressed gas jets.

When in this position a series of explosive bolts will cause the capsule to eject from the satellite. Immediately thereafter, a retrorocket will be fired which will slow the capsule and direct it into a reentry trajectory.

At an altitude of about 50,000 feet, a switch, operated by the force of deceleration, will release a 20-pound parachute which will slowly lower the capsule, now weighing about 35 pounds, to the water.

C–119 airplanes from Hickman Feld scouting the Hawaiian area hope to spot the parachute visually because of its bright orange color, by signal from the radio beacon or by means of the plane's own radar, since the parachute is equipped with a reflecting undercoating of aluminum. If an airplane is within the immediate vicinity of the capsule as it falls, it is planned to snatch it out of the air with specially designed equipment. Destroyers waiting below will be ready to retrieve it should the aerial grab fail.

The conically shaped capsule, which will float on the water, has a diameter across the bottom of 2½ to 3 feet and a height of about 2 feet. It contains a radio beacon which will emit signals for about 10 to 18 hours, sufficient time, it is believed, to enable the waiting planes and ships to detect it.

The Discoverer II is believed to have passed within several hundred miles of the North and South Poles. It was visible to the naked eye in the North and South Pole regions. Our people at the U.S. IGY station at the South Pole saw it pass overhead on 22 consecutive passes. It appeared to them as a bright small moon. The satellite was also observed by individuals at the Admiral Byrd station, several hundred miles from the South Pole.

Considerable control was exercised over Discoverer II from the ground below.

It may be of interest o review the separate elements of these automatic controls, as well as ground-initiated commands. On various passes over the tracking network in the Alaska-Hawaii-California area, the satellite was commanded to relay its telemetry data to the ground and did so several times successfully.

Discoverer II was also commanded, on its second pass, to incorporate an actual orbital period of 90.5 minutes into its automatic control equipment to insure capsule ejection at the proper time and place.

Due to initial malfunction of a segment of the satellite's timer system, an orbital period of about 95 minutes was incorporated in response to the command from the ground. There was no opportunity to correct this error until after the 17th orbital pass. In the meantime, the capsule was automatically ejected, over the Spitzbergen area apparently, instead of over Hawaii.

Timer control of the satellite was accomplished on the 22d pass, but by this time the capsule had been ejected.

A second major form of control to which the Discoverer II was subjected is known as attitude control or stabilization. Prior to second stage ignition and injection into orbit, Discoverer II was placed into a horizontal position by means of an inertial reference package and a hydraulic control system, aided by an infrared horizon scanner.

Upon ignition, the pneumatic jet control system was replaced by a hydraulic control system which gimballed the Bell second stage engine, maintaining the satellite in a horizontal position during orbital injection. The infrared sensitive horizon scanner continued to operate, relaying corrections to the second stage guidance system.

After the Bell engine cutoff, the pneumatic jet control system resumed operation. Compressed gas under high pressure was metered to a series of external jets which stabilized the satellite as it orbited the earth.

A third form of control over the Discoverer took place when the satellite's attitude was changed in orbit as a prelude to capsule ejection.

The control functions applied to the Discoverer II required relatively small amounts of energy. A considerable increase in space propulsion energy will be required in order to accomplish a change in orbital altitude and direction or to maneuver a satellite from orbit to orbit.

In this regard, it is worthy of note that ARPA is planning a more advanced program than the Discover, dubbed "Mrs. V," for maneuverable, recoverable space vehicles. A major effort is also being directed toward the development of advanced space propulsion through the study of the feasibility of ion, plasma and charged particle jets.

The members of our committee are keenly aware of the importance of such developments to both the civilian and military space efforts of the United States. Such early programs can lead to the preciseness of control which will be required for interplanetary travel as well as for the development of maneuverable space vehicles which can operate in space in much the same manner as aircraft now perform in the atmosphere.

Many problems must be solved before man can venture safely into outer space, but if we have the vision and the courage to forge ahead, success will surely crown our efforts. Above all we must not be afraid to try, again, and again, and again, until we succeed.

We must be prepared to meet failure, as well as successes. Dr. Arthur Kantrowitz, director of the Avco-Everett Research Laboratory, put it well, I think, when he told our committe in a recent hearing: "I would feel better about our space program if I saw us making more mistakes than we do."

"Let's take a chance," said Dr. Kantrowitz. "Let's have the courage to risk making a mistake."

I cannot close without a word of caution about the state of our research "reservoir." If we are to continue to forge ahead, we must not lose sight of the importance of supporting the search for new knowledge. Only in this way can we replenish the well from which all progress flows.

We want results, yes. But we must prepare the way for results by laying the groundwork in advance, by continually searching for the truth. Here is where we will find many of the failures Dr. Kantrowitz referred to, but out of failures will come success.

Dr. Wernher von Braun, who heads the Army ballistic missile development program at Huntsville, Ala., says, "We are too busy with crash programs and are in danger of forgetting the long-range requirements which lie ahead and which will demand much more really new knowledge. We are concentrating upon doing things now with existing systems or with those which can evolve from existing technology."

"If we delay initiating basic and supporting research until the things down the road are upon us," he warns, "it will be too late. We will suddenly find ourselves brought to a stop by the exhaustion of our resources."

I agree 100 percent with Dr. von Braun and it is for this reason that I have introduced H.R. 5266 in Congress to set aside 10 percent of all Government expenditures for research and development for basic research. I plan to press for enactment of this legislation.

It has been a pleasure to appear before you and to address this body. The men and women assembled here tonight are making a real contribution to the welfare of the United States and the progress of mankind.

The great unknown, awesome in its immensity, stretches before us. Great adventures beckon us. We must always keep our eyes on the goals ahead, undaunted by failures. If we do so, success will surely be ours in the end.

Thank you.

West Berlin Knows It's the Big Stake at Geneva

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1959

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, staff reporters Chalmers Roberts and Murray Malder have given an excellent and objective account of the situation in West Berlin on the eve of the Geneva talks in the May 10, 1959, issue of the Washington Post and Times-Herald. I hope it will be widely read.

I noted with interest the reference to our military garrison of 11,000 men as a token force serving primarily a psychological and morale function. No-

body, of course, can deny that this is part of their mission in Berlin. From a strictly military point of view, and in the final analysis, it is doubtful whether they could hold West Berlin too long in the event of a crisis. However, it is here asserted, as one who recently inspected the garrison, that the battle group in Berlin under the command of Gen. Barksdale Hamlett is a highly skilled fighting unit. It combines superb qualities of intelligent comprehension of its delicate diplomatic role, with an alert battle readiness that reflects sober realization of its military position. The officers and men in the Berlin Command are playing a vital role. They come from a tradition that gave us Bastogne and the Berlin airlift.

I commend this garrison to my colleagues and to my countrymen. They should not be overlooked:

WEST BERLIN KNOWS IT'S THE BIG STAKE AT GENEVA

(By Chalmers M. Roberts and Murrey Marder)

WEST BERLIN.—Looked at from here, there is a disarmingly simple meaning to the East-West Foreign Ministers' Conference which opens at Geneva Monday.

In the hearts and minds of West Berliners, the decision which confronts the free world in the talks about to begin in the Palais des Nations is this: Is the West prepared to abandon, however indirectly, the psychological offensive in the cold war which West Berlin and its 2 million free citizens represent?

Here in West Berlin, the outlook naturally enough is first of all the narrow one. When you stand in the middle of West Berlin looking down the broad and busy avenue which runs seemingly unobstructed under the historic Brandenburg Gate and into Communist East Berlin, your field of vision is narrow indeed. The enemy here is close at hand and free Berlin, whatever the legal rights involved, is dependent on Soviet sufferance for its access to the free world.

A DUAL SYMBOL

But Berliners know, just as Soviet Premier Khrushchev knows, how great are the stakes involved here. When you shove aside the underbrush of words which have piled up on both sides of the Iron Curtain about what is called the Berlin crisis, the vista is not narrow but very broad.

For the loss, even the blunting of West Berlin's current role could very well have the effect of ending today's instability in East Germany to Khrushchev's satisfaction and of creating instability in West Germany, which in turn would unhinge the Atlantic alliance.

The city serves as two symbols. First and most important for the West is its significance as an outpost of western life deep in Communist territory. Its second function is an a symbol of potential—but not foreseeable—German reunification in freedom. Khrushchev wants to eliminate or at least diminish the first symbolic meaning. He cares so little about the second that he is content for the present at least to leave it as a history-book footnote.

A CARD AT A TIME

For 5 months Khrushchev has played upon his dual symbolism with great diplomatic cunning and remarkable success. Like a poker player dealing out his own cards from all parts of the deck and turning them face up one at a time, Khrushchev has managed to keep the West in a state of uncertainty and disorder while still holding onto his hole card.

Khrushchev first said in November that West Berlin should be converted in to a demilitarized free city shorn of its United States, British, and French garrisons. Hostile subversive activity directed against any nation would be banned. Communist East Germany would make the sacrifice of assuring access to the city until the distant day when East and West Berlin might again become the capital of a united Germany.

Eliminating the garrisons would completely end West Berlin's function as a Western outpost. The garrisons are only token forces of about 11,000 men which serve a plateglass function: their presence signifies Western determination to hold West Berlin for the free world, for any attack on them would bring on world war III.

WHAT IS, IS

By making an alternative offer later to permit some Western troops to remain in West Berlin—provided a Soviet token force joined them—Khrushchev helped clarify his real intentions.

Khrushchev is using the pressure he created on the city to bargain over Western access to it in return for recognition of the conquests which Soviet communism has made in Central Europe since World War II.

The Soviet Premier expressed his intentions exactly in a Moscow press conference in March: "Two wars took place—the First and Second World Wars—and what fell off the capitalist carriage, that is to say, what broke away from capitalism and changed over to the rails of socialism, cannot be switched back to the past."

"Let us stop arguing," said Khrushchev, "about this question and let us register what exists. Let us live in peace and not interfere in one another's internal affairs."

TIME TO CONSOLIDATE

By living in peace, of course, Khrushchev does not mean abandoning the battle between communism and capitalism. He means continuing it on terms most advantageous to communism—with a reduction of the West's willingness to use the threat of war to head off communism's advance.

As Khrushchev and other Communist leaders see the world, the Red Star is rising triumphantly, boosted by the Soviet sputnik and missile advances; a period of relaxed European tension will now permit the Soviet bloc to consolidate its gains before the next step forward.

"Don't be hasty, therefore," Khrushchev told East Germany's Communists at Leipzig. "The wind is not blowing against you. Think everything out."

West Berliners, who showed the world their nerve during the Berlin blockade in 1948–49 and in the years before and since, did show a few signs of jitteriness when Khrushchev's demands on West Berlin first burst forth in November. Some few hundreds pulled out of this Communist-encircled outpost and some capital fled the city, too. But the amounts of both were relatively insignificant and have been more than replenished.

PERSONAL ASSURANCE

The fact that West Berlin as a whole has stood firm under Soviet pressure is a remarkable evidence of mass courage. Yet Berliners are not totally unshakable, either. They glance about for signs of reassurance continually, especially from the United States.

When an American based here chats over the garden fence with his West Berlin neighbor about what the American will plant "next fall" or "next spring," the word quickly spreads around the neighborhood. It is these signs of personal faith which are the most comforting.

As Khrushchev's declared strategy shifted its focus away from the narrow issue of West Berlin and toward his real goal of firming up the Communist status quo, tension eased here. West Berliners are very aware, however, that if Khrushchev has trouble attaining his broad goal, he can again tighten the squeeze on this city.

West Berliners are particularly concerned about the British desire for "flexibility." By instinct, they tense up on hearing such comments as that of Britain's Earl of Home in the House of Lords last week saying that Britain foresees "a fruitful field opening up toward real coexistence."

British Prime Minister Macmillan's trip to the Soviet Union produced no hope here for a real relaxation of tension. Instead, there is nothing but uneasiness about Britain's role in the forthcoming talks, coupled with the hope that United States firmness will outweigh any British plan to accept the status quo in Europe, however indirect that recognition may be.

BAIT FOR IKE

Nobody here, any more than in Washington, London, Paris, or Bonn, expects three or four weeks of talks by the foreign ministers in Geneva to bring any solution of the Berlin issue. The prevalent opinion in all the Western European capitals is that at most the Geneva talks should produce Khrushchev's bait to get President Eisenhower to a summit conference.

Some senior diplomats in Western Europe are inclined to think that if Khrushchev does decide that some such bait must be forthcoming at Geneva, it will be offered on an extraneous issue: ending nuclear tests. The gap in those lengthy talks, also being held in Geneva, has narrowed of late, and it would not take too great a step by Khrushchev to close or nearly close it.

The Russians got Mr. Eisenhower to the 1955 summit meeting by signing the Austrian treaty. This time a real indication of a test suspension agreement could do the trick.

It is not of course impossible that the Soviets will offer a new move at Geneva on the Berlin and German issue. Current Western tactics are to put forward the so-called package plan on Berlin, German reunification and European security and then sit back and wait for a Soviet offer to bargain.

Perhaps the majority of Western diplomats, however, tend to believe that the Russians will simply put forward their own package calling for a free city with some United Nations presence to dress up the move, plus a German peace treaty which would simply formalize the present division of Germany and bring diplomatic respectability to Walter Ulbricht's Communist East Germany.

Berliners here, like the West Germans in Bonn, are wary of a United Nations role. They would accept some sort of presence, perhaps, but certainly nothing which would take from the hands of America, Britain, and France the firm control of West Berlin. It may be, some think, that Khrushchev will have a new twist to offer at Geneva on the United Nations involvement.

It is often said, especially from the military standpoint, that West Berlin is indefensible—which it is—and therefore a Western liability. Nothing could be more wrong than to judge only the city's military status, however. Here in West Berlin the evidence is overwhelming that this free city is all the headache to the Communists that it has so often been called.

A constant stream of refugees from the East flows through here to the West. There is a daily influx of East Berliners to see the sights and sense the atmosphere of West Berlin, and every day between 600 and 1,000 East Berliners crowd the U.S. Information Agency's Amerika Haus to read West German papers and to see films of life in the West.

The contrast between the crowded affluence of West Berlin and the drab bareness

of East Berlin may indeed distort the economic disparity, as the economists believe. But the psychological impact is massive. Here the opinion is general that Khrushchev's Berlin crisis owes its origin in considerable part to Ulbricht's feeling that East Germany cannot be stabilized unless and until something is done to blunt the effect of West Berlin.

It may well be that the Soviet tactic at Geneva will be to play upon the thinly veiled differences among the Western Allies by picking this and that item from the Western package. Indeed, Neues Deutschland, the Communist East German paper, the other day front-paged a cartoon showing two workmen looking helplessly at a huge package marked "Western Package" which they could not move through an open door marked "Entrance to Geneva Conference." The caption on the cartoon read: "It won't work. If the package is not taken apart, it will block the entire Conference."

Another Soviet tactic is to befog and becloud the issue. In West Berlin, however, the issue seems as clear as the May sky.

Of all the millions of words spoken in the 6 months since Khrushchev first created the Berlin crisis last November 10, the simplest, clearest, and most comforting have come from Mr. Eisenhower. His speech of March 17 had a massive impact here, especially his statement that "we will not retreat 1 inch from our duty. We shall continue to exercise our right of peaceful passage to and from West Berlin."

Any result of the Geneva Conference, or of a subsequent summit conference, which contradicts that solemn pledge will open the door to disaster here. Perhaps that is not a valid judgment, but there is no doubt that that is the way West Berlin looks at it today.

Legislative Recommendations of the American Bar Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 5, 1959

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, on May 12 and 13 the Illinois Federation of Republican Women will meet in Springfield, at which time they will discuss the legislative recommendations of the American Bar Association.

I believe it is significant enough to set forth in my remarks the 10-point program of the American Bar Association as adopted in its national meeting held in Chicago 2 months ago.

Never has there been a greater demand for the conscientious and careful consideration of these recommendations. Certainly they are sound and wholesome for the future and security of America and the preservation of our way of life. As one who is deeply concerned with un-American activities and the lethargy of many citizens in this field, I wholeheartedly endorse the 10-point program as one who has introduced legislation in this field consistent to the problems which have arisen as an outgrowth of various Supreme Court decisions.

The American Bar Association officially recommended that the U.S. Congres pass the following legislation:

First. Restore to the States the right to enforce their own antisubversive laws.

Second. Restore to congressional committees the same freedom to investigate Communists and pro-Communists that these committees have always had to investigate businessmen and labor leaders.

Third. Restore to the Smith Act the provision which makes it a crime to teach or advocate the violent overthrow of the Government.

Fourth. Restore to the Smith Act the meaning of "organize" which includes organizational work done after 1948, so that Communist organizers cannot hide behind the statute of limitations.

Fifth. Restore to the executive branch the right to determine and to dismiss security risks in both sensitive and nonsensitive positions of the Government.

Sixth. Restore to the States the right to set standards high enough to exclude from public employment and education those who refuse to testify about their Communist activities and associates.

Seventh. Restore to the executive branch the right to question aliens awaiting deportation about subversive associates and contacts, and the right to deport aliens who are Communists at any time after entering the United States.

Eighth. Restore to the executive branch the right to deny passports to those who refuse to sign a non-Communist affidavit.

Ninth. Restore to congressional committees the right to determine whether the questions asked of pro-Communist witnesses are pertinent.

Tenth. Restore to the Foreign Agents Registration Act the requirement that propaganda sent from the Soviet Union and disseminated within the United State be labeled for what it is.

Congratulations, President Truman

SPEECH

OF

HON. PAUL C. JONES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 7, 1959

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I am happy that we have this opportunity to express ourselves on the occasion of the 75th birthday of Missouri's most distinguished citizen, but even more pleased over the fact that President Truman can enjoy reading the tributes that are being paid to him. All too frequently such eulogies are delayed until an occasion when they can be only a comfort to a family in an hour of bereavement.

While I enjoy the reminiscence of this hour, the thing that gives me the greatest joy and the most satisfaction is the fact that President Truman is having that unique experience of enjoying during his lifetime the growing esteem and the increasing appreciation of the contribution which he made during his years of official service, and which he continues to make in the role of elder statesman. As he goes about the Nation speaking to university and college groups, impressing upon the minds of these young people their responsibilities in preserving the rights and liberties which we enjoy under our Constitution, he is continuing to perform a service of inestimable value.

I, along with my father, was among those who supported "Judge" Truman when he was first a candidate for the U.S. Senate. As individuals and through the newspaper which we operated at that time, we supported him in each of his campaigns, because we believed, as was later confirmed in all of his actions, that he was a man with a sincere desire to do the things that he believed were honest and right, and which would result in the greatest amount of good for the people whom he represented.

This did not mean that I always agreed with his judgment, and there were times when he was President that I did not agree with and did not support all of his policies. But, I also knew that he could appreciate my position in representing a constituency in southeast Missouri, with which he was most familiar since some of his most enthusiastic and effective support had come from that area during his elections to the Senate, and which, incidentally, has remained with him throughout his career.

However, Mr. Speaker, even when I could not agree 100 percent with President Truman, I always found that there were so many things in which we were in agreement, that it was never difficult for me to make a choice in his favor. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, all of the members of our great Democratic Party did not always make that choice, but it has been a great satisfaction to me to hear some of those who during his service as President were among his most severe critics, but who after he had left office and they had witnessed some of the changes that have taken place, were willing to admit, "Well, President Truman wasn't so bad, after all."

Yes; the man from Independence continues to grow in stature and influence, and today there is no question in my mind about the eminence of his place in history, or of the esteem in which he is held by a vast majority of the American people, who admire courage, frankness and fairness, to mention only a few of the many virtues for which we honor this champion of freedom and liberty on his 75th birthday.

Alcoa's Safety Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 11, 1959

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, the attainment of a high record of efficiency after keen competition is a matter of widespread interest, particularly when it

concerns such a question as safety, which is a main objective of the American people throughout our country.

For this reason, it is noteworthy that the Alcoa Steamship Co. has just been awarded first place in this year's safety contest conducted by the marine section of the National Safety Council. The enviable good record of Alcoa has been recognized generally, so that the basis on which this year's award is made confirms the beliefs of many individuals and companies who have enjoyed the benefits of Alcoa services.

It is noted that the officers and men sailing Alcoa's fleet of freighters maintained an accident rate of 2.94 in achieving this result through operations of both passenger and cargo ships.

William C. White, president of Alcoa, and a member of the board of directors of the American Merchant Marine Institute, deserves the commendation of the American people. His continuing high standard of achievements is worthy of recognition by public-spirited citizens.

The presentation of the safety council award was made by Carl F. Vander Clute, general manager of the Gulf Oil Corp. marine department and also general chairman of the marine section. Because of the importance of this eminently satisfactory showing, I desire to bring this matter to public attention by publication of these remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Communism in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON H. SCHERER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 11, 1959

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, sometimes those of us who are members of the Committee on Un-American Activities feel that the revelations of the nature and objectives of the Communist apparatus resulting from our committee hearings, are not reaching the American people. Naturally, I was gratified when one of America's leading anti-Communists, Roger E. Sherwood, brought to my attention a thesis written by Paul Charron, a student at St. Xavier High School, Louisville, Ky. The title of this excellent work, "Communism In America—Its Early Years and its Present-day Plot to Destroy America," speaks for itself.

I include the essay:

COMMUNISM IN AMERICA

"War to the hilt between communism and capitalism is inevitable. Today, of course, we are not strong enough to attack. Our time will come in 20 or 30 years. To win we shall need the element of surprise. The bourgeoisie will have to be put to sleep. So we shall begin by launching the most spectacular peace movement on record. There will be electrifying overtures and unheard-of concessions. The capitalistic countries, stupid and decadent, will rejoice to cooperate in their own destruction. They will leap at another chance to be friends. As soon as their guard is down, we shall smash them with our clenched fists." [1]

From the inception of communism in the revolutionary bloodbath of 1917, right up to the present day, the sole aim of the Communist movement has been to annihilate the capitalistic state at any cost. Contrary to the beliefs of those who, beguiled by Communist protestations of good-will and peaceful coexistence, feel that the Communist threat is lessening, the Communist movement is flourishing as never before; poisoning the minds of thousands upon thousands of gullible Americans who accept the endless barrage of communistic propaganda at its face value, failing to see through the cloak of good-will and false promises with which the Communists have disguised their movement. Indeed, anyone reasoning logically, can, in view of the shameful atrocities committed by the Communists in Hungary, Poland, and China, and in view of the recent trials of Soviet espionage agents, see that the Communists are most certainly not lessening their campaign against the American state. Rather, they are sharply accelerating their movement to overthrow the democratic Nation in which we live.

THE EARLY YEARS

The Socialist movement in the United States actually began in 1890 but did not really begin to gain support until the Bolshevik revolution of 1917 cast it into national prominence. The movement grew by leaps and bounds and in September of 1919, Socialist leaders convened in Chicago to draft a constitution for the new Communist Party of America.

Its propose was "the education and organization of the working class for the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the abolition of the capitalist system, and the establishment of the Communist Society." [2] It was also affiliated with the Communist International, which shall be mentioned further on in this article.

Also in September of 1919, the Communist Labor Party was formed. It was made up of delegates to the Socialist Party Convention of August 30, 1919, who had been excluded from the convention because of improper credentials. These delegates, after negotiating with the organizational committee of the Communist Party for the purpose of unity, finally decided that they would organize their own party and so the Communist Labor Party came into being. This party declared itself in complete accord with the principles of communism, as laid down in the Manifesto of the Third International formed at Moscow.[3]

On January 12, 1920, a communication from the president of the executive committee of the Communist International was addressed to the central committee of the Communist Party of America and the Communist Labor Party, on the necessity of immediate unification. Months of negotiations between the two groups resulted in a split within the ranks of the Communist Party of America. In May 1920, a convention was held in Bridgman, Mich., and resulted in the formation of the United Communist Party by merging the group splintered from the Communist Party of America with the Communist Labor Party.

In June of 1921, the Communist Party of America and the United Communist Party united under the common heading, the Communist Party of America. The constitution of the new party was much the same as the two previous ones and they added in their "purpose" the words "its (C.P.A.) purpose is to destroy the bourgeois state machinery." [4]

In the latter part of 1919, the Department of Justice submitted a great deal of evidence on the Communist Party of America to the Department of Labor. The result of this was the issuance of a great number of warrants for deportation hearings. These deportation cases were based on the theory that the Communist Party of America advocated the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force and violence and, therefore, its officials and members who were aliens were subject to deportation as being members of an organization proscribed by immigration laws.

The Communist Party of America was forced underground by the wholesale arrests and deportations. However, in June and July of 1921, The Third Congress of the Communist International authorized the Communist Party of America to form an open political party that could operate legally. The ultimate result of this communique was the formation of the Workers Party of America. Its new constitution was not phrased as strongly as the previous one but was, of course, blindly devoted to the Communist cause and purpose, namely, the overthrow of capitalism through the establishment of the Workers Republic. The Communist Party of America continued functioning as previously but now it functioned secretly.

In the summer of 1923, the C.P.A. (underground) found it necessary to hold a convention. The secret convention was held in a wood near Bridgman, Mich., during the latter part of August of that year and it attracted three representatives of the Commintern or Communist International as well as the leading Socialists of the United States. The convention came to a sudden and abrupt end when State and Federal authorities raided the convention and arrested the Communist leaders.

Faced with the prosecution and possible imprisonment of the top leaders of the American section, the Communist International, on December 3, 1922, decided that the Communist Party of America should function as an open legal party.[5] On April 7, 1923, the C.P.A. voted to dissolve and merge with the Workers Party of America. This merger, with the blessings of the Comintern, was swiftly executed.

This merger of the two Socialist Parties and the dissolution of the underground organization brought the continuing battles for leadership of the party into national focus. Although they accepted the right of the Russian Communists to boss them, the top American Communists did not cease their bickering and maneuvering for control of the party and so here began the split in the party which was not felt until 1957 and which shall be spoken of later in this paper.

The rising threat of Nazi aggression around 1935 prompted the Russians to change their tactics slightly. Previously the Communist Parties in America had received their instructions from the Comintern in the form of directives, letters, etc. In 1935 a new method of transmitting instructions was adopted. Pronouncements of spokesmen of the Comintern were circulated internationally in such Communist publications as War and the Working Class, New Times, and International Affairs, and in America by Daily Worker, Political Affairs, and The Masses and The Mainstream. The purpose of this change in operations was to lull other governments into believing that the Soviets were no longer interested in organizing the Communist conspiracy in other countries, so that the Communists could gain the support of the democracies against the Nazi threat. Here is the party's first attempt to disguise its role as the center of world revolution.[6]

Footnotes at end of speech.

During the war years the Communists worked amiably with the Allies to suppress the Nazi uprisings but immediately after the war resumed their vicious campaign to pervert the rest of the world and all freemen.

The gap in the ranks of the Communist Party of America, which was first opened in 1923 and which was widened by the struggle for power in the Soviet Union in 1955 through 1957 and the use of Soviet troops in Hungary and Poland in 1956, finally burst during the 16th convention of the Communist Party, USA at New York on February 9–12, 1957. A revisionist faction led by John Gates, then editor of the Daily Worker, clashed with a group led by William Z. Foster, the head of the party since 1945. Gates and his followers were dissatisfied with the party policies, resented the intervention of Soviet troops in Hungary, favored independence from Moscow, and wanted to change the name of the party to a political association. Foster and his followers favored looking to Moscow for guidance—in other words, blind submission to the wishes of the men behind the massive doors of the Kremlin. A middle of the road group led by Eugene Dennis finally threw their support to the Foster faction to defeat Gates. Gates and most of his followers resigned from the party in disgust, leaving it firmly controlled by Foster and his cohorts and unflinchingly obedient to the will of Moscow.

Having traced the lineage of the Communist Party in America from its inception in 1917, through the war years, up to the present time, and having been made acquainted with the basic why's and wherefore's of the Communist movement, we may now proceed into a discussion of the current attacks the Communists are using in their plot to destroy America.

THE PRESENT-DAY PLOT TO DESTROY AMERICA

A prominent method of subversion is through propaganda. Premier Khrushchev's frequent declarations to the world that he and his henchmen have no aggressive designs and the convivial handshakes and smiles of Soviet Ambassador Mikhail A. Menshikov are indeed hard to see through. But when you read of Russian diplomats being arrested as espionage agents and when you read of another bloody purge such as in Hungary in 1956, you can see that someone is lying and hard, cold facts cannot be disputed.

Also the American public is fed a steady diet of Red propaganda in the little, harmless looking pamphlets that mysteriously find their way to one's doorstep. These pamphlets present an unrealistic and falsified view of life in the Soviet Republic. The aims and the program of the Communist Party are shown out of text in a rephrased and attractive manner. These pamphlets have but one diabolical purpose—to tear the American from his heritage and change him into a pliable tool of the Kremlin.

The lies of the Communist papers of America, led by the Daily Worker, and the two-faced, insidious falsehoods of the Communist news agency, Tass, are well known and therefore will not be dwelled upon.

One other means by which the Communists seek to eradicate the American Nation is by infiltration into influential positions. So far the most successful areas of infiltration for Communists have been (1) colleges and universities or in other words, among our students; (2) national and minority groups, particularly in creating strife between Negroes and whites; (3) in religious organizations, seeking to create bigotry and hatred among one another; (4) in the field of labor, seeking to pit the workingman against capital; and (5) among the poor, of which there are always so many.[7]

It is most certainly no coincidence that most causes of national tension are strife in the last few years have fallen in the above-mentioned categories.

Next we have perhaps the most ruthless of all the Communist subversion methods; namely, the espionage system where enemy agents attempt to penetrate into the brain of the democratic state, her government, and pluck from it the secrets which make the Nation a power of the world. The Reds seek to gain these secrets by fair means or foul—rather by foul means, for there is no fair way to attain this valuable information—and they will commit any crime—I repeat, any crime—to attain this data. Robbery, murder and sabotage are not at all uncommon to the Kremlin agents.

Early in 1956, a Kremlin offensive was launched which consisted for the most part of warm smiles, convivial gatherings, and declarations of peaceful coexistence. The belief that some Americans persist in retaining that the Russians are actually interested in peace or anything approaching peace would be quickly dispelled if they would glance at the facts concerning the Soviet espionage plot to undermine America. William F. Tompkins, then chief of the Internal Security division of the Justice Department stated before a congressional committee in 1956 that the FBI had referred 481 cases of espionage to the Department of Justice in the last year and a half. Before the same committee a year later, Tompkins testified that 160 cases of espionage had been presented to, or were pending in, the Department of Justice in the first 6 months of 1956.[8] And the story is the same the world over. Between March 1, 1956, and October 2, 1958, 15 big espionage cases were broken in 8 different countries, Finland, Greece, Japan, Austria, Iran, Germany, Denmark, and Sweden.

In the United States, Communist spy activity is at its peak. This is evidenced by the large number of arrests and convictions on spy charges in the last year and a half. A few of the more prominent are: October 8, 1957, Jack Soble was sentenced to 7 years in prison after pleading guilty in his trial to spying for the Soviet Union; July 8, 1957, Mr. and Mrs. George M. Zlatowski were indicted as members of a global Soviet spy ring run by Soble and were charged with 38 overt acts of espionage. At the time of the indictment Mr. and Mrs. Zlatowski were in Paris. Both denied the charges but refused to return to the United States for trial; November 15, 1957, Col. Rudolf Abel, an officer of the Soviet Intelligence, was sentenced to 30 years in prison and fined $3,000 for passing U.S. defense and atomic secrets to Moscow.

These organized spy rings are not the only espionage tactics carried on by the Russians here in America. There are cases too numerous to mention where Soviet agents have contacted naturalized American citizens or Americans who have relatives behind the Iron Curtain, with propositions to betray the United States. If these Americans refused to comply with Russian demands, they were faced with the threat of imprisonment or death to their relatives, not to insure that a wrong would be righted or a crime prevented, but in an effort to guarantee acts of betrayal.[9]

"Experience has revealed that foreign espionage agents seek the protection of legal cover. By that, I mean they seek admittance into the United States on diplomatic passports. They seek assignments to some official foreign agency and thus conceal themselves under the diplomatic cloak of immunity. To further avert suspicion, a high-ranking espionage agent may very well be employed as a clerk or in some minor capacity in a foreign establishment. However, when he speaks, those with higher-sounding titles follow his orders without question. Foreign espionage services maintain strict supervision over their activities in this country."[10]

These words of Mr. J. Edgar Hoover in testimony before the Senate Appropriations Committee in 1950 shed the light on another espionage tactic of the Russians, that of sending their agents to the United States to gather information under the diplomatic cloak of immunity. This statement is backed by the words of Mr. Victor A. Kravchenko, economic attaché of the U.S.S.R. Purchasing Commission in Washington during World II who asked for, and was granted political asylum in the United States in 1944. When he testified before the House Committee on Un-American Activities in 1947, Mr. Kravchenko made the following statements concerning the duties of Soviet diplomats and representatives in the United States:

"I must state in general that no person holding an important position in connection with the economic, political, or military organizations and arriving in the United States from the Soviet Union arrives without a special assignment as to the collection of secret information."

Question. "As to every person assigned to this county from the Soviet Union.

Mr. KRAVCHENKO. At least I may state that every responsible representative of the Soviet Union in the United States may be regarded as a possible economic, political, or military spy. I did not know of one department in the Soviet purchasing commission, whether it was aviation, metal, auto tractor, or other, which was not occupied in collecting secret information about its equivalent in American industry."[11]

There are dozens of other Soviet diplomats who have defected to freedom and who swear that the words of Kravchenko are true.

And this is not all. Since 1953 six Soviet "diplomats"—formerly attached to the Soviet Embassy in Washington have been expelled as spies and it is known that four others have engaged in espionage or have attempted same. Also, five Soviet representatives to the United Nations have been expelled from the United States since 1949 for similar reasons. Ten other agents, all personnel of the Communist satellite nations assigned to their embassies and consulates here, or to the United Nations, have been declared persona non grata and asked to leave the country. If further proof were needed to show the insincerity and deceit with which the Russians speak of friendship, Pamfil Riposanu, former first counseller of the Rumanian Legation in the United States who with two comrades quit the legation after the 1947 Communist purge in Rumania, supplies it. Before the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee in June 1949, Riposanu testified:

"In my opinion the Communist governments of all satellite countries use everyone—not only diplomats, every person, every chauffeur, every man who is sent here—for espionage and propaganda."[12]

We have now discussed some of the heinous tactics which the Communists are presently using in their attempt to corrupt all Americans in hopes of overthrowing the democratic system. We must remember that plotting, conspiracy, secrecy, and betrayal are all weapons of Leninism and likewise in the words of J. Edgar Hoover, that "communism is more than an economic, political, social, or philosophical doctrine. It is a way of life; a false, materialistic religion."[13] Just as we believe in God as the purveyor of all truth, so the rabid tools of the Kremlin believe that communism is the root of all good.

Prevailing upon the words of Pope Pius XI in his encyclical on atheistic communism, Divini Redemptoris, I would close this paper.

"Communism * * * strips man of his liberty, robs human personality of all the moral restraints that check the eruptions of blind impulse. There is no recognition of

Footnotes at end of speech.

any right of the individual in his relations to the collectivity; no natural right is accorded to human personality, which is a mere cogwheel in the Communist system." [14]

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Pilat, Oliver, "The Atom Spies," New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1952.
2. The Committee on Un-American Activities, "Patterns of Communist Espionage," Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1959.
3. The Committe on Un-American Activities, "Organized Communism in the United States," Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1958.
4. The Committee on Un-American Activities, "Operation Abolition," Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1957.
5. Oraze, Stephen, "The Plot to Destroy America," Divine Love, winter 1958–1959, pages 3–7.
6. Hoover, J. Edgar, "Communist, New Look," Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1958.
7. Picard, Frank A., "What Makes A Communist Tick," U.S. News & World Report, March 19, 1954.
8. "The Papal Encyclicals" edition by Anne Fremantle, New York, the New American Library of World Literature, Inc., 1956.

[1] Dimitri Z. Manuilsky, speaking at the Lenin School of Political Welfare in Moscow, 1930, as quoted by the Commitee on Un-American Activities in "Patterns of Communist Espionage" (Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1959, p. 1).

[2] From the Party Constitution adopted at the Communist Party Convention in Chicago, September 1, 1919, as quoted by the Committee on Un-American Activities in "Organized Communism in the United States" (Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1958, p. 37).

[3] The Party and Labor Program of the Communist Labor Party, at the Socialist Party Convention of September 1919, Committee on Un-American Activities, "Organized Communism in United States," p. 42.

[4] The Constitution of the C.P.A. adopted at the Joint Unity Convention of the United Communist Party and the Communist Party of America, May 1921, Committee on Un-American Activities, "Organized Communism in United States," p. 62.

[5] Committee on Un-American Activities, "Organized Communism in United States," p. 79.

[6] Ibid., p. 98.

[7] Stephen Oraze, "The Plot to Destroy America," The Divine Word (winter 1958–1959), p. 5.

[8] Committee on Un-American Activities, "Patterns of Communist Espionage," p. 5.

[9] Ibid., p. 2.

[10] Ibid., p. 24.

[11] Ibid., p. 25.

[12] Ibid., p. 50.

[13] Oraze, p. 3.

[14] "The Papal Encyclicals" edition by Anne Fremantle (New York, the New American Library of World Literature, Inc., 1956, p. 256).

Rumanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 11, 1959

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, Sunday, May 10, was Rumanian Independence Day, the day on which Rumania achieved national unity, freedom, and independence. Again this year the occasion was marked by public gatherings throughout the Nation, attended by the many friends of Rumania.

As part of their plan to extinguish freedom from Eastern Europe, the Communist rulers have forbidden public observance of this historic date in Rumania. Celebrations have been shifted from the 10th to the 9th of May, the anniversary of a Soviet victory, in an effort to alter the significance of Independence Day.

We may be certain, however, that this day was appropriately commemorated in the hearts and the minds of all the Rumanian people. Despite dark years of Communist repression their resolute courage and steadfast faith in freedom continues unbroken. They have known oppression many times before, but have always maintained their profound love of liberty in the face of harsh totalitarianism.

The city of Cleveland is proud to include many persons of Rumanian descent among its populace, and I am privileged to represent many of them in my constitueney. They have contributed substantially to the richness of our community life, and are among our most responsible citizens.

Let us renew the historic bonds of friendship with a liberty-loving people and pray to Almighty God that the day will soon return when they may again live in freedom and independence.

Civilian Health Records

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 11, 1959

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert an abstract of a pamphlet published by J. Theron Hunter, M.D., of Solana Beach, Calif., in which he recommends the universal acceptance of individual health records for civilians. Dr. Hunter has been using this system for over 30 years, and recommends it to the medical profession because of his growing concern over the trend toward socialization of medicine, feeling that nothing should be ignored which could help reverse this trend:

CIVILIAN HEALTH RECORD

(By J. Theron Hunter, M.D.)

This is a recommendation for the universal acceptance of individual health records for civilians. They are in book form, individual personal records for men, women, and children. I am convinced that they are worthwhile after using them for over 30 years.

The proposal is submitted in an attempt to bring all types of medical and surgical practice into a closer alliance, with the sincere hope that the advantages will accrue to the benefit of patients, the medical profession, and medical schools, the last to derive financial aid from sale of the books through a nonprofit organization to print and distribute them.

The chief advantages are: The repetition of taking family and past histories is unnecessary; histories are more acurate and reliable; they save time of phoning, writing, or wiring doctors or hospitals for information; are adaptable to all types of practice because of two facing pockets at the back of each book for carbon copies of reports and data of important illnesses and operations; no longhand writing by physicians is necessary; a lifetime record of health is provided; they are especially useful in programs of periodic examinations; valuable for consultations or referrals; helpful when patients change doctors or locations; the maternity section for several pregnancies may alert a physician to extra precaution; an up-to-date record is as informative as a hospital chart; create good will to improve public relations; good records act as a deterrent to malpractice suits; entries by physicians may show a disability to prevent induction for military service resulting in subsequent medical discharge; they could be useful in prepay plans to lower premium rates with more coverage if authentic periodic examinations were made a part of the contract.

Cards and pamphlets are inadequate as health records because they are easily lost, and as they are presented to patients gratis, appreciation of their importance is as negligible as anything people receive for nothing.

The medical profession and the laity must demonstrate more interest in regular periodic examinations if any degree of success is to be realized in the fight against cancer and other fatal diseases. They are the only logical method for the early detection of serious conditions that require prompt and adequate treatment. Also, the medical profession and allied groups would be relieved from spending time caring for persons with chronic diseases which should have been discovered in a curable stage. The regular checkup, when more widely adopted, will make hospitals less crowded, and provide more pleasant, healthful, and economic living.

It seems absurd that better records are kept of the pedigrees of animals, and services on automobiles, than essential facts relative to the lives and health of human beings.

The Festival of Jeanne d'Arc

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 7, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, May 8, marks the anniversary of that glorious day in history when a young maiden, guided by noble visions, led 10,000 men of France to victory over experienced English troops at Orleans. The story of that young woman, Jeanne d'Arc, told and retold in literature, drama, poetry, and art, has been a source of inspiration to thousands ever since. The Festival of Jeanne d'Arc, celebrated tomorrow by the people of France, brings to mind the qualities of Jeanne d'Arc which have made her memory endure for more than five centuries, and the equally endurable bond between France and the United States.

Jeanne d'Arc was a humble but deeply religious shepherdess who loved France and was distressed by France's occupation by foreign troops, its economic crisis, and the prevailing indecision

about the right of uncrowned Charles VII to rule. Guided by visions which assured her of Charles' right to rule and commanded her to expel the enemy, Jeanne convinced the Prince of her divinely inspired mission. She was placed in command of 10,000 men and led them to the dramatic and impressive victory at Orleans, resulting in the liberation of large portions of French territory and the coronation of Charles as King. The strength and purity of purpose of the Maid of Orleans raised the spirits of the French troops from the depth of defeat to the height of victory.

The qualities which made Jeanne d'Arc an inspiring leader are ones which will always be needed in times of national crisis and which are essential in the free world today. One of these qualities is humility, the maintenance of a modest sense of one's own significance in relation to the rest of the world. Another is religious faith, belief that there is a divine will and a sincere attempt to follow this will. A third such quality is a sense of mission and wholehearted dedication to a cause which one believes is worthy. Courage, purity, and patriotism were other qualities which have made Jeanne d'Arc a heroine to peoples of all countries.

It is France and the people of French descent in this country who are especially remembered on this anniversary of the victory at Orleans. Many of the first settlers of this country came from France, and since 1820 more than 600,000 additional men and women have journeyed from France to make their home in the United States. Moreover some 270,000 French-speaking people who were born in Canada are now living in this country. In our neighbor to the north almost a third of the people are of French origin, and the flourishing French culture in some localities there is a source of delight to all American visitors. We are grateful for the great contributions in many spheres of life which have been made to our country by its citizens of French origin.

Ever since Lafayette came to the aid of the Continental Army led by George Washington, France has occupied a special place in the hearts of Americans. Gratitude for French assistance in time of need has been supplemented by a common devotion to liberty, democracy, and the rights of individuals. Today the alliance of France and the United States under the North Atlantic Treaty is essential to the maintenance of the ideals of liberty, justice, equality, and democracy which our two countries hold so dear. It is my hope that our bonds with France will not only be continued but that they will be expanded and strengthened in the years to come, and that NATO will be expanded from a military alliance into a means for increasing cultural, economic, and politicals ties as well. On this day celebrating the festival of Jeanne d'Arc, let us dedicate ourselves to strengthening these ties so that we can be sure that the great tradition of liberty shared by France and America will never be obliterated but will reach ever greater heights of realization.

U.S. Public Health Activities in Underdeveloped Areas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 11, 1959

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, one of the major obstacles to progress in the underdeveloped areas of the world is the widespread prevalence of debilitating diseases. Each year such diseases take a staggering toll in human lives and wasted energy.

A malaria epidemic in Ethiopia alone last year is estimated to have caused 50,000 to 60,000 deaths in a 2½-month period. All areas of the country up to an elevation of 6,800 feet were affected, and millions of people involved.

Trypanosomiasis — African sleeping sickness—a disease which attacks both man and his domestic animals, has been described as the single most important bottleneck in the development of much of the African continent. Almost equally pervasive is schistosomiasis—bilharzia — the debilitating disease transmitted by snails that live in irrigation canals and estimated to affect more than 100 million people in the Near East, South America, Africa, and elsewhere.

Another common disease in many newly developing countries is tuberculosis, which annually kills hundreds of thousands. Most frequently found in young and middle-aged adults, its victim is often the family wage earner or the mother who cares for the children. Its effect on a country's economic productive capacity is enormous.

Diarrheal diseases in various forms account for one out of every four human deaths that occur each year. While some occur frequently in epidemic form, most represent a constant, day-to-day threat of illness and death. Simple cleanliness through good bodily hygiene is the key to prevention of these infections, but inadequate and impure water supplies in many of the less developed areas makes improvement difficult.

Mention should be made, too, of trachoma, an eye disease rarely found in the United States, but common in the Middle East and Africa. An estimated 3 million persons have been blinded by it and other infectious eye diseases in the Middle East alone.

These are some of the numerous diseases that the underdeveloped areas must cope with, invariably with inadequate doctors, nurses, hospital facilities, and medical equipment. In one such country, with a population over 8 million, there are less than 80 practicing physicians and only 600 hospital beds. In another, 70 percent of all babies are delivered by midwives who do not know or practice basic hygiene. In still another, one province with over 1 million inhabitants does not have a single physician.

The United States is actively engaged in extensive bilateral and multilateral programs of public health improvement with other governments. Since the first joint program of the present type was launched in Ecuador in March 1942, technical cooperation in this field has grown progressively.

Our bilateral health assistance programs center primarily on training of health personnel, organization of services and programs, and planning for better health. Supplies and equipment are significant contributions in special projects such as the worldwide malaria eradication campaign.

The response to these projects has been enthusiastic, with local sources contributing substantially more than is spent by the United States on joint programs. Host governments are being stimulated to increase the total health activities of their own countries, with a consequent improvement in the national health.

Some insight into our health programs in action overseas may be gained by an examination of representative programs in three countries—India, Ethiopia, and Puerto Rico.

In India, where malariologists have calculated nearly half the free world's total population exposed to malaria exists, real progress is being made. The eradication program is under direction of the Indian Ministry of Health, and the United States through ICA is supplying the foreign exchange needed for imported insecticides and other commodities. During fiscal year 1959, 260 million people will be protected and it is expected that this will be increased to 360 million in fiscal year 1960.

A study reported in the Indian Journal of Malariology estimates the return on malaria control measures to be about 50 to 1 in increased production, as compared to the cost of DDT spraying operations. Malaria control in the state of Uttar Pradsch has permitted the reclamation of hundreds of thousands of acres of land formerly idle, with the production of large quantities of vitally needed wheat. Estimates of the World Health Organization indicate that the national income of India could be augmented by $500 million annually through malaria eradication.

Ethiopia is currently in the communicable disease era. Statistics available from Government hospitals indicate that probably 70 percent of the population suffers from some form of intestinal parasites; 25 percent to 35 percent of the population is at risk from malaria; 30 percent of the population suffers from veneral disease; possible 3 percent have active pulmonary tuberculosis; some areas have a 6 percent to a 7 percent incidence of leprosy; trachoma and other eye infections may affect as many as 60 percent in selected regions; and typhus, relapsing fever, and pneumonia take a tremendous annual toll during the cold, raw, rainy season. Poor nutrition plays a significant role leading to deaths resulting from many infections which would otherwise not prove fatal.

There are currently only five Ethiopian nationals who are doctors of medicine. The bulk of professional medical attention falls on the shoulders of 160 foreigners of different nationalities. All of the Ethiopian physicians and half of the foreign physicians are concentrated in Addis Ababa, leaving but one doctor for each 400,000 persons in areas outside of Addis.

There are currently 4 schools of nursing in the Empire, but, since the graduation of the first class in 1953, only 90 to 100 nurses have completed their schooling and are practicing.

In 1953, a project agreement was signed by ICA with the Ethiopian Government in conjunction with the World Health Organization and the United Nations Children's Fund for establishment and operation of the Public Health College and Training Center at Gondar, Ethiopia. This institution was designed for and is training Ethiopians to staff local health departments. Health officers take a 3-year course, community nurses a 2-year course, and sanitarians, a 1-year course. On August 23, 1957, 20 health officers, 15 community nurses and 12 sanitarians were graduated as the first class from this institution. These graduates then served a year's internship in the province in which the college is located and under direct supervision of the project staff. After August 1958, these graduates were assigned to local health services in other parts of the empire. In August of 1958, a second class composed of 29 health officers, 13 community nurses, and 19 sanitarians was graduated. Thus by August 1958, this institution had educated 108 well-qualified health workers trained specifically to attack the major health problems of the country. A small corps of laboratory technicians is also being trained in this institution and 12 will finish their course in August of 1959.

In 1954 a contract was signed with the University of Puerto Rico, under which the university accepted people from Latin America for training in public health. All public health classes are held in Spanish. Training in spoken English is a part of the curriculum. Puerto Rico provides a golden opportunity to demonstrate American democracy and know-how operating within a Spanish culture. That this combination can be successful is readily evident to the visitor from Latin America to Puerto Rico.

The contract has been a real success. Each year since 1954, 25 to 30 ICA sponsored trainees have been given professional training. Equally important, many trainees each year have been trained for other agencies such as WHO and PASB at their expense, and the Ministries of Health of Latin America have used Puerto Rico for training sponsored and financed by their own resources.

Mr. Speaker, solution of major health problems in the underdeveloped areas is an important concern to the people of the United States. Our participation in public health assistance programs is a natural expression of the American tradition of extending a helping hand to our fellowman, and as such deserves our wholehearted support.

Surgery or a Mustard Plaster?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON H. SCHERER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 11, 1959

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, the astute and capable Constantine Brown in Washington's Evening Star of last Friday clearly pinpoints the dilemma we face in dealing with the Communist cancer. It is my feeling that this penetrating analysis of the foremost issue of our day should receive the widest possible attention from all thinking Americans. I include the article:

Diplomacy with a capital D is being used by our policymakers in the executive and legislative branches on the American people to accustom them to the idea that talks between our Chief Executive and the big boss of the Kremlin might prove useful.

Judging from a number of nationwide polls, the bulk of Americans are unsympathetic to another summit meeting, at least until Premier Khrushchev gives in advance some tangible evidence that he wishes to live in peace with the free world.

Insistence on tangible evidence of Moscow's peaceful aims was the theme song of the administration after the summit meeting 4 years ago proved such a lamentable flop. But there is not the slightest doubt that another summit meeting, regardless of how the Geneva foreign ministers meeting comes out, has become a certainty.

This decision for a summit meeting, taken at the highest levels in Washington and London, is being spoon-fed to the American people. They must be accustomed to the idea slowly, by means of public relations devices.

All Americans, except a handful of Communists or dedicated fellow travelers, are bitterly opposed to communism and regimentation under the rule of men and not of law. In the years since the end of the last war we have seen the spread of the Communist cancer all over the world. Nations on Russia's borders were taken over by force. In other areas there were, and continue to be, incessant attempts to establish the Red flag by subversions.

We all, including the advocates of coexistence, recognize the Soviet cancer. Yet by their attitude many with heavy responsibilities toward the people of this country act strangely. They appear to be afraid to remove the Red cancer either by surgery or by heavy X-ray treatment. Instead, they hope that by using antiquated remedies, which have proved ineffective, we might at least arrest the disease.

Cultural exchanges, adulation of Communist visitors and artists and an exaggerated estimate of the real Communist military and economic might are the palliatives which our leadership provides to arrest and cure the dread political disease which in the long run will destroy the tissues of freedom which make this country the best in the world. There have been attempts by people in the last stages of this political disease to handle it by heroic means. The German and Polish outbreaks against the Communist tyranny in 1953 and 1956 showed that these subjugated people reached the conclusion that only drastic surgery could cure the cancer from which they were suffering.

The Hungarian rebellion in 1956 and the more recent revolution in Tibet, a long distance from each other, should have opened the eyes of those who believe that we can coexist with the Communists. They did not. The powerful free world which relies on the power of its ideals more than its formidable military strength watched the sacrifices of these little peoples with cheers and noble words of encouragement, but with arms folded. It was too proud to fight or even intervene diplomatically to put an end to the slaughter of these people whose crime was that they wanted to be free.

There is an increasing appreciation by politicos in the hub of the free world that cancer can be arrested only by drastic means, otherwise its cells get into the bloodstream and spread all over the body. Political as well as physical cancer can be cured by heroic methods. When the patient is too scared to submit to such treatments his demise is inevitable.

Teamsters Local Aided Hospital Move

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 6, 1959

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, in my brief remarks I do not intend to discuss in any way the merits of the legislation presently before committees of Congress regarding labor reform. The teamsters unions have been severely criticized but I do want to give credit where credit is due and mention an incident that took place last winter in the city in which I live.

Morgan County had just completed building a new modern hospital of which we are very proud. We had limited funds and in addition to obtaining money under the Hill-Burton program and a general bond issue, individuals and organizations throughout the county had contributed generously to this worthwhile endeavor. The very capable hospital board had been very frugal in the planning and building of this hospital, but practically had depleted their finances by the time they were ready to move into the new building.

Teamsters Local No. 193 of Indianapolis, in cooperation with the owners of the trucks, donated their services and equipment, came to Martinsville and moved the patients and all furniture and equipment to the new hospital in a very capable and orderly manner without cost to the taxpayers.

There was no publicity or fanfare about this act. It was just a bunch of good fellows, in cooperation with management, that performed a very necessary and valuable service to our community for which all were most grateful.

Water Resource Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 11, 1959

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the consideration of the appropriations for the Federal Power Commission some mention was made of the relative progress of our development of hydroelectric resources in comparison of that of Soviet Russia. In this connection, Maj. Gen. E. C. Itschner, Chief of the Corps of Engineers has given to the Congress a report on Russian activities in water resource developments. This report is a most authoritative statement of the accelerated Russian progress in this field. We can justly take pride in our own accomplishments in the water resource developments. However, General Itschner's report makes clear that we have no justification to be complacent and certainly we should not underestimate the achievements of the Russians. In view of the interest expressed on this point, and under unanimous consent, I insert excerpts from General Itschner's report in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The Chief of Engineers report follows:

STATEMENT BY MAJ. GEN. E. C. ITSCHNER, CHIEF OF ENGINEERS, U.S. ARMY, BEFORE SENATE COMMITTEES ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS AND PUBLIC WORKS, FEBRUARY 18, 1958

Mr. Chairman, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers is concerned with Soviet water resource development as part of our overall military engineer intelligence mission, and also because we are interested in how the water resource development and flood control mission, which is one of our principal missions in the United States, is performed in other lands.

Much of our information is obtained from Soviet sources. The Soviets are proud of their accomplishments in this field and publicize them widely. Sometimes the task of coordinating and interpreting the facts and statistics is difficult and confusing, and we do not always have all the detail we would like. For example, it is all but impossibe to measure their efforts in monetary terms. Nevertheless, I believe we have enough information to give this committee an evaluation of Soviet accomplishments, progress, and programs in the water resource field.

SUMMARY OF SOVIET STATUS

The Soviet water resource effort is demonstrating to the world what can be done in this field by well-considered, long range planning and a willingness to make sacrifices in present standards of living in order to achieve the goal of a great future industrial development. Indeed, the Soviets have given water resource development a priority second only to the development of heavy industry designed to support military programs. This fact must be viewed in the light of Secretary Khrushchev's statement: "We declare war on the United States in peaceful production. * * * We will win over the United States." Thus they have openly challenged us to a competition for world economic dominance. Obviously, in view of the priority given it, they regard their race against us in water resource development as a key contest in this competition for world supremacy.

I would like to summarize for you how the race stands today.

In hydroelectric power development, the Soviets already approach us in total installed capacity and have individual projects under construction that far exceed any American project in capacity.

In inland waterway navigation, they have projects that rival ours, and plans that probably surpass ours, though the amount of navigation on their waterways is less than that on American waterways.

In irrigation, the types of development are considerably different, but the Soviet effort is roughly comparable to ours in scope. They have bigger projects than ours, and they probably are irrigating new acres at least as fast as we are.

In other aspects of water resource development, such as flood control, water supply, and recreation, they do not have projects equal to ours but appear not to need them at this time.

Their engineering, vessels, and construction, allowing for their different circumstances, appear to be equal to ours.

Their power equipment and engineering, in items like generators and transmission lines, are excellent, and they are superior to ours in a few characteristics.

The most remarkable fact about the Soviet water resource effort is its rate of growth At the end of World War II much of the European portion of the Soviet Union was devastated. Their major programs have been accomplished largely within 10 years—the bulk of them, in fact, within the past 5 years. The economic and strategic import of the Soviet water resource effort is most significant. The Soviets are basing the creation of new economic provinces, including new industrial and agricultural complexes, squarely upon multiple purpose river development plans. And they are using water resource development as a means of dispersing industrial and othe strategic installations throughout their vast domain—an area three times as big as the United States.

SOVIET ENGINEERING CAPABILITY

I shall try to summarize the Soviet achievement in each of the principal fields of water resource development; but first, by way of background, I should like to describe certain general characteristics of their work, to indicate the caliber of capability they apply to the solution of their problems, and, by way of illustration, to describe briefly some of their engineering programs.

Most Soviet water resource projects are multiple purpose. The hydroelectric function receives emphasis and priority, but generally the gigantic Soviet power developments are associated with equally huge navigation or irrigation projects.

The Soviet Union does not have concentrations of population like we do along our eastern seaboard. Further, the short warm-weather season in some of the most populated areas relegates water recreation to a relatively minor position. Where needed, as in the Moscow area, water resource projects embrace both water supply and recreation.

Soviet demands for building materials, including concrete, are great. Consequently they lean toward building very large earth and rock fill dams, using concrete only for critical portions such as locks, spillways, and powerplants.

Most major Soviet rivers flow through generally flat terrain. Gradients are gentle and there are few gorge-like dam sites. Consequently, long, high dams are often required to provide the necessary heads. Seasonal variations in flow are great, and this also requires large reservoirs. Many project sites, particularly in the European part of the Soviet Union, consist of a high bluff on one riverbank and a wide flat flood plain on the opposite bank. This has required the Soviets to develop engineering techniques for the construction of earth dams several miles in length, in addition to reinforced concrete powerplants, spillways, and navigation structures. Their engineers also have had considerable difficulty with poor foundation conditions. According to their own accounts they have never had a failure; but we know of at least one project that encountered serious difficulties because of improper allowance for or handling of ice jams.

The wintry climate of the U.S.S.R. creates considerable construction difficulty during most of the year, but the Soviets have shown marked ingenuity in dealing with this handicap. In particular, they have employed advanced techniques for minimizing delays in the placing of concrete in cold weather.

Soviet technology has proven itself to be completely adequate to meet technical problems in the water resource field. In the earliest phases of the effort, before World War II, their progress depended on technological advice and equipment from Western nations, and some projects were built only by harsh exploitation of forced labor. Today, however, large projects are planned, engineered, and equipped entirely from within the Soviet Union. They are staffed by workers receiving premium pay rates, and there is very little, if any, use of forced labor.

Because of Soviet accounting, allocation, funding, and monetary procedures, it is meaningless to evaluate the Soviet effort in monetary terms. Ostensibly the program is financed through the sale of bonds to the public. Some 6 years ago the government launched its seventh bond drive since World War II. The goal of that one drive was to raise the equivalent of $7 billion for water resource work. The program has grown since then. However, money ostensibly made available for water resource development is often diverted to other purposes.

They do not have to face some costs that we must face—notably the cost of land acquisition. Ownership is vested in the government and all land disposition is under its sole control. Villages and towns in an area to be inundated can be arbitrarily moved to higher land or eliminated. For instance, before filling the Kuybyshev Reservoir on the Volga River, the entire city of Stavropol', with a population of 25,000, was moved to a new site, and several river ports, notably the one at Kazan', had to be completely rebuilt.

Flood control as we know it is a minor problem in the Soviet Union. The spring floods are regular and high, so there has been very little settlement in the flood plains of rivers. The large reservoirs built for river flow regulation in connection with other functions also inherently serve to a certain extent a flood control function.

When a reservoir impignes on a developed urban area, dikes are erected, and some of these dikes are several miles long and incorporate new river port installations. Otherwise, few levees have been built on river banks, and throughout the country most of the rivers are in their natural state over most of their courses. There is little use of training works to improve channels or stabilize banks, and little or no use of cutoffs, to shorten transit distances on meandering rivers.

As to the quality of Russian engineering, a British technical delegation recently inspected some of their projects and reported: "Russian engineers are not lacking in engineering ability when dealing with the varied problems met in river control and development works. * * * They have been most successful with the projects they have attempted and they are obviously backed with sufficient technical know-how and experience to enable them to deal with any difficulties or troubles which may arise." The quotation is from a series of articles which appeared last September in the British technical publication Engineering.

Soviet construction has now reached levels of technique and scope nearly equal to those of the United States, and it must be expected to accelerate during the next 10 to 15 years.

To illustrate the kind of work they are doing, I will mention a few representative Soviet projects.

The Kuybyshev project on the Volga River has a plant with 2,100,000 kilowatts installed capacity, generated by 20 vertical Kaplan turbines with turbine rotors 30½ feet in diameter operating under a normal head of 63 feet. By comparison, the 18 turbines at America's largest power plant, Grand Coule, have a combined rated capacity of 1,944,000 kilowatts. Thus the rated capacity of the Soviet generators is 108,000 kilowatts, the same capacity as those at Grand Coulee Dam. Actually the American generators have been operated for long periods of time considerably above their rating, so it is quite possible that the two generators have about the same real capacity. The turbines at Grand Coulee, which has a 340 foot head, are of the Frances type and therefore are much smaller than the Russian turbines. The largest Kaplan type of turbines in the United States are those at the Dalles Dam on the Columbia River, which are 23½ feet in diameter. They drive generators which are rated at 78,000 kilowatts under an 81-foot head.

This dam is composed of earth dam sections located between powerplant and spillway, and between spillway and a by-pass canal. These dams total 9,184 feet in length and have a maximum height of 164 feet. By comparison, Fort Peck Dam, the largest in the United States, is 21,026 feet long and 250 feet high. The concrete spillway at Kuybyshev Dam is 3,280 feet long and has 38 65-by-33 foot vertical lift sluice gates handled by three 250-ton traveling cranes. It is designed to pass a flow of 1,412,000 cubic feet per second of water. By comparison, the Fort Peck spillway has a capacity of 250,000 cubic feet per second, regulated by four diversion tunnels and 16 40-by-25-foot gates. The bypass canal at Kuybyshev Dam consists of two pairs of locks and an intermediate basin, plus appurtenant canals and basins upstream and downstream. The locks are 100 by 1,000 feet which compares with the 110-by-1,200 foot size of the largest American barge locks. I cite these statistics to indicate that the Soviets are building works comparable to ours in all aspects.

Some other interesting Soviet projects include four dams notable for their length—Dneprodzerzhinsk Dam, on the Dnieper River, over 12 miles long; Tsimlyanskaya Dam, on the Don River, 8.7 miles long; Gorki Dam, 8.7 miles long, on the Volga River, and Kremenchug Dam, about 7 miles long, on the Dnieper River. These are all completed or under construction.

Two super power dams, both well underway, are Krasnoyarsk Dam on the Yenisey River and Bratsk Dam on the Angara River. Krasnoyarsk Dam will be a concrete structure 2,300 feet long blocking a V-shaped mountain valley. It will have 4,004,000 kilowatts installed capacity—double the biggest American plant—and will include a vertical ship elevator which will lift vessels 370 feet upward to a metal trough. This trough will cross over a railroad line and open into the reservoirs. Each of the generators at this dam will generate 286,000 kilowatts as compared to 108,000 kilowatts for the biggest American generators.

The Bratsk Dam is a 3-mile earth dam ending in a massive concrete spillway and powerplant in a deep rock gorge. The plant will have 3,840,000 kilowatts capacity, derived from eighteen 213,333-kilowatt generators.

One of the better known Soviet projects is the Volga-Don Canal, which connects the Black and Caspian Sea Basins, and permits the Soviets to build submarines in large inland shipbuilding yards along the Volga River. This waterway was built between 1949 to 1952. From the Volga, a canal extends 63 miles westward to the upper end of a 160-mile-long reservoir on the Don River impounded by an earth dam nearly 9 miles long and about 150 feet high. Power from the 160,000-kilowatt powerplant is used to pump water from the reservoir to the summit reach of the canal for operation of the locks. There are 13 locks, all modern and highly ornamented. The reservoir and powerplant also furnish water for the irrigation of nearly 5 million acres of semiarid land to the south.

Another noteworthy project is the 75-mile Moscow-Volga Canal, built during the 1930's. This canal has very large locks, 100 by 1,000 feet and 18 feet deep over the sills. In other words, they are almost as big as the locks now under construction on the Ohio River, but are deeper than our newest Ohio River locks which have 15 feet of water over the sills. The Moscow-Volga project also includes a 3-mile-long earth dam and a 30,000-kilowatt powerplant. Pumping stations raise water from the reservoir to the summit reach of the canal, which also serves as a reservoir for the Moscow city water supply. The project plan provides for pumped storage to help meet peak load conditions in the Moscow power grid, which is served mainly by thermal plants. Several of the project reservoirs have been developed for boating and bathing.

These examples will suffice to show the caliber of ingenuity and engineering which are being applied to Soviet water resource development. I have two tables here which I would like to submit for incorporation into the record, with your permission, Mr. Chairman. Table I shows the magnitude of construction work in two Soviet dams and one American dam. Table II compares certain major Soviet and American dams and powerplants.

Now I should like to summarize the Soviet accomplishments in certain specific fields of water resource development, beginning with hydroelectric power.

HYDROELECTRIC POWER

The total known capacity of Soviet hydroelectric plans over 10,000 kilowatts capacity, complete or under construction, is 25,883,188 kilowatts. This figure does not include 44 plants for which the capacities are not available to us. In addition, the Soviet Union has hundreds of small plants, built mainly to serve rural and agricultural needs.

By comparison, the total U.S. hydro capacity at the end of 1957 was 27,676,000 kilowatts, with approximately 10 million kilowatts more under construction. Thus right now Soviet hydroelectric development appears to be roughly equal to ours in amount. However, their rate of increase is greater than ours.

The United States has no plants completed which reach the 2 million kilowatt mark, although John Day Dam on the Columbia River, on which construction will start this year, will ultimately have 2 million kilowatts if sufficient upstream storage is developed to make this amount of capacity economically justified. It will have initially 1,200,000 or 1,400,000 kilowatts. Grand Coulee Dam, also on the Columbia River, has 1,944,000 kilowatts of installed capacity in two powerhouses, plus 30,000 kilowatts by house units. Considerable study has been given to the construction of a third powerhouse which would increase the capacity to close to 3 million kilowatts. The combined Canadian-United States Barnhart Island powerplant on the St. Lawrence River, rapidly nearing the power-on-the-line date, will have 1,880,000 kilowatts of installed capacity, half of which goes to each country. The new Niagara powerplant of the New York Power Authority, on which construction will commence this year, will have 2,190,000 kilowatts of installed capacity and thus will be, for some time at least, the largest U.S. hydroelectric plant.

But the U.S.S.R. has 10 plants ranging from 2 million to 6 million kilowatts, of which 1 is almost complete, 3 are under construction, and 6 are in planning or preparatory stages. One single plant, the Yenesey plant on the river of the same name, will have a capacity of about 6 million kilowatts, greater than the total capacity of all the powerplants at all the dams ever constructed by the Corps of Engineers, which now is 5,250,000 kilowatts. Just five Siberian plants will have a combined capacity half again as great as the total hydro capacity of all Federal projects in the United States, taking the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, and TVA together.

For detailed reference, I would like to submit for the record two more tables. Table III is a list of all known Soviet hydroplants of more than 10,000 kilowatts, and table IV is a list of all U.S. hydroplants over a quarter of a million kilowatts capacity.

These Soviet achievements have been accomplished during a relatively short span of time, during which the construction program appears to have gathered a momentum which has not yet reached a peak. For instance, in 1956, hydroelectric power capacity was increased by 2 million kilowatts, three times the amount placed in operation in 1955. By 1960, a 170 percent increase is planned over the total available in 1955. The memorandum of the chairman to members of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, dated December 20, 1957, has further material on this point.

A major feature of Soviet power development is the construction of a national transmission grid which will bring electricity, generated sometimes at remote hydro sites, to industrial centers of the U.S.S.R. The beginnings of this plan have already been accomplished in the recent completion of the 2-circuit, 400-kilovolt, 3-phase alternating current transmission line between the Kuybyshev powerplant and the Moscow industrial area. One circuit is 506 miles long, the other, 559 miles. So far U.S. power operators have had no need to build lines of this length and voltage. One noteworthy Soviet line now under construction will bring Stalingrad power to the Donbas industrial area, 300 miles to the west. This line will carry 800 kilovolt direct current to an inverter substantion. Building this equipment required Soviet engineers to solve unprecedented electromechanical problems.

About 70 percent of all Soviet power is used for industry. Most plants of 10,000 kilowatts or more are already on the growing national grid, and consequently it is difficut to determine just what industrial development is associated with any given hydroelectric development. For example, more than half of Kuybyshev's power is being fed into the Moscow local network which serves the Soviet Union's greatest concentration of industry. The remainder is transmitted to Kuybyshev, Saratov, and the Urals to supplement the output of other powerplants in serving the oil, steel, and other industries. The new plant at Irkutsk, though only partly complete, is already serving a growing aluminum industry in central Siberia and is also providing power for electrified sections of the Trans-Siberian Railroad.

The Soviet achievement in hydroelectric power is of great economic and political value to the Soviet Union and the cause of world communism. Soviet coal deposits are generally of poor quality and often must be hauled great distances by overburdened rail lines. Many of their thermal plants burn peat fuel. Consequently, Soviet fuel costs are higher, and the hydro powerplants are of even greater relative value to the economy than in the United States. Since the same situation is also true in many other parts of the world, the Soviet achievements are of great interest in such areas. These achievements are receiving great stress both in

Soviet technical literature and in propaganda aimed at Asian and Middle Eastern countries. The engineering features are described in detail, and installations have been proudly shown to teams of visiting engineers from countries all over the world including some from the United States.

Address by Hon. Thomas S. Gates, Jr., Secretary of the Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY R. SHEPPARD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 11, 1959

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by the Secretary of the Navy, the Honorable Thomas S. Gates, Jr., Navy League Convention, Philadelphia, Pa.

I am here, in Philadelphia, to keep a promised rendezvous with my friends of Philadelphia and of the Navy League of the United States.

As I do so, my active duty in the Navy is coming to an end.

Out of the past comes a treasured Navy experience. It began early in 1942 at Quonset Point, survived the years of World War II, was marked by a hiatus as a Reserve officer on inactive duty, and finally carried into the official responsibilities of these almost 6 years in Washington.

With about 10 years of active duty and a high percentage of grown-up life involved, it is tempting to look backwards. With the years the stories always grow better, the risks of battle greater, the memories less sharp, and it is emotion that speaks for what has been. With it all, the shared experiences make deep friendships deeper.

Out of tradition, experience, frustrations, and sometimes success could come an attitude of pride, satisfaction, and a tendency to live well with what has happened.

Unfortunately, greater knowledge and the troubled difficulties of today breed restlessness, a seeking for something better—even perfection.

When you have been exposed to a lot, sit inside the family, see the flaws, the weaknesses, and then overstate them to yourself, you expect too much and you cannot look behind.

The work undone, the better answers, the greater service, the possibilities, and the stakes you play for—all scream out and say "Look ahead." Emerson said, "Hitch your wagon to a star." We are reminded to beware of false prophets—not to believe the crystal ball, and everyone knows there are risks that go with pure idealism.

Tonight, I am going to let the chips fall. I do so in hope that I can be helpful. I do so as I reach the beachhead of so personal a D-day.

It is not to banish hope, but to achieve realism that we seek to penetrate the clouds that hang low over our country. Peace we hope for and believe in, but it will be an uneasy peace. The basic concepts of cummunism will not change quickly—if at all. The United States has no thought of varying from the ideals of freedom on which this Nation was founded. No true partnership can be built between these directly conflicting philosophies. Temporary arrangements might be made, from time to time, in mutual self-interest, but a partnership requires more substance.

The struggle between two great power bolcs and two great religions of the spirit will stay about as it is for years. The intense effort of trying to convince and win the respect of the uncommitted rising people of many lands will go on and on in extra innings. This we must accept and learn to live with.

The U.S.S.R. will continue to probe and test our determination and our will.

As an essential part of this forecast, we will see an indefinite requirement for strong military services, large defense spending, alert and combat-ready forces in being, with which to back up our foreign policy.

The need will continue and grow for more enlightened American leadership, foreign help to those less fortunate—a need to travel, to see, to talk the languages, to invest, experiment, to gamble, and to sell.

In such a world environment what is the blueprint for the blue uniform of the Navy and for the blue water it sails?

Can we write the music for this blueprint in blue today and have it strong, fresh, bold, and imaginative for tomorrow?

I believe we can write it and it is worth writing. It will come from sources old and loved.

Perhaps it will sound harsh and too modern, but the discords will mellow with time. They may even fit the tastes of tomorrow.

The blueprint and the music will not be exact. They will change as others contribute, but we need a modern version.

This we do know: Future power and military strength will include inevitably a U.S. Navy.

By itself, the momentum of history will recognize this. We must add to the traditionally proven value of free oceans the new power of nuclear propulsion, the new requirements for sea-based offensive hitting power, the new accent on free world treaties and friendships, the new studies of the oceans with the research required not only for the military uses, but for the benefit of mankind. Therefore, it can and will be a very different Navy.

What it turns out to be is largely—almost entirely—in the hearts and hands of the Navy itself. The Navy must determine its own destiny. It must accept and exploit the great changes around us.

The structure for this exploitation exists and is very fine. So are the people. There is inherent greatness within the Navy and it has been proven and tested many times, in many places.

However, if in our preparation for the future, we are influenced by self interests; if we tend to divide internally into traditional blocs of interest; if we continue to jealously watch the other services and to resist change, it is not going to be a very good destiny. Such a navy will not command public confidence and respect or gain the great support it will need to do its job. This job can succeed, remain undone, or fail. If it fails, the loser is the United States, and with it the free world. The great battle in which we and our children are engaged will be over. The failure will be in the American system of which the Navy is a product. We are a proud and prime example of its success. Thus it is conceivable that we can cause its collapse. The Navy has a free choice—will it lead or will it drift?

If the Navy chooses the way it must, there is much to be done.

The future will demand more than ever that the strength of decision and unity of purpose must lead objectively in military policy, and must survive all of the peacetime pressures toward an isolated America. The Navy must not stand in concrete—neither must it drift—it must forge ahead.

Decisions of our Government are difficult and complex. They can be made only by those with a knowledge of economic, financial, political, and military factors. Military decisions must include all of these factors. Thus the Navy must, within itself, contain such knowledge so that it can govern its future actions accordingly.

This will require even greater moral leadership and courage, solid unity, self-discipline, and dedicaton to purpose, out of which can come a better national defense. If these require change, then change must be accepted and the Navy must contribute, or better still, lead. This can occur, can be accomplished and we can still maintain the identity and integrity of the naval service. The Navy has within itself the capacity to do these things if emotion is directed toward national objectives and if attitudes of strong men become compatible and the work they do is oriented to reflect a new and shared spirit.

Some of the tools required to accomplish such unity of spirit and action will differ as we go down the road, and in general, they will involve some changes in pattern from today.

For example, we should not focus on differences with the other services, but rather learn from them, help them, and work with them. We might buy some of their strong convictions.

The horror and destruction of a major nuclear war between the U.S.S.R. and the United States, together with the mutual suicide it would produce, makes such a war unthinkable. But if deterrence fails and both sides strike, how could either side last very long?—and what will be the aftermath throughout the surviving world after the major power centers have been demolished? Therefore, for the detailed planning work we do, I can only agree in the theory that supports the concept of immediate and total destruction of the homelands of both adversaries. But some can rationalize forever that such a concept is not valid. I vote we agree on it as commonsense.

By the same token, we should drive home to the other services and the public, the real possibilities of limited war, and of the inevitable continuance of the cold war. People in all places should be made aware of the unchanged Communist objectives for world domination, of their plans to create chaos and disorder, of their attacks against weak spots, especially against rising new and uncommitted nations.

The deployed fleets of the Navy, together with their embarked and ready Marine landing forces, are the Nation's most evident and effective response to these tactics.

The Navy and Marine Corps, in particular, must retain their capacity to handle these limited wars. They must have the equipment and men in being, on the spot and physically and mentally combat ready.

The cold and limited war problem is not simple, but it is vital to understand. In a limited war situation, the Navy must maintain a capability to use either nuclear or conventional weapons to the controlled degree necessary to achieve the objective. More funds are required for this purpose. More accent on its importance is needed. This support will have to come from the elimination of certain of the very expensive mass-destruction, single-purpose weapons systems which have a priority of claims against our national resources. The Joint Chiefs of Staff continue to struggle with divided opinions as to the emphasis to be placed on various systems; and the Secretary of Defense continues to struggle handicapped by traditionally divided service opinions. The kind of constructive, objective teamwork that enabled us to win wars would help him. Again, good sense argues for understanding and agreement. Intelligent answers can be found within the informed minds of the best of our military and civilian officials.

I believe the Navy should put its contribution to the Nation's general war deterrent/retaliatory capability, primarily into missiles, based underseas. This, except for warning and reconnaissance, would place the carrier

forces in the business of limited war where they excel and, in fact, are the best and often the only practical way to handle a limited war situation—and also in ASW, where naval air will long remain an indispensable member of the team.

Once this was decided, ship characteristics, equipment, and weapons should be adjusted for the mission.

We should ask scientists and industry to help us with fresh thinking on our long-range objectives and on our weapons systems.

We should establish a long-range planning group that will possess a clear identity and independence. Its composition should include scientists and persons from industry and academic life, along with naval officers with recent operational experience. This group must enjoy a close and continuous relationship with American universities and industry. It should possess its own funds with authority to contract for studies by outside organizations. Furthermore, it must be able to recruit the best qualified persons both from within and outside the Navy for short-term work on special projects.

The conclusions of this long-range planning group should not be diluted by the opinions of others, but should flow directly to the Secretary of the Navy and the Chief of Naval Operations and the Commandant of the Marine Corps, who can later consult with anyone they respectively may choose.

We have learned from past experiences that whenever a group of such men is brought together, there are temptations to divert them to currently urgent tasks. Such a group should remain free to pursue long-range thinking and planning and not to be drawn into the mill of everyday work. Today, we can pause and well use some intelligent reflective thinking in the midst of the tumult of so vast a transition. Thinking of this sort will mix intelligence, international relations, and foreign policy into planning, and will enable us to establish balanced building blocks for our future. From there we can obtain guides for the design of our systems. Perhaps then we could design the best surface ship for offensive operations and the best possible series of systems to face up to the great challenge of Soviet submarines and Soviet sea-based missiles.

A long-range plan so produced can do more if it is objective and is based, as it must be, on a sound understanding of the needs of national defense. It can make a major contribution to the advice so urgently needed by the Secretary of Defense. With such a plan in hand, the Secretary of the Navy and the Chief of Naval Operations could have considerable constructive influence, and thus the Secretary of Defense and our total defense effort would be better served.

The Navy is going to have to become more single-mission minded in its ships and weapons. New designs must place an accent on a single job. The jack-of-all-trades no longer makes sense, nor can we afford him. The world has changed with present and future weapons, and the old multimission purpose is outmoded.

The difficulties and doctrines of ASW, attack, air defense, electronic war, or amphibious operations, all demand their special purpose systems. We are moving in this direction now and we will move faster.

The demand for more nuclear powered ships, more specific weapons systems, and more emphasis on research will continue to cause great changes.

Much of what will be done will involve our people—civilian and military.

There will continue to be significant changes in our shore establishment. Older, less useful installations must be closed. There will be many consolidations, as demands for different skills make themselves more apparent.

The management of the shore establishment will require precise, careful planning, and expert handling, and all actions, within it, must be accomplished with reason and in complete fairness.

Our military people should develop stronger leadership and educational programs as the emphasis on quality grows. The new Navy will require that most officers receive some measure of post-graduate training. With this will come more specialization and more continuity for line officers within a speciality.

Career patterns should be reviewed and changed to include more stability in work. Concepts for promotion must change to reflect this so that longer assignments, and assignments back and forth from sea to specialty, more related to individual ability, carry with them equal chances of promotion.

Selection boards must be instructed to recognize these factors.

Our officers must now compete and contribute to the work of many staffs. There is the Joint Staff of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the staffs of unified commands, and staffs vital to the business of defense and of our international relationships.

Other officers must work with the design and operation of the advanced technical aspects of new systems.

As we explore space, delve under the ice and the oceans, live with the startling advances of science, and share the work of command and foreign policy, our officers must become scientists, economists, ambassadors, as well as sailors.

This can never be accomplished with the short tours of duty or the constant rotation systems we have followed in the past.

More education, stability, and expertness, is a certain requirement for the future Navy, and equality of career opportunity must accompany it.

Our enlisted men need better stability also. Our deployments keep them away from home long months. These deployments should be reviewed and better standardized, if possible.

However, when they return home for their time of shore duty, we can definitely improve their stability of assignment.

If we need to abandon one of the echelons of commands now considered so essential to our readiness to do this, then it would be worth exploring.

Longer deployments than those planned seem inevitable under continued conditions of tension, but men properly led will accept this for the good of their country. We can help them on shore duty by letting them stay in one place and leaving them literally ashore and in one place longer.

The other services can learn some things from the Marine Corps in this respect. Their pride of service is the best of us all.

The Marine Corps can improve, become better integrated within themselves, the Navy, and Defense. Their single-mindedness is good and bad. The Navy and the Marines must share their respective faults and virtues and move together into the future, as I am sure most sailors and marines want to do.

I trust you who are close friends and a part of the Navy family, share with me the certain belief that our Navy today is strong and competent. It is sound and true and sails the seas with confidence and pride. It has absorbed enormous changes and still has some growing pains.

The technical advances have been profound and have come upon us quickly. They will continue and we will ride well with them.

Over the years, I have made many speeches that have outlined our missions within the framework of our national defense. I have always praised the great dedication and purpose of the Navy and Marine Corps. These speeches told the truth, and I stand behind them today just as I did when I made them.

Tonight, there is no difference. In the serious ventures of national defense we seek to do more and to do it better. All of my associates share this view. All are aware of the possibilities to improve as I have outlined them. All are working for these goals.

No one could ask for better associates both military and civilian. The teamwork and friendships of these relationships will be a treasured experience always. Such support can come to only a few in one lifetime. I can only humbly thank all hands of the Navy for such confidence. Included must be the men who have worked with me, briefed me, driven me in cars, transported me in boats, planes, and helicopters, and patiently shown me what they were doing in naval offices, installations, and ships all over the world. I want to thank General Pate and Admiral Burke in particular for a most unique working relationship and devoted partnership. General Pate has reached the age when he must retire, and unfortunately he leaves us in January. Nothing could be better for us all as a nation than to know that Admiral Burke will continue to serve as Chief of Naval Operations and remain on the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

No one will ever come into the Office of the Secretary of the Navy better qualified than Secretary Franke. His long experience, painstaking work, keen knowledge and deep devotion to public service will lead the Navy on into a wiser and better future.

To him and to my other civilian partners I owe everything, and they are the truest friends I will ever possess.

I have deep friendships also in the Navy League. Constantly during my time in Washington you have helped me. I am grateful to you one and all. The Navy League has now grown up, and a Forrestal dream has come true. It has been my privilege to watch this happen. Your future is assured and I wish you well as you continue to give us and our fellow citizens the benefit of your informed, independent advice and wisdom in the best interests of a strong Navy and a strong defense.

It has been said that service in the Navy is based largely on emotion. I think this is so. It is the deep love of the sea and of service on it that makes its role both unique and difficult to understand. Unless you have done it, you can never share this emotion. It is more important than organization, than staff work, than shuffling the papers of a big department wisely.

But emotion cannot be subdivided.

The Navy must be a cross-section of American life, but it need not be a mirror of that life.

Always it must strive higher—in keeping with its great obligation and the trust which it holds in its hands for our future.

Threatened Veto of TVA Self-Financing Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE BROCK

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 11, 1959

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, last week the majority of the membership of this House voted for a legislative program that would permit the TVA to operate on a sound financial basis and institute a self-liquiding plan, while retiring the original investment. TVA would also pay interest on the outstanding balances. This legislative action should have

warmed the heart of the most ardent conservatives but to me it meant at last putting the TVA on a sound business basis. On this subject, I can readily speak with a voice of experience in the operation of public power systems.

Before coming to Washington, I served for a year as president of my own Nebraska public power district. I also served for some years as vice president of the Nebraska REA. This classifies me as a stalwart in defense of sound public power investment and operations. I feel that we passed a substantial piece of legislation last week. It certainly was a workable bill and should ultimately benefit the taxpayers of the Nation.

Under permission to extend my remarks, I place in the RECORD an editorial published in the Sunday issue of the Washington Post. This editorial is very timely and echoes the sentiment expressed by the majority of this House when passing the TVA bill last week:

HOBBLES FOR TVA?

The repeated administration warnings that the President would veto the Tennessee Valley Authority self-financing bill if it came to him in the form just approved by the House can mean only that Mr. Eisenhower is supporting those foes of public power who want to throttle TVA. The restrictive amendments which the President wants and the House denied him would give the Treasury, the Budget Bureau, and TVA foes in Congress the authority virtually to nullify the usefulness of the self-financing features of the bill. Would a Budget Bureau which has consistently refused to approve new direct appropriations for needed expansion of TVA power plants be any more likely to approve bond issues for the same purpose? It seems unlikely.

If, on the other hand, the administration is concerned only with putting TVA on a business-like basis, capable of standing on its own feet and meeting its own capital requirements, the House bill amply provides for it. For the first time, TVA would be obliged to pay interest on the outstanding Federal investment in its power facilities as well as to continue to retire that investment. For the first time, TVA would be legally restricted to the area it now serves, which does not even include all of the Tennessee Valley. The Authority's bond issues would be subject to a congressional veto and the Treasury would be able to delay the issues as much as 90 days to fit them in with its own financing program if this seemed desirable.

What more could the most conservative friend of the TVA ask? The inference can only be that those who are asking for more hobbles are not TVA's friends.

Missouri River Basin Projects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY W. WIER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 11, 1959

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert a letter received from Gov. Orville L. Freeman, Governor of Minnesota, and a resolution adopted April 15, 1959, by the Missouri States Governors regarding the necessity for going ahead on projects already planned and programed for the Missouri River Basin:

ST. PAUL, MINN., *May 7, 1959.*

The Honorable ROY W. WIER,
Congress of the United States
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR ROY: I am enclosing for your consideration a copy of the resolution adopted by the Missouri States Governors at their April 15 meeting, regarding new starts on projects in the Missouri River Basin.

If we are to have proper and expeditious development of the natural resources of the Missouri Basin, we can ill afford to postpone projects already planned and programed. I hope, therefore, that you will give your support at this session of the Congress to this bipartisan effort.

Sincerely,

ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
Governor.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED APRIL 15, 1959, BY MISSOURI RIVER STATES COMMITTEE AT COUNCIL BLUFFS, IOWA

We the Missouri River States Committee, consisting of the Governors of the States of Iowa, Colorado, Kansas, Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, and Wyoming, comprising one-sixth of the area of the United States of America, in meeting assembled, do hereby adopt the following resolution:

"Whereas the Missouri River States Committee, created in December of 1941, was organized for the express purpose of securing flood control, irrigation, navigation, power development, and related improvements of the entire Missouri River Basin; and

"Whereas through the efforts of the Missouri River States Committee and other groups, the Missouri Basin project was authorized by Congress in the year 1944, and

"Whereas during the 15 years since that time substantial progress has been made in meeting the objectives of flood control, navigation, water supply, and power development and, to a lesser degree, irrigation and other improvements, and

"Whereas the orderly development of natural and human resources of the Missouri River Basin is impeded and severely handicapped by the 'no new starts' policy, and

"Whereas said 'no new starts' policy impairs the economic strength of the entire country by preventing the development of natural resources in the basin as an investment in the future welfare and security of the United States as a whole, and

"Whereas the construction of planned projects would strengthen the economic base of this region and of our whole country at a time when full development and use of our national resources are urgently needed in the struggle between the free world and the areas of the earth dominated by Communists: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That this committee urge the Congress of the United States to implement its authorizations of reclamation and flood control and other projects by appropriating the necessary money for the initiation of said projects; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That this resolution be forwarded by the chairman of the Missouri River States Committee to the Honorable CLARENCE CANNON, chairman of the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives of the United States, and the Honorable CARL HAYDEN, chairman of Appropriations Committee of the Senate of the United States."

The Case for Productivity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, a very able editorial by Engene P. Conser appeared in the Realtor's Headlines for March 16. I believe it might well be considered by all Members and, under unanimous consent, I include it in the RECORD:

THE CASE FOR PRODUCTIVITY

(By Eugene P. Conser)

Realtors as a group are progresaive in their thinking and in their actions. They are developers, expansionists, optimists. They don't believe in standing still. There must be growth, activity, transfers of property if they are to prosper. To them, therefore, restrictions on business are anathema. It is difficult to sympathize with any governmental act which tends to impose restraints on business. This is why realtors find it difficult to be sympathetic to restraints upon inflation. We like the effects of a little inflation. We don't like the higher cost of money that is an effective major tool to curb inflation.

As a result of this very natural response to the restraints which counter-inflationary measures impose, there is considerable economic thinking now reflected in Congress that the Government should act to further increase productivity, growth and expansion in the economic world. This reaction would be most acceptable if it were not for the fact that proposals are for increased Government participation, increased Government spending, increased Government control, and increase Government subsidy in the process—and in the name—of creating greater productivity. Unfortunately, the result can only be further restraints upon business, competition with business, higher costs, more spending, increased taxes, and—undoubtedly—more inflation.

Many a realtor has watched families create substantial estates; they also have watched families foolishly spend themselves into bankruptcy. If there is one difference between the family and Government, it is only in the fact that Government has unlimited capacity to incur debt. With the family, creditors eventually catch up with it.

We could suggest to the Congress methods by which it might help create greater productivity, encourage expansion, and add to the growth of business. For example:

1. Demonstrate by performance that you no longer will play Santa Clause to every facet of American life that seeks a financial subsidy from the Federal Treasury.

2. Insist that any authorization for spending—whether by grants or loans—from the Federal Treasury, clear through a single source. How else can you create fiscal responsibility?

3. While subsidies—through grants or loans—now are being given, adopt a policy of gradual reduction of such subsidies. Pledge the good faith of the Government to such a program—just as previous Congresses have so pledged the payment of subsidies for years into the future.

4. While Government is engaged in the lending of money, require that loans be made at self-sustaining rates. Any agency using Government capital should be fully repaid by the borrowers within a reasonable term of years.

5. Avoid extending Federal supervision (and subsidy) into areas of local incentive and local competition.

6. Base foreign aid upon insistence that credit machinery be created which will bring local currencies out of hiding and make the local economy self-sustaining rather than dependent indefinitely upon U.S. capital.

7. Break the power of racketeers who force either management or employees into exerting involuntarly economic restraints contrary to the public interest.

8. Establish a formula for annual payments on the public debt and pledge the good faith of the Government to raise the taxes necessary to adhere to such payments.

9. Adopt a formula for gradual long-term withdrawal of restraints upon international trade, serving notice upon business, industry, and agriculture that in this rapidly shrinking world neither the United States nor any other country can long maintain arbitrary restraints or subsidy among nations any more than similar restraints between our States would have been practicable a century ago.

These are not easy decisions to make. But they are the decisions that must be made if this country is to continue expanding productivity and avoid deterioration in the value of its currency.

Remarks of Catherine Curtis at Annual Meeting of the Texas Co.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 11, 1959

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, Miss Catherine Curtis, president of Women Investors Research Institute, Inc., recently attended the annual meeting of the Texas Co. in New York City.

Her remarks on this occasion were brief, but certainly to the point. I believe they can be read, pondered and inwardly digested with considerable profit by many persons, both in and out of Congress:

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Foley, and the official Texas Co. family, I come to you each year, as you know, from Washington, and I enjoy the meeting each year a little bit more than I did the year before. I would like to congratulate you on this meeting, on your comments, on your report.

But as I sit here and listen to the stockholders, I just wish some of them could go to Washington and sit in on the committee hearings and sense the feeling, the attitude of some Members of the Congress regarding stockholders and industry generally.

Of course, we know in countries where socialism was in the ascendancy, that the attacks were always made upon business, upon big business, and that is what is happening in this country today. There is a group in Congress which wants to make the oil industry a public utility. There is another group that wants to divest you of your pipelines. There are other groups that want to push you into higher tax brackets—control your prices and your production.

So it makes little difference how excellent our company's management is, how capable, how courageous, if our representatives in Washington have the power to tax away our property, to control our industry, and, in every way possible, to prevent it from natural, normal functioning.

You hear the most amazing plans put forth. There is one idea being promoted on the Senate side right now that the price of products is too high, because the dividends paid to stockholders are too high.

They cleam we should have smaller reserves or none at all. In other words, they recommend that prices be cut, dividends be cut to a reasonable amount and if a company needs money for expansion or replacements it should be forced to go into the marketplace and borrow—or should sell more stock. I don't have to tell you what a program like that would mean to our big corporations and to our stockholders.

You know, we hire a maid or employee, and we keep track of her. We watch what she is doing. We don't let her steal our food, if it is a maid, but we pay no attention to our Congressman in Washington. I think the time is long past due when we have got to keep just as much track of our representatives in Congress as we keep of our household servants, and that means writing them, calling them on the phone, writing letters to newspapers, to let them know that we know what they are up to, and let them also know that stockholders are not so-called bloated bondholders, but are voters.

They are not big business. They are little people who own anywhere from 5, 10, to possibly a hundred share of stock on average. These holdings are often in the hands of people, in older years, to whom the income and the security of capital means a great, great deal.

I don't want to talk too long, but if we, as stockholders, would just augment the efforts management has made to protect the interests and assets of our company, I think we would be doing a great service not only for our company, but for our country. Thank you so much. [Applause.]

Maj. Gen. A. J. Drexel Biddle, Adjutant General of Pennsylvania, Calls for a Stronger Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 11, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address made by Major General Biddle at a meeting of the Baltimore chapter of the Association of the U.S. Army at Fort Meade, Md., on April 24, 1959:

ADDRESS BY MAJ. GEN. A. J. DREXEL BIDDLE AT MEETING OF BALTIMORE CHAPTER, AUSA, FORT MEADE, MD., APRIL 24, 1959

It is both a privilege and an honor to join this fine turnout.

I believe in the Association of the U.S. Army. I believe in its objectives. I believe in its membership's including officers, noncommissioned officers, enlisted men, and civilians.

And, I believe in the necessity for an organization to remind all of us that the Army is indeed the keystone of national defense.

I regard active membership in this vigorous and forward-looking association as an opportunity to serve not only the association—not only the Army, but our country.

In this period of our national life, it is perhaps risky to begin a sentence with "what's good for," but I am willing to take that chance, by emphasizing the fact that what's good for the Army is good for national defense. I am confident the association is good for the Army. This indeed is an organization that we can all support without reservation.

And, just as the association is good for the Army, so it is good for the members of the association.

I know you'll all agree that our people are entitled to enlightenment on our country's position, in relation to the rest of the world.

Well, the association of the U.S. Army believes in the importance of informing the people of the facts—and, you may be sure, the members of the association may count upon being kept posted on significant developments.

The need for the association becomes more evident each day.

It is the firm belief of many military students that the Army has been cut too drastically, too quickly. And the association has done much, through its local chapters, and nationally, to apprise Congress of this condition. Both Houses, as you know, have held out for 900,000 instead of a proposed 870,000.

National headquarters of the association is greatly interested in the Baltimore chapter—and you may be sure that we shall be ready to cooperate in every way possible toward helping you grow.

It would be appropriate at this point, I think, if I were to touch on a subject that's close to all our hearts—one that requires the greatest degree of perseverance and patence, and, at the same time, the exercise of sustained vigilance—namely, our search for peace.

Our consideration of the matter, I think you'll agree, calls, at once, for a restatement that a search for peace is, indeed, a solemn purpose, prayerfully shared by all Americans—and that what we seek, is an enduring, honorable, and just one, consonant with our indestructible faith in freedom, under the guidance of God.

But, under the conditions of our times, the price of peace is vigilance. And, inextricably linked with vigilance is a military posture second to none. Anything less would not be good enough. For, in war, there's no such thing as second best. Only if we planned and prepared for the worst, could we afford to be optimistic.

Whether we like it or not, we are now committed to a race for survival.

What we are striving for is tranquility of mind. We hold that people should not be compelled to live in fear. Rather, that they should be allowed to live in peacefulness, and to devote their talents, their time, and their efforts to satisfying the needs of mankind, and to getting on with the furtherance of our Nation's progress.

Certainly, it is our devout wish to bring about these conditions, and it is our desire that there not be overlooked any opportunity for discussions, which might conceivably lead to an honorable accommodation of differences between ourselves and our allies, on the one hand, and the Soviets on the other.

Yet, each time we have offered to engage in talks which, at the outset, might have seemed to open the way toward this end, the leaders of militant communism have deliberately placed some stumbling block in the way. The record shows that the Soviets have reneged openly on every important agreement reached at the 1955 summit conference in Geneva.

A disturbing feature of Moscow's unceasing diplomatic offensive is its overbearing nature. In its arrogance are a total indifference to the rights of others, and a confidence in subversion, deceit, and blackmail. This insolence finds expression in such phrases as "We will surpass you," "We will outproduce you," "We need no God." And now it's "Get

out of Berlin." This has been followed by Khrushchev's contemptuous offer of terms which add up to "heads, Moscow wins; tails, you lose."

We've seen where the conciliatory and generous approach of the past landed us. The Berlin crisis is an outgrowth of the West's misplaced faith during World War II in the productiveness of postwar cooperation with the Soviets. Unfortunately, it was this attitude that led to agreements which set the pattern for the occupation of Germany, and for much of the subsequent developments.

We've found that the masters of the Kremlin will not negotiate on an honorable basis of seeking to eradicate differences and reaching an understanding. What they seek is surrender on the installment plan. To them negotiation is a tactical technique to insure unceasing conflict. From their standpoint a global settlement, prior to attaining their objective of world preeminence, would be inconceivable. There are no signs that the Communists are prepared to relinquish their territorial or ideological imperialism.

The prospect of fruitful results from the pending Foreign Ministers' Conference and proposed summit discussions is far from bright. But as long as the proposed discussions might bear some promise of useful results, the exercise of our best efforts would seem to be indicated.

While it would be in keeping with our nature to be hopeful of useful conclusions, it would only be good sense to insulate our hopes with a generous degree of cautiousness.

So, whether we may expect to achieve peace in our time the kind of peace we insist upon is a matter of conjecture.

But, in the meantime we are faced with the serious business of furthering the development of our country—and we must be allowed to get on with this job. But to be able to do so, we urgently need time, and a psychological climate conducive of the greatest possible degree of confidence and tranquility of mind.

I strongly believe such a climate is an absolutely attainable objective, but to attain it, we need a sustained military posture of such strength, as to deter the Soviets from further meddling in free world affairs.

We've been recently assured about our current capability of defeating the Soviets in a war. We've been told that our deterrent power is massive and adequate.

As we all know, it has been through the moneys appropriated in the past several years, that this formidable position has been attained.

But what now concerns many is whether the appropriations of the present will be sufficient to enable our deterrent to continue effective in the next several years to come.

This concern stems from statements indicating the possibility of our accepting a position of inferiority in the missiles field, within the next several years. For, it is believed that the increasing arrogance of the Soviets would be apt to find considerable stimulus from any evidence here of a willingness to concede them a lead. They might be more than apt to interpret this, not only as a sign of complacency and weakness, but even as an invitation to attack.

It is, moreover, felt that if conditions, 6 or 8 months ago, were such as to render this policy practical, it is rapidly being overtaken by developments. One has only to follow the trend of pronouncements from Soviet sources to appreciate their increasing exploitation of their ICBM capability, as an instrument of blackmail.

The transition from bombers to missile-readiness is admittedly an expensive ordeal. For, maintenance of an indisputable posture that is essential during this critical period necessitates not only readying our required long-range missile capability, but, at the same time, providing what it takes to keep up the great striking force of SAC. But I believe that, if our people were fully informed of the vital importance to our national security of these two factors, and of keeping abreast of the Soviets in the missiles field, they would be willing to foot the bill—even if it required extra taxes.

The new look, you may recall, was designed to acquire a greater bang for the buck. This implied, of course, a greater dependence upon nuclear weapons. But it also implied that, as the cutbacks in manpower and materiel of the Armed Forces took place, they would be compensated by the placing of an adequate number of medium and long-range missiles in the hands of troops trained for their use.

Yet, the questions that arose in the recent congressional debates, and in subsequent press releases, would seem to reflect considerable doubt on this score—yes; widespread doubts as to whether adequate operational nuclear potential had been actually achieved to compensate for the cutbacks already effected, as well as for those presently under consideration.

And, there appears to be considerable apprehension lest these cutbacks in our modernized conventional warfare potential might prove too heavy to allow for the desirable degree of balance between nuclear and modernized conventional potential. And, what is troubling a lot of people, is that in the very services that go to make up our mixed retaliatory capability, some are reportedly suffering from deficiencies; others from obsolescence.

One had only to follow the recent congressional debates to perceive how they reflect the concern of a people not kept fully informed, and consequently rendered uneasy by such reports. This, among other reasons, is why it was so important that steps were taken very recently to assure our people, our allies, and potential enemies, of our present military invincibility—and why it was so necessary that our military authorities took occasion to publicly underline this fact.

As matters had stood up to the point of these recent publicly voiced assurances by our governmental and military authorities, we had already received Moscow's answer as to what value it erroneously placed on the strength of our defense posture in relation to its own. That answer had come in the form of Moscow's insolent ultimatum concerning Berlin.

Maybe the Soviets are trying to play a pair of deuces like a royal flush, but I'm sure many of us learned from unpleasant experience, as we grew up, that a bully does not threaten unless he is confident he can get away with it. Nor, when he gets set to go places, does he wait around for his opponent to get himself into shape.

You see, it's not just a case of our knowing we have what it takes to break the back of the potential enemy, but of our having enough to convince him that he's flirting with massive burial, when he threatens us.

It seems to me that Krushchev's fresh wave of arrogance reflects not only his confidence in communism's own military prowess, but even a potentially dangerous miscalculation of our military capability, and our will to trigger it, if necessary.

Indeed, for him to assume he could get away with an attack, or with his demands for surrender on any given issue, would be just about as dangerous as if he possessed the actual capability.

Miscalculation has triggered other wars. And, here we are dealing with a headstrong, fanatical master of a totalitarian state, whose agents, as in the case of Hitler's agents, would go far to avoid crossing up the wishthinking of their boss.

In the early thirties, when Hitler was rattling his tanks and his bombers, and helping himself to one country after another, much confused, naive, and in some cases, timid thinking found expression in the view that "you could do business with Hitler."

Just as today, while Khrushchev is rattling his missiles, there is an audible refrain that "you can negotiate with Khrushchev." The idea is, of course, that such a price should be paid Khrushchev; as to persuade him to abstain from starting a shooting war over Berlin. Yet, strangely enough, there seems to be no evidence of insistence that he grant anything in return. Far from being a give-and-take policy, this would be all give, and no take.

There's been this same kind of fuzzy, timid thinking that's given voice to criticism of our military authorities, for having publicly emphasized our capability of defeating the Soviets in war. It would seem that these critics, prior to sounding off, might the more usefully have considered the circumstances against the overall picture. For, published discussions, and things that have been brought to light in the recent congressional debates on military matters, had given rise to such doubts, both at home and abroad, concerning our military posture, that it was high time we heard from our competent, professional military minds.

This was necessary to boost the confidence of our own people and of our allies, and to keep the respect of our potential enemies.

I hardly need point out that two highly important factors in an effective intelligent foreign policy is prestige, the reputation for unchallengeable power, and the ability to so advertise this power position as to make the desired impression abroad. Prestige attains its ends, when the nation enjoying the reputation both for power and for keeping the use of it within bounds, can forward its foreign policy without having to resort to the use of that power.

There were times in our history when our prestige was permitted to sink to such a low point that the ground was cut from under our foreign policy, and our vital interests were placed in danger—even to the point of leading to miscalculation on the part of the enemy.

I have in mind two examples, one, prior to our entry into World War I, when the military power of the United States was held in contempt by the German Government, and two, prior to our entry into World War II, when the Japanese attack at Pearl Harbor implied contempt for our military strength—and when further scorn was manifested by declaration of war on the United States by Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy.

History and experience serve to emphasize that there's but one way to insure against such miscalculations, and that is a continuing posture of such strength as to enable us to impress upon our potential enemies that an attack would result in unacceptable consequences.

As I see the picture, in Berlin, we are looking down the muzzle of a gun—and with Moscow playing for keeps. What is more, Khrushchev seems to have gotten himself out on a limb concerning this issue, but without provision of a ladder, upon which to step down, if necessary. It's a situation very similar to that created in April 1939, by Hitler, concerning the Polish Corridor and Danzig. You may recall that, when Hitler designated Nazi-German control over the Corridor a must, he failed to provide a ladder of escape.

Then, too, the Middle East is again figuring increasingly as a target of Soviet aims. And this means, of course, that while we are dealing with the problem of Berlin, Moscow is exploiting nationalism on the one hand, division, on the other, throughout that critical area.

Perhaps it would be well to refresh our perspective. So—let's run over Moscow's and its Allies' objectives.

As I read the current picture, in its full meaning, the Berlin ultimatum, the deliberate incitement of trouble in the Middle East, the Communists' seizure of Tibet and the forces build-up on the Communist mainland opposite Formosa, and now the Communist machinations in the Caribbean, are all related, and form a multipronged threat as part of the global strategy of the Moscow-Peiping Axis to gain world domination.

Their long range aims are to gain control over the land masses of Europe and Asia, that contain the greater part of the world's population, and a large share of its resources; this, with a view to isolating and preparing for an eventual showdown with the United States.

At this stage of the game, Moscow seeks to stabilize and gain Western recognition of its control over the captive countries in Eastern Europe, which comprise its World War II booty. At the same time, Moscow seeks such an agreement on Berlin as to enable it to seal off the prayerful hopes of these captive peoples.

For this reason, and because Moscow desires to firm up and quiet the Soviets' Western front while Soviet political, subversive, and possibly military forces go to work on the Middle East, Moscow seeks a withdrawal or reduction of the weight of Western political influence and military forces along the Iron Curtain—and this would significantly include the elimination of West Germany as a military component of the North Atlantic Alliance.

Meanwhile, Moscow aims to gain control over at least the bulk of Mideast oil, and thus gain a throttle-hold over Western Europe with its largely oil based economy. It would thereupon attempt to exploit this advantage toward forcing Soviet terms on Western Europe, which would importantly include the liquidation of NATO, and any of our overseas bases in which Western Europe is concerned.

So if it were only the Berlin situation we had to contend with, it would be bad enough. But, there are many signs that presage further crises during the coming months—and these may include renewed harassment in the Far East.

When I previously emphasized the continuing importance of the role of the Army, I meant, of course, ground forces, armed with tactical nuclear weapons, capable of waging modernized conventional warfare.

It is my belief that, until such moment as the potential enemy might venture—either prior to, or during hostilities—to risk suicide by a restort to massive strategic nuclear attack, the most effective means of defending free world positions—and this also applies to intervention in conflicts of potentially limited scope—rests in well-integrated forces, which importantly include the Army.

If, in Berlin, the potential enemy were to advance with forces far outnumbering our own garrison and those of our allies, a resort might very well be made to massive strategic nuclear warfare.

In at least the early stages of massive strategic attack, and counterattack, the exchanges would be taking place at great distances apart, and over the heads of the armies in the field.

It would, then, mean that the allied armies, equipped with tactical nuclear weapons, and acting in coordination with the air and naval forces, would have to bear the brunt of preventing the enemy's hordes from marching to the Atlantic seaboard. Then, too, there would be clashes in other areas outside the main theater of operations—and here again the ground forces, integrated with air and naval forces, would have to stem the tide.

Besides, our action in Lebanon demonstrated that military intervention in a conflict of potentially limited scope, does not necessarily entail the danger of general war.

After all, what renders this, as well as defending free world positions by well-integrated forces feasible, and what restricts the potential enemy's selection of battle methods, is the capability of our massive strategic retaliation. And, it is recognition of this vital fact that points up the necessity of a sustained unchallengeable missile deterrent—and, until this is attained, SAC kept fully up to scratch.

We may never use it, but we must have it in the wings, and this, meanwhile, applies equally to the maintenance of our Strategic Air Command at its maximum capability.

In order to convince the enemy, it may take more than we know to be enough to defeat him. Yet, it would be better to possess this convincing capability and not have to use it, than to possess any less, and perhaps have to use it.

Now a word about Khrushchev's economic challenge. Were the Soviets sincere about this, and if it were for honest profit that would contribute to the individual well-being of the Soviet people, it might conceivably be a case of peaceful, economic competition between the two sides.

But, unfortunately, it would boil down to the conduct of business for political action, aimed at disruption of free world economy. It would mean that whenever Moscow felt it could undermine the free world markets, it would dump its slave-produced goods—even if needed for domestic consumption.

Labor represents about 75 percent of the cost of the manufactured goods we sell overseas. But, because of Moscow's control of slave labor, it does not have to take into consideration this labor cost.

A further sinister device, to which they resort, is to purchase and dump goods, produced elsewhere. Through their dumping last year, the Soviets disrupted the tin market, and among others, the market for Egyptian cotton in West Germany, and the market for aluminum, notwithstanding their domestic shortage of that metal.

Moreover, it would be hard to believe that the Berlin ultimatum, dated as it is for late May, was not calculated, among other things, to work a hardship on ours and free Europe's economy, by damaging the European tourist trade, and American business concerns servicing this trade.

As economic war heats up in intensity, questions are apt to arise concerning the prudence of buying goods produced largely on the backs of slave labor—and of permitting our opponents to cash in their mainly slave-produced gold at $35 per ounce, only to have those same American dollars used to support economic warfare against us.

It is significant I think that, while preparing his 7-year plan, Khrushchev has been boosting his nuclear potential and modernizing his conventional warfare potential. In a recent interview with a distinguished representative of the American press, Khrushchev implied his concern lest an economic conflict might lead to a shooting war. And he may well be right. Who is capable of making a water-tight prediction, one way or another, on this score? Just as the Western allies eventually found it in the interests of their survival to stop Hitler, so the day may come when the free world will have to take positive action to halt the cold war.

Meanwhile, in the conduct of world affairs, it is essential that we remain steadfast to moral principles, and firmness in our position—and, that we beware lest, among those who advocate flexibility, might be some, whose purpose is the false bargaining of appeasement.

Hence, a continuing preeminent military capability, and the will to trigger it, if need be, are basic to the effective forwarding of our foreign policy.

These are the elements that enable the kind of long-range planning that obviate resort either to an ad hoc procedure in the realm of foreign policy, or to the crash job in the military domain.

These are the elements that must be standing at the alert behind the chairs of our diplomatic negotiators. This is the only language the Soviets understand.

A Veto of the TVA Bond Bill Will Question Ike's Sincerity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK A. STUBBLEFIELD
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 11, 1959

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following most penetrating analysis of the threatened veto of the TVA self-financing bill, which appeared in the Louisville Courier-Journal on Sunday May 10, 1959:

A VETO OF THE TVA BOND BILL WILL QUESTION IKE'S SINCERITY

House passage of the TVA self-financing bill constitutes a hard Democratic challenge to the President on the issue of public power, and it is not a challenge the President can regard lightly. The bill is by any standards a moderate one, watered down to meet the objections of TVA's private-utility foes. And if the President vetoes it because it does not give the Treasury and the Budget Bureau control over TVA bond issues, as GOP congressmen are now warning that he will do, he will call into question the sincerity of his own prior statements concerning TVA and its welfare.

This is not an ideal bill, for TVA or for the States that benefit from its operation. The punitive, vague, troublesome and pointless provision in the bill restricting TVA to its present service area, does deep injustice to Kentucky and many of its towns. Forbidding TVA to use bond finances to serve customers outside its present territory does not hurt TVA, which can use all the power it can get within its present area. But it is a grievous blow to several Kentucky towns and counties which have fought for years to make themselves eligible to receive TVA power.

Great quantities of electricity generated at Barkley Dam will flow southward to be used by TVA. But under this bill, none of this power can be used by people past whose farms and towns it flows. The small city of Monticello has worked for years to get TVA low-cost power but will now be unable to do so, though TVA powerlines from Wolf Creek Dam run within 2 miles of Monticello's city limits. Part of Fulton will be eligible to receive TVA power; the rest of the city will not.

Despite this bad provision, however, this is a good bill, and its passage and approval will be welcomed by the TVA and the cities, farms, and industries that depend on the valley agency for electricity. It ends a 5-year deadlock in Congress over the expansion of TVA power production, for under present law, new plants can be built only with money voted by Congress, and Congress has consistently refused, since the advent of the Eisenhower administration with its pro-private power bias, to vote such funds. But power demands in the valley have been in-

creasing at the rate of 12 percent a year, not counting the increased demands by atomic energy plants and other Federal agencies in TVA territory. Obviously, something must be done or these people will not have enough electricity to go around.

This bill would solve the problem by giving TVA authority to issue revenue bonds, to be retired by its own power revenues, with which new powerplants might be constructed. It limits TVA to issuance of $750 million of such bonds, and requires it to come back to Congress for further authority in 5 years. It also requires TVA to notify Congress and the President in advance of power construction financed by bond funds, and to consult with the Treasury on terms, conditions, and timing of bond issues. Congress will have 90 days in which to reject each proposal, and the Secretary of the Treasury can delay each bond issue 90 days if he wishes.

DID HE MEAN IT?

The failure of President Eisenhower to approve this mild bill will seriously discredit his statements, made during the campaigns of 1952 and 1956, that he favors the welfare of TVA. The President has already raised the question of the sincerity of his remarks by appointing to the TVA Board of Directors men who were openly hostile to the ideas on which TVA is based. And if he now vetoes this bill because it does not give the Treasury and Budget Bureau control over TVA bond issues, as some fear he may do, he will only substantiate the charges of TVA supporters that he is trying to destroy TVA for the benefit of private power companies while posing as its friend.

Giving Treasury and Budget power of life and death over TVA finances would be the equivalent of appointing Russia to guard West Berlin. Both are dominated by investment bankers openly biased in favor of private power companies and openly hostile to TVA. It was in Treasury and Budget that the infamous Dixon-Yates contract was written. Neither has approved a TVA power appropriation since 1953, despite the growing need in the valley.

The cynical surrender of TVA and its people to foes such as these will ill become the leader the the great crusade. And it will only afford the Democrats another issue in the coming campaign.

Four Decades of Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 11, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Times-Leader of May 5, 1959:

FOUR DECADES OF SERVICE

The community will join with the Evangelical United Lutheran Churches of West Nanticoke and Slocum in extending best wishes to the Reverend A. Ward Campbell on the occasion of his retirement after devoting 44 years to the ministry. He and his wife will reside at Slocum Corners.

Nanticoke and Plymouth Township are indebted to him for service beyond the call of pastoral duty. He played a leading role in such organizations as the American Red Cross, the Council of Civil Defense, and Mental Health Committee, establishing himself as a good citizen and neighbor as well as a spiritual leader.

As president of the Nanticoke Ministerial Association for two terms, chaplain of Ransom Convalescent Home and a prominent figure in Pennsylvania Masonry, he further exemplified the ideals of a life dedicated to God and humanity.

That his extracurricular activities were appreciated was demonstrated when personal friends and appreciative fellow townsmen reciprocated by contributing generously when his church was destroyed by fire and a new edifice was erected.

As a son of the late Reverend W. J. Campbell, former conference superintendent, he came by his zeal and talents naturally.

Recommendation of Cooley Committee for More Effective Spectrum Management

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OREN HARRIS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 11, 1959

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, on March 27, 1959, there was transmitted to the Congress a report and recommendations of the Special Advisory Committee on Telecommunication, commonly known as the Cooley Committee after its Chairman, Victor E. Cooley. In addition to Chairman Cooley, the Committee consisted of the following individuals: W. Preston Corderman, major general, U.S. Army, retired; Frank G. Kear; Irvin Stewart; William G. Thompson.

The Cooley Committee submitted its report and recommendations on December 29, 1958, and its recommendations included a draft bill calling for the establishment in the Executive Office of the President, of a three member National Telecommunications Board to assist the President in the discharge of his responsibilities with regard to telecommunications and radio spectrum management.

Mr. Speaker, I introduced today the draft bill recommended by the Cooley Committee so that that bill may be considered by our committee together with other proposals previously introduced relating to spectrum studies and spectrum management.

Mr. Speaker, in order to permit all interested persons and Members of Congress to study the recommendations of the Cooley Committee, I would like to insert at this point the report of that Committee:

REPORT OF SPECIAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON TELECOMMUNICATION DECEMBER 29, 1958

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

DECEMBER 29, 1958.

Hon. LEO A. HOEGH,
Director,
Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HOEGH: We have the honor of sending to you for transmittal to the President the report and recommendations of the Special Advisory Committee on Telecommunication as called for by your letter of November 4, 1958, creating the Committee and setting forth its mission.

Since the initial meeting of the Committee which you convened on November 18, we have reviewed the administrative organization and procedures currently in force dealing with day-to-day matters relating to telecommunications management within the executive branch and the growing demands for frequency assignments by both government and nongovernment applicants. We have also considered the broad overall methods of allocation of the radio spectrum and the assignment of radio frequencies as well as the availability of desired frequencies. The results of our considerations are embodied in our report which you requested be completed and in your hands prior to January 1, 1959.

The Committee is unanimous to recommending to you the conclusions reached in its report.

Respectfully submitted.

W. PRESTON CORDERMAN,
Major General, U.S. Army (Retired).
FRANK G. KEAR.
IRVIN STEWART.
WILLIAM G. THOMPSON.
VICTOR E. COOLEY.
Chairman.

INTRODUCTION

The telecommunication systems of the United States are essential to the national security, to the safety of life and property, to international relations, and to the business, social, educational, and political life of the country. As such they are one of the Nation's most valuable assets in peace and provide vital and essential support in the prosecution of war.

The President in recognizing the importance of telecommunications declared in his letter to Speaker RAYBURN dated July 28, 1958, that "changing technology along with changing needs in Government and nongovernment areas present problems in the telecommunication field which require searching examination. The situation is becoming no less complicated by prospective developments in satellites and space vehicles as well as defense weapons systems. Thus it has seemed to me that a fresh examination of the role of the Federal Government in this field would be desirable."

The concern felt by the 85th Congres was indicated by the Senate's adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 106 establishing a Commission to investigate the utilization of the radio and television frequencies. This resolution was approved with amendments by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce but did not come to a vote in the House.

Industry's concern was evidenced more than a year ago and reaffirmed this year through the adoption of a resolution by the Electronic Industries Association calling for a study of the spectrum. Nongovernment users of the spectrum, for example the broadcasters, have indicated a need for additional channels in certain frequency ranges not now available.

While landline and submarine cable facilities are capable of expansion almost without limit, such is not the case with the radio spectrum. There is only one such spectrum, the usable band of which extends in the present state of the art to about 30,000 megacycles—a frequency of about 30 billion cycles per second. This figure may give the impression of an inexhaustible supply, but unfortunately all parts of the spectrum are not equally usable. Different parts have different characteristics, many being very useful while others have little or no current application. In consequence, requests for frequencies having the most favorable characteristics are of sufficient volume often to cause an excess of demand over supply.

The importance of efficient use of the spectrum is emphasized from a national security standpoint by the expanding need of

radio channels in the Department of Defense. Not only have all branches of the military become increasingly dependent upon spectrum use for communications, but the engineering design of space vehicles and many of our most modern weapons makes the use of radio channels essential to their operation and direction. Also urgent is the increased need of frequencies for modern airplane operation, and other important services are equally demanding.

The demand for radio frequencies has been growing steadily since the early 1900's. At the time of the Berlin Radio Conference in 1906 the usable radio spectrum comprised about 500 kilocycles of space. Currently nearly 40 million kilocycles of space, or about 80,000 times as much, is allocated in the United States, of which about 15 million kilocycles is used so intensively that it has become difficult to satisfy new requirements. The increase since the beginning of World War II is about two-hundred-fold and since the Korean action began is about fourfold. Thus it is vital to the welfare and security of the country that the radio spectrum be efficiently and effectively used.

With the foregoing in mind, and being aware of his responsibilities in this field, the Director of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, on behalf of the President, created the Special Advisory Committee on Telecommunication to review the role of the Federal Government in the management of telecommunications. The text of the Director's letter is attached as appendix A.

In view of the study given the subject in recent years, the results of which are available, the committee felt it was not necessary to hold hearings to determine the existence, nature, and scope of the problem assigned to it. A review of past studies in light of the current situation was undertaken. The discussion and recommendations which follow are based on this review.

OUR CURRENT MECHANISM

The Government of the United States has from time to time established agencies to deal on a continuing basis with various aspects of telecommunication management which includes radio, landline, and submarine cables. As the use of telecommunications has grown, with the Government itself a major user, existing Government mechanisms have required and will continue to require adjustment and strengthening.

The Communications Act of 1934, as amended, gives to the President the responsibility for assigning radio frequencies to the Federal Government agencies, and to the Federal Communications Commission the responsibility for assigning frequencies to commercial and private users, including State and local governments. Thus the law establishes a dual control over a single national resource. Additionally, the act vests in the President wartime authority over all telecommunications.

The necessity for a mechanism to supervise and administer the Government's needs and uses of telecommunications was stressed by the report of the President's Communications Policy Board in 1951.[1]

The mechanism which was subsequently established on a minimal basis consisted of a Telecommunications Advisor to the President and a small professional staff. Later reorganization resulted in a downgrading of the office. This important work is now assigned to a numerically inadequate staff—about 12 people—under the direction of the Deputy Assistant Director for Telecommunications who reports to the Director of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization through the Assistant Director for Resources and Production. Thus it has no established source of high-level direction from executives knowledgeable in telecommunications.

Assisting the Deputy Assistant Director for Telecommunications is the Interdepartment Radio Advisory Committee (IRAC), a committee of Federal agency experts which affords technical guidance in the assignment of radio frequencies to Government agencies. This committee reports to the Director of OCDM through the Deputy Assistant Director for Telecommunications. The IRAC is primarily a group of coequal users and as such is not an appropriate group to act, nor does it act, as a policymaking or authoritative body.

The Federal Communications Commission which succeeded the Federal Radio Commission in 1934 regulates non-Government telecommunications, including the assignment of radio frequencies, with a staff of about 1,000 people. Administering the work of the Commission are seven Commissioners which give it a continuing source of high-level direction.

These various segments form our national regulatory and control mechanism of telecommunications.

CONSIDERATIONS LEADING TO A CONCLUSION

As inferred in the introductory paragraph of this report, the basic problem giving rise to the appointment of this committee is the fact that in certain parts of the radio spectrum the demand for frequencies has become greater than the supply, and the further fact that the trend in volume of applications, both government and nongovernment, for frequencies in specific bands indicates that the situation will grow progressively worse.

Although it has been possible to date through piecemeal compromise on the allocations and assignments of radio frequencies to satisfy most requests in a workable manner, it is plainly of great importance to our national security and welfare that the mechanism of allotting and assigning frequencies, particularly in the government field, be reviewed and strengthened to the end of assuring the most effective use of a scarce but essential national resource.

A consideration disquieting to many is the fact, as mentioned earlier, that the law establishes a dual control over the radio frequency spectrum, the President having responsibility for government use and the Federal Communications Commission for nongovernment use. Thus there is no individual, agency, or board invested with the responsibility for the effective use of the radio spectrum as a whole.

In reviewing the structure as it has evolved the committee was continuously struck by the absence of adequate provision for high-level consideration on the Government side of a variety of matters of vital national importance in the area of telecommunications. The Federal Communications Commission provides a vehicle for adequate consideration in the non-government area. In sharp contrast, as indicated earlier, decisions in the area of government use or of conflict between government and nongovernment use, are often made by compromises at the operational level by staff members, who though competent in their fields, do not necessarily have the total picture of national interest. There is also an unfortunate absence at present of anyone in the executive branch with adequate knowledge, experience, and stature to act for the President in these matters and there is not available therein an organization adequate to accumulate the information and experience upon which to base sound action.

CONCLUSION

In the opinion of the committee any sweeping change in the regulation and control of telecommunications by the Government, and in the legislation therefor, should be considered only after extensive study and the development of a well-thought-out course of action. The committee does feel, however, that in advance of such a study, certain immediate steps can and should be taken to strengthen the executive branch side of telecommunications management.

It has been suggested that additional powers in this area might be given to the Federal Communications Commission. To give such powers to the FCC would present a number of difficulties. That body is fully occupied with its regulatory and assignment functions in the nongovernment field. The duties needing attention, including the allocation of frequencies to Government agencies, call for a different type of operation than is required in an agency concerned with the regulatory problems of nongovernmental users. It would also seem inappropriate to give the FCC the power to act in matters affecting the executive agencies or responsibilities relating closely to national defense or foreign affairs. These are areas of decision which belong to the President and should be his prerogative to delegate. Because of these considerations the committee believes that these broad discretionary functions can best be discharged and the strengthening best be accomplished through creation of a board within the executive office of the President to act for and be answerable to the President in the carrying out of his responsibilities under the Communications Act.

The type of responsibility which is contemplated should, we feel, be vested in a board of three rather than in a single individual. A wisely constituted board can bring a variety of experience and points of view to the problems with which the United States is confronted in the area of telecommunications, and we believe that the desirable diversity of viewpoints can be achieved with three properly selected individuals.

The new Board would necessarily be privy to the plans of all agencies it serves, for both present and future use, under an assurance of complete security for all information which it receives. Its decisions would have a bearing upon war plans and upon the production of vast quantities of civilian and military equipment. It would introduce a positive planning factor into decisions which are now being made on the basis of insufficient information as to present plans and probable future developments, scientific and otherwise.

The Board should undertake studies of the kind and intensity of use of currently assigned frequencies; acquaint itself with the present state of both military and civilian operations and research which may have a bearing upon the future demand for frequencies; prepare itself to suggest areas in which additional research might be undertaken in the light of probable future requirements, both civilian and military; review the international telecommunications situation with a view to strengthening our international posture; and keep continually under examination the entire field of telecommunications in order to advise the President of any actions which it thinks he should take to advance the public interest.

The type of organization we have in mind would have the following characteristics:

1. It would be established by Congress at the request of the President.

2. It would be established in the Executive Office of the President at a level to give it direct access to the President and to the heads of Government agencies using telecommunications.

3. It would have its own staff to the extent necessary to assure both the objectivity of the information upon which it acts and the unbiased character of recommendations based upon that information.

4. It would have the authority to require any Government agency to produce any information within its field of interest and

[1] Telecommunications—A Program for Progress.

to provide any assistance which it believes necessary to a proper decision.

5. It would have continuity to facilitate the development of long-range policies.

6. It would be an agency with no responsibility for the operation of any telecommunications.

7. It would not disturb the present functions of the Federal Communications Commission, including that of determining which applicants shall receive assignments within bands set aside for nongovernmental use.

MEASURES RECOMMENDED

Recommendation in summary

It is recommended that a Board be established through legislation requested by the President in order to provide the President with the means of discharging his responsibilities in connection with national telecommunication resources, including the Government's use of the radio frequency spectrum.

A draft bill designed to accomplish the foregoing recommendation by establishing a National Telecommunications Board is attached as Appendix B.

A draft Executive order designed to establish mobilization planning responsibilities for the Board is also attached as Appendix C.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A NATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATIONS BOARD

There should be established in the Executive Office of the President a National Telecommunications Board which reports directly to the President. The Board should consist of three members to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Chairman should be designated by the President. Board members should receive compensation in accordance with prevailing scales in comparable Government bodies. The Interdepartment Radio Advisory Committee (IRAC) should report to and assist the Board in the performance of the Board's functions as the Board may direct.

Functions of the Board

The Board should assist and advise the President in the discharge of his responsibilities as President of the United States in connection with U.S. telecommunication resources to meet the changing demands of national security and welfare, and should act for him in the discharge of his responsibilities arising from the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, for management of the Federal Government's use of the radio frequency spectrum in such a way as to provide the optimum accommodation of present and foreseen future needs of national security, safety of life and property, international relations, and the economic, social, educational, and political life of the Nation and the general welfare of its people.

The Board should formulate telecommunication policies, plans, programs, and standards designed to assure efficient telecommunication management within the executive branch of the Government with due regard for the maintenance of sound and healthy commercial telecommunication services both domestic and overseas. The Board should coordinate the formulation of U.S. policies and positions within the executive branch of the Government for international negotiation and should assist and advise the Secretary of State in the projection internationally of U.S. telecommunication policies and positions. The Board should provide policy guidance for and direct the implementation of U.S. international telecommunication treaty obligations by the several agencies in the executive branch of the Government.

The Board should carry out such policy making, planning, and executive functions as are required for the discharge of the President's responsibilities arising from section 305 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, for the assignment of radio frequencies to Government stations or classes of stations. The Board should formulate policies, criteria, engineering standards, and procedures for the allocation and assignment of radio frequencies to the several agencies of the executive branch of the Government and for the use thereof. The Board should maintain or cause to be maintained suitable records of assignment of frequencies to Government users and the publication of lists of Government frequency assignments as appropriate.

The Board should, as a special duty, review the national table of radio frequency allocations being employed by Federal Government and non-Federal Government users. This review should be undertaken in consultation with the Federal Communications Commission to the end that a determination be made as to whether the current division of radio spectrum serves the National interest to an appropriate degree. The Board should make a report of findings to the President for transmission to Congress. The report should contain, in addition to the findings resulting from the review and the comments of the FCC thereon, such recommendations as may be considered desirable and applicable. The report should be made at the earliest date consistent with the task to be performed but no later than 2 years from the appointment and qualification of the Board members.

The Board should maintain continuing review of the national table of radio frequency allocations, coordinating with the Federal Communications Commission, for the purpose of ensuring an appropriate division of spectrum space between the Federal Government and non-Federal Government users. The Board should formulate, and coordinate with the FCC, the development of long-range plans for future use of the radio spectrum resource. The Board should encourage the operational application of new techniques, improved equipment and methods to promote a more effective use of the radio spectrum and to conserve radio frequencies.

The Board should, as a further special duty (1) study the role of the Federal Government in the management of U.S. telecommunications; (2) study the administrative organizations for discharging the Government's responsibilities with particular reference to the division of responsibility under the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, and the terms of the proposed bill; and (3) not later than 2 years of the appointment and qualification of the Board members, report to the President for transmission to the Congress the Board's recommendations on what changes, if any, should be made in the existing administrative organization.

The Board should carry out such other duties and responsibilities as may be directed by the President from time to time.

The Board should establish and maintain liaison as required with departments and agencies of the Federal Government and the telecommunication industry, including but not limited to the broadcasting, electronic, and communication services, with particular reference to research and development and new manufacturing techniques and capabilities, for the purpose of improving telecommunication services, the conservation of the spectrum, and for increasing productivity of the total resource. The Board should encourage research and studies in those areas where the need exists.

The Board should, in the formulation and promulgation of policies, plans, programs, criteria, standards, and procedures of national import, consult as appropriate with the Federal Government agencies.

Mobilization planning responsibility

The Board should also:

1. Formulate national telecommunication policies, plans, and programs designed to assure maximum security to the United States in time of national emergency with a minimum interference to continuing nongovernmental requirements;

2. Formulate plans for the adaptation of nondefense telecommunication services and facilities to the requirements of defense in a national emergency or war;

3. Direct and coordinate the development by the several agencies of the executive branch of agency plans, programs, and actions designed to carry out approved national plans, programs, and actions in an emergency;

4. Formulate plans and directives to provide for the control of telecommunications in a national emergency;

5. Formulate plans for the conversion of defense telecommunication services and facilities no longer required for defense purposes after an emergency to the purposes of reconstruction, rehabilitation and peace.

In order to avoid duplication within legislation concerning the mobilization planning function which is already a legislated responsibility of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, it appears preferable to exclude this function from the draft bill and provide, in the form of an Executive order, for Presidential delegation of this planning responsibility.

APPENDIX A

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
OFFICE OF CIVIL AND
DEFENSE MOBILIZATION,
Washington, D.C., November 4, 1958.

Mr. Victor E. Cooley; Maj. Gen. W. Preston Corderman, U.S. Army, retired; Dr. Frank G. Kear; Dr. Irvin Stewart; Mr. William G. Thompson:

On behalf of President Eisenhower, I write to invite you to serve as members of a temporary Special Advisory Committee on Telecommunication to the President and me. This committee is created to review the role of the Federal Government in the management of telecommunication and, based on such review, to make recommendations to me which I may submit to the President, on actions essential to improve the allocation, management, and control of radio and television frequencies for Government and non-Government use. It is thought the Administration should be in a position to recommend to the Congress that a Commission be appointed to advance specific recommendations in this vital field. Other persons invited today to be members of the committee are as listed on the attachment to this letter.

Our economy and national defense today are highly dependent upon the smooth functioning of our national telecommunication services. The rapidly changing technology and changing needs in Government and non-Government areas are presenting increasingly difficult problems in telecommunication management. The situation is becoming no less complicated by developments in satellites and space vehicles as well as defense weapons systems.

It would be genuinely appreciated if you will accept this invitation and attend the initial meeting of the committee on November 18 and 19, 1958, at 10 a.m. on November 18, in my office, room 100, Executive Office Building, 17th and Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. It is my opinion this assignment will not be too arduous or require you to be away from your normal responsibilities an undue amount of time.

Because early action in the field is needed, it is my hope the committee will be able to complete its assignment and have its recommendations in my hands prior to January 1, 1959.

In the execution of your mission, you will receive the full cooperation and assistance of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization and other agencies of the Federal Government concerned.

You will be compensated for services rendered as a member of this committee as indicated on the attached transmittal sheet.

Your willingness to give us the benefit of your knowledge and experience by accepting this important assignment will be of great assistance in our effort to solve the many important problems in our communication services which is so vital to our Nation.

Sincerely yours,

LEO A. HOEGH.

APPENDIX B

H.R. 7057

A bill to provide the President with the means to discharge satisfactorily his responsibilities in connection with national telecommunication resources including the Government's use of the radio frequency spectrum

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "National Telecommunications Act of 1959".

NATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATIONS BOARD

SEC. 1. There is hereby established in the Executive Office of the President the National Telecommunications Board, hereinafter referred to as the "Board", which shall report directly to the President. The Board shall consist of three members to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Chairman shall be designated by the President and shall receive compensation at the rate of $20,500 per annum. The other two Board members shall receive compensation at the rate of $20,000 per annum. All actions of the Board except those relating to internal administrative matters shall be by affirmative vote of a majority of its members. The Chairman shall be responsible for the internal administrative direction of the Board and its staff.

FUNCTIONS OF THE BOARD

SEC. 2. (a) The Board shall assist and advise the President in the discharge of his responsibilities as President of the United States in connection with United States telecommunication resources to meet the changing demands of national security and welfare and shall act for him in the discharge of his responsibilities arising from the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, for management of the Federal Government's use of the radio frequency spectrum in such a way as to provide the optimum accommodation of present and foreseen future needs of national security, safety of life and property, international relations, and the economic, social, educational, and political life of the Nation and the general welfare of its people.

(b) The Board shall formulate telecommunication policies, plans, programs, and standards designed to assure efficient telecommunication management within the executive branch of the Government with due regard for the maintenance of sound and healthy commercial telecommunication services both domestic and foreign. The Board shall coordinate the formulation of United States policies and positions within the executive branch of the Government for international negotiation and shall assist and advise the Secretary of State in the projection internationally of United States telecommunication policies and positions. The Board shall provide policy guidance for and direct the implementation of United States international telecommunication treaty obligations by the several agencies in the executive branch of the Government.

(c) The Board shall carry out such policymaking, planning, and executive functions as are required for the discharge of the President's responsibilities arising from section 305 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, for the assignment of radio frequencies to Government stations or classes of stations. The Board shall formulate policies, criteria, engineering standards, and procedures for the allocation and assignment of radio frequencies to the several agencies of the executive branch of the Government and for the use thereof. The Board shall maintain or cause to be maintained suitable records of assignment of frequencies to Government users and the publication of lists of Government frequency assignments as appropriate.

(d) The Board shall, as a special duty, review the national table of radio frequency allocations being employed by Federal Government and non-Federal Government users. This review shall be done in consultation with the Federal Communications Commission to the end that a determination be made as to whether the current division of radio spectrum serves the national interest to an appropriate degree. The Board shall make a report of findings to the President for transmission to Congress. The report shall contain, in addition to the findings resulting from the review and the comments of the Federal Communications Commission thereon, such recommendations as may be considered desirable and applicable. The report is to be made at the earliest date consistent with the task to be performed but no later than 2 years from the appointment and qualification of the Board members.

(e) The Board shall maintain continuing review of the national table of radio frequency allocations, coordinating with the Federal Communications Commission, for the purpose of ensuring an appropriate division of spectrum space between the Federal Government and non-Federal Government users. The Board shall formulate, and coordinate with the Federal Communications Commission, the development of long-range plans for future use of the radio spectrum resource. The Board shall encourage the operational application of new techniques, improved equipment, and methods to promote a more effective use of the radio spectrum and to conserve radio frequencies.

(f) The Board shall, as a further special duty, (1) study the role of the Federal Government in the management of United States telecommunications; (2) study the administrative organizations for discharging the Government's responsibilities with particular reference to the division of responsibility under the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, and the terms of this Act; and (3) not later than two years of the appointment and qualification of the Board members, report to the President for transmission to the Congress the Board's recommendations on what changes, if any, should be made in the existing administrative organization.

(g) The Board shall carry out such other duties and responsibilities as may be directed by the President from time to time.

(h) The Board shall establish and maintain liaison as required with departments and agencies of the Federal Government and the telecommunications industry, including but not limited to the broadcasting, electronic, and communication services, with particular reference to research and development and new manufacturing techniques and capabilities, for the purpose of improving telecommunication services, the conservation of the spectrum, and for increasing productivity of the total resource. The Board shall encourage research and studies in those areas where the need exists.

(i) The Board shall, in the formulation and promulgation of policies, plans, programs, criteria, standards, and procedures of national import, consult as appropriate with the Federal Government agencies.

(j) The Board is also authorized: (1) subject to the civil service and classification laws, to select, employ, appoint, and fix the compensation of such officers, employees, attorneys, and agents as shall be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act, and to define their authority and duties; (2) to appoint such advisory committees as shall be appropriate for the purpose of consultation and advice to the Board in performance of its functions hereunder and to obtain services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55(a)), at rates not to exceed $100 per diem for individuals; and (3) to place in grades 16, 17, and 18 of the General Schedule established by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, not to exceed ten positions which shall be additional to the number authorized by section 505 of that Act.

ORGANIZATION OF NATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATIONS BOARD

SEC. 3. The term of office of each member of the Board shall be six years, except that (1) any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term; and (2) the terms of office of the members first taking office after the date of enactment of this Act shall expire, as designated by the President at the time of appointment, one at the end of two years, one at the end of four years, and one at the end of six years. Two members shall constitute a quorum of the Board. Each member of the Board shall be a citizen of the United States.

ANNUAL REPORT

SEC. 4. The Board shall make an annual report to the President for transmission on or before the 15th of March of each year to the Congress, summarizing the activities of the Board for the previous calendar year and making such recommendations as it may deem appropriate.

TRANSFER OF RECORDS, PROPERTY, PERSONNEL, AND FUNDS

SEC. 5. The records, property, personnel and funds used, held, employed, available, or to be made available, in connection with the functions vested in the Director of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization by Executive Order 10460 of June 16, 1953, and Executive Order 10705 of April 17, 1957, shall be transferred, consonant with law to the Board.

APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 6. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary and appropriate for the carrying out of the provisions and purposes of this Act.

APPENDIX C

EXECUTIVE ORDER CONFERRING UPON THE NATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATIONS BOARD THE RESPONSIBILITY FOR MOBILIZATION PLANNING TO CONTROL AND REGULATE NATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATIONS IN AN EMERGENCY

By virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and laws of the United States, including the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, (50 U.S.C. App. 2061, et. seq.), and as President of the United States and Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces of the United States, it is hereby ordered as follows:

SECTION 1. The National Telecommunications Board which is responsible for assisting and advising me pursuant to my responsibilities for the management of U.S. telecommunications, shall assume the additional responsibilities for mobilization planning to control and regulate national telecommunications in an emergency. These responsibilities shall include but not necessarily be limited to the following tasks:

(a) The Board shall formulate national telecommunication policies, plans, and programs designed to assure maximum security to the United States in time of national emergency with a minimum of interference to continuing nongovernmental requirements.

(b) The Board shall formulate plans for the adaption of nondefense telecommunication services and facilities to the requirements of defense in a national emergency or war.

(c) The Board shall direct and coordinate the development by the several agencies of the Executive Branch of agency plans, programs, and actions designed to carry out approved national plans, programs, and actions in an emergency.

(d) The Board shall formulate plans and directives for an emergency telecommunications agency to direct the control and priority of use of U.S. telecommunications in a national emergency.

(e) The Board shall formulate plans for the conversion of defense telecommunication services and facilities no longer required for defense purposes to the purposes of reconstruction, rehabilitation, and peace.

SEC. 2. The Board, in the process of carrying out the foregoing responsibilities, will consult with the various Government agencies and commercial enterprises as necessary to produce effective planning at the national level in order that individual agency plans may become integral parts of the whole. It will form such committees and boards as are necessary to assist and advise it in discharging these additional responsibilities.

SEC. 3. The mobilization plans developed by the Board shall be consistent with the policy direction and program guidance established by the Director of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

APPENDIX D

STATE OF THE UNION MESSAGE

Changing technology, along with changing needs in government and non-government areas, presents serious problems that require searching examination in the field of telecommunications, particularly as respects administration and use of the radio spectrum. These problems affect both the national security and the industrial and social welfare of the country. The present government mechanism is not adequate to meet these problems. To correct this situation I will send to the Congress a bill requesting that a National Telecommunications Board consisting of three members be established in the Executive Office of the President whose primary mission will be to carry out the responsibilities imposed on the President by the Communications Act of 1934 in connection with national telecommunications resources, including management of the Government's use of the radio frequency spectrum, and of all telecommunications in time of emergency.

Harry Truman's 75th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 11, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include two news articles and the text of Dean Acheson's remarks on the occasion of former President Truman's 75th birthday anniversary, which was observed on Friday, May 8, at dinners throughout the country. News articles and text appeared in the New York Times, Saturday, May 9, 1959:

TRUMAN IS TOASTED AT 75 AT DINNERS COAST TO COAST

(By Robert Alden)

Birthday candles burned brightly across the Nation last night as Democrats honored Harry S. Truman on his 75th birthday. At 66 parties in cities from coast to coast, the former President was hailed as a great leader of his party and a distinguished President.

Sixteen of the cities were linked by a closed-circuit two-hour telecast that enabled them to see a 2-hour program in tribute to Mr. Truman, who attended the dinner here at the Waldorf-Astoria.

The most dramatic part of the birthday program came when Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt described the moment on April 12, 1945, when she told Mr. Truman, "Harry, the President is dead." Mrs. Roosevelt said last night:

"The character of my friend was proved on that terrible day. He was frightened—as he should have been. For no man had ever been placed so abruptly in such a seat of responsibility.

"And yet there was never in him the slightest hint that he would try to evade what fate had thrust upon him. I knew then he was a good man. Later I thrilled to watch him grow to greatness.

"With every decision he grew, until to the entire world he was a towering figure. The decisions he made then shaped the very world we live in today."

WHEN THE GOING WAS ROUGH

Mr. Truman, at the $100-a-plate dinner in his honor at the Waldorf, heard Melvyn Douglas, the master of ceremonies in New York, ask former Secretary of State Dean Acheson in Washington:

"What was President Truman like to work for when the going was rough?"

Mr. Acheson replied:

"The answer to your question begins in a recent experience of one of my friends and colleagues in the last administration. He was revisiting the White House and seeing a well-known and genial Washingtonian heading for the President's office, cocked an inquiring eyebrow.

"'Oh', he was told, 'he's going in to cheer up the President.'

"'That's funny,' said my friend, 'in our day the President used to cheer us up.'"

Mr. Acheson said he believed that history would rank Mr. Truman high.

Mr. Truman also saw and heard Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON of Texas, the majority leader, say at the dinner in Boston that "to no man living is so much owed by so many."

"Today—around this world—millions of men and women live in freedom who would not have that freedom except for the courage and forthrightness brought to the leadership of the West by one man—Harry Truman," Senator JOHNSON said.

He called Mr. Truman "the greatest of living Democrats—one of the great Democrats and greatest Americans of the ages."

ADVICE FROM MARK TWAIN

There were homely, but no less revealing touches at last night's birthday parties. In a pickup from Independence, Mo., Miss Mary Jane Truman, the former President's sister, said that her brother always had this quotation from Mark Twain on his desk:

"Always do right. This will gratify some of the people and astonish the rest."

Miss Truman also recalled that their mother had exercised a tremendous influence on Mr. Truman.

"She influenced Harry to study music," Miss Truman said, "and then she'd say to him, 'Remember, always play in the key of Be Natural and you'll get along in life.' And Harry's like that, you know—he's always so natural."

Miss Truman added: "Harry used to take me everywhere. Maybe that's why I never married. I just never met anybody as nice as Harry."

In another tribute from Independence, Msgr. Curtis L. Tiernan, chaplain for Mr. Truman's artillery company in France during World War I, spoke. He recalled that on one occasion the company was caught in a crossfire between the Germans and the French and started to panic.

FEW WELL-CHOSEN WORDS

"Captain Truman stood up and delivered a few well-chosen words and stopped the rout," Monsignor Tiernan said.

"What were those well-chosen words?" the chaplain was asked.

"Well, I don't know whether I should repeat it on the air," Monsignor Tiernan replied.

He was assured that the television circuit was a closed one.

"Well, I still don't think I should repeat it," he said. "It was good plain Missouri talk. It took the skin off the ears of those boys and turned them right around."

Monsignor Tiernan was asked if he had felt obliged to rebuke Mr. Truman for his "good plain Missouri talk."

"Oh, hell no—sorry. He was a soldier and he knew his job," the former chaplain replied. "He took his battery through the bloodiest battles of the war, and he only lost two men. He never asked any of them to do anything he wouldn't do himself, and they loved him for it. He brought them home safe and sound."

In another tribute, SAM RAYBURN, Speaker of the House, who was on the flower-bedecked dais here with Mr. Truman, looked at the former President and said:

"Harry, history is going to be kind to you. They are going to forget the few times that you have not taken dead aim, but have shot from the hip. They are going to remember you for the great things you have done."

DIARY GIVEN AS GIFT

On behalf of the Truman Diamond Jubilee Committee, Mr. RAYBURN presented a birthday gift—a handwritten diary in five volumes of a Civil War soldier, Harrison Whittimore, Company K, First Massachusetts Infantry. The volumes include a series of letters describing the conflict written to the soldier's father and aunt.

Paul M. Butler, chairman of the Democratic National Committee, speaking from Washington, said:

"I just hope that whoever will be our standard-bearer in 1960—whoever will be the victorious Democratic candidate in 1960—has been studying the record [of Mr. Truman]."

Mr. Butler also said he believed that Mr. Truman would have been happy to return to the Senate after he had left the White House.

"But he had a respect for the continuing Office of the Presidency and he would not stoop to use the power of that great office to win for himself what, by comparison, was a more minor political post," Mr. Butler added. "He would not campaign for himself. But the remarkable thing about Harry Truman is that he did not hesitate to campaign for others."

Also recalled at last night's birthday parties on film was Mr. Truman's impersonation of H. V. Kaltenborn, the radio commentator, predicting Mr. Truman's defeat in 1948. Speaking from Boston last night Mr. Kaltenborn said:

"While I continued to wonder whether the imitation really with the most since form of flattery, President Truman kept busy. He led the free world in the fight against com-

munism, launched the point 4 economic aid program, and helped Greece and Turkey defeat the Communist menace. Best of all he took the bold step of using force to defeat Communist aggression in Korea."

"Tonight we can all join in congratulations and good wishes to a man who makes the age of 75 seem like a halfway station in a lusty life," Mr. Kaltenborn said.

WAGNER PRAISES TRUMAN

Mayor Wagner said of Mr. Truman at the Waldorf dinner:

"The calendar tells us that this man, this great American, is 75 years of age. We, all of us, know better. He is eternally young, and as long as we have in America men with the spirit and the vision of Harry Truman, the Nation itself can never age."

Former Governor W. Averell Harriman said, "No President made decisions in peacetime of such far-reaching consequence, influencing the course of history."

Entertainers participating in last night's telecast included Jack Benny, Danny Kaye, Mort Sahl, Jimmy Durante, and Leonard Bernstein. A special film on Mr. Truman's tenure in office was produced for the occasion under the direction of Dore Schary.

Accompanying Mr. Truman to his birthday celebration in New York last night were his wife Bess, his daughter Margaret, and his son-in-law, Clifton Daniel.

The cities that were linked by closed-circuit television were New York, San Francisco, Denver, Washington, Chicago, Gary, Ind.; New Orleans, Boston, Detroit, Kansas City, Oklahoma City, Houston, Chattanooga, Dallas, Dayton, and Cleveland.

The national chairman for the birthday celebrations was Roger L. Stevens and the chairman for the New York dinner was Samuel I. Rosenman.

Mr. Truman plans to leave for his home in Independence later today.

TRUMAN STRIDES INTO 76TH YEAR—GETS CAKE AND A SERENADE FROM NEWSMEN, THEN SETS BRISK BIRTHDAY PACE

(By Philip Benjamin)

At 7:20 o'clock yesterday morning, former President Harry S. Truman blew out 25 candles on a store-bought birthday cake.

The cake had been presented by reporters and photographers assigned to accompany Mr. Truman on his customary morning walk. It was Mr. Truman 75th birthday.

Besides the cake the newsmen offered, in the lobby of the Carlyle Hotel, at 76th Street and Madison Avenue, a "low-fi" vocal arrangement of "Happy Birthday to You."

Mr. Truman appeared surprised and pleased. "I didn't expect this," he said, grinning. "I expect it'll take about three blows." Actually, it took only two to put the candles out.

Then the former President, never looking better set out on his walk—up Park Avenue, over to 5th on 82d Street, down 5th. He carried a walking stick, which he waved at well-wishing passersby. A department of sanitation truckdriver saluted him with a "shave and a haircut two bits" beeping of his horn.

He had two birthday wishes, Mr. Truman said, as he strode along, 110 steps to the minute.

"I wish for peace and happiness for all the people of the United States," he said. He wished also for "another boy in Margaret's family," referring to his daughter, Mrs. Clifton Daniel, who is expecting another child.

Looking back, he said, he made plenty of mistakes. "I'd be sprouting wings if I hadn't." Mr. Truman remarked.

His greatest decision was to go into Korea, he declared, "because the whole United Nations was involved."

Though he disagrees politically with President Eisenhower, he said, any reports that he is feuding with the President are "damned lies."

Mr. Truman, nearing the Carlyle Hotel again, said he expected to live at least 10 or 12 years more, and "I may fool people, as I did lots of other times."

At the hotel entrance, he bade goodby to the newsmen and went upstairs to show the birthday cake to Mrs. Truman.

TEXT OF ACHESON'S TRIBUTE TO TRUMAN

The answer to your question (by Melvyn Douglas) begins in a recent experience of one of my friends and colleagues in the last administration. He was revisiting the White House and, seeing a well-known and genial Washingtonian heading for the President's office, cocked an inquiring eyebrow.

"Oh," he was told, "he's going to cheer up the President."

"That's funny," said my friend, "in our day the President used to cheer us up."

Shakespeare put it this way, describing a night visit of Henry V to his troops before Agincourt:

"Every wretch, pining and pale before,
Beholding him, plucks comfort from his looks.
His liberal eye doth give to every one,
A little touch of Harry in the night."

That "little touch of Harry" which all of us got all the time, came from an inexhaustible supply. It came from his boundless energy and vitality.

He could, and did, outwork us all. A few hours of sleep would recharge him to the point where he had to walk some of it off early in the morning.

From this reservoir came the energy needed to get to the bottom of the toughest problem. He had no need for papers predigested into one-page pellets of pablum.

When things went wrong, he took the blame. When things went right, he gave one of his lieutenants the credit. One thing we never doubted: That among all the hazards and dangers of public life, the boss stood like a rock to support us. He expected—and received—the same loyalty that he gave.

DEVELOPMENT OF A PRESIDENT

Today no one can come to the office of President of the United States really qualified for it. But he can do his best to become so. Those of us who went the course with President Truman were privileged to see, at first hand, the development of a President whom, I believe, history will rank high. One could see this development in the quality of his judgment. At the outset it was inclined to be hasty as though driven by the press of work to be done.

But no one ever learned faster, and it was not long before his first question was, "How long have we got to work this out?" He would take what time was available for study; and then decide.

President Truman's capacity for decision always seemed to me his greatest attribute. General (of the Army George C.) Marshall has called this capacity the rarest gift given to man. And he would insist that President Truman had it to a high degree.

No one can decide and act who is beset by second thoughts, self-doubt and that most enfeebling of emotions, regret.

ON TO ANOTHER DECISION

With the President a decision made was made, and he went on to another. He learned from mistakes (though he seldom admitted it), and did not waste time regretting and bemoaning them. That is, he learned from all mistakes but one—the fast answer in that nightmare of Presidents, the press conference. We kept on hand, as a sort of first aid kit, a boxful of clarifications for these events.

One last word, in which I am sure my colleagues of past years would agree. No men were less alike than two men, both named Harry S. Truman.

One was the public figure—peppery, sometimes belligerent, often didactic, the "give-'em-hell" Harry. The other was the patient, modest, considerate and appreciative boss, helpful and understanding in all official matters, affectionate and sympathetic in any private worry or sorrow.

This is the "Mr. President" we knew, and know, best.

Position of American Legion on Pension Bill H.R. 6432

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT W. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 5, 1959

Mr. CLEMENT W. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to submit for the RECORD, the position of the American Legion on the pension bill, H.R. 6432. This is the statement of policy by the national executive committee of the American Legion, adopted April 30, 1959. This statement is submitted at the request of Col. Thomas W. Miller, who was a member of this House from 1914–16. Colonel Miller is a founder of the American Legion, and vice chairman of the Paris caucus. For years he has fought the battles of the Legion, as national commiteeman and as chairman of its legislative committee.

Following is the statement:

The American Legion has recognized the following factors as being an essential element in its consideration of Federal programs to provide disability pensions for war veterans. The term disability pension as used here is generally applicable to the provision of death pensions for the widows and dependent children of deceased war veterans of World War I, of World War II, and of the Korean conflict:

1. The right to pension is grounded in the fact that the receipent served his country with honor during a period of war.

2. The criteria for entitlement place the emphasis on a cause of need, that is a permanent disabiling condition sufficient to preclude or to seriously interfere with employment.

3. The procedural requirements are not such as would cause the claimant embarrassment either in his relationships with representatives of his Government or with members of his community.

4. The receipt of pension is not considered to be synoymous with being a pauper or a failure.

The national executive committee of the American Legion, meeting in Indianapolis, Ind., April 29, 30 and May 1, 1959, believes that the plan submitted to the Congress by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, designed to revise existing disability pension laws and regulations, does not meet the stated criteria. The Administrator's plan is incorporated in H.R. 6432, 86th Congress, introduced by request by Congressman OLIN E. TEAGUE, April 15, 1959.

H.R. 6432 is not acceptable to the American Legion.

Therefore, authority is vested in the national commander to seek disability pension legislation which (a) recognizes the need to grant the long-sought increase in rates

for those eligible to disability pension awards; (b) adheres to the basic purposes of disability and need in such legislation; (c) gives proper consideration to correction of inequities as they are reported to exist and at the same time prevents the creation of more numerous inequities such as those now proposed in H.R. 6432; (d) grants equality of eligibility for death pension for widows and dependents of deceased veterans of World Wars I and II and the Korean conflict; (e) increases the awards to recipients in the lower income brackets and accomplishes this purpose without doing violence to those awards going to recipients whose outside income is at or near the upper limit of income permitted; (f) provides for measures which will improve existing disability pension laws within the framework of our mandates.

A New Approach to Labor-Management Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT P. GRIFFIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 11, 1959

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, recently the distinguished ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor, the Honorable CARROLL D. KEARNS, of Pennsylvania, delivered an important and timely address before the Invest in America Committee in Philadelphia. As the House proceeds toward consideration of needed labor reform legislation, the views of Congressman KEARNS on this subject are particularly meaningful. His excellent address follows:

A NEW APPROACH TO LABOR-MANAGEMENT PROBLEMS

(An address delivered by Hon. CARROLL D. KEARNS)

The labor reform legislation which has become such an important issue this year is an old problem. Congress has been working on it for years. When we look back to the middle thirties we recognize today's proposed legislation as the third step in a continuing process.

First was the Wagner Act, passed in 1935. There Congress stated the labor policy of our country. Briefly, it is to encourage collective bargaining and to protect American workmen in their exercise of full freedom of association. When the Wagner Act was passed, Congress decided the only labor reform needed was to protect employees from antiunion conduct by employers.

Twelve years later, the enactment of the Labor-Management Relation Act of 1947, commonly called the Taft-Hartley Act, recognized the necessity to protect workmen from union conduct also. This was the second step in labor reform. At that time the Congress wisely felt it was necessary to state specifically, as a part of the labor policy of our country, the fundamental right of workmen not to associate or deal collectively.

Today, in the third phase, labor reform continues to be concerned with protecting the rights of individual workmen. Our policy has not changed. But now it has been clearly shown that these rights need to be protected from abuses in the internal affairs of unions. Also, some activities of employers and unions in their relationships with each other continue to be detrimental to American workmen. The task before us is to strengthen and add to the present safeguards.

You may well ask wether new laws are needed. The corrupt activities exposed by the McClellan committee are, for the most part, violations of existing criminal statutes. Lack of democracy within unions is often contrary to existing State law. Other infringements on the rights of workmen are violations of the National Labor Relations Act.

But performance under existing laws is sadly lacking. Performance must be improved.

Individuals subject to these laws must cooperate in carrying out the intent of the law. Emotional appeals, such as the union condemnation of Taft-Hartley as the "slave labor" act, should be forgotten.

Government officials likewise need to improve their performance. More emphasis should be placed by Government law enforcement officials on the necessity of protecting the rights of individual workmen. Courts should avoid strained and legalistic interpretations.

But, we in Congress also have a responsibility to improve performance. We can be most effective, in my opinion, by recognizing that we must provide laws which are easily enforced. Experience demonstrates present laws do not meet this test. Therefore, we do need new legislation. Its language must be simple and clear to all concerned. It must not be subject to misinterpretation by enforcement officials. This is a big order but I am confident we can show substantial improvement.

The Congress will be deluding itself and the public if new laws rely on criminal enforcement. As I said a moment ago, this has proven to be one of the weakest aspects of performance under existing law. Most of the corruption brought to light by the McClellan committee has been a violation of one or more existing criminal statutes. But how many of the criminals have been convicted? Only a handful.

Here is the basic weakness of Senator KENNEDY's approach to the third step in labor reform. His bill, which the Senate passed, is a criminal statute. He would require a tremendous number of reports of activities of unions, union officials, employers, labor consultants—just about anyone coming into contact with the labor movement. For enforcement, he relies primarily on criminal penalties. What reason do we have to believe that performance under these criminal laws will be any greater than under existing law?

In Senator KENNEDY's "Massive reports" theory reasonable, regardless of how enforced? Most of the activities to be reported are perfectly legitimate. Honest union officers and employers will file reports. But are corrupt and dishonest persons going to file reports of their dishonesty? If so, a whole new concept of law enforcement is opened to us. Perhaps we should require all persons who exceed a speed limit to file a report of the traffic violation and thus solve the speeding problem.

There are some good features in the Senate bill. For example, the principle of a "Bill of Rights" for union members is truly gratifying. Protection of union members from unfair treatment by their own leaders is the heart of the third step in labor reform. A bill of rights is essential but the Senate provisions must be strengthened.

Here again, the bill of rights must be a part of a law which will secure performance. It too, must be easily enforceable. I have already expressed my doubts as to criminal penalties to secure enforcement of labor reform laws. The burden of proof in criminals cases is too great.

Union members should be able to enforce their own rights in State courts. I understand the Senate bill includes such a provision. But working men and women should also have some simple means of securing the help of the Government. Lawsuits are expensive. The unions will have plenty of money to defend their position in the suits but many rank and file members will not have the funds to prosecute them. We must give the members additional, effective means of enforcement of their rights.

It was also encouraging to have the Senate at least recognize the principle that additional restraints on organizational picketing and secondary boycottts are needed. These two weapons have been used by labor racketeers again and again to interfere with the rights of decent, law-abiding Americans. Unfortunately, the improvements made by the other body in this area are woefully inadequate.

Another serious deficiency in the Senate bill is its failure to deal satisfactorily with the so-called no man's land of NLRB jurisdiction. At present, because of a ruling of the Supreme Court, there is no forum where cases may be heard and no remedy available to small employers who do not come within the NLRB jurisdictional standards. The Senate would permit State agencies, but not State courts, to handle such cases if the State would apply the Federal law. It is highly questionable whether the few States which have suitable agencies will accept this kind of dictation. And, in those States where there are no little NLRB's, small employers and their employees will continue to be without a remedy.

I am confident that we can write a bill in the House which will be a big step forward in protecting the individual American workman in exercising his fundamental rights. To do so, the bill must provide:

1. TRUE DEMOCRACY WITHIN UNIONS

It must give each member a bill of rights governing his relationship with his union. He should be able to speak freely for or against the policies of his leaders. He must be able to vote secretly on issues vital to him. He must have equal rights with his fellow members. In short, a union must belong to its members—not to its officials.

2. HONESTY WITHIN UNIONS

Each member must receive full and accurate reports of activities of his union and its officials. The union member is the best watchman over the finances of his own organizations. But he needs the help of the Government in investigating mishandling of union funds and in correcting any wrongdoing.

3. PROTECTION FOR INNOCENT WORKMEN AND SMALL EMPLOYERS FROM COERCIVE PICKETING AND SECONDARY BOYCOTTS

Not all picket lines and boycotts are coercive. But some, which are permitted under existing law, clearly injure American workmen in the exercise of their freedom of association and the exercise of their free choice as to dealing collectively. Reasonable compromises can be worked out. The line may not be perfect, but we can show major improvement.

4. ELIMINATION OF CRIMINAL ELEMENTS FROM THE UNION MOVEMENT

This will be accomplished only if we provide simple practical means of enforcement. The right of union members to the courts should not be curtailed, but the working people of this country and small employers deserve quicker and less expensive methods of securing justice, using the framework of proven means of law enforcement.

5. A FORUM FOR EVERY DISPUTE

The no man's land must be eliminated and, through either State or Federal courts or agencies, there must be a place where labor reform cases can be heard. The same forum need not be used for all cases, but no one subject to the law of the United States should be without a remedy if his fundamental rights have been impaired.

As ranking member of the minority on the House Committee on Education and Labor, I

will do everything in my power to see that our committee reports out a bill which will assure the working men and women of this country the fullest protection of their individual freedom. It is not an easy job but one which must—and can—be done.

Montana Governor Vetoes Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 11, 1959

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a veto message by Gov. J. Hugo Aronson of Montana on the subject of Federal Aid to Education. This message is very timely in that the bill which the message refers to is now under consideration by the House Committee on Education and Labor:

MONTANA GOVERNOR VETOES FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

(During the 36th Montana Legislative Session, a Senate Joint Resolution to the President and Congress of the United States favoring Federal Aid to Education was vetoed by Montana's Gov. J. Hugo Aronson. The text of the veto message follows:)

SIRS: I am herewith returning Senate Joint Resolution No. 4 without my approval for the following reasons.

A sound comprehensive education, with the accent on learning to think rather than to merely "parrot," is essential to the United States of America as we know it. Our schools rank along with home and church as a bulwark against the forces that are forever seeking to destroy our Republic and its free enterprise economy.

In view of the extreme importance of education to our Nation, it is obvious that those at the State and local levels are most aware of the quality of education being given our youth. This is particularly true at the local level, since parents and others who deal with them every day know our youngsters best.

Federal aid to education will only result in taking more and more control away from the State and local levels. There are those who will say that certain pieces of legislation guarantee that control remains at home. This is a fallacy, since the Federal Government always sets up certain standards for States to meet. This is the right of the Federal Government if we allow our tax dollars to be taken to that level and then returned, minus a substantial tithe. Each standard, no matter how innocent it sounds, is another delegation of power to the Federal Government, at the expense of the State and local governments.

Much has been said about standards of education. This must be of greatest concern at the State and local level. The same applies to teachers' salaries. If both standards and salaries are low, then the State and/or community will slip behind its neighbors in many respects. No State or community can afford to let this happen for very long. Therefore, the best remedy for either low standards or salaries lies at the local and State levels.

Federal aid may sound like a "get rich quick" panacea for all educational problems. However, one must remember that Federal aid dollars still come from the same taxpayers as other tax dollars. There is no hidden mother lode. In the long run, it is far cheaper for all concerned to pay taxes at home to operate a sound educational system than it is to send them elsewhere, only to find out later that you have lost control of your educational system and your tax dollars have had a tariff extracted from them.

There is an added objection to the endorsement of this specific Federal aid to education measure, which is now before Congress. At a time when a balanced budget is certainly needed, this particular piece of legislation endorsed by this resolution is one of the most costly before Congress. If approved, it could easily prove to be a champion budget-buster. The estimated cost is $11.4 billion over four years.

If the money is available for Federal aid, then it is available at the local and/or State levels for education. Let us take care of this major function ourselves. The only Federal aid needed is for its proponents to support a return of some tax sources to the State and/or local levels.

For these reasons I am returning Senate Joint Resolution 4 without my approval.

Very truly yours,
J. HUGO ARONSON,
Governor.

Geographical Center of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. Y. BERRY
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 11, 1959

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to a bill I am introducing today which would authorize the establishment of the Central National Monument at the geographic center of the United States, which is located near the Black Hills in my district in South Dakota.

With the admission of Hawaii to the Union, the location of the geographic center is now permanent. Tourists from across the Nation are interested in seeing the spot of the geographic center. It is a point of national interest and the national interest will be increased by the designation of a 10-acre spot as a national monument.

The national interest will be increased by the fact that those living in South Dakota, and particularly western South Dakota and eastern Wyoming, are planning a drive to finance the construction of an appropriate marker to be located in the center of this 10-acre plot. The marker will be donated by residents over a plan prepared by the National Park Service. The owner of the land upon which the geographic center of the Nation is located has agreed to donate the necessary acreage for this purpose. The monument itself will be without expense to the taxpayers of the Nation other than the small expense of maintenance of such a national monument.

Since the geographic center of the Nation is of universal interest, since such geographic center should be properly designated, since this national monument can be accomplished without cost to the taxpayers of the Nation, I ask that Congress take the necessary steps to designate this geographic center as a national monument in the interest of the people of the Nation and those in years to come.

Enactment of Flood-Douglas Area Redevelopment Bill Urged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 11, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following memorandum from Mr. Bernie Blier, executive director of the Northeastern Pennsylvania Industrial Development Commission, as well as a letter from Mr. Vic Diehm, chairman of the Pennsylvania State Chamber of Commerce community development committee, to Mr. Arnold Edmonds, executive director, Pennsylvania State Chamber of Commerce:

MAY 5, 1959.

To: Pennsylvania House delegation.
From: Bernie Blier, NPIDC executive director.
Subject: Diehm observations on area redevelopment legislation.

In response to an inquiry from the State chamber of commerce, Vic Diehm expressed his vigorous support of an adequate area redevelopment program. As a longtime chairman of the State chamber of commerce's community development committee, active in Hazleton and northwestern Pennsylvania industrial development, and a member of the Pennsylvania Industrial Development Authority, his observations represent a keen awareness of the vital need for Federal legislation to support and complement existing local and State efforts.

I thought that you might like to know of NPIDC's feelings, particularly in the absence of strong support by local chambers of commerce who should be on the firing line in support of area redevelopment legislation, but obviously hesitant because of a full understanding of its local coordinated possibilities.

NORTHEAST PENNSYLVANIA INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION.

NORTHEAST PENNSYLVANIA
INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION,
April 11, 1959.

Mr. ARNOLD EDMONDS,
Executive Director, Pennsylvania State Chamber of Commerce, State Chamber Building, Harrisburg, Pa.

DEAR ARN: As you will notice, I am writing this with my NPIDC hat cocked on my head. For the time being, I have removed my hat indicating chairmanship of the Pennsylvania State Chamber of Commerce community development committee and also my hat indicating I am a member of the PIDA.

About 6 or 7 years ago, the State Chamber of Commerce of Pennsylvania helped to father the NPIDC. It was designed as an experiment, to see how the areas could work together in the field of industrial development. Some slight assist was given by the Department of Commerce, but the greater part of the job fell to community development committee of the State chamber, with the usual fine assist of Walter Schenck.

In a short time, this commission became nationally known, despite the fact that it had no funds, no paid members, and no paid publicity agents. To this extent, we were invited by President Eisenhower to discuss industrial development plans at the White House on May 11, 1954.

After hearing us, the President assigned the situation to the U.S. Department of Commerce, and particularly to Dr. Gabriel Hauge. One of the bright boys of the Department of Commerce shook us up when he recommended that people out of work should move to someplace where there was work. As off the side, I might point out that people in Pennsylvania did just that to Bucks County and now there are so many people out of work in Bucks County that it qualifies for assistance.

One of the things that we recommended to the President was the establishment of some national agency to aid depressed areas, such as northeast Pennsylvania. The President, said in part, that he would take what we had given to him to heart, inasmuch as northeast Pennsylvania was way far out in front of the rest of the country for pulling themselves up by their bootstraps. As is well known to you, Scranton, Wilkes-Barre, Hazleton, Pottsville, Shamokin, and intermediate points had been doing this job without either State or Federal aid for years.

I inserted that to show that we of northeast Pennsylvania—are real veterans in industrial development, and we realized in 1954 that the time was coming when we would need Federal aid.

In the fall of 1956, upon the recommendation of the U.S. Department of Commerce, I was asked to be a member of the policy committee of the National Planning Association to look at the question of depressed areas: a national problem. In addition to myself from Pennsylvania, Charles E. Oakes, chairman of the board of the P. P. and L. was named. Mr. Oakes did not serve, but he delegated Frank Mueller, vice president of the central diivsion (P. P. and L.'s largest), and located in the heart of northeast Pennsylvania. Others on the committee included the vice president of Sears, Roebuck; the president of Todd-A-O; William L. Batt, Jr., new secretary of labor for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and then serving as director of Toledo's Development Commission in Ohio; and others. Of these people, I think you can see that we were not a group of men too far away from the center of the course.

Part of our recommendation was that the Federal Government should assume the responsibility for a vigorous program to remove chronic local unemployment, in collaboration with local and private programs. This special committee made special mention of the fact that it seemed incongruous that billions should be sent abroad for foreign aid and many depressed area spots appear throughout the United States.

At the time this committee was making its study, the number of areas with substantial unemployment was 88, consisting of 23 major areas, and 65 smaller labor market areas. At the end of January 1959, this figure had grown to 259, consisting of 76 major areas and 183 smaller labor markets.

Now, why should we in northeast Pennsylvania reform a national aid bill, when we have demonstrated over the years that we can help ourselves? Simply because we realize that we are taking the pitcher to the well just too often. In 1946, in a short 3-week drive which I had the privilege to lead—we raised $660,000 in spot cash—no pledges, no bonds, just cash on hand at the end of 3 weeks.

In 1955, Dr. Ed Dessen had a group of younger boys and they put together a $700,000 fund-raising campaign, which was about one-third cash and two-thirds bonds. They are now a little past the middle on their $500,000 drive. Cash is not nearly as plentiful, and the going is much tougher. They have reached about $338,000 of their goal and should make it. However, I think this time they are going to have to run a little bit longer.

None of the bills that have been submitted, either administration or from the Democratic side of the House, had been 100-percent perfect. I do think that the Douglas bill is about the best that has been offered. True, there are packages in there that should be amended and changed.

There are several misstatements in the "Federal Spending Facts" survey. I heard Senator DOUGLAS myself discuss the antipirating provision. From what Senator DOUGLAS said, I am sure that legislative history is quite clear so that the bill could not be used to finance relocation.

I don't believe that the cost indicating average investment per job went far enough to show all that it included. The testimony stated that only were land, buildings, and equipment included, but also working capital and inventory. According to section 6 of the bill, these items are specifically excluded. I am sure that the testimony will show that investment for jobs in Pennsylvania was only about $2,000 rather than $15,000.

This letter has grown too long already. I apologize for it with your very busy day. However, I did have a flyer from Walter asking for opinions before the board of directors got together on the 14th. For that reason, I have made this as full of facts and reasoning as I possibly could.

Subject to some revisions and the possible tightening of others, I am convinced that the Douglas bill is the best presented thus far. I hope that it will pass so that we can get into action. It always reminds me of the old saying of we industrial people here in northeast Pennsylvania, "We go to Washington for help, and we get a prescription. However, before the medicine gets to us, the patient is dead."

With kindest personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

VIC,
VICTOR C. DIEHM.

Statement of the Honorable Walter S. Robertson, Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs, Before the House Foreign Affairs Committee in Support of the Mutual Security Program for Fiscal Year 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 15, 1959

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, Walter Robertson had a very distinguished career in shaping our U.S. Far Eastern policy. He will go down in history as one of the top level diplomats in our time. It is a pleasure to include his excellent statement in the RECORD for my colleagues in Congress as well as the American people:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I welcome the occasion to appear before you at this time in support of the mutual security program.

In discussing the pertinent aspects of our foreign policy in the Fast East, I shall give special attention to the Communist Chinese aim to drive the Chinese Government from Taiwan, bring about a reduction of U.S. power and influence in the Western Pacific, and to bring Asia under Communist domination. As this committee is among the best informed in the Congress on the political importance of the Far East, I shall confine myself in this statement to the salient features of the situation as it stands today, with some indication of what it portends. I shall draw your attention once again to the incalculable value of the mutual security program as a material support to the application of U.S. foreign policy, and to free world security, in the Far East. I am convinced that authority for continuation of that program on an adequate scale is indispensable to the success of U.S. diplomacy in the Far East in the present world conjuncture.

The specific aid program will be discussed by Capt. T. F. Howe, U.S.N., of the Far East region, Department of Defense, and by Dr. Raymond T. Moyer, ICA Regional Director for the Far East.

The Far East comprises the land and sea area formed by Japan, Korea, China, the Philippines, Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos, Thailand, Burma, Malaya, Indonesia, Australia, and New Zealand. More than a third of the earth's population live there in widely contrasting circumstances—freedom and slavery, abundance and poverty, industrialized urban areas, and stone-age tribal communities. It is a farflung, diverse, unstable area where a great struggle is going on, the outcome of which may well determine whether freedom or communism shall prevail in the world.

Communist China poses a threat which commands our first attention. It controls one-quarter of all humanity and disposes of great military manpower. It threatens everywhere and concedes nowhere. In close alliance with the Soviet Union, it is making every effort to expand by subverting the free countries of the Far East through military threats and pressures, economic warfare tactics, diplomatic and political intrigue, infiltration, propaganda, and all the other standard penetration devices of international communism. The subversive capabilities of Communist China are enhanced in the Far East by such basic factors as:

(a) The central dominant geographic position of Red China with its huge regimented population in contrast to the much smaller countries scattered about its rim.

(b) The presence in southeast Asia of over 12 million overseas Chinese.

(c) The inadequate regional unity and cooperation existing among the free nations of Asia.

(d) The inexperience in government and management in the free Far East, it being recalled that 8 of the 11 Asian countries named above gained independence since 1945.

(e) The surge of nationalism and anticolonialism which is often reflected in suspicion of western countries.

(f) The sudden transformation of the USSR in 40 years from a relatively backward country to a modern industrial-scientific giant. Communist China is now striving to make a similar great leap forward but in a greatly compressed period of time. Provided they overlook the disastrous price paid in human values, this Communist formula for quick material results can appeal to the impatient temper of Asian peoples grasping for the first rung of the ladder leading out of age-old poverty and oppression.

All these factors are fully exploited by the Communists in their relentless drive for domination of the Far East. In pursuing their ambitious material goals, the Chinese Communist leaders have calculated that their program would be unattainable without transforming the Chinese people into

complete and unthinking tools of the state. To this end they have organized with particular intensity over the past year virtually all of mainland China's peasantry into communes. Under this appalling system, which is liquidating family life and destroying all human values, the people are turned into mere robots serviceable to the state for whatever tasks it assigns. What is even more ominous is the militaristic character of the commune system. Using the pretext of American aggression and to the accompaniment of a strident anti-American campaign, the Peiping regime has drafted the entire adult population both inside and outside the communes into a people's militia, organized on regular military lines. This peoples militia supplements the regular Chinese Communist armed forces totaling 2.5 million men and a million-strong public security apparatus.

Meanwhile, there is an increasing arrogance in Peiping's outlook on the world. It appears to care less and less about the opinions of outside countries. It is developing a dangerous overconfidence. It does indeed feel that the East wind will prevail over the West and that communism is the irristible wave of the future.

All this was evidenced in their foreign policy actions over the past year.

The first sign in 1958 of Peiping's harsher line appeared in April when it launched a campaign of all-out economic warfare against Japan. It severed economic and cultural relations with Japan just before the Japanese elections. It seized Japanese fishing vessels off the China coast. It suspended repatriation of Japanese nationals. It called openly for the defeat of Japan's Liberal Democratic Party in the May elections. All this failed of its immediate purpose. Peiping then carried its campaign against Japan a step further. It urged overseas Chinese merchant communities, which are highly influential in the commercial life of southeast Asia, to boycott Japanese goods. At the same time it flooded southeast Asian markets with Red Chinese products at cut-rate prices. This was done to gain foreign exchange, of course, but also it was done to drive Japan and other countries out of southeast Asian markets and to penetrate the countries of the area politically with economic weapons.

In mid-July Peiping launched a new drive to seize Taiwan. The massive shelling of the Quemoy Islands which opened on August 23 and all subsequent events are too fresh in our minds to bear repeating, but I do wish to underline some of the lessons of that recent crisis.

The Chinese Communists are out to get Taiwan, not the offshore islands. They have clearly demonstrated by word and deed that they will oppose any solution to the offshore islands problem which does not serve the Communist objective of acquiring Taiwan and eliminating free China whose existence is a major obstacle on communism's path of expansion. The Communists are embarked on an intensive campaign against the Republic of China, involving military, political, and psychological pressures which can be applied in varying combinations as may be most tactically expedient.

It is absolutely certain, I believe, that if the United States were to fall back in the face of such threats as those contained in Peiping's artillery assault against Quemoy or in Khrushchev's crude, insulting letter to the President (which the President rejected), that would merely confirm the rulers of the bloc in their suppositions regarding the efficacy of force and threats. Not only would this induce further Communist probings in the Far East but it would also magnify the risks of war. That is why, during the height of the Quemoy crisis, our friends in the Far East were so anxious that we stand firm and why, if we do not stand firm, they may feel compelled to reevaluate their positions accordingly. I think we can say with all realistic modestry that our friends in the Far East look to us as the main counterpoise to Communist expansionism. As the London Economist stated last autumn about the attacks on Quemoy: "It is the complete disappearance of the American presence from the scene that the Communists are after. And whether anti-Western feeling and neutralism are weak or strong in these Asian countries, and whatever their public postures, they know well enough that if the eagle once takes flight, the dragon—and perhaps the bear, too—will have to be propitiated."

The shocking suppression of freedom in Tibet by Communist China gives dramatic point to this mounting arrogance. Peiping has overthrown the established Government of Tibet and taken up arms against the Tibetan people. Communist China in this bloody and unprincipled action has shown its true face to its Asian neighbors.

The foregoing developments and opinions attest to the fact that the threat of Red China has never been so broad and ominous as it is today. It emphasizes anew the challenge posed to our way of life.

Since the Communist regime in China is unlikely to be replaced in the foreseeable future and is most unlikely to be alienated from the U.S.S.R., our principal means for dealing with the threat it poses will continue to be (a) by maintaining an adequately strong U.S. military posture to deter and, if necessary, to counteract Communist aggression; (b) by continuing to help build up the military, political, and economic strength of the free Far East as rapidly as feasible; (c) by exerting such means (i.e., nonrecognition of Red China and opposing its seating in the U.N.) as are available to us to check the growth of Chinese power and influence.

The free countries of Asia face vastly complex problems in the development of their political processes and in attaining economic growth. They are desperately seeking to maintain and consolidate their independence. They look to the United States for assistance, not only because of our great military and economic power but also and more importantly because they know that we share their objectives of promoting independence, human values and improved conditions of life. They know, and we know, that our security and progress are related to theirs.

All the countries of the Far East have come in recent years to have a far keener understanding of the nature of the Communist menace and with our help, which they urgently need, they are year by year placing themselves in a better position to meet the threats and difficulties that beset them. Grave problems remain and there are no grounds for complacency. However, the situation today in the Far East is a marked improvement over that prevailing several years ago when the area was wracked by wars and widespread insurgency, accompanied by the loss to communism of Tibet and north Vietnam.

Since 1954 no free territory has fallen under Communist domination in the Far East. The countries of Free Asia have since then enjoyed a degree of security that enables them to concentrate some of their energies on the task of economic growth and development. This has released the positive and constructive energies of the peoples of Asia. But for U.S. foreign policy and its indispensable support, the mutual security program, it is certain that a number of Far Eastern countries would now be part of the Communist empire. This main result of our policy, the existing freedom of the non-Communist countries of the Far East, is well worth all that it has cost. The effort and the price of foreign aid should be measured in terms of the value of the main result. Mistakes and shortcomings in the administration of the mutual security program must not be allowed to obscure the enormous contribution it has made in helping achieve the major objectives of our foreign policy.

The role of American aid in the Far East varies according to the special situation in each recipient country. It is determined by need, by the state of our relations with the country, by the nature of its foreign policy, and by our foreign policy objectives respecting it. Aid is essential to help friendly countries in the Far East grow in strength and retain their national freedom.

We assist the embattled divided countries—Korea, Vietnam, China—with all forms of aid to the extent of their essential need so far as our resources permit. These three countries, each a frontline defense against the forces of international communism, receive the bulk of defense support aid to the Far East and extensive military and other forms of assistance.

We assist other countries in the Far East with which we have security arrangements, except Australia and New Zealand, with military and economic aid to lend strength to their defense posture in all its aspects—political, military, economic. These countries include Japan, the Philippines, and Thailand.

We extend assitance of one kind or another also to countries which have a foreign policy of neutrality, because each of them is friendly and wishes to remain nationally independent. Their continued independence is important to the security of the free world. Our aid to each such country is extended within a carefully considered framework of recognized common interest, all factors considered, including the existence of any Communist bloc aid or credits to the same country.

So far, only three Far Eastern countries—Burma, Indonesia, and Cambodia—have accepted Communist bloc aid. U.S. aid to these three countries helps them to avoid becoming unduly dependent upon bloc aid.

The adoption by the bloc of aid techniques substantively similar to ours reflects the Communist estimate of the effectiveness of our aid programs as an instrument of our foreign policy. It must be said too that the Communist ability to intrude their politically-fashioned aid programs into the free world portends internal trouble for any recipient country unable to restrain organized Communist subversion within its boundaries. Every one of the neutral countries has cause for alarm over the organized Communist activities which may now give momentary support to the existing government but have the ultimate purpose of supplanting it with a Communist government under alien control.

I wish to dwell for a moment on the importance of the economic development front in the struggle with international communism. In the Far East a number of countries are newly sovereign, inexperienced in the arts of national government, and confronted with an urgent popular demand for rapid economic growth and development. Economic development does not of itself produce political and social stability. Stability presumes confidence in government and a sense of national unity. It is rather a dynamic and can be a disturbing process, displacing much that is sold in outlook and custom to make way for the new. However, in the present world scene, a respectable rate of economic development is a political issue in every underdeveloped country with the Communist alternative promising get-rich-quick schemes held before the people by Communist propaganda. Economic development, with an attendant upward trend in living standards, has therefore become indispensable to popular confidence in non-Communist government. It is therefore imperative that the Development Loan Fund be supplied with adequate

funds to play well its crucial part in resolving this issue in favor of the free world.

I am convinced that authorization and appropriation of the amount proposed for the fiscal year 1960 is of vital importance to our national interest. I should like to reemphasize that the mutual security program is essential to the attainment of our foreign policy objectives. Its effectiveness would be reduced by truncation of the carefully developed program underlying the request for the coming year. We already have achieved much in the Far East with the help of this program.

Survival of the free world in the face of Communist imperialism will depend upon continuity of our policy, adequacy of the means for its support, and perseverance in our chosen course of action.

Public Law 660 Helps Clean Up a River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 11, 1959

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I should like to include in the RECORD a letter I received recently from Mr. Robert W. Balliger, of Durango, Colo. Mr. Balliger is chief of the sanitation section of the San Juan Basin Health Unit. His letter pertains to the efforts which several communities in southwestern Colorado have made, and are continuing to make, to solve the problem of stream pollution. Mr. Balliger's letter makes particular reference to the Animas River, since that stream was the subject of recent discussion in the RECORD regarding pollution of its waters by several communities, and by certain industrial firms. The people of the area have been working toward a solution of the problem for some time, and a great deal of progress has been made in the last few years. In this respect, I should like to call particular attention to Mr. Balliger's statement in regard to the part legislation such as Public Law 660 has played in helping small communities solve such problems. Mr. Balliger's letter follows:

SAN JUAN BASIN HEALTH UNIT,
Durango, Colo.

The Honorable WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
Member of Congress, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

SIR: This letter is being written at the request of Mr. Jack Holden, manager of the Durango Chamber of Commerce, in answer to the letter written him by you regarding the pollution problems of the Animas River.

The pollution problems of this stream are many and it is not intended that they be minimized. However, it is unfortunate that statements such as W. L. Bruce's which are partly true but are also exaggerated facts, half truths, and imaginary circumstances find their way into public record.

Something is being done to clean up the Animas River as well as other streams in the area. Durango is improving municipal sewage collection and installing adequate sewage-treatment facilities. Pagosa Springs, which has been without such facilities, is now installing sewage collection and treatment. Dove Creek, which had neither before, has completed additional sewers and adequate sewage treatment. Ignacio is completing studies for addition sewer lines and adequate treatment facilities for the municipality and Consolidated Ute Agency located near there.

I sincerely doubt if any of these projects could have been realized without aid of such legislation as Public Law 660. It is also necessary that such means be continued if more cities and towns are going to correct their pollution problems.

No one knows the extent of chemical and radioactive material pollution of the Animas River from the uranium-processing mill at Durango. Some results and recommendations should be forthcoming in the near future of studies partly completed on this problem by joint efforts of the Public Health Service, New Mexico State Health Department, San Juan County Health Department of New Mexico, Colorado State Health Department, and the San Juan Basin Health Unit of Colorado. Efforts to obtain necessary information are being conducted by Vanadium Corp. of America itself in order to understand the problems before solving them.

You are aware of the economic depression in Silverton. One of the main questions has been how to finance a project to correct pollution conditions such as untreated sewage being disposed of in the river. It is certainly hoped that new developments being brought about in Silverton will change economic conditions for the better and enable the people of Silverton to solve such conditions in the Animas River.

Very truly yours,
ROBERT W. BALLIGER,
Chief, Sanitation Section.

Approved:
ARTHUR L. WARNER, M.D.,
Medical Director.

Address by Hon. Fred Seaton, the Secretary of the Interior

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHIL WEAVER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 6, 1959

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, recently the Honorable Fred A. Seaton, the Secretary of the Interior, made a remarkable address to the student body of the University of Hawaii. I believe his remarks should be spread in the RECORD for the benefit of all Members of this House.

The address follows:

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR FRED A. SEATON BEFORE THE UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII, HONOLULU, HAWAII, MAY 7, 1959

This convocation of your own great University of Hawaii is for me a happy occasion. Among other reasons, it marks the second time within a year it has been my privilege to speak to a university in a Territory of the United States just before the achievement of long-sought statehood.

When the 50th star is finally affixed to the American flag, what a glorious day it will be for Hawaii, the Federal Union and the free world.

I am one of those who believe wholeheartedly in your eagerness and ability to shoulder your new responsibilities which necessarily accompany the blessings of statehood. I am confident you will use your new opportunities vigorously and wisely. Toward that end it behooves us all to abide by Woodrow Wilson's admonition "that we are not put into this world to sit still and know; we are put into it to act"—to act as best we can in the service of our community, our State, our Nation, and the entire family of man.

In order so to act, we must think and plan long years ahead. We must consider, for example, the decade 1965 to 1975—years when we may be confronting at least two major challenges.

For one thing, Russian Premier Nikita Khrushchev hopes to realize his boast that, at some point in those years, his country will sweep ahead of ours—and of all others—in economic production.

Personally, I believe that the Soviet Union will not be the world's foremost economic producer in 1970. Nonetheless, its output may well rise to 60 percent of ours, as against about 40 percent now. Unavoidably, of course, that rise in Soviet productivity will increase the Soviet Union's capacity, as it chooses, either to improve the meager living of its people or further to endanger the free world by way of aggression.

For a second thing, assuming the perpetuation of the Chinese Communist regime, it may well rule by the year 1975 over 894 million Chinese on the mainland, a number nearly equal to the then combined population of the Soviet Union and the United States, multiplied by two.

True, without an enormous industrial growth, Communist China will remain, as today, a truculent but relatively feeble monster. But as the regime there holds to its belligerent ways, every increase in its industrialization, though accomplished at terrible cost in human life and pain, increases its power to threaten other nations. As to that, I suspect that no matter what the men in the Kremlin say publicly, even now they ponder the fact "other nations" might well someday include the Soviet Union.

My own conviction is that the Reds will not have succeeded in industrializing China enough by 1975 to tempt them to risk the madness of a major war. Nevertheless, we do expect that they, along with the Soviets, will continue to thrust outward, using every subversive device imaginable to probe for weaknesses in the armor of the free world. The impact of these expansionist tactics will likely materially influence your adult lives and the lives of all citizens of the free world.

Faced with these tactics, it seems obvious we have but three alternatives. The first two are unthinkable: (1) declare war, (2) surrender. Only the third is possible for a Nation which is sane and brave and free: compete with vigor, be strong militarily, and always remain ready to negotiate wisely and sincerely for peace with honor.

Here at home and abroad, we must make certain the free world economy continues to swell its mighty torrent of production. That means many things. One is we have no realistic choice other than to maintain our worldwide policy of mutual security. Another is that we must ever strive toward removing all artificial obstacles to trade, except those which must remain because of a clear and overriding national interest.

The doing of these things not only helps counter the expansionism of the Soviet Union and Red China; even more importantly, it recognizes the revolution of rising expectations which is taking place in the less-developed countries of the world. We must continue our help to the people in these countries in their efforts to achieve better homes, better sanitation, better food, better education and—above all—liberty.

In this struggle of others for a better life, our own great Nation certainly has been the champion, both by precept and example. The United States of America has not been the represser, nor will it ever be.

In truth, by heritage and conviction, you and I believe profoundly in the right of any people freely to choose the economic system

by which they hope to better their standard of living. You and I also believe something else: any nation which still has a freedom of choice should mark well the fact that no matter what economic system it may choose, there can be no production statistics which would justify the surrender of its mind and will to Communist rule.

The specters of many once-free nations cry out from the grave of human rights. They are eloquent witnesses to the tragic truth that the greatest mistake of all is to follow the Communist pattern.

Too many have discovered too late that in the world of the Communist will, the false dawn of economic promise inevitably darkens into the black and terror-filled midnight of political captivity and degradation of humanity.

There is—and always there will be—an easy way to slavery. To the gaining or the keeping of liberty, there is no easy way.

The easy way to slavery may take various forms. It may be the way of outright military conquest and submission. It may be the way of beguilement and subversion. It may be the way of sloth, disinterest, or internal weakness, or it may be a mixture of all. Whatever the way, the end result is the same.

It is an ironical fact of history that just 1 day before the President of United States signed the Hawaiian statehood bill the Dalai Lama began his flight from Tibet to India. Here, in Hawaii, American citizens of Asian extraction in Hawaii were gaining new political rights through the peaceful processes of legislative action in a Republic. At the same time, the people of Tibet were being forcibly deprived of even the small measure of self-government which the Chinese Communists had previously guaranteed to them.

Contrasted with Hawaii's fulfillment of her dreams, the Tibetan nightmare of murder and torture should be a historic reminder to every free nation of these three things:

First, of Chinese Communist perfidy, specifically their breaking of a 1951 agreement that the Tibetans should have full autonomy and the right to pursue without interference their religion and customs;

Second, of the Communists' iron-fisted brutality toward all who stand in their way; and

Third, of the fact that, when freedom has such implacable foes, it must have even more unshakable friends if it is to continue alive in the world. Those who are free must band together, stay together and work together, with courage, understanding, and constancy—if they are to remain free.

In the Far East, as in the world, American policy is based on the recognition of these three facts.

You will recall that last fall the Chinese Communists were threatening to take Quemoy and Matsu and then Taiwan, and finally to force the United States out of the Western Pacific.

In the face of this threat, and it was a dire one, certain people looked only at the immediate problem and either neglected or refused to think ahead. Having fallen into that error, they then tried to repeddle an old idea in the guise of something new. "Retreat," they said, "Let the Communists have those little islands. How would Americans feel," they cried, "if Communist forces were in possession of our Staten Island, lying offshore from New York?"

Fortunately, the President of the United States, long experienced in the wiles of the Reds, stood firm, and the American people supported him in his wise decision. The result you know. The Communists did not take Quemoy and Matsu, to say nothing of Taiwan.

Another idea, abroad for a long time but currently redressed as something new, is the recognition of Red China. To do so would reverse the U.S. policy established in 1950 and supported ever since by the leaders of both political parties.

What would recognition of Red China mean? Among other things it would likely mean the free world's eventual loss of Taiwan, the extinction of 600,000 Chinese Nationalist troops, and the breaking of our island chain of defenses in the Western Pacific. In the eyes of the Chinese Communists, who publicly proclaim their hatred of the United States and respect only military might, such recognition would be a clear victory for them. In the eyes of the free countries throughout the Far East—countries looking to us for help in stopping any Communist crossing of their borders—such recognition would be considered both retreat and defeat for the free world.

Our refusal to recognize Red China serves both a moral and a practical purpose. Certainly, neither the Japanese, the Koreans, the Vietnamese, the Filipinos nor other free peoples could look with equanimity at the prospect of an Asia dominated by Red China and her ally, Soviet Russia.

All our valued friends have vividly implanted in their minds the current lessons of Tibet.

They remember Red China's confiscation of foreign property in 1949.

They remember its repeated violation of the armistice agreements in Korea and Indochina.

They remember its communes and forced labor.

They remember its liquidation of 18 million Chinese people in 9 years—a number equal to nearly 30 times the population of Hawaii.

Such memories help to explain why, as we steadfastly adhere to our China policy, America does not stand alone.

Such memories help to explain why, in 1954, a number of free nations in the Far East joined the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization—determined to draw the line on Communist aggression in their part of the world.

Basic to the immediate features of U.S. foreign policy is our fundamental belief in two convicitions so eloquently expressed by Thomas Jefferson: "Nothing is unchangeable but inherent and inalienable rights of man" and "I have sworn upon the altar of God eternal hostility against every form of tyranny over the mind of man."

We need constantly to remind not only ourselves but all other peoples as well that we of America stand proudly, today and forever, for the rights of man and the freedom of the mind.

We should make clear, for example, that it is the Red Chinese regime, not the U.S. Government, which has refused to allow American reporting out of the China mainland. Today there are 30 American correspondents representing 30 news-gathering organizations whose passports are valid for travel there. For nearly 2 years the Chinese Communists have refused to all them entry, just as they have refused to permit any Chinese newspaperman to visit this country.

Such intransigence on the part of the Communists is a bar to one people's knowledge and understanding of another.

A second hindrance is the Communists' clever and diabolical propaganda, endlessly distorting the truth.

And for ourselves, there are difficulties in the fact that we and the peoples of Asia perforce must span not only distance but also differences—differences of race, of religion, and of culture. Here, the new State of Hawaii can have its golden hour. That is so because you are particularly fitted to tutor your fellow Americans in understanding and solving the problems.

Already you have shown much evidence of your will and your capability in this respect. Hawaiian achievements in social research, in the instruction of Asian students coming to the United States and of American students going to the Far East, and in the introduction of philosophers from East and West—these are a splendid beginning.

It is my prediction you will expand such rewarding activities in the years ahead.

In that respect I should like to see the University of Hawaii become an ever more thriving laboratory with professors and students constantly seeking new ways to interpret our history, our culture, and our foreign policy into terms which Asian people plainly can understand.

Moreover, I should like to see—and I expect to see—the State of Hawaii, facing as it does toward Asia, become an ever more brilliant showcase of American freedoms and American economic growth. I suggest one way to do this would be to establish here a permanent international trade and culture center, designed to serve as a magnet and clearing house for buyers and sellers of American and Pacific area merchandise.

Perhaps it could be called Pacific House, both because of its location in your beautiful islands, and because of the meaning of the word "pacific"—"making or tending to make peace." Such a project, I submit, could well be one in which government and private enterprise could join.

Further, your great university and your State will always be a living demonstration of a key fact about the American people: That what we oppose, even beyond communism, is the forcing of communism—or any other system—on an unwilling population.

We can be pardonably proud of the incontrovertible fact of history that in this century the United States has neither sought nor acquired new territory, except for the peaceful purchase of the Virgin Islands from Denmark in 1917. Outside our traditional continental limits we have granted freedom to Cuba and the Philippines, self-government to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and statehood to Alaska and Hawaii.

I repeat that you of Hawaii, perhaps more effectively than your fellow Americans, can make this truth abundantly clear throughout all Asia.

All of us together, must before keep the peoples of the world the stark contrast between the Communists' international exhibit A—Hungary and Tibet—and ours—Alaska and Hawaii.

What America really wants for the world is a new age in international relations, an age in which the rule of force and fear will give way to the rule of law—that kind of universal law of which a kindly and brilliant Englishman, Richard Hooker, said more than three centuries ago: "Her voice [is] the harmony of the world: All things in heaven and earth do her homage, the very least as feeling her care, and the greatest as not exempted from her power."

Trusting in God, let us each, to the utmost of our ability, help usher in that new age. Let us each do our part in keeping America, as Abraham Lincoln hoped it always would be, never the terror but forever the example of the world.

Shall We Tolerate Practices Which Destroy Competition?

SPEECH

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 7, 1959

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, many of us who are fighting to preserve our system of free and competitive enterprise are much disturbed about the position representatives of big business are taking regarding the use of monopolistic practices, including the practice of price dis-

crimination. It is becoming increasingly clear that they insist upon the law being left so that big business firms may continue to exercise their great economic power in using the practice of price discrimination to destroy small business firms, substantially lessen competition, and enhance the growth of monopolies.

For several years I and others who have struggled in the interests of small business and a free and competitive enterprise system have urged the enactment of legislation provided for by H.R. 11. In brief, such legislation would tend to restrict to use of the practice of price discrimination by big business firms where the effect would be to substantially lessen competition and tend to create monopolies, even though the large firms practicing price discrimination did so with good intentions and for some good purpose—in other words, acted in good faith with the economic result of destroying competition.

Our efforts to secure enactment of this legislation have been opposed by representatives of big business firms in many ways. They have included a great flood of propaganda against our proposals to strengthen our antitrust laws in that respect. Arguments in such propaganda are so devious that they appealed to the unsuspecting. Innocent and well-meaning people have been confused. Some have been led to believe that H.R. 11 would prevent competition. The propaganda has been so artful that it has been with difficulty that anyone could demonstrative its fallacy. However, recently an editorial appeared in the New York Journal of Commerce, entitled, "The Battle Over S. 11." S. 11 is the Senate companion bill of H.R. 11. That editorial in the Journal of Commerce took the position that "good faith" meeting of a competitor's price should continue to be an absolute defense to an action challenging destructive monopolistic discriminatory pricing practices. The editorial closed with the conclusion that Congress should reject once and for all the proposals which had been made to strengthen our antitrust laws against price discrimination destructive of competition.

From these circumstances it is clear that the naked issue of whether H.R. 11 and S. 11 should be enacted into law is, like the bills themselves, quite simple. It is this: "Shall we tolerate practices which destroy competition and create monopolies even when those practices are based on good intentions?" In an effort to sharpen and make clearer that issue, on April 22, 1959, I wrote Mr. H. E. Luedicke, editor of the Journal of Commerce, 80 Varick Street, New York, N. Y., and criticized the editorial policy of the Journal of Commerce for its support of practices which destroy competition and create monopolies. Also, I challenged the editor of that great newspaper to utilize its power and influence for the good of the public interest in the cause against practices promotive of monopoly. In that connection, I invited the Journal of Commerce to suggest language for inclusion in legislative proposals that would, if enacted, effectively bring a halt to price discrimination practices threatening our free competitive enterprise system.

On Tuesday, May 5, 1959, the Journal of Commerce, in accordance with my request, published, on its editorial page, most of the letter I had written to Mr. Luedicke, April 22, 1959. Also, at that time there appeared a new editorial on the same page, entitled, "Sorry, Mr. PATMAN, * * * but we cannot join you in your fight for what you call the public interest in price legislation."

This editorial, which appeared in the Journal of Commerce May 5, 1959, replied to my request for suggestions and legislative proposals which, if enacted, would effectively bring a halt to these price discriminatory practices threatening our free and competitive enterprise system. That reply appeared in the following words:

> You asked in your letter to us which is reprinted on this page: "What language would you suggest for inclusion in such proposals?" And you explain that you are interested in proposals 'that would, if enacted, effectively bring to a halt these practices which threaten our free competitive enterprise system."
>
> Such a direct question deserves a direct answer. We would simply delete three lines from your controversial bill. Using the committee print H.R. 11, we would cut the lines 16, 17, and 18 on page 2 which read "that unless the effect of the discrimination may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly in any line of commerce, in any section of the country."

When that proposal of the Journal of Commerce is read in the light of the full text of H.R. 11, it is better understood. Therefore, the entire text of the substances of H.R. 11 is quoted as follows:

> Upon proof being made, at any hearing on a complaint under this section, that there has been discrimination in price or services or facilities furnished, the burden of reputting the prima facie case thus made by showing justification shall be upon the person charged with a violation of this section, and unless justification shall be affirmatively shown, the Commission is authorized to issue an order terminating the discrimination: *Provided, however,* That unless the effect of the discrimination may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly in any line of commerce, in any section of the country, it shall be a complete defense for a seller to show that his lower price or the furnishing of services or facilities to any purchaser or purchasers was made in good faith to meet an equally low price of a competitor, or the services of facilities furnished by a competitor.

It is easy for one to see that if H.R. 11 should be amended as proposed by the Journal of Commerce it would not strengthen the antitrust laws. Instead it would immeasurably weaken such laws further. That further weakening would be accomplished by writing into statutory law a provision that a firm may discriminate in price regardless of the fact that the effect of the discrimination would be to substantially lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly. In other words, the Journal of Commerce proposes the enactment of H.R. 11, but only with the qualification that it be amended so as to permit big business firms to continue the practice of price discrimination with the result of substantially lessening competition and tending to create monopoly.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that I be permitted to revise and extend my remarks by inserting at this point copies of the editorial entitled, "The Battle Over S. 11" as it appeared in the Journal of Commerce March 31, 1959, my letter April 22, 1959, to Mr. H. E. Luedicke, editor, Journal of Commerce, and the editorial entitled, "Sorry, Mr. PATMAN," which appeared in the Journal of Commerce, Tuesday, May 5, 1959.

The materials referred to are as follows:

THE BATTLE OVER S. 11

Everybody seems agreed that good faith meeting of a competitor's prices should continue to be an absolute defense to a charge of violation of the price discrimination provisions of the Robinson-Patman Act.

On the surface even S. 11 and H.R. 11—the two companion bills now before Congress which are designed to strengthen the Robinson-Patman Anti-Price Discrimination Act—seem quite reasonable in this respect. They only propose to restrict the good faith defense where the effect of a price discrimination may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create monopoly.

This would hardly explain what all the shooting was about in the recent hearings on this bill before the Antitrust tnd Monopoly Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee and the House Commerce Committee over the past few weeks.

The rub is—and it explains the bitterness of the legislative struggle over S. 11 this year—that the phrase "may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly," if read fast, seems to require only that there be a "reasonable possibility" that the discrimination "may" lessen competition. Since such a finding could be made in practically any situation in which a case is brought, it logically follows that the proposed legislation would virtually eliminate the good faith defense.

If our economy is to be truly competitive, a businessman must have the right to meet, within the boundaries of the good faith defense, a competitor's lower price. Restricting this right, as proposed by S. 11, is contrary to our basic antitrust policy.

As Alex Akerman of the law firm of Shipley, Akerman, & Pickett of Washington, D.C., and Atlanta, Ga., said in testimony before the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee of the Senate: Although S. 11 would severely restrict the sellers' freedom of competition, the bill would not necessarily eliminate competitive injury. And he also stressed that "the good faith meeting of competition-defense is not a loophole that permits subversion of the legitimate goals of the Robinson-Patman Act."

What makes this year's fight over S. 11 different from earlier episodes is that, for the first time, the buyers have been getting into the act. They are holding that S. 11 will have a tendency to place limitations on the opportunity to buy, and therefore will raise the prices of the commodities purchased by wholesalers or retailers and ultimately force higher costs on the consuming public.

Perhaps one of the least understood but most important functons of a good purchasing agent is to develop competition between qualified sources of supply. As George Renard, our own man for purchasing policies, says, par for this search and research is the best product from the best supplier at the best over-all cost through its useful life. It is the purchasing agent's responsibility to encourage suppliers to cooperate in that search for the best value

by bidding against each other and selling to his company at the lowest reasonable price.

The whole procedure of buying is anchored on discrimination. We must discriminate in what product to purchase, from whom to buy it, and in the price we are willing to pay. In doing so, we are bound to injure competitors, if failing to give them orders is considered to be an injury.

That kind of discrimination by buyers breeds competition between sellers, which is the objective of our antitrust laws. Legislation that would make such discrimination illegal should carefully avoid any unwarranted infringement on our freedom to buy and to develop competitive sources which will increase the mileage of the dollars we spend.

George Renard states flatly that Senate bill 11 would be "a staggering blow to the purchasing profession." It also would deprive the American public of the benefits which flow from a competitive business system.

S.11 would add nothing constructive to the operation of competition, but would impair these vital processes. The only types of price discrimination which are not desirable are already precluded by present law. Thus, S.11 is merely redundant. Where it changes the legal situation, it weakens competition.

Congress should reject it once and for all.

Mr. H. E. LUEDICKE,
Editor, Journal of Commerce,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. LUEDICKE: Reference is made to your editorial appearing in the Journal of Commerce, March 31, 1959, entitled "The Battle Over S. 11."

There the editorial position is taken on what Congress should express as a public policy in the field of antitrust. This matter is so important and the policy you suggest would present such serious and grave questions that I believe it would be only fair to your readers that you permit them to read this response to your suggestions. Therefore, it is requested that you publish this letter on your editorial page as prominently as your editorial to which this is in answer.

Your editorial took the position that "good faith" meeting of a competitor's price should continue to be an absolute defense to an action challenging destructive monopolistic discriminatory pricing practices. The editorial closed with the conclusion that Congress should reject once and for all the proposals which have been made to strengthen our antitrust laws against price discrimination destructive of competition. However, you did admit that "on the surface" these proposals "seem quite reasonable" since "They only propose to restrict the good faith defense where the effect of a price discrimination may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create monopoly."

That admission is a fair summary of what the bills H.R. 11 and S. 11 would do. In other words, they would help us protect competition and thereby tend to preserve our competitive enterprise system. That feature of these legislative proposals strongly appealed to the Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives of the United States. As you know, the members of that committee are conservative men. In the report recommending that the House of Representatives enact these legislative proposals (H. Rept. 2202, 84th Cong.), the Judiciary Committee stated:

"Price discriminations favoring preferred buyers present a danger to the competitive enterprise system which is inconsistent with the policy of the price discrimination statute. Firms can abuse their superior market position and engage in discriminatory practices that eliminate small suppliers and small retailers from the competitive scene. In practical effect the law as presently construed allows the private interests of a discriminator to outweigh the public interest in preserving competitive opportunity at all levels of business activity. H.R. 11 would reassert that the public interest in protecting the economy against discriminations which may substantially lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly must prevail over private interests served by discrimination."

Overwhelming evidence has been accumulated for several decades showing the appalling effects of price discrimination in destroying free competition and leading to monopoly. The practice of price discrimination was one of the primary instruments used by the old Standard Oil Trust in acquiring approximately 90 percent control of the oil industry. It was necessary to dissolve that monopoly but such result was accomplished only after protracted antitrust litigation.

Subsequently, Congress enacted legislation, including the Clayton Antitrust Act of 1914 and the Robinson-Patman Act of 1946, which was believed would somewhat reduce the problem in dealing with price discrimination destructive of competition. The idea behind that legislation was to prevent the creation of monopolies and thereby avoid a procedure of standing by and allowing those with great economic power to practice price discrimination in the building of monopolies and then act to dissolve such monopolies.

Efforts of the Federal Trade Commission to enforce these laws against price discrimination have turned out to be almost wholly ineffectual. The small amount of progress which was being realized in that regard came to a halt when the Supreme Court of the United States in 1951 and again in 1958, ruled that the powerful Standard Oil Co. of Indiana may practice price discrimination with impunity, regardless of the fact that the practice is shown to have resulted in the destruction of competition and the tendency to create a monopoly. Therefore, the naked issue over whether H.R. 11 and S. 11 should be enacted into law is like the bills themselves, quite simple. It is this: "Shall we tolerate practices which destroy competition and create monopolies even when those practices are based upon good intentions?"

It is believed it should not be difficult for one to resolve that issue, especially in the light of our nationnal antimonopoly public policy to protect competition, preserve our free competitive enterprise system, and prevent monopolies. Certainly no practice destructive of competition and creative of monopoly can be said to be consonant with our antimonopoly public policy, even though the architect of such practices had some good, though misguided, purposes in mind.

Now, where are we? We have a serious loophole in the law which operates against its use to stop effectively pricing practices destructive of competition and creative of monopoly.

At this time I and other Members of the Congress are besieged with appeals from small businessmen that something be done to stop destructive discriminatory pricing practices. I, personally, have presided at hearings before committees of the Congress where an abundance of evidence was presented showing beyond dispute that discriminatory pricing practices are being used in a number of industries to the destruction of competition. For example, during December 1958 I presided over hearings before the House Small Business Committee in Dallas, Tex., where much evidence was received showing that some large nationwide processors and distributors of dairy products were selling milk in Dallas, Tex., at prices below cost. In other cities, such as Waco and Houston, Tex., they were selling essentially the same products at much higher prices, thereby subsidizing the below-cost sales in Dallas. Small businessmen, attempting to compete in Dallas with the nationally advertised branded merchandise of the national distributors were being ruined and put out of business. The small local concerns were not selling at discriminatory prices. However, their less recognized branded merchandise could be sold only at a price less than the price of the nationally advertised brands. Therefore, they sought to give the public a low nondiscriminatory price on good but little advertised merchandise. It happened that these low prices were met by the larger concerns only through the use of the practice of price discrimination.

The price discriminatory practices which were used in Dallas, Tex., to the destruction of small business concerns are being repeated in other areas over the country. In some of those areas where small concerns have disappeared and the large concerns have gained a monopoly, the public is paying higher prices than before the small competitorrs were eliminated.

Those of us in the Congress who are struggling with this problem in our effort to preserve our free competitive enterprise system need help. We need suggestions on what language should be considered for inclusion in legislative proposals that would, if enacted, effectively bring to a halt these practices which threaten our free competitive enterprise system. What language would you suggest for inclusion in such proposals?

Your newspaper is a great force which could be utilized for the good of the public interest in this cause. Therefore, may I suggest with great humility that you consider joining us immediately in this fight for the public interest by acting to prevent price discriminations which are destructive of competition and creative of monopoly.

May we have your suggestions?

Sincerely yours,

WRIGHT PATMAN.

SORRY, MR. PATMAN

But we cannot join you in your fight for what you call "the public interest in price legislation."

We believe that your whole premise in this fight is wrong and that your bill would not help but rather destroy competition.

As we have said before, your proposals "on the surface" seem to be quite reasonable since "they only propose to restrict the good faith defense where the effect of a price discrimination may be 'substantially' to lesson competition or tend to create monopoly."

Maybe we did not spell out this remark sufficiently when we first used it, but the phrase "on the surface" was of course meant to indicate that such interpretation did not stand up under closer inspection. This statement we now repeat.

You ask in your letter to us which is reprinted on this page: "What language would you suggest for inclusion in such proposal?" And you explain that you are interested in proposals "that would, if enacted, effectively bring to a halt these practices which threaten our free competitive enterprise system."

Such a direct question deserves a direct answer. We would simply delete three lines from your controversial bill. Using the committee print H.R. 11 we would cut the lines 16, 17, and 18 on page 2 which read "that unless the effect of the discrimination may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly in any line of commerce, in any section of the country."

This, we believe, would make the good faith defense an absolute one. Maybe this would destroy the real purpose of the bill, as you envision it but, in our book, this is the only way in which the bill can be made to jibe with the free enterprise system.

The Robinson-Patman amendment to the Clayton Act apparently proposed to make differences in prices not based on differences in costs and illegal discrimination.

The Federal Trade Commission interpreted that to mean that differences in costs must be reflected in a difference in prices. That interpretation would make the good five-cent cigar or $30 ton of steel sell at a variety of prices in different markets.

The businessman said that this was not practical. He is obliged to meet competition in all markets; so, an exception was made to permit him to do so. If he is not permitted to do so, a local distributor or manufacturer has the opportunity to develop a monopoly. H.R. 11 (or S. 11) would remove the exception that was granted in the Robinson-Patman Act.

Where is the "public interest"—meaning that of the buyer and consumer—in this situation?

Mr. Patman says a nationwide processor and distributor of widely advertised dairy products, meeting the price of a small, local, less-known product can put him out of business. Should the local, small operator be granted price protection by barring that competition, so that he can create a monopoly?

It seems that the public is answering that question when it chooses the widely advertised product as the better value at the same price.

If we wish to prevent monopoly in any market, it would seem logical to encourage competition in every market. Of course, some competitors are bound to be injured by competition, because competition "is the effort to secure the business by the offer of the most favorable terms." Where there is competition, someone loses the business and, if that is an injury, it is the bounce of the ball.

The aim of the Government should be to protect freedom of opportunity for the public to buy in competitive markets. It is confusing to find the investigators of so-called administered prices supporting a policy of discrimination in prices that is inconsistent with the principles of practical competition.

Texas is an important industrial State and Lone Star products must be sold competitively in many markets outside of Texas.

As has been stated, on the editorial page of the Journal of Commerce of May 5, 1959, there was reprinted most of the letter I wrote the editor of the Journal of Commerce April 22, 1959. A part of the letter the Journal of Commerce did not reprint included a quotation from House Report No. 2202, 84th Congress, in which the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives made the finding that price discriminations present a danger to our competitive enterprise system.

I am more convinced than ever we should enact legislation to strengthen our antitrust laws against monopolistic price discrimination. Certainly, those who are to follow us will not be fooled by any excuses for our failure to so act. We should continue our efforts to secure this needed legislation. I am strengthened in that effort by the conviction that we are on the right side and in the belief that the little people we represent will know that we did not fail to carry the fight for them and for what is right.

A Candy Jar Is a Good Idea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 11, 1959

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, recently I read in a Jacksonville newspaper an interesting account of Charles Wainwright, principal of Baldwin School, telling how he always keeps a candy jar on his desk to reward pupils who have reason to be rewarded. It seems to me there is a fundamental lesson in this for all of us. In the turmoil of making a living and fulfilling our responsibilities there is too often a tendency to fail to give the rewards to others that they deserve.

Principal Wainwright points out that this may have practical applications among adults as well as youngsters. He has founded an annual "free for nothin' " barbecue for the community of Baldwin and as a result I am sure is finding that the school which he heads has become a more important focal point in all of the living in that community. Certainly there are now many more people who understand the problems of the school and who contribute to its welfare in a more generous manner. I include herein a newspaper account from the Florida Times-Union of May 2:

ANNUAL BALDWIN EVENT—FREE BARBECUE DRAWS 1,000 HUNGRY PILGRIMS

(By Richard A. Martin)

Baldwin School was a mecca yesterday for about 1,000 hungry pilgrims who shared in the community's third annual "free-for-nothin" barbecue.

Everybody was invited, without charge, to the schoolhouse where outdoor serving tables groaned with the weight of barbecued pig and chicken, homemade cakes and salads, soft drinks and baked beans. Serving went on continuously from 5 to about 7 p.m. A body just picked up a plate and got into line and there seemed to be no end to the mouth-watering delicacies on hand.

The idea for the community barbecue began 3 years ago when Principal Charles O. Wainright heard of dissatisfaction about school costing so much—including admission prices to sports events and various fees.

Wainright got together with members of the community and told them if they were unhappy about the situation maybe it could be corrected—to a degree. The principal suggested several kinds of activities, all to be free to the children.

Then someone came up with the idea of a free barbecue for everyone. That first year between 400 and 500 people attended, but most were still skeptical. "They stood in line and asked, 'What's the catch?' " Wainright recalled. Finding there was none, they began looking forward to the event, which since has doubled in size.

To prepare for the barbecue, Wainright and about 20 high school boys started cooking 8 hogs and about 80 chickens Thursday evening.

"We were all going to stick with it 'till the job was done," Wainright said with a chuckle. "But about 1 a.m. I looked up and one boy was dozing, then another, and so on." By daylight yesterday the meat was ready but only three cooks remained: Wainright, Ivy Lucas, a filling station operator, and one hardy 9th grader, Clayton Hill.

Over 100 homemade layer cakes were baked by the women of the community, and others—businessmen included—prepared or contributed the rest of the trimmings.

The somewhat bleary-eyed principal, who reported for work as usual after freshening up a bit, was feeling the effects of his chores by the time the barbecue was underway yesterday evening.

Early in the afternoon there was a track meet, with all the school participating, one class against another, and a dance from 8 p.m. to midnight rounded out the affair.

Wainright, who was too busy joking with everyone and making them feel at home, said, "I'm going to stay for the first dance. After that it's anyone's ball and me for some sleep."

Urban Renewal and Slum Clearance Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 11, 1959

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, our urban renewal and slum clearance program is now at a crucial place in its progress. For the past 10 weeks it has been resting in the House Rules Committee pigeonhole.

This legislation is extremely important to our Nation's economy and every day's delay is harmful. It seems to me that the Rules Committee has had more than enough time to consider the housing and urban renewal bill. If the Rules Committee continues to bottle up this important and needed legislation I feel that the leadership of the House would be justified in taking the necessary steps to bring the bill to the floor of the House for consideration and a final vote.

Urban renewal is clearly a part of an important national problem to provide a decent home and suitable living environment for every American family. Urban renewal will play a large part in stemming the rise of juvenile delinquency. Federal urban renewal aids are investments in better families, better citizens, and better communities. These are investments which will return dividends in higher national income, and increased sources of revenue for local, State, and Federal governments. These investments which, if neglected, can result in economic and social retrogression in place of progress.

Mr. Speaker, a number of constituents in my Eighth Congressional District, as well as the mayor of Boston have taken the time and the effort to write me here in Washington requesting that the housing and urban renewal bill be brought to the House floor for immediate action. I appreciate receiving their views and agree with them that this legislation must be enacted into law at the earliest possible moment. We cannot stand by and watch our cities slowly disintegrate and wither away.

In order that my colleagues may know the thinking of the people in my area on urban renewal legislation I am setting forth a few of the letters I have recently

received. The letters speak for themselves:

CITY OF BOSTON, *April 21, 1959.*

Hon. TORBERT H. MACDONALD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I appreciate your communication relative to the urban renewal legislation now pending in Congress.

Emphatically, I am in favor of this legislation which will make it possible for the urban renewal programs of our cities to move ahead on a 3-year authorization which, in my opinion, is the least limitation that should be in the bill. Increased relocation payments are also imperative for it is in this field that we encounter considerable difficulty and opposition when urban renewal projects are proposed. Additional planning grants are also most desirable for, as you know, planning is not only essential, but it is expensive.

Any attempt to amend the provisions of the bill to eliminate low-rent public housing for the elderly would be a hard blow to cities such as Boston which are now embarked on such a program.

In my opinion, the urban-renewal legislation which has been in effect has done more to directly help cities, such as Boston, than any other Federal activity. This kind of legislation must be continued if our large American cities, and especially the older cities, are going to be able to meet the need of rebuilding which must be done if our large cities are to be desirable places in which to live or do business.

The current demands on municipal governments are so great that none of our cities can tackle urban renewal without considerable help from the National Government. The State governments, in almost every case, are unable to help cities in this field and, as you well know, the legislators from nonurban districts do not look kindly upon financial participation by the State government when cities are the beneficiaries.

Urban renewal, and its counterpart housing, are the two weapons by which a city can be rehabilitated and by which our people can be adequately and decently housed. Any amendments to the present bill which would decrease the contribution by the Federal Government or restrict it to a very brief period of years would have a debilitating effect on municipal programs now in the infancy stage.

I sincerely hope that the present bill will be adopted without material change. I know you will exert your full influence in this matter because I know you understand this problem and you have witnessed in our own area the fruits that can be done through urban renewal and public housing.

Best wishes.

Respectfully,

JOHN B. HYNES, *Mayor.*

SOMERVILLE, MASS., *April 23, 1959.*

Hon. TORBERT H. MACDONALD,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I respectfully solicit your continued support of the 1959 housing and urban renewal bill.

Our city has benefited through the passage of the 1954 bill to the extent that we have what is considered by all our citizenry an ideal housing facility for aged people. However, at the present time we can only accomodate 64 families.

Approximately 12 percent of our entire population of nearly 100,000 is made up of people who have reached or passed the age of 60 years. There is a great need for more elderly housing to provide adequate shelter for them and it seems that the only method of acquiring it is through governmental action.

You are quite aware also that Somerville is an old city, approximately 4 square miles in area. In fact, we are known to be the most densely populated city of our size in the Nation. We can not expand because of the lack of land. Our only salvation to cope with the modern day standards of housing is a program of urban renewal for which we have previously qualified through the functioning of our workable program.

It will be a tragedy for our people if this program is curtailed in any manner. Over 65 percent of the houses in Somerville are owner occupied. The investment of these people must be protected. We are not in a financial position to independently carry on a full scale program for the renewal of our city facilities, to eliminate substandard housing, or the several other steps necessary to protect the city against blight.

You will render another great service to our community by your strong support of this bill.

Respectfully yours,

WILLIAM P. DONOVAN,
Mayor.

MEDFORD REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY,
Medford, Mass., April 22, 1959.

Hon. TORBERT H. MACDONALD,
Assistant Majority Leader,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MACDONALD: It is most gratifying to learn of your support and interest in urban renewal. I am also thankful of the opportunity you have provided for airing my opinions on this important legislation.

The 1959 housing and urban renewal bill will have a tremendous influence on the national economy. Over half of the Nation's wealth is invested in our cities, and it is the responsibility of the Federal Government not only to protect this huge investment, but also to generate conditions conducive to continue urban expansion. Urban renewal is the best method yet devised to protect our cities through the prevention of blight and decay. If the decay of our cities was to go unchecked, the resulting economic situation caused by the gradual decay of such a large portion of the national wealth, would have a cyclical effect rivaling that of the great depression of the thirties.

It is an appalling fact that in this, the wealthiest nation in the world, over half of the population lives in substandard housing. Slum clearance alone cannot generate enough new units to replace all of the substandard housing. There is a great need for more private construction, especially in the middle- and low-income brackets. It is the responsibility of the Federal Government to stimulate this private construction. A new approach to this task must be mapped out as the old methods have failed to produce the necessary supply of homes within the price range of this vast segment of our population.

With regards to the present ligislation, I have the following recommendations:

1. An increase in the capital grant expenditures from $500 million to $1 billion annually. The present sum does not anticipate the great expansion that is forthcoming in this field.

2. An accelerated and improved program of public housing for the aged. It has been our experience that a high percentage of the slum population is comprised of elderly couples who cannot afford decent rentals.

3. An increase in the budget of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, which would enable this Agency to increase its staff in order to handle the ever-increasing administrative functions of urban renewal.

4. The elimination of some of the ponderous redtape thereby cutting down the dead time between the initial stages of application and the actual undertaking of a project. This period now can extend anywhere from 2 to 5 years and results in hardships to the families living in the area and increases the ultimate cost of the project.

Socially and economically there is a crying need for an urban renaissance in our country. The stakes are so high that we just cannot afford false economy. An expenditure of $2.1 billion for urban renewal, when compared to the task that must be accomplished and to other appropriations, especially to those for farm subsidy, seems like a relatively small amount.

Sincerely yours,

NATHANIEL GRAUEL,
Chairman.

MEDFORD REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY,
Medford, Mass., April 22, 1959.

Hon. TORBERT H. MACDONALD,
Assistant Majority Leader, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MACDONALD: Your support of an expanded urban renewal program is highly commendable; more particularly so, when contrasted with the lethargy toward this program of self-preservation shown by so many of the Metropolitan Boston communities.

If we in truth accept the fact that the magnitude of the problem of obsolescence besetting our older cities is reflected in the national economy to the extent that effort must be expended to reverse the trend, then we had better face up to the task far more realistically and vigorously than heretofore.

Recognizing that we are an urbanized nation—with two-thirds of our people, three-quarters of our industrial jobs, and over half of our real wealth to be found in urban concentrations—would seem to indicate indisputably that these vital centers require and should have at least an equal proportion of tax money returned to help stabilize urban economy as that proportion now spent on farm subsidies. One wonders what forces have led to our present per capita allocation of resources in the magnitude of $3,000 per farm family and $84 per urban slum family at a time when we have 1 million more slum dwellers than farm dwellers.

Certainly in the light of the above, I most wholeheartedly urge the passage of a bill providing realistic and adequate capital grant authority which must of necessity be greater than any amount yet contemplated. In addition, I recognize the need and urge that the Bureau of the Budget provide far more adequate sums for staffing the Housing and Home Finance Agency and its regional offices with sufficient trained career personnel to process applications, contracts, and financial requests so that the present costly months of delay can be eliminated.

Though a volume could be written about specific amendments to the Housing Act which are needed, the following are a few that I consider most important:

1. More funds available for development of commercial and industrial use of land without present restrictions requiring residential use at beginning or end.

2. More imaginative and workable methods of financing to stimulate an increased housing supply for the low and moderately low income family.

3. Recognition of the need for more rental housing to serve the above groups who are, by and large, neither able nor capable of buying and maintaining sound housing—no matter how worthy the goal of home ownership. To aid such a program the requirement for private nonprofit sponsorship of 221 rental housing should be eliminated and private enterprise should be urged to build with the allowance of reasonable profit. (It is time we stopped bending over backward because of the 608 scandals.)

4. Reduction of housing construction cost through some method of providing building materials at reasonable and not excessive profits.

5. Stimulation of research and use of new materials toward the same goal of structural soundness at decreased cost.

6. Enforceable demands in the Federal Highway Act and the Housing Act to insure coordination of these two programs to eliminate the waste and delay now encountered. Emphasis is desperately needed to insure that State highway departments use criteria relating to the economic impact of highways on cities in the choice of alinements in addition to the usual engineering cost and traffic count criteria. Today only a minimal amount of lip service is being given with the result that time and money are wasted and the future of our cities is not being well served.

7. In the area of public housing it has long since been apparent that four walls and a roof do not provide all that is necessary for the rehabilitation of slum families. Congress should recognize the need for the expenditure of funds for trained personnel for management-tenant relations. Hard core social problems do not evaporate with changed environment; and help is needed if public housing is not to become the repository of only the adjusted families, closing its doors to slum families now being pushed from slum to slum, prey to further degeneration and increasing the cost of police and social services.

8. Perhaps all of this means that we are striving only to be technicians and not yet scientists—dedicated to serve the total requirements, physical, cultural, and economic, of areas which have become, for one reason or another, the living spaces embracing the aspirations of great concentrations of people. The provision of funds for fundamental research to point the way to the kinds of cities we really need and should be striving for seems implicit even as we continue to struggle and learn through our present limited project-by-project approach.

To return to the implication of the second half of my first sentence, Congressman MACDONALD, all the Housing Acts that can be conceived will not serve our total economy unless some method is found to stimulate local interest and action. Medford after all these years still seems to look upon the redevelopment authority, an agency of its own creation notwithstanding, as an imposter and the requirements for city planning, code enforcement, and capital budgeting as heinous Federal dictation which the city consistantly refuses to begin to meet even though committed by virtue of a loan and grant contract executed last summer.

This appears to me as a tragedy since Medford is in the unique position of needing urban renewal largely oriented to conservation and rehabilitation but threatened with the eminent need for slum clearance by virtue of the fast growing, obsolescence of public facilities and residential structures hastened by the population change as more families are displaced from the core cities.

I, therefore, end my lengthy letter with a sincere request for your advice and help in awakening the community to the dangers that threaten its proud heritage and the opportunity available to its elected officials and civic leaders to reverse the downhill economic slide and to replace it with increased investments, proper land use, and growing fiscal capacity to meet its needs.

Sincerely yours,

CAROLYN B. WEAVER,
Executive Director.

MEDFORD, MASS., *April 20, 1959.*

Hon. TORBERT H. MACDONALD,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR TORBY: I am pleased to acknowledge your communication of the 14th, concerning your support of an expanded urban renewal program.

As you may know I was a member of the first urban renewal commission here in Medford prior to my election to the city council, consequently this subject is of much interest to me. I am in favor of the Housing and Urban Renewal bill and I am please to see that you are convinced that it should be enacted into law. As you say, aside from the benefits gained by the cities and towns it would provide a great source of employment. We in Medford have an urban renewal project known as the Union Swan development underway at the present time.

Concerning the special housing program for the needs of our elderly people, I feel that our council would favor such a program especially the apartment type located convenient to stores, churches, and transportation. Unfortunately, our local housing authority wanted to locate separate houses near Victory Park and later on property set aside for recreation purposes adjoining Wright's Pond. Neither of these, in my opinion, are suitable being located far from the conveniences above mentioned as ideal for the elderly. Our council is on record in this respect.

Please be assured that I will be glad to give you any further views concerning the subject that you may desire. I further assure you of my support in behalf of this legislation. It should benefit not only Medford, Malden, and Sommerville but the whole Eighth District.

Sincerely,

BOB DRENNAN.

BOSTON, MASS., *April 23, 1959.*

Hon. TORBERT H. MACDONALD,
Member of Congress,
Boston, Mass.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MACDONALD: I very much appreciate your letter of April 14, 1959, relative to the provisions of the 1959 housing and urban renewal bill.

I strongly favor the passage of said bill, because of the essential assistance which it will give to many of our municipalities where blight areas and slums have developed and expanded over the years.

As a lifelong resident of Malden, Mass., and a local taxpayer, I fully realize the serious deterioration which several sections of our city have experienced and the critical need for halting its continued growth. The high tax rate in Malden, and legal obstacles, have hindered any major step toward correcting said serious deficiencies. It now appears that pending Federal legislation with regard to housing and urban renewal can offer to qualifying municipalities the essential financial and legal aid which they need.

I believe Malden is approaching its important urban renewal problem in a sound and effective manner, thanks to the conscientious and energetic efforts of our mayor, Walter J. Kelliher. The mayor secured a preliminary planning study through the city's planning board; this study was followed by the appointment of an Urban Redevelopment Authority, which has a keen appreciation for the need for correcting the city's blighted areas; certain taxpayers have voluntarily donated a substantial sum to finance activities pertinent to the problem; and a competent urban renewal consultant has been employed for the professional services needed to advance the project.

Malden's Redevelopment Authority is about to request Federal funds for carrying out its first project; however, it is understood that no funds are available at present. Without Federal funds, there is grave doubt that the city can provide the full project cost. Furthermore, the specific project area is found by our consultant to have "10 percent nonresidential exception," meaning the urban renewal area is less than 55 percent residential and, consequently, it is desirable that provisions regarding said "10 percent nonresidential exception" should be kept as favorable as possible for Malden's specific needs. It appears that Malden's capital grant request would be of the magnitude of $700,000.

The city's initial urban renewal project will remove a severely blighted area and provide in its stead an area well suited for industrial development. Such a development is very essential at the locality of the project if the city is to retain one of its most important industries, this industry being a major employer of local labor. The said industry contemplates a sizable modern plant.

It is anticipated that new taxable property, about 10 times the present taxable value of the site, will result from the completed development of the urban renewal area. Certainly, this would be a substantial contributing measure in improving the city's municipal economy.

I am pleased indeed to learn that you plan to favor the pending legislation herein referred to.

Very truly yours,

RALPH W. HORNE,
Member of Malden Urban Redevelopment Authority.

THE FIRST NATIONAL
BANK OF MALDEN,
Malden Mass., April 30, 1959.

Hon. TORBERT H. MACDONALD,
Congressman From Massachusetts,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR TORBERT: On return to my home after 10 days' vacation, I found your letter of April 14, in which you so adequately outline your position with respect to the urban renewal program.

As you know, Mayor Kelliher prevailed on me to accept the chairmanship of the Malden Redevelopment Authority last October, and in spite of a busy schedule, I accepted because I sincerely believe that this program is of vital importance to the city in which I live and work. We have a project application now ready for filing. This application needs only the formal vote of the Malden Redevelopment Authority, which I expect will be completed this evening; and a favorable vote of the Malden City Council. The matter is to be taken up at their meeting on May 5, so you can see I am vitally interested that funds be made available so that we can at least make a start in this direction in Malden. The project which we have in mind would eliminate 60-odd substandard homes, and would make land available to industry in an area where such expansion is sorely needed. This particular project is one which lends itself to early approval as there is immediate need for this land by industry, and I visualize substantial additions to real estate valuation in this project, if we are to carry it to completion. This we cannot do without Federal funds.

Mr. Horne, a member of our authority, has very graciously given to me a copy of the letter which he wrote to you recently, and I concur with all of his statements. Your interest in this matter is deeply appreciated by all of us who are trying to make Malden a better place in which to live and work.

Sincerely yours,

SIDNEY M. PRICE,
President.

READING, MASS., *April 20, 1959.*

Hon. TORBERT H. MACDONALD,
Congress of the U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MACDONALD: We are writing in answer to your letter with regard to your proposed bill for urban development. Although Reading is not at this moment in need of such development, we are certainly in sympathy with the need of this type of housing in communities surrounding Reading, the areas through which our citizens must pass, work, shop, and visit. We are aware of the program that was instituted in Somerville, and we feel that this program is an excellent program and one which is greatly needed to assist our community and the communities throughout the Nation.

The growing need for this type of housing is certainly pressing, and may we extend to you our continued support and best wishes for its successful enactment.

Sincerely yours,

LAWRENCE DREW,
RUDOLF SUSSMANN,
JAMES E. CALVIN,
Board of Selectmen.

MALDEN, MASS., *April 30, 1959.*

Hon. TORBERT H. MACDONALD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I have lived in Malden my entire life—was born here, attended the local schools, married, and settled here. So you see I find myself in an excellent position of having literally watched the deterioration of our hometown. I am certain that we all realize that cities change over a long period of years (particularly old ones like Malden) but if we do not guide them in the right direction, they will certainly change for the worse.

The full realization for the need for this program came to me about 3 years ago when I was appointed chairman of an urban renewal committee for the League of Women Voters. I had a large committee study this program for 2 years and we brought back to our membership all the vital facts concerning it—the background, including detailed information about the "workable program," the financial aspects both from the Government and local points of view, the human values which foster disease, crime, and delinquency, and a pretty sad picture of what our local scene looked like but more important—what it would look like if we continued in our lethargic ways.

Not only is the league behind this program 100 percent, but church groups, parent-teacher groups, Community Chest, and many other civic groups all realize the extreme need for the passage of this bill in order that Malden may once again become a desirable community in which to live.

I feel that it is the right of every citizen to have at least the hope of some adequate return for an all-time high tax rate and thus be able to maintain our rightful position as a modern, progressive business and residential center. I feel that this program should have the highest priority for the benefit of all.

Sincerely yours,

(Mrs. Sol S.) BEATRICE RICHMOND.

The Forand Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 11, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article on the Forand bill, which appeared in the official publication of the Office Employees International Union entitled "White Collar":

THE FORAND BILL

Representative AIME J. FORAND of Rhode Island, has introduced a bill known as H.R. 4700 which provides for certain medical and hospital benefits for social security beneficiaries.

Representative FORAND deserves much praise for this proposal to alleviate important difficulties facing the aged. Three-fifths of all people 65 years and over had incomes of less than $1,000 a year in 1956 and 1957.

It is apparent, therefore, that these people cannot turn to private insurance in accordance with the contention of the medical societies. In most instances, their only recourse at the present time is public assistance or other forms of public welfare, only after their savings are exhausted. This alternative destroys the dignity of many men and women in their later years.

In effect, the provisions of the Forand bill will provide for a type of prepaid insurance under the social security system.

Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Fleming made public a comprehensive report which supports labor's claims that retired workers cannot afford the rising costs of medical care.

George Meany, AFL–CIO president, states: "Our members want high quality medical services, both before and after retirement, and are willing to pay for them on a budgeted prepayment basis during their years of employment."

It is our feeling that the Forand bill should be judged on the basis of need and it should not, under any circumstances, become a matter for political partisanship.

Negro Ex-Councilman of Jacksonville Shows Kindness and Understanding Which Make Him a Leader

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 11, 1959

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the Florida Times Union of Jacksonville, Fla., recently published an interesting account of an interview with Ex-Councilman George E. Ross, who today demonstrates kindness, understanding, objectivity and a type of fine American spirit which we should all seek to achieve. I am glad to have included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this thoughtful newspaper article:

HITS BLOC VOTE—NEGRO EX-COUNCILMAN OPPOSED TO INTEGRATION

A 91-year-old Negro is Jacksonville's oldest former city councilman, and the only living member of his race to have held a public office in this city.

He is George E. Ross, of 1406 Davis Street. His age, his experiences and his background have clothed him in the dignity, the self-possession, and the pride of achievement which tub-thumping integrationists claim every member of the Negro race is destined to achieve—but Ross is not an integrationist.

Ross has a ready and articulate answer to a question as to the racial strife which has been brewed throughout the Nation in recent years.

NOT FOR INTEGRATION

"I am not for integration," he declares emphatically. "I, and most members of my race, have no desire to leave our own group, our own people, and mingle with white people in every level of their society. We do want one thing. We want an equality of opportunity for education."

And he quickly adds, "We have that opportunity in Jacksonville, in fact in all of Florida. Our Negro schools are excellent. I see no reason why Negroes should ever try to integrate the public schools in this city and I certainly hope it never happens here."

Ross is a native of Gainesville, spent his childhood there, in Cedar Key and Key West, and learned the cigar-making trade. He came to Jacksonville before the turn of the century, to go to work for the Gonzales and Sanchez Cigar Co. and lay the foundation for the rich life which has followed.

Ross bought the property where he now makes his home, and which has been converted into a two-unit apartment building. His four children, all living, were born there, and it was his residence in 1901 when he successfully ran for the city council from the old sixth ward, on the Republican ticket.

TWO NEGRO MEMBERS

At that time, the council consisted of two representatives from each of the city's nine wards. Ross and another Negro, J. Douglas Wetmore, were elected to the sixth ward posts at the same time, and were the only two Negroes in the council.

Wetmore served only one 2-year term, but Ross was reelected for a second term, to become the city's last Negro councilman. During his first term, when Pleasant A. Holt, one of Jacksonville's outstanding political figures of the early 1900's, was council president, Ross was named a member of council's committee on relief and charged with aiding in the rehabilitation of Jacksonville and its people after the great fire of May 3, 1901.

It is a thumbnail delineation of his character to hear him mark, without hesitation, that period of service as his outstanding contribution to his city.

"It's true," Ross recalled, "that my own people were hardest hit by the fire. When their homes burned, all their possessions went with them; they had no other resources. They needed such essentials as food and clothing, they had no money, and our council relief committee was the only salvation for them. With the help of city funds and donations, we were able to do the job."

Ross smiled at one recollection of the committee's work. "No bill I ever submitted for clothing or supplies was ever questioned," he said. "And every one was found to be proper and in order by the auditors."

The former councilman considered the job of rehabilitating Jacksonville after the fire the biggest problem during his tenure. "But our council was very active, and it was very harmonious. Harmonious not only racially, but politically. During my terms, there was never the slightest friction between me and the other councilmen, because of my race," he said.

"No," Ross shook his head, "I'm not active politically any more. I vote—I've never missed an election—but that is all. And I don't think the Negroes here are helping their own cause by this so-called bloc voting.

"The bloc vote is a sacrifice of independence and it can be misled," Ross continued. "But I do think the large Negro population of Jacksonville deserves representation on its governmental bodies.

"Anything else means taxation without representation, and our country was founded on opposition to that.

"I think a Negro member of city council now would be a good thing for our entire city and I don't believe it would cause any more friction on that body than it did when I served there."

ACTIVE IN COMMUNITY

In addition to his political service, Ross has been active in all phases of Negro life in this community. He has served twice as grand master of Prince Hall Lodge, Free and Accepted Masons, for many years was superintendent of the Sunday school of St. Stephen's Methodist Church and a member of its board of trustees.

"But I'm not as young now as I used to be, and I've just about retired completely from all public affairs. I don't even have any advice or suggestions to offer the politicians of today, or any Negro who might be elected to public office. I feel that to give advice would be most presumptuous on my part."

Ross smiled again. "I do feel flattered when some of our leaders come to talk with me about their problems. And I never fail to point out that Jacksonville has been a good place for both Negroes and white people to live, that we have lived in harmony, that we have seen none of the strife that has beset other cities. But politics? No, I'm out of that," he declared.

Small Business Administration Invades Construction Field

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHIL WEAVER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 6, 1959

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, on the 23d of April of this year John B. Quinn, executive vice chairman of the National Resources Development Association, in an address to the Associated General Contractors called attention to a new threat to the construction industry—the invasion of that industry by the Small Business Administration.

I have personally been genuinely interested in small business, but I also have at heart the need for saving tax dollars, and the need for free enterprise and the protection of our freedoms. For these reasons I am taking the liberty of inserting the entire address by Mr. Quinn in the RECORD for my colleagues to see.

The address follows:

SPEECH BY JOHN B. QUINN OF LINCOLN, NEBR., EXECUTIVE VICE CHAIRMAN OF THE NATIONAL RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION, BEFORE THE (11-STATE) WESTERN AGC CHAPTERS CONFERENCE, MONTEREY, CALIF.

Mr. Chairman and members of the conference, on behalf of the National Resources Development Association I am appreciative of the opportunity to speak with you relative to issues and interests of a common nature.

Over a period in excess of 15 years my work has brought me in constant contact with leaders of the construction industry. Especially have I coordinated with those who are workhorses—the pivot wheels—the managers of the various State chapters of the Associated General Contractors.

The great fight in the Missouri Basin—that covers 10 States and one-sixth of the land area of the Nation—to keep Government control—and in fact to actually keep Government itself out of the construction industry through another TVA was my introduction to AGC State managers and to that stout warrier for the cause of free enterprise and the low-bid construction formula, H. E. "Doc" Foreman, who guided the national AGC during my early years in this work.

My activities include participation in (1) the contest in Congress and in the States to keep gas tax revenue for roads and highways; (2) the increase of the gas tax in several States where needed; (3) the discouragement of "day labor" on construction projects sponsored by the Federal and State governmental agencies; (4) the great crusade for the St. Lawrence Seaway; (5) coordination with friends of the Interstate Highway System; (6) encouragement of Government's investigation and advance study of land and water projects of economic value; (7) resistance to the constant pressure to stop the start of new projects authorized by Congress; (8) initiation of regional planning conferences on all types of future construction needs; and (9) joining with others at this time in spearheading an activity designed to retard the progress of the Federal Government from further encroachment upon a tradition that is as old as the free enterprise system itself. I refer to the Small Business Administration's entry into the construction industry as authorized by the Congress whereby some can bid and some cannot bid on selected construction contracts let by the Federal Government.

As you can readily see all the activities mentioned deal directly with the political, but nonpartisan, area of thinking. This is true simply because decisions that count are either fostered or resisted by those in Government. Some are elected and some are appointed but they all—in their own way—make a mighty contribution, good or bad, to the rules, the regulations, the laws and the interpretation of the laws that so vitally affect the livelihood of our people and touch every phase of this Nation's economic life.

There is a lot of room for disagreement among those who are governed. No thinking person gives unanimous support to all laws and regulations. Therefore the contest on the selling job for approval or disapproval by the people of an idea or a philosophy is a continuous activity that is accepted as one of the factors in our American way of life.

Fortunately in America no one has ever been able to control or direct the thinking of all the people all of the time.

In our concept of what is right and what is wrong we are guided by the rule that everyone can get into the act in an endeavorment to sell an idea—to oppose, to support—to build, to destroy—to stand pat or to change.

It is reasonable to propose that progress is not marked by opposing all that is old or accepting all that is new. Progress comes about in the settlement of problems through a degree and gradual mixture of change that works to the benefit of all; not just a few.

Sometimes a big and sudden change for an industry is in the making without benefit of a full realization of the many ramifications involved or the degree and extent of change contemplated by present and future administrators of a law through regulations.

A good example of this is the congressional act of 1958 that directs the Small Business Administration to insure that a fair proportion of the Government's contracts goes to small businesses. The activity of SBA in the construction industry has been described as "progressing from the creeping to the galloping state."

In a relatively short time, the SBA has progressed from (a) no activity in the construction industry to (b) a set-aside program in the Corps of Engineers, with a $50,000 limitation as to each contract; then to (c) entry into all branches of the Department of Defense, simultaneously with which it (d) caused to be eliminated any reference to dollar limitation as to each contract; then to (e) a proposed plan whereby on a 1,000-unit Capehart housing project—500 units would be set aside for small business thereby creating a probable situation where the large contractor would be a union operator and any number of the small business contractors would be nonunion; then to (f) activity with the Bureau of Public Roads to encourage and develop the utilization of small business concerns in the construction of Federal aid and Interstate Highway Systems.

Just 3 months ago, almost to the day, Donald A. Hipkins, SBA Deputy Administrator, in a speech delivered in Miami stated that SBA's program in construction had heretofore been able to make only a token progress in setting aside construction contracts for small firms and that the program had not reached its full potential. Mr. Hipkins certainly told the truth. Some of the convention attendants must have consumed a liberal dose of tranquilizers because the delayed reaction to the actual SBA intent and effect of regulations has taken about 3 months to comprehend.

In representing the National Resources Development Association I wish to make it crystal clear that we do not oppose small business organizations—nor do we oppose the so-called large business organizations.

We have spent the larger amount of our efforts to pinpoint the need of future planing in construction at the municipal, State and Federal levels. The great bulk of the proposed projects considered will be built by small business firms. Our theory is that in the mutual interest of the taxpayer, and of those in the construction industry, that advance planning of economically justified projects—to be let on the low-bid basis—is a sound program of benefit to all concerned.

In an effort to survive—all contractors—large and small joined hands to oppose the TVA expansion of Government in the construction business in other basins of the Nation. All oppose the use of day labor—by the municipal, county, State, or National Government. Construction firms favored the contract method and they let the world know about their position. They were united.

Again and again—contractors, labor forces and others, who believe in the American free enterprise system, have presented a solid wall against unnecessary governmental encroachment upon a system that presented an opportunity to all to advance in business without Government aid and in accordance with ability, skill, and resourcefulness.

I believe that SBA's entry into the construction industry, whereby large efficient contractors are forbidden and barred from bidding on some projects is not in the interest of maintaining or mobilizing the Nation's full productive capacity or in the interest of war or national defense programs.

I believe this because the protected projects for some theory is bound to cost the taxpayer more money. America's number one defense need is her economic ability to maintain a costly program of peace in this cold war. Any program that is designed to cost more than is absolutely necessary contributes to the weakening of our defense program.

I believe that if the Federal Government can have an SBA protective clause in the law that the same theory but in many different forms can and will be extended into State, county, and municipal laws or ordinances. Where such practices would stop—who would be eliminated or excluded in the musical chair game—nobody knows. Not even the economic theorists that would change a proven and established procedure could outguess the future for construction firms. Perhaps we would end up with three

classifications—large, small, and tiny contractors.

This situation creates an issue that requires sober and intelligent analysis on the part of those who seek unification of position between small and large contractors. It will be a painful decision especially for those who could temporarily profit in the first quarter of the game. Discussion and education of the present and future advantages and disadvantages are essential.

N.R.D.A. stands for and will work for repeal of the law that permits differentiating between small and large contractors. We do this in the interest of defense and economy.

Hon. Harry S. Truman

SPEECH
OF
HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 7, 1959

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am glad on this 75th birthday of President Harry S. Truman to pay tribute to his many fine accomplishments and to say a few words of personal regard. I remember the feeling of sympathy I felt for him when the news came of the death of President Roosevelt, sympathy because I knew it would be difficult to follow a world figure of the stature of his predecessor. This news came to me when I was in guerrilla fighting in the Philippine Islands near the end of World War II. President Truman, in the months and years which followed, proved time after time that he was capable of making well the big decisions which history would place upon him.

I remember a few years later at a banquet in Washington when I was a freshman Congressman in a wheel chair at a banquet in a Washington hotel, President Truman and our fine majority leader, JOHN MCCORMACK, perceived that there would be real trouble in placing the chair at the table assigned to me and they both insisted that I join them at their more adjustable table. This I did. The thoughtfulness of President Truman and Mr. MCCORMACK was certainly deeply appreciated by me. The outstanding remark that I can remember the President making in the conversation that evening was that if he had to make the decision again to drop the atomic bomb, he would have made the decision just as he did when history called upon him for that decision. His major decisions in the field of foreign affairs were of tremendous significance and will affect the world for centuries to come. I do not know of a single one of them that history so far has indicated as faulty.

No two people see everything exactly alike, and I can remember one occasion when President Truman wrote me what I considered to be a rather strong letter of disapproval of my position on a particular matter. He shortly thereafter wrote me a very kind letter which indicated that he realized that his first letter had been a little fiery in language. In referring to the earlier letter he said: "Sometimes we get ruffled for no good cause." Certainly this is another indication of the bigness of his character, and at the same time his persistent courage in standing for what he thinks is right. I believe the American people can be very, very grateful that a man of his fine qualities led them in the particular years of peril when he had these tremendous responsibilities upon his shoulders. I consider that I am a very lucky person to have known a man of his character and to have served in Congress when he was President.

That he is still very active in many things for the benefit of our country is well known to everyone. An illustration from my own mail was a recent letter from him encouraging me in my efforts to bring about the construction of the cross-Florida barge canal. He wrote:

> I hope that someday cross-Florida barge canal can be completed. In my opinion it is necessary for the welfare of the whole country.

As I close my remarks, I would like to say that one of the things that will last with me the longest about President Truman, and to which I have often referred in speeches, is a little incident illustrative of his strong personal loyalties. It was when the President was being criticized by some publicity seekers for being away from Washington when his mother was very ill in Missouri. His remark at that time was to the point when he said:

> She sat up with me many times when I needed her and I want to reciprocate when she needs me. Whenever she wakes up, she wants to talk to me. I want to be there.

I am glad that his loyalties to persons are accompanied by equally strong loyalties to his country and to God.

Ukrainian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 11, 1959

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from the Ukrainian Congress Committee of American, Jersey City branch:

UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE
OF AMERICA,
JERSEY CITY BRANCH,
Jersey City, N.J., May 1, 1959.

Hon. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GALLAGHER: The Ukrainian Congress Committee, Jersey City branch, supports wholeheartedly House Joint Resolution 334, introduced in the House of Representatives on April 8, 1959, by Hon. WALTER H. JUDD, of Minnesota.

This resolution, which was referred to the House Committee on the Judiciary, authorizes and requests the President of the United States to issue a proclamation designating January 22 of each year as Ukrainian Independence Day.

We, Ukrainians of Jersey City, believe that such resolution inviting the people of the United States to observe the anniversary of the proclamation which declared Ukraine to be a free and independent republic, deserves unanimous endorsement. We, therefore, request you, as our Representative in Congress, to give your kind attention and support to House Joint Resolution 334.

Best wishes extended to you by Marcel Wagner.

Respectfully yours,
ANTHONY SHARAN,
President.

People Are Urged To Do Something About Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHIL WEAVER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 6, 1959

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to call to the attention of the House one of the most impressive editorials to appear in recent weeks in any American newspaper. The editorial from the Omaha World-Herald is impressive for two reasons, one being the good commonsense conveyed by the writer and the other being the way in which the people are urged to take action against inflation.

As my own voting record shows, I have long fought against the useless and wasteful spending programs so often proposed in the Congress. I have said that only by action of the people can this waste be cut. I am pleased that the World-Herald has taken this method of arousing the people to the dangers they face, and that the newspaper has been able to direct the energy it has so ably stirred up.

The editorial follows:

THIS IS THE GREAT PROBLEM: YOU CAN HELP TO SOLVE IT

The greatest issue in America this year is inflation.

President Eisenhower says that Secretary of the Treasury Anderson agrees. So do a host of other thoughtful Americans.

This is not a far-away issue involving only politicians and economists. It is a local issue, an individual issue. It affects the well-being, present and future of every one who lives in the United States.

What is inflation?

It is the process of destroying the value of the dollar, so that it will buy less this year than it did a year ago.

And what is the basic cause of inflation?

It is the constant increase in the supply of money. This is brought about chiefly by too much spending by the Government in Washington out of an empty Treasury.

Secretary Anderson recently explained the problem in these simple words:

"Now suppose I wanted to write checks of $100 million starting tomorrow, but the Treasury was out of money. If I called up a bank and said, 'Will you loan me $100 million at 3½ percent for 6 months if I send you over a note to that effect?' the banker would probably say yes.

"Where would he get the $100 million?

"He would merely create that much money, subject to reserve requirements, by crediting our account in that sum and accepting the

Government's note as an asset. When I had finished writing checks for $100 million, the operation would have added that sum to the money supply."

This process, the Secretary went on, is about the same as if the Treasury had issued $100 million worth of greenbacks.

And how does constant, continuing inflation harm the American people?

It takes away from them what they gain in wage increases and profits. It robs them of a substantial share of their pensions. It makes the future uncertain and perilous for everybody.

This is not a new problem. The outcome of uncontrolled inflation should be known to all.

Germany has been through it. There the inflationary smash led to Hitler, defeat in World War II, and partition.

Hungary has been through it, and Hungary today is a Communist satellite.

China has been through it, with results that need not be detailed here.

Everywhere, in all ages, uncontrolled inflation has led to unlimited disaster.

But perhaps you say that if the President and the Secretary of the Treasury are aware of this danger, what is there to worry about?

The President and the Secretary do not make the appropriations. Congress does that. A great many Senators and Representatives seem utterly ignorant of the peril and have set out to wreck the President's budget. If they are successful, they will cause more inflation in the way that Secretary Anderson described. They may cause the inflationary spiral to spin so fast that no one will be able to stop it.

That is where the issue is today—in Congress.

That is where good Americans can and should use their influence.

If our readers agree that this is the most urgent problem of the times, we suggest that they write at once to their Senators and Representatives, urging them to stop foolish spending, to stay within the President's budget, and to make sure that there will be no deficit in the next fiscal year.

To aid those who wish to take part in this campaign, we are publishing on page 9 today a map of the area in which the World-Herald circulates. It shows the congressional districts, gives the name of the Representative of each, and gives also the names of each of the Senators.

This is not a partisan matter. No matter whether your Representatives in Washington are Democrats or Republicans, no matter whether they have already taken a stand on this issue, we think it will be wholesome for them to learn directly from you how you feel about it.

If you agree, please send a postcard or letter or telegram to your Representative and your two Senators, expressing your views as plainly as you can, in your own words.

And for the good of the country do it today.

Address by Vice Adm. Robert B. Pirie at Loyalty Day Program Held at Nanticoke, Pa., on Saturday, May 2, 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 11, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following remarks of Vice Adm. R. B. Pirie, U.S. Navy, at Nanticoke, Pa., U.S. Loyalty Day, May 2, 1959:

Mr. Ruck, ladies and gentlemen, I am very much honored to have had the opportunity to participate in Nanticoke's impressive Loyalty Day parade. I am most happy for this added opportunity to talk to the citizens of Nanticoke.

When President Eisenhower signed into law last summer the bill establishing the first day of May each year as Loyalty Day in the United States, the occasion marked the successful climax of 10 years of effort by the Veterans of Foreign Wars to gain national recognition of a theme worthy of the attention of every American.

The results of this great work are now being observed all over the United States by millions of American citizens.

Your VFW post has gained a single honor among its many here in Nanticoke recently—the result of the successful fight led by its citizen's committee for your new Mill Memorial Library.

I congratulate the Nanticoke Post of the VFW in having been in the forefront so often.

Today is a day when every loyal American should pause to reflect on the various kinds of defenses his country is building against the inroads of international communism. This is because the welfare of every one of us, and that of our children following us, is at stake. Only by an active interest in these vital matters can we be sure that we understand all the factors.

The Armed Forces of the United States make up a team that forms a major instrument of our national policy as it deals with the forces of international communism led by Russia.

Your Navy is an important partner in this team, and I would like to tell you today a little about how we fit into the picture.

First of all, however, I'd like to give you a little background. We Americans want to maintain freedom of thought and of action for the individual. We believe in our way of life. We don't want to take anything away from anyone, but, on the other hand, we don't want anythnig taken from us.

We are peace loving, but willing to fight for a principle when we know we have right on our side. We believe in fair play and want to be treated in a similar manner. We tend to feel that other governments surely must be motivated in the same way.

We cannot imagine that any group of people could be dedicated to any set of principles other than our own lofty ones.

It is this naive view of things that threatens to blind us to many important events that have occurred repeatedly in the past under the leadership of Russia and which should give us a clue.

Actually, what can be expect from a system of government that teaches that there is no God and that the individual exists only for the good of the State? We certainly cannot expect an application of the Golden Rule.

We should thoroughly understand that communism is like the mythical Medusa. Out of its head there springs a crown of writhing snakes. And each one of these has a deadly sting. In fact, the military strength of Russia and her satellites is only one of these snakes, and while we're watching that one, we must keep an eye on all the others.

The Communists have demonstrated over and over again that military force is only one method they will use in their efforts to achieve their announced goal of world domination.

The fact is that we are faced with a treacherous adversary who will employ any means available to achieve his goal. He will strike in many different ways, always exploiting our weaknesses.

How do we know this? Recent history teaches us the lesson.

In World War II, fought at great expense to keep the world free, Russia, under the guise of a voice of freedom, was supported in its war effort by vast quantities of goods from the United States. We even kept Russia alive by sometimes diverting vital war materials from our other stanch allies.

Yet, while this river of goods was flowing in freedom's name, Russian leaders were laying plans for the treacherous absorption of many small countries along her borders and the destruction of their liberty. And we know what happened to Poland, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, Hungary, Rumania, and Lithuania.

After the war ended in Europe, and with the United States concentrating its energies on defeating Japan, Russia moved in and placed the harsh yoke of its power on many of the free countries of Europe from which so many of your forebears came. The bright light of freedom in Europe, once again, was only a dream.

After Russia consolidated its European position by ruthless pressure on the satellite nations, the West was further alarmed, and finally galvanized into action, by Russian activities which threatened the freedom of Greece and Turkey.

Then there was obstructive opposition to the Marshall plan and the Austrian treaty. The Russians blockaded Berlin, and now threaten that city for a second time. Then there was Korea and Indochina and, lately, the crises connected with the Sucz Canal, Lebanon, and the Taiwan Straits. All inspired by the deceitful forces of communism.

It is startling to reflect that international communism is not very old. It had its start only about 40 years ago. Yet, it now embraces two-fifth of the earth's surface and a large portion of its population; and had the free world not united through such alliances as NATO and SEATO, much more territory and peoples of the world would now be under its control.

Much of the early acquisition of territory and peoples came about by military action and physical force. But in other instances it was accomplished by combinations of four types of operations at which the Russians are very expert.

First, there were political operations. The so-called fifth column appeared in many countries. Active Communist parties were established in some instances.

In others, Communist-inspired movements were submerged in other political parties without their members realizing it until almost too late.

There were treacherous forces at work to weaken the ranks of democracy.

And the fact is that this type of effort continues in a wide variety of places today. The free world must be ever alert to it.

The second type of warfare used by Communists is psychological. Sometimes this is called fourth dimensional warfare. This method exploits fear, either in the individual or in a whole nation collectively. It is an assault on the mind. It makes tensions more severe and alters the emotional behavior of a nation. It, too, is going on today.

Psychological warfare includes the use of propaganda. It often makes use of the trick employed by trial attorneys and college debaters. You form a proposition which has no basis in fact for debate and by boldly pretending you are right, force your opponent to refute it. It is the technique of the "big lie."

As an example, we bit hard on the charge of germ warfare in Korea. We wasted a lot of time and energy refuting that one instead of taking the offensive. We could have, for example, brought up the mass

murder of the populations of Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania.

Psychological warfare combines propaganda with subversion, economic blackmail, threats of assassination, political pressure and, as a last resort, even military force.

Then there is a third area of Soviet operations which could strike at our way of life like no other. It is economic warfare.

Russian industry is becoming very strong and comes close to satisfying her military needs. But other consumer goods being produced aren't necessarily going to the Russian people. These materials are going out of Russia to support economic penetration in many countries which are clamoring for help in modernizing their agriculture and industry. Russia is going ahead fast in making this help available, because she intends to ensnare the unwary nations by this means.

The Russian people, who are already accustomed to sacrifice, do not have to give up anything more to support this program.

Finally, the fourth way the Communists are making their bid for world domination is through cultural warfare.

Thousands of Russian students are in training, studying in detail the countries where they will be sent as trade or diplomatic representatives. Their job is to weave the Communist line into the local culture.

Russia is having quite a bit of success in this subtle field. Many countries, which were formerly colonial possessions of our Allies, are tasting new-found liberty. Most, however, are having great cultural and economic difficulty because of their new-born status. That is where the Soviets will try to take maximum advantage of weakness and then move in. There, new liberty could be short-lived.

There you have the picture. We are faced with an offensive over a wide front. What must we do about it?

Our national security and the collective security of our Allies is, to use a sea-going phrase, "an all-hands evolution." What this really means is that the United States can get this security only by every citizen working hard for it.

We can remain free, and we can help our Allies to do the same. To accomplish this, we must develop a combination of political, spiritual, psychological, and military strengths—this includes being ready and willing to apply military force whenever and wherever it is needed.

When we talk about military strength as a very necessary part of this picture, we are talking about something that costs a lot. And what's more, the cost will probably get higher. The plain fact is, however, that we must make the sacrifices necessary to increase our strength. There is no acceptable alternation.

But, if we should spend our money for military things we don't need, we could soon wreck our national economy. That would be playing right into the Communists' hands. On the other hand, things would be even worse if we don't get the things we do need.

You all should realize that we in the military are not the ones who will make the final decisions regarding what our military strength will be. That is in the hands of the civilian part of the Government; in other words, the Congress and the Executive Branch. The Nation's military leaders can only make their professional judgment and recommendations clear to their civilian superiors.

This means that the decision rests ultimately with yourselves, and you must make these decisions on the basis of a thorough understanding of the many factors involved.

What we as a Nation have to do, along with the free world, is contain communism without resorting to general war.

The consequences of an all-out nuclear war are too terrible to comprehend. It would literally be the end of the world.

Nevertheless, in order to keep the Soviets in their place, we must maintain a nuclear deterrent force that they know can knock them out of the box if they should attempt a nuclear strike against us. This means that we must have powerful enough forces to keep the Soviets from starting an all-out war.

Now, deterrence is actually a state of mind. A person, or nation, doesn't do certain things because he knows that there will be inevitable and unacceptable penalties against him, if he does. This is deterrence.

Immediately after World War II, it was the atom bomb which we alone had, and Soviet knowledge that we had it, which undoubtedly deterred them from advancing into other parts of the world, particularly those nations in Western Europe.

In the intervening period, this advantage that we enjoyed has disappeared because we have now reached the point where Russia also has nuclear weapons. You might say we are getting to a point of nuclear deterrent stalemate, because each side has great nuclear power which neither one wishes to use because of the inevitable consequences.

In addition to all this, the delivery systems for this nuclear capability have been changing in recent years. Intercontinental ballistic missiles, intermediate range ballistic missiles, or fleet ballistic missiles are becoming practical as a means for hurling nuclear bombs through the air.

The Russians have been developing a similar capability.

Since it is essential that we develop and maintain a national nuclear deterrent, we in the Navy believe that one of the best delivery systems the Nation will have is the Polaris fleet ballistic missile system with the Polaris missiles in submarines.

This system has the great advantages of mobility and ready concealment in ocean expanses. It cannot be zeroed in by an enemy ballistic missile, because a ballistic missile must be fired at a fixed target to be effective.

Therefore, it is an ideal form of nuclear deterrent. We hope that this is going to be a major contribution to the nuclear deterrent forces of the United States.

A big bonus advantage of the Polaris system, besides concealment and mobility, is that it is away from your homeland, and, in war, civilians at home are not going to be zeroed in by an enemy missile because of it.

We have a phrase we use a lot in regard to the Polaris missile system. It is "Move deterrence out to sea, where the real estate is free, and where it's far away from me."

Between the various U.S. forces, then, we have a capability for destroying the war-making capacity of Russia with nuclear weapons if she attacks us. Since she is thought to have the same, a nuclear deterrent stalemate does, indeed, exist.

What other things, then, do we need to defend ourselves and the free world against the inroads of communism? And why is an all-out war capability not enough?

The answer is that because of the awful consequences to both sides in all-out war, the chances of such a conflict are becoming more and more remote. This does not mean, however, that Russia will not continue to try to achieve world domination by inspiring military actions short of all-out war. In other words, through wars limited in a geographical sense as well as limited in the kind of weapons employed. Korea is a good example of what I mean.

Our answer to this centers around an ability to move quickly to any area with sufficient forces to handle with precise and discriminating force, brushfire incidents or limited wars. These may occur as a result of the Communists' trying to take advantage of small countries that cannot handle such situations themselves. This sort of piecemeal absorption would ultimately destroy the free world and us with it. We cannot allow it to happen.

Let us not forget that over 70 percent of the earth's surface is covered by water and the great majority of critical, or potentially critical, spots in the world border on the seas.

We can't forget, either, that despite the vast and rich resources of the United States, we are essentially a maritime nation dependent upon our sea lines of communications with other free nations for economic growth.

Thus, we must be able to insure the day-to-day freedom of the seas and to control the sea routes to any area of localized aggression. We must be able to strike in that area with precision and discrimination, using appropriate weapons. And we must be able to put our amphibious Marine forces ashore, if required. In other words, we need strong seapower.

This is where your Navy becomes of paramount importance. Our naval forces are powerfully constituted to discourage and deter such aggression, and yet they have the inherent precision and flexibility to operate in such a manner as to avoid triggering off an unlimited war. Thus, the problem of how much and what kind of deterrent capability takes on another dimension.

If our naval forces were not modern enough and large enough, we would be forced to rely totally on our all-out nuclear weapons. This would involve unacceptable risks to our country.

With our present and planned naval forces which include our Marines, we can use, if we wish, conventional weapons where they will suffice, and so avoid the risk of all-out conflict. We also have a powerful nuclear capability in our attack carrier striking forces to back up our intent to control the seas and the sources of Russian seapower in any kind of war. This is a national advantage which is of immeasurable value.

The best instrument, in our opinion, to handle these limited war situations is the attack carrier task force deployed and ready in potential trouble spots of the world and backed up by our Marines and amphibious ships.

We have the 6th Fleet deployed continuously in the Mediterranean and the 7th Fleet in the Far East for just these purposes. Our national interests will require us to continue these efforts for a long time to come.

These task forces can move to any place in their threater on short notice where they may be required to stamp out brushfires.

In the recent case of Lebanon, for example, it was less than 24 hours from the time the President of Lebanon asked for help that we actually had Marines ashore under cover of our attack carriers in the 6th Fleet. These positive and precise actions prevented that crisis from growing into a holocaust. Your Navy, with its attack carrier striking forces, played a similar role in the Quemoy crisis around Formosa last fall. We must keep our Navy strong and modern by providing it with new ships as our old ones wear out.

Perhaps some of us think that no one local area is worth fighting for. But remember, one little area after another equals the world, and Russia has been nibbling away for years now.

If we want to remain free, tomorrow may be too late to do something about it. The problem and the responsibility does not belong just to those of us in uniform. It belongs to every loyal citizen of this country.

Now, what can you do to help?

First of all, encourage serious discussion of international affairs in your community and how our alliances with other maritime nations can be preserved. Understand that the Nation's future is dependent upon keep-

ing our seapower strong, modern, and flexible. Remember, any inroads that the Soviets make in foreign trade areas cut into our vital economic ties with our friends overseas.

When enough talking about these matters is done, its influence is bound to be felt back in Washington. Your distinguished Congressman, Mr. FLOOD, has his finger on your collective pulse. When he knows he has your support, his job is made infinitely easier in helping to provide adequately for national defense.

Important, also, is the weight of your voices in influencing our youth. You have direct control of your school systems through your boards of education and influence through parent-teacher associations. I firmly believe that we have begun a trend back toward some of our oldtime principles of loyalty and service to the country. We must continue this trend. Let us do it through youth activities such as the Boy Scouts, YMCA, and YWCA.

These organizations need our help in inculcating high standards of morality, in teaching the qualities of leadership, and in demonstrating the value of hard work.

I am reminded of the American soldier who defected to Red China after service in Korea. When asked why he returned, he stated that he came back because of the easy living here. It had been necessary for him to work hard in China. He still believed in communism but didn't like the hard work.

We must neutralize the philosophy of the fast buck.

Moreover, we must emphasize the need for greater concentration in courses of study that lead to careers in science and technology. The disciplines of these courses produce better citizens.

Foreign languages, too, help in our international relations. We have a crying need for improving our ability to talk with other peoples in their own language.

In brief summary, I would like to leave you with these thoughts. We are faced with a threat from communism in many forms: militarily, politically, psychologically, economically, and culturally. We are close to a nuclear stalemate with the Russians.

Despite our nuclear deterrent capability, the Communists have taken over a large portion of the world. What will stop these tactics? It is highly mobile naval forces that can be rapidly moved to wherever Communist-inspired trouble develops. We must have the ability to apply pressure with discrimination to protect our friends and do damage to the enemy.

We must be able to insure the freedom of the seas and control them if necessary. The attack carrier striking forces and our Marine amphibious forces are the Navy's major contribution.

The mobile air base, the attack aircraft carrier, is the heart of these task forces. It provides planes to fight over a beachhead or to strike at the sources of enemy seapower when required. These planes must be able to meet the best Soviet-built planes that we might encounter. This means that we must continue to provide our Navy with high-performance airplanes. These, in turn, will require aircraft carrier decks about the size of our U.S.S. *Forrestal* from which to operate.

So far, we have been getting along with a number of modified World War II carriers, but they are rapidly becoming obsolete and wearing out. Soon they will be over 20 years old.

They can handle modern naval aircraft only marginally when compared to our newer carriers. A continuing new construction program is mandatory. That is why we are asking for another *Forrestal* carrier in our budget for fiscal year 1960, and we need your support in this program.

Again I wish to say that the fine citizens of Nanticoke and post No. 290 of the Veterans of Foreign Wars are to be congratulated on the outstanding job you have done in promoting the observance of Loyalty Day.

I know that this first celebration of Loyalty Day is only the beginning of a ground swell of patriotic action that will make itself felt throughout the world.

I thank you.

Aid To Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD G. WOLF
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 11, 1959

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial appearing in the Des Moines Register entitled "Aid to Latin America."

We are all aware of our tenuous relations with the countries of Latin America. Because of our ineffective communication with the people of that area of the world, and our undue interest and support of dictatorships in Latin America we have betrayed our own heritage and the aspirations of the Latin American people. In the present review of our mutual security program I sincerely hope that it will be possible to aid the peoples of Latin America in a more rational and effective manner.

Clearly we are thinking in this direction. The Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs headed by our distinguished colleague, ARMISTEAD SELDEN, has just issued a report on U.S. relations with Latin America. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues. The Selden subcommittee calls for: first, a modified approach to Latin American dictators; second, increased reliance on the Organization of American States; third, revised military aid program with gradual reduction of military aid; fourth, encouragement of more nongovernmental people-to-people activities; fifth, expansion of binational center programs; and sixth, better and more sustained news coverage of Latin America through the mass media. I hope that steps will be undertaken by the Congress and the President to make the Selden committee recommendations the policy of the United States in Latin America.

[From the Des Moines Register, May 5, 1959]

AID TO LATIN AMERICA

Fidel Castro last week called for greatly increased American aid to Latin American countries in a speech at Buenos Aires, Argentina.

His speech was welcomed by many Latin American countries represented at the meeting of the Inter-American Committee of 21. They take the same view as Cuba's Prime Minister but haven't spoken out so bluntly.

The speech also brought a quick reaction from U.S. delegates to this meeting. They pointed out that the United States is making major contributions in aid to Latin American countries. They stressed that some Latin American countries are not doing enough to help themselves.

A new look at the question of aid to Latin America will be valuable. Castro's talk may bring this about.

Secrecy about the spending of foreign aid money makes it difficult to appraise U.S. policies. The Government regards the breakdown on what aid goes to individual countries as a military secret. Another reason for avoiding breakdowns on where aid goes is that this increases pressure from one country to get as much or more aid as another country.

The proposed mutual security program for the fiscal year 1960 calls for spending a total of $169 million in Latin America. This would be divided as follows: Military assistance, $96.4 million; special assistance, $27.6 million; technical cooperation, $45.2 million.

Castro argues that money used to supply arms to Latin American countries would be better spent for capital investment. We agree that a shift in the entire aid program from less spending for military aid to more emphasis on economic development programs is advisable.

But reexamination of spending for economic aid also is needed. Castro wants more money for capital investment by the Government of Cuba. The U.S. position is that Cuba's greatest need is to adopt policies which would encourage greater investment by private capital.

The United States is attempting to cooperate with Latin American countries in supplying governmental money for investment. It does this through the Inter-American Developmental Bank, the Export-Import Bank, the International Monetary Fund, and the Development Loan Fund.

Private investment in Latin America is heavy, too. Such investments in Latin America increased from $3 billion in 1946 to $8.8 billion by 1958. This investment represents 80 percent of the total foreign investment in Latin America and is the biggest concentration of U.S. private investment in any area of the world.

Some new proposals on foreign aid have been advanced recently which deserve consideration in considering the problem of helping Latin American countries.

Representative CHESTER BOWLES, Democrat, of Connecticut, believes foreign aid should be determined by a country's ability to make effective use of this aid, not by the extent of the Communist menace in the country. He doesn't think sizable economic aid should be granted unless the country has a sound economic program and is making a real effort on its own to solve its financial and economic problems. He would give technical assistance to countries that don't qualify for aid so that they can get in position to qualify for help.

The Wall Street Journal also calls for a new concept of foreign aid. It calls for "abandoning the idea that the U.S. Treasury is a cornucopia for any country just because it is undeveloped, or backward or in financial troubles or could use some U.S. dollars."

It says the United States should use some "precision in what kind of aid we give." The aid shouldn't be granted, it says, without a showing that it can be used profitably and that the country is willing to do its part. The result of such standards would be to turn from grants to loans and to approve specific projects rather than general programs.

The Wall Street Journal's position is interesting because it has in the past been generally hostile to the foreign aid program. Now it takes a more moderate position: it thinks it would be sheer nonsense to abandon all foreign aid but it calls for drastic reorganization of the present program.

We question if the way to do this is as the paper suggests: abolish the International Cooperation Administration and start from the beginning again. It thinks that is ad-

visable because it believes the ICA is top-heavy with bureaucracy and too much concerned about justifying its existence. The paper thinks policy decisions should be made by the State Department and Defense Department, rather than the ICA.

We do agree, however, that some reappraisal of the role of foreign aid is needed. And a good place to start is in the problem of what kind of aid to give to Latin American countries and what standards to apply in determining where this aid goes.

Resolutions Adopted by the Textile Workers Union of America, AFL–CIO

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 11, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the resolutions adopted by the international executive council of the Textile Workers Union of America, AFL–CIO, expressing their views on matters of interest to the labor movement and citizens of America:

RESOLUTION ON FEDERAL STANDARDS FOR UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

Textile workers have borne the brunt of the suffering caused by the decline of the textile industry in the United States. Hundreds of mills have been liquidated, displacing more than 200,000 workers since the war and leaving a train of misery and joblessness in their wake. It would be fitting that special provision be made to help meet the needs of these distressed workers. Instead, the present system of State-determined unemployment benefits actually discriminate against textile workers.

Unemployment benefits in textile States are generally lower than in nontextile States and the maximum durations of benefits are inadequate to tide textile workers over until they can find work. The textile States have demonstrated their inability or unwillingness to establish decent standards for unemployment compensation. It is time the Federal Government set such standards and put an end to the inequitable practice of providing the most niggardly unemployment benefits to those most in need.

The average weekly benefit paid for weeks of total unemployment was $26.70 in textile States in December 1958 compared to $30.41 in all States. In most textile States the average weekly benefit was less than $24. These pittances do not provide for even the basic necessities of life. They force the families of unemployed textile workers to resort to public or private charity for their means of survival.

The limited duration of benefits permitted by State laws has resulted in the exhaustion of benefit rights by some 2 million persons during the past year. In textile States the rate of benefit exhaustions is exceedingly high. During the first 8 months of 1958, more than 40 percent of the claimants exhausted their rights in Alabama, Virginia, and Tennessee. In Roanoke, Va., where a rayon plant employing 2,100 workers was closed last August, three-quarters of the displaced workers are still unemployed today and more than half had exhausted their unemployment compensation by late March.

The uneven impact of unemployment among the various States has drained the unemployment compensation reserves of the badly hit States. A Federal system of reinsurance is needed to pool the risks of unemployment throughout the Nation.

The Karsten-Machrowicz bill (H.R. 3547) would establish Federal standards which are imperative if the State unemployment compensation laws are to accomplish the purpose of a genuine unemployment insurance system. The maximum benefit in each State would be half the individual worker's weekly wage, up to two-thirds of the State average weekly wage. A uniform maximum duration of 39 weeks would be provided by all States. Federal funds would be used to reinsure reserves of States whose funds have been depleted by high rates of unemployment.

The action of the House Ways and Means Committee in rejecting the Karsten-Machrowicz bill in favor of an increase in the unemployment insurance tax rate with no increase in benefits is a betrayal of the committee's responsibility. This action must be reversed by the Congress: Therefore be it

Resolved by the executive council of the Textile Workers Union of America, ALF–CIO, That we call upon the Congress to enact the Karsten-Macrowicz bill to provide an American standard of unemployment compensation benefits. Only Federal standards can preserve the dignity and self-respect of American workers during periods of unemployment.

Adopted April 29, 1959.

RESOLUTION ON AMENDMENTS TO FLSA

While productivity is constantly on the rise, our economy has been slowed down in one major respect by Federal minimum wage standards which are woefully inadequate.

The current $1-an-hour Federal minimum wage was too low even when it was first adopted in 1956. Events since that time have rendered that section of the Fair Labor Standards Act completely obsolete.

There has been a steady rise in the cost of living, on one hand, and a significant rise in the national wage level, on the other. Underlining the trend toward higher pay is the fact that a $1.25 minimum has now been generally established in the textile industry, north and south alike. This development is another compelling reason for the adoption of a new Federal minimum wage of $1.25 an hour.

There is still many islands of substandard pay in our Nation. In Gaston County, N.C., for example, some 25,000 textile yarn workers still receive an average wage of only a penny or two above the $1 legal minimum. In northwest Georgia's chenille industry, few workers receive more than the $1 minimum and there are grounds for suspicion that even that standard is being violated in many plants.

These workers and many others in similar situations are desperately in need of the guarantee of a $1.25 hourly Federal minimum. Moreover, there are still some 20 million wage earners who are unprotected by the law and do not even enjoy the guarantee of the present $1 minimum.

Despite the crying need of millions of American workers for a $1.25 minimum and extended coverage under the Fair Labor Standards Act, the House Committee on Education and Labor—even at this late date—has failed to fix hearings on legislation to remedy this situation. The only ray of hope evident so far is the fact that a Senate Labor and Public Welfare subcommittee has agreed to hold hearings on FLSA improvements May 5.

This situation clearly calls for renewed efforts to stir action on such legislation: Therefore be it

Resolved by the executive council of the Textile Workers Union of America, AFL–CIO, That—

1. We condemn the failure of the House Committee on Education and Labor to fix hearings on FLSA improvements and call upon all liberals in the House of Representatives to press for quick action in this field.

2. We call upon all local unions, joint boards and rank-and-file members of TWUA to intensify their efforts in behalf of these FLSA improvements which are so essential to the elimination of grinding poverty among textile workers and to the stabilization of the textile industry.

3. We commend the joint AFL–CIO minimum wage committee and the citizens committee on the Fair Labor Standards Act for the outstanding work they are performing in educating the public on this subject.

Adopted April 30, 1959.

RESOLUTION ON THE KENNEDY-ERVIN BILL

The executive council of the Textile Workers Union of America, AFL–CIO, reemphasizes the fact that, despite the disclosures of corruption in a handful of trade unions, not a single finger of suspicion has been leveled at our union or at the overwhelming majority of American labor organizations. Nevertheless we, too, were sickened by these revelations of misconduct.

Like the AFL–CIO, we adopted a code of ethics to insure the continuance of honest practices and the maintenance of democracy in our organization, notwithstanding the fact that this problem did not exist in our ranks.

Moreover, we joined with the AFL–CIO in supporting some legislation over and above the requirements of our code. And although the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee reported out a bill which went beyond the mere issue of cleansing unions of corruption and entered the arena of weakening trade unions in collective bargaining, we were prepared to support such legislation even though we considered some portions unwarranted.

However, a host of amendments to the original bill by antilabor Senators and by the Republican administration, has radically changed the character of that legislation and poses a sinister threat to the existence of the labor movement. These amendments serve to restrict further labor's rights to organize the unorganized and to obtain economic improvements in behalf of American workers.

Although more reasonable Senators have succeeded in modifying some of these proposals, this does not overcome in any way the fact that the Kennedy-Ervin bill in its present form seriously curtails labor's basic rights. We are shocked by this development and we must conclude that the McClellan exposures are being used only for the purpose of weakening and destroying organized labor in America.

For example, the restrictions and limitations on the activity of local union officials, and the requirements for detailed and multitudinous reports on pain of jail or fine, will discourage rank-and-file workers from accepting local union offices, most of which involve no compensation. As a result, they will destroy the availability of local leadership, without which the labor movement cannot continue to function.

Although we are aware that the bill contains some long-overdue amendments to the Taft-Hartley Act which call for prehearing elections and restore the right of economic strikers to vote in representation elections, these are merely sweeteners for the bitter pill which the remainder of this legislation contains.

Because, as a whole, it is detrimental and injurious to organized labor and foreign to

the problem of trade-union corruption, we condemn the present version of the Kennedy-Ervin bill and urge the House of Representatives delete these objectionable amendments from the legislation it is about to consider.

Adopted, April 29, 1959.

The Omaha Alcohol Plant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE BROCK
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 11, 1959

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, on January 7, this year, I introduced in this House my bill, H.R. 2970, which would provide for the increased use of agricultural products for industrial uses. The opportunity has now come to implement such proposal into legislative action and ultimate material gain, by reducing the accumulated agricultural surpluses in certain commodities with some of the means we have at hand. I refer you to the Omaha alcohol plant, which has been listed for sale by the General Services Administration. The Nebraska Legislature has recognized the value of this plant, as an immediate existing facility to carry out the aims of H.R. 2970. Accordingly, the Nebraska Legislature has memorialized the Congress, and the General Services Administration, in protest against this proposed sale, or the sale of any other existing Government facility, until such time as the Congress has the opportunity to consider and enact legislation to utilize such facilities to implement the provisions of H.R. 2970, or similar legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely believe that such action will be in the prime interest of economy and will do much toward reduction in our fiscal year budgets and the national debt, by elimination of a substantial portion of expenditures for purchase and storage of agricultural surpluses.

May I further extend my remarks and include the resolution of the Nebraska Legislature in today's proceedings of the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

LEGISLATIVE RESOLUTION 31, LEGISLATURE OF NEBRASKA, 69TH SESSION

"Whereas agriculture is the basic industry in Nebraska; and

"Whereas one of the major problems facing agriculture, the State, and the Nation is the practical and economic disposal of the abundant production brought about by increased efficiency and technological advance of farm and ranch operations; and

"Whereas there are various proposals now pending in the Congress of the United States to promote a greater usage of farm products in industry; and

"Whereas these proposals call for greatly expanded programs of research in this field with experimental operation of pilot plants and facilities; and

"Whereas such legislative proposals have broad bipartisan support and hold a promise of a solution for disposal of farm surpluses and improvement of farm income; and

"Whereas these proposals also call for lease to private individuals or corporations of present Government-owned facilities which might be used in such programs of research and utilization; and

"Whereas one such plant is located in Omaha, Nebr., close to ample supplies of surplus grain with excellent transportation facilities, water supply, and labor resources: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the members of the Nebraska Legislature in 69th session assembled.—

"1. We memorialize the General Services Administration of the United States that we protest any sale or disposal of the Omaha alcohol plant or any such similar plant prior to possible usage development for such plant under legislation now pending or being considered by the Congress of the United States or which might be introduced which legislation has for its purpose an expanded program of industrial usage for agricultural products.

"2. That a copy of this resolution suitably engrossed be sent to the General Services Administration and to each Member from Nebraska in the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States.

"DWIGHT W. BURNEY,
"President of the Legislature."

I, Hugo F. Srb, hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of Legislative Resolution 31, which was passed by the Legislature of Nebraska in 69th regular session on the 4th day of May 1959.

HUGO F. SRB,
Clerk of the Legislature.

Poison in Your Water—No. 74

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 11, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the Aurora (Ill.) Beacon-News of June 27, 1958, entitled "Testimony Reveals Fox River Pollution":

TESTIMONY REVEALS FOX RIVER POLLUTION—FORDON PARK DEVELOPER ASKS COURT RULING AGAINST SANITARY DISTRICT

Pollution of the Fox River became an issue Thursday in testimony taken by Circuit Judge Charles G. Seidel in a suit brought by Fordon Park Developer William H. Ruth against the Aurora Sanitary District.

Ruth hopes to force the sanitary district to serve his 435-acre subdivision. The district, on the other hand, has refused to add the sewage to already overcrowded sewer lines on the west side. It seeks instruction from the court, particularly in view of the $3,800,000 bond issue for new lines defeated by Aurora voters last December.

The question of how much the sewage treatment system pollutes the river was injected by Richard S. Nelle, chief sanitary engineer of the State sanitary and water board, who testified.

The hearing will continue Tuesday at 1:30 p.m., at Geneva.

Nelle said the Aurora plant frequently bypasses millions of gallons of highly dilute, but untreated sewage into the Fox River.

"There's no question but that this pollutes the Fox River," he said. He added that this is a real danger to public health.

Nelle's testimony was buttressed by that of Supt. Walter A. Sperry, Sr., of the treatment plant who conceded that on some days in each month from 10 to 40 million gallons of overflow goes directly into the Fox from sanitary district bypasses.

Nelle said this condition could be corrected by addition to the plant, and expansion of the sewer line system.

Ruth's suit asks for a declaratory judgment by the circuit court to force the sewer district to accept the Fordon flow. He charges the sanitary district refused to take it, since its lines on the west side already carry too much.

Ruth was the first to testify. He was interrogated by his attorney, Martin L. Overman of Glenn Ellyn. Ruth asserted he has paid taxes into the district's maintenance fund as a property owner. He said the Fordon Park development includes 1,195 building lots, as well as land for a shopping center and 3 churches.

It was further established that Ruth proposed to connect sanitary sewers from his project to an interceptor at Garfield Avenue and Westlawn Avenue but that this was not feasible because the facility was constructed by special assessment and such connection would be an encroachment on this special assessment.

Attorney Robert E. Dolph, counsel for the sanitary district pointed out that Ruth had been given the district's permission to connect some 65 homes to the interceptor at Illinois Avenue but other permits were denied because they were for homes that were on the west side, or backside of the Fox River Valley watershed. The permits granted were on the east, or fall side of the same watershed and could be handled by gravity.

Ruth testified that since December 30, 1957, when he became owner of the Fordon Park area, he has expended about $500,000. He said, too, that he had met with the sanitary board of trustees and understood, at a meeting held earlier this year, that an interceptor running from the sewage disposal plant south of Aurora to the Blackberry watershed, some 2,000 feet west of the Fordon Park area, thence running north to North Aurora and thence east along Butterfield Road to Marywood, was being contemplated.

Attorney Dolph pointed out to the court that on December 17, 1957, a bond issue of $3,800,000 for the purpose of enhancing and increasing the sanitary district facilities was turned down by the electorate and the system was already taxed almost to capacity and, at some seasons, beyond capacity.

Uniform Milk Sanitation Code Needed for Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 10, 1959

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, it would be difficult, if not impossible, to conduct the business of the House of Representatives under one set of rules on Monday, a second code on Tuesday, and still a different procedure on Wednesday. Confusion and chaos would be the inevitable result, and it would not be long before every Member demanded the adoption of a single body of rules to cover every session.

Fortunately, we have but one set of rules. But the example illustrates the confusion that exists today in the American dairy industry. Although it

is quite feasible for a dairy to ship milk anywhere in the country, such commerce is hampered by the myriad of conflicting State and city milk sanitation codes that have developed through the years.

It is not unheard of, for instance, for the manager of a Wisconsin dairy to have to be under 10 different sanitation codes. Far from seeking to improve health standards, many local sanitation codes exist to restrict competition from outside daries. Such codes are actually trade barriers in the disguise of sanitation standards—and nothing more.

So to the confusion and waste that result from the current pattern of multiple standards is added the curse of monopolistic trade practices and the higher consumer costs they create.

The remedy for these dairy industry ills is, quite obviously, a uniform national standard for milk sanitation. To accomplish this goal, my distinguished colleague from Wisconsin, LESTER JOHNSON, has developed and introduced H.R. 3840 which would establish the U.S. Milk Ordnance and Code as the single standard for fluid milk and fluid milk products shipped in interstate commerce. I am proud to have cosponsored this measure.

In addition, H.R. 3840 will topple the restrictive trade barriers that have grown up as the result of the multiplicity of State and local codes and thus allow all the milk-consuming public to purchase first quality milk at reasonable prices. Adoption of a uniform national standard will simplify sanitation code enforcement and compliance, and that means savings to taxpayers, farmers, and consumers.

Mr. Speaker, both farmer and consumer stand to gain much by the passage of this bill to set a uniform, national standard for milk sanitation. I hope that the House will act on H.R. 3840 quickly and favorably.

"Fidel Castro: Rebel, Liberator or Dictator?"—The Critics Review Jules Dubois' New Book—3

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 4, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following book reviews which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor and the Saturday Review:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Apr. 8, 1959]

FROM THE BOOKSHELF: CASTRO AND CUBA

(By Bertram B. Johansson)

"Fidel Castro: Rebel, Liberator or Dictator?" by Jules Dubois.

Even before publication, this volume on Cuba's revolutionary hero, Fidel Castro, now Prime Minister, had hung up several publishing records.

It was only hours after Fulgencio Batista's dictatorship fell on January 1 of this year and Major Castro marched triumphantly into Havana that Bobbs-Merrill began negotiating for a seasoned writer on the Cuban upheaval.

They contracted with Jules Dubois, veteran Latin American correspondent of the Chicago Tribune, to write the book.

With the help of a staff and a Bobbs-Merrill editor who flew to Cuba, Dubois produced the volume in 20 working days. In less than 3 months, the book was ready for the public.

Such a feat might wreck any literary piece of this length. It has not. In effect, Mr. Dubois has been writing this book for the last 12 years of his considerable experience in the Latin American field.

He has perhaps one of the most comprehensive files on Dr. Castro and the Caribbean area, knows the Premier intimately, and has ben granted access to many papers and secret court trials of the rebel leader which have never before been made public. Mr. Dubois helicoptered out to the Sierra Maestra area for the first news interview with the rebel leader after his victory over Batista.

Though there are some evidences of haste, the book nevertheless will perform the valuable function of placing before the public the first background material on the meaningful events of the last several years in Cuba.

Throughout the book, Mr. Dubois quotes Premier Castro at length, sometimes for pages. Though the ideals and thoughts expressed in these long proclamations, speeches, and letters do, in themselves, provide valuable material and insights for the reader, they slow down the pace of the narrative. It might have been better if the writer had extracted the quintessence of them and then included them in an appedix.

Aside from this drawback for the average reader (the student of Cuban affairs will find these long stretches extremely interesting) the book is rich with new material.

Because Cuba was held so rigidly under censorship during the Batista regime, insufficient information on the callous corruption, the incredible atrocities, and the extent of persecutions, had been provided for the American public.

As a result, North Americans have not been able to interpret with understanding the Cuban independence movement which had the wide support of all classes, from the lowest peasant to the richest plantation owners.

The Dubois book will bring about more needful understanding of the Cuban problem. It begins to place in perspective the atrocities permitted during the Batista regime. There are estimates now that as many as 20,000 Cubans were killed in that reign of terror.

Mr. Dubois' accounts of the last hours of the Batista government before it fell make fascinating reading. There are many details given here of the furtive preparations for the Batista flight that have never before been published.

Another rich section of the book is that which deals with the life of the Castro rebels in the Sierra Maestra region and the final military campaigns. Mr. Dubois took part on many occasions in that rought and ready outdoor living when he went up into the mountain fastnesses to live with the rebels and obtain his many interviews.

While the book is generally pro-Castro in its thrust, because it deals with his eminently successful military revolution against the Batista dictatorship, Mr. Dubois does not predict what might become the final judgment onthe Castro career.

The events of the next few months and years, and how Premier Castro and his cabinet approach Cuba's economic problems will more likely provide that judgment of history, though Premier Castro's reputation for strategic and tactical acumen is quite secure.

[From the Saturday Review, Apr. 4, 1959]

TOP COMMANDO OF THE CUBAN COUP

("Fidel Castro: Rebel, Liberator or Dictator?" by Jules Dubois, leaves unanswered the question posed in the subtitle of this biography of the new Latin American strong man, but it does throw light on a blistered situation. Reporter for CBS News, Blaine Littell covered the Cuban post-revolutionary period.)

(By Blaine Litell)

Jules Dubois has produced the first English language account of Fidel Castro's revolution in Cuba. As the Chicago Tribune's Latin American correspondent, Mr. Dubois is perhaps the only reporter who could have undertaken this lightning task. He first met Castro in 1947 and has covered the Cuban political scene extensively ever since. After the revolution had been won and Bastista had fled, North American correspondents had a difficult time trying to make sense of the electric, sleepless, and confusing days. However, of all the reporters about, Mr. Dubois was quickly identified and sought out as one of the few who really knew what was going on.

Thus, when Mr. Dubois set out to write this book he had his facts in hand. The book is full of them—names, dates, and faithful, unabridged translations of many of the letters, radio broadcasts, speeches, and manifestos that issued from the prolific pen of Fidel Castro. In the eyes of American reporters, Castro's marathon speeches and 5-hour news conferences needed editing. And so, for that matter, does Mr. Dubois. He has assembled his facts chronologically but he has not weeded out the ones that lead nowhere (and recent Cuban history is full of these); nor has he stitched the important and meaningful events together in such a way as to make clear why it finally became possible for Castro, who started with nothing, to triumph over Batista, who started with everything.

Perhaps it is too soon for anyone to answer the questions posed in the book's title. But there are clues to Cuba's future course, and Castro's own words and actions, as transcribed by Mr. Dubois, provide many of them.

The pattern of Castro's revolution was set in its early days. After invading Cuba by sea in December 1956, Castro and a small band of followers headed for the Sierra Maestra.

"When we arrived at the Sierra Maestra," Castro told the author, "we executed a ranch foreman who had accused tenant farmers and peasants of being pro-rebel, and who had increased the holdings of his landlord from 10 acres to 400 acres by taking the land of those he denounced. So we tried him and executed him and won the affection of the peasants."

This statement helps as much as any to illustrate Castro's capacity for sizing up a situation and taking direct, if harsh, action. It also demonstrates Castro's sense of public relations since to have shown leniency during a period of Batista-inspired terrorism would have been taken by the Cuban people as a sign of weakness. Castro, himself, seldom employed terror as a weapon. As a matter of fact, he was scrupulously fair in his treatment of those who, in his opinion, were fighting him honorably.

To most Americans, Castro was a distant, shadowy, and somewhat romantic figure until he won. Then, all too swiftly, he landed on the front pages as a fist-shaking anti-American calling for vengeance. If we concluded that he was a dangerous hothead, it is Mr. Dubois' contention that we were judging Castro out of context. Castro and what

he stands for were not conceived overnight but emerged slowly and logically. Mr. Dubois also makes clear that Castro's attitude toward the United States might have been entirely different if we had played another kind of diplomatic game in Cuba. But, instead, we gave Batista arms, which he used against the rebels, and our military missions trained his soldiers. Thus, both diplomatically and militarily, we were backing a dictator against a self-proclaimed democrat and this, quite naturally, angered and continues to anger Castro.

It is the author's conclusion that if Castro has failed to understand our behavior, it is not entirely his fault, and if we have failed to understand him, that, too, is not his fault.

Newspaper Boy Values

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 11, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, for the past 18 years the Boston Daily Record-American and Sunday Advertiser—Hearst newspaper—have sponsored a radio program known as the "Boston Daily Record-American and Sunday Advertiser Newspaper Boys Radio Show." This program is intended primarily to give youngsters who sell newspapers an opportunity to develop their talents and to focus the attention of the people on other activities of these boys, whose only contact with the public is as a newsboy on the corner or in the delivery of newspapers to the homes of their customers. Throughout the years men and women in business, finance, and politics, and other walks of human activity have been invited to make remarks appropriate to such a program, which program is now under the direction of C. Mungie, and assisted by Thomas Grahman, circulation director of the Boston Daily Record-American and Sunday Advertiser.

I was invited to participate in this program on April 27, 1959. It was a pleasure for me to participate in this program which is constructive in nature and productive in excellent results. In my extension I include the remarks that I made on the Newspaper Boys radio show on April 27, 1959:

[From the Boston Daily Record, Apr. 27, 1959]

NEWSPAPERBOY VALUES TOLD BY MCCORMACK

(By Tommy Shulman)

Congressman JOHN W. MCCORMACK, majority leader of the U.S. House of Representatives, praised newspaperboys on the Newspaperboys' Radio Show Sunday morning at 9:30 over NBC's WEZE. We are pleased to publish Congressman MCCORMACK's radio address:

"I am very happy to appear on the Boston Daily Record and American-Sunday Advertiser Newspaperboys Radio Show. Newspaperboys have always held a spot close to my heart. Busy boys who are devoting their spare time to learning and earning.

"Most gratifying to me is the knowledge that the only newspaperboys regular weekly program in the country originates in my congressional district. Many times have I heard the praises of your songs, fine instrumental music, educational and patriotic dramas.

"BECOME SUCCESSFUL MEN

"I assure you that well deserving is the nationwide recognition and the many citations and awards that have been bestowed upon this program.

"For every newspaperboy is a businessman. He is a builder—the size of his route—or the sale of his papers depends a great deal on his ability, his determination and his personality.

"I have never known a newspaperboy who has not been a success. We find the newspaperboys of my days now professional men, leading businessmen. We find them in the arts and the sciences, that is due to the fact that in their early years, they had the determination to go ahead, in a sense to be a Horatio Alger and with that determination, they built themselves, studied, educated themselves and took the journey of life into higher positions of responsibility, enjoying also a position of confidence and respect in the minds of their fellow men.

"WIDE RECOGNITION

"As I have said, I have never known a newspaperboy who was not a success. I have never known one who was not a leader in his community. I feel it would be fitting and proper that your fine Record, American and Sunday Advertiser newspaperboys program, be recognized as widely as possible and I intend to see that this is called to the attention of my colleagues in Congress.

"The newspaperboys of today, like those of yesterday, typify the real American boys with the interest of God, the interest for his Nation and his family at heart. Many of you boys, newspaperboys of today but leading citizens of tomorrow, will inherit the responsibility of guiding the destiny of our great country.

"I have never known a newspaperboy who did not love his mother and his father or who failed to make contributions to his family, turning in his earnings to his mother in order to enable her and his father to keep the family going. I have seen so many of them myself when I was a youngster and they all made good.

"With such boys as these destined to assume the responsibilities of the future, I have no misgivings for the welfare and the national interest of our country."

Remarks of Lt. Gov. Malcolm Wilson, of New York, at Franciscan Brothers Centennial Dinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. DORN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include excerpts from remarks of the distinguished Lt. Gov. Malcolm Wilson, of New York, at Franciscan Brothers centennial dinner at Hotel St. George, Brooklyn, N.Y., Tuesday, May 5, 1959, as follows:

Tonight we mark the end of one century since the third order regular of St. Francis accepted the invitation of Bishop John Loughlin to send some of its brothers from Ireland to help him establish a parish school system in the newly created Diocese of Brooklyn, for it was in May of 1858 that Brother John McMahon and Brother Vincent Hayes from Roundstone Monastery arrived in this city. Here, having courageously faced and overcome the inevitable difficulties of starting a new project, they, with the assistance of three lay teachers, opened St. Francis Academy at 300 Baltic Street—the first private Catholic secondary school in the Diocese of Brooklyn.

The Brooklyn Franciscan Brothers owe much to their Irish heritage. From the Irish congregation, steeped as they were in the traditions of the "Isle of Saints and Scholars"—traditions which they had helped in great measure to build—came not only the first founders of the Brooklyn order, but its leaders for many, many years.

Tonight is an occasion for rejoicing and for giving of sincere thanks on the part of the people of Brooklyn—yes, and of all the State, too—for what this hundred years since the advent of the Franciscan Brothers has meant to them; the young souls that have been trained in the Brothers' skillful hands, the hearts that have been turned to God, the minds that have been opened to the wonders of eternal truth.

Surely a century is a long span, but to find the inspiration which is still guiding these men, we must cast our minds back even 600 years further—and from a fevered modern life—from our age avidly thirsting for peace and serenity, we come as to a cooling draught to the simple little saint in whose footsteps these brothers follow, to the man who has made such a tremendous impact on the human heart.

Today, in a world torn apart with hatred, filled with the insufferable arrogance that is man without God, we turn with deep nostalgia to look at the humble, simple and—above all—happy St. Francis of Assisi. Through the corridors of time his voice reaches us tonight filled with laughter and with singing—always with singing—because his heart was so filled with love for his Creator and with love for every fellow creature that it had either to overflow in music—or to break.

In penetrating the heavy shadows of those centuries to the time when St. Francis founded his order, it must not be surprising to us that Pope Innocent III hesitated before he gave sanction to so novel an experiment as was Francis' idea of gathering a group around him to make the effort to live—quite literally—by the Sermon on the Mount. For the church even then was old, and had been sorely tried, and the Holy Father had no way of knowing that this little poor man of Assisi was initiating a movement that would rejuvenate Christianity to its marrow.

And how better could even Christianity have had a new birth than in a song of love? And the singing is what is inseparable from St. Francis. He even exhorted his followers: Yes, be modest, mild, humble, friendly—do the Lord's work in many fields. But above all, be cheerful—be glad in the Lord.

I am frank enough to admit that I would not have the courage to follow Francis today—but surely the need for him and everything for which he stood is deeply felt. As Paul Gallico said in his magnificent essay on St. Francis, "The higher the civilization, the more brash and insufferable the arrogances, the dearer the longing for the simplicity, peace and humility of which he was capable. For it is recorded that after he had stripped himself of everything he had—the last shred of clothing, the shoes from his feet, the staff from his hand, the food from his lips—when he had learned to sleep out in the chilling rain with a stone for a pillow, when he could sell even the book of Scriptures that nour-

ished him spiritually to provide bread for a woman in distress—then it was that this great creative artist of the world's most beautiful poem of living wrote the climax of his farewell to earthly pride, for he shed even the last remaining arrogance, the arrogance of poverty and humility. "Take no pride of your voluntary poverty" he counsels the Brothers, "for behold, there is a beggar even more ragged, miserable and theradbare than you, and you are in debt to him for everything you have."

Gradually in the century after the death of Francis, his followers came to Ireland, and by the 15th century had established 50 monasteries. During the Protestant revolt these monastery schools were destroyed and many of their inhabitants martyred. But even this did not stifle in the hearts of those who were left the burning desire to teach youth. Having no place else to turn, many of them became hedge-masters, so called because they secretly taught the Irish children, often behind hedges, in opposition to the English law. To these men belongs in great measure the credit for keeping aglow in the small white huts of Ireland, the light of culture—and for keeping alive in young hearts a thirst for knowledge which today these Brothers whom we salute here tonight continue to spend their lives in quenching.

With the passage of the Catholic Emancipation Act in 1829, circumstances were eased—and the Brothers continued the vital work of teaching youth and instructing young and old in their faith. At that time began the tradition among the Franciscan Brothers which has lasted to the present day—namely, an emphasis on teaching in parish schools and in Christian doctrine classes, today known as the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine.

It has been testified time and again by the clergy of Ireland that the Catholic faith was preserved in Galway by the efforts of the Franciscan Brothers. It was the great Archbishop McHale of sainted memory who praised their schools where, as he put it, "Children, besides receiving the rudiments of learning, are deeply embedded with the principles of faith and morality and are taught that which is most valuable in education—to become honest citizens."

It was from this great Irish order then that 100 years ago this month came two Franciscan Brothers to the Diocese of Brooklyn. From their Irish confreres they brought and have handed down through the years a devotion to the Franciscan approach to education, to humility, obscurity and a love for the education of the young. The Irish Brothers have imparted to their successors here an ideal of training young people who will serve well their faith, their country and themselves.

St. Francis Academy, the first school opened by the Franciscan Brothers of Brooklyn, has developed now into two noted educational institutions: St. Francis Preparatory School and St. Francis College, both of which have played an important part in the history and growth of Brooklyn—where, in addition to providing free or inexpensive higher education to many of the young men of the area, a substantial number of priests of the diocese have received their initial training.

Since their arrival from Ireland in 1858, these Franciscan Brothers have operated in the Diocese of Brooklyn 10 educational institutions of their own, one orphanage, and 25 parish schools. In additional, they have conducted 3 summer camps and many Confraternities of Christian Doctrine.

In the 20th century the Brothers have undertaken eight new parish schools in the Diocese of Brooklyn. In 1957, just prior to the centennial year, two new foundations were made at Notre Dame Parish in New Hyde Park and St. Aidan Parish in Williston Park. During the centenary, a new school and friary were also opened in Our Lady of the Angels.

Their century of labor in the elementary schools of the Catholic Church represents substantial donated service to the people of this community. Their contribution to the establishment of the system of Catholic schools in the diocese of Brooklyn is a monument to the resourcefulness and perseverence of the Franciscan Brothers. The words of his holiness, Pope Pius IX, in his encyclical on the Christian education of youth can be fittingly applied to the Franciscan Brothers of Brooklyn: "Perfect schools are the result not so much of good methods as of good teachers; teachers who are thoroughly prepared and are well grounded in the matter they have to teach, who possess the intellectual and moral qualifications required by their important office, who cherish pure and holy love for the youth confided to them."

In closing, we salute again these teaching troubadours of Christ. We are singularly fortunate that they generously answered Bishop Loughlin's plea for help those many years ago. For, as a man with a better flair for words than I has put it, "fools can make wars and lead the world to slaughter; scientific learning has catapulted us into space and elbowed its way through the firmament of a hundred billion light years closer to God's throne, but not one single, split second nearer to Him in spirit. Soldiers, statesmen, and conquerors catch the eye and the intellect, but the lovers of God capture our hearts."

For all the world loves a lover and the happy little Saint and his followers have had an irresistible appeal for all men, from the days when he walked in the way of the Lord until tonight when we felicitate his brothers gathered here. Yet let no one think that because there is a smile and a song on their lips there is not in their souls the tempered steel that makes the perfect soldiers of Christ. For when St. Francis cheerfully donned the uniform of Lady Poverty, as Chesterton said: "The servants of God that had been a besieged garrison became a marching army; the ways of the world were filled as with thunder with the trample of their feet; and far ahead of that ever swelling throng went a little man singing—as simply as he had sung that morning in the winter woods, when he walked alone."

From grateful hearts we say to these wonderful Franciscan Brothers—ad multos annos.

Benson's Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. R. GROSS
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 11, 1959

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I offer for reprinting in the RECORD, an excellent editorial from the Reinbeck (Iowa) Courier whose publisher, Mr. LeRoy Moser, is one of the veteran weekly nswspapermen in our great agricultural State. The editorial follows:

The House Committee on Agriculture, after a series of hearings involving the Department of Agriculture, headed by Ezra Benson, has reduced the information to a few important, summarized sentences. They are quite an insight into the conduct of the Department of Agriculture by Mr. Benson, and refute just about every favorable thing that has been said about the Secretary. Neither the farmer, the consumer, nor the taxpayer can be very happy with the statistics.

Here are some of the most important:

The farmer's gross income was $15.3 billion in 1952; it was $13.1 billion in 1958.

In 1951 the Agriculture Department's annual budget was $1 billion; in 1960 the budget has been set at $6.7 billion.

Four million people have left the American farm in the past 6 years.

The purchasing power of farm prices is the lowest in 18 years.

The actual spending by the Department of Agriculture is now 56 percent of the total net income of American farmers.

In 1953 the Department of Agriculture had what Benson termed a "swoolen bureaucracy" of 67,406 employees; as of last November the Department now has 89,464 employees, an increase of 32 percent, and slated to be 98,487 by next June.

Benson's own office expenses were $2.1 million in 1953; they are budgeted at $2.8 million this coming year.

The above facts simply illustrate one basic fact. Benson has not reduced surplus, expenses, employees or food prices in any way. He has reduced the farmer's income.

He is still unable to understand that lower support prices are no key to a balanced agricultural economy. The plain fact is that the lower the price the more the farmer produces in a struggle to survive.

In January 1953, when Benson took office, crop surpluses held by the Government were inventoried at $1.1 billion. The estimate for next June 30 is $6.8 billion.

Benson still insists as he has from the beginning that the best and surest way to reduce farm surpluses is to lower the price. Farmers, he seems to believe, will quit raising so much corn, oats and beans if the price is made low enough to discourage heavy production. He has carried out that belief during the past 6 years with lower price supports and the result is a surplus six times as high as it was when Benson took over the Agricultural Department. And still Benson believes that he is right. And the strange part of it is that the President and many others, even some farm leaders, agree with him.

A Filipino Expresses His Gratitude

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 29, 1959

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert the text of a letter addressed to my good friend Max Abelman of Brooklyn. This letter is from a doctor in the Philippines whom Mr. Abelman had helped get into the Jewish Hospital in Brooklyn where he served his internship. It is an expression of gratitude to an American for his humanitarian deeds. At the request of Mr. Abelman, I hereby insert this letter:

DAGUPAN COLLEGES.
Dagupan City, Philippines,
March 12, 1959.

MR. MAX ABELMAN,
Brooklyn, N.Y.

DEAR MAX: I have shown your letter to the members of the family and they have expressed their strong admiration and sincere

appreciation for all the kind thoughts you have extended not only to Bernice and myself but also to the dolos Santoses and the many Filipinos. Your spirit of humantarian service to all but particularly among the Filipinos have no equal and certainly has embedded deeply in our hearts. You have helped not only the Filipinos but also the Europeans and some Americans as well. Your bigheartedness has been expressed and manifested in leaps and bounds and without limit. You have done all these things at the sacrifice of your health, at times, including your dignity. There is no better way of expressing our sentiments than to say once again as your very good friend the Hon. Carlos P. Romulo has said, that "you are not only one of the typical Tom, Dick, and Harry who are the plain, simple and bighearted Americans but you are Max, Brooklyn's Ambassador of Goodwill." In addition, allow me to call you the "Philippine Ambassador of Brooklyn."

Dr. BLAS O. RAYOS, Jr.

Lausche, Feighan Act To Save Ellis Island

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 16, 1959

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I am gratified that my proposal to establish Ellis Island as a national shrine has received such spontaneous support from one of the Nation's outstanding newspapers, the Cleveland Plain Dealer.

Under leave granted, I am inserting in the Appendix of today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent article which appeared in the Cleveland Plain Dealer, May 8, by Alvin Silverman, and an editorial which appeared in the Cleveland Plain Dealer Sunday, May 10, titled "To Save Ellis Island":

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer, May 8, 1959]

LAUSCHE, FEIGHAN ACT TO SAVE ELLIS ISLAND

(By Alvin Silverman)

WASHINGTON, May 7.—U.S. Senator FRANK J. LAUSCHE, Democrat, of Ohio, and Congressman MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN, Democrat, of Cleveland, today launched an 11-hour move to stop the sale of Ellis Island to a private bidder.

Acting independently, the two were motivated by the same desire—to preserve as a public domain the historic shrine which so many thousands passed on their way from foreign shores to outstanding American citizenship.

Time was a critical factor. The General Services Administration is scheduled to act upon bids for disposal of the 27-acre former immigration center in New York Harbor by 5 p.m. Friday.

LAUSCHE, FEIGHAN and at least one organized group have different ideas about what should be done with the "front door to freedom." But all agreed that first the sale must be stopped.

PHONES GSA CHIEF

LAUSCHE telephoned and then wrote a letter to Franklin G. Floete, General Services administrator.

"I believe Mr. Floete will hold up action," the Senator said tonight.

FEIGHAN went right to the top. He sent a telegram to President Eisenhower. His message said:

"I respectfully urge you to exercise executive authority directing General Services Administrator Floete forthwith to postpone and cancel the sale of Ellis Island, which is due to be consummated May 8 at 5 p.m.

"Ellis Island was the port of entry of close to 2 million immigrants, whose descendants today number at least one-tenth of our present population.

"To these 20 million Americans, Ellis Island is their Plymouth Rock.

"On Monday, May 11, I plan to introduce legislation in the House of Representatives proposing the establishment of Ellis Island as a national shrine administered by the Smithsonian Institution.

"It would contain exhibits of early immigrant life—complete microfilm records of all immigrants.

"My legislation also will propose that the Statue of Liberty ferry from the New York City Battery be rerouted to include a stop at Ellis Island.

"Establishment of Ellis Island as a national shrine will forever complement the Statue of Liberty. Both epitomize freedom and individual liberty to the world.

"I am inviting Members of the Senate and House Subcommittees on Immigration and Naturalization to join with me in cosponsoring this bill."

GROUP SEEKS ISLAND FOR TRAINING CENTER

As LAUSCHE and FEIGHAN swung into action, a group of businessmen and scholars had joined in an effort to turn Ellis Island into an international training center for Americans assigned abroad.

Several American corporations have indicated their interest in the cultural institute plan which is championed by William M. Brennan, New York management consultant and Dr. Frederick Burkhardt, president of the American Council of Learned Societies.

Senator LAUSCHE wrote Administrator Floete, following their telephone conversation.

"My attention has been called to the fact that you are now considering bids for the sale of historic Ellis Island and that by 5 p.m. Friday, May 8, you will have to act upon the bids.

"I learn that Mr. William M. Brennan of New York is advocating that the island be acquired by a nonprofit international institute for use in training of American employees and their families prior to leaving for foreign service assignments.

"The particular land for which the highest bidder, the Atlas-Buffalo, Inc., of Yonkers, N.Y., has offered $671,000 consists of 27 acres and, with its buildings, is appraised at more than $6 million.

"Ellis Island is known to millions throughout the world as the 'front door to freedom.' It is the symbol of liberty and the sanctuary which received them when they came from foreign lands to the United States. It would be a travesty to sell this historic shrine and site to private promoters for future use for commercial development.

"I feel rather certain that there is some method of preserving this historic site as a public domain.

"If the plan proposed by Mr. Brennan cannot be worked out," LAUSCHE's letter continued, "exploration should be made about the willingness of our people, primarily those who came to our shores through Ellis Island, by public subscription to save the site.

LAUSCHE LISTS HIS REASONS FOR ACTION

"I urge that you reject the bid because:

"1. The island because of its historic significance, should not be allowed to pass from public control into private hands.

"2. The bid made by Atlas-Buffalo, Inc. is wholly inadequate in the face of the more than $6 million evaluation that has been placed on Ellis Island by responsible appraisers.

"3. The several proposals made about means and methods of saving the island should be fully explored.

"4. Additional time is needed to properly air in public discussion and the U.S. Senate the wisdom of allowing this shrine to pass into private hands."

Administrator Floete, who seemed more than willing to cooperate, must have been baffled by the sudden interest in Ellis Island, which was closed more than 4 years ago.

General Services Administration was handed the job of selling it after no other department of the Federal Government indicated any interest in its use. Several years ago, there was talk of establishing a narcotics hospital on the site but a survey found the location impractical.

Even the proposal to turn it into an international training institute has been before Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Arthur S. Flemming for some time but no recommendation from him has been made.

GSA first took bids on the disposal of Ellis Island about 16 months ago. Twenty-one bidders responded and the highest in the neighborhood of $201,000, came from Sol G. Atlas, head of the Atlas-Buffalo, Inc. His announced plans are to construct a resort area on the island, including an auditorium and marina.

GSA rejected all these bids as too low and, about 3 months ago, still with no one showing any special interest, asked for new bids. Again Atlas was the top bidder but this time his bid was $671,000.

Administrator Floete has until 3 p.m. tomorrow to accept this bid, reject them all, or call for a 60-day negotiation period.

(General Services Administrator Floete rejected all bids.)

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer, May 10, 1959]

TO SAVE ELLIS ISLAND

Between 1890 and 1954 millions of immigrants came into the United States through Ellis Island. Thousands of Greater Clevelanders were among the 20 million or so; many, many more thousands are descendents of those who came, penniless or otherwise, in search of a fuller life.

The Federal Government invested more than $6 million in the New York Harbor island before it was closed, and since then it has maintained the facilities. Bids from private investors were sought twice and the highest received on the first call was just above $201,000. This was rejected as too low; a second round of bids recently brought a high offer of $671,000 from the same company which earlier thought $201,000 was enough. It wants to turn the place into a resort.

It had been expected in Washington that this bid would be accepted. But fortunately two Clevelanders, Senator FRANK J. LAUSCHE and Representative MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN, have spoken up to keep Uncle Sam in possession.

The new bids have been rejected, too, due to their intervention.

The Senator and Congressman favor turning the island into a national shrine; there have been other ideas promoted, such as using its buildings as schools for training private individuals assigned abroad about how best to represent their land.

It is fitting that the leaders in objecting to the sale of the island should be Clevelanders. For here, as much as anywhere in the Nation, have newcomers from every continent been welcomed, and Cleveland, we like to think, represents the best combination of neighborhoods which have kept elements of old world cultures and of neighborhoods which are thoroughly mingled.

The LAUSCHE-FEIGHAN shrine idea is a laudable one, providing that it be given the proper financial and popular support needed to develop the island, and providing arrangements for reaching it are adequate later. Once sold, the hope of making Ellis a memorial would have been gone forever.

What will happen, as far as making it a memorial, likely will depend on reaction of leaders among nationality groups here and elsewhere. Some in Cleveland already have promised support. Now is the time to back Senator LAUSCHE and Representative FEIGHAN with ideas and pledges of contributions, for a final decision on what to do cannot be put off much longer.

Small Business Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 7, 1959

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a small business tax reform bill which is identical to the small business bill introduced by the Republican members of the House Small Business Committee.

We must face up to the responsibility of providing the means by which our small business institutions may grow and expand on a sound constructive basis. The bill would provide addition reform and revisions of certain sections of the Internal Revenue Code to assist small businesses, and overcome the difficulties encountered in their efforts to grow, expand, and modernize. Small business represents the broadest base of our entire economy and we must recognize the importance of small and new businesses and enact a tax policy which encourages freedom of entry into business. The tax system should be designed to stimulate incentive and provide growth but not penalize either large or small firms. This is necessary to our free enterprise system.

Unless we provide for the growth of small and medium sized businesses we shall inevitably be confronted with a greater merger and business failure problem than we have now.

In brief the purposes of the bill are to provide for expansion, growth, and modernization, to permit individuals and partnerships filing income tax returns for small and independent businesses engaged in trade or commerce to have election to be taxed as a corporation, to provide a normal tax rate of 20 percent for taxable years after June 30, 1959, to provide family-sized farmers and others engaged in agricultural pursuits an exemption for the improvement, modernization, and renewal of buildings, and to provide small and independent business an exemption for goodwill in the determination of the value of the estate.

I think that this legislation is absolutely necessary to the Nation and should be enacted into law without delay.

Role for Businessmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER THORNBERRY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 6, 1959

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, the Taylor Daily Press, of Taylor, Tex., in its issue of April 28, 1959, contains an excellent editorial on the role the businessman should play in the affairs of his Government.

As the Taylor Daily Press points out the business and professional men of Taylor have taken a leading role in the city and school affairs and with the same unselfish public spirit can make a splendid contribution to their Federal Government.

Because I think that the Members of Congress will appreciate this splendid editorial I place it in the Appendix of the RECORD. The editorial is as follows:

ROLE FOR BUSINESSMEN

Businessmen have been urged by the president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce to take a greater interest in politics. In urging participation, William A. McDonnell said we must quit thinking of politics as a dirty word.

Both of these suggestions are good ones. If we think of politics as a dirty business it is quite likely to be just that. If practical, sound-thinking people take an active interest in their Government, it can be run on a businesslike, clean basis.

Businessmen are often criticized when they take a public office for protecting their own interests. There are no doubt instances where this is true. There is a long record of businessmen serving well and their constituents benefitting from faithful, unbiased performances.

In Taylor, merchants and professional men have traditionally taken a leading role in city and school affairs. This has resulted in good government, sound economy, and intelligent planning. Taylor is a fortunate community.

Businessmen are accustomed to making decisions, handle funds often the property of others and doing so with a sense of integrity that goes with responsibility.

This becomes increasingly important as government becomes bigger and bigger and spiraling inflation takes its bite of every dollar collected in taxes and spent in civic improvement and service.

This is not to say that a wage earner cannot accept these same responsibilities. We do believe that the type of experience gained in business serves as training to effect the economies necessary to combat inflation and handle the problems of growing Government.

We are in a new phase of the cold war with the Communist world. This is developing into a fierce competition on a trade level. The great western democracies with their higher standards of living and costs of production could lose this battle unless sound thinking and efficiencies are effected.

These principles must be put into practice locally and then carried through State and national levels. Inflation and higher taxes cannot go on forever or the United States could isolate itself from the rest of the world to a far greater extent than it did in the thirties and early forties.

No battle is ever lost until it is over. However, we are doing a good job of pricing ourselves out of the great east-west struggle for world markets. Now is the time to make the right decisions to throw the economic balance in our favor.

Well Done, Secretary Herter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 11, 1959

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the Springfield Sunday Republican yesterday editorially complimented Secretary of State Christian A. Herter for his calm, dignified, but impressively frank, address to the Nation last Thursday night on the Berlin crisis.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I ask that the editorial about Secretary Herter, who was Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts for 4 years, be printed in the RECORD:

WELL DONE, SECRETARY HERTER

The speech delivered over the air Thursday night by Secretary of State Christian A. Herter was made memorable by both its quality and by the circumstances which surrounded it. In essence it was a moving appeal to the Nation for understanding, an understanding of world conditions, and for support of firmness in meeting them—all this as a better alternative to an ultimate call to arms.

Those of us to whom Massachusetts is home may justifiably feel an added thrill of pride in Mr. Herter's demonstration of high abilities. He was calm, dignified but impressively frank. Reporting on the conference of allied foreign ministers which he had just attended in Paris in anticipation of the conference with the Russian representatives beginning in Geneva tomorrow (for which he has already recrossed the Atlantic) he held out no exaggerated hopes and warned against expecting miracles. His caution that it is perhaps an American failing to look for too quick results, and for that reason to be less well conditioned for slow and difficult negotiations, should add to the public confidence inspired by his own finely expressed confidence that, in our determination to stand fast in Berlin, we are following the one course from which stability and lasting peace may ultimately come.

Not often does a new statesman step from the wings to the center of the stage with the limelight of threatening events so focused upon him as Mr. Herter has now done. The events which have threatened before have seldom if ever been of such magnitude as those which threaten today. For reasons which Eisenhower recently expressed at his press conference, it may be true that the only real decision which can be reached will be reached, if reached at all, at a summit conference with himself and Khrushchev both in attendance late in the year. But it is already apparent that Secretary Herter may become the chief agent in shaping that decision and in paving the way for it. He has made a conspicuously good beginning.

Appendix

The Tibetan People's Struggle for Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 12, 1959

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the entire free world has watched with admiration the struggle of the people of Tibet against the Communist overlords of China. We have also witnessed with horror the retaliatory tactics engaged in by the Red leaders.

Recently, the Committee of One Million Against the Admission of Communist China to the United Nations, sent me a letter and memorandum concerning developments in Tibet. In them, the need for firmness against communism and for aid to the Tibetans was underscored. As a member of the committee, I read with great interest their comments on this situation. Because of the need for more information in this country on Communist China and Tibet, I ask unanimous consent to have the letter and communique printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and communique were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE COMMITTEE OF ONE MILLION AGAINST THE ADMISSION OF COMMUNIST CHINA TO THE UNITED NATIONS,
New York, N.Y., April 21, 1959.

DEAR FRIEND: Enclosed is a communique containing excerpts from various reports we have recently received from the Far East telling of the continuous struggle carried on by the people of China against the Communist regime. Although reports of fighting between the Chinese and units of Red China's Army have filtered through the Bamboo Curtain for some time, it has taken the anti-Communist struggle now going on in Tibet to break through the almost total news blackout.

The Tibetan people's struggle for freedom, which has captured the imagination of freemen throughout the world, is but one part of the unceasing fight of the Chinese people against the regime which has enslaved them. As with the Hungarian struggle for freedom, the free world is again presented with a challenge and an opportunity. The free world did not meet this challenge during the Hungarian revolution and thus the great sacrifice of the Hungarian people produced only another monument to man's insatiable thirst for freedom. In Tibet and China today, the free world is faced with an even greater dilemma. Geographical and physical conditions make it practically impossible to extend any concrete help to the Tibetan and Chinese freedom fighters who carry on daily guerrilla and sabotage activity against the Peiping regime.

There is one thing, however, that freemen can and must do. They must keep alive the morale and hope of those who struggle against Communist slavery by refusing to do anything which would build the power and the prestige of the Communist regime. In spite of the Tibetan fight, and the reports of other battles being waged in the heart of Communist China, there are still those in our country who advocate the admission of the Peiping regime to the U.N., its recognition by our Government, and even trade and cultural relations with Red China. Any of these actions would be a betrayal of those brave men and women who are carrying out an active battle against our common enemy.

The Committee of One Million is the one group in the United States dedicated to mobilizing and consolidating public opposition to any such moves. By standing firm against any action which would appease Red China, we will be keeping faith with those who have taken up arms against this regime.

This is not only the fight of the Chinese people. Those who are fighting today in Tibet and in mainland China are, in effect, the frontline troops of all freemen. We must back them up every way we can.

Sincerely yours,

MARVIN LIEBMAN,
Secretary.

COMMUNIQUE TO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

Subject: The continuous anti-Communist struggle in China.

The fight which the people of Tibet are now waging against the Communist regime in their country has electrified the world. Reports leaking out of Tibet, in spite of a total Communist blackout of news, have shown that the Tibetan people are carrying on in the same tradition as the gallant people of Hungary did a short time ago—standing fast against savage Communist fire in defense of their liberty and national heritage. It is important to know that the current fight in Tibet is not a revolution but rather the latest battle in a 9-year war against communism.

The fighting in Tibet is only a part of the continuous and active struggle against communism which is being carried out in all parts of China. Stringent Red censorship makes it difficult for the Western World to know the full extent of the Chinese people's constant battle against the Communist regime. The Communist propaganda line is to deny the existence of any active revolutionary and anti-Communist forces in China. In their official releases, the Peiping regime blandly underrates the extent of the rebellion and labels those forces which actively engage Red army troops as "bandits" or "reactionary elements."

These "bandits" and "reactionary elements" number into the hundreds of thousands throughout China. They are dedicated to the fight for freedom and carry out daily guerrilla and sabotage action against the Communists. Voluminous information has been gathered here in Hong Kong of such fighting, of which Tibet is the latest example. Unfortunately, some in the Western World still choose to believe Communist propaganda rather than the facts.

In Tibet today, an estimated 100,000 warriors are fighting Red Chinese army contingents. The Khamba rebels of Tibet have been joined by fierce Amdowa and Golak tribesmen. The fighting has spilled over from Tibet into the Chinese Provinces of Szechwan and Tsinghai. Reports have been received of hundreds of young Chinese soldiers deserting the Communists to join the rebels.

In Sinkiang Province, Chinese Moslems have taken the field against the armies of the Peiping regime time and again, and have engaged in pitched battles which involve hundreds, and many times thousands, of troops. Peiping recently captured one of the leaders of the Chinese Moslem community, Ma Chen-wu. He was accused by Peiping of organizing a "counterrevolutionary armed revolt" of such strength that large areas were under his complete control. Ma's Moslem freedom fighters operated along the area bordered by Outer Mongolia, a colony of the Soviet Union. Reports reaching Hong Kong through refugees and other sources indicate that the flames of this Moslem revolt spread into the borders of the Soviet Union itself.

Each day brings in fresh reports of armed fighting in the communes of Red China. Just 2 months ago, the free world was able to physically and personally observe one such uprising from Macao, the Portuguese colony. Residents of Macao were awakened one night by the sound of gunfire just across the water on mainland China. They rushed to their rooftops and watched as the people of a fishing commune rose up and attacked Communist Party headquarters. The light of flaming buildings brightened the night sky and the crack of gunfire continued until the early morning hours. A handful of refugees who escaped informed Macao authorities that members of the newly organized fishermen's commune, driven to desperation by hunger and the oppressive acts of their local commissars, openly revolted—a revolt which was put down in bloodshed.

Reading between the lines of official Peiping pronouncements, it can be seen that there is a continuous struggle against Communist enslavement. Lo Jui-ching, Chief of the Red Security Services, was quoted recently as saying: "More than 370,000 counterrevolutionaries and other criminals in society throughout the country have surrendered voluntarily to the authorities." These figures are just an indication of the massive opposition that exists against Communist rule in China.

We have information of rebel forces actively fighting Chinese Communist rule in every province of China. The Communists will do everything possible to keep these facts quiet. It is their propaganda line to assure the world that they are in complete control of the Chinese mainland. This is not so.

It is important that the Western World recognize the existence of this growing opposition to Communist rule on the part of the Chinese people. Although the West can do little at this time to assist the anti-Communist revolutionary forces in China, it must certainly not take any action which would strengthen the regime against which so many Chinese are giving up their lives. The people of China, as free people throughout the world, despise Communist rule. Sooner or later they will overthrow the regime which keeps them enslaved. These brave people have confidence in the friendship of other free peoples throughout the world. The West must do nothing to betray this confidence.

Citation Presented to James Joseph Lynch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 11, 1959

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday morning last, in Brooklyn, I was happy to be present on the occasion of the presentation of a beautifully inscribed citation to an outstanding citizen of the congressional district I have the honor to represent. This citation was presented at the annual father and son communion mass and breakfast of the Holy Name Society of St. Paul's Roman Catholic Church. I have known Jim Lynch as a neighbor and friend for over 40 years and well know how well he deserved the tribute.

Under the permission heretofore granted me by unanimous consent of the House, I include the program of the occasion including the language of the citation presented to Mr. Lynch:

HOLY NAME SOCIETY, ST. PAUL'S ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH, BROOKLYN, N.Y., 1872–1959—ANNUAL FATHER AND SON COMMUNION MASS AND BREAKFAST, MOTHER'S DAY, MAY 10, 1959

Mass at 8 a.m., St. Paul's Church, celebrated by Rev. Joseph A. Mullen, moderator.

Breakfast at 9 a.m., Torello's Restaurant.

PROGRAM

Invocation: Rev. Joseph A. Mullen.

Greetings from chairman: Patrick Finnerty.

President's remarks: Albert J. Casazza.

Moderator's remarks: Rev. Joseph A. Mullen.

Citation to James Joseph Lynch, presentation of inscription: Rev. Joseph A. Mullen.

Address: Very Rev. Msgr. William M. Casey, director, St. Vincent's Home for Boys.

Benediction: Rev. George C. Magee.

Communion breakfast committee: Chairman, Patrick Finnerty; cochairman, Frank Ramos.

Officers: President, Albert J. Casazza; vice president, John Bush; secretary, John W. Sullivan; treasurer, Martin Donahue; marshal, James Fagan; corresponding secretary, Thomas Busby; diocesan union delegate, James Lynch.

Color bearers and guards: St. Paul's Troop 902, Boy Scouts of America.

CITATION: JAMES JOSEPH LYNCH

Born in Brooklyn in 1897, a member of St. Paul's Parish since 1916, he has represented with distinction the Holy Name Society as delegate to the Diocesar Union of Holy Name Societies of the diocese of Brooklyn for a period of more than 20 years; his record of outstanding service gives good example to the members of the society. Over these years he has diligently attended and participated in the monthly meetings of the diocesan union, frequently at great personal sacrifice, and thereafter faithfully reported the proceedings to the assembled membership of the society. His indefatigable endeavors in the activities of the society, and his perspicacity and sound judgment in its councils and meetings have played an incalculable part in advancing the objectives of the society.

An ardent Catholic, he has been active in many other societies of the parish and has given unstintingly of himself so that he might help others. Modest and humble, he is a person instilled with a fervent desire to assist in the work of God and the church. By his faithful observance of the law of God and of man, and by his work in God's vineyard, he exemplifies those distinguished members of the laity who, under the direction of the hierarchy and in obedience to them, strive to extend the kingdom of Christ and the peace of Christ by prayer, word, work, and example.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 12, 1959

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of May 9, 1959:

WASHINGTON REPORT
(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, 5TH DISTRICT TEXAS)

MAY 9, 1959.

The Trinity River survey appropriation was the subject of the Appropriation Committe's hearing at which a large Dallas group appeared. Congressmen of the Trinity River area joined the delegation of Texans in a united front requesting the survey by the Corps of Engineers. I was happy to join in support of this interstate matter. It is both legitimately a Federal-State proposition and within justifiable cost limits of flood control and navigation projects by the usual tests of priority. The big "if" is whether boondoggle and wasteful projects will also receive attention now, thus squeezing out legitimate projects in the exceeding of the budget.

President Eisenhower warmly greeted Bill Junker of Dallas, the Goodwill Industry's Man of the Year, along with Bill's mother and Goodwill officials. The President's attention was a further honor to Bill who was elected by his 35,000 nationwide handicapped fellow workers. Along with personally commending Bill Junker, the President described animatedly the paintings and art objects in his beautiful oval office. He is looking very fit. I had the opportunity to commend the President for his efforts to maintain a balanced budget. When I exhorted him to stand firm, he laughed and said it wouldn't be he who weakened. It was up to Congress.

H.R. 3460, a bill to amend the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933 (TVA), to permit self-financing by the TVA issuing its own bonds up to $750 million, was the subject of long, controversial, but generally good-natured debate. The TVA is wholly owned and operated by the Federal Government. Electricity developed serves 5 million people in 1,250,000 families in 80,000 square miles in parts of 7 States—Georgia, Virginia, North Carolina, Alabama, Mississippi,, Tennessee, and Kentucky. Originally, the TVA was intended for navigation and flood control. A small amount of hydroelectric power development was included. Since then the electricity production has mushroomed to include many steam-generated powerplants. Power output and area served has grown terrifically. This bill would permit the TVA's three-man Board of Directors to issue bonds for new powerplant and facilities construction on terms and conditions of their choosing.

Arguments for include: (1) Twelve percent yearly growth requires $180 million yearly in plant expansion; (2) 50 percent of power produced is used by Government installations; (3) besides paying 3 percent interest yearly ($36 million) on TVA Federal indebtedness of $1,200 million, this amount will be reduced from TVA revenues by $10 million per year; (4) Congress has 90 days to veto new TVA construction. Arguments against include: (1) Though wholly federally owned, the Federal Government would have no control—neither the Treasury Department over the bonds, the Budget Bureau over expenditures, since this would be outside the budget, nor Congress, since usual appropriations procedures would be sidestepped; (2) the opposition of the Treasury, Budget Bureau, and Comptroller General were not printed in the hearings or report, so Congressmen were denied this usual information; (3) TVA bonds would compete with U.S. bonds without Treasury control; (4) bonds, though alleged to be secured solely by TVA revenues, would in fact be U.S. obligations since TVA is federally owned.

For myself, the more fundamental objection was not stressed, as almost everyone accepts this 27-year-old experiment in socializing power production, and that is that Government should not be in business operation in competition with its citizens in their private enterprise. Further, subsidy for a few at the expense of all is not a Federal right, even though the Federal Government has done so. These basic objections should be met head on and solved. My suggestion? That the TVA be sold by the Federal Government to the people of the area served by the TVA, a simple and sensible solution to disposing of public power facilities here and elsewhere. Amendments sponsored by Republicans to improve the bill by reestablishing congressional control over this financing were defeated by the Democrats in almost a solid partyline vote. Obviously, this will be a political campaign issue by both parties with some exceptions, namely, the switching of Republicans in the TVA area and a few Democrats outside TVA. The closeness of amendment votes indicated that a Presidential veto cannot be overridden by the House. Interesting, indeed, was the "Buy American" amendment sponsored by a Democrat labor leader in which the Republicans with only a handful of Democrats supported U.S. industry. This amendment would have forbidden TVA to buy foreign equipment with its lower cost because of lower wage rates.

The $64 question now is: Will the House Democrat leadership bypass the Rules Committee to force out the huge, costly housing bill? At present, a Rules deadlock has it bottled up. Will the spending deluge of this and other pet programs yet engulf us? Right now, it's a stalemate. The people hold the key to the balanced budget and deficit financing. They should write their Representatives and Senators.

The Late Ralph H. Moyer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED MARSHALL
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 11, 1959

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, the recent death of Ralph H. Moyer marks the passing of a real pioneer in several of the farm programs which have been so important to the development of American agriculture. He was associated with the Department of Agriculture for almost 26 years and at the time of his death was Deputy Director, Performance Division, Commodity Stabilization Service.

It was my privilege to become acquainted with Ralph Moyer in the early days of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration. He was a leader in the development of the corn-hog program and a dedicated public servant who virtually lived for his work. Later he became just as dedicated to the advance of aerial photography in measuring farm acreages. His pioneering efforts in this field resulted in a considerable saving in time and money with the development of photographic measurement rather than manual measurement in the field.

When he began his work in the experimental stages of aerial photography, it was in use in relatively few counties. It has now become established as an accurate and economical method of measurement and about 95 percent of all cropland in this country has been photographed.

The clerk of our Subcommittee on Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriations, Mr. Robert Moyer, is a worthy son of this distinguished public servant. To him, and to his mother and sisters, we extend our deepest sympathy in their great loss.

TVA Affects All Taxpayers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 11, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a very interesting editorial which appeared in the Lawrence, Mass., Evening Tribune on April 28, 1959:

TVA AFFECTS ALL TAXPAYERS

The Congressional Action Committee of the Greater Lawrence Chamber of Commerce recently wrote to five U.S. Representatives and Senators from Massachusetts, expressing concern about proposals to expand the Tennessee Valley Authority and to establish still another gigantic Federal valley authority.

In brief, it used several arguments which contained sound contentions: Competition with communities in the area receiving power from TVA at low rates, made possible by taxpayers' dollars from this area, is completely unfair, and to increase such competition seems foolish. The scheme proposed for financing the expansion of TVA facilities, to give comparatively few people slightly cheaper electricity at the expense of taxpayers, is the issuance of Federal revenue bonds, a dangerous procedure of bypassing Congress and its control over budgetary spending through annual appropriations.

Under its original program, production of water power at TVA was supposed to be only a byproduct of such activities as flood control, reclamation, conservation, and recreation.

Just how far, then, has it wandered from its original intent? While its role as a producer of hydroelectric power was to be secondary, today coal produces three-quarters of the electric output of TVA, which sells power cheaper than private producers.

This is not due to efficiency. It is because TVA pays no Federal taxes or interest on Federal funds. These can be readily classified as special and costly privileges, enjoyed only by residents and industries in the Tennessee Valley. This is what the local Congressional Action Committee means when it says that expansion of the Valley Authority will benefit a few people at the expense of, and to te detriment of others, including Massachusetts residents.

Each time that lobbyists for Federal public power push a Government electricity project through Washington, everybody is taxed to pay the bill.

The TVA measure could become an economic Armageddon. If TVA is permitted to sprawl across the countryside in a manner permitted by proposed legislation in Washington, other Federal projects could be expected to engage in the same activity under future exemption from Congressional or budgetary control. Federal competition on such a scale, enjoying the benefits of cheaper rates of interest for their bond issues and lower taxes, could eventually drive private companies out of business.

For the fifth consecutive year, Congress has been requested to allow the TVA to overlook the financial policy of looking to Congress for appropriations. It wants to issue and sell $750 million in bonds to assist in financing the power program. If approved, these bonds would not be a Federal obligation.

If such an activity is permitted to escape Congressional control it would only be a short time before the Federal budget and and the Federal debt would come close to the meaningless stage. In effect, the cash of the taxpayers would be used with less supervision by their elected representatives in Washington.

TVA already has strayed too far from its original intent. The taxpayers of areas other than those who live in the TVA area—and we are especially interested in those which the Congressional Action Committee here speaks for—have been shelling out more than their fair share of taxes, while those in the 105,000 square miles served by TVA are paying less than their fair share of taxes.

How can the Government repudiate the debts of an agency completely owned by the Government itself? The answer is that Congress should tell the TVA to abandon the idea of being removed from Federal controls.

Americans already have been taxed over $5 billion to pay for Federal public power. If Federal public power lobbyists have their way, however, that's just the beginning. They want billions more.

Program for National Forests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 27, 1959

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, many of our colleagues know of my interest in natural resources. In recent years, I have become gravely concerned as to what can happen to these resources under the accelerated impact of intensified use. I refer specifically to the 181 million acres of national forests in 39 States and Puerto Rico.

In any vast enterprise of this kind, long-range planning to meet both current and future resource needs is vital. Such plans are of little use if a strong action program fails to materialize. First, however, we must have the basic plans before the Congress can intelligently move into an effective action program.

Notwithstanding the efficient manner in which the Forest Service has managed the national forests over the past 50 years, the next 50 years will be characterized by multiple problems in meeting the needs and demands of millions of people for the resources the forests provide.

It is gratifying, therefore, that the Department of Agriculture has moved to make the next 50 years of Forest Service management of the national forests more complete and comprehensive. They have recently submitted to the Congress a report which provides the needed measures to meet both current demands on the forests and the resource development needs to the year 2000. This report is now in the hands of the House Agiculture Committee. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. GRANT], chairman of the subcommittee on forestry, has announced hearings on this forest program for May 14 and 15. It is a program that should have the full support of the Members from every State.

The second largest area of national forest land in the Nation is in my congressional district. These 13 million acres are exceeded only by the 15½ million acres of my colleague from the first district of Idaho, Mrs. PFOST. This vast storehouse of natural resources, water, timber, game, fish, forage, and recreation, is dedicated to the use of not only Montana's citizens but also to citizens everywhere in America.

The tourist industry is booming everywhere, people naturally go to the forests for recreation and respite from the tensions arising in crowded urban areas. Our forests in Montana attract thousands of these outdoor enthusiasts. We have beautiful scenery, fine streams, and good places to camp. However, we need additional sanitation and other campground facilities to relieve overcrowding in the presently developed areas in western Montana.

This "program for the national forests" now before the Congress includes the projects necessary to meet the recreational needs of an expected 130 million annual visitors by 1969. For example, it is estimated that 10,000 new camp and picnic areas should be constructed and maintained during the next 10 years. It will be necessary to maintain and expand 5,000 existing improved recreation areas. Also many of the existing areas need improved sanitation, cleanup, and public safety facilities to make them adequate to handle the some 70 million visitors now coming to the national forests.

The annual harvest of timber is expected to increase from 7 to 11 billion board feet of timber within the next 10 to 15 years under this program. Salvage and sale of stagnant timber stands will be increased, up-to-date timber inventories will be made and timber management plans will be completed for all the national forests. Last year the billion dollar mark in forest receipts was reached. Under this program for full development of the national forests, the

second billion dollars in forest income should be realized within the next 10 years. Not only the Federal Treasury, but also every county with national forest land benefits from the increased sale of timber and other forest resources. Twenty-five percent of the gross receipts is refunded to the counties within the forest for schools and roads. Local employment is benefitted in cutting and harvesting the timber crop. Local industries are kept active and the general economy of an area within or adjacent to the forests is enhanced.

Under this program the building or rebuilding of about 90,000 miles of forest development roads and 8,000 miles of trails is planned. Also 149,700 miles of existing roads will be maintained to full standards. In Montana's national forests such roads are necessary if the full cut of timber is to be harvested and if the forests are to be protected and managed in an effective and businesslike manner.

There are many other facets in this complete program for the national forests. It is an essential program which can return benefits many times over the projected costs. An important secondary benefit would be a 60 percent increase in the number of workers harvesting, processing and marketing the nation-forest timber crop and other forest products.

This will mean jobs for some 620,000 more people. Local trade channels alone could be enriched by nearly a billion dollars which the public would spend for hunting and fishing equipment, licenses, lodging, transportation, and other items furnished by communities in or near our forests.

Mr. Speaker, this is a program which will not only improve forest land and its resources but also provide substantial direct financial returns both locally and nationally. The intangible benefits also will be great.

This report would have been complete had it included tentative estimates of costs, schedules, and priorities for placing various phases of the plan into operation and estimates of total benefits as related to the cost of developing these benefits.

We, in the Montana congressional delegation, have had some experience with attempting to secure just such information. Last July, we asked our regional Forester to lay out a program to fully develop Montana's forest resources. Regional Forester Charles Tebbe did an excellent job, which has been printed as Senate Document No. 9, "Full Use and Development of Montana's Timber Resources." However, the Regional Forester did not furnish the cost estimates and priorities we requested, presumably because he was ordered not to.

On January 14, the senior Senator from Montana, Senator MURRAY, the junior Senator from Montana, Senator MANSFIELD, my colleague [Mr. ANDERSON] and I wrote the Secretary of Agriculture. We asked his cooperation in having Mr. Tebbe provide by April 1 the balance of the information we had requested. To date, we have heard nothing further from that request. If we can't get the costs and priorities for a long-range forest resource development program for a single State in 5 months' time, I wonder how long it will take the Congress to get some figures on a program for the whole Nation.

We must remember, too, that even long-range development programs, such as Mission 66 and Operation Outdoors, which were submitted with costs and priorities, are now way behind schedule because requested funds were insufficient to carry them forward at the well-publicized rate.

I hope that, during the hearings, the committee will be able to get some cost figures on this proposal, so the Congress can relate them to the benefits.

Old World Quality Retained in Famed St. Vincent Bread

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. DENT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 13, 1959

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of personal pleasure to present to the House a short, but illuminating sketch on one of the real landmarks in my district.

Well over 100 years ago the Bavarian German Benedictine Fathers built St. Vincent's Archabbey at Latrobe, Pa.

In this beautiful setting, in the lush foothills of the Alleghenies, these intrepid Fathers built a lasting monument to service to Almighty God from nothing but willpower, self-sacrifice and the rich soil of Westmoreland County.

One of their first projects was a bakery shop. It is this bakery still in existence, and with the original equipment still in place, that I want to bring to the attention of the House today.

Mr. Speaker, I present the following account by Margie Carlin for insertion in the RECORD:

OLD WORLD QUALITY RETAINED IN FAMED ST. VINCENT BREAD—ORIGINAL EQUIPMENT THAT MISSIONARIES SHIPPED ACROSS MOUNTAINS IN 1854 STILL IS BEING USED AT BUSY MILL IN LATROBE

(By Margie Carlin)

Two massive stones, weighing more than a ton each, have been grinding flour at St. Vincent's Mill, Latrobe, for more than a century.

Most of it goes into the well-known St. Vincent bread, the same mealy, crusty, heavy Old World bread that fed the first monks to cross the Allegheny Mountains as missionaries more than 100 years ago.

The missionaries were German Benedictines and they built St. Vincent's Archabbey and College literally from scratch.

They had to be self-sustaining, so one of their first projects was a large mill, built from timbers cut from the surrounding forests.

All the machinery of the mill remains today as it was when it was built in 1854. There are sturdy wooden bins, huge millstones, massive beams and wheels. The only newcomers are the electric motors, installed 5 years ago.

Brother Joseph Weigl, who's in charge of the mill, has been at St. Vincent's 56 years. He was born in Bavaria 71 years ago and came to Latrobe in 1903.

He took over the operation of the mill 5 years ago and is immensely proud of the fine flour he produces. It is ground from wheat grown on the monastery farm. He says:

"Only the bran is removed. Our bread is the way bread was meant to be. Nothing is added or taken out. Our baker just mixes our flour with salt, water and yeast."

Most of this tasty bread is consumed by the priests, brothers, and students at the college.

Brother Joseph supplies the baker with about 11,000 pounds of flour a month and some 700 pounds of this is used for pies. About 100 loaves of bread are baked every day. Each loaf weighs about 8 pounds.

Almost every guest leaves with a loaf tucked under his arm. The bread used to be sent all over the country until the bookkeeping got to be too much of a problem.

The baker is Frank Zareczny, who has been making the bread for 46 years. He keeps the giant brick oven banked all year around.

When the one day's batch of bread is finished, he stokes the oven up to 800 degrees. By the fololwing morning, the heat stands at 350°, just right for the bread.

The loaves are laid on the bricks and baked for 70 minutes. The result is bread with a distinctive taste.

The college public relations head, the Reverend Edmund Cuneo, gives the bread a different flavor once in a while. Before he attends a wedding, he usually has a loaf baked with a rolling pin inside.

Besides the fine flour it produces, the mill is interesting from a historical point of view. Brother Joseph believes it's the only mill in Westmoreland County that still has the original wooden equipment and thinks it's one of few in the country still intact.

One of the interesting things Brother Joseph likes to show visitors is the old-time account books, which date back to 1861.

Written in precise German script, they tell the story of Civil War hardships, the bad and good years of the farms around St. Vincent's and grain prices over the years.

Long ago, the mill produced about seven sacks of flour a week. Now Brother Joseph mills about seven sacks in 1 day.

Quite a difference, but, happily, no difference in the bread.

I expect to bring some of this wonderful bread to Washington in order that it may be served in the House restaurant as a treat from my district.

Retirement Rules Unfair

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 11, 1959

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Theodore G. Klumpp, one of the outstanding members of the medical profession in this country, addressed the American Medical Association's Council on Rural Health at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst, Mass., on April 23, on the very interesting and thought

provoking subject of "Compulsory Retirement."

THIRTY MILLION PERSONS OVER AGE 65 BY 1980 IS ANTICIPATED

This meeting was sponsored by the New England States Medical Societies and was attended by many prominent medical men. Dr. Klumpp pointed out that there are now 15 million persons over age 65 in this country, and by 1980 it is anticipated that this number will grow to approximately 30 million persons over 65 years of age.

ROLAND SAYS THESE FACTS POSE THOUGHT-PROVOKING QUESTIONS

These facts give rise to important questions. Will the American society of the future force all of these persons over 65 to retire? Will it mean years of idleness, loneliness, and a feeling of uselessness for these people? Can the talents of many of the elderly, just attaining their zenith at age 65, still be retained on a part-time basis? How will the American society, and yes, perhaps Congress, face up to this problem and try to close the gap between idleness and loneliness on the one side, and useful productivity, and recreation on the other hand, so that these aging citizens may enjoy the twilight years of their lives? These questions we must answer.

DR. KLUMPP HAS A BRILLIANT BACKGROUND IN MEDICINE

The subject is treated with candor and knowledge and Dr. Klumpp is to be commended for his address on the subject. He graduated from Harvard Medical School in 1928 and in his long and interesting career was assistant clinical professor at Yale University Medical School. He was chief of the Drug Division of the Food and Drug Administration in Washington from 1936 to 1941, and at present is president of Winthrop-Stearns, Inc., pharmaceutical company. Dr. Klumpp has been chairman of the Task Force on the Handicapped in the Office of Defense Mobilization. He has received many awards and is the author of many articles on therapeutics, foods, drugs, and illness.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I ask that the news story from the Springfield (Mass.) Daily News of April 23, 1959, relating to Dr. Klumpp's address at the University of Massachusetts, be printed with my remarks in the RECORD.

RETIREMENT RULES UNFAIR—DR. KLUMPP SAYS MORE CARE NEEDED IN DECISIONS

AMHERST.—A more realistic approach to compulsory retirement was called for today by a New York physician.

Dr. Theodore G. Klumpp pointed out that society has been illogical and inconsistent in its attitude toward compulsory retirement. "Whenever society adopts a rule that eliminates the fit with the unfit, destroys the good with the bad, or punishes the innocent with the wicked, it is not a good rule. Civilization progresses by changing rules of this kind," he said.

Dr. Klumpp addressed the afternoon session of the fourth annual New England Rural Health Conference at the University of Massachusetts. He is president of Winthrop Laboratories, a New York pharmaceutical company, and a member of the American Medical Association's Committee on Aging.

The doctor suggested that the same care exercised in selecting a person for employment should be used in retiring that individual. "Certainly a man isn't fit one day and unfit the next because one page of the calendar has turned." He pointed out that an entirely new set of social, economic, and political problems are being created as by-products of the technological advances of medical science.

The greatest threat within an absolute welfare state, according to Dr. Klumpp, revolves around the aging population trend. The population is increasing and at the same time people are living longer. He said, "Since the turn of the century, our population has doubled, but the number of persons over 65 has quadrupled. In 1900 among an average group of 1,000 persons you could count on 17 dying that year. Today, only nine out of that same number will depart from this world. There are currently 15 million persons over 65 years of age and by 1980 it is anticipated that we will have approximately twice that number of this country."

Dr. Klumpp emphasized that the problem of aging must be approached from the human side—the needs and wants of the older people as well as from the economic side of the problem. The real thing to sustain us in this life is the work we have been accustomed to doing for the past 40 to 50 years of our life.

The 1-day meeting was sponsored by the New England State medical societies and AMA's Council on Rural Health.

Panama Canal: Lifeline of U.S. Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 11, 1959

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a review of the latest book on the Panama Canal, "The Untold Story of Panama," by Earl Harding, published on April 27, 1959 by the Athene Press of New York and distributed by the Bookmailer, also of that city. The review was by Dr. Ruth Alexander in her well-known column "Our America" on the Spotlight Page of the May 10, 1959, issue of the New York Mirror.

The review follows:

PANAMA CANAL: LIFELINE OF U.S. DEFENSE

(By Dr. Ruth Alexander)

With publication of his long-awaited book, "The Untold Story of Panama", Earl Harding has become the man of the hour.

He has been recognized as an authority on Panama since 1908, when, as a staff member of Joseph Pulitzer's Morning World, he was sent to investigate the 'Hidden Revolution' of 1903, which almost cost us the canal rights.

The timing of this book is portentous. It is the drama of living history. Roberto Arias, the leader of the recent anti-U.S. invasion, is descended from the clan that bred Thomas Arias, leader of the 1903 revolution against us.

President Theodore Roosevelt ranked our acquisition of canal rights in Panama and the building of the canal, not only as the greatest achievement of his administration, but of equal importance to the stature of the United States as the Louisiana Purchase of 1803.

Interference with our status in Panama by Nationalists, by Liberal—subversives in the United States or by Communists, is comparable to conceivable interference with our status by French Nationalists, our own Liberals subversives and Communists, in the territory encompassed by the Louisiana purchase.

The United States and the Republic of Panama were notably good neighbors, until the time bomb planted in 1946 by Alger Hiss, then Secretary General of the United Nations, branding the Canal Zone as occupied territory.

This has since served both Panamanian and North and South Americans of opportunist and subversive character with an authoritative weapon of agitation against us, designed to nationalize, or transwer control of the canal to the United Nations.

As Harding emphasizes, with punctilious documentation, the Panama Canal is a vital not only to hemispheric communication, but it is "the lifeline of our national defense and the backbone of our ocean borne commerce."

Its loss by either of the above methods, would mean our end as a world power.

Conservation, Not Conservatism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 4, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY'S forceful speech, "Conservation—America's Frontier," delivered in my hometown, Eugene, Oreg., on April 21, 1959, was warmly received. I want to make the text available as widely as possible, so, under a previous consent, I am including it following these remarks.

Mr. HUMPRREY has many friends in Oregon, as indeed he does in each of the 50 States of this Union. I have received many letters about his recent trip there. People are enthusiastic about him and many urge that he be the Democratic standard bearer in 1960.

Oregon has an early primary. This means that Presidential possibilities like HUBERT HUMPHREY have an opportunity to find out where they stand at the ballot box early in the year. It is my belief that Senator HUMPHREY'S recent trip to Oregon gave him many new and enthusiastic friends.

CONSERVATION: AMERICA'S FRONTIER

(Remarks of Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY at Democratic dinner meeting, Eugene, Oreg., April 21)

Anyone who travels over the great West, and sees the massive timber stands, the powerful rivers, the vast grazing lands, realizes that the West is the storehouse of America's great natural wealth.

Now, there is sometimes a tendency to believe that the West is the only part of the country that is deeply concerned about preserving and developing those resources.

Well, that might have been partly true a few years ago, when our conservation programs were moving steadily forward. Then many people were probably inclined to take these resources for granted.

But in the last few years, everyone in America has had an education on the value of their natural resources and, believe me,

the cost of tuition has been mighty high. For this administration has not only failed to develop our resources—it has launched a program of giving them away.

I don't need to recite the full record for you people here in Oregon, for this is home territory for the big giveaway—the Al Sarena land grab, for example, and the fiasco about the Klamath Indian Reservation.

I am sure you know about the granting of special oil leases on wildlife refuges to favorites of the Eisenhower administration, and the threat to the national forests by a small group seeking special privileges.

And there would have been more, had it not been for Democratic Senators and Congressmen, such as those from Oregon. They have sounded the alarm. They have focused a spotlight on the big giveaway.

Yes, the American people have been getting quite an education on the value of conserving natural resources. I suppose you might call it a liberal education.

But the evils of the past are not as important as the needs of the future.

Now when I talk about the resource needs of America I am not just thinking of the material resources—the food and fiber, the minerals and chemicals it takes to supply a growing population. I am thinking of other human needs that must also be met—nonmaterial needs.

I am thinking of the need for recreation, for example. America is abundantly supplied with bigger, better, and more powerful cars to take the family off on a vacation, but America is not so well off in places for them to go to enjoy themselves. Our national parks are overcrowded; many of our streams and rivers are polluted—hardly the ideal site for a family vacation.

America has a big job to do in assuring resources for the future.

Today there are 172 million people in the United States. By 1975, just about when today's babies will be getting out of school, the Census Bureau tells us there will be some 215 million people. By the year 2000, some say we will have 300 million people—but estimates run as high as 360 million—twice the population we now have.

To supply this exploding population will require twice the agricultural output, more than again as much water as we are now using, 50 percent more timber growth, and double the output of minerals.

How are we going to get these?

Well, one thing is certain. We are not going to achieve these goals unless we plan ahead. I don't need to tell you people here in Oregon that a tree doesn't grow in a year—either in Brooklyn or in Oregon—nor is a dam built or a grazing range revegetated in a matter of months.

In the field of resources, this country has been living on the heritage of two Roosevelts: Teddy Roosevelt, the first great conservationist President this country ever had, and another Roosevelt, who had the good sense and the imagination to put young men, as well as rivers, to work in rebuilding and conserving America's natural wealth. I mean, of course, the Democratic Roosevelt—Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

Harry Truman kept up the Roosevelt tradition. He knew the value of resource development. He too cared deeply for America's future.

But in the last 7 years, we have been coasting along, living on the past, ignoring the pressing needs of the future.

Other nations through history have followed a similar course, and they have paid dearly for it. The price they paid is written in the seared, overgrazed and deforested Middle East. Where once stood the magnificent Cedars of Lebanon, there is barren desert; and the ingenious irrigation works of ancient Babylon are silted up from the floods that swept the overgrazed watersheds of the Tigris and the Euphrates.

America today is not the Middle East; far from it. But the price of a do-nothing policy on resources is dear indeed.

What is the job to be done in protecting and building America's natural wealth?

One of the first jobs is to get an up-to-date accounting of just what resources America has. We are now a 49-State Union, and before the year is out there will be 50 States. I am told that two-thirds of the new State of Alaska has never even been subjected to an accurate geological survey. Who knows what wealth may lie in the unexplored areas of Alaska? Perhaps Hawaii has hidden natural treasures as well—I'm sure it has.

But there are pressing jobs to be done in developing the resources we have within our traditional borders.

For example, to meet the needs of our growing population, we will have to expand the output of our forests by 50 percent in the next 50 years. This means the reforestation of some 28 million acres of currently bare land.

It means timber stand improvement measures on 140 million acres of poorly stocked land.

It means an intensified effort to protect our forests against insects, disease, and fire.

These programs must begin soon, for a forest does not spring up overnight.

Next, our growing population demands urgent attention to the problem of water—that precious substance we so often take for granted. How are we to supply a growing nation with an adequate supply of water—clean, usable water? Today, there are thousands of miles of rivers and streams which are too polluted for municipal or recreational use without expensive treatment.

One of the urgent priorities for Government action is the construction of the water treatment plants needed to serve not only the domestic needs but the growing industrial needs of America.

As one step toward meeting this problem, I have joined with Congressman BLATNIK of my State in introducing legislation to rapidly expand our construction of pollution treatment facilities with Federal assistance to States, municipalities, and industries.

As could be expected, this Republican administration opposes that measure. It wants to pile the burden of pollution control onto the already overburdened States.

But rivers flow across State boundaries, and they affect all our people. The responsibility here is clearly a Federal one. Even the Old Guard Republicans ought to recognize that.

Now, instead of devoting its energies to opposing a sound antipollution program, this Republican administration ought to be throwing its full energies behind pressing forward at top sped toward a breakthrough in the desalting of sea water. For here lies the brightest hope, not only in America, but in water-starved countries the world over.

Fresh water cheaply available in the United States would bring prosperity to domestic areas that have too long suffered in drought.

Fresh water cheaply available in the Middle East, North Africa, and the arid parts of western South America, would bring a spectacular rise in the standard of living to some of the poorest areas of the world.

This is the kind of a struggle we should be seeking with the Russians—a struggle to see who can break through first in research programs for the desalting of sea water.

But instead of doing everything in our power to accomplish this, the Eisenhower administration is making this vital research program a repository of defeated politicians. Speaking for myself, I am not enchanted by the thought of the water problems of America running off a lame duck's back.

But water is not only a blessing; it can also be a curse when it sweeps uncontrolled over our plains and spills over the banks of our rivers.

Whether water be blessing or curse depends in large measure on what we do with our watersheds—whether we permit them to lie bare or whether we cover them to stop or control the flow of water.

Nearly 300 million acres of watershed land need terracing, stripcropping, grass cover, or other water-arresting measures.

This, too, is an urgent job for America, if we are to control our water, and prevent our best soil from being washed offi the lands and into the rivers.

On the rangelands, such as those here in eastern Oregon and throughout the intermountain area, overgrazing has taken its toll. Revegetation by newly developed methods of brush busting and reseeding to crested wheat grasses can greatly improve these lands and offers the hope of doubling the cattle-carrying capacity of much of this land.

Here again we have a choice: fertile, productive grazing lands, or intermittent dust bowls which permit much of our natural wealth to be scattered to the four winds.

There are other jobs to be done in the resource field: as productivity and leisure increase, so will the need for recretation areas. At the direction of a Democratic Congress, the Government has just begun a review of our outdoor recreation resources, but already some private estimates indicate a need for acquiring and devoting some 3 million additional acres to recreational needs.

These are some, but by no means all, of the jobs that need doing if our country is to protect and develop her natural wealth.

No doubt, those of us who advocate these programs, will be labeled spenders—that worst of GOP epithets.

But we are not spenders—but prudent investors—investors in the future of America—the soundest investment on any market.

It is the Republicans who are extravagant; they are wasters—they are the exploiters.

Every pound of our soil that is washed from our farms by flood that could be saved by watershed cover is a waste.

Every drop of water that flows in our rivers that could be harnessed to produce energy and power, but it is allowed to run free to the sea is a waste.

Every acre of timberland that is allowed to stand unimproved, every acre of grazing land that needs reseeding but lies bare, is a waste.

The Democrats who believe in conserving and building resources are not the spenders.

It's the Republicans who pursue a do-nothing policy and a giveaway policy on resources who are the real spenders—spenders of our national wealth.

The way this administration seems to size up things is this:

We can afford 4½ million people out of work, but we can't afford to do the things needed to build our country's future.

To me, this just doesn't make sense. If there is one thing we can't afford, it's to have people without jobs. That's the biggest waste I can think of—not just economic waste, but, more important, human waste.

One of the reasons I have recommended the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps—patterned after the CCC of Franklin Roosevelt—is to put our young people to work conserving and building our resources. There is plenty of work to be done—some estimate that it would take 150,000 men working for 10 years to do the minimum conservation work that I have just described.

Isn't it tragic to allow this work to go undone while we permit millions of men to remain idle, unable to find work—an inexcusable waste of men and resources.

The Republicans have never understood the West.

They cannot understand the West, for the West is new; the West is frontier, while the

Republican Party is addicted to the past and the status quo.

The Republican Party cannot understand the West because it is a party based in the financial houses of the East.

It seeks to feed on the West, not to develop it.

What better proof of that could there be than the fact that since the Republicans took over in Washington 6 years ago, there has not been one single new start on a multi-purpose dam.

Harry Truman stood at Hungry Horse Dam in Montana when it was inaugurated in 1952 and said, "Take a good look at this—it's the last you'll see for a long time."

And he was right. It was the last dam we've seen—and the last we will see until the Democratic Party regains the White House.

And regain it we will.

In the long, hard cold war with the Communists, our resources could well become the decisive factor.

Make no mistake, this will be a long struggle. In part, it is a battle between men and systems of government and patterns of social order.

But it is also a contest of materials and resources.

The great Northwest, so rich in natural resources, represents the Nation's stockpile and its reserves in the waging of the cold war.

The judgment of posterity will depend on how we, today, care for and develop those precious resources.

Increasing the Foreign Demand for Farm Products

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP A. HART

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 12, 1959

Mr. HART. Mr. President, Prof. Lawrence Witt, of the agricultural economics department of Michigan State University, read a most interesting paper at a meeting held at the Agricultural Adjustment Center, Iowa State College, April 6, 1959. The subject of Mr. Witt's remarks was "Increasing the Foreign Demand for Farm Products." It was such an informative document concerning one of our most pressing problems, that of how to turn our farm surpluses from a "cross that we must bear" into an effective instrument for world peace, that I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. It is my hope, as a cosponsor of the Food for Peace program which was introduced recently by the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], that the Committee on Foreign Relations will move in the very near future to hold hearings on this needed and most constructive project.

There being no objection, the paper was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INCREASING THE FOREIGN DEMAND FOR FARM PRODUCTS

(By Lawrence Witt, Michigan State University)

Surplus production has grown to some 8 percent of total agricultural production, and threatens to increase still more. While the surplus has been growing, we have turned in desperation from one device to another in an effort to match production and consumption at acceptable prices. After the efforts of the twenties in strengthening the competitive process of reaching an equilibrium had failed, more direct methods were used. Efforts were made to control supply, then to expand domestic demand, each with a variety of techniques. Even as these programs floundered, the war and postwar experience demonstrated that a strong export market (even though dependent on dollar gifts and loans), would strengthen agricultural prices and reduce stockpiles. Hence it was both logical and with a sense of frustration that a massive export program came into being in 1954.

This program puts substantial emphasis on sales for local currency, but also includes barter, loans and gift provisions. The export program combines two values close to hearts of most farmers (and many agricultural economists). These are that the farmer's product should be used usefully, not destroyed, and that there should be no hungry people in the world while there is surplus food available. The program is made more appealing by its buoyant influence upon farm prices and its success in reducing stockpiles below what they might have been. The ignorance of the foreign exchange mechanism, of the real worth of foreign currency to the United States (especially when deposited in the other country's central bank), and the nebulous link with economic development all help to confuse the issue. The impression is left that the large quantities of wheat, cotton, tobacco, etc., shipped abroad must somehow do some good.

As we discuss this topic, I should like to have you think of it in a broader context—as a part of a broad international challenge appropriate to agricultural economists and social scientists at Iowa State and other agricultural colleges and universities. Despite 5 years of a program costing the economy over $1 billion per year, there is no solid research dealing with this program. Is this because it is a foreign rather than a domestic program? Have we failed to see the full importance of this program to the national economy?

Moreover, with regard to the mass of world problems which involve farm people—tenure problems, development problems, instabilities of world commodity prices, and a variety of other agricultural and economic problems—agricultural economists have had little to say. A few have been drawn into action programs overseas; still they have not written much about the problems spread out before them and of which they are so much a part. Clearly we have been seriously ethnocentric in our United States—based research and other activities, leaving to others the formulation of the proper interrelations of domestic and foreign policy.

Furthermore, we tend to reject involvement in value formation—in partially specifying important values for society or at least strongly arguing for a set of values. No one should know better than we the amount of subsidy which has been involved in our education and training. Why should not our trained minds contribute more fully in posing and resolving the value conflicts of the society which has made these investments? To continue to ignore value issues, particularly in the international field where the vast majority of the people are unable to even articulate the relevant values, is morally irresponsible and a complete dereliction of duty—as well as physically suicidal. Look over the bulletins and articles of any experiment station and the articles in the Journal based upon real research. How much has been contributed to an understanding of the interrelations between foreign and domestic policy? Multiply this by 50 and the result is still unsatisfactory.

THE GENERAL SITUATION

All this is really an introduction to an apology for the inability to provide precise answers to the problem posed by the title. Almost the only reports that can be drawn upon are either a generalized policy statement based upon the values implicitly assumed in classical economics, or a description of what has been done in carrying out the congressional mandate. On the one hand, the tensions created by deviating from traditional trading patterns lead some economists and political scientists to a thorough damnation of the program. On the other hand, the easing of the surplus burden, and its consequent presumed effect on the price and income position of American farmers is lauded as a material accomplishment. My view is that the truth lies somewhere in between. I should like to make a tentative approach, largely by showing the complications of the program and possible differential impact.

First, what is the general export situation? During the past 4½ years we have shipped or contracted to ship about $7 billion worth of farm products under special programs. Current farm export levels are close to $4 billion per year. Some 30 to 40 percent of this total represents directly subsidized exports, with an additional amount, perhaps 20 to 30 percent being sold for dollars at special prices. The remainder are commercial exports for dollars. Most of the special exports have been under Public Law 480—The Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act—but additional quantities have gone under section 402 of the ICA program, under the International Wheat Agreement, special dollar loans, and under legally reduced prices of the CCC program. Not all of the Public Law 480 are sales for local currency; significant amounts have gone as grants and donations, or have been bartered for strategic materials. Wheat, cotton, and fats and oils (soybean oil), are major commodities. Tables 1 and 2 provide some total figures.

In the aggregate, aside from military equipment, this program has become the largest transfer of wealth between the United States and other countries since the Marshall plan—and the program is far from over. In fact its very place in your program suggests that it is being considered as a more or less permanent alternative to efforts to stuff more food down the throats of domestic consumers. Why do we have this program? What is it intended to accomplish? Two serious questions immediately arise. Who decides where, how much, and for how long such an export program is desirable? Secondly, suppose foreign countries were to say, "We want no more wheat, cotton, or soybeans, but we will accept great quantities of tobacco, feed grains, and dairy products under these special provisions." Would and should agriculture adjust its commodity mix to these needs, or are we so concerned with preserving traditional patterns, values, and institutions that such measures cannot be considered?

TABLE 1.—*Exports of U.S. farm products under Public Law 480 with comparisons*

[Millions of dollars]

Program	1956–57	1957–58	Total, 1954–58
Public Law 480:			
Foreign currency sales	902	650	2,065
Grants and donations	250	267	1,001
Barter	401	99	924
Other exports	3,171	2,984	11,371
Total exports	4,724	4,000	15,361

TABLE 2.—*Commodity composition of all Public Law 480 agreements signed through June 30, 1958*

[In millions of dollars]

Commodity	Export market value	Estimated CCC cost
Wheat and wheat flour (bushels)	1,028.0	1,732.1
Feed grains (bushels)	192.8	335.6
Rice (hundredweight)	181.8	288.8
Cotton (bales)	509.9	681.4
Cotton linters (bales)	.3	.3
Meat products (pounds)	39.2	39.2
Tobacco (pounds)	142.3	142.3
Dairy products (pounds)	43.8	74.2
Fats and oils (pounds)	384.7	391.0
Poultry (pounds)	1.7	1.7
Dry edible beans (hundredweight)	.4	.4
Fruits and vegetables (pounds)	15.2	15.2
Seeds (hundredweight)	.4	.4
Total	2,540.5	3,702.6
Ocean transportation	301.8	301.8
Total, including ocean transportation	2,842.3	4,004.4

GOALS OF THE PROGRAM

It is necessary to inquire more specifically into the goals of the program, and the extent to which they have been accomplished. To do either of these is far from a simple task. Values are not given; they must be untangled, related, reviewed and compromised. Moreover, this must be done not only relative to U.S. values, but also interrelated with the values of each of the other countries affected. It is accurate and all too easy to say "We know not what we do". We do not have a clear statement of the national purposes of the program, less so than when it began. Certainly we do not know the impacts upon other countries, except in a superficial and fragmentary fashion. Perhaps it will be mutually beneficial to think together this afternoon about these programs. Take first the U.S. objectives.

The early and clear objective is the disposal of supplies of farm products overseas—supplies which have accumulated or are likely to accumulate at prevailing prices and production levels. To some this is the sole objective of the program, and all other considerations are incidental. It appears, however, that a somewhat contrary view should be held and that several other objectives are becoming more significant.

Time and again the values of the American society have shone forth clearly in an organized effort of giving—the relief program under Herbert Hoover after the First World War, help for the Japanese earthquake victims, UNRRA, the Marshall plan, UNICEF, the CARE packages and similar programs. The legislation for Public Law 480 (and sec. 402 of ICA) clearly provides that food may be given under emergency conditions, without waiting for special legislation (as was necessary earlier in providing a gift of wheat to India). Beyond this there is an element of humanitarianism in the sale of local currency which justifies such special export programs as an effort to match "underfed people" with excess supplies. If there had been no Public Law 480 program, there still would have been donations, possibly more than in this category now.

A third objective has come into greater prominence as the program began to operate. It is partly implied by the title "Trade Development and Assistance Act," and is more than a rationalization. This is the desire to use the surplus farm products as an instrument of economic development. As efforts to develop new large markets for farm products got underway, it was logical to look carefully at the low income, high population areas of the world. In today's international arena, development is a key symbol for these areas; hence the USDA must be concerned with development. Moreover, the competition and politico-economic relations with other exporting areas are such that the program is more defensible if many of the products are channeled into new, noncommercial markets.

There are a number of other possible accomplishments which appear to be congruous with the American value system. These will become clearer by looking at individual programs. Among these goals are political stability, greater internal competition, and support of anticommunist efforts through strengthening the military forces.

THE INDIVIDUAL PROGRAMS

In turning now to individual countries, it should be stressed that these suggestions are little more than tentative hypotheses—hypotheses which suggest the complexity of the effects and the necessity for more careful studies of the program impacts.

Pakistan: The program in Pakistan comes close to being built in as an integral part of the nation's resources. A number of observers question whether it would be possible to stop the program. (About $186 million at market value was shippepd or programed through June 1958.) The rupee cost of the imported wheat is higher than the price paid local producers. Since the price charged to consumers is intermediate, losses on imported wheat are offset by Government profits on locally produced wheat. Internal farm prices, however, are being increased slowly.

Internally it appears that the Government has been more influenced by the political pressures of the refugees, migrants, and squatters in the principal cities than by the agricultural groups. Thus, an adequate supply of low cost food becomes an important element in lessening political instability, while the Nation tries to stimulate local production and marketings by nonprice means. A major share of the rupees accumulated has been allocated to the support of the Pakistani military buildup as a member of the Baghdad Pact. Some of this military effort does have economic development significance, both in the training of soldiers to handle machines, and in the improvement of communication. The quantitative importance of this aspect of the program is not clear.

Japan: In the case of Japan it appears that the Ministry of Agriculture is a major local supporter of Public Law 480 agreements. (Some $150 million of commodities are involved.) Most of the accumulated yen are used for agricultural development, or for U.S. Government expenditures which save dollars (such as housing for military dependents). The Ministry of Agriculture appears to be able to induce the Ministry of Finance to permit the use of some of these funds outside the regular Government budget. In this way irrigation and drainage programs are implemented which were planned for a later date. Thus, despite a decrease in dollar earnings, the program has contributed to development, and to an earlier reduction in food imports. On the other hand, there appears to be a change in dietary patterns from sweet potatoes to rice, and from rice to wheat, which has the reverse effect. Much of this is due to the rising levels of living within Japan, and not solely to the availability of Public Law 480 commodities—which really do not bulk large in the total Japanese trade.

The Philippines: For the Philippines (with a small program involving some $15 million) it is necessary to enter into more speculation. General monetary and exchange problems make it clear that a limited amount of exchange would have been allocated to cotton. Many observers suggest that only a few textile manufacturers would have received allocations for the importation of cotton. Consequently the majority would have been squeezed out of the textile industry, with substantial profits possible for the successful applicants. With Public Law 480 cotton entering the country, there was cotton for everyone, enabling the industry to remain competitive. Hence, those textile manufacturers less close to the Government become internal supporters of the program.

Indonesia: In this country, the local currency (from a $100 million program) has been accumulated. However, in an effort to control inflation, the Indonesian Government has directed that almost none of the funds be spent. Thus, it becomes necessary to look at the general monetary and fiscal program and identify the marginal reductions in expenditures had special import programs not been available—admittedly a difficult problem. The foreign exchange crisis and/or the local food problem probably would have been more severe. More should be said, but I am unable to do so.

India: The largest single program is in India (attaining $425 million of farm products). It appears that the imports went largely to feed the major port cities of Bombay, Madras, and Calcutta. Shipments from the interior to these areas were blocked to avoid cross shipments, but probably also with some impacts on the internal price structure. It appears that prices are lower than they would have been with no program—however, a series of donations is probably the real alternative. It appears that the large income elasticity for food and semisubsistence level of production may have held greater food supplies in the villages in recent years—thus contributing to urban shortages. Both price policies and the distribution of income between sectors appear to have been affected in consequence.

Under the agreements, a major part of the rupee balances were allotted to economic development. These funds were deposited in the central bank. There is reason to believe that the Indian Government, with sophistication issued other currency to support its development program. It avoided the use of Public Law 480 currency accounts, and in this way was able to support local programs without having to clear programs with U.S. officials. Again the identification of this extra program is an exceedingly difficult task.

Brazil: Wheat is a major part of the program in Brazil ($180 million of agricultural products are involved). Part of the U.S. supplies replaced wheat normally purchased from Argentina, but not available because of production and price policies there. While the funds presumably were used for economic development, there are indications that the first agreement was an exceedingly loose document. Brazilian authorities appear to have had great discretion in the use of the funds, and have added substantial fuel to the already roaring inflationary fire. In effect they spent the local currency twice.

Canada: Finally we turn to Canada, where many people feel that the U.S. program has cut in on Canada's wheat export prospects. Mr. C. D. Howe, Minister of Trade and Commerce in 1955 stated:

"I think there is no doubt that by their (United States) disposal policies they have displaced our products in certain markets. What we can do about it, I do not know. The policies of the United States are their policies and are not ours. We follow our own policies. As I say, we protest where we think a protest is warranted, and we have protested in connection with certain recent transactions."

In a recent document published jointly by the National Planning Association and

the Private Planning Association of Canada, the statement is made.[1]

"Canadian protests have gone much further than simply criticizing the disposal of surplus wheat. They also have been concerned with the particular methods of disposal—for example, the barter program which has been used to tie the disposal of wheat to the acquisition of minerals for U.S. stockpiles."

One newspaper article reported: "The cards are stacked against us in our economic poker game with the United States. It now has become clear that the only reason we may be able to sell more wheat in the world market is because we will soon be selling a lot less lead and zinc. This tie-up between lead and zinc and wheat is an intriguing one and the strings attached to it all lead back to Washington—Washington has been stockpiling lead and zinc, taking a lot of the minerals in exchange for surplus wheat. * * * This buoyed up the world market and kept prices relatively stable. With United States suddenly cutting off this heavy buying for the stockpiles, the bottom fell out of the market."

One Canadian official commented this week: "We haven't had a chance in this thing. The only reason we were able to sell our lead and zinc was because we couldn't sell our wheat. Now, the only reason we may be able to sell more wheat is because we can't sell our lead and zinc."

At the GATT meeting on November 21, 1957, the Canadian view included the following statement:

"The Canadian delegate pointed out that his delegation did not object to genuine United States' aid programs and the extension of help to needy countries; indeed, within the limits of its capabilities Canada had also extended aid of this kind. Further, in more general terms his delegation had no objection to U.S. disposal programs which had the effect of increasing consumption of the commodity in question by the amount of the disposal. The main objection was that, by a variety of techniques such as export subsidization, sales for local currencies, barter deals and tied-sales, the United States was promoting exports of wheat and flour with such determination and in such volume that it caused great damage to Canada's normal commercial marketing of these products. This was evidenced in export statistics from the United States and Canada in 1955–56 and 1956–57; while U.S. exports rose from 347 to 547 million bushels, in the same period Canada's exports fell from 309 to 261 million bushels."[2]

The Canadians themselves by these figures say that total North American wheat exports have expanded by some 150 million bushels. However, an additional 50 million of exports are a non-Pareto transfer of Canadian exports to American exports. Their objections center on the barter phase of the program.

PUTTING MORE EMPHASIS ON DEVELOPMENT

A little over 20 years ago Fred Waugh led a seminar on this campus in which he outlined the basic idea of the "stamp plan." One of the questions on which he was probed repeatedly was, "Why not preserve consumer sovereignty by giving the low-income families cash and letting them buy food directly?" The answer was along this line. "You cannot get many dollars for such a program from Congress. However, you can do a lot to bring about a better income distribution, if you tie it to an agricultural surplus program. This blending of values makes it more acceptable politically."

There is an analogy with the special export programs even in the discussions in 1954 as the original act was passed. Congress will appropriate a certain amount of dollars and authorize loan funds which contribute directly to economic development. It appears to be willing, at least in the short run, to appropriate additional money to a program which blends two objectives or values—namely, surplus disposal and aid to poorly fed people.

Certainly in these programs Congress is limiting the area of decision available to other countries, in the same way as the stamp plan limited consumer decisions.

In its present form it is clear that the Public Law 480 has no chance of being hailed as another monument in the tradition of lend-lease and the Marshall plan. It is necessary to search for new dynamic and thrilling ideas appropriate to the leadership role the United Sattes should be playing. Just as reconstruction was the major goal in Europe after the war, so economic development is the major goal in the countries receiving much of the surplus food. An appealing and dynamic program could be developed if economic development were blended in as a major goal—rather than as something to be edged into sideways. Famine relief would then be a subsidiary but legitimate part of a program which focused on the twin goals of economic development and surplus disposal. What would such a program look like?

1. It would be a long time program which would make food and fiber available to countries with development programs requiring such supplies. This would permit a country to restructure its economy without the necessity to look at its domestic food supplies crop year by crop year. Once the United States had committed itself to a 5- or 10-year program of agricultural exports, these amounts would become full-fledged claimants to our production in the same way as the domestic consumer.

2. Realistic longtime-development programs in other countries would be needed which contemplated training, investment, population transfers, public and private facilities, etc., as necessary parts of the program. Some countries will need help in formulating such a program. Imported farm products could offset some of the short-term production declines that would follow in some countries, or offset inflationary pressures as people in other countries increased food consumption. Training programs for farm people probably would involve increased consumption by those participating, and some decrease in production on the farms they left.

3. Dollar loans and grants would be needed in association with farm products. It appears that in many of the countries the range of likely projects would require that 40 to 60 percent of the extra needs be in food and fiber, but some nonfarm commodities would be required. (Roadbuilding with a low state of the arts would depend heavily on food and fiber.)

4. A number of projects, particularly strategic in economic development, might not be given proper cognizance unless the United States was willing to provide additional farm products and dollar supplies contingent upon the inclusion of such programs.

5. The United States would by itself or with other nations absorb the risk of flood or drought disaster, through world or U.S. reserves earmarked for this purpose.

6. Presumably as individual countries define their programs and compare local needs with local production, the gaps will add up to a total combination of commodities which is different from the commodity mix now in surplus. Adjustments will be needed in U.S. domestic policies to induce the requisite flow of production. Exports might decline somewhat, particularly while the development programs were being formulated.

7. It will be desirable to induce other developed countries to participate in the program—in an international transfer of resources—so as to utilize the wheat surplus of Canada, the coffee surplus of Brazil and Latin America, and the industrial talents of Western Europe in this effort. The degree of multilateral effort certainly should be increased.

8. Considerable study is needed as to the amount and type of investment, both physical and human, that is needed to enable a particular economy to take off on a self-sustaining cycle of economic growth. Every effort should be made to insure that this level of effort is attained and maintained. Agricultural export programs should be fully integrated with development programs. To do so in our "sectorist" government is difficult. Interested, sympathetic, and competent nongovernment efforts are clearly needed.

FINAL STATEMENT

There are a number of positive elements in the present program. Additional ones could be incorporated into the operations. Unfortunately, many of the positive elements are slipping away because the program is viewed as temporary. Others slip away because we are not giving sufficient attention to the requisites of sustained economic growth, and as economists we do not know enough about how to engineer development. Much of the difficulty derives from the emphasis on U.S. derived values, and insufficient attention to how our values and those of other countries might be blended and compromised so as to attain a larger value satisfaction.

With this, I turn once more to the role which agricultural economists should play. With their training in economics, their knowledge of agriculture, and their familiarity with quantitative methods, agricultural economists have much to contribute to an understanding of economic growth. In the domestic scene we find ourselves concerned with aggregate responses—supply curves, market adjustments, national control programs, etc. Yet, we hesitate to move one step further and inquire into similar relationships overseas. Some of the puzzling relationships might be clarified if we had the benefit of the perspective of another economy.

Secondly, we should stress the importance of value formulation as a vital contribution of our work. We cannot expect the general population to urge upon Congress the importance and validity of certain values which Americans have respecting other peoples, unless we, ourselves, as professional social scientists give a part of our effort to the study of values in the interrelationships of foreign and domestic policy. If you believe, as I do, that the lack of a positive program is a major criticism of America's world position, then the creation and advocating of such a program is fundamental. Against the alternative of thermonuclear war, or even the threat of it, any economic development effort is small change. Surely when the history of the 1960's is written (assuming there is someone to write it), it should not be said that the trained minds stood aside when these human values should have been discussed.

[1] W. E. Hamilton and W. M. Drummond, "Wheat Surpluses and Their Impact on Canada-United States Relations," January 1959, pp. 3–4.

[2] Ibid., p. 4.

Failure of the Mandatory Farm Price Support and Production Control Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 12, 1959

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I have said many times that our present agricultural mandatory price support program is a failure. Moreover, it is the most expensive failure in our history. During the next fiscal year alone, the American people will be charged more than $1 billion just for storage, transportation, and interest on Government-held surpluses resulting from price support programs. Total expenditures of the Federal Government for programs primarily for the support of farm prices and farm incomes constitute the largest non-defense-related item in the Federal budget.

Mr. Don Paarlberg, now special assistant to the President and former Assistant Secretary, of Agriculture, in a recent address in Ithaca, N.Y., documented the case for new legislation to allow greater flexibility in Federal farm programs and to provide greater freedom for our farmers.

His message contains a timely warning against further temporizing on this issue. The public is becoming increasingly alarmed at the huge cost of these programs to both consumers and taxpayers. The farmers are becoming increasingly restive under the leash of more and more Government control with less and less hope of permanent improvement in their situation.

I know that Mr. Paarlberg's important address on this subject will be of interest to many Members, and I ask unanimous consent that the text of his remarks be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE DON PAARLBERG ON THE OCCASION OF A BANQUET SPONSORED BY THE NEW YORK STATE COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE, THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF BUSINESS AND PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION, AND THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF FOOD CHAINS, ITHACA, N.Y., APRIL 29, 1959

In this speech I intend to make three points:

1. The mandatory farm price support and production control program is a demonstrated failure.

2. This failure is to be attributed primarily to outmoded legislation, not administrative shortcomings.

3. The remedy lies in corrective legislation along lines recommended by President Eisenhower and Secretary Benson.

I

The failure of the mandatory farm price support program, after 25 years of trial, is now clear to anyone who is willing to examine the record.

I am not speaking of price supports at moderate levels such as are in use for soybeans and some other crops. Nor am I speaking of marketing agreements and orders as for milk and certain specialty crops. Nor am I referring to the purchase of surplus crops and their diversion to the school-lunch program and to needy persons. Properly administered, all of these have proved helpful. Certainly I am not speaking of the worthwhile programs related to research, education, credit, and the conservation of our soil, water, and timber resources.

What I am speaking of is the mandatory system which requires price support for a few favored commodities at artificially high prices, and couples that support with a half-hearted and ineffective production control effort. This is the system which has failed. The failure has perhaps been most clear with respect to wheat, cotton, and corn, and less so with respect to other crops.

This program came into being during the disastrous days of the great depression, when drastic action was called for. The error lies in that a depression-oriented program was carried forward with relatively few changes first into a time of war, then into a time of postwar prosperity, and now into a time of technological revolution.

To charge the program with failure is a serious matter. I shall cite evidence in support of this judgment.

1. Farmers who grow the regulated crops have lost markets.

Cotton has been the subject of more solicitude in the way of price support and acreage control than practically any other crop. What has been the result?

During the 5 years, 1925–29, before the program began, the United States produced 56 percent of the world's cotton. During the last 5 years, this percentage fell to 31. From 1925–29 to 1954–58, production in the United States fell 16 percent. In the countries outside the United States production more than doubled. Instead of exporting cotton we exported the right and the opportunity to produce it. And we gave encouragement to handmade fibers at home and abroad.

Wheat is another crop which has been the subject of much regulation and support. During this same span of years, the United States share of world wheat production fell while surplus stocks accumulated.

Formerly the largest tobacco market in the world was at Wilson, N.C. Today it is in Northern Rhodesia, in Africa.

It is easy to demonstrate that for a given year, other things equal, a short crop of cotton or of wheat will bring a higher income than a large crop. This is the basic idea underlying production control. The important fact, however, and the fact often overlooked, is that other things do not remain equal. Other suppliers come forward and substitutes are offered. Thus, while we pursue our short-run self-interest, in the long run we do ourselves grave injury.

While supported and controlled crops have steadily lost markets and fallen behind as income earners, that segment of agriculture which has avoided control has continued to expand and win new markets.

Livestock production is not controlled. Livestock producers not only were able to find markets for the natural growth of their industry, but managed as well to market the production from the acres taken out of wheat and cotton. From 1925–29 to 1954–58, per capita consumption of beef, pork, and poultry combined rose 25 percent.

During a quarter century of support and control, the share of our farm income earned by cotton fell from 12 to 7 percent. Meantime, the share of farm income earned by uncontrolled hogs, cattle, poultry, and eggs increased from 34 to 39 percent.

2. Most of the dollars are spent in supporting the production of a few large producers of a few crops.

The favored basic crops have been singled out from some 250 farm commodities for special treatment. Though these six crops bring in only a little over 20 percent of farm income, they account for 85 percent of the Federal inventory of price-supported commodities.

Contrary to popular opinion, most of agriculture is free of controls and most farm products are sold in competitive, unsupported markets.

Also contrary to popular opinion, the price-support program affects primarily the large rather than the small farmers.

Nearly a million and a half farms produce wheat. Ninety percent of the expenditures for price support on wheat result from productions on about half of these farms—the largest ones.

Nearly a million farms produce cotton. Seventy-five percent of the expenditures for cotton price support result from production on about one-fourth of these farms—the largest ones.

For wheat, cotton, and rice producers who have allotments of 100 acres or more, the net budgetary expenditures per farm for the present fiscal year are approximately as follows:

	Per farm
Wheat	$7,000
Cotton	10,000
Rice	10,000

A frequently quoted rationale for the price-support and acreage-control program is that it is needed to make operations profitable for the small producers. But the large producers get many more Government dollars than the small producers, giving them an added competitive advantage.

3. Surplus stocks continue to grow.

Mandatory price supports are at a level which stimulates production and chokes off markets. The control program fails to check the rising surplus.

Despite acreage allotments, despite a soil bank program, and despite massive surplus disposal, Government investment in surplus farm commodities is at a record level, approximately $9 billion, and is still growing.

Just to store this vast hoard costs more than a billion dollars a year.

We already hold such huge stocks of wheat that if not one bushel of the oncoming crop were harvested, we would still have more than enough for domestic use, export sales, foreign donation and needed carryover for an entire year. And, the oncoming crop is estimated at 1,220 million bushels, the fifth largest in history.

4. The program is excessively costly.

During the present fiscal year, the net budgetary outlay for programs for the stabilization of farm prices and farm incomes will be $5.4 billion. Not all of this goes to farmers, of course. Part of it goes to commercial warehouses for storage. There are charges for interest and administration, which do not go to farmers. Some unpredictable part of this outlay will be recovered through disposal operations. But, the net realized cost is certain to be large.

Not a bushel of wheat and not a bale of cotton is presently exported from the United States without a substantial subsidy.

Budgetary expenditures of the Federal Government for programs primarily for the support of farm prices and farm incomes now are the largest non-defense-related item in the Federal budget. They run well in excess of $1,000 per farm. Net farm income in 1958 was $13.1 billion. The net budgetary outlay for the support of farm prices and farm incomes, $5.4 billion, is thus equal to 40 percent of net farm income.

As has been said, not all of this money goes to farmers. Insofar as disposal operations serve foreign policy and relief needs, costs arising therefrom should not be attributed to the price-support program.

But even after making appropriate revisions of the budgetary figure, whatever they may be, the outlay attributable to the support program directly is very great. These heavy costs might be justifiable if they were temporary, if they were solving the problems of our farm people, and if they were leading to a better balance of supplies and markets. But, unfortunately, this is not true.

II

As I said at the outset, the farm price-support and production-control program may now be judged to have been a failure.

Whose failure is this?

The question is asked not in a effort to fix the blame but in order to learn where we may look for a solution.

It is not a failure of our farm people. They are stalwart, self-reliant, and resourceful. They have done an outstanding job of producing efficiently. From the standpoint of technology they have advanced more rapidly in recent years than any other major sector of the economy. They have in fact responded to the price incentive as farm people—and other people—traditionally have.

Certainly the failure cannot be laid at the door of those farmers, a majority of the total, who earn their income from unsupported livestock, poultry, fruits and vegetables, who have steadily fought all efforts to support the prices of their commodities.

The American Farm Bureau Federation, largest by far of all farm organizations, has worked long and hard to get the Congress to relax its legislative grip on farm prices and farm production.

The failure of the farm program is not a failure of the farm people.

Nor is it a failure of Secretary Benson.

The program now in effect is not the program recommended by Secretary Benson. It is a program first enacted a quarter of a century ago, only slightly modified since that time.

In 1954 Secretary Benson asked Congress for legislative changes, and was given part of what he asked.

In 1956 the Secretary asked the Congress for the authority to make further adjustments in the level of price supports. This authority was denied. He asked that the Congress consider placing a dollar limitation on the amount of price support to any one producer. This was not done.

In 1957 the Secretary asked Congress for authority to eliminate the preferred treatment accorded to the so-called basic crops. This was not provided.

In 1958 the Secretary asked for authority to scrap the legal formula which set the stage for increased levels of price support. He was given a part of what he asked—and several harmful provisions which he did not request—for corn, cotton, and rice. Nothing important was done with respect to the other crops.

In 1959 the Secretary tried a new approach. He suggested alternative solutions. Three months have elapsed and the Congress has not even considered these alternatives.

The President has sent to the Congress four special messages on agriculture, all pointing to the necessity of reducing the price incentives which lead to the production of crops for which there is no market.

This long series of recommendations was not based on some whimsical notion of the President or the Secretary. It was based on the widest review of farm policy ever undertaken in this country. It was based on the findings of many competent research and advisory groups, among them the National Agricultural Advisory Commission, a bipartisan group of 18 men, the majority of whom are farmers.

Meantime, the Congress has given the Secretary many things for which he did not ask, legislation aggravating the problem rather than working toward a solution.

Acreage allotments have been increased, raising surplus stocks even higher.

New crops have been added to the list which must be supported.

The production-stimulating payments provided by the agricultural conservation program have consistently been forced upon the Secretary in excessive amounts.

The Secretary has been forthright in pointing out what needs to be done. He has waged an educational campaign that may yet succeed.

The Secretary has thus dealt courageously with a problem not of his making. Though dedicated to economy in Government, he has had to witness a doubling and a redoubling of the cost of programs he could not change but had to administer. Though a believer in the capability of farmers to make their own decisions, he has had to impose burdensome Government controls.

The failure of the mandatory price-support and production-control program is not a failure of the farm people or of Secretary Benson; it is primarily a failure of the Congress.

In making this flat statement, I want to acknowledge the good record of the Congress as regards price-support legislation for most farm products, the commendable action with regard to surplus disposal, and the many excellent continuing services provided for our farm people. I want to acknowledge the directionally correct but insufficient steps taken by the Congress in years past to reduce price-support levels. The onrush of farm technology has been so rapid as to swallow up the effect of these modest downward adjustments.

The truth is that the pace of the scientific revolution in agriculture has been more rapid than either the executive or the legislative branch anticipated. Both should feel regret for having underestimated the bounty of nature and the sharp advance in technology.

The chief failure of which I speak is the present inactivity in Congress in the face of irrefutable and widespread evidence that the mandatory support program has been weighed in the balance and found wanting.

Those Members of the Congress who make the strategy decisions apparently have decided that any real solution to the price-support problem will be most difficult, quite lacking in political dividends. Rather than face up to this problem, they foster the illusion that the failure of the farm program is attributable to Secretary Benson. They count on the difficulty which the public has in distinguishing between legislative and administrative responsibility. They hope to turn public dissatisfaction regarding the farm program toward Secretary Benson, who must administer it, rather than toward the Congress which authored it.

The farm program now being offered by the Congress is a one-point program: "Belabor Benson."

Secretary Benson has taken an oath to administer the laws enacted by the Congress, and this he is doing to the best of his very considerable ability. That certain of these laws are a failure is no fault of his. But, if he can be made the scapegoat, this has, in the eyes of some, the twin merit of safety explaining the failure and postponing the difficulties involved in its solution.

Meantime, while the Congress delays, surpluses mount, costs rise, markets disappear, and dislocations increase.

Agriculture's public relations deteriorate as costs and surpluses rise. The good will of the public, one of the most important assets which our farm people enjoy, is steadily being drawn down. As the farm population becomes a smaller percentage of the total, the need for good public relations steadily increases.

III

What is the solution?

The solution is to be found in legislative changes which provide, for the commodities receiving mandatory price support, treatment similar to that provided for all other farm products, most of which are in reasonably good economic position.

The solution is to be found in returning to our farm people a larger role in deciding what they shall plant and how they shall market their crops.

The solution lies in programs which build markets, not destroy them, which channel farm products into use, not into storage. A warehouse is not a market and a storage bin is not a customer.

On the basis of the record, strict production controls are not the answer. The evidence of 25 years is that the Congress will not enact, the Secretary cannot administer, and the farm people will not accept the kind of production controls needed to balance supply and demand at the price objectives specified in present law.

If farm products are to be abundant, they cannot be priced as if they were scarce.

It would be well to deal with this problem legislatively now. It would be well to make now the reasoned and gradual changes which are the product of rational thinking, rather than to wait and invite the abrupt and painful dislocations which could come when and if the public patience is finally exhausted.

Back in 1950, the public suddenly lost its patience with potato price support and Congress outlawed the entire program. Potato producers, who are relatively few in number, went through a difficult readjustment. To subject millions of wheat and corn and cotton growers to this abrupt kind of adjustment would be a grave matter indeed. It would be better not to test the public patience to the breaking point.

The President outlined a course of action and called attention to the urgency of this matter in a special message 3 months ago. The Secretary of Agriculture followed up with various alternative recommendations within the framework of the President's statement.

The solution need not be precisely the one the administration has recommended. But it must acknowledge the fact that we should no longer, through incentive prices, encourage the production of crops for which there is no market.

If nothing is done, we shall soon be committed for another crop year to the program which causes so much difficulty.

This is a wealthy country. If we were not, changes would have been forced long ago in the farm price support program.

But even a wealthy country cannot continue to waste its substance in the endless accumulation of surplus stocks, particularly when it needs its resources in a struggle for economic leadership with the countries of the Soviet bloc.

Some people have come to say that there is no solution for the farm price-support problem. A better statement would be that there is no easy solution. A 25-year hunt for an easy solution has produced only new disappointments.

Even if needful changes are made now, surplus stocks would continue and costs would remain very high for a long time. Commodities which have been sheltered for 25 years cannot quickly be returned to the rough-and-tumble of the marketplace. Our farmers cannot quickly crawl out from under a nine-billion-dollar stockpile. The return to a more orderly program must be a gradual process. We have started in that direction. The movement must not stall.

Correction of our price-support legislation is retarded by folklore and fairy tales. One of these is the idea that the administration

wants to do away with price supports. There is no intention to take away from farmers the right to legislation which protects them from the excesses of unfettered competition. These rights have been fought for and won, and I applaud the victory. The thing I am saying is that these hard-won rights should not be squandered in the continuation of a self-defeating program.

Another block to constructive action is the erroneous idea that as prices fall farmers will increase production in order to maintain income. This notion is refuted by all objective research. It is refuted by the Congress itself, which as recently as 1958 extended the Wool Act, based on the correct principle that production increases result from high prices, not low prices.

Still another obstacle is the attempted justification of the present program on the basis that other groups are subsidized and other groups have price protection. The question is not whether farmers, like other groups, have a right to helpful legislation; they do. The question is whether the legislation in question is truly helpful. On the basis of the record the answer must be "no."

The time will come when the penalties for temporizing further with this grave problem will be greater than the problems involved in dealing with it directly. And that time may be sooner than some people think.

Address by Dr. You Chan Yang, Korean Ambassador to the United States at Marymount College, Arlington, Va.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 12, 1959

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, associate editor of the publication, World Affairs, who has on several occasions delivered the opening prayer at sessions of the Senate and who is a member of the faculty of Marymount College, Arlington, Va., has brought to my attention an address delivered before faculty and students of the college on May 5 by Dr. You Chan Yang, Korean Ambassador to the United States.

In this address, Dr. Yang suggested that while the Geneva Conference is focusing attention on the question of German unification, we should not forget the reunification of Korea, which is being blocked by failure of Communist China to carry out her promises.

Dr. Yang's conclusion that firmness is the only thing the Communists understand is one with which I agree, and I ask unanimous consent that his timely reminder may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF ADDRESS GIVEN BY DR. YOU CHAN YANG, KOREAN AMBASSADOR TO THE UNITED STATES, BEFORE THE FACULTY AND STUDENTS OF MARYMOUNT COLLEGE IN ARLINGTON, VA., MAY 5, 1959

Mother Eymard, members of the faculty, distinguished guests, and young ladies, only a blind and foolish man would not welcome the opportunity to address such a charming and attractive assembly of feminine scholars. Only an unperceptive man would fail to recognize the challenge implicit in your invitation to speak to you during these critical times. Only an unwise man would neglect to address himself to the great world problem of the great struggle now going on between the Communist and free worlds.

Thus, for many reasons, I am more than delighted to have the opportunity to speak to you in all frankness and candor about current international developments. As the world awaits the forthcoming summit talks, momentous decisions must be, and shall be, made during the next several months. Speaking for the Republic of Korea, I wish to tell you officially that we are most apprehensive that those talks will be used by the Communists as a propaganda springboard.

Frankly speaking, I know full well the kind of slander and sneers which will be leveled at the Republic of Korea. There will be, of course, as in the past, the same old tired arguments from the Soviet bloc. The free world shall consider their source and ignore them. But the insidious and unfathomable opposition could also develop within the so-called neutral bloc. The confused leaders of this bloc, in seeming impartiality and asserted dedication to peace, have misled, again and again segments of world opinion and sometimes even portions of American public opinion.

College students of this country, in particular, are being systematically fed a steady diet of outright lies, which have been sugar-coated with smooth and high-sounding talk about dedication to world peace.

Let me become more specific. The question of German unification, of course, will arise at Geneva. But let us examine the equally important question of Korean reunification. Some misguided diplomats have manged to distort the record in the past on this vital question. Sometimes they have inferred that the Korean war was really a "civil affair." You have heard that President Rhee has been an unpopular advocate of aggressive means to reunify our country. Many times you have heard the argument that once we recognize Red China, and deal with her as an equal, then some kind of an arrangement can be worked out for Korea. Unfortunately, these are all deliberate lies.

Let us look at the real record on the Korean reunification question. You will recall that after years of deadlock with the Communist Russian authorities the United States took the case of divided Korea to the United Nations. Following the defeat of Japan, Korea was divided along the 38th parallel, with Soviet troops occupying the northern half. The United States had desired to withdraw its troops from the southern half and to have free elections held throughout Korea, leading to a reunited, independent nation.

Despite Soviet opposition, and despite their refusal to permit the United Nations inspection and election teams to enter the northern part of Korea, free elections were held in the southern half which was accessible. Thus, under United Nations sponsorship, the Republic of Korea was born and our great President, Syngman Rhee, was elected as first head of the state. Later, the Republic of Korea was granted full recognition by every major free nation of the world. The United Nations itself recognized the Republic of Korea as the only true Government of all Korea.

Two United Nations agencies, the Commission on Korea and its successor, UNCURK (the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea) sought to restore my unhappy, divided country to its rightful place in the international community. But they were thwarted at every turn by the Communists.

Finally, in June 1950, just as we had been predicting all along, the Red barbarians launched their infamous unprovoked aggression against the Republic of Korea. Called into urgent session by the plucky and determined President Harry Truman, the United Nations took prompt and vigorous action—authorizing the sending of an international task force of free men to help us stem the tide of Red aggression.

For the first time in the history of this world, the principle of collective security was applied. Men from 16 free nations rallied to our defense—and to the collective defense of the free world. It was at that moment actually that the United Nations was really born. It was at that time when structure really assumed substance.

Then, in February 1951, following the entry of the Chinese Communists into the Korean conflict, the United Nations, by an overwhelming vote, branded as aggressor, the invader—this time Communist China itself. Communist China has been asked to withdraw its troops from the northern part of Korea. Communist China has been asked to observe the stipulations of the armistice agreement. Communist China promised to negotiate the peaceful unification of Korea within 90 days from the signing of the armistice. Still later Communist China was asked by the United Nations to permit the Neutral Nations Supervisory Commission to enter the northern part of Korea and inspect against the possibility of an illegal buildup of military forces there. At the Geneva Conference, Communist China was asked to accede to the very reasonable proposition that free, United Nations supervised elections be held in the northern part of Korea as the means toward unification and to fill the vacancies still left open in the National Assembly since the founding of the Republic of Korea. In every single one of these cases, the Peiping regime violated international law and order, and perversely flaunted the requests and orders of the United Nations. That record is clear; no amount of double-talk can obscure these basic facts.

President Rhee and the Republic of Korea have sought reunification again and again by peaceful means. We have asked only—as has the United Nations—that Communist troops be withdrawn from the soil of the northern part of Korea, and that consequently free elections be held under the supervision of United Nations inspection teams. Our position is as simple as that. Only the nonpeaceful Red Chinese thwarted this logical and simple method of solving the Korean problem.

And please remember that we patiently retain this stand, despite our most grave concern for our brethren in the north. It should be obvious to all, that, given the opportunity, our brothers and sisters, aunts and uncles, fathers and sons, would quickly rejoin us.

The apologists for the Communists like to ignore the fact that since 1943 literally millions of Koreans from the north have braved death in order to escape Communist rule and to join us in the south. Day after day we hear the pitiful pleas of those struggling under the yoke of Communist suppression for us to come and save them before starvation and death conquer all.

It is most difficult, I assure you, for President Rhee to close his ears year after year to these cries of anguish. And in conjunction with that point, I want to make something absolutely clear in regard to the Korean peoples' support of President Rhee. As an American columnist pointed out in a report from Korea recently: "Unity with the north * * * is as much an obsession with the people as it is with the President." Those who overstress domestic difficulties within Korea—and they do exist there just as they do in every country—always ignore the basic fact that all political parties in

Korea are in agreement on the question of unification.

Apologists for the Communists rehearse the same old tired argument in regard to free China. I would not blame you at all if you were confused about the real status of the Chinese problem. Perhaps you have been told that it would be the better part of valor to dump the free Chinese Government. One specious argument being advanced for that proposition runs something like this: "Formosa is not important, nor are its islands. Besides, if the Chinese had their way, they would probably end the conflict and rejoin the central government. Chinese after all are Chinese, and Chiang really does not have the support of the people on Formosa."

People who talk like that have forgotten some very simple facts we learned during the Korean war. Do you remember when the Chinese Communist prisoners of war were screened and given their choice—whether to return to their families and homes in mainland China or to turn their backs on their past lives and choose Formosa and freedom? The stark figures are that of those Chinese Communist prisoners of war, 14,369 chose Formosa and freedom and only 220 expressed a desire to return to Red China. Let us not hear any more argument that the Peiping regime represents the true will of the Chinese people, and hence it is inevitable that they take control of Formosa.

Similarly, the Communists are sowing untruths about the peoples' revolt in Tibet. But, in this case, even neutralist leaders are opening their eyes.

I am personally becoming a little tired of the argument held by many of the so-called neutral diplomats that the growth of the Communist form of government throughout the world is inevitable. Communism is not the wave of the future. It is the deluge from the past. It is a stark and ruthless imperialism that does not even compare with the so-called period of colonialism. Of course, we people of Asia are on the march to greater heights. But let no man presume to speak as representative for all of us, nor to say that the trend is for us to leave the camp of the free world. When you think about Asia, please remember that that team includes the Republic of Korea, Free China, Vietnam, the Philippines, Thailand, the Tibetan freedom fighters, and others, specifically and directly opposed to any arrangement of any kind with the Communists.

Indeed, the Asian People's Anti-Communist League, under the leadership of President Rhee was formed several years ago to consolidate the free Asian nations opposed to communism. I dare say that this side of the Asian coin is not usually shown to you by those diplomats who only pretend to speak for all Asia and to hint that all Asian people are ready to embrace the Communists.

As for the future, perhaps we, as students of American history, could do well to gain guidance from the words of another great President Roosevelt—Theodore Roosevelt—in his speech delivered in Chicago in 1891:

"Our country calls not for the life of ease, but for the life of strenuous endeavor. The 20th century looms before us big with the fate of many nations. If we stand idly by, if we seek merely swollen, slothful ease, and ignoble peace, if we shrink from the hard contests where men must win at hazard of their lives and at the risk of all they hold dear, then bolder and stronger peoples will pass us by and will win for themselves the domination of the world. Let us, therefore, boldly face the life of strife, resolute to do our duty well and manfully; resolute to uphold righteousness by deed and by word; resolute to be both honest and brave, to serve high ideals, yet to use practical methods."

That advice is nearly 70 years old, yet it is as valid today as when first given by Theodore Roosevelt.

Firmness is the only thing the Communists understand. When we are bold and resolute, they shrink back from the field of battle. When we uphold righteousness, they blush with shame.

In conclusion, as the chief protege of the free world, the Republic of Korea extends the challenge to its god-parents to stand firmly against all future Communist tricks and talkathons. We call upon you, the wonderful and generous people of America, for your continued support. Together, believing in the codes of the free world, and determined to liberate the oppressed everywhere, Korea and America can march forward together to make the remainder of the 20th century happier. The way to peace is strenuous, but it is well worth the endeavor.

I thank you.

Law Day Commemorates Basis of American Freedoms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 12, 1959

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the President has designated May 1 as Law Day, an event commemorated in the Congress and throughout the Nation. In this connection, I believe to be of interest an address at the Law Day U.S.A. commemoration in New York City, delivered by Miss Mollie Strum, national vice president of the Federal Bar Association. Miss Strum, an outstanding trial attorney in the Department of Justice, was the first and only woman president of the predominately male Federal Bar Association's Empire State Chapter. I ask unanimous consent to have the address which she delivered on that occasion printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LAW DAY U.S.A.
(By Miss Mollie Strum)

Chief Judge Ryan, Law Day Chairman Judge Cashin, distinguished members of the judiciary and the legal profession, my friends, Law Day, like Mother's Day, now has 1 day a year designated for its celebration. Both deserve daily observance.

As surely as life is the sum of the forces that resist death, so, democracy is the sum of the forces that resist oppression, hate, and intolerance. Democracy must be based upon law. Today is Law Day.

The keynote for our American system of government can be found in the opening words of the Constitution: "We, the people * * *." Uppermost in the minds of our Founding Fathers who wrote the Constitution in 1787 was fear of tyranny. Our Government is based on the divine right of the people.

Our Constitution has become known as a living Constitution. Although it merely prescribes the framework of government, it lives because of laws made and interpreted by men. It is ever being expanded, amended, and interpreted to meet the demands of our people. The Federal judges in our audience today are among the greatest legal minds of our times, whose lives are dedicated to upholding the principles of our Constitution and who do it very ably every day.

Therefore, I stand humbly before you, grateful for this challenging and flattering assignment.

Please grant me poetic license to express the following thought. It may be sacrilegious to talk of changing the lawyer's bible, the Constitution, on Law Day, but I want to rewrite the preamble to the Constitution. I want it to begin: "We, the lucky people," not just "We, the people." After all, we, who are favored with the blessings of liberty, whose rights are guaranteed by the Constitution, are apt to take our good fortune for granted. We, fortunate to be born in the United States of America, to live in the United States of America, to be protected by the laws of the United States of America, should take a moment to contrast our philosophy of government with others; they do. In our country, every individual is a king, as opposed to Iron Curtain countries, where the state is paramount, the individual unimportant.

In this age of jet air transportation, artificial satellites, and space travel, the world has shrunk. Freedom at home is not secure when any part of the world suffers enslavement, oppression, and hunger. It is well known that Communist countries ruthlessly oppose all religion. The flight of the Dalai Lama from his home in Tibet is the latest proof of this sad fact.

The people of the world are reaching out for the essential human freedoms. Today, less than one-third of the world's population is well fed. Today, more than 700 million people—almost half of the world's adults cannot read or write any language. Today, there is untold suffering in many lands. Our form of government, yes—our Constitution gives them courage and hope. The Constitution of the United States guarantees the dignity of man in our country. The other people of the world, who do not have what we have, want the same sacred freedoms under law.

We Americans, aware of the blessings of liberty must remember that the words of the poet, John Donne, written at the beginning of the 17th century, are still true today:

"No man is an Iland, intire of it selfe; every man is a peece of the Continent, a part of the maine; if a Clod bee washed away by the Sea, Europe is the lesse, as well as if a Promontorie were, as well as if a Mannor of thy friends or of thine own were. Any mans death diminishes me, because I am involved in Mankinde. And therefore never send to know for whom the bell tolls. It tolls for thee."

As we count our own bessings, let us pray that the oppressed people on this earth, with the help of God, and the inspiration of our way of life, will someday also enjoy freedom under law, and eventually that Law Day, USA, may be universally observed as Law Day, One World, with liberty and justice for all.

God bless you all, you lucky people.

The Best Protectionism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP A. HART
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 12, 1959

Mr. HART. Mr. President, today's Wall Street Journal contains an editorial on the subject of international trade

which I think deserves to be widely read, particularly by those who believe that protectionism from foreign competition in the form of tariff increases and quotas is the answer for American industry faced with competition from abroad.

While I do not go along with all the conclusions which the editorial draws, I think it is well worth our attention. Although the editorial does not specifically point this out, one of the most potent weapons with which to fight inflation is a tariff policy which encourages lively competition both here and abroad.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, May 12, 1959]

THE BEST PROTECTIONISM

A big fair now going on in New York City is designed to dramatize the role of world trade in our lives. Yet, somewhat ironically, at the very same time the trend of American policy is not toward freer international commerce but the reverse.

Both in the administration and Congress, protectionist pressure is making itself felt. There will be much more such pressure the more successful foreign producers are in competing with U.S. business in this country and elsewhere. One measure of their success so far is the heavy outflow of gold from the United States last year, a phenomenon also evident this year.

Now rising protectionism may seem like a perfectly normal reaction in these circumstances; if imports are hurting the sales of some American firms, why not cut down on the imports? Unfortunately, the way it works out is not nearly that simple. The evils of protectionism far outweigh any temporary protection.

This is, after all, a market economy, and the keys to such an economy are competition and the sovereignty of the consumer. Protectionism strikes at both. By reducing competition and putting the protected industry in a privileged status it encourages sloth and inefficiency.

It is often argued that protectionism is merely a means of assuring fair competition; specifically, that it compensates for the fact that labor costs are generally lower abroad than they are in this country. This is one of those superficial bits of folklore that, on analysis, turns out to mean much less than it seems to.

Thus a recent study by the National Industrial Conference Board shows that foreign labor costs are, indeed, often lower than American. But what is of far more significance is that materials costs are generally lower in the United States, with the result that the smaller foreign labor costs may be no competitive advantage at all. And anyway, it is an unquestioned fact that U.S. firms have been managing until quite recently to compete very well during the 25 years that we have been gradually reducing restrictions to trade.

So the argument that more protectionism is needed now to enable American companies to compete falls to the ground. What we find instead is an arbitrary interference with competition, which robs the consumer of both the range of choice and the price benefits to which free competition would entitle him.

We ought to remember that the secret of America's fantastic growth is precisely this competitive consumer-directed market economy. The more we inhibit it the more we dim the prospects for future growth of both the domestic economy and the foreign trade on which so many of our firms depend. It should be unmistakably plain that a nation does not foster economic growth by restrictionist devices; the two things are contradictory. By a policy of protectionism we hurt only ourselves.

But if protectionism is a futile "remedy" because it misses the boat, what is the answer to the competitive difficulties a number of companies are beginning to experience? Clearly enough, part of it is renewed efforts to achieve the most efficient and lowest cost operation. More broadly, the answer also lies in war on inflation, for it is the legacy of inflation that is already causing some of the trouble. Another round of inflation could finally price our goods out of world markets; the effects of inflation are something not even the most efficient producer can compete with.

The people who demand more protectionism are making essentially the same argument as those who want price and wage controls. Unmasked, the argument is this: We refuse to deal with inflation at its source in heavy Government deficits, so we get inflation and then we try to cure some of the effects of inflation through direct economic controls or, in this case, through the control of protectionism.

It is an argument of absurdity, and the protectionism this country really needs is from that kind of thinking.

Price of Eggs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 12, 1959

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, once more I direct the attention of the Senators, particularly those on the Agriculture Committee to the low prices that the farmers are getting for their eggs. On April 10, 1959, I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter from Mr. and Mrs. John Braaten of Kindred, N. Dak., showing the price of eggs at 18 cents per dozen. On May 4, 1959, I received a letter from Alvin A. Olson, of Hillsboro, N. Dak., showing the price of eggs at 17 cents and the prices are still going down because today I received a letter from Mr. and Mrs. Leo F. Stover of Larimore, N. Dak., stating that they are getting 16 cents per dozen. Their letter follows in full.

Mr. President, I know these folks are fine examples of American citizens honestly earning a living and in some of the cases rely upon the money they get from eggs and butter to pay for their grocery bill. I assume, every time I put these letters in the RECORD, they were brought to the attention of the Agriculture Committee and the Secretary of Agriculture. Apparently nothing is being done. Certainly with the Democrats controlling two-thirds of the House and two-thirds of the Senate and with their promises to help the little fellow, here they have a glorious opportunity to pass legislation which will help. I hope they will use the power that they have to get the Secretary of Agriculture and the Congress to do something about these very serious problems.

I ask unanimous consent that the letters from Mr. Alvin Olson and Mr. and Mrs. Leo F. Stover be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HILLSBORO, N. DAK., *May 4, 1959.*

Senator BILL LANGER.

DEAR SIR: Just wanted to write a line in regard to egg prices. Seems something could be done to stop this unfair profit price the middlemen take on our eggs.

Now we get 17 cents for top grade, and that grade is very tough and sometimes unfair. I am sure a lot of No. 1 we should get. I think they drop in for No. 2, and when they sell them just over counter they charge 35 to 40 cents a dozen, which is a profit of 15 to 20 cents a dozen. A few years ago it used to be 5 or 6 cents over counter. But now they try to get 200 percent profit.

You know we can't come out to pay the feed that they eat by far.

Wish you could get a law that all hatcheries that hatch chickens would not be allowed to keep hens for egg production, as lots of them do. Some have up to 10,000 hens, and that cuts out a lot of us smaller raisers. It looks to me that they want to starve out us smaller raisers like me. We keep about 400 hens each year to help along on our farm, as we farm only 160 acres, and we need a little income from different small sources.

If these bigger raisers or hatcheries get control of market, I am sure we would have to pay 40 or 50 cents a dozen.

Wish you would try and do something about the egg price and grading, and I hope a law could be passed in Washington.

I remain,

Yours respectfully,

ALVIN A. OLSON,
A Dirt Farmer.

(Egg prices don't pay for the wear and tear on the hens.)

LARIMORE, N. DAK., *May 6, 1959.*

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. LANGER: Today our local creamery paid us 16 cents a dozen for fresh eggs. We are informed that in cities such as Grand Forks, Fargo, and Minneapolis, that eggs are being sold at exorbitant prices compared to what we as farmers get for them.

We know there is a surplus, but even if there is, we would like to know why there can be such a spread between producer and consumer, and why a variation in prices in different States.

There is a surplus of most commodities, but the prices seem to be more stable in comparison to egg prices.

Any information you can give us will be appreciated.

Yours truly,

Mr. and Mrs. LEO F. STOVER.

Memorial of Bataan Veterans National Organization Opposing Statuary Memorial on Corregidor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 12, 1959

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the Bataan Veterans National Organization,

at its annual convention held in Carlsbad, N. Mex., on April 9, 10, and 11, 1959, went on record memorializing the President and the Senate and House of Representatives to oppose legislative action to create a statuary memorial on Corregidor, commemorating those who served in the defense of mankind during World War II. The convention recommended instead that any appropriation for this purpose be diverted to the creation of a research hospital in honor of those who gave their lives.

The national commander of the Bataan Veterans Organization has sent me a copy of the memorial passed and requested that our careful consideration be given to this recommendation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the memorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the memorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORIAL MEMORIALIZING THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, THE PRESIDENT OF THE U.S. SENATE AND RESPECTIVE SENATORS, THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE U.S. CONGRESS, AND THE RESPECTIVE CONGRESSMEN

Whereas the members of the Bataan Veterans National Organization do go on record as being opposed to the legislative action by the Congress of the United States, whereby creating a statuary memorial on Corregidor, commemorating those who served in the defense of mankind during World War II; and

Whereas the members of the Bataan Veterans National Organization do hereby urge the President of the United States, the President of the Senate and respective Senators, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress and respective Congressmen to do everything possible in their legislative powers to divert the proposed appropriation for such a memorial statue; and

Whereas the Bataan Veterans National Organization do hereby urge the creation of a research hospital for the betterment of all mankind, such research hospital to advance the treatment and cures of tropical diseases, effects of radiation, and in all ways help to eliminate the sufferings of all people regardless of nationality, color or creed; and

Whereas we, the Bataan Veterans National Organization, would welcome the creation of such a research hospital that we as an organization could foster through our efforts in the coming years, thereby keeping alive the memories of our fallen comrades who so gallantly served and died: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Bataan Veterans National Organization, annual convention April 9, 10, 11, 1959, Carlsbad, N. Mex., That responsible officials of the United States and the Congress and the New Mexico delegates to Congress be respectfully urged to initiate such a change in memorial as we do recommend; be it further

Resolved, That copies of the memorial be delivered to the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States; the Honorable RICHARD M. NIXON, President of the Senate of the U.S. Congress; and the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, Speaker of the House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this memorial be delivered to the Honorable DENNIS CHAVEZ and the Honorable CLINTON P. ANDERSON, U.S. Senators from New Mexico; and the Honorable JOE M. MONTOYA and the Honorable THOMAS G. MORRIS, Representatives at large from the State of New Mexico; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this memorial be delivered to the American Ex-Prisoners of War Organization, and the New Mexico Veterans Service Commission

---

Cobalt Next Victim of U.S. Ax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CHURCH
OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 12, 1959

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, at Cobalt, Idaho, the Calera Mining Co. operates a cobalt property which has produced as much as 1,000 tons a day of high grade cobalt ore. This mine is now threatened with extinction by the decision of the administration to look to foreign sources for its cobalt.

The business editor of the Salt Lake Tribune has written a fine article explaining the situation of this mine, and I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COBALT NEXT VICTIM OF U.S. AX

(By Robert W. Bernick)

Domestic cobalt is "headed out."

And this, despite the appeal of westerners and their representatives.

With it goes the creation of another mining ghost town in Idaho and an idle industrial facility employing union labor in Utah.

The decision on whether this disaster will be visited upon the western cobalt mining and refining industry is up to the executive department of the Federal Government at Washington, D.C.

The next 30 days will be crucial in any decision which may come.

But there is, to date, precious little indication that the miners of cobalt will fare any better at the hands of the bureaucracy than have the liquidated tungsten producers, the starved mercury miners, the fluorspar people, or the crippled lead-zinc industry.

The story of cobalt is the same as for other strategic metals in the United States.

It is an old, old story in this between-wars world.

It is a wretched story of lost jobs, lost careers, and a mistake in the national defense.

Prior to World War II, cobalt production in the United States was limited to about 200,000 pounds a year—as a byproduct of iron mining at Cornwall, Pa.

The World War and its desperate need for strategic metals resident to this bastion of freedom caused Washington to search in near panic for U.S. sources of cobalt.

The development led to an expensive gamble by Calera Mining Co. on untried metallurgy, not only at the Blackbird mine in Lemhi County, Idaho, but on the refinery at Garfield, Utah.

Similar processes were involved at the National Lead Co.'s Fredericktown, Mo., properties—where cobalt was to be recovered from complex ores.

The difficulties in refining were not the only ones. Milling the arsenical, cobalt-copper ores at Blackbird posed initial difficulties.

In all it was a gamble for Calera, an affiliate of Howe Sound Co., which represented an investment of more than $12 million.

Calera had just completed opening of its mine, construction of townsite facilities, etc., at what is now called Cobalt, Idaho, when the Korean War broke upon the world. Once again, Washington called insistently for more cobalt.

At this call, the mill at Cobalt was expanded from 600 tons a day of ore to 1,000 tons a day. The General Services Administration entered into a contract to buy 4 years' supply of the metal.

It also entered into longer term contracts with foreign producers of cobalt (this is where the "old, old story" comes in. We're still buying lead from a foreign nation at better than 17 cents a pound, for example.)

Large production potentials were located in Cuba, Canada, and Africa.

(In the case of Cuba, there are now cries that Congress investigate the situation which developed regarding "cobalt and Batista.")

Be that as it may, in Idaho there was founded a community of 1,500 persons, with schools, church, and even a saw mill.

At Garfield, a refinery to produce 3 million pounds of cobalt a year was erected.

The process has been troublesome—and even now, the companies need more time to perfect metallurgy to reduce costs.

But the GSA purchasing contract is running out in a matter now of weeks.

At the same time, the stupidity of the Federal Government's open-handed spending on foreign contracting has now resulted in world cobalt prices dropping to as low as $1.75 a pound.

Domestic consumption of cobalt runs at 7 to 8 million pounds a year. African output, initially subsidized by foreign aid programs, is in the range of 16 million pounds a year.

The Nicaro, Cuba cobalt-nickel properties will deliver 4 million pounds a year—a delivery on which the U.S. taxpayer will pick up the tab if the metal cannot find a market in this country.

The Union Miniere du Haut Katanga, the big Belgium Congo metals producers which is known the world over for its "sweet charity," produces cobalt as a byproduct of open pit copper mining.

With high grade ore and the cheap labor of Congo natives, Katanga can produce cobalt at actual cost for less than $1 a pound. But, in fact, it can sell cobalt for any price it wishes to on the world market, and in the United States force the western miner to the wall merely by letting the "copper carry the cobalt."

Actions of the last decade have proved without a doubt that the executive department of the Federal Government, regardless of incumbent or party in power, has no material regard for the American western miner. In fact, it is apparent that he is a pest which should be liquidated in favor of foreign friends with whom we must share our prosperity but not our poverty.

But irrespective of any attitudes toward the domestic mining industry, Washington is making both a mistake in terms of the national defense of the American people—and also in terms of their pocketbooks.

It turns out that the Howe Sound Co. probably could shut down tomorrow and gain about $4½ million as a tax credit which could be applied to profits of its other divisions. (We even wonder why they want to stay in the mining business.)

That's $4½ million that the Internal Revenue Service can't collect or the foreign aid group can't spend.

In addition to loss of taxes in Tooele County, Utah, Lemhi County, Idaho, will lose its biggest single taxpayer at a rate of $80,000 a year. In 1957, Calera had 450 men

at work at Idaho mine and mill with a payroll of $2 million, from which they paid $332,000 a year to the Internal Revenue Service and $33,000 in State income taxes.

As the end of the GSA contract loomed, employment at Cobalt, Idaho, was dropped to 115 men at present.

As for national defense—what right-minded military man, if he had the say, would entrust the future dependency of the United States in terms of cobalt on a strife-ridden Africa or the stability of Cuba under the Castro brothers?

The answer to this question doesn't require a political opinion. It should be a matter of commonsense.

But when did commonsense have anything to do with Washington's attitude toward the domestic mining industry?

Address by Maj. Gen. Mark E. Bradley, Jr., Acting Deputy Chief of Staff, Materiel, to Chamber of Commerce Armed Forces Luncheon, Charleston, S.C., May 11, 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 12, 1959

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include, herewith, an address made by the distinguished South Carolinian, Maj. Gen. Mark E. Bradley, Jr., Acting Deputy Chief of Staff, Materiel, to the Chamber of Commerce Armed Forces luncheon, Charleston, S.C., May 11, 1959:

ADDRESS BY MAJ. GEN. MARK E. BRADLEY, JR., ACTING DEPUTY CHIEF OF STAFF, MATERIEL, TO CHAMBER OF COMMERCE ARMED FORCES LUNCHEON, CHARLESTON, S.C., MAY 11, 1959

Thanks, Mr. Fishburn, General Clark, Congressman Rivers, honored guests, ladies and gentlemen, grandpa, it is a pleasure to be here today, and to have the privilege of addressing this luncheon which is the kickoff event of your Armed Forces Week.

As I understand it, during the next several days the citizens of Charleston will have a chance to see static displays, demonstrations, and selected weapon systems representing all our services.

I hope that every one of you and your friends will take advantage of this opportunity—and I believe Charleston will because the military traditions of this city exceed those of any in the country. If any one is interested in our danger and in what we're trying to do about it, I believe you folks are.

At a time in our history when a superior military capability is vital to international diplomacy, and to our Nation's survival, it behooves every American to acquaint himself with the armed services and how they are doing their job.

Let me make it clear that this emphatic thought is not just an idle plea.

In light of present international tensions, the dramatic technical progress being made on all fronts, and the importance of a deterrent force as a tool for peace, the military organizations cannot be isolated from the population.

All of us, in service and out, must join forces in the all-out drive of the free world to prevent communism from reaching its announced goal of world domination.

Now let's talk about the threat—what the United States must do and is doing about it and how the Air Force fits the picture.

I am sure all of you have read or have heard that the aim of Soviet-directed communism is to establish its ideology throughout the world. Yesterday as a Mothers Day greeting, we had new kindly words from Mr. Khrushchev.

In a theoretical sense, the purpose is to create a utopian society—with everybody equal and without government.

Beliefs and peoples being what they are, this ideal can be written off as more Russian propaganda—but it sounds good to a hungry Chinaman or a poor African.

Further, the Kremlin bosses—being what they are—have no more intention of equalizing people throughout the world than they have of granting equality to their own and their satellite citizens.

World control is their real intent, and even if patriotism were dead, from a purely personal point of view—working conditions in Siberia are lousy.

This fact is emphasized by what we know is going on inside the U.S.S.R.

They say they are, and they may be, reducing the number of men in their military forces.

But they are increasing the capabilities of these forces with a vigor and zeal available only to a forceful dictatorship.

Concentrated scientific, industrial, educational, and military programs now underway in the Soviet Union are primarily geared to the creation of an aggressive force.

(And we must call it an aggressive force; it is not a purely defensive structure, for no one has indicated an intent to attack them.)

The results of these programs are well known.

The Soviets have a large number of high performance bombers that can hit targets in this country.

They have built up a large submarine force, probably potentially capable of nuclear power and guided missiles.

And in the field of ICBM's—if they are not ahead of us, they are at least as well advanced as we are.

To assure continued rapid progress, the Soviets have concerted drives going in all the technical fields of endeavor.

For example, it has been estimated that somewhere in the neighborhood of 80 to 90 percent of all their research and development effort is directly related to military and associated programs.

Also, they have built up a large heavy industry complex.

In their recently announced 7-year plan, they set as goals a 68-percent increase in their steel production over 1958, a step-up in pig iron output of 80 percent, and a 65-percent rise in rolled steel production.

Past history of other 5-year plans makes us agree that, while they may miss the exact percent increase—they will make tremendous strides in that direction.

Their space research programs are certainly moving forward.

There can be no doubt that they have up to now put into orbit heavier satellites than we. The only manmade satellite about the sun wears the Red star.

They have made significant accomplishments in the propulsion, guidance, materials, and electronics fields.

And it appears to be logical and feasible that they will put man in space within the relatively near future.

As a guarantee of future progress, the Soviets are increasing the number of graduates in the technical fields.

Unlike our own programs—which incitentally will produce 10,000 fewer engineers than are needed this year—their educational plans virtually guarantee as many scientists and engineers as the state requires.

It appears, then, that on the home front the Soviets are gearing their capabilities to continued aggression on a long-term basis and both economically and militarily.

Their confidence in these efforts is evidenced by the increasing number of international conflicts and crises they are fomenting.

As you know, examples include Lebanon, the Taiwan Straits, Iraq, and certainly West Berlin.

They are now the bear that growls like a wolf—rather than who walks like a man.

Individually, no single one of these poses an immediate threat of war.

But collectively, the involvements do dilute the effectiveness of the free world.

For, although none has led to shooting engagements directly affecting U.S. forces, they require a continual state of readiness and dispersal of power.

We must be in position to react immediately in any world location to local problems without weakening our ability to retaliate in case of all-out aggression.

The pressures exerted by the Soviets against the free world have posed both political and military challenges to the United States.

As a result, the Defense Department—which has the responsibility of equipping a force complex to counteract the military challenge—has created versatile defense/offense capabilities in support of national policies.

These capabilities make up our defense team.

This team must be able to defend the United States from attack, deter all-out war—or win such a war if deterrence fails.

At the same time we must maintain flexibility to cope with local crises whenever and wherever they occur.

In all sincerity, I am convinced that today we possess the ability to meet these requirements.

And when I say "we," I am referring to all the services—Air Force, Army, Navy, and the Marine Corps.

Now, let me assure you right away that I recognize the importance of the whole defense team—Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marines. My mission here, however, is not to discuss them all.

But I do want to give you a brief review of current Air Force capabilities and what we intend to do to meet the challenge of the space age.

Under the new defense organization, established last year, all air combat units will function under the direct command of unified or specified combatant commanders.

These commands are in turn responsible to the Secretary of Defense for the performance of their combat mission.

This authority is exercised for the Secretary of Defense through the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

However, prior to assignment to unified or specified commands, they are outfitted and trained by the Air Force to perform strategic, tactical, and air defense missions.

After assignment the military services continue to retain basic responsibilities for all aspects of administration and logistic support of service forces.

It is our job to obtain and train people for them, conduct the necessary research and development, procure their hardware, provide logistic support, arrange for their internal organization, budget their expenses and develop appropriate doctrine governing their employment.

Now what kind of weapons is the Air Force developing and furnishing now and in the future?

Today, B–52's and B–47's—supported by KC–97's and 135's—have the power and punch to retaliate decisively in case of all-out war.

THEY ARE THE DETERRENT

And within the near future, American-based Atlas intercontinental missiles will provide a faster retaliatory capability.

For the immediate future, the supersonic B–58 will replace the B–47's.

Two other ICBM's will come into the inventory—the Titan, which uses a liquid propellant, and the Minuteman which will employ a solid propellant. And instant reaction.

For the nearer term, the B–52 will be equipped with the Hound Dog air-to-surface missile.

This last, by the way, will have the effect of extending the aircraft's range while at the same time providing increased crew safety and survival.

Beyond this time period in question, some people believe that missiles will entirely replace piloted vehicles.

This I cannot buy.

Until radically different weapons are devised, there will continue to be a need for manned aircraft.

Someone must go look. People and things must be hauled.

A completely static condition on both sides is unbelievable. Can you imagine myriads of characters on both sides poised with finger over button and nothing else.

Accordingly, the Air Force is moving ahead with plans for a truly hypersonic intercontinental, 2,000-mile-per-hour bomber, the B–70. As well as the F–108, a long range interceptor of comparable performance.

As a logical supplement to the long-range bombing capability, tactical units have the speed and mobility to go anywhere on earth in the event of local tension.

Such aircraft as the F–100, F–101, F–104, and the upcoming F–105 provide the free world with improved means to counter limited outbreaks of war—during the next few years I think you can expect to find these aircraft wherever you also find the Navy carriers and the Marines.

For continental defense, an integrated system including Air Force, Army, Canadian Air Force, and Navy piloted interceptors, the Bomarc and Nike defense missiles, radar warning lines, and the semiautomatic ground environment create a formidable network against air attacks by the enemy.

These systems provide a comprehensive blanket of protection for the entire North American Continent.

This is not to say that the defense net is 100 percent penetration proof.

A realistic look must recognize the fact that some attackers can get through to hit targets within the United States.

But we believe the more difficult we make the task of surprise attack, the less likely it is that such an attack will be initiated. I think we all agree, however, that the deterrent threat must remain our real bulwark. A defense never won a war and never will.

These forces represent the air might we intend to rely on to thwart an aggressor.

A primary backup for them, however, is the airlift capability of the Military Air Transport Service.

MATS, which is more familiar to you, perhaps, than the other airpower components, gives us a flexibility of global movement which allows us to exploit the real effectiveness of both tactical and strategic units.

By being able to airlift fighters, weapons, and personnel to virtually any part of the world within 48 hours or less, we actually have the potential of preventing localized "hot-spots" from turning into shooting conflicts.

Last summer, as examples, MATS enabled tactical units to react to two local disturbances—one in Lebanon, the other in the Taiwan Straits.

In less than 2 days' time, we shipped fighter interceptors halfway around the world in C–124's.

In a like time period, we deployed fighter-forces plus support.

In addition to augmenting the deterrent capability of the Air Force, the Army, and the Navy, MATS has a significant economy value.

It permits us to ship high value items—engines, ground handling equipment, etc.—to oversea points as needed, and in short order.

This means that we do not have to buy large quantities of spares to make up for time lost in transit.

Also, during last fiscal year, we moved more than a million military travelers by air; the work time this saved us resulted in making about 27,000 more man-years available for the country's defense.

If time permitted, I could elaborate on an unlimited number of instances wherein MATS has played and is playing a major defense role.

The main thought, however, is that this service provides an essential flexibility for our logistic and combat forces which is an absolute must if the free world is to continue forestalling the onrush of communism.

Now, as all of you know, great forward strides currently being taken are paving the way for true space operations.

The Air Force intends to accept the space age challenge with the same vigor with which it moved into the jet age.

We firmly believe that both piloted and unmanned space vehicles will come into being as operational weapon systems.

To bring this about, we are working closely with the Advanced Research Projects Agency, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and the industrial forces of our Nation.

Today I wouldn't even attempt to guess at the shapes and performance capabilities of these future systems.

However, I am firmly convinced that before long they will be operating at hundreds—perhaps thousands—of miles above the earth, extending our defense capabilities, furthering our drive for world peace.

If we do not believe this and work toward it, we will face the same fate that has overtaken so many nations who were too slow, too lazy, or too stupid to take advantage of scientific progress.

At the same time we must also be very careful not to drop our proven manned weapons too soon—in fact, I am confident that the airplane as we know it today is here to stay.

Ladies and gentlemen, as I told friends over in Anderson last Saturday night, I am not complacent about our future military strength when it is compared to the growing might of the Soviets.

They appear to be driving toward the creation of a superior aggressive force with all the resources available to a dictatorial power.

Their purpose is clear.

And it will take a determined attitude on our part to prevent them from achieving their objectives. We must remain ahead of them in brains, technical capability, and development of better weapons and I do not see hiw this can happen on a 35-hour week.

In summary I feel we are in such a strong military posture today that our enemy does not dare attack us.

For the future our work is cut out for us. The pace is being set by a strong and ruthless runner. It will be up to you and me and the people of the free world to determine our fate by our own efforts. I have confidence, but confidence alone will not cut the mustard. We must work, we must think, we must remain the strongest.

Thanks.

GTA Daily Radio Roundup

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 12, 1959

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a Daily Radio Roundup, prepared by the GTA Public Relations Department, St. Paul, Minn., dated May 7, 1959.

There being no objection, the Daily Radio Roundup was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GTA DAILY RADIO ROUNDUP OF MAY 7, 1959

The fine points of the ways that nations deal with nations are hard for many of us to understand. A question you'll often hear asked at a local farm or co-op meeting is: "Why do nations bicker and quarrel and sometimes get involved in shooting wars?" Maybe the ordinary people of the world can find some answers where diplomats and high officials have failed.

For example, why have some nations been sitting on big stockpiles of wheat and complaining about surpluses when that grain is badly needed in other parts of the world? We hear talk about flooding markets, and stealing customers, and no money to pay. But still here is the wheat and over there are hungry people. Why not bring the two together?

So many ordinary people in so many nations have been asking that question that the pressure on men in high places to find some answers has been intense. You've all heard about the "food for peace" drive in this country. And now there are signs that it may be paying off.

In Washington a 3-day conference of the world's major wheat exporting nations has just been concluded. These countries are the United States, Canada, Australia, France, and Argentina. They talked over and outlined several cooperative programs that would help bring food to the hungry and a tangible profit to the wheat nations.

Here, for example, is what is suggested for the United States:

First. Step up assistance to needy people at home with direct feeding programs, such as the school lunch program and food for people on relief or out of work.

Second. A big increase in projects under which wheat is sold to countries like India. These countries would pay in their own currencies and the United States would lend the money right back to them in the form of long-term development loans.

In addition it is proposed that the big wheat surplus nations get together to set up national food reserves in countries or areas of the world in greatest need. Then if famine strikes, as it has recently in Haiti and India, the food is ready and waiting to feed the hungry.

Now doesn't that sound like good sense to you? GTA members who attended any of the stockholders' meetings in St. Paul in recent years and heard Senator HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, speak will recall that it is essentially his food for peace program. The Senator proposes that the United States have a Peace Food Administrator. Someone, as he said in a recent speech, "with a vision of what our food can mean to the world and someone with the ability and boldness to end buckpassing and conflict between the many agencies of Government involved in food use abroad."

So the pressure has been mounting for such a program. It led up to the recent conference in Washington that we just men-

tioned. Farmers will be watching for a definite program of action to be announced because it is in their interest, too, to have surpluses used to build peace.

And certainly, food for peace costs only pennies compared to the toll that war takes in lives and dollars.

Co-op farmers have always taken a firm stand in favor of programs to feed the hungry at home and abroad through their organizations like GTA, the co-op way.

Oregon Daily Journal Supports Foreign Aid Funds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 12, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I think all of us in the Congress have been impressed by the very strong and effective bipartisan support which has been given to President Eisenhower's foreign aid program by the only living ex-President of the United States who is a member of the Democratic Party. Of course, I refer to the illustrious Harry S. Truman, whose 75th birthday anniversary has just been celebrated by the Nation.

Because this whole question is most timely today, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a cogent and informative editorial in support of foreign aid, entitled "Aid a Part of Foreign Policy," which was published on the editorial page of the Oregon Daily Journal of Portland for May 5.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AID A PART OF FOREIGN POLICY

Protected as we were for many years by miles of ocean and warned from the beginning of entangling foreign alliances it is our nature to ask only that we be let alone.

We have fought, as a rule, only when attacked and then we have fought with a civilian army which wanted to end the war as quickly as possible and get back to the business of peaceful living.

An example was our refusal after World War I to join the League of Nations and another, our all-too-hasty demobilization after World War II.

Events subsequent to World War II thrust us into the middle of world politics but as a people we still resist the theory of Clausewitz, German military theoretician, that "war is a continuation of politics by other means." Neither do we really like the idea of using foreign aid as an instrument of politics. We are exceedingly generous when famine, flood, or earthquake ravages a foreign land, but except for this we are intolerant of an expenditure which does not produce immediately a dollar's worth of results for every dollar invested. And we believe the least to be expected is gratitude for our largess and loyalty to the form of government which made it possible. These attitudes are reasonable and could be the basis of foreign policy were it not for policies of the Russian and Chinese Communists.

They are not interested in keeping the status quo nor are they interested in self-determination for the people of Asia and Africa. To them war, particularly localized conflicts, is an instrument of politics and economic aid is in the same category.

This does not mean we must descend to the same level. It does mean we cannot rest secure behind a Maginot line of atomic missiles and a policy of massive retaliation, and it means we must look at economic aid as an important part of long-range foreign policy.

It is for this reason that some of the recent sharpshooting at the economic development loan program doesn't make sense. The fact that economic aid is to be used as an instrument of foreign policy does not mean we should close our eyes and throw away the key to the treasury.

Aid, whether it be to a flood or famine victim or to a government which wants to build a power dam, should be administered efficiently. But this should be achieved by proper supervision at the administrative level and not by a meat-ax approach to appropriation measures.

The Challenge of the American Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH GREEN
OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 11, 1959

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following remarks of Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, at a Democratic dinner meeting in Portland, Oreg., on April 22, 1959, "The Challenge of the American Economy."

On April 23, the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] spoke at a Democratic dinner meeting in my home city of Portland, Oreg. His remarks, addressed to the question of the challenge which the world situation and our own domestic situation poses for the American economy, were typical of the insight and the leadership which this outstanding Senator, this great Democrat, and great American has continued to demonstrate.

This speech was a good speech, Mr. Speaker. It did not equivocate, it did not evade issues, it did not flinch from facts. It was a speech which deserves the careful attention of every American interested in the future of our economy and the future of our people. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed, following my remarks, in the Appendix of the RECORD:

THE CHALLENGE OF THE AMERICAN ECONOMY

I want to talk to you tonight about the great challenge to the American economy—about my deep concern over its domestic aspects and my even deeper preoccupation with its implications in the field of world affairs.

There could be no more fitting place to probe this challenge than here in the great Pacific Northwest. Those who first opened this area breasted an immense challenge to their courage and strength, their practical ability, their imaginative faith. They persisted when the going was most severe.

But today, the past seems less inspiring than the eternal, forward-looking thrust of the people of this area. The very air here is quick with a sense of unmet needs, restless aspiration, determination to press ahead and to excel.

And those are the very qualities that are needed to meet today's challenge.

This challenge to the American economy can be simply stated: It is to live up to our full potential.

If we achieve this goal, our position as a world leader will be the stronger and our capacity to do the domestic jobs at hand will be the greater.

If we continue to fall short of that goal—as we have in the past half decade—the world will hold us in less esteem. And, more important, we will be less able to carry out those programs, both here and abroad, that go with world leadership.

A nation that aspires to world leadership—a nation that must lead to survive—must set its standards high and its goals higher.

Think, for a moment, of the image we now present to the world.

Twice in 5 years our economy has been ravaged by recession.

Today, 4½ million Americans are without jobs—and yet our Government glows with satisfaction that the number is 4½ instead of 5 million.

For more than half a decade, our economy has been crawling forward, while other nations have been speeding ahead.

We lack the schools and hospitals and roads and health services that we could and should have. We, the richest Nation on earth, assert that we cannot afford to raise our sights or our standards in these fields. Our Government even tells us that we cannot afford the national defense that our military leaders say we need.

We alone of all nations stand on the very threshold of realization of the prophets' dreams of unlimited abundance. Our troubles arise from our failure to call forth this abundance fully, and to use it wisely.

Others suffer because they cannot yet do what they need. We suffer only because we are not yet doing what we can.

This has not always been true of America. We have risen to challenges and attained our full potential in times past. But more recently, we have been dozing, and even the Lilliputians could tie up Gulliver when he fell asleep.

What are some of our major defaults today?

Let's look first at the greatest economic resource of any nation—its people, and especially its young people.

Millions of our youngsters are in overcrowded classrooms, with insufficient and inadequately paid teachers. Hundreds of thousands, with both ambition and ability, are denied higher education, either because they cannot afford it, or because the schools of higher learning have no room for them.

In the underdeveloped countries, only a tiny fraction of the children obtain even the rudiments of formal education. This, however, is not by any fault of theirs; they simply lack the resources to do more now.

But our own educational deficiencies exist while we have idle resources begging to be used. We have or can easily produce the steel and cement and lumber to build schools. We have idle manpower, waiting to be put to work. And what's more, if we were able to keep our economy running at full capacity, there would be ample public revenues to pay for the schools—and the teachers too.

And yet we are told that we cannot afford more schools.

Our people also need good housing and health services. But isn't it tragic that almost a quarter of the richest Nation on earth is still living in urban and rural slums. Isn't it tragic, too, that health services for a majority of the people have not begun to keep up with the amazing progress of medical science. Doctors and nurses, hospitals, and other health facilities, are in nationwide short supply, acute short supply in some areas, because of uneven distribution. Here

again, we do not lack the basic means to do better; we simply have not marshaled the determination.

What of our older citizens? We now have more than 15 million senior citizens, 65 years of age and over, and the number is increasing very rapidly. Despite some recent progress in social security programs, a large majority of these people still live in genuine deprivation. Their incomes have not kept up with the rising cost of living, and have fallen even more seriously behind advances in technology which should mean better living standards for all. A vast expansion of social security is imperative.

Two million American families and individuals still have incomes below $1,000 a year. More than six million American families and individuals have incomes below $2,000.

Of course, poverty is infinitely worse in many other lands, where tools and skills are not available. But it seems hard to believe that so many millions of citizens of the richest Nation on earth lives in poverty or close to it, only because our tools and skills are not being fully used.

After human resources, the second great source of the wealth of nations is natural resources. Some countries lack these resources. Others have them under the ground or in the water, but do not yet have the techniques to call them forth. But we in America lack neither resources nor know-how.

We need a tremendous lift along the whole front of resource development and conservation. The magnitude of the job, the high costs, the interstate character of much of the work, and above all the national interest, demand that the Federal Government—in cooperation with States and localities—resume its historic responsibility for resource deevlopment. In fact, the programs need to be bigger and better than ever before, responsive to the new needs and economic capabilities of our country.

Why are we falling so tragically short in the development of our human and natural resources? Because we are saddled with an administration that believes in living off our inheritance rather than adding to our substance.

The Republican administration has allowed our economy to limp along over the past half decade, faltering badly at times, falling far short of the growth it should enjoy.

During the past 5 years, the economy has grown less than half as fast as it grew in the first half of the 20th century—and only about one-fourth as fast as it needs to grow if we are to prevent new technology and automation from becoming an economic Frankenstein that we cannot control.

The losses from this economic slowdown are staggering. In the past 5 years, our low growth rate caused us to lose an estimated $150 billion in production. It forced upon us 10 million man-years of needless unemployment. It costs the average American family almost $3,000 in income.

And it has cost the Government billions of dollars in lost revenues—dollars that could have been put to work building schools and hospitals and broadening social security and building natural resources—and, at the same time, giving jobs to millions who sought but could not find them.

The Republicans decry spending and waste. But they are the greatest wasters of all. For how could there be greater waste than men without jobs, factories and mills without production, children without proper schools, families without proper shelter?

The Republicans also decry deficit spending. But under whose administration, I ask, are we suffering a $13 billion deficit—the largest in peacetime history? We are suffering this under a Republican administration which has sat through two economic recessions hoping America would come through on a swing and a prayer.

The Republican decry big spending. But it doesn't seem to bother them that the interest payments on our national debt have risen nearly $2 billion a year since they took office. And this is the direct result of their high-interest, hard-money, tight-credit policy which bears the trademark of a man named Humphrey. But I can assure you, it is not the HUMPHREY you see before you now. I can also assure you, we are not even remotely related—either biologically or politically—a fact that pleases both of us.

By the time this tight-money policy has run its course, nearly $20 billion will have been taken from those who have little to embroider the earnings of those who already have much.

I leave it to your own imagination as to what could have been done with that $20 billion—in schools and roads and hospitals and higher unemployment benefits and social security, not to mention the defenses we need but supposedly cannot afford.

The financial policies of this administration are not only wrong in detail; they are wrong in philosophy. They assert that we can meet larger and larger problems by doing less and less.

They do not understand the ultimate source of the wealth of nations: the improvement of human resources, the conservation and expansion of natural resources, the building of plant and tools to the full limits of technology—and, most important, the full employment of the people.

What could the attainment of these goals mean to America in the next 5 years?

If we brought our economic growth up to proper rates, and avoided a repetition of our limping progress over the last 5 years, we would, in the next half decade, produce an extra $400 billion in goods and services.

We will have the benefit of more than 16 million man-years of productive employment.

The average family would enjoy $6,000 more in income.

And local and State governments, together with the Federal Government, would have the use of an added $70 billion in revenues with which to meet the needs of a growing population.

We cannot attain these goals without looking ahead and planning for the future, setting targets for ourselves and devising programs to meet them.

So far as I can see, this Republican administration has only one goal: to balance this year's budget. That one shining goal seems to blind our national leaders to any grander goals for future years.

Mr. Khrushchev must be mighty happy to view this Nation devoid of any long-range goals or aspirations, to hear America's leaders assert that a free people cannot look ahead as a nation, cannot translate their aspirations into bold targets, and cannot call upon their unique combination of free enterprise to meet these targets.

I do not believe in an all-powerful centralized government. But I do know that our Federal Government is, or should be, a great instrument of the whole American people. I do know that it is, or should be, an effective single mirror of their yearnings and servant of their needs.

The Thirteen American Colonies recognized that they could survive only as one Nation. Lincoln put the holding together of the Union above all other objectives. And Franklin D. Roosevelt, in the time of the great depression, was able to bring home to the whole American people that the Federal Government was their Government, and that it bore a bedrock responsibility for their well-being in times of stress.

I cannot believe that we have now come to a time when the Federal Government should become a silent junior partner in the saga of America, or take a vacation.

But that's just what this Republican administration seems to want. They want a caretaker government—not a positive force for progress. They want a custodial government—to keep books and records, not to help make records of social progress.

My friends, the farmer must cultivate his farm well; but he cannot solve the problem of world food prices.

The small businessman must watch his expenditures and his sales and improve his methods; but he cannot protect himself against monopolistic threats, nor survive in a sluggish national economy.

The worker must do his own job faithfully; but he cannot create job opportunity when it is not there.

The average family must try to live within its means; but it cannot do this if its breadwinner is unemployed, and it cannot prosper and advance against a powerful headwind of unfavorable nationwide conditions.

The States and localities have much to do; but they cannot be solvent if their industries and workers are on part-time.

In these times, families and localities and States can be strong only in a strong nation. But a strong nation needs strong leadership. A national administration which tells the people only what they "cannot afford," can never fulfill the role of a leadership which realizes what the American people can do. A national administration which believes in scarcity and stagnation, can never achieve the results of a leadership dedicated to abundance and economic growth.

To resume the progressive evolution in our national life which has been the hallmark of American achievement, we need a new spirit in Washington.

This administration appeals to the people's timidity and their caution.

The times call for a government which appeals to men's confidence in themselves, which challenges them to meet higher goals, and which dares men to dream great dreams.

As the Bible tells us, "If the trumpet gives an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself to the battle?"

Our responsibility to ourselves and to the world is such that we must act with greatness. No people has ever risen to greatness without being called to greatness.

The tragedy of these years is that the voice that should summon us is silent.

The Search for Water in Arid Regions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 12, 1959

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, in our search for a solution of our domestic and international problems here in the Congress, it might appear at times that we fail to recognize the individual efforts of scholars and scientists who work toward these same goals.

I should like to call attention to Mr. Olindo Romulus Angelillo, an American consulting engineer and scientist.

Mr. Angelillo only last week was highly honored by two great Italian universities for his study on the practical possibility to expand the normal horizons of preparation, conducting an economic utilization of hydrogeological researches and exploration of water from rock fissures,

Mr. Angelillo received the medals entitled Galileo and Curtatone from the University of Pisa. He also was awarded the gold medal of the University of Padova. Both of these were singular honors.

The search for water in arid regions of the world most certainly deserves the attention of this Nation and of all nations.

As Mr. Angelillo said in his lecture before faculty members and students of the Universities of Pisa and Padova:

Water will provide the means for those in the regions of the world less endowed by nature, to have new hope and to make further progress in dignity.

After considerable research, Mr. Angelillo has concluded that a vast underground supply of water is available to arid countries if they follow his principle of the exploration of water from rock fissures.

Following his lectures in Italy, the hope was expressed by Mr. Angelillo, and by responsible faculty members of the two universities, that there be established an international foundation to be known as "Galileo Galilei" in honor of the father of science. This international foundation would develop through research the location, development, production and utilization of especially deep flowing waters beneath arid regions.

Such a foundation would coordinate the scientific disciplines of the Universities of Pisa and Padova, as well as major institutions of advanced thinking in the United States and elsewhere.

This is a project of vast magnitude, and one which, it is hoped, will be marked with full success.

I ask unanimous consent that the attached papers be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement and letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY MR. OLINDO ROMULUS ANGELILLO, MAGNIFICO RETTORE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF PADUA, PADOVA, ITALY

Egregio Rettore, thank you for the privilege of highest liberty accorded me to present the charts that set forth my studies and interpretation of the geohydrology of the Mojave Desert in California.

The approach to the location and production of water flowing along deep fractured rocks, termed rock fissure acquifers, required consideration and coordination of fundamental data contributed by each of the several scientific disciplines.

I can best set forth this significant fact by relating my experiences at your historical University of Padua.

At the conclusion of an examination of the Mojave charts under the conference chairmanship of Professor Del Nunzio, Professor Marzolo and Professor Ghetti took me to the Galileo Room and to the Morgagni anatomy amphitheater and thereafter to the Senato Accademico salon; where while facing the busts of both Galileo and Morgagni I said: "By proceeding along the path to which these great men guided us we should succeed in the quest for water thruout the world."

Professor Marzolo repeated the question he asked me in the Morgagni anatomy amphitheater:

"Do you believe that the fractures within the crust of the earth are interconnected?"

My answer was "Yes; and that we will so find it; provided we fully understand the motion within the earth itself."

A study of your hydrological field models shows how the underlying formulations, as a result of the processes of deep underground water, occasioned the swing of the lamp for Galileo to observe, as this lamp became a most extraordinary instrument to register the motion within the earth itself.

In a like manner the waters, which your professors suggested I inspect at Abano, brought forth in bold relief that which is intended by the term "the behaviour pattern of waters flowing along interconnected deep rock fissures." A system similar to the anastomosing system defined by Morgagni. This is only fully indicated by the observed evidences at your large scale field hydrology models constructed to study nature in its wholeness.

I was gratified by the manner in which your continuing uninterrupted contributions to the science of hydrology during the past eight centuries became living present in our discussions with Professor Tonini and Professor Harzolo at Abano.

I was pleased to note at your institute laboratories as well as at your field laboratories the scope of your researches, such as:

1. Your study of entrained gases in water and their effect upon the precipitating tendencies of water.

2. The study of that fluid state between water and gases while water is in an imbalanced equilibrium.

3. Your study of rock cavitation, a problem of prime importance in the understanding, of the action of deep migratory water.

Also of promise are your studies of the many characteristics of snows and glacial-snow hydrology.

All this work together with your studies of massive hydrology should contribute much to the practical recognition of time and changing patterns in the subsurfaces of the desert areas.

I was particularly impressed by your field studies of turbulences, profiles, and flowage behavior which approximates the cascades in rock fissures, either displaced or contorted by crustal disturbances.

Your planned studies of the deserts of the Middle East merit my highest commendation for its clear openminded approach; which is the result of your centuries of experience in the multipurpose utilization of water.

I am confident that the methods with which you pursue the quest for facts through research, is an assurance to humanity that there is now, and that there will continue to be an enthusiastic dedicated leadership able to resolve the integrated hydrological problems with respect to the availability of an adequate supply of water in arid regions.

It will be only as a result of the fullest application of your eight centuries hydrological knowledge that will give accessibility to the many continuing replenishing sources of water flowing deep beneath the less endowed arid regions of the world.

Your history since Galileo's pupil Benedetto Castelli (1511–1643) and Domenico Guglielmini (1655–1710) gives hope that the door to deep rock fissure water will be opened. This hope will give to all mankind the opportunity to build an enduring foundation for the peace with dignity.

REPLY OF IL RETTORE OF UNIVERSITY OF PADOVA

PADOVA, 5 MAGGIO 1959.

Mr. O. R. ANGELILLO,
Consulting Engineer,
Los Angeles, Calif.:

In view of your gracious visit during the last few days at the hydrological laboratories of this university, I am pleased to receive your statement.

I am also happy that you have initiated the suggestion of an international foundation, Galileo Galilei, whose purpose is to develop through research, the location, development, production, and utilization of especially deep flowing waters beneath the arid regions. Such scientific progress will be a contribution to the peace of the world.

Our university is grateful and happy to be enlisted in the cause, and as a Galilean University to assume responsible leadership in scientific research with respect to the Mediterranean regions and Middle East including India.

This is to confirm the fact that the University of Padova will be happy to make its appropriate scientific contribution in the development of such a program, with particular reference to such disciplines as geophysics, meteorology, snow and glaciology, hydrology, geotectonics, all directed toward the utilization of water for agricultural and domestic purposes.

To this end there will be devoted the scientific skill and experience of our scholars to accomplish the practical objectives.

This activity will be undertaken by an approach of coordinated scientific disciplines on the part of this and in cooperation with other universities of Italy and the entire world, in order to realize the maximum advantages of teamwork of comprehensive scope.

In brief time we will present a program to set forth what be required to attain the results hoped for.

As a token of recognition of your evaluation of the concepts of Galileo and your contribution to create a foundation for the true peace of the world, the University of Padova is happy to confer upon you a Gold Medal of Merit.

GUIDO FERRO,
Il Rettore.

Helping Satellites Become Free

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 12, 1959

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared recently in the New York Herald Tribune regarding the bill which the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and I have introduced to amend the Battle Act. I believe this editorial states most effectively the reasons which make this change in the law compelling.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Apr. 15, 1959]

HELPING SATELLITES BECOME FREE

A bill being introduced in the Senate today by Senators AIKEN and KENNEDY, with administration backing, deserves wide support and quick passage.

The bill would make it possible for U.S. aid to be extended to countries now bound by the Iron Curtain, if those countries were making a bid for freedom from Soviet domination. Under present law, the United States may aid only nations found not to be controlled or dominated by the Soviet Union. Under the Kennedy-Aiken proposal, aid would be specifically denied only to the U.S.S.R., Red China, and North Korea. It would make it possible for aid to be given to other presently Communist bloc nations on

a presidential finding that such aid would help those nations break free from Sino-Soviet control.

In the self-defeating limits of the present law, we deny ourselves one of our potentially most effective means of weakening the Soviet empire. We force the satellite nations to be dependent on the Soviets. Humanitarian considerations aside, our own national interest demands that we should open every practicable avenue of escape to these captive nations.

We have recognized, and rightly so, the urgent need to counter Soviet economic offensives in the underdeveloped and uncommitted areas. Yet at the same time we have clung to an outmoded law by which we deny ourselves the opportunity to launch an economic offensive in presently Soviet-dominated areas that might show signs of disaffection.

In the global chess game in which we and the Soviets are the principal players, the deliberate limiting of our own strategic initiatives is sheer folly. A bill similar to the Kennedy-Aiken proposal was defeated last year, 43–42. Let's see that it passes this year.

The Crackdown

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 12, 1959

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent article published in this week's Newsweek, written by Ben Bradlee, the Newsweek correspondent, which outlines in clear terms the mobilization of the Teamsters Union against the labor reform bill that recently passed the Senate by a vote of 90 to 1.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CRACKDOWN

In its 2-year drive to rid organized labor of racketeers and corruption, the Senate Rackets Committee has turned up incontrovertible evidence that the biggest union in the Nation—the Teamsters—is also the most corrupt and graft-ridden. Witness after witness took the stand to detail the Teamsters' long record of shakedown, fraud, mayhem, and murder. The Senate committee's exposures led to the ousting of the Teamsters from the AFL–CIO; to the jailing of the Teamsters' ex-president, Dave Beck; to the trial of his successor, Jimmy Hoffa; and to the nationwide cry for labor reform.

As a result, the Teamsters kept quiet while the Kennedy-Ervin labor-reform bill made its way through the Senate (Newsweek, May 4). Chesty Jimmy Hoffa and his boys knew that public sentiment was against them and that AFL–CIO leaders found them despicable. They knew, moreover, that in the U.S. Senate, any lobbyist tainted by association with the Teamsters might do them more harm than good.

But now that labor reform is before the House of Representatives, the Teamsters have moved out of the Capitol Hill shadows. Now, the International Brotherhood of Teamsters is leading the fight to weaken—or kill—any labor bill in this session of Congress.

The Teamsters battle plan has been skillfully drawn:

Jimmy Hoffa himself is to be publicly disassociated from the campaign.

Pressure will be applied to Congressmen only through officials of local Teamsters unions. Many of these local officers are known to Congressmen as "nice guys, and anti-Hoffa," and this suits the Teamsters' strategists perfectly.

As fronts for their lobby, the Teamsters are putting up two of Hoffa's smoothest lieutenants—professorial Harold J. Gibbons, a vice president, and pudgy, affable Sidney Zagri, a Teamsters lawyer. But the man staging the drive from behind the scenes is Hoffa—profane, crafty, and bellicose as ever.

WITH SCRAMBLED EGGS

The key maneuver in the Teamsters plan involves a series of explanatory breakfasts for Congressmen, not at Hoffa's headquarters, but in private dining rooms at the Congressional Hotel, a few steps from the House and Senate Office Buildings. Here is how it works:

Shortly after KENNEDY's bill passed, Zagri wired the officers of Teamsters locals in Kentucky, West Virginia, and Tennessee, notifying them of the time and place of a breakfast, and giving them their instructions. The local officers, in turn, wired their Congressmen invitations to the breakfast, and reminded them of the number of Teamsters in their districts. The local officers then flew in to Washington, and at 8:30 a.m. Friday, they were on hand in the Veto Room of the Congressional Hotel to serve as hosts. But they did not speak.

Instead, after the orange juice and scrambled eggs, Harold Gibbons rose to welcome the guests (nine Congressmen and several aids representing absent Congressmen), and to introduce Zagri, who would analyze the Kennedy-Ervin labor bill from the Teamsters point of view.

A master of low pressure sweet reasonableness, Zagri outlined the Teamsters' principal objections: The ban against hot-cargo contracts (which permit workers to refuse to handle products of a firm that uses nonunion labor), the picketing restrictions, and excessive powers for the Secretary of Labor.

The Teamsters' Tennessee-West Virginia-Kentucky breakfast is but one of many that will be held before labor reform comes to a vote in the House. Similar breakfasts have already been held for California and Pennsylvania. The New York Congressmen will sit down with the Teamsters at breakfast this week. Nick Morrissey of the New England Teamsters Council has invited the New England delegation for May 18. Lawrence W. McGinley, president of the New Jersey-Delaware Council has issued invitations to Congressmen from his districts for May 26.

With every meeting, the Teamsters seem to be gaining support. One Congressman who attended a session, an expert on both labor and lobbying said the Gibbons-Zagri presentation was "probably one of the best lobbying jobs ever done." And though Jimmy Hoffa might be out of sight, his purpose was plain to see. He is moving skillfully and with apparent success, to block any new law that would force the Teamsters to clean house.

More Waste by Defense Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEPHEN M. YOUNG
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 12, 1959

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, a recent editorial, entitled "More U.S. Arms Waste," which was published in the Cleveland News on April 28, 1959, is worthy of study.

The Cleveland News is a leading Republican newspaper in the State of Ohio, and the statements in this editorial appeal to me. In fact, the editorial expresses, in excellent language, my own thinking that we Senators must do our utmost to end the waste of the taxpayers' money.

It appears to me that officials of the Department of Defense are to be condemned for their wasteful policies.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. I commend the editorial to my colleagues in the Senate.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MORE U.S. ARMS WASTE

The Army has let the city of Cleveland know that production of self-propelled 90-mm guns will continue at the Cadillac tank plant until June 1, but that thereafter the plant will not be leased either to the city or private interests. The plant is one of a number of facilities being studied for possible use in a limited or general war for production of armaments.

This was all brought out in testimony before a House appropriations subcommittee. The military spokesman, however, was a bit vague about what the Army had in mind.

Does this mean a mothball process? Some 59 plants are now being held by the Government but produce nothing, thus adding to costs and waste of taxpayers' money.

The worth of these mothballed industrial plants, according to earlier testimony before a House armed services subcommittee, is $1½ billion. Unused plants held by the Army, Navy, and Air Force originally cost $1½ billion, but would cost much more to replace now.

And it is taking more than $31 million a year to maintain these installations which are now lying idle.

Here, if the Federal Government is interested in cost reductions and economy, might be a fine place in which to start a pruning process. We can't believe that holding all these plants is necessary when Defense Department officials have said it is cheaper in most instances to expand private plants than to convert Government-owned facilities.

A House subcommittee is reported to be studying the possibility of eliminating many of these plants or reducing the list of those mothballed. The longer it takes to make these decisions the longer harassed taxpayers are forced to contribute to the armed services' wasteful housekeeping.

Hon. John W. McCormack, House Majority Leader, Honored by Children's Hospital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROSS BASS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 12, 1959

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, today I had the rare privilege of attending a most impressive and inspirational ceremony in honor of our great majority leader, the Honorable JOHN MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts. During this cere-

mony, a plaque in recognition of this gentleman's devoted and effective interest and support in behalf of Children's Hospital was unveiled.

It is certainly unnecessary for me to point out this great man's many achievements in the interest of humanity during his long and active career as a public servant. However, I would like to include in my remarks a copy of the speech made by the president of Children's Hospital, Mr. R. B. Swope; a short biographical sketch of Mr. McCORMACK, which was included in a brochure published for this occasion; and, a message to the Congress which was also included in the brochure.

I shall long remember this well deserved honor which was accorded our distinguished majority leader, as his lovely wife and many friends came to pay tribute to his service:

Ladies and gentlemen, may I extend to all of you a warm welcome to what I regard as an especially significant occasion.

We are gathered here to honor an annual member of the hospital. This particular annual member also is a Member of Congress and majority leader of the House of Representatives, the Honorable JOHN W. McCORMACK.

The special significance of this gathering lies in Mr. McCORMACK's dual connection with this institution, as an annual member of the hospital and also as one of the leaders of the group of busy public servants who have the responsibility for governing the great Capital City this hospital was founded to serve.

The issue of our hospital publication, the Arrow, which all of you have been given here today, expresses more fully the thought which I would like to repeat to you now—that this hospital owes a debt of gratitude to Mr. McCORMACK, and through him to all Members of Congress.

That men and women as busy as the Members of Congress take time from crowded schedules to offer us wise counsel, to listen to our problems, and to give us the governmental support that we must have to continue in our mission as a hospital, is to me a great source of inspiration.

It is likely that without the support of Congress this hospital could not survive.

The lobby where we are standing now would not have been possible without financial aid authorized and appropriated by Congress.

Congressional action made it possible to build our new research center. And I am proud to say that our drive for $460,000 in matching funds now stands at approximately $350,000.

These things and many more are in the minds of all of us today as we gather to honor a man who symbolizes the warm relationship that exists between this hospital and Congress. He sets an example of devotion to which all of us might well aspire.

I shall not attempt to recite Mr. McCORMACK's many achievements and honors. Some of them are set forth in a brief biography which also is included in your copy of the Arrow.

I shall simply sum up by saying that in addition to the many, many things he has accomplished during his long and productive career as a member of the governing bodies of his State and country, he has been our unfailing friend to whom we have never turned in vain. And now I am going to ask two of the children this hospital exists to care for if they will please step forward. I believe they have a small token of our esteem for Mrs. McCormack, who also honors us by her presence here today. I am going to ask Cathey Finnigan and Jimmy Weiger to unveil the plaque in honor of Mr. McCORMACK which will always have an honored place here in the main lobby of our hospital.

THE HONORABLE JOHN W. McCORMACK

On National Hospital Day, May 12, Children's Hospital honored the Honorable JOHN W. McCORMACK, House majority leader, a friend of all Washington hospitals and an annual member of Children's Hospital.

Last year Mr. McCORMACK marked 30 continuous years in the Congress of the United States. He was elected in 1928 to fill a vacancy, having won a nine-man contest for the seat.

MAJORITY LEADER SINCE 1940

Mr. McCORMACK first became majority leader in 1940, succeeding Representative SAM RAYBURN upon his election as Speaker of the House. With the exception of the Republican-controlled 80th and 83d Congresses, Representative McCORMACK has held the office of majority leader in each succeeding Congress.

Among those colleges and universities which have bestowed honorary degrees on Mr. McCORMACK are Boston University, Holy Cross College, Boston College, and Tufts College in his home State of Massachusetts. Villanova College, Georgetown University, and Catholic Universeity also have conferred honorary degrees on this outstanding Congressman.

Mr. McCORMACK's church honors include the Order of Malta First Class, the Peace Medal of the Third Order of St. Francis, and knight commander, Order of St. Gregory, with star. He is also a member of the Knights of Columbus.

The House majority leader has been decorated by the Governments of the Philippines, the Dominican Republic, and Italy.

LONGTIME INTEREST IN HOSPITALS

Mr. McCORMACK's interest in hospitals dates from his early career. In 1926, as a member then of the Massachusetts Senate, Congressman McCORMACK introduced legislation to establish a Cancer Hospital in Massachusetts—a State institution to be operated by public funds. Under the leadership of the then State Senator McCORMACK, the bill passed the Massachusetts General Court and was signed by the Governor and became law. The Cancer Hospital was located at Pondville, Mass., and has been in existence there ever since. This is the first public Cancer Hospital in the United States.

During his career in the Congress, Congressman McCORMACK has been one of the leaders in the fight to appropriate Federal funds for medical research, and as the years passed, to increase the appropriations for such purposes. As the Congressman well said on several occasions when an appropriation bill was before the House of Representatives: "There is no better investment we could make than appropriate funds for medical research to bring hope to the sick and afflicted, not only of our country but of the entire world."

A MESSAGE TO CONGRESS

The most valuable resource of America is a child. Without a generation of healthy, happy, well-adjusted children there would be nothing—nothing to work for, nothing to plan for, no one to carry on.

It was the fact that the then existing generation of Washington children was not as healthy, happy, and well-adjusted as it ought to be that impelled a group of Washington citizens in 1870 to incorporate under the name "the Children's Hospital of the District of Columbia."

It is doubtful if any thinking person would contest the statement that Children's Hospital in the ensuing 88 years has made a contribution toward helping its community to possess succeeding generations of healthier, happier, and better adjusted children.

Throughout these years the hospital has healed the sick child if it was humanly possible to do so and has helped to keep the well child well. There are grandparents alive today whose lives would not have been as fruitful, healthy, or happy except for some act of caring on the part of Children's Hospital.

Children's Hospital could not have accomplished these things without the wholehearted support of the Washington community and the wholehearted support of those who govern the National Capital.

In dedicating a plaque in honor of Representative JOHN W. McCORMACK, of Massachusetts, majority leader of the U.S. House of Representatives, Children's Hospital in a very real sense also is paying tribute to the entire Congress of the United States and to preceding Congresses, to whom it has never turned in vain for wise counsel and help in fulfilling its mission.

Children's Hospital is privileged to be one of the Washington health institutions which annually is asked to help care for the increasing burden of poor children who need care but who could not be cared for without the approval of Congress in setting contract rates and providing public funds.

Children's Hospital is privileged to have been one of the Washington institutions that has been given by Congress the ability to grow and play an increasingly important role in the field of public health through such farsighted measures as the Hospital Center Act and the Hill-Burton Act.

Children's Hospital is privileged to be one of the research institutions that receive grants of funds appropriated by the Congress to help in the unceasing fight against ill health caused by little understood or unknown diseases.

Representatives of Children's Hospital invariably have been received courteously and sympathetically by the committees of Congress studying legislation that affects its work.

Children's Hospital owes a debt of gratitude to the busy Members of Congress. We take this opportunity to express our appreciation of their continuing support.

R. B. SWOPE,
President, Board of Directors.

Inflation: Cause and Effect

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. ROSS ADAIR
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 12, 1959

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, we are all interested and concerned at the prospect of continuing inflation. A recent editorial in the Shelbyville (Ind.) News is illuminating, I think. Therefore, under leave, I include it herewith:

INFLATION: CAUSE AND EFFECT

Almost everyone talks about inflation—and it is certain that everyone is hurt by inflation—but too few of us actually know much about it. Perhaps if we did, then we would be in a better position to fight it, and more inclined to fight it.

A very pointed discussion of the subject was presented recently over the Manion Forum Network by a distinguished American citizen—Charles B. Shuman, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation—and we

think some of his statements are worth careful consideration by us all.

In answer to the question: "What is inflation?" Shuman says "It is simply a constantly rising price level with the resulting decline in the purchase power of money."

He goes on to point out that we are now in the midst of a long sustained period of inflation. "During the last 18 years, the prices of goods and services have doubled in the United States. In other words, the dollar of 18 years ago is now worth 50 cents. * * * The $750 that you invested in a Government bond 10 years ago was the cash difference between your old tractor or your old car and a new one. Today you would need to add more money to the $1,000 from the bond to make the same trade."

Mr. Shuman points out that: "Higher wages cause higher prices which bring on demands for another wage hike and so on until the bitter end. This is inflation.

"Inflation, what does it do to you?

"Constantly rising prices destroy much of the value of insurance policies, annuities, social security, pension and other savings plans for old age. The incentive to save is reduced. Capital for business, industry and agriculture becomes scarce. Unemployment increases because of reduced investments in factories and tools.

"With either gradual or rapid inflation, savers become spenders as they lose confidence in the value of tomorrow's dollar. Young people find their savings for the education of their children or the business they hope to own is destroyed by inflation more rapidly than it accumulates.

"Yes, inflation hurts us all. Inflation is short-changing today's citizens and threatening to bankrupt the next generation. Inflation is the Nation's No. 1 economic problem."

The American Farm Bureau Federation president correctly points out that this short-changing, or failure to receive full value of income dollars, has reached a serious stage when the purchasing power of the U.S. dollar has been cut in half in 18 years. "Worse yet," he states, "if the inflationary trend continues at the present rate, it appears that the dollar's purchasing power will be cut in half again in the next 18 years. If allowed to continue unchecked, inflation could well destroy the value of our dollar, bringing economic ruin to the Nation."

This is just an idea of the effect of inflation. Now, what are its causes?

"Today," he says, "there are two major causes—the continuous round of wage-price increases and excessive spending of the Federal Government."

During World War II, there was a logical excuse for huge Federal budget deficits. But why should they continue for 13 years? Why indeed. As Mr. Shuman also points out, it is easy to spend money, especially when it does not seem to belong to anyone. "Demands by citizens for Federal aid for highways, schools, river dams, slum clearance, airports, and hundreds of other desirable projects, plus additional billions for foreign aid, veterans' benefits, and farmer ACP payments add up to deficit financing and great inflationary pressure. When Government spends more than it takes from the taxpayers, it competes for goods and services and drives prices up with money that has not been earned. Excessive Government spending long has been recognized as an important cause of inflation. Government creates inflationary pressures whenever it spends beyond its income."

As Mr. Shuman says, there are two major inflationary pressures at work, and both are, in a sense, either Government induced or sanctioned. One is the wage-price spiral, "where strongly organized labor asks for and gets increases not necessarily based on increased productivity. Many times," he adds, "industry's resistance to unjustified wage demands is not as great as it should be. Too often, big business and big labor sit across the bargaining table to establish wage rates and selling prices of manufactured products with little regard for the consumer's interests.

"The second pressure at work to cause inflation is that created by Government when it spends more than it takes in, thus competing for goods and services, driving prices up with money that has not been earned."

How to combat inflation? Here are three needs to get the job done, according to Mr. Shuman:

1. Monopoly and price-fixing powers which big labor and big business have today must be curbed.

2. Spending by the Federal Government should be reduced to the level of its income—in short, balance the budget.

3. Citizens must take a greater interest in local and State governmental affairs and improve their ability to perform necessary Government functions at the local level.

The American Farm Bureau Federation president concludes that: "If we do not discontinue the continued pressure of inflation, if we don't set our financial house in order, we strike a serious blow at the structure that has made for success in this Nation."

The Summit Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WINT SMITH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1959

Mr. SMITH of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, much is being written about the impending summit conference between top men of the United States, Russia, Great Britain, and France. It is generally recognized that at these top level conferences in the past 20 years, the United States has generally come out second best. These conferences began back at Yalta, Teheran, Berlin, and the last one at Geneva, Switzerland.

Recently I received a copy of 10 recommendations that U.S. members should remember when they go to this impending conference. They were received from Robert Welch, head of the Committee Against Summit Entanglements.

I append these 10 items:

The committee respectfully petitions the President of the United States not to attend a summit conference with the tyrants of the Kremlin, for the following reasons:

1. It will further increase Soviet prestige.

2. It will further discourage, and weaken the will to resist, of anti-Communists everywhere.

3. It will play right into the hands of all of the appeasement-minded politicians, and weaken the position of the firm anti-Communist statesmen, in all the governmental circles of the remaining free world.

4. The results of the last summit conference have proved to be huge gains for the Soviets, and huge losses for the anti-Communist forces. We should be guided by this experience.

5. Experience has further and fully demonstrated that any agreements which the Soviets do make will be ignored or broken, as soon as it suits their convenience.

6. The only questions raised or discussed will be as to how far we will give in to Soviet demands. Under such conditions we have all to lose and nothing to gain.

7. The President of the United States is seriously handicapped, in bargaining in any such conference with a man like Khrushchev. The President's commitments are not final, but must later be ratified by the Senate, as is well known to the Soviet Premier, who can himself speak with dictatorial authority.

8. It is an unconstitutional way for an American President to conduct foreign affairs. Treaties must be entered into with the advice and consent of the Senate. Even if retroactive consent is later obtained, both Senate and Executive are violating the Constitution as to the advice of the Senate during the negotiations.

9. Syngman Rhee is correct that "what is morally wrong can never be politically right." It is morally wrong to fraternize with murderers.

10. And Jacques Soustelle is correct that, when dealing with the Soviets, always or on any issue, "to negotiate is to surrender."

The Cause of Human Dignity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1959

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday, May 6, I had the great privilege of attending a dinner given by the National Conference of Christians and Jews at New York's Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, in honor of Mr. Louis Stein, president of Food Fair Stores, Inc. Mr. Stein was awarded the National Conference's Brotherhood Award for 1959, in recognition of his outstanding contribution in this most meaningful of all fields of endeavor.

The occasion was a most fitting one for the delivery by the guest speaker, the Honorable James P. Mitchell, Secretary of Labor, of one of the finest and most moving addresses on the unbounded capabilities of the human spirit and man's infinite potential for moral brilliance and grandeur that I have ever heard.

I was so stirred by the spirit and breadth of the Secretary's excellent remarks, entitled "The Cause of Human Dignity," that I felt they should be brought to the attention of all Members of Congress.

The Secretary devoted his text to reaffirming with brilliance and clarity that if mankind is to preserve and advance the great ideals of human freedom and dignity, he must realize that their effective consummation is inextricably interlocked with the duty to strive toward their effectuation. Stressing the moral and economic reasons for the elimination of barriers of prejudice and bigotry, he emphasized that both deep moral values and enlightened national self-interest demand the eradication of discrimination. This challenge, he explained, "is the most important decision facing America today."

Secretary Mitchell's moving thesis reflects so fully the great aims of the conference and is so appropriate to the needs of the times that I deem it an honor to request that it be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks, as follows:

THE CAUSE OF HUMAN DIGNITY

(Address by Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell before the National Conference of Christians and Jews, New York, N.Y., May 6, 1959)

I am happy to be here this evening, to add my voice to the others who have taken this time to honor Mr. Stein.

As you know, Sir Winston Churchill is visiting in Washington at this very moment. It was 18 years ago this coming June that Sir Winston was in the United States on a previous visit; as some of you may remember, he spoke at the University of Rochester, here in New York State. In that speech he presented an idea that has remained with me, and one, I believe, that we here this evening can review with good advantage.

"The destiny of mankind," Churchill said, "is not decided by material computation. When great causes are on the move in the world * * * we learn that we are spirits, not animals; and that something is going on in space and time, and beyond space and time, which, whether we like it or not, spells duty."

For us, of course, the greatest cause is that of human freedom, as it expresses itself in the cause of political freedom, the cause of individual liberty, the cause of human dignity, the cause of freedom from want, and freedom from ignorance, and freedom to worship as one will.

Mr. Churchill, with his customary wisdom, did not relate these things to mere material computation. He did not add up imports and exports, investments and labor forces, industrial plants and agricultural potentials, and give the total of these as freedom.

He related the great causes, rather, with "something going on in space and time, and beyond space and time." He was certain that any computation would fall into a great error which did not account for the accountable, the unpredictable: the creative power of the free spirit.

He perceived that man's greatest causes, today as 18 years ago, arise from the acknowledgement of that spirit.

Some people saw, 18 years ago, that this was the fundamental distinction between the free societies of the Western World, and the tyranny of the Communist world.

So coarse and shallow is the Communist view of man and his destiny that a few weeks ago a Soviet theorist announced that the satellites and rockets of recent years have adequately disproven the idea of God since they reached into heaven and didn't find Him.

I sometimes think that this kind of moral moronity is a greater danger to peace than armed aggression.

You will note, also, that Mr. Churchill's idea of a transcendental destiny is interlocked with the idea of duty.

Having realized what he is, man is obligated to act upon that knowledge.

Certainly our philosophy of life is much more than a structure of thought and logic; it is a pattern for action and plan for activity.

Thus, we in the Western World are presented with this decision—what actions are we to to take in response to our public belief in man's dignity?

Let's start right here at home.

I need not tell a gathering like this how short we are of acting as if we believed in the dignity of all men—both in what we do and what we say within our own border.

We pride ourselves on being a state created to protect human dignity. And we have a long tradition of opportunity here, based upon our early history when every newcomer to these shores found an open road and a wide land.

Now, however, the test of freedom is no longer only whether or not we can provide opportunity to newcomers—but to our own people who are witihn our borders but outside our society, closed off from the full experience of American life by barriers of racial and economic discrimination.

To meet this test, we can no longer rely on wide ranges of open land and new roads through a wilderness.

The old national road to the west, the old Homestead Act, find their equivalents in equal job opportunity in all our plants and offices and mills and mines and ships. The road to new opportunity is no longer a geographic line on a map; it runs through the plant gate to the hiring office, and it may end in the President's office.

But we all know it has barriers, detours, do-not-enter signs for many thousands of American citizens who hope to travel down it. It was not long ago that Jews and Irish immigrants faced these signs. Today the Negro in the South, and in some northern communities; the Puerto Rican on the east coast; the American oriental on the west coast; the American Indian—these stand by the wayside, watching the parade of American progress go by. Their presence is enough to make us suspect that what we say about America and what we do about it are sometimes two different things.

Yet this discrimination is intolerable, not only from moral but for economic reasons as well, reasons that can be proven down to the last decimal point.

Economically, we cannot support our standard of living for an exploding population, and maintain an adequate defense, without making use of all our human resources. We need all the talent, all the skill we can muster, and we need to develop it now.

Let me give you the figures:

There are 100 million more people in this country than there were in 1900. More than 50 million children have been born since World War II. By 1970, there will be 210 million Americans.

Now, note this fact:

In 1970, there will be 20 million people in this country over 65 years of age. That is a tremendous number of people not in the most productive age group. At the same time, because our birth rate was very low during the depression years of the 1930's, there will actually be nearly 2 million fewer 20- to 29-year-olds in our male population in the 1960's than there are now.

Consider what that means in terms of need for skilled manpower, for reviewing our personnel policies in regard to older men and women.

But that isn't all the story. Within those statistics there are important currents and changes which put an even heavier strain on our supply of trained, educated manpower:

The composition of the workforce is changing. We are needing fewer unskilled laborers; in fact, we will need no more to do all the essential jobs in the 60's than we have today. But we'll need 50 percent more professional and technical workers, 30 percent more craftsmen, and 30 percent more semiskilled workers.

Those are the figures. To sustain our present standard of living, to say nothing of mobilizing better the human resources we have in a highly competitive world, we must start now to train and educate all our young people, whatever the color, wherever their parents were born, wherever they may worship, because we cannot be without them.

The low birthrate of the 1930's has produced a generation which will be able to produce enough goods and services for a much larger population only if it is fully used, only if we waste none of our human resources. That is a practical argument which should satisfy even those who have no patience with history—or with humanity—or with religion.

But, although this practical argument is a compelling and convincing one, our stake in broader opportunity is much larger and much more essential to America on another level, and one that is difficult to document.

In the world today there are 20 new nations under the sun. They are something new to history—and they are going through a measuring-up and sizing process, making a careful estimate of the value of friendship, especially when it comes to the two most influential members of the community of nations: Russia and ourselves.

How do we look to them?

Do we look like a society topheavy with the chosen and preferred? Do we look like a society that makes varvelous progress at the expense of the least of us? Is it as Ghandi said to an American visitor inquiring about peace: "Go back to America," Ghandi said, "and when you have learned to treat your Negro citizens as equals, then come talk to me of peace. Until then, I will not listen to you."

In a world in which the educated, opulent white man is in the small minority, just how far do we expect a society to be honored that honors him to the exclusion of others?

It is against that background of world awakening and of domestic economic need that the true stature of the opportunity problem in our Nation must be measured.

The chance to live a decent comfortable life, to enjoy the products of industry and agriculture, to have the protections of medicine and savings, to have open access to the benefits of education and employment, and to worship in the manner that the conscience dictates—that is what the struggle for the world is all about. This is what it boils down to, as an aspiration only for many, many millions, and as a reality for a few lucky ones. How we conduct ourselves in the pursuit of these goals, whether selfishly or selflessly, is the most important decision facing America today.

One might think that there are few occasions for a practical pursuit of our duty; as a matter of fact, almost every day is an occasion.

A great number of writers have, for a long number of years now, tried to write about what they call "the American experience"—trying to define it, to analyze it, to picture it. I think, in the end, it is this—a feeling of respect for each and every fellow human being, knowing in our hearts that there really is something going on in space and time which has to do with the human spirit, and knowing in our hearts that we have a duty because if it.

Thank you.

What We Give and Get Back

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1959

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I attach herewith a very thoughtful editorial from the Decatur Herald, Decatur, Ill., of May 10, 1959, with reference to a survey of the Congressional Quarterly on Federal-aid grants. This is a nutshell

résumé of Illinois and what it can expect to derive from Federal-aid grants—and also what it will pay in taxes to get its proportionate share returned to the State of Illinois and its municipalities.

The editorial follows:

WHAT WE GIVE AND GET BACK

Illinois is not among the favored States in the distribution of Federal aid grant funds.

A compilation of aid payments to States, made by Congressional Quarterly, shows the State receives a smaller proportionate share of funds from the Federal Government than the proportionate share of Federal taxes collected in the State.

Actually, the total returned to the States through grants in aid is less than 10 percent of the total Federal tax collections.

Congressional Quarterly's compilation shows $7,420,770,000 returned to the States in 1958 as compared with total Federal tax collections of nearly $80 billion.

Illinois received about $285 million in grants and paid the Federal Government $6,478 million in taxes.

This made Illinois sixth among the 48 States surveyed (Alaska hadn't been admitted yet) and third in taxes paid. The Illinois figures are roughly comparable to those of Ohio, a State slightly smaller in population.

In percentages, Illinois provided 8.1 percent of the taxes paid into the Federal Treasury by the States and received 3.8 percent of the grants to States.

The largest category of grants came in the form of highway funds ($57 million), old-age assistance ($41 million), veterans' readjustment benefits ($31 million). Other categories of Federal aid include Air Force and Army National Guard, soil bank payments, aid to dependent children, unemployment compensation, and agricultural conservation.

Generally, big industrial States such as Illinois account for a much larger proportionate share of the Federal tax collections and receive a smaller proportionate share of the grants in aid.

The highest per capita return in grant money ($150) went to Wyoming. Illinois' share in the "largesse" from Washington was $29 per person, not much more than the lowest per capita payments ($21) to New Jersey.

Of course most Federal expenses are for services (such as the Armed Forces) not duplicated by the States. But the figures above give a much clearer meaning to the term "Federal aid" so often sought after by State and local governments.

Credit Unions—Bulwark of Economic Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KEN HECHLER

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1959

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, credit unions are economic democracy in action, as I indicated in the following statement which I made this morning:

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE KEN HECHLER, FOURTH WEST VIRGINIA DISTRICT, PRESENTED TO SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 3, HOUSE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY, MAY 12, 1959, ON H.R. 5777 AND RELATED BILLS TO AMEND FEDERAL CREDIT UNION ACT

Mr. Chairman, on behalf of over 36,000 credit union members in my home State of West Virginia, I wish to express my support of your bill, H.R. 5777.

I know your committee is aware of the great progress credit unions have made since the first one was established half a century ago in the United States. And I would like to commend you, Mr. Chairman, for your untiring work on behalf of credit unions in the quarter century since the passage of the Federal Credit Union Act of 1934.

As time and experience move along, the 1934 act needs strengthening. Exactly 9 years ago this month, I was with a great champion of credit unions, President Harry S. Truman, when he dedicated Filene House in Madison, Wis., to the memory of the Boston merchant and philanthropist who did so much for this movement. But since that day in 1950, as in other fields in the mid-fifties, we have not made the bold progress of former years.

I believe, as proposed in H.R. 5777, that Federal credit unions should be permitted to invest in the shares of central credit unions. I would also like to see the limits on certain types of loans raised, including the limit on unsecured loans, and I believe it would be wise to extend loan maturity from 3 to 5 years. The limit on unsecured loans should be increased from $400 to $1,000. After all, we know that since 1949 the purchasing power of the consumer dollar has decreased, and a $1,000 loan today would barely exceed the purchasing power of a $400 loan made in 1949.

It is for the welfare not only of individual credit union members, but for the entire economy of our country, that I support this legislation. In making these statutory changes, we are only taking note of the changes which have occurred in our economy—changes which, in most instances, have had their most telling effect upon the little man, the wage earner and the white-collar worker.

Mr. Chairman I believe deeply that the strength of our way of life lies in the fact that you and I and a majority of the Congress and the American people are convinced that freedom of economic opportunity is essential to our survival. Freedom of economic opportunity can only be achieved if we are concerned with the protection of that freedom for the little people—because we know that the big boys can take care of themselves.

Now credit unions are one of the best examples of economic democracy in action, for the benefit and protection of the little people, and we ought to do everything in our power to strengthen them. The people need a source, a safe source, from which to obtain small loans at low interest rates without turning to loan sharks.

In these days when we hear and read so much about Government expenditures and taxes, it is refreshing to recall that the Federal Credit Union system under the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare does not cost the American taxpayer a red cent, and is self-sustaining. And we have an opportunity by passing H.R. 5777 to strengthen the whole system without spending any more money.

Several weeks ago, I had the honor to be invited to address the annual luncheon of the West Virginia Credit Union League, in my home town of Huntington, W. Va. I expected 30 or 40 hardy experts to be present, but I was amazed when 130 credit union officers from all over West Virginia turned up at the luncheon. Since they had been getting a steady diet of credit union facts for 24 hours I told them I'd talk with them about outer space and the work of my Committee on Science and Astronautics. I've never had such an attentive audience and while they listened to me talk about outer space they indicated by their questions that they had their feet on the ground. Finally, I did slip over a few remarks about credit unions, and I pledged my support for H.R. 5777.

This morning, Mr. Chairman I am here to redeem that pledge. For West Virginia, for the economy of the country and for the average man everywhere, I hope you will use your efforts to secure the enactment of this worthwhile legislation.

Congratulations to the New Government of Laos

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1959

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I wish today to greet the Kingdom of Laos, Prince Souphanouvong and His Excellency, Ourot R. Sovannavong, Permanent Representative to the United Nations. I take this opportunity, also, to congratulate the new Laos Government, presided over by His Excellency, Phoui Sananikone. This Government, whose policy is one of restriction, austerity, and order, has set itself a hard and definite objective which can be summed up as follows:

First. Fight against Communist infiltration and development in the kingdom.

Second. General reorganization of the political, economic, financial, and social fields.

Third. National recovery.

The task of stabilizing nations newly emerged from colonialism is an immense one which we of America too often fail to appreciate. For, as His Excellency Sananikone states it:

> Yesterday, we had to work out the reunification of our motherland and the reconciliation of all the Lao peoples. Today, our goal is to safeguard our independence and our newly achieved unity by protecting them against the most terrible evil that threatens them: Communism.

His Excellency, Phoui Sananikone, emphasized that the government program rested on the following basic principles:

First. The fight against extremist ideology.

Second. True unity and independence of the Kingdom.

Third. The well-being of the Lao people and respect for the regime while seeking to promote education and medico-social welfare even to the most desolate regions; and to contribute to the maintenance of peace through a strict policy of neutrality within the framework of the principles of Panchasila and of the Charter of the United Nations.

In addition to the above enunciated policy of Laos, His Excellency pointed out that in the area of economic and financial policy the country's objective is the economic development and full exploitation of the country's national resources. In this latter regard, he pointed out that his government supported an all-out drive in favor of both foreign and local investments.

His Excellency deserves the commendation of leaders of this country for his announced policy and for the resistance

he has maintained against Communist infiltration. It was his forthright leadership that saved that nation from being overrun by the Communists last year. But for the $48 million in United States aid which tiny Laos received in 1957, the Communists might have rolled up an added victory in Asia and have now been in possession of another beachhead there.

Though determined to define itself, Laos wishes to remind its friends everywhere that it is traditionally a peace-loving country with only one wish to rebuild its economy severely damaged by war and lift the level of its people on all fronts. Again, I wish to salute the tiny country for its determination to be both free and peaceful.

National Association of Plumbing Contractors Will Hold 77th Convention in Florida

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES A. HALEY
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 12, 1959

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, one of the great trade associations in the construction industry, the National Association of Plumbing Contractors, will have its 77th annual convention and its 1959 National Plumbing-Heating-Cooling Exposition in Miami Beach, Fla., May 31–June 4, 1959.

There is an excellent reason why this splendid trade association is meeting for the first time in its long history in Florida, and that reason, Mr. Speaker, is because its president, John M. Rhoades, has been successful in his strenuous endeavors to bring this outstanding conclave to Florida.

The president, John M. Rhoades, of Sarasota, Fla., is one of our most respected citizens. He has built a fine business—a credit to himself and his profession. He is not only a successful businessman, but also a thoughtful, constructive, and progressive contractor.

Mr. Rhoades was born in Lakeland, Fla. He attended Georgia Tech and served region 4, Federal Public Housing Authority, as a mechanical engineer in Atlanta, Ga., during World War II. He is president of the John M. Rhoades Co., in Sarasota.

In association work, he served three terms as president of the Associated Plumbing and Mechanical Contractors of Florida, and is secretary-treasurer of his local association. He has been active in the National Association of Plumbing Contractors for the past 12 years, serving as chairman of the conference, sanitary, and sanitation committees, and as a member of the convention auditing, industry development, policy and interindustry liaison committees. He served on NAPC's board of directors in 1952–53 and was elected second vice president of NAPC in 1956.

He has been associated with the plumbing busines in Sarasota, Fla., for the past 34 years. A member of the Episcopal Church of the Redeemer in Sarasota, he is also a Kiwanian and an Elk. A 32d degree Mason, he is a member of the Egypt Temple Shrine in Tampa, and Samoor Grotto and Scottish Rite Club in Sarasota.

I wish to take this opportunity to join with my fellow Floridians in congratulating President John M. Rhoades and the National Association of Plumbing Contractors on 77 years of achievement and service to its membership and to the construction industry. My best wishes go to President Rhoades and the NAPC for a most successful convention and exposition in Miami Beach within the next few weeks.

Federal Administrative Practice Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 12, 1959

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I have reintroduced today a bill I was privileged to cosponsor during the last Congress, entitled the "Federal Administrative Practice Act."

This is a major and comprehensive piece of legislation which would implement proposals advanced by the American Bar Association after intensive study and independent evaluation of current administrative procedures and practices.

Mainly, the bill does four things. It would establish at interagency level the Office of Federal Administrative Practice which would be the vehicle through which badly needed coordination and direction of procedures and practice on matters of concern to all governmental agencies would be accomplished. The bill would provide new and improved procedures for the selection, appointment, and administration of Hearing Commissioners. The bill seeks to increase the efficiency of the Government legal services by establishing for the first time a legal career service for civilian lawyers in Government which would serve not only to attract the more capable and talented lawyers to Federal service but would provide incentive and encouragement so desperately needed to keep them in Government service. The final major purpose of this bill is to assure all persons the right of representation before Government departments and agencies by both attorneys and qualified lay persons, the bill would assist attorneys around the country by providing for centralized admission to practice; at the same time, it imposes standards of conduct upon these representatives, and contains a provision for adequate disciplinary proceedings.

During the last Congress, reports were requested from 26 Government departments and agencies. The reports have been received, most of them in support of the general objectives of the bill, some in support or in opposition to some parts of the bill, and most of them suggesting amendments to the legislation.

I respectfully submit that with the ever-increasing amount of administrative practice within Government circles, there is a great need for a thorough congressional study of this field to bring up to date and to improve the legal procedures and services of all of our Federal departments and agencies, some 70 in number. My bill seeks to simplify and modernize these procedures, to make them more uniform wherever that can be done, to encourage able lawyers to enter Federal service as a career, and to assure our citizens that they will receive fair and impartial consideration at hearings conducted before truly independent hearing commissioners.

Each of us in Government and all of our citizens have an interest in this proposal. I hope the Committee will see fit to schedule consideration of this legislation in its agenda this year, so that full testimony and study can be given this subject and all suggested amendments carefully reviewed, to the end that our vast governmental operations in this field are improved and modernized in the best interest of our citizens and the legal officers of our Federal Government.

Deficit Spending Means More Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUSSELL V. MACK
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 7, 1959

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, continuation of unbalanced budgets means more inflation which is another way of saying means a dollar of constantly shrinking value. The present day American dollar compared to the dollar of 1939 now will buy only 48 cents of merchandise.

Today's 48-cent dollar, unless Federal budgets are balanced, may become a 24-cent or even a 10-cent dollar.

The wise thing for Congress to do is to balance the budget and keep it balanced. That is the way to end inflation.

The following article by columnist David Lawrence tells the dangers inherent in unbalanced Federal budgets:

THE PEOPLE WILL HAVE TO MAKE A CHOICE—BUDGET BALANCING, DEFICITS, AND THE THREAT OF PRINTING-PRESS CURRENCY

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON.—It's hard for the average man to realize just what is involved in Federal budget balancing and in the increases in Treasury deficits.

At a National Press Club luncheon the other day for Raymond J. Saulnier, Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, this question was asked with reference to the drop in the purchasing power of the dollar from 100 cents in 1939 to 48 cents today:

"If I have only a 48-cent buck in my pocket, haven't I got 48 cents more than I had in the depression?"

Dr. Saulnier replied that nobody now is much concerned with 1939 except historically, and then added pointedly:

"I'd like to protect your 48 cents, you see, from now on."

This is a simple statement of a dilemma that faces the American people. Do they want to see the dollar decline still further in purchasing power so that the 48 cents they have today would before long be cut down to 24 cents?

A LIVE TOPIC

The drama of money—the threat of printing-press currency—is not yet a subject of popular discussion. But among those whose business it is to deal in Government securities—a man, for instance, like Aubrey G. Lanston of the New York firm which bears his name—the topic is very live. Lanston, speaking a few days ago before the Cleveland Society of Security Analysts, said:

"I think it will become plain that the people of this country will have to make a choice, some time over the near future, either by positive action or through default.

"They can force Congress to administer Federal finances in a responsible way—something we have urged other so-called less advanced countries to do—or we will end up, first, with selective controls of a mushrooming character and, ultimately, with a chaotic breakdown in our economy.

"The financial irresponsibility on the part of the Government has created a series of deficits that have been financed by commercial banks. No matter what you have read to the contrary, that is the fact.

"Further, it seems inevitable that the commercial banks will be obliged to absorb whatever deficits develop from here on. It also seems likely that the increase in the Government-security holdings of commercial banks will enlarge by somewhat more than the amount of future deficits, because the banks will be the only major buyers left.

"Therefore, the banks also will have to absorb whatever Government securities are sold by others.

"This kind of frenzied public finance poses a serious threat.

"We should recognize now that the number of spending measures that have been, or will be passed between now and the close of the 86th Congress, call for increased Government spending for fiscal 1961 and for later years, too.

"AN UNHAPPY PROSPECT

"The prospect of another deficit—for fiscal 1961—coming on top of a deficit for fiscal 1960, and all those that have preceded these, could produce some substantial, unstabilizing, psychological repercussions. The nonchalant, fiddling attitude of Congress—as a whole—toward a balanced budget for 1960 may be building a base for explosive developments later on."

These are significant words from one of those persons who normally speak in the most restrained phrases about Government finances.

SHORT TERMS FAVORED

Lanston's concluding advice to the public might well be pondered by those Members of Congress and others who have been ridiculing the idea of a balanced budget. He said:

"Here is the way I look at the picture: I can see no point in investing in the lowest yielding credit of all—United States Treasury securities—at long term in a background wherein the purchasing power of the dollar has been depreciating and seems likely to continue to depreciate. * * * Therefore, the best buys in Government securities are those that are short in term."

But what is this going to do to the Treasury, which has to sell for cash somewhere between $11 billion and $12 billion in Government securities during the present calendar year, to say nothing of refinancing the many billions of other previously issued securities which come due in the next 18 months?

When will Congress realize that the Treasury Department's task is of transcendent importance to the American people and the future of the whole economy?

The Cruelest Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 27, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial which appeared in the Evening Tribune, of Lawrence, Mass., on May 7, 1959, about the important matter of inflation:

THE CRUELEST TAX

The cruelest tax in the United States hits Americans in the low income brackets most heavily. It is called inflation. Increased Federal spending, which liberals insist has the purpose of aiding people of limited means, actually makes daily living much more difficult for these citizens. This is a highly important point.

Incidentally, Sylvia Porter, whose daily syndicated column appears on this page, wrote a series of articles on blame and remedies as far as inflation is concerned. It starts Friday and it concerns some of the top experts assembling in conference to find solutions to this Nation's key public problems. Inflation must come close to heading the list if it doesn't already occupy that position.

For the man-in-the-street, in Lawrence or in Los Angeles, inflation represents a kind of creeping paralysis. He can't juggle his investments to compensate for the higher cost of living; he hasn't got any investments except, possibly, a home and life insurance policy. And inflation makes maintenance of his home increasingly difficult and reduces the value of his life insurance.

Constantly rising prices destroy much of the value of insurance policies, annuities, social security, pensions and other savings for old age.

The incentive to save is reduced. Capital for business, industry and agriculture becomes scarce. Unemployment increases because of reduced investments in factories and tools.

Parents find the money saved for the education of their children is destroyed by inflation more rapidly than it accumulates.

The high cost of living affects entire communities as well as individuals. Real estate taxes rise as cities seek funds to carry on municipal housekeeping. Every item a municipality buys is boosted in price by the pressure of inflation. Thus, homeowners find it more and more expensive to maintain their homes and to get free of whatever indebtedness they may face. Money that a homeowner would use to discharge a mortgage must be turned over to the Federal Government. We can see all this right in our own area.

There is almost no end to the list of fields in which the Federal Government is handing out funds. The way that Americans are paying is through inflation—and history tells us that inflation has caused more human misery and suffering than anything short of war, famine and pestilence. In brief, it is a matter of returning to a sound economy or suffering the consequences.

If it is allowed to continue unchecked it can bring economic ruin to the Nation.

You have watched inflation corrode the dollar in your pocket year after year. You have a right to demand that every dollar is well spent and fully accounted for, and to ask that the unneeded dollar is left in your pocket.

If you don't think the job is being done as well as it should, use your citizen's privilege and make your voice heard. Maybe with some sharp prodding from you, our watchdogs in Washington will do more than bark at shadows. Maybe we'll get the sound, sensible, sizable savings we're entitled to have in this continuing battle with inflation.

On Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ERNEST WHARTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 11, 1959

Mr. WHARTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks on the important subject of inflation, I wish to include a factual editorial from the Poughkeepsie New Yorker bearing on the so-called price notification bill.

You will note that this deplorable situation is attributed to four major items—taxes, wages, raw materials, and Government deficit financing. The second and third items are surely akin and while I am unalterably opposed to higher taxes, the fact remains that it has been a long time since we have had a substantial tax increase at the Federal level. And so there remains a choice between high wages and deficit financing or possibly a combination of the two.

The Poughkeepsie New Yorker editorial follows:

RIGHT PROBLEM, WRONG ANSWER

Nobody likes high prices. That's why Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, Democrat, of Wyoming, has a chance of getting his price notification bill passed.

Something needs to be done about high prices, but it's even more important to do the right thing. This bill might look as if it would stem price rises. But it couldn't, and it would probably even keep prices up. Here's why:

This bill provides that certain businessmen would have to give 30 days' notice before raising prices, and then explain to the Federal Trade Commission in a public hearing why the increases were necessary. After the hearing, no matter what the FTC or the public thought, he could raise his prices.

So, the law could delay a price increase for 30 days, but could not prevent it.

But it could prevent reductions. Who would lower prices on the basis of a temporary drop in raw materials, if raising them when the raw material costs returned to normal would require 30 days' delay and be a Federal case?

Even in sluggish lines like machinery, business changes its prices at least three times a year on the average. In some lines there are changes almost daily. But these changes are not all upward. Among 1,500 products studied, more than two-thirds have had downward as well as upward changes

in the last few years.

Furthermore, the rising cost of living, statistics show, isn't due to manufactured products affected by the bill. While durable goods have gone up only one-tenth of 1 percent and soft goods only 1.5 percent in the last 6 years, the cost of services has risen almost 5 percent. So this bill would have no effect on the prices showing the biggest jumps—haircuts, medical service, laundry, and countless other budget items.

This bill was written on the theory that company profits have been responsible for rising prices. But the Department of Commerce figures show that company profits, both in percentage and in actual dollars, are much less than they were even 10 years ago.

Prices are set to include all costs. Profits are limited by the actions of competitors.

Prices have gone up because of increases in taxes, in wages, and in the cost of raw materials—and because of inflation caused by Federal deficit financing.

The businessman has the least power to do anything about prices. It's silly to try to control prices by controlling him, when he cannot control the costs imposed upon him. It is like writing a price bill making the clerk in the supermarket responsible for the price he stamps on a box of detergent.

Commission on Country Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1959

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, of late we have seen in many of our large metropolitan newpsapers much criticism of the agricultural situation in this country today. It was, therefore, with much pleasure that I read an article by Aubrey Graves in the May 10, 1959, Washington Post about the real tragedy facing agriculture—the possible extinction of the family farmer and the end of a way of life that has become a basic American heritage.

Mr. Graves makes reference to my bill, H.R. 5022, to establish a Commission on Country Life patterned after the one sparked by President Theodore Roosevelt in 1908.

Preliminary hearings in the family farms subcommittee disclosed differences of opinion as to the makeup of the Commission; but there was a general agreement that such a body could at least focus national attention on a disastrous prospect for the rural areas. It goes far beyond the realm of farming and includes an equally serious problem of what to do with the farmer who is unable to earn a living at his chosen profession and yet wants to raise his family in the healthful environment and atmosphere of the country.

The Commission on Country Life is of great interest to those who live in rural areas; however, it should be very carefully considered by urban people and their representatives because if country people are forced to go into the cities to seek a livelihood, the problem will be dumped squarely into the laps of the city folks.

Mr. Graves' article follows:

FINALLY THE FIGHT BEGINS FOR A BELOVED WAY OF LIFE

(By Aubrey Graves, the Squire of Grisby Hill)

"We need the development of men in the open country who will be in the future, as in the past, the stay and strength of the Nation in time of war, and its guiding and controlling spirit in time of peace." (Theodore Roosevelt.)

So concluded a special message to the Senate and House of Representatives dispatched from the White House 50 years ago.

It transmitted the report of a Commission on Country Life which, after holding hearings in 30 communities, blueprinted a better future for the Nation's farmers.

The effect of these 1909 recommendations stimulated improvements in rural health, rural schools and churches, and youth work. It led to formation of the Agricultural Extension Service and gave the background information and understanding necessary for development of cooperatives and farm organizations.

Now, after a half a century, there is need for further congressional action to save the best of our rural values. The factory in the field threatens to supplant family-farm operations. Unless steps are taken now to prevent it, it seems inevitable that large, industrialized farming enterprises, heavily subsidized by Federal price-support programs, will replace independent family units, which rarely receive any substantial help.

Between 1950 and 1954, according to the Census Bureau, 600,000 farm units of 259 acres or less disappeared.

The only place for the family farm, one group is saying, is as an adjunct to industry. Unless you take industry out into the country and let a fellow farm part time, when he is not working in the factory, then he has no future, this bloc contends.

If he doesn't like that prospect, well, then, get off the farm. This, in effect, is what the little man who considers farming not only as a way of making a living but also as a way of life, is being told.

Former Representative Brooks Hays, of Arkansas, isn't buying any of that. "It reminds me," he said, "of what the Indian chief said when a new area was taken into the United States and an agent went out and found the chief with 10 wives.

"'Look, you cannot have 10 wives, you are under Federal law now,' the agent said. 'What do? What do?' the Indian asked. 'Tell them they cannot be your wives,' the agent answered. 'Just pick one and tell the others they will have to go somewhere else'."

"'Umm, you tell them,' the Indian replied.

"The family farmer," Hays said, "is tired of being told to go somewhere else."

On Capitol Hill last week, hearings were started on legislation, introduced by Representative CLARK W. THOMPSON, Democrat of Texas, to help the man on the land cling to his heritage.

"It is significant," said Milo K. Swanton who came halfway across the continent to testify, "that the Communists were not able to substitute their system for the family farm system of Yugoslavia." Swanton operates a 130-acre farm near La Crosse, Wis.

"One of Stalin's bloodiest orgies," he continued, "resulted from his efforts to overcome the tenacious love of soil and home possessed by the Russian peasants."

Swanton said it was "not a matter of trying to hold on to a nostalgic past of the farm I knew as a child, and which I would like oftentimes to go back to. That is gone. I want to strengthen the family farm that we have today and put it into a stronger position to face uncertainties of the future."

"The world," Hays said, has tended to go off and leave the little farmer. He has been left on a hillside, suffering the ravages of erosion. While we have given notable service to the problems of harvesting and marketing, the problems of the farmer's children—their health, education and opportunities—have not received the attention they deserve."

THOMPSON'S bill (H.R. 5022) would establish a second Commission on Country Life, to delve into its trends and influences and to chart a course for the years ahead.

The Highest Tax: Unemployment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 11, 1959

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I was among the honored guests at the second annual dinner sponsored by the York County, Pa., Democratic organizations dedicated to the memory of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, last Thursday, May 7, 1959, at York. It was my privilege not only to be among the honored guests, but it was also my great privilege to hear an address by the distinguished and able senior Senator from Minnesota, the Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY. It was an address that I commend to Members of both Houses of Congress, to members of both political parties.

The address follows:

THE HIGHEST TAX: UNEMPLOYMENT

(Remarks of Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat, Minnesota, York County Democratic Committee dinner, York, Pa., May 7, 1959)

I want to talk about a subject that is supposed to be forbidden to politicians: taxes. (Did I hear a groan in the back row?)

Now before you begin heading for the exits, let me make it clear that I am not going to talk about the taxes that you pay to your county or your State or the Federal Government. The memory of that April 15 deadline is, no doubt, all too vivid in your minds to require any refreshing from me.

But there are other kinds of taxes—taxes the Republicans don't talk about, and don't want you to think about.

Let me tell you what I mean.

Here in York County, I am told that about 1 out of every 10 job-seekers is out of work. Now I consider that a tax of the worst kind, for it deprives the people of this county of things they ought to have.

It deprives the breadwinner of an honest means of earning a living for himself and his family.

It deprives the businessmen of purchasing power that is needed to keep Main Street prosperous.

It deprives York County of badly needed revenues to help conduct the public's business: roads and schools and teachers' salaries and sewers and clean streets.

Yes, unemployment—needless unemployment—is a terrible tax on the people of this county. It is a foolish, wasteful tax.

Pennsylvania is paying the tax of unemployment, too. I am told that almost a half million Pennsylvanians are out of work.

I am also told of the vigorous efforts being made to improve the economic well-being of this State by your fine Governor, Dave Lawrence. I know he will do everything—and I mean everything—within his power to reduce unemployment in the State.

But there is only so much a Governor can do. For unemployment is not just a State problem; it is a national problem.

No State can do well when the Nation is not doing its best.

Unhappily, this particular kind of tax—this tax of unemployment—is not just being paid by the people of York County or Pennsylvania. It is being paid in hundreds of counties across the nation. It is being paid by much more than four million Americans.

Now I hope that no one will breathe a word of what I have just told you about all this unemployment. I'm afraid I have just divulged one of official Washington's best kept secrets.

You know, I sometimes get the impression that the Republicans honestly believe that if they ignore unemployment long enough, and refuse to recognize its existence, that somehow, by some miracle, it will go away.

Every month, the leaders of this Republican administration breathlessly await the latest unemployment figures to be worked up by the Labor Department. If the figures are encouraging, they release them a little earlier than usual—but not before the President, and the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of Labor have all issued separate glowing statements telling the country how great the new statistics are going to be.

Now I join with the leaders of this administration in rejoicing at every gain in employment and every drop in unemployment. But when I look at these glowing statements issued by the Republican leaders, I look in vain for some expression of compassion for the millions of families who have no breadwinner. I look in vain for some sign of concern for the hundreds of thousands of families who have exhausted their unemployment benefits and have nowhere to turn.

And I am filled with misgivings and mistrust when I see these Republican leaders juggling with these figures as if there were no human lives involved.

The Secretary of Labor tells us that there will be only three million Americans unemployed by next October. Of course, to the man who's out of a job, "prosperity-around-the-corner" doesn't go very far toward paying the bills or feeding the family.

But no matter—what's important to the Republicans is that the slogan sounds good. Prosperity by fall. Prosperity by October.

What the Republicans don't tell you is that October is traditionally a month of very low unemployment—a month when the figures look the best. But when you take into account the seasonal swings in unemployment, three million in October is actually almost no improvement over what we have now.

But that's not what this Republican administration would have you believe.

Maybe you don't believe me when I tell you that national unemployment is a tax. Well, let me put it in dollars and cents.

Since this Republican administration took office, the American economy has grown only half as fast as it did in the previous 8 years.

That half growth has cost the average American family $3,000 in real income since 1953.

It cost the Nation more than $150 billion in lost production—goods that should have been produced and bought and put in every American home.

It cost the American farmers $30 billion in income.

It cost American businessmen some $40 billion in investment opportunity.

And it deprived State and local governments as well as the U.S. Treasury between $25 and $30 billion in badly needed revenues—money that could have been put to use in building better roads and better schools and more hospitals—and a stronger defense against the Communists.

Now maybe you begin to understand what I mean when I call unemployment a tax.

Let me tell you about some other Republican taxes.

Let me tell you about the tax of Republican inflation. Now in a sense, this is the most remarkable tax of all, for the Republicans have achieved the impossible. They have brought on rising prices in the midst of high unemployment.

As they say on the radio these days, "They said it couldn't be done."

But Humphrey did it—and not the HUMPHREY you're looking at, either. It was a Humphrey named George who preferred a stable dollar to a vigorous economy and got neither.

The Republicans are fond of talking about the sound dollar. It may surprise you to know that the Republican inflation since 1955 has been the most rapid we have ever experienced except under conditions created by war.

How did they do it?

How did they cause recordbreaking inflation during recession?

Well, they did it partly with economic slack, for idle plants and idle men breed inefficiency, and inefficiency means high prices.

But they also did it with some costly economic policies, costly to every American man, woman, and child.

Perhaps the most high-priced of these is the so-called tight money policy. In case you don't know what the tight money policy is, it's what makes it cost so much to borrow money for a car or a house.

Before that tight money policy has run its course, it will have taken about $20 billion out of the pockets of the American people, an average of about $400 per family.

If that's not a tax, I don't know what is.

It's the Republicans who are the taxers of this Nation, for they tax America with unemployment; they tax it with tight money; they tax it with inflation. If you want to go on paying that kind of tax, it can be easily arranged; just vote Republican in 1960.

Personally, that is a prescription I do not commend to my own family, so I hardly feel it fair to recommend it to you. In fact, I am tempted to slip in a suggestion that you vote Democratic.

Now let me tell you about the taxes we can all avoid paying, if we are able to achieve once again the same economic growth we had under President Truman.

If we do that instead of allowing our growth to lag at its present pace, America will gain some $400 billion in total output in the 7-year period from 1958 through 1964.

The average American family will enjoy about $6,000 more in real buying power during that same period.

Federal, State, and local governments will have the use of about $70 billion more in revenues.

Which way will America choose? The way of stagnation? Or the way of growth?

This question is not just important to America. It is important to the entire free world.

America today is challenged, but not merely by Communist growth and expansion. Even if that threat were to disappear—and it will not—we would still be challenged by the knowledge and aspirations of millions of people all around the world.

For the first time in human history, these people know that there exists the means, the know-how to stamp out starvation and to create plenty. They know that the economic and political means can be devised to harness this technology to the service of mankind.

Because of our unrivaled potentials here in the United States, these people's eyes are fastened upon what we do.

To the extent that we do what we can and should, we shall provide an example for others to follow. To the extent that we fail or falter, many will be drawn by the blandishments or yield to the threats of the totalitarian States.

Our influence abroad depends in large measure upon our policies at home. There is no such thing as a forward-looking international policy and a backward-looking domestic policy. A nation which is not in tune with the second half of the 20th century at home, cannot hear the impelling cry of the second half of the 20th century all around the globe.

Nations and peoples overseas, struggling despite pitifully scarce resources to provide full employment, cannot maintain high respect for a nation which tolerates or even cultivates high unemployment.

Poor nations and primitive peoples who cannot afford to do what they need, cannot greatly respect a nation which says that it cannot afford the essentials which its idle resources would easily provide if put to use.

Free nations growing several times faster than we and watching the totalitarian States grow even faster, cannot greatly respect a nation which confuses economic stagnation with economic stability.

Other nations cannot greatly respect a nation which refuses to join them in using some of our surpluses of foods and other materials to help erase a small portion of their staggering deficits.

Nor is our world prestige enhanced when, preponderantly through their own hard efforts, other peoples improve their economic condition, only to have America begin to fear that they will take markets away from us or impair our world trade. Can it do us any good to pretend that we want the rest of the free world to become stronger, if our leadership regards their weakness as the source of our strength?

For international as well as domestic reasons, therefore, America must return to the road of full prosperity, full employment.

One of the great legislative milestones of the postwar era was the enactment of the Full Employment Act of 1946. That law pledged the Government of the United States to devote every resource at its command to assure maximum employment and production for America. It called on the Government to plan for that purpose.

If the present Republican administration has not flagrantly violated that law, it has totally disregarded its spirit. For it has now sat through two great economic recessions, devoting most of its energies to a desperate search for signs of better times, and seeming to place its faith in the song, "Wishing Will Make It So."

There has been no Government thrust for full employment because our Government has lacked that essential ingredient: Presidential leadership.

Fortunately, this has not always been the case. Presidential leadership was not lacking when America heard the words, "We have nothing to fear but fear itself"—words that came from the magic voice of Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

Nor was presidential leadership lacking when the White House was occupied by that man of Independence, who tomorrow celebrates his 75th birthday—Harry S Truman.

Before the war, Franklin Roosevelt devoted his energies to banishing the scourge of a Republican depression and seeing to it that there was a job for every American.

After the war Harry Truman devoted his energies to banishing a time-honored economic axiom: that every war must be followed by a recession.

Under Harry Truman, America adjusted from war to peace, without faltering.

Under Harry Truman, the Congress enacted the Full Employment Act.

Seven years later, as he was leaving office, President Truman told Congress of the true meaning of that act. Let me recall his words for you:

"Full employment means more than jobs. It means full utilization of our natural resources, our technology and science, our farms and factories, our business brains, and our labor skills. The concept of full employment values ends as well as means: it values leisure as well as work; it values self-development as well as dedication to a common purpose; it values individual initiative as well as group cooperation. In the broadest sense, full employment means maximum opportunity under the American system of responsible freedom.

• • • • •

"We cannot afford to be complacent. We cannot assume that henceforth what needs to be done to promote the maintenance of full employment will be done. None of us—regardless of party—should let the idea of full employment generate into a slogan bandied about for narrow political advantage. Like freedom, it needs to be guarded zealously and translated into action on a continuing basis."

Those words of Harry S Truman ring true today. Let every American take them to heart.

People to People in South America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 12, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, last November a group was formed to travel through South America as a part of the President's people-to-people program. In this group was Mrs. Oscar M. Ruebhausen, observer for the League of Women Voters at the United Nations. In the national publication of the league, the National Voter, for May 1959, Mrs. Ruebhausen reported on her trip. I commend this report to my colleagues and under a previous consent include it here:

PEOPLE TO PEOPLE IN ACTION

(By Mrs. Oscar M. Ruebhausen, observer for the League of Women Voters at the United Nations)

When asked "How would you like to travel in South America for a month?" I said "Who wouldn't?" My offer came from the Carrie Chapman Catt Memorial Fund, who gave me a grant to represent them and the League of Women Voters on a people-to-people mission under the auspices of International Seminars, Inc.

Last November, 30 men and women representing 25 U.S. organizations set forth to meet South American leaders and discuss mutual problems. The organizations, whose membership totaled over 60 million, were a real cross section. Among us were representatives of groups who sometimes oppose each other's policies, such as AFL–CIO and National Association of Manufacturers. Our first adjustment was to learn to know each other. Many of our group had never talked personally to a labor leader, joked with a Catholic priest, or sat down to eat with a Negro.

Since we were so different, I wondered if in our meetings with the South Americans we would bicker among ourselves over controversial aspects of U.S. policy. This did not happen. The more the United States was criticized by the South Americans, the more our group became a cohesive and friendly whole.

The impetus for our trip came last May after Vice President NIXON's visit to South America when it became apparent that anti-U.S. feelings were rising. We wanted to comprehend the South American point of view.

In our tour of three-day visits to eight cities in seven countries we followed much of Mr. NIXON's route. The pattern in each city consisted of one seminar on economic affairs and one on social and cultural matters with South American leaders who were more or less our counterparts—a doctor for our doctor, architect for architect, farmer for farmer, etc. The seminars were followed by a town meeting to which anyone could come and ask questions.

SE HABLA INGLES

Luckily, IBM had provided us with earphone equipment so that with the help of interpreters we had simultaneous translation. Over 70 percent of the South Americans we met spoke fluent English, but they were highly critical of us for not speaking their language. All we could do was agree.

Another thing which distressed the South Americans was the tendency for North Americans to think of all Latin Americans as being alike. The nationals in each country are proud of their own heritage and don't wish to be lumped together as South Americans. It is certainly true that Peruvians, Brazilians, and Chileans are as different from each other as, say, the Spanish, the Portuguese, the Germans and the Irish.

Another common criticism of the United States was that we are soft on dictators. Again and again we were asked why we gave Perez-Jimenez, of Venezuela, a medal and a visa to our country. Repeatedly we were asked why we gave arms to Batista, of Cuba, and Rojas Pinilla, of Colombia, which they in turn used to kill their own people. It is ironic that we in the United States worry that South Americans will turn to dictatorships while they worry that we are too friendly toward dictators.

INFLATION, CROPS, BABIES

Although South America does have serious political and social problems, the overwhelming difficulties are economic. Practically all countries suffer from galloping inflation. In the United States the cost of living has risen nearly 25 percent in 10 years, but in Chile the rise is that much or more every year. Since self-imposed austerity programs and higher taxes are always unpopular remedies for inflation, many Latin countries look to "somebody else"—the United States—to help rescue them. They want a bigger share of U.S. loans and private investment, and fail to realize that our efforts to stabilize the economies of countries in other parts of the world also benefit them.

The other serious economic problem of South America is that so many countries are dependent on one crop, whether it be oil in Venezuela, copper in Chile, or coffee in Brazil. When the price of this commodity falls or when the United States imposes trade barriers, financial loss is extreme. When we protect a special interest which may provide one percent of our national income, we are likely to hurt a South American industry which may provide 80 percent of its income. The protection gained is hardly commensurate with the injury inflicted.

In our travels we saw the need for more production, more food, more schools, more everything. South America has the fastest growing birth rate in the world. Its population has trebled in the last 50 years and will do so again in the next 50 years. Although keeping up with its babies is a real struggle, South America is a rich area with many resources to develop.

HANDS ACROSS THE EQUATOR

Along with our discussions of South America's opportunities and difficulties went a great deal of friendship and hospitality. They are a warmhearted people who will turn themselves inside out to extend friendship.

I had the opportunity of visiting many of the women's groups which had been assisted previously by the Carrie Chapman Catt Memorial Fund. Although there are no counterparts of the League of Women Voters, the existing organizations have similar questions. Over and over again I was asked how a group raises money, gets and keeps members and organizes committees that will work. Although women have the vote in all the South American countries but Paraguay, and do serve in the legislatures, most women are not supposed to concern themselves with political issues. Their status is more that of U.S. women in the 1920's whose interests were largely in the field of women's rights with an emphasis on education and social welfare.

However, these women deeply appreciated our coming, and one of them put her thoughts in a touching way when she said, "It comes inside to my heart to be thanking you for making a so big traveling for a woman at woman look and talk and feeling of friends." I wish I could have expressed the thought as well in her language.

Poison in Your Water—No. 75

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 12, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the Washington Post and Times Herald, Washington, D.C., on January 22, 1958, entitled "Pollution High in Northern Virginia."

The article follows:

POLLUTION HIGH IN NORTHERN VIRGINIA

(By Ralph Reikowsky)

The Capper-Cramton money was designed for the purchase of land along certain streams which drain northern Virginia. Instead of park land which could help carry off high water, Northern Virginia has flooded basements.

Consultants have told Fairfax County that a costly flood control program will be necessary if subdividers continue the practice of building homes on flood plains. Such a flood control program would be a sinkhole which would eventually swallow up millions of dollars more than a modern park system would have cost, consultants predict.

To complicate the problem further, every stream valley designated for parks in the Capper-Cramton Act, and in fact every stream valley in the area except Colvin and Cub Runs in western Fairfax County, is heavily polluted. While this pollution exists, planners feel it is doubtful if the NCPA would approve, or the localities would desire, the development of parks along the streams. Health experts have told northern Virginia planners the life of every person playing in them would be in jeopardy.

REGIONAL APPROACH

A regional approach to the park problem is the only answer, according to most of the officials. Such an approach is being made more difficult because of the growing complexity of government, eepecially in Fairfax County.

Officials feel that fledgling local governments may delay too many precious years while solving more pressing problems before they are prepared to cooperate in a regional park plan.

Meanwhile the suitable park land is disappearing. There are no large undeveloped areas in Arlington and few small areas left which would be suitable for parks. In fact, only two small sites were recommended for park acquisition in a recent county study.

Alexandria's position is only a little better. Nearly all of its vacant land lies in a pocket in the western part of the city, which is surrounded by heavy development and far removed from the homes of most residents.

Falls Church, Vienna, and Fairfax are too preoccupied with other problems of annexation, sewage, and water to think about park purchase programs.

FAIRFAX STUDIES

No action has been taken or is contemplated in the near future on the recommendation of planner Francis Dodd McHugh that Fairfax County develop its school grounds into community recreational centers. The Fairfax planning office, however, has barred any building development on the flood plains of the streams in the county, another McHugh recommendation.

No planning is being done on another proposal, made by a study group of the Fairfax Park Authority, that five natural areas on the western and southern fringes of the county be converted into regional parks.

These areas and their proposed approximate acreages are: Great Falls, 800 acres; Elk Lick-Club Run Park, 300–500 acres; Bull Run Park, near the Manassas Battlefield, 2,000 acres; Occoquan Park, overlooking the lake created by the Alexandria Water Co. dam, 800 acres; and Gunston Cove, a proposed nature sanctuary near Gunston Hall, 500 acres.

The study group, noting that 25 years ago the population of northern Virginia was 76,000 concluded:

"In another 25 years it is conceivable that unless controlled the entire county will present an industrial and commercial complex rivaling the bleak concrete and steel landscape now existing between Jersey City and New York.

"The time to acquire open spaces and natural area parks is now, before the onrushing tide of development engulfs all traces of natural landscape."

Controlling Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1959

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing in the House of Representatives today a bill which is to be known as the Anti-Inflation Act of 1959. The bill would authorize the President to freeze our entire economy for a period not in excess of 90 days, during which period the Congress of the United States would have time to adequately consider the advisability of continuing the freeze, and the best manner in which to effectuate controls, if found necessary.

We all recognize that resort to direct controls is dangerous to economic freedom and incompatible with our free enterprise system. Nevertheless, in an emergency, I feel that the President should have authority, at least for a limited period, to protect consumers, workers, farmers, persons living on fixed or limited incomes, and business against the menace and danger of runaway inflation. The position of world leadership of the United States rests primarily upon the strength of our economic system, and must not, under any circumstances, be jeopardized by sudden inflation.

Our dollars purchase less and less every day, and it is about time that the machinery to cope with this problem be made available if and when needed.

When I first came to Congress over 6 years ago, in 1953, the purchasing power of the dollar, using 1947 to 1949 as a base period, was 87.4 cents. As of March of this year that purchasing power had been reduced to 80.4 cents, a decline of almost 7 cents in a 6-year period. Using 1939 as a base period we find that the dollar is worth only 48 cents at the present time, so we can clearly see that in a 20-year period we have lost over 50 percent of the value of the dollar.

History has demonstrated that the greatest danger from inflation comes when an emergency suddenly develops. It is national policy that the President have the authority, at the moment of crisis, to take the necessary steps to protect the economic stability and security of the Nation. I believe my bill will provide such protection.

Revise and Prosper: Depreciation for Tax Purposes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1959

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, industry faces a peculiar problem in this area of startling developments. From day to day, mechanical and scientific breakthroughs are achieved which give a constantly changing complexion to values.

To keep pace with the time, to compete in this rush of astonishing accomplishment, is a task of itself. There are countless businessmen, manufacturers, producers who would move to close the gap—who would keep pace—except the Federal tax policy for depreciating their expensive equipment and plant acts as a drawback rather than an incentive.

Calling attention to this important matter is McGraw-Hill Publishing Co. with an editorial which appears in publications of the company for April and May, 1959. Under leave to extend my remarks, I insert at this point the article on depreciation reform, entitled, "Why Industry Needs a Modern Tax Policy":

A shockingly large proportion of our industrial plant and equipment is obsolete. Over $95 billion would have to be spent—and spent soon—to bring our industrial facilities up to the best modern standards. Yet plans for 1959 call for little more than $30 billion of actual spending—barely enough to make a start on this backlog of modernization.

At the heart of the problem of obsolescense is a Federal tax policy that discourages business from replacing inefficient facilities. It is the purpose of this editorial to spell out a tax reform Congress can make this year—with little cost in terms of tax revenue—that would go a long way toward removing the barrier to modernization of plant and equipment. This reform is a more realistic system of tax deductions for depreciation and obsolescence of productive facilities.

A BARRIER TO MODERNIZATION

Industry abounds with examples of old and obsolete facilities—despite large expenditures made in the past few years. Two-thirds of our metalworking equipment is over 10 years old. Over half the capacity of our chemical process industries was installed before December 1950. Only a minor fraction of our railroad freight moves in new freight cars or the new pushbutton freight yards.

The tax law bears a large part of the responsibility for this lag in modernization because of its important influence on business investment in plant and equipment. For many years the tax law has permitted as a deduction from income a reasonable allowance for wear and tear and obsolescence of productive facilities. These annual deductions affect business investment in several ways.

They are the way a company recovers its investment in plant and equipment.

They determine in large measure, the amounts of money that are spent each year to replace and modernize facilities.

Furthermore, the schedule for depreciation often determines when a specific machine or building is actually replaced.

The law requires that depreciation deductions be spread over the useful life of a building or machine. But the periods of useful life for tax purposes today still depend heavily upon tables drawn up by the Treasury almost 20 years ago. These tables reflect the replacement practices of depression years. Also, they were compiled at a time when the pace of technological progress in industry was much slower than it is now. For nearly all types of equipment the indicated period of useful life is longer—sometimes much longer—than most experts consider realistic at today's rate of technological advance.

The result of these outmoded depreciation schedules is that the recovery of investment is dragged out, and the replacement of obsolete equipment is delayed.

IN THE RIGHT DIRECTION

Congress should establish, by law, the right to use shorter depreciation periods on productive equipment. It should do so in a way that would free industry from obsolete concepts of the rate of technological change and would provide incentives to install new equipment and produce new products.

The Tax Reform Act of 1954 made some progress in this direction—but not enough. It introduced new methods for calculating depreciation—the declining balance and the sum-of-the-year's digits—which enable a business to recover most of the investment in a new facility in the early years of its useful life. However, these new methods do not accomplish their desired purpose when the supposed useful life is still an unrealistically long period of years.

Industry is by no means free from blame for the failure to bring depreciation policy into line with the needs of a modern, growing economy. According to Joel Barlow, president of the Tax Institute, "Management has largely ignored the Commissioner's invitation * * * to come into the Internal Revenue Service office and make a case for

shorter depreciable lives by establishing technological obsolescence."

The failure of many companies to see their own interest in more realistic depreciation not only holds them back from modernizing their own facilities but also lends support to the Treasury in its continued adherence to an outdated policy.

A SUGGESTION FOR REFORM

An excellent model for reform of the depreciation policy in our tax law is the system used successfully in Canada for a decade. In Canada, all productive equipment may be depreciated at relatively fast rates assigned to each of 14 broad categories. The Canadian system permits depreciation up to twice as fast as the antiquated tables of useful lives now followed in the United States. It also gives the individual business far greater flexibility in determining depreciation schedules that fit its own needs and experience.

For example, in the category or bracket covering general machinery a taxpayer in Canada may depreciate up to 20 percent of the machine's value annually, on a declining balance basis. In the United States the fastest rate at which many types of machinery can be depreciated is only 10 percent. In other categories, from tools and dies to buildings and pipelines, the Canadian system also allows faster depreciation and provides greater incentive to invest in new facilities.

The cost of this reform in terms of lower tax revenue would be small—probably less than $500 million in the first year. And even this would merely be postponed, not permanently lost. Indeed, there is very good prospect that tax revenue would not suffer at all. The increase in spending for new plant and equipment resulting from this tax reform would mean an increase in wages and profits—and therefore in taxes—in industries that produce machinery and other capital goods.

A realistic tax policy on depreciation would provide a badly needed incentive for industry to replace obsolete and inefficient facilities with up-to-date plants and equipment. It would step up our rate of technical advance and economic progress. And it would put U.S. industry in better shape to meet the growing competition from other countries that have grasped the advantages of fully modern technology.

Happy Anniversary for General de Gaulle and France

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 27, 1959

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, our felicitations go forth to France and her great president and leader, Gen. Charles de Gaulle.

A year ago, France was in a desperate plight. Chaos impended and all looked to De Gaulle. He responded bravely. France, having been rescued from bloody uncertainty, breathed freely. The world was relieved, especially the Western World. France became her historic self again, proud and glorious.

The general, with heroic effort, rebuilt the government, strengthened the central authority, and freed the nation of the splintering political factions that had plagued France for decades. Communists were given cold comfort; they were no longer able to foment strife and trouble.

In his 1 year of tenure, the general has revalued and made firm the franc, increased taxes, and inaugurated a system of austerity for his fellow Frenchmen, and they did not rebel. He has cut many unwarranted and unfair subsidies, even reduced veteran pensions. He has strengthened the presidency, the office he holds.

Recently, as a result of all these measures, French exports topped imports. The franc is presently so stable that tourists are no longer looking for bargains on the black market, but are getting their francs from the banks. The threat of further inflation has so lessened that the Bank of France, in a confident mood, has lowered the discount rate from 4½ percent to 4 percent. This lowered rate should encourage borrowings for plant expansion and extended activities.

The unresolved problem is Algeria. This unruly area has caused the French much concern and casts a shadow over the good works of De Gaulle. The relentless war is like an open wound that is draining France of much blood and treasure. Four hundred thousand of her men are pinned down in this long drawn-out struggle. If there is a way out, it is hoped General de Gaulle will find it. We wish him success. The solution of the Algerian problem would add even greater luster to his name. Let us hope, for the sake of Algeria and France that this tragedy will end soon and peace shall descend upon a land torn asunder with flame and bullet.

Then De Gaulle can tackle other difficulties besetting France and especially, give further impetus to her economy. If anyone can make France bloom and boom, it is General de Gaulle.

In an article in the current issue of Fortune, entitled, "De Gaulle's Audacious Economics," there aptly appears the following:

"The road is hard, but it is beautiful," De Gaulle told the French a year ago. "The end is difficult, but it is great. Allons." And France has indeed gone forward, into the Fifth Republic, now into a grand design of economic reforms almost as radical as the political. * * * The astonishing news out of France is that the grand design is taking hold.

Mr. Speaker, we all hail France and her great leader on this eventful anniversary.

"Our American Heritage"—Mary Aline Magner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 12, 1959

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, in this era of uneasiness in world and domestic problems, it is a refreshing privilege for me to call your attention to the efforts of Miss Mary Aline Magner, a resident of my congressional district, and to her fine music, copies of which she has recently provided each Member of Congress, along with a thoughtful and sincere letter.

We should be especially proud of the spirit, pride, and love for God and our country demonstrated in Miss Magner's words and music. Through these carefully written lyrics, we are reminded that our cherished freedom remains a priceless privilege—gained through struggle, prayer, and unity in our American heritage.

Justin Smith Morrill Homestead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. MEYER
OF VERMONT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 12, 1959

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Speaker, on March 23 I introduced a bill to provide for the establishment of the Justin Smith Morrill Homestead at Stafford, Vt., as a national monument. This bill, H.R. 5934, now with the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, is most appropriate for Congress to consider at this time, because we are approaching the centennial celebration of the great Land-Grant College Act of 1862, better known as the Morrill Act for its sole author, Senator Justin Smith Morrill, of Vermont. It would be fitting indeed to make provision in ample time for the dedication of this shrine to the memory of Senator Morrill during the year of events which is being planned for 1962 to mark the 100th anniversary of the establishment of our national system of land-grant colleges and State universities.

In connection with this proposal, I would remind the Members of the House that we have already acted favorably on April 20 on a bill, H.R. 4012, to provide for a Centennial Celebration Commission and for other appropriate recognition of the Morrill Act in 1962. This bill, introduced by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, Congressman CELLER, takes note of both the establishment of land grant colleges and State universities and the establishment of the Department of Agriculture, both of which occurred in 1862. These historic acts have had an invaluable, almost incalculable, bearing on the development of agriculture and higher education in the United States.

It is fitting indeed for Congress to establish such a commission as provided in H.R. 4210 in order that appropriate events can be arranged and supported during 1962.

One such appropriate event of this centennial celebration would be the dedication as a national monument of the home of the author, in fact the sole author, of the act which we will be commemorating, the Morrill Act. Senator Justin Smith Morrill was born in Strafford in 1810, the son of a blacksmith, and he received his own formal education in the little red schoolhouse of the day. He had to leave school at the age of 14

to go to work, but he never forgot the importance of books and education. Morrill was successful in business, and when he felt that he had acquired enough to live on, he turned to public affairs and served Vermont in the U.S. House of Representatives and Senate for 44 years. Having been denied higher educational opportunities himself, Justin Smith Morrill was resolutely determined that others would have this great opportunity, and he initiated and provided the leadership for passage of one of the most memorable educational measures yet known, the Morrill Land Grant Colleges Act. It was the high point of a distinguished career.

We all know the enormous importance of the land-grant colleges and State universities. There are now 68 of them in our country, at least one in every State, including Alaska and Hawaii, as well as one in Puerto Rico. It is estimated that about 20 percent of the Nation's college students are enrolled in land grant institutions. More than 40 percent of the doctorate degrees in all subjects, more than half in the sciences and in the health professions, and all those in agriculture, are conferred by land-grant colleges and universities. Furthermore, the quality has been extraordinary. Of 35 living American Nobel Prize winners who went to college in this country, 21 have earned degrees from land-grant institutions. This is truly evidence of the national character of the Morrill Act and of the interest that there is in honoring is author, Justin Smith Morrill.

Morrill distinguished himself as a legislator, and was referred to at the time as the "Gladstone of America." It is said that in the field of finance lay his greatest talents, and he gave years of leadership to the Ways and Means and Finance Committees in Congress. Also, he served as chairman of the Senate Committee on Buildings and Grounds and is largely responsible for the planning and execution of the terraces, fountains, and gardens around the Capitol, as well as the completion of the Washington Monument. However, it is interesting that this Vermont Senator, deprived of higher learning himself, should be remembered best for the Land Grant College Act, and for his important part in the establishment of the Library of Congress as a truly national institution during the 19th century. This merely serves to confirm the broad character and vision of Morrill, a man to whom higher education and the Nation owes so much.

Strafford always remained home for the Senator, and his homestead there is an attractive, charming place, definitely and closely related to the Senator's work and achievements. Acquisition would be by gift from the Strafford Historical Society, Inc., and would be made possible by the generous support which is already indicated by friends of the society and admirers of Morrill. The house is reasonably well preserved, and is a delightful example of Victorian gothic. It is set near the Common in one of our beautiful Vermont villages, the village where Morrill was born and went to school, where he operated a general store, and where he returned regularly all during his 44 years in Congress. This village will be within about 15 miles of a main intersection in the projected new Interstate Highway System, making it easily accessible to travelers from both Boston to the east and from Connecticut and New York to the south. Yet it will at the same time be far enough from these main routes so as to be assured of the quiet and deep charm which our Vermont villages exemplify.

There is wide interest in this project among educators all over the country. Everyone familiar with land-grant colleges will agree that it would be fitting to honor the man whose vision is responsible for their establishment. The centennial office of the American Association of Land-Grant Colleges and State Universities has already indicated its interest for this proposal in conjunction with its plans for the centennial celebration in 1962. We will want to take action early enough so that dedication can be arranged in conjunction with the centennial activities planned for 1962. That is the obvious and appropriate year for such a dedication, and it would be a high point of the celebration. The impact of Senator Morrill's efforts are national and even worldwide in scope, and in many ways they are more memorable and more important for their positive results than are many of the other events which we already commemorate. The name of Justin Smith Morrill means a great deal to our country as a whole and is particularly honored in the field of higher education.

In Vermont our State legislature is taking steps already to do its part in observing the centennial celebration, as urged in section 7 of the proposed H.R. 4210. I am sending a copy of the recent resolution to this effect by our general assembly to Chairman CELLER, and I would also like to insert this resolution in the RECORD at this point:

JOINT RESOLUTION 23

Resolution relating to the observance of the 100th anniversary of the enactment of the Morrill Land-Grant Act of 1862

Whereas the Morrill Land-Grant College Act was enacted into the laws of this Nation in 1862; and

Whereas the author of this act was Justin Smith Morrill, of Strafford, Vt., a Member of the U.S. Congress from Vermont for the period 1855 until 1898; and

Whereas the act which carries the name of this famous Vermonter has resulted in the founding of 68 land-grant colleges and universities, of which the University of Vermont is one; and

Whereas those 68 colleges and universities have given instruction and training to hundreds of thousands of young men and young women of our Nation, many of whom could not otherwise have afforded a college education; and

Whereas the year 1962 will be the 100th anniversary of the Morrill Land-Grant College Act; and

Whereas the American Association of Land-Grant Colleges and State Universities are planning a nationwide observance during 1962 for the 100th anniversary of the Morrill Act: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate and house of representatives, That the Governor of the State of Vermont appoint a committee of five members to serve without compensation. This committee's duties will be to plan a suitable statewide observance during 1962 for the 100th anniversary of the Morrill Act and to honor the famous Vermonter, Justin Smith Morrill, who designed the Morrill Act.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to bring to the attention of the House two further resolutions in support of the Morrill homestead bill, H.R. 5934. These resolutions show the strong local support which such a project will have, as well as showing the interest which Vermont has in obtaining its first national monument, and in fact its first recognition of any sort by the National Park Service. At present our State has no national monument, and no more appropriate one can be suggested than the homestead of Justin Smith Morrill, a great Vermonter and a great American statesman, whose vision and determination served the cause of education, and thus the Nation, so well. It would be a monument of truly national interest and character. The resolution of the Vermont General Assembly, passed on April 14, the anniversary date of Morrill's birth in 1810, and the resolution of the Strafford Historical Society, Inc., which has been most active in support of this proposal, are as follows:

JOINT RESOLUTION 27

Joint resolution relating to the Justin Smith Morrill Memorial and urging the passage of H.R. 5934 by the Congress of the United States

Whereas Justin Smith Morrill of Strafford, Vt., was a Member of the U.S. Congress for nearly 50 years; and

Whereas he served his State and country with honor and distinction; and

Whereas there is now pending before the Congress of the United States a measure, H.R. 5934, providing for the purchase and restoration of the Justin Smith Morrill homestead in the town of Strafford for the purpose of its preservation as an historical monument to his memory and achievements; and

Whereas on April 14, 1810, 149 years ago today, Justin Smith Morrill was born in the town of Strafford; and

Whereas this general assembly is cognizant of the great honors that have been brought to the State of Vermont by his many achievements, particularly as to his authorship of the famous Land Grant Acts to colleges in the field of education: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives, That the General Assembly of the State of Vermont hereby goes on record as favoring the passage of H.R. 5934 by the Congress of the United States, and urge early and favorable action by the Department of the Interior in this matter; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state is hereby directed to send copies of this joint resolution to the President of the United States, the Vermont congressional delegation, the Secretary of the Interior of the United States, the president of the University of Vermont, the president of the University of New Hampshire, the president of the University of Massachusetts, the director of the Vermont Historical Society, the chairman of the Vermont Historic Sites Commission, and the president of the Strafford Historical Society.

RESOLUTION OF THE STRAFFORD HISTORICAL SOCIETY, INC., STRAFFORD, VT.

Whereas Justin Smith Morrill contributed much for the good of the country during his long service as a Member of Congress; and

Whereas his most memorable achievement was his authorship and adoption by Congress of the Land-Grant College Act signed into law by Abraham Lincoln on July 2, 1862; and

Whereas the impact of this legislation has been and will continue to be of enormous value to our Nation's progress; and

Whereas in recognition of the Nation's debt of respect, a bill has been introduced into Congress by Representative WILLIAM H. MEYER, providing for the acquirement and administration by the Secretary of the Interior of the Morrill homestead in Strafford, Vt., as a national monument: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the board of directors and members of the Strafford Historical Society urge the passage of the bill; and be it further

Resolved, That favorable consideration be given to dedicating the monument on July 2, 1962, the centennial of the Land-Grant College Act; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to Congressman MEYER and to any others whom our members may select.

Liberalism's Full Circle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAMER H. BUDGE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1959

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks there follows an article published in the Wall Street Journal under date of May 4, 1959. It is something on which those in and out of the Congress could well reflect:

LIBERALISM'S FULL CIRCLE

What is present-day liberalism?

Six Congressmen who consider themselves liberals recently attempted to give their own personal answers to that question. Though a number of the answers, which appeared in the New York Times magazine, sound like platitudes, they nonetheless reveal some of the difficulties with liberalism as a political philosophy.

Consider these responses:

Wisconsin's Representative REUSS said the "liberal" has "no particular body of doctrine." New York's Senator JAVITS stressed as a guiding principle the "preservation and strengthening of free institutions." And Minnesota's Senator HUMPHREY declared, "The liberal's answer to the crisis of our time is a program of action to summon all the resources and resourcefulness of free men."

Now among these definitions are very considerable divergences, and this fact seems to reflect intellectual confusion. Part of the confusion, we think, can be explained in historical terms.

The European liberal of the past (and some Europeans who use the term today) had a clear body of doctrine. He stood for maximum individual freedom as the only source of an acceptable political structure and of material abundance. Acutely aware of the lessons of past tyrannies, he opposed particularly the encroachments of the state.

Somewhere along the line, in the transplanting from Europe to America, the liberal lost his historical perspective and, it would seem, some of his capacity for cold clear thinking. Dissatisfied with the lot of man as he found it, he began to fall into the fallacy of human perfectibility.

This is fallacious because it rests on what is essentially a sentimental view of the nature of man. It assumes the evil man does is attributable not to himself but to society. Implicit in such an attitude is a denial of the most fundamental criterion of human conduct—individual responsibility; simply reform society and you automatically improve man's soul.

Thus for individual initiative and individual responsibility is substituted some form of collective approach. But appealing to the better nature of this or that group does not work fast enough to suit the metamorphosed liberal; he wants utopia today. His problem is how to get it.

Accordingly, while still paying lip service to the preservation and strengthening of free institutions, the liberal in our time tends to think much more in terms of a program of action to summon all the resources and resourcefulness of free men.

This last description is in fact the most revealing of all. For clearly it is only the government that can devise such a program of action; the government must do the summoning. In that notion lies the antithesis of the free society.

In a free society men are not zealots rushing to the banner of some total government program of action, devoting all their resources to it. They are individuals pursuing their diverse interests, and from that diversity comes the material and spiritual richness found only in a free society. And since individuals will not, as the liberal wants, willingly embrace a total program of government action, the liberal must turn to government compulsion.

So it is that the liberal has come full circle. Born of statism, he rebelled against it, and now has been led back to statism. It is an unhappy progression, and the Congressmen's confusion of definitions suggests that many liberals today are not fully conscious of the logical conclusion of their approach.

That indeed is just the pity. Men who are blind to history, human nature, and the consequences of human action are not the best guardians of human liberty. The well-intentioned can become the worst tyrants.

Home No Longer Castle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 27, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a very interesting editorial which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor on May 6, 1959:

HOME NO LONGER CASTLE

Many Americans will be profoundly shocked by the news that their homes can now be invaded without a search warrant. Protests are rising. We trust that the Supreme Court will find in new cases good reasons to reverse a 5-to-4 decision just rendered. For as Mr. Justice Frankfurter said regarding another search and seizure case in 1950: "Progress is too easy from police action unscrutinized by judicial authorization to the police state."

We recognize that questions of "search and seizure" are among the most difficult the Court encounters. We sympathize with its problem in maintaining individual liberties when they conflict with community interests. And we have often commended the High Court for its devotion to the rights of citizens. But in view of what it has done in that cause in the past this latest decision is all the more strange and questionable.

It involved the case of a Baltimore citizen who refused to let a city inspector search his home for rats. The majority of the Court held that a health inspector need not obtain a search warrant for such purposes and that the citizen was properly subject to fine for resisting. This is a major blow to the old doctrine that a man's "home is his castle."

Speaking for the minority, Mr. Justice Douglas said: "The decision today greatly dilutes the right of privacy which every homeowner had the right to believe was part of our American heritage."

This ruling is particularly hard to understand in the light of earlier decisions barring search. For instance, the Court has held that police cannot hunt for stolen property in an automobile without a specific Court writ. Only last year it voided the conviction of a man because police broke into his house without telling him they had a warrant for his arrest. Two years ago it set aside—because of illegal search and seizure—the sentences of three persons who had harbored Communists convicted under the Smith Act.

Curiously enough, Justice Frankfurter, speaking for the majority, indicated that it was because search in the present case was not for evidence of crime that it should be permitted. This puts the Court in the position of saying that a search warrant is required to enter a house to locate a murder weapon or to look into an automobile which may hold money from a bank robbery, but is not required if some local sanitary inspector desires to see whether premises contain some material he considers unhealthful.

This appears all the more unreasonable since in a murder or robbery case delay might permit escape while presumably unsanitary conditions would not ordinarily get out of hand while a search warrant was being obtained. The Supreme Court nobly resisted the public hysteria which assumed that if a charge of communism was involved the Bill of Rights should be forgotten. We hope that after more consideration it will similarly resist the too-common assumption that if someone says health is involved the fourth amendment and other constitutional guarantees are void.

Untold Story of Panama

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1959

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, since becoming actively associated with interoceanic canal problems in 1949 as chairman of a Special Subcommittee To Investigate the Operation of the Panama Canal, I have noted the publication of thoughtful works dealing with canal history and problems.

The latest addition to this cumulating literature is a book by Earl Harding, former day news editor of the New York World, entitled "The Untold Story of Panama," published April 27, 1959, by the Athene Press, and distributed by the Bookmailer, both of New York.

Its importance is indicated by United Press-International cabled news story of April 26 to Panama, Latin America, and Europe by Harry W. Frantz, distin-

guished Latin American correspondent of that press organization.

Because of the growing public interest in the Panama Canal, under leave granted, I include the indicated news story:

UNTOLD STORY OF PANAMA

(By Harry W. Frantz)

WASHINGTON, April 26.—U.S. citizens face a long political struggle to keep control of the Panama Canal, according to a new book entitled "The Untold Story of Panama," which appeared today.

The author was Earl Harding, a New York writer. He was a correspondent and investigator for the New York World during the period of its defense preparations against a criminal libel suit brought by President Theodore Roosevelt against the World and the Indianapolis News.

The suit was quashed by a Federal court ruling in 1910 that there was no Federal libel law, a view upheld by the Supreme Court. Harding now offers a digest of information and documentation which the World would have used if the case had been tried on the facts.

The book appears to have current significance because of its general exposition of the historical background of Panama-United States controversy concerning Canal Zone sovereignty provisions in treaty of 1903; agitation for internationalization of the Panama Canal, and recurrent incidents connected with relations between the Canal Zone and the Republic.

These problems have created international confusion which may have to be clarified before the U.S. Congress decides whether to build an enlarged locks canal at Panama, a sea-level canal there, or an entirely new canal on the Nicaraguan route.

In a preface to "The Untold Story of Panama," Harding wrote:

"Nasser set a pattern for canal seizure at Suez in 1956. Although legally inapplicable to the Panama Canal, the Nasser example of expropriation delighted Panamanian radicals. The danger implicit in ignoring their reactions was not recognized by most North Americans, who have assumed for half a century that trouble at Panama always evaporates.

"The seriousness of the situation at the isthmus was brought home to the United States by the Nixon incidents in Lima and Caracas in May 1958, and by almost coincident outbreaks of wild disorder in Panama, with defiant challenging of U.S. sovereignty over the Canal Zone preceded by a Panamanian flag-planting invasion of the zone heralded to the world as Operation Sovereignty.

Harding said that pressures little realized by the North American public have been building up steadily and persistently in Panama and elsewhere since the Suez crisis. He said that anti-American attitudes in Panama can be traced to fact that the Panamanians and many North Americans do not know the historical truth about events early in the century.

Harding wrote that the Panama waterway seems to be approaching its greatest crisis due to fact that problems of increased capacity and modernization have been complicated by organized attacks against U.S. jurisdiction in the Canal Zone.

He said that Congress recognized this situation by adoption in February 1957 of a resolution for a comprehensive inquiry into all aspects of the interoceanic canal problem. "Out of this inquiry by the board of consultants, now only partially completed, U.S. taxpayers hope for a constructive reassessment of isthmian canal problems and a program for their permanent solution which an informed Congress can approve and authorize."

In a chapter on the Nicaraguan route as an alternative to the Panama Canal, Harding said that the first essential step would be a reexamination and interpretation of the Bryan-Chamorro Treaty of 1914.

Ratification by the U.S. Senate in 1916 contained a proviso that Nicaragua's failure to consult Costa Rica before entering into a canal treaty with the United States should not invalidate Costa Rica's rights under the Costa Rican-Nicaraguan Treaty of 1858.

Another question would be whether the Bryan-Chamorro Treaty gave the United States an enforceable option to build a canal. Some experts think that the treaty would be merely a preliminary to further agreement on terms of construction.

Alaska Fisheries Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH J. RIVERS
OF ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 11, 1959

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I have heretofore extended my remarks in the RECORD in support of legislation to ban importation of salmon caught by the Japanese in their North Pacific high seas fishery because of the ruinous effect of such fishing on Alaska's Bristol Bay salmon runs. The fact is, however, that not only the Bristol Bay fishery has been critically depleted, but the salmon runs on the entire coast of Alaska have been seriously depleted during the years of Federal management of this important resource. Accordingly, I am pleased to submit for the consideration of my colleagues an important document from the Alaska State Legislature, which cogently portrays the entire situation and the need for Federal assistance to restore this great national asset. The document follows:

"SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 4

"To the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States, and to Each and Every Member of the Congress of the United States:

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the State of Alaska in first session assembled, respectfully submits that—

"Throughout the history of Alaska as a Territory, since 1867, the fisheries have constituted Alaska's most valuable resource. During this period more than 11½ billion pounds of salmon constituting protein food of superlative quality has been shipped from Alaska to the rest of the Nation and to the world;

"But, unfortunately, most of the income from these salmon fisheries, amounting to over $2 million on the wholesale markets, has passed to interests outside Alaska, and the salmon harvests of Alaska have fallen from their sustained optimum levels of 6 million cases average and 8 million cases maximum, from 1926 to 1944, to less than 2,500,000 cases in more recent years;

"During this same period, inadequate, indeed negligible, amounts (less than 1 percent of the total wholesale income) have been spent for the conservation and propagation of Alaska's salmon fisheries which, under many years of Federal stewardship have declined severely and are rapidly approaching extinction, notwithstanding it is of paramount importance to the maintenance of this valuable food resource and to the economic well-being of the State of Alaska and the United States that these fisheries be restored to their maximum productivity as rapidly as possible; and

"Therefore, the Legislature of the State of Alaska, in first session assembled, asks that the Congress of the United States be respectfully requested to provide the State of Alaska Department of Fish and Game with annual funds to be spent for the rehabilitation of Alaska's salmon resources, including such activities as research, fish laddering and guiding devices, stream-clearance projects, and fish hatching and rearing operations as may be necessary to restore these resources, and that the funds shall not be less than $5 million per year and shall continue for not less than 15 years or until the harvest of salmon in Alaska reaches and maintains a sustained level of 6 million cases."

Passed by the senate April 3, 1959.
WILLIAM E. BELTZ,
President of the Senate.

Attest:
KATHERINE T. ALEXANDER,
Secretary of the Senate.

Passed by the house April 16, 1959.
WARREN A. TAYLOR,
Speaker of the House.

Attest:
ESTHER REED,
Chief Clerk of the House.

I hereby certify that the above and foregoing constitutes a full, true, and correct copy of Senate Joint Memorial 4 as passed by the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Alaska.
KATHERINE T. ALEXANDER,
Secretary of the Senate.

National System of Interstate and Defense Highways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE HOLT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 12, 1959

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution that was passed by the Van Nuys Chamber of Commerce. I am sure the resolution will be of interest to my colleagues in the House of Representatives:

Whereas the Federal Highway Act of 1956 stated "it is the intent of Congress that the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways" be completed as nearly as practicable over a 13-year period and that the entire system in all States be brought to simultaneous completion, and also establishes the amount of appropriations for each year authorized by the act; and

Whereas in said act there was established a highway trust fund for which gasoline and some other highway users taxes were earmarked, however, the greater part of excise taxes on sales of automobiles, tires, and accessories (which are also paid by highway users) are still left to the general fund; and

Whereas by this arrangement, approximately 42 cents out of every dollar of Federal automotive taxes went into the general fund of the Treasury in the fiscal year 1958; and

Whereas in said 1956 act it was declared to be the policy, "if the receipts of the trust fund * * * be less than the total expenditures from said fund, that * * * the Congress shall enact legislation in order to bring about

a balance of total receipts and total expenditures * * *"; and

Whereas section 209(G) was adopted just before the bill was passed by Congress, requiring that the trust fund be put on a cash basis; and

Whereas the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1958 increased certain allocations somewhat over the 1956 act, and set aside the pay-as-you-go plan as provided in the Byrd amendment to permit full appropriations for the 1958–59 and 1959–60 fiscal years; and

Whereas as a result of the act of 1958, and in anticipation of future appropriations to be made to the various States in conformity therewith—

A. The State of California's Department of Public Works has geared its activities to the purpose of constructing the interstate highways in the State of California as specified in said 1956 act, by (1) building up the organization of engineers and other employees in the State highway department, to meet the increased demands; (2) purchasing hundreds of millions of dollars worth of required rights-of-way for the Interstate System; (3) preparing engineering plans for several years in advance to keep ahead of construction.

B. Contractors have purchased millions of dollars worth of equipment to handle the contracts awarded them, and in anticipation of future awards. Also have built up large organizations of technical and highly skilled employees to handle current and anticipated contracts.

C. The entire economy of the State is now geared to accomplish the declared purposes of Congress as set forth in the 1956 act, for instance: construction of plants to proivde cement, steel plants to manufacture steel for bridges, machinery companies to build highway machinery, etc.; and

Whereas stopping of the interstate program would bring about a chaotic condition in the entire economy, and increase the cost of the highway system, when construction is resumed; and the delay would greatly inconvenience the millions of people in the State of California (and particularly in the San Fernando Valley, with its explosive population growth) depending almost entirely on their automobiles for transportation; and would disrupt the organization of the State highway department, as well as the contractors, who would face enormous losses on account of idle equipment, and dismissal of their employees, resulting in a pyramiding of unemployment in the State of California; and

Whereas if the funds earmarked for the general fund, being collected from excise taxes on automobiles, tires, and accessories were added to the trust fund, no problem of shortage in the trust fund would exist; and

Whereas there is inherent in the designation National System of Interstate and Defense Highways recognition of the importance of this system to the military and civilian defense of the Nation, and implying support for the system from other sources than merely the funds produced by automotive and highway users taxes;

Now, therefore, we respectfully urge that Congress pass without delay, such remedial legislation to continue without interruption the established pace of the construction of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, and provided definite assurance of its uninterrupted continuance until the entire system is completed. We also urge the President of the United States to approve such legislation as expeditiously as possible, so as to avoid any slowing down of the present program.

Adopted by the executive committee of the Van Nuys Chamber of Commerce in session this 28th day of April 1959, by unanimous vote.

Attest:

NELSON LAVALLY,
Secretary-Manager.

Tribute to Miss Mary O'Keeffe of Riverside, Calif

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 12, 1959

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, well-deserved tributes have been paid recently to a grand lady, whom I am proud to call my friend, Miss Mary O'Keeffe, of Riverside, Calif.

Intrepid in her devotion to her faith, her country, her political convictions, and her nursing profession, Miss O'Keeffe will continue to exert an influence in her community and beyond through the period of reduced activity made necessary by her present illness.

I was fortunate in my recent campaign for the U.S. Senate in having Miss O'Keeffe as my campaign coordinator in the Riverside area. For her loyalty, her energy, and her political acumen in my behalf I will always be grateful.

The California State Senate has unanimously adopted a resolution praising Mary O'Keeffe for "half a century of devoted service to the cause of good government." In her home city of Riverside a few weeks ago an overflow crowd gathered at a testimonial dinner in her honor.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two articles about Miss O'Keeffe from recent issues of the Riverside Daily Enterprise.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Riverside (Calif.) Daily Enterprise, Apr. 5, 1959]

CROWD PAYS TRIBUTE TO MARY O'KEEFFE

An overflow crowd of more than 500 persons attended a testimonial dinner in honor of Miss Mary O'Keeffe, member of the Riverside County Democratic Central Committee, in Arnold Heights School auditorium last night.

The dinner, sponsored by the Democratic Central Committee, paid tribute to more than 10 years of civic work in Riverside County on the part of Miss O'Keeffe.

Congressman D. S. SAUND told the audience that he attributed much of his success in Washington to assistance he had received from Miss O'Keeffe, and said that his desire to run initially for the office had been prompted by her.

Delivering testimonial speeches to Miss O'Keeffe were Alex Yakutis, president of the Democratic County Clubs, and Jack Kovely, candidate for sheriff in the last election. Clifford Dean of Banning, a candidate for State assembly, presented a gift to the guest of honor.

Tape records and telegrams congratulating Miss O'Keeffe and praising her civic contributions were presented from Paul Butler, Democratic National Chairman; Gov. Edmund G. (Pat) Brown, Senator Clair Engle, and numerous other dignitaries. Resolutions congratulating Miss O'Keeffe were read from the Riverside City Council and County Board of Supervisors.

John McSweeney, chairman of the County Democratic Central Committee, presented a scroll to Miss O'Keeffe bearing the signatures of committee members.

William Siape, candidate for Riverside City Council, inaugurated a scholarship fund which will raise $1,000 to be presented to a student nurse chosen by Miss O'Keeffe, who is also a nurse.

Chairman of the dinner was Joseph M. Kelleghan. Coral Davis was master of ceremonies. Harry M. Daugherty introduced Miss O'Keeffe.

[From the Riverside (Calif.) Daily Enterprise, Apr. 30, 1959]

SENATE COMMENDS MARY O'KEEFFE

Praising her for half a century of devoted service to the cause of good government, the State senate has unanimously adopted a resolution commending Mary E. O'Keeffe, Riverside County Democratic Party leader.

The resolution, introduced by Senator Fred Farr (Democrat, Monterey), states the senate has learned with regret that illness has forced (her) to take temporary relief from her duties as senior Democratic leader of Riverside County.

Miss O'Keeffe recently was honored at a testimonial dinner attended by Congressman D. S. SAUND and other Democratic Party notables.

The Senate resolution notes that Miss O'Keeffe served six times as a delegate to the Democratic National Convention and has long been a member of the Riverside County Democratic Central Committee and the State Democratic Central Committee.

It points out that in her vocation as an obstetrical nurse she has rendered a devout and competent service to great numbers of residents in her neighborhood.

It says that Miss O'Keeffe, a Catholic and a leader in the Catholic Daughters of America, "is not only distinguished by her interest in public affairs but is also known as a person of devout religious faith."

The resolution congratulates Miss O'Keeffe on her enviable record, commends her for her faithful service to the right as she sees the right, and * * * hopes for her speedy recovery.

A copy of the resolution and a scroll were forwarded to Miss O'Keeffe by the secretary of the senate.

The resolution was prepared by Thelma Zulch, former Riverside County Democratic Central Committee member who now resides in Palo Alto.

Sound Financing Pays

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 12, 1959

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Peoria, Ill., Journal-Star of May 10, 1959:

SOUND FINANCING PAYS

Illinois is a fortunate State. More than half the States in the Union—29 of them—are in serious financial trouble this year, according to Newsweek magazine, but our State is not one of them.

There is just one reason for this happy situation. Illinois did not embark on fantastic welfare schemes as Michigan did or spend money freely on roads and schools and hospitals as some other States did when they thought the high wartime revenues would continue indefinitely.

Illinois has lived within her budget. We have not had as many new university buildings as we might have liked to have, or as

many new roads, or as many State services as we might think we need but we kept within the amount of money which was in hand. The result is that we are facing no such deficit as Michigan, which can't pay her university teachers, or Minnesota, where they are talking about adding a sales tax to their already stiff income tax, or Ohio, which is running in the red at the rate of $166 million a year.

Under pressure of demands for additional facilities, Governor Stratton is talking about an increase in the sales tax this year but our present situation is all the more reason for the institution of more rigid economies and a squeezing of every bit of fat out of the State budget.

Illinois stands to profit from her favorable financial situation. Increased taxes in other States—Massachusetts is thinking about the first sales tax in the State's history and California needs $256 million in new revenue—will prevent some new industries from locating in those States. If Illinois can present a favorable tax picture we will be in a good position to invite new industrial development to our State.

Governor Freeman, of Minnesota, has ordered his State legislature to sit until the State's financial problem is solved. His recommendations are for an increase in each bracket of the State's income tax by roughly 1 percent, to raise corporate income taxes, to install a tax-withholding system, and to increase taxes on iron ore, cigarettes, whisky and other items. The income tax with a base of 1 percent on the first $1,000 of income already is one of the stiffest in the Nation and high corporate taxes already have caused Minnesota-Honeywell, one of the State's biggest industries, to favor out-of-State expansion.

Sound financial policy has paid off for Illinois in the midst of economic disaster in all the States around us. The success of this policy in the past is all the more reason for continuing it in the future. The legislature should take a microscope to the Governor's budget and strain out enough of the excess in it to keep it within balance without the imposition of additional taxes.

Lt. Gen. S. T. Williams, U.S. Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, toward the end of last month I took advantage of the privilege granted me and inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 20 a statement in which I expressed my high regard for Gen. Samuel T. Williams, Chief of the U.S. Military Assistance Advisory Group for Vietnam.

Last fall I had the pleasure of revisiting Vietnam, having been there in 1955 for the first time. On the occasion of my earlier visit General Williams was just taking over as Chief of our Military Advisory Group. He is one of America's greatest soldiers and has done a remarkable job in that country, as I outlined for my colleagues.

A copy of the March 20 RECORD found its way to the desk of Mr. Ed P. Williams, business manager of the Fort Worth, Tex., Independent School District and brother of General Williams. This is not strange. But the sequel is worth recording.

Mr. Ed Williams wrote our beloved Speaker of the House of Representatives the following letter:

FORT WORTH INDEPENDENT
SCHOOL DISTRICT,
Fort Worth, Tex., April 7, 1959.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SAM: Back in 1920, I lived in Van Alstyne, Tex. Our late mutual friend, Sam Pattie, bless him, operated his drygoods store next to the bank where I worked.

At this time, the boys were returning from World War I and being mustered out. My brother Sam was located at Camp Pike, Ark.

One morning I received a phone call from Sam in which he told me he was in trouble and needed help quickly. He said there was a mixup of names in his outfit and that he was being mustered out when really it was another Williams who wanted out. He, Sam, wanted to stay in and the records would have to be straightened out in Washington.

I told him I would see what could be done. Sam Pattie was next door and I told him the story. He said, "I know what to do, I'll wire SAM RAYBURN." He did wire you and in a few days brother Sam advised that his troubles were over and that he was to remain in the Army where he wanted to be.

SAM, please refer to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for March 20, 1959, page A2506, which contains an extension of remarks by Representative GEORGE P. MILLER.

The soldier referred to by Mr. MILLER is the Sam T. Williams you befriended in 1920.

I am calling this incident to your attention in order that you may know your assistance to this young man in 1920 was not misplaced.

With very best regards. and good luck, I am,

Sincerely,

ED P. WILLIAMS.

Daughters of the American Revolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WINT SMITH
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1959

Mr. SMITH of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago the DAR was in Washington for its annual convention. As usual, both before and after this assembly, which is held in Constitution Hall—their own—the internationalists, intellectual carpetbaggers of the ADA and other noted leftwing promoters all made their usual silly and unpatriotic remarks about this organization.

Some said "These elderly ladies should confine themselves to past history." One woman commentator even tried to ridicule the hats worn by the members. Not one paper gave this convention any front page coverage. If the ADA had been in convention, the Washington Post, the bellwether of the leftwing press would have had their news on the front page and a lead editorial on the leftwing pink page of the Post.

When some delegate took the convention floor to ask that the DAR go on record as favoring the United Nations, this event was broadcast from coast to coast as a great event. The commentator said, "This is the breakup of the old conservative DAR clique. A new day portends, no longer will patriotism be the only virtue, and that, at long last the DAR has finally admitted that patriotism and reverence for its ancient heritages is nothing more nor less than bigotry run wild."

But with all the carping criticism in the press and radio, the DAR brought forth their usual down-to-earth patriotic resolutions.

One of their resolutions called for the withdrawal of the United States from the United Nations.

Henry Cabot Lodge, U.S. representative to the United Nations released a public letter he wrote to the DAR condemning their action for recommending withdrawal by the United States from the United Nations.

I consider the reply made to this letter by Mrs. Mary Barclay Erb so outstanding that I commend it in the highest terms. Mrs. Erb's reply can well be used as a textbook on the United Nations and what it really means to all citizens who still believe in and cherish the patriotic ideals of our ancestors.

Here is Mrs. Erb's letter to Lodge:

JULY 2, 1958.

The Honorable HENRY CABOT LODGE,
U.S. Representative to the United Nations,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. LODGE: According to several radio broadcasts and the daily press, you released, on June 17, 1958, copies of a letter written by you under date of May 15, 1958, to the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution.

The office of the president general advised me that this letter has been acknowledged; nevertheless, I cannot, as a loyal member of our national society resist comment in justification of the adoption of the resolution pertaining to withdrawal from the United Nations.

I should like first to refer to your statement that you note with interest the resolution of the national society of 1956 in support of the United Nations. I feel that you should reexamine the resolution to which you refer. I do not believe you will derive much comfort from this resolution as supporting the United Nations with which you are associated. For the sake of the record, let me quote the 1956 resolution:

"*Resolved*, That the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, continue to support the United Nations Organization in its original purpose as a group of sovereign nations working together for world peace and understanding, and to oppose its threatened conversion into a world government.

"Whereas our national society has been consistently on record as against the many specialized agencies, which purport to be a part of United Nations, formulating policies such as the Genocide Convention and Covenant of Human Rights, which would deprive us of the individual liberties and free enterprise on which our Nation was founded so firmly and which have made it so strong and great;

"*Resolved*, That the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, again stand firmly and emphatically on its insistence that the United Nations abide by the objectives set forth in its charter and desist from participation in any plan, project, agency, or principle which would intervene in our internal affairs, interfere with our domestic legislation, or spread doctrines

contrary to our American philosophies and way of life."

I believe that your misunderstanding as to the import of the action taken by the national society in 1956 as compared with the action taken in this year, 1958, arises from a failure on your part to recognize that the term "United Nations" has two distinct meanings in current terminology among American citizens. There is a United Nations which represents the hope and aspirations of every intelligent American who is devoted to world peace and is in favor of any organization which would be solely devoted to and effective in its operations for the assurance of peace, honor, and good will to men. This was the type of organization which the American people and their representatives in Washington were informed had been created in 1945 in San Francisco.

The second United Nations is the United Nations which has revealed its true nature by actual operations during the past 13 years. It is this United Nations with which the Daughters of the American Revolution was dealing this Spring, 1958, and it was from this United Nations that Congress was urgently requested to withdraw and it was the withdrawal of this United Nations from the soil of the United States of America that Congress was urgently requested to demand.

Whatever might theoretically have been possible for the United Nations created by that charter of 1945, can no longer be the basis for appraisal by American citizens in the light of the judgment of actual history.

It was only 4 years after the adoption of the charter that the American people learned that the chief architect, supposedly acting on our behalf in San Francisco, was actually the treacherous agent of our most deadly enemy. History has also revealed and developed many other significant facts concerning this organization which was planned with such high hopes but was actually born in treason.

I believe it is only by consistently recognizing the existence of these two United Nations that any intelligent discussion can be carried on at this time.

For instance, when you say that only 6 percent of the American people favor withdrawal from the United Nations, implying that 94 percent approve of the United Nations, such statement can have meaning only if you are talking about the ideal United Nations for which most Americans might fervently wish.

We would be inclined to think that a very small percentage of the citizens of the United States know factually what the present United Nations in reality is; how it functions, and what its results have been. Certainly, a great majority have never even seen or read a copy of the Charter of the United Nations. A large number of our citizens have been propagandized through every channel of communications into believing that the United Nations is the only alternative to war, and that it has been somehow designated as the savior of mankind. Given the same use of communications and channels for propaganda, the opposite could be proved. If our citizens could be told the facts about the activities of the specialized agencies of the United Nations, it is very likely that that opinion could be changed.

You state that withdrawal of the United States from the United Nations would surely result in disaster for our country apd that indeed it could lead to world war III.

There are many clear-thinking leaders in our country today who would not, in any sense, agree with this statement.

I believe that such a sweeping prediction of disaster must be carefully examined dispassionately by statesmen and experts far removed from the center of United Nations' activities in which you find yourself. Let me merely ask you one question to illustrate what I mean. What has this United Nations accomplished in opposition to the spread of godless communism throughout the world during the period of its existence? During the life of the United Nations, communism has spread its sway from 200 million to more than 900 million people.

Is an organization which is powerless or unwilling to oppose the forceful extension of Communist slavery calculated to preserve ultimate peace, or will it result in a final choice between world slavery and world war? Let me deal with this general question in greater detail below.

In your comments on some of the "factual errors" in our resolution, you adopt the somewhat baffling tactic of repeating our affirmative statements with the injection of the negative, underlined or in italics. Let me endeavor to deal as fully as possible with your individual comments one by one.

1. You say that the United Nations has no "anti-Christian philosophy" and is not hostile to the "Christian fundamentals of the United States of America." Let me suggest, on the contrary, that the net impact of the United Nations has revealed itself as not only anti-Christian, but anti-God. I should like to have some significant instances where the influence of the United States in Christian philosophy and Christian fundamentals has countered to the slightest degree the impact of the powerful Godless forces of the Communist bloc in the proceedings of the United Nations or in any part of the field of activities radiating from or sponsored by the organization. When you say that "it is certainly a Christian precept that nations should live together in peace with one another as good neighbors, which is what the United Nations Charter says and what the United States is trying with all its strength in the United Nations and everywhere else, to bring about," you are affording another excellent example of the confusion between the two United Nations. The ideal United Nations should be exactly what you described. This United Nations presents merely a question of facts. I await your factual instances in support of your position.

2. You say that the "United Nations is not a declining factor in the maintenance of international peace." Its "influence is demonstrably growing. It has done things in the field of war prevention, notably in the Middle East, which no country, including the United States, could possibly have done by itself. It is often—but not always—an effective instrumentality for peace. It is never a cause of war or anything harmful to the United States."

The objective historian of current events will have great difficulty in following you in these statements. As I write, violent conflicts exist in a dozen places throughout the world. In the Middle East, in which you feel the United Nations has been notably influential, battles rage in Lebanon, Cyprus, and north Africa. Recently, a Canadian high official in the so-called United Nations Control Forces between Israel and Egypt was killed. The Arab bloc under the tutelage of Moscow is arming—for peaceful purposes? The encroachment of Soviet influence in this area, which you mention with pride, has been enhanced significantly in recent months and years, making it more and more inevitable that any controversy which touches off violence will create an expanded area of conflict rather than a restricted area. You apparently regard with satisfaction the presence in this troubled area of the pathetically weak United Nations patrol. What will you expect of the United States if and when the members of this little force are besieged and murdered? Is the United States committed to back up this force by military means or is it not? What chance is there, therefore, of the United States remaining neutral in the event of an outbreak of hostilities generally in the Middle East, no matter who is the aggressor or what the merits of the campaign?

As I write, the last vestige of resistance to the Communist-inspired Sukarno Government in Indonesia is crumbling despite the assurance of the United Nations to respect the aspirations for independence of the Indonesian groups. Need I point out the tragic retreat before the forces of Communist slavery in China, Indochina, Middle Europe, including Hungary? I believe it is fantastic that you in the year 1958, after the 13-year record of the United Nations, bring yourself to boast of the United Nations as a growing influence for international peace.

While I am on this subject, I note that you make no reference to Korea. I should like very much to present to you my version of this tragic war and disgraceful truce in defeat, but before doing so I wish to ask you to favor me with your version of one phase of this conflict. Was the Korean war commanded and directed by the United Nations or by the United States of America? I earnestly hope that you will find time to enlighten me on this one subject in advance of all others.

3. You say that "the Bang-Jensen incident was not 'an instance of violation of diplomatic immunity' and did not 'prove the United Nations to be a center of international espionage' and did not prove the United Nations to be 'a refuge for disloyal American citizens'—which it is most certainly not, since every American employee of the United Nations must be cleared under U.S. civil service and the FBI procedure."

Concerning the Bang-Jensen incident, I refer you to the enclosed editorial from the June 12 issue of the Indianapolis Star. In view of this disgraceful development, will you still insist that the Bang-Jensen incident is not a violation of diplomatic immunity? It certainly is a notorious example of Communist domination of the United Nations. Why has no action been taken by the United Nations on the Bang-Jensen U.N. Report on Hungary? What did our representative in the United Nations do about that report? Could our United Nations delegation have prevented this latest outrage against the author of that report? If we are powerless in these situations then why are we tied helplessly into this web of intrigue and why should we not leave such an organization where we share its moral and financial responsibilities without equivalent authority in such important phases of its activity?

If clearance of American employees of the United Nations by the FBI and the Civil Service is a guarantee of their loyalty to this country, then please explain the second report of the U.S. Senate subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, reporting on the administration of the Internal Security Act, March 22, 1954. This report concludes that:

1. American Communists had penetrated the United Nations Secretariat.

2. They aided one another in getting jobs in the United Nations.

3. They are particularly valuable to the world Communist conspiracy when employed in the United Nations from which they can operate both here and abroad under cover and sometimes even with diplomatic immunity.

Can it be denied that the individuals found guilty in the Senate investigations were protected by the Secretariat of the United Nations under the provision of chapter XV, article 100 of the charter?

Why did 200 American employees of the United Nations suddenly resign when this committee began its hearings in 1951? Were not 17 American employees in the United Nations Secretariat discharged by the United Nations Secretary General Trygve Lie when they refused to affirm or deny to the Senate

committee that they were members of the Communist Party? Did not the United Nations Administrative Tribunal rule (Aug. 21, 1953), that the United Nations Charter does not justify discharge of a United Nations employee for membership in the Communist Party and that these discharges, for that reason, were illegal? It is my recollection that the permanent employees in this group were ordered reinstated with backpay (in one case $40,000), and that the United States paid one-third of these backpay accumulations. Does this not prove that the United Nations is a refuge for disloyal American citizens.

4. You say that "the small nations in the United Nations do not vote as a bloc and the United States has never been defeated in the United Nations on any vital question. Moreover, the United States is completely protected by the veto against any act contrary to our interests."

Since 1945 the number of nations belonging to the United Nations has increased from 49 to 81. Of those 32 members added since the launching of the United Nations, 15 are either obvious puppets or at least satellites of Communist Moscow. Of the remaining 17, not more than 5 can possibly be regarded as allied in tradition or interests or religion with the United States. Has this disproportionate increase in the atheistic communistic powers in each instance been approved by the United States? Can anyone viewing this tremendously overwhelming existence of power in unfriendly nations possibly assure the American people that the interests of the United States and of these other powers will not diverge on occasion when the United States will be outvoted?

But you say "the United States is completely protected by the veto." I should like to ask you whether the United States will use its veto power to prevent the admission of Red Communist China when such admission is approved by the membership as will inevitably result ultimately in view of the more or less furtive support for such admission emanating from official leadership and, incredibly, from some American businessmen. However, your reference to the veto cannot be permitted to pass without the recognition of the similar power possessed by the Soviet Union. How many times has the Soviet Union exercised its veto power? The record shows 81 times. How many times has the United States protected its interests by use of its veto? None.

I await with great interest your analysis as to the command during the Korean war in the light of the Soviet power of veto. I do not have to remind you that the Military Staff Committee of the Security Council of the United Nations has without exception at all times functioned under the aegis of a Soviet executive officer of the Security Council. The under-secretary for Political and Security Council Affairs, who is at the head of the Military Staff Committee, has consistently been a Communist—three times of the Soviet Union and once of Yugoslavia. This actual power, coupled with the veto power, makes the United Nations a queer organization with which to conduct conflicts in which the lives of American boys are jeopardized.

In this connection, with reference to the concern of the United Nations with the fate of American soldiers, I might tell you that I am fully aware of the failure of Dag Hammarskjold and yourself to see the group of 83 mothers of boys missing in Korea when they attempted to interview you at the United Nations in 1954.

5. You say that "the United Nations does not have any means of shaping domestic law in the United States of America by treaty law or by any other means. It is instead specifically precluded by the Charter from interfering in a member state's domestic affairs."

It is quite incomprehensible to me that anyone in your position could possibly make any such sweeping denial of the revealed and potential power of the United Nations to create domestic law in the United States. I should like to call your attention to the resolution adoped by the Daughters of the American Revolution in 1955. This resolution listed specific instances in which interference with, and threats to the Constitution of he United States, emanated from the United Nations. It referred to: (1) The Fujii case in California, (2) the steel seizure case, (3) the propaganda of the declaration of human rights, (4) the genocide convention, (5) UNESCO.

6. You say: "The United Nations is not 'a socialized one world state'; it is not 'being developed' into one; and I would oppose its becoming one. The United Nations is not a government of any sort. It has no sovereignty. It cannot impose a tax, draft a soldier, or pass a law. Everything that it does is purely recommendatory."

The following citations from the United Nations Charter are pertinent to this statement:

Article 2–7. "Nothing contained in the present charter shall authorize the United Nations to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state."

So far so good, but note these:

Article 7–1. "There are established as the principal organs of the United Nations * * * an Economic and Social Council."

Article 13–1. "The General Assembly shall initiate studies and make recommendations for the purpose of * * * (b) promoting international cooperation in the economic, social, cultural, educational, and health fields, * * * assisting in the realization of human rights and fundamental freedoms."

Article 55. "The United Nations shall promote: (a) higher standards of living, full employment, and conditions of economic and social progress and development; (b) solutions of the international economic, social, health, and related problems; and international cultural and educational cooperation; * * * (c) universal * * * observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms."

Article 57–1. "The various specialized agencies, * * * having wide international responsibilities, * * * in economic, social, cultural, educational, health, and related fields shall be brought into relationship with the United Nations."

Article 62–1. "The Economic and Social Council may make or initiate studies and reports with respect to international economic, social, cultural, educational, health, and related matters and may make recommendations."

Article 62–3: "It may prepare draft conventions for submission to the General Assembly."

(You are aware, of course, that by Supreme Court decisions—*U.S.* v. *Pink*, volume 315, page 203—such treaties or executive agreements change the internal law of the United States.)

Article 64–1. "The Economic and Social Council * * * may make arrangements with members of the United Nations and with the specialized agencies to obtain reports on the steps taken to give effect to its own recommendations."

Article 56. "All members pledge themselves to take joint and separate action * * * for the achievement of the purposes set forth in article 55."

Article 2–2. "All members * * * shall fulfill in good faith the obligations assumed by them in accordance with the present Charter."

Article 2–5. "All members shall give the United Nations every assistance in any action it takes."

In the light of the activities of the ILO, GATT, WHO, UNESCO, and the technical assistance board supported by the World Bank and International Monetary Fund it is difficult to understand how other than a socialized world state can be expected. These claims can be supported by the official publications of the different specialized agencies and, in addition for UNESCO, by the statements of many associated with its history.

In his book, "Modern Law of Nations," Dr. Philip Jessup charted the practical path from the charter of the United Nations to world government. This, he claims, can easily be done by charter interpretation, with no change whatever in the charter. In his book, "War or Peace," page 204, Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, states, "I have never seen any proposal made for collective security with 'teeth' in it, or for 'world government,' or for 'world federation' which could not be carried out either by the United Nations or under the United Nations Charter."

My apologies for the great length of this letter, but because of your interest in our resolution I thought you might also be interested in the thoughts of another American. I wish to make it very clear that in no way is this to be considered an official reply from the national society, for that prerogative remains with the Executive.

I believe that continued membership by the United States in the United Nations will result in loss of the prestige presently enjoyed as the leader of the world. Our Nation will gradually be forced to conform to the practices supporting the ideals of the international oligarchy and will lose its sovereignty and independence. Its wealth will be sacrified in support of worldwide activities. Every year finds our blessed country more strongly enmeshed in the schemes of the internationalists. It will require the strength and courage of fearless, clear-thinking, dedicated Americans to lead us back, through the maze of articles, conventions, and treaty law which now threaten us by their eventual acceptance, to the Constitution of the United States.

As a free nation, divorced from the United Nations, the United States would again control its destiny and the freedom of its citizens. It would as a Christian nation give, but according to its own decisions, to those in need all over the world. Its foreign relations would be conducted by diplomatic negotiation, its youth would be brought home from the more than 60 countries where they are stationed. Without question, the United States as a strictly sovereign nation would quickly supersede Russia, her greatest enemy, in all ways, therefore control the world situation and bring peace to mankind.

Sincerely yours,

MRS. RAY L. ERB.

"Hanging Sam's" Memories

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, a tragic error which could have robbed America of the services of a man who has proved himself to be one of her great military leaders was averted by the interest manifested by the then young Congressman from Texas, SAM RAYBURN.

Incidents like this have marked the long career of our Speaker and have endeared him to the hearts of all of us.

It is interesting to note that since my remarks on March 20, the New York Herald Tribune published an article on Sunday, April 12, by Mr. S. L. A. Marshall on General Williams that confirms that which I told the House.

I include that article as part of these remarks:

OF ARMS AND MEN: "HANGING" SAM'S MEMORIES

(By S. L. A. Marshall)

"Hanging" Sam Williams must have a smile on his face these days. The newspapers say the Allies have a neat top-secret plan for undoing the Russians should there come a military showdown west of Berlin.

If the word that everything is peaches in the Western camp travels as far as Saigon, Vietnam, where "Hanging" Sam holds forth, it could either give him a chuckle or cause the raising of a questioning eyebrow.

Now a three-star general of the U.S. Army, and one of the better-loved and saltier characters of the Army, Sam is chief of MAAG operations in the southeast Asia rice bowl region, maybe taxed with problems, but at least happily remote from the Berlin dilemma.

There was the other time, though, when Sam carried most of its weight on his own square shoulders. In 1948, there were other Americans on the pivot, but it was Sam's nose which was to be used to bulldoze a way into Berlin, if the Russians got tough. While sweating out how to discharge this minor chore, Sam read a few stories from the home press carrying the good news that the U.S. Army was prepared for any eventuality. It's a national habit.

Much water has flowed under the Elbe bridges since he told the story, but that's all to the good, since it might have fulled and ripened with the years. What follows is a reasonable facsimile thereof.

In the late spring, 1948, when the threat of blockade loomed heavy, Sam was commander of the 26th Infantry, the Blue Spaders of the big Red One Division. It was his second tour as such and he felt right chesty about the prime condition of his regiment.

Stationed at Bamberg, just north of Nurnberg, the Blue Spaders spent much of their time training on the ranges at Grafenwohr. There they were visited frequently by the division commander, Maj. Gen. "Shrimp" Milburn, whose fame was made more lustrous in later years by his flawless leadering of U.S. I Corps during the worst days in Korea.

At Grafenwohr there suddenly descended on Williams & Regiment a party of senior officers from stateside. Gimlet eyed, they looked the blue spaders over. The intensity of this inspection, left unexplained, built up a mystery which baffled Sam wholly.

One four-star general said to him: "These men don't look like they are afraid of Russians." Sam was proud of his outfit; he felt it was bursting out all over with esprit. So he answered: "Why should they be?" We don't think every Russian is 9 feet tall and weighs 300 pounds." He thought that crack reflected unit sentiment but it caused a certain lifting of the eyebrows.

The visitor departed. Then Milburn came over to unbag the kitten. If troops had to be used to break the Berlin blockade, Sam's blue spaders would be the main body. With the column would ride some division engineers and part of its organic tank battalion. To give the venture an allied flavor, one company of British rifles and one of French would also start. What other plans were afoot, or what hand would hold the overall responsibility, Sam heard not.

But Sam, like the namesake McGee, stayed cool and calm in the heart of the furnace roar. Being tagged meant first of all rounding up every bit of information which might help with the problem.

Right off, he was told that the blue spaders would have a 20-kilometer-wide corridor to move through. That wasn't too bad; there is some elbow room within such latitude.

So Sam immediately requested higher headquarters to supply him with maps which would show down to the last meter the boundaries of the strip over which he would be allowed to maneuver.

In due time, back came the reply that there was no 20-kilometer on the ground, but only in the air. By land, the corridor was limited to the pavement of the autobahn and the few feet of earth shoulder on either side.

Said Sam, in words not intended to be a classic of understatement: "Quite naturally, the extraordinary conditions complicated my tactical problem somewhat."

He forthwith instructed his battalion commanders that the first movement of any man or vehicle off the autobahn would enable the Russians to claim that the movement had violated their territory. Put in that straitjacket, he had less time to worry about what he would do if the Russians blew their bridges in his face, and none at all to become confused because his engineers couldn't round up enough materiel to span the possible water spaces.

"I remember," said Sam, "telling 'Shrimp' that when the regiment started, I wanted to go and go fast. I couldn't be looking over my shoulder all the time for orders. I wanted a clear unequivocal directive before crossing the border that I should make Berlin come hell or high water. If the Russians tried to stop us, that would mean war. I didn't relish having some second guesser saying later that Sam started it all on his own.

" 'Shrimp' agreed. He said: 'I'll have several copies struck and placed in bank vaults back home for future reference and the sake of history.' "

So ends Sam's story, which has no moral. The airlift, which also developed happenstantially, relieved him of the necessity of having to save resolute national policy by the seat of his pants.

Florida Oldsters Refuse To Decline

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, everyone knows that Ponce de Leon came to visit Florida in 1513 in search of a fountain of youth. In 1564 when the French came to settle Florida, under Rene Laudonniere, they found no one but Indians living in what is now the United States and among these natives there were many who were very, very long lived. Today, all of us who live in Florida know that the beauties and opportunities in our fair State give good incentives for living just as long as is possible. Yet, even in our beautiful State, with its many opportunities, there are many people of advanced years who are able and willing to do work which society has attempted in the past to reserve for younger people. Somehow, everywhere in America, we should find a way to provide more employment opportunities for those in advanced years.

Recently I read an excellent editorial by Mr. Kenneth A. Brown, executive director of Goodwill Industries of Jacksonville, with which I will conclude my remarks. This was published in the April 2 edition of the Capital Labor News. Mr. Brown points out that the Goodwill Industries organization is making available to many of our older citizens the constructive work which many of them seek, not only in Florida but elsewhere in the United States:

FLORIDA'S SENIOR CITIZENS

(By Kenneth A. Brown)

All too often the senior citizen is what a Florida newspaper writer has called an arbitrarily retired member of society to be congratulated on the way he carries his years, and regaled at intervals with pep talks, travelogue pictures, and amateur theatricals at sessions of the Homeville Civic and Social Club.

Compliments, felicitations, and entertainment are well and good; but what the sincerely well-meaning friends don't seem to know is that a lot of the oldsters make their regular appearances at the agreeable and helpful events because so little else is left to do.

A very considerable number of these older citizens don't like the prospect of continued doing nothing. They have no quarrel with those who try to add to their enjoyment of the golden years, but they would like to be doing something on their own.

These are times of seeming contradictions, in many ways. Doctors, insurance companies, and everyone else, it would appear, are engaged in the effort to prolong the lives of our people.

Within a short period of time, life expectancy has been lengthened by a score of years; and social workers, welfare agencies, community clubs, and civic organizations vie with one another in the creation of programs to insure a greater measure of enjoyment for the oldsters during their declining years. But the joker in the rummy-deck is that a large segment of the seniors are not declining at all.

They're still in good trim physically, mentally alert, and fully capable. But they are off the job, usually without their consent: and if you ask us, whose work puts us in direct touch with their situation, it's not at all funny.

We all love babies and teenagers, and other groups of all ages, but no one is so deserving of our love and helpful attention as a grand old lady or gentleman. Old-age pensions, retirement pensions, social security, and the like are all very fine, but they don't fill the hours.

They don't meet the psychological needs of the elderly who continue active in mind, and potentially useful to themselves and to society in every way.

Many of them are resentful of the practice, in busines and industry, that almost literally says "Get out!" to the person who long has contributed the best of his hand and brain, just because he has rounded out a certain number of calendar years; and it is most regrettable to see them denied the privilege of doing something for themselves.

Our Goodwill Industries has endeavored to fill the breach between creative action and what one of our older friends has defined as "fruitless repose."

The more than one hundred Goodwill chapters in the United States have in their employ many of the seniors whose experience, aptitudes, and skills add not only to material production but to their own mental and physical satisfactions. For them, the same as for our multitude of handicapped employees, Goodwill has become what one

of their number has denominated "the organization with a heart."

It is the contention at Goodwill that to do our full part in the field of human service is to see that every willing worker, regardless of age or any other extraneous condition, is given the opportunity for employment as long as he is able to handle the job.

And this, I should say, can be done with no denial of opportunity to those of younger years, who have no reason, as a rule, for application to a welfare agency. It is beyond reason that in an economy in which everything is ready at hand—machinery, tools, raw materials and all—the way may not be devised to meet all demands.

Minor unemployment periods come and go—sometimes greater ones; but soon, we may confidently believe, we shall have improved and expanded our industrial system in a way to see that no willing worker shall be unwillingly idle. That is one of the slogans at Goodwill Industries—no unwilling idleness; and its application to the needs of the senior citizen, everywhere, should be as directly objective as we have made it for the handicapped.

We are hopeful that nothing in these lines may be taken as a slap at the carefully outlined plans by which thousands of our older people are enabled to get more out of life. What we are emphasizing is the fact that so many of these fine citizens, of both sexes, are still without the opportunity to exercise the abilities and realize the desires they yet retain.

Development of Our National Forests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. MEYER
OF VERMONT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 12, 1959

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Speaker, from the vantage point of the professional forester, I wish to comment briefly on the report "Program for the National Forests" which the Agriculture Department sent to the Congress on March 24, 1959.

Because of the multiple use aspects of forest land which this report involves, it should be of interest to every Member and more particularly to my colleagues who have national forests in their States or districts.

With the rapid increase in our population and the increasing demand for natural resources to maintain an expanding economy, the use pressures on forest land are growing daily. Careful planning and full development of our forests are therefore necessary if both current and long-range resource needs are to be met.

Winter sports have become an intensive use on the Green Mountain National Forest in Vermont. We welcome this activity because it balances the recreational use in the forest and provides a year-long use by tourists. Because the areas are accessible to the heavily populated metropolitan areas in New England and the Northeast, their orderly expansion as provided for in this "Program for the National Forests" is essential. The local economy of the area is considerably benefited by the money which the skiers and recreationists spend on winter sports and other outdoor activities on the national forest.

This "Program for the National Forests" will improve hunting and fishing. Our lakes and streams on the Green Mountain National Forest provide sport fishing for thousands of visitors each summer. As more thousands come to Vermont and to the other national forests throughout America, full development of this wildlife resource of the forest is necessary and desirable.

To a forester, multiple use means the full use of all the renewable resources on forest land. The growing, cutting and sale of timber is one of these uses. In Vermont, much high quality maple timber is harvested from the national forest.

This activity supports many small community forest industries. It provides the raw material for the manufacturer of maple bowls and other specialty products which require a high input of local labor. These wood products supplement the tourist trade and again the local economy of areas surrounding the national forest is improved. Also there are other special uses of national forest trees which provide the sap from which the famed Vermont maple syrup is made.

The nature of our country in Vermont and much of New England is such that watershed values are high. The land is glaciated and unstable. We have found that forest cover is one of the best stabilizing forces to keep the land from eroding into our streams and valleys. As a forester, I am pleased that this "Program for the National Forests" has plans for stepping up the management and protection of the watersheds on all the national forests throughout America.

This broad-scale program for the national forests includes accelerated research in forest genetics, timber cutting methods, new uses for low-quality trees and better protection from fire, insects, and disease.

Such research is essential if the forests' resources are to be kept renewable in quantities to meet the impact of present and future use.

Mr. Speaker, it is gratifying to know that the Forestry Subcommittee of the House Agriculture Committee plans to hold hearings on May 14 and 15 on this long-range conservation and development program for the national forests. I hope many of my colleagues will take advantage of this opportunity to indicate their interest in the full development of the national forests.

Cross Country With the on to Oregon Cavalcade—II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 12, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, the on to Oregon cavalcade is making its way across country and finding warm hospitality wherever it goes. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following story from the May 7, 1959, Drain Enterprise which covers the journey on the trail from April 27 through May 2. This daily diary of the trip to Oregon from Independence, Mo., by wagon train is being written by Mr. Robert R. (Rudy) Roudebaugh, of Drain:

WAGON TRAIN ENCOUNTERS RAIN, WIND, FOG, AND HEAT

Jotting notes on a pad while jostling along in the driver's seat of a covered wagon traveling a rocked road in Kansas does not sound exactly easy. Also scribbling a few lines during meal and rest stops and dropping the notes at post offices en route is the method the Drain covered wagon driver, Robert "Rudy" Roudebaugh has been supplying North Douglas County readers of the Drain Enterprise with a firsthand, personal account of the 2,000-mile trip from Independence, Mo., to Independence, Oreg.

The notes are mailed from day to day and are complete up to and including last Saturday, May 2. Mrs. Kiwanda Roudebaugh will join her husband on the wagon train trek shortly after their daughter Judy, graduates from Drain High School the end of May.

April 27: Free breakfast given for wagon train travelers at St. Mary's cafe. Dan and Daze (horses pulling Drain wagon) are in dress and ready to roll. We are leaving one swell town of 1,300 people, about the size of Drain. They gave us four meals plus feed for horses and a good place to camp. Weather is rainy and heavy fog. Time is now 8:07 a.m., and we are on our way saying goodby to a good town and the many good friends I have made.

At 9:38 the wagons stopped to shake rocks out of the brakes as we have been on gravel road all morning. Dan and Daze pulled on the bit all morning. No wind today. Janell still asleep.

At 11:23 we stopped at Histon cemetery to water horses. Cemetery has Indians buried from ages of 2 to 92. We are on our way. At Vermillion River ate lunch. Camped at ball park at Louisville, Kans., (population 200) arriving at 2 p.m. Winds up to 20 miles per hour.

Janell has been invited out to dinner. Townspeople have turned grade school gym and cafeteria over to us.

April 28, leaving Louisville: Rod and Gun Club cooked our meal last night. Janell, also Dan and Daze have a cold. All hooked up and ready to go at 8:09. We are going north on Highway 99 with the sun out bright. At 11:04 going over Port Creek. Saddle club is out to meet us. Arrived in Westmoreland, Kans., 11:27 making camp at ball park. The town fed us at the cafe for lunch. Janell has met another girl from here. We made 11 miles today.

April 29: At 7:35 ready to roll. We have 22 miles to make today. If Dan and Daze are not better will have to travel slower. Weather bright and sunny, temperature 80 degrees. At 9:52 we are 15 miles from Frankfort at place called Blaine. The school pupils are out to see us. Entering Marshall at 11:25. Stopped at school and gave out autographs. 11:15 crossed Clear Port Creek. 12:07 passed Mt. Hope cemetery. 12:19 stopped for lunch and watered horses. Dan drank water and Daze ate some grain and drank. Weather is nice with little wind. We have 5 miles left to Frankfort. We camped at 4:45. The people fed us supper. Janell sleeps good. She slept all morning yesterday.

April 30: All ready to go but Dan does not feel a bit good. He don't eat much grain or hay. We have 26 miles to go. It's 7:49 and we're starting off. Plenty of photographers

here. Janell is driving the team. They have quieted down. We went by the Vermillion river. At 10:45 stopped for a rest 2 miles out of Blue Rapids. Marysville is 10 miles away. At 11:01 in Blue Rapids. We went by high school and grade school. At one school the pupils were not out. Schools are all up in the town square. The band played three songs for us. Town has a population of 1,200 to 1,500. The Blue Rapids Chamber of Commerce gave us a picnic lunch. Dan did not eat, but drank water. At 2:12 we're at Alcove Springs. A historic spot where wagon trains long ago used to stop and fill up with water. We are 6 miles from Marysville. Temperature must be 80 or 90 degrees. Arrived in Marysville 4:29 and pulled into camp at Kansas National Guard building at 4:41.

May 1: Good bright day. At 7:55 ready to roll across Blue River. State line only 11 miles. At 10:56 I see some little town up ahead. Hot winds have came up. Farmers stop their work and cut loose. At 11:46 pulled up to feed horses and give them an hour to feed and rest. Winds are now up to 50 miles per hour. Back roads are dirt and gravel. At 12:68 it's time to roll. At 1:59 we stopped at the only pony express station that is left in the United States. Station is 101 years old. Original building still stands. At 3:51 arrived in camp this side of State line. Dan feeling much better. He is best walker of the pair. People are beginning to come in.

May 2: Ready to roll at 7:51. Stopped in Hollenberg 10:07. This is last t own in Kansas, 1 mile from Nebraska State line. Crossed over into Nebraska at 10:40. We have been on rock and gravel road all morning. At 11:58, it rained half inch in 15 minutes. Now on our way to Steele City. Wet to the skin. We stopped to run down a loose horse. Daze just tries to keep on going. Back on oil road again. Rain peps horses up. At 2:18 its pouring again at Endicott, population 200. At 3:55 we are entering Fairbury. Riding club coming to meet us carrying U.S. and Nebraska State flags. The club is named "Blue Valley Ranglers." At 4:17 arrived at city park where we will make camp over the weekend.

The Proposed Equal Rights Amendment to the U.S. Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 12, 1959

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Miss Sarah Jane Cunningham, the gifted daughter of our former colleague, and friend, Paul Cunningham, points up the injustices under which the women of the United States still labor.

Our Constitution is a very great document, but its greatness hinges on the fact that it is susceptible to change. A change on the status of women is long overdue.

The equal rights amendment, which has been before the Congress for over 15 years, to my knowledge, continues to gather dust in the gloomy files of the Judiciary Committee, while the gallant American male, in and out of Congress, pursues his way in the firm belief that he is protecting American womanhood from the terrors and dangers of equality.

The article follows:

THE PROPOSED EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT TO THE U.S. CONSTITUTION

(By Sarah Jane Cunningham)

The famous 14th amendment to the Constitution was adopted in 1868 after the Civil War. It states that all persons born or naturalized in the United States and subject to its jurisdiction are citizens and no State shall make or enforce any law abridging the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States. It further commanded that no State shall deprive any person of life, liberty or property without due process of law, nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

The Constitution is the supreme law of the land and is said to be a great charter of human liberty, unique in the history of the world. But, oh, what the Supreme Court has done to that great charter of human liberty where women are concerned. The interpreter is indeed the lawgiver. The Constitution has been prevented from protecting women from the rankest kind of discrimination, injustice and inequality by the interpretation—or misinterpretation—placed upon it, that is, by benchmade law.[1]

Not many years ago in a case concerning the labor restrictions of women hotel employees, the court said: The law of this land today is that labor restrictions against women only do not violate any rights women have under the Constitution.[2]

The Constitution does not protect any American woman against the enactment by any State legislature of laws prohibiting the employment of women in any kind of business, in any profession or barring her from any lawful means of earning a living. Many States have done just that and the Supreme Court has ruled that in so doing they do not violate the Constitution. The Supreme Court has made the Constitution powerless to protect women.

Shortly after its adoption, the Supreme Court actually announced that the 14th amendment could not be set up to protect women against unequal laws which were a barrier against the right of females to pursue any lawful employment for a livelihood. Mr. Justice Bradley said that and the Court has not changed its mind. If the legislature has not excluded women, it must have intended to, said Justice Bradley; besides, it belonged to men to make, apply, and execute the laws.[3]

In the case of a woman lawyer who requested the right to practice law in a State whose statutes said that qualified persons could practice within the State but was denied that privilege, the Court said that the Constitution does not require States to give to women the equal protection of their laws.[4]

The very latest word on the subject by the Supreme Court is that women may be barred from any employment and deprived of the use of their property in spite of the Constitution.[5]

Because women have been termed second-class citizens because of decisions rendered by the U.S. Supreme Court in interpreting the Constitution, it will be necessary to overcome this discrimination by going to the very root of the trouble and there making the correction.

Although the Constitution of the United States forbids any State to deny to any person the equal protection of the laws, believe it or not—

Men, aliens, and corporations are persons entitled to the equal protection of the laws of this country; American women are not.

It is unconstitutional to try a Negro man with a jury from which Negro men have been excluded; it is not unconstitutional to try a woman, black or white, with a jury from which women have been excluded.

To exclude men from jury service would be to deny them a trial by a jury of their peers and the equal protection of the laws; excluding women from jury service is no such violation of the Constitution.

It is unconstitutional to place restrictions on men's liberty to contract; it is not unconstitutional to restrict women's liberty to contract.

It is constitutional to bar women from any lawful means of earning a living; such laws as to men are unconstitutional and void.

Women may be subjected to labor restrictions; men may not.

Women may be excluded from business and the professions; men may not.

Women in business and the professions may be discriminated against; men may not.

Women may be deprived of their property without due process of law; men may not.

Sex, marriage, and motherhood are the bases of rank injustice and discrimination against American women.

In utter amazement, people ask how such a thing can be in this American Republic. Bishop Hoadly had the answer when he said that "whoever hath an absolute authority to interpret any written or spoken laws, it is he who is truly the lawgiver, to all intents and purposes, and not the person who first wrote or spoke them." Justice Holmes condensed it when he remarked that the Constitution is what the courts say it is.

The Supreme Court of the United States has said that a woman is not a person who is entitled to equal protection of the laws under the Constitution, and that the Constitution cannot protect her against inequalities and discrimination as long as they are based solely on sex.

[1] "What is the Constitution Worth to American Women?" Brown, Helen Elizabeth, Women Lawyers Journal 36:1, 13-Winter 1950. *Strander* v. *West Virginia*, 100 U.S. 303 (1880); *Bradwell* v. *Illinois*, 16 Wall. 130; *Lockwood, petitioner*, 154 U.S. 116; *Minor* v. *Happersett*, 21 Wall. 162; *Muller* v. *Oregon*, 208 U.S. 412; *Riley* v. *Massachusetts*, 232 U.S. 671; *Commonwealth of Massachusetts* v. *Welosky*, 276 Mass. 398 (1931); *Welosky* v. *Commonwealth of Massachusetts*, 284 U.S. 684 (1932); *Lochner* v. *New York*, 198 U.S. 45 (1908); *Miller* v. *Wilson*, 236 U.S. 373 (1915); *Adkins* v. *Children's Hospital*, 261 U.S. 525 (1923); *Radice* v. *New York*, 264 U.S. 292 (1924); *Morehead* v. *New York*, 298 U.S. 587 (1936).

[2] *West Coast Hotel Co.* v. *Parrish*, 300 U.S. 379 (1937).

[3] *Bradwell* v. *Illinois*, 16 Wall. 130 (1872).

[4] *In re Lockwood*, 154 U.S. 116 (1894).

[5] *Goesnaert* v. *Cleary*, 335 U.S. 464 (1948).

Our Phony Farm Support Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER NORBLAD
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 11, 1959

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial written by Mr. Kenneth Holmes in the News-Register of McMinnville, Oreg.:

OUR PHONY FARM SUPPORT PROGRAM

The inequity of today's Federal farm program is illustrated by a story in the New York Times telling how 9 out of 12 large producers of crops chose to forfeit all or part

of their 1957 crops rather than to repay their Government support loans.

According to Times a survey of the large loans on corn, wheat, cotton and rice showed that three big growers repaid a total of $1,539,310 plus 3½ percent interest. Nine other large borrowers let the Government take all or part of their 1957 crops placed under price support loans. They obtained loans totaling $3,668,482 and only repaid $1,053,141.

These were among a total of $1,334,318,409.34 loaned out on 1957 wheat, corn, cotton and rice crops. Out of this total farmers paid back to the Government $368,698,232.41 to redeem all or part of their crops placed under price supports.

The above figures came from the records of the Commodity Credit Corporation as of last December 31. Says the Times, "They show how the Government's large holdings of major crops have been built up as farmers permitted the Government to take over their products pledged for the Federal loans because markets could not absorb the abundant production at prices as high as those offered by Federal farm price supports."

Farmers pay the 3½-percent interest on the loans if they redeem all or a part of their crop. If they turn over their pledged crop collateral to the Government, they pay no interest.

They are responsible for storage for the life of the loan; but if they turn over crops to the Government, the Government assumes responsibility and pays producers for holding the crops until the Commodity Credit Corporation arranges for movement into Federal storage. Cotton is an exception in this last case; for cotton growers are allowed to put their product in commercial warehouses, which bill the Government pays for storage.

In the same issue of the Times is the story of how Stanley Yankus, of Dowagiac, Mich., sold his farm at auction for $30,000 because he was tired of the battle over governmental restrictions on his crops which cost him $5,000 over a 6-year period. His farm had a 14-acre wheat allotment. Yankus admitted he raised more but claimed that his chickens were fed every grain he raised.

It looks as if Mr. Yankus was not big enough or rich encugh to manage to clean up on the Government farm support program. He was seeking peanuts (figuratively, of course); he should have been after millions. If he had dealt in millions of bushels and millions of dollars instead of a measley 14 acres and a few chickens, he'd have cleaned up. A person's got to think big to be a success these days.

We think that things have gotten rotten ripe in the Federal farm program, and it is time something drastic was done to remedy the situation. It is bad business; it is bad agricultural; it is bad government; it is planned missuse of Government moneys.

Russia Favors Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 11, 1959

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, of course, Communist Russia favors the U.S. foreign aid program. This is plain commonsense that our taxpayers keep telling me back home. Naturally, Soviet Russia favors foreign aid for two reasons—it weakens the United States economically, and diverts that much money from possible use on our missile program. Soviet Russia, being one of the largest recipients of our aid, would advocate aid for other countries to help promote communism in those countries.

Mr. Speaker, I need only remind you that Soviet Russia received over $11 billion from America during World War II. With this aid, she was able to conquer Poland, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Hungary, Bulgaria, Albania, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, East Berlin, Manchuria, China, North Korea, and other areas. Russia's most ambitious and exciting policy is to have America develop the undeveloped countries of the world before she makes her bid to take these countries over. Even in England, a nation with hundreds of years of background in freedom and democracy, our money was used to destroy the free enterprise system.

Mr. Speaker, the following is from INFORM, an intelligence source which has been remarkable for its accuracy:

MOSCOW URGES ACCEPTANCE OF U.S. AID

The winning of underdeveloped countries has long occupied the attention of the Soviet Union, where it comes under the Moscow Institute of World Economy. This institute is directed by an Armenian, Arzumyan, and it has now elaborated a program which will serve as a basis for Soviet policy in the months to come.

Financial aid by the United States to underdeveloped countries will be encouraged in every way by the Soviet Government so long as such aid is granted without strings attached.

Soviet missions in the countries concerned are being instructed to urge the governments to which they are accredited to:

1. Establish state socialism; i.e, use the funds received for purposes of industrialization, mainly of the state-operated sector, and replace individual enterprise wherever possible by state management.

2. Use American funds against America; ie., introduce measures to protect the economy of the country in question from competion on the part of overindustrialized countries, particularly the United States.

3. Seize foreign capital and foreign business concerns, and nationalize banks operating on foreign capital.

4. Institute strict control over imports and currency transactions.

An Open Letter to the Congress of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUSSELL V. MACK
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 7, 1959

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the May 1959 issue of Roads and Streets, a national publication serving the highway industry, contains an "Open Letter to the Congress" by the editors. In view of the widespread interest in the present development of our Federal-aid highway program, I feel that this article should be read by all Members of Congress and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD:

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES

Two and a half years ago the U.S. Congress—after months of penetrating investigation—drafted one of the most far-seeing internal improvement programs the Nation has ever witnessed. We refer to the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956, which put into being a sound, long-range national highway program. We believe that the roadbuilding program created by that measure (and strengthened by the act of 1958) was an admirable combination of reason and inspiration. It was a clear recognition of the expressed desire of the American people for a safe, up-to-date system of interstate highways.

That program is now in danger of being seriously violated.

The Bureau of Public Roads has reported that because of existing financial limitations, $2½ billion authorized for the 41,000-mile system of national interstate and defense highways for fiscal year 1961 cannot be apportioned to the States this summer, as originally planned. Furthermore, of the $2.2 billion authorized for the following year, only $500 million may be apportioned.

The object of this editorial is to call this problem to your attention and to point out what will be the inevitable result if corrective legislation is not enacted soon.

DO NOT BREAK FAITH WITH STATES

The effect on some State highway programs would be immediate. In fact, the Interstate program would grind to a stop first in those States which have progressed the fastest and made the best record of quick and efficient use of the Federal funds. The first to be penalized would be those States which Congress has repeatedly commended for their progress, Ohio, California, Florida, New York, Louisiana, Illinois, Missouri, Michigan, and others.

Engineers would have no choice other than to shut down major interstate projects. Strips of pavement in some sections would lie half-completed, a silent testimony to indifference. Rights-of-way cleared through urban areas and homes already emptied of families preparatory to construction would stand a witness to apathy.

These are very real possibilities.

A delay of 1 year's interstate apportionment would produce not just 1 year's delay in specific projects, but close to two. It is impossible to just drop such construction projects and pick them up again without losing momentum. The nature of the work, seasonal limitation, advance planning, and the machinery of State contracting procedures are such that if Congress fails to assure the 1961 apportionment this summer, highway departments would lose close to 2 years of production as a minimum.

FORTY-PERCENT DROP IN CONTRACTS FORESEEN

The effect of such a curtailment on the road-building industry would be rapid and tragic. Objective statistics indicate that a cutback in Federal aid for the Interstate System from $2½ billion to nothing this year, and from $2.2 billion to $500 million next year, will force contract awards downward in a dismaying plunge. The Bureau of Public Roads foresees a 40-percent drop in contract awards starting next fall.

The uninformed may assume that the Federal-aid program has produced a surplus of work, which could be shaved down for a year without any real harm to the industry.

This is not true. The big program has just begun to reach the construction stage in volume and the highway contracting industry is still working at only 64 percent of its capacity. Competition for existing jobs is aggressive with a national average of 6.5 contractors bidding on every project.

This is not an industry in which a few huge firms dominate the field. The vast majority of America's thousands of contractors who do highway work head small organizations of men with specialized skills.

We agree with Gen. Louis W. Prentiss, executive vice president of the American Road Builders Association, that any curtailment of the national highway program would produce very real economic distress in the industry. And it would shake the confidence of these hardy businessmen in Congress' intentions of maintaining a long-range, balanced, soundly financed highway construction program.

"It will not be so easy, a second time, to find men who are willing to invest their money in roadbuilding capacity in the expectation of finding a place in an expanded program," General Prentiss points out.

The same might be said of the supporting industries. Equipment producers and materials suppliers have just begun to make the sales necessary to keep their plants on a reasonable level of production. It was only a few months ago that Life magazine ran a full-feature story revealing the plight of people in Peoria, Ill., where the livelihood of so many families engaged in construction equipment production depends upon the continuity of the highway program. The same may be said for numerous other communities throughout the country. And some of these cities are already in depressed areas.

EFFECT ON LABOR

To put an unnatural stop to the interstate program would be to kill jobs in areas already suffering from unemployment and would stifle the comeback many equipment factories have just begun to achieve.

What about the effect on thousands of men and women whose livelihood is in highway construction work? Here is where a recession in the industry would be most painful. The Department of Labor has estimated that a billion dollars' worth of highway construction produces employment for 63,750 men per year on the project itself and another 78,750 men per year off the site. Cancellation of the scheduled $2½ billion apportionment this August and over $2 billion next summer would produce a loss of 641,250 man-years, according to one conservative estimate. This would ripple through the entire one-seventh of the national economy which lives directly or indirectly off of highway transportation.

It is unbelievable that the Congress would permit that kind of distress.

These are the hard facts that cause the roadbuilding industry concern. We recognize that although some of the problems which a curtailment of the interstate program would create are problems of the roadbuilding segment of the American business community, the effect goes far beyond this industry. We have confidence that Congress is interested in the welfare of every single segment of our economic life, large or small.

In the case of the national highway program, so many other Americans are affected, aside from those engaged directly in roadbuilding or equipment manufacturing, or materials production, that we feel we speak for a far greater number of Americans.

EFFECT ON COMMUNITY PLANNING AND INDUSTRIAL EXPANSION

What about the disruption of community planning? In many of the cities you represent, Mr. Congressman, urban renewal projects are intimately tied to the location and completion of proposed expressways. In every city where an interstate freeway is delayed this fall by lack of Federal funds, municipal planning for numerous other allied projects—such as new schools and housing projects—will be thrown out of gear. To delay the construction of these expressways would be to hang a cloak of uncertainty over the fate of many other community projects.

What about the expansion plans of private enterprise? One of the remarkable developments in the national highway program has been the desire it has created for small and medium industries to seek sites adjacent to or near points of access to Interstate System highways. The Nation needs all the industrial expansion it can encourage—to stimulate greater tax revenue, to provide greater employment. A delay in completion of new interstate roads means a loss in much needed revenues and a loss in local employment.

FOUR THOUSAND LIVES EACH YEAR AT STAKE

And most important, what about the curtainment of safety benefits which we know flow from the completion of modern highways. Safety engineers have testified that the opening up of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways would mean a saving of 4,000 lives a year from traffic accidents. The early beginnings of the interstate program—creating modern highway segments 2½ times safer than ordinary highways—has just begun to bring a small drop in the national traffic fatality statistics, according to the National Safety Council.

Who would want to delay the interstate program for a year, for any reason, if so many human lives were at stake?

This is the picture which, we hope, you as Congressmen will grasp, and in so doing, exert the leadership so sorely needed to carry the national highway program through a period of disagreement over interim financing measures. In the light of these sobering facts, some financing plan, even if temporary, must be enacted.

Too much is at stake to permit the interstate highway program to falter even for 1 year for lack of temporary financing.

Myron Taylor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 27, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial on Myron Taylor and the special service he rendered as the personal representative of the President to Pope Pius XII.

MYRON TAYLOR

The death of Myron Taylor this week recalls the special service of this extraordinary man as special U.S. envoy to the Vatican during the years of the war. Strictly speaking Myron Taylor was never an ambassador and he was never a representative either to the Vatican or the Holy See; as everyone knows he was really a personal representative of the President of the United States to Pope Pius XII.

Whatever else the Taylor mission may have proved it certainly should have made it clear whether or not such representation was to the U.S. advantage; after Taylor it was not necessary to argue the matter academically, the facts were available for judgment. We must suppose that President Truman found the evidence impressive when he saw fit to suggest a successor to Taylor on a permanent and proper basis. For all of that, we do not have such a representative, and, because of strong Protestant pressure, we are not likely to have one for a long time. If this is a diplomatic handicap to the United States in its world operation, we know precisely where the responsibility rests.

Taylor himself, both during and after his years at the Vatican, was a man of the most impressive discretion. He was also an immensely charitable person who contributed to many good causes in this country and elsewhere. Not himself a Catholic, he never allowed himself any but the most proper attitudes toward things Catholic and at the same time even the most nervous of the Protestant elements unfriendly to his mission could find no cause for complaint. To have treaded so gently in delicate paths was a tribute to an acumen which matched his generosity.

His death has now closed a chapter which will be an episode of high historical importance in the history of our country. Few men have entered the service of the state from business who came with so many qualifications and left with such universal respect. Unfortunately, it seems less and less likely that qualified people will accept burdens of this kind in the future if the recent Luce affair is a sample of what they must expect. Taylor was spared all of this and his memory, like his life, will be recalled in dignity.

Farm Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AL ULLMAN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 29, 1959

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, because I am sure the Members will be interested in the following, under leave granted I request permission to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this article from the Wallowa County Chieftain on Oregon's farm production:

FARM PRODUCTION HEADED FOR HIGHER LEVELS—OREGON AGRICULTURE SEEN AS ONE GIANT SUPERMARKET

Draw a line through Oregon aggriculture and you come up with something resembling a modern supermarket.

From the rain-soaked cranberry bogs of the coastal belt to the high, dry rangelands of eastern Oregon, farmers produce more than 100 commodities on a commercial scale.

As Oregon reaches the century mark, this giant supermarket is pumping more than a half billion dollars of purchasing power into the State's economy each year. And experts say we haven't begun to reach full potential.

Where are Oregon's key reservoirs for such future expansion? A prime example is the sprawling eastern Oregon range. Income from the more than 20 million acres of open range—roughly a dollar an acre from grazing—may double in the next quarter century, believes E. R. Jackman, veteran range crop management specialist at Oregon State college.

New chemicals to kill brush, and machines to seed the range are now available. Ranchers and OSC researchers are teaming up to give the range a badly needed facelifting.

Closely linked to the rangeland potential is stepped-up interest in livestock feeding in Oregon. Increased local production of feed grains and hay may reverse the practice of shipping large numbers of Oregon beef cattle out of State for finishing.

ONE BILLION DOLLARS MORE MEAT NEEDED

Men close to the livestock picture estimate that farm sale of livestock in the Pacific Northwest will have to increase by more

than $1 billion by 1975 to meet fully west coast consumer demands for meat. Value of production at the wholesale processing level is forecast at nearly $1½ billion, adding millions in new payrolls for Oregon.

An even greater challenge in the livestock field is the need for local pork production. Oregon now ships in about two-thirds of its pork supplies, with the Portland market commanding the highest prices in the Nation as a result of transportation costs.

A major step toward more Oregon-produced pork was taken recently with plans for an industry-sponsored swine-testing station near Hermiston. Designed to upgrade Oregon swine-breeding stock, the program has been approved by the swinegrowers, the Oregon Wheat Commission, and Oregon State College agricultural experiment station.

The station will be financed by the commission and will test about 250 hogs annually. OSC scientists will measure performance of animals consigned to the station by local swine breeders.

MORE IRRIGATION ESSENTIAL

Another big potential for the State's agriculture is more and better irrigation. Oregon now has 1½ million acres of irrigated land. Another 1¼ million could be irrigated if available water resources were fully developed, say leading resource planners.

Irrigation not only increases output per acre, it also helps the farmer raise different crops with a higher market value.

The area of land irrigated in Oregon increased 130,000 acres between 1949 and 1954. About half the increase was in the Willamette Valley. Statewide, most of the land that can be developed by individual or local irrigation enterprises has now been placed under irrigation, according to authorities. They add that any extensive future development must of necessity be keyed to multiuse water development projects.

Other major changes on the farm front point to increased efficiency to keep on top in a highly competitive industry. The picture, in dairying for example—fewer but larger dairy farms and plants.

The time may be close at hand when a dairy plant in one area may supply markets all over Oregon, predicts Dr. S. Kent Christiansen, Oregon State College agricultural economist.

FEWER, BIGGER DAIRIES

Economic forces in years ahead may trim Oregon's present 5,000 commercial dairy farms to less than 1,000 farms supplying all dairy products needed in the State.

The dairy plants appear headed in the same direction. About one-fourth of the State's dairy plants went out of existence between 1945 and 1955 and the trend continues.

Such casualties of competition, efficiency, and capital have been hastened by new developments in transportation and marketing. This has helped dairy plants expand into markets outside their immediate locality, Christiansen explains.

Modern agriculture is also bringing the farmer into closer linkage with the total food marketing process. The future points to farm production to meet specifications of giant supermarkets operating on lower per unit profit than the most efficient U.S. corporations of today.

Dr. G. Burton Wood, Oregon State College agricultural economics department head, says supermarkets operating on the slim unit markup will be closely tuned to needs and preferences of food buyers. In turn, the markets will make rigid demands on farmers to produce what the market demands.

Farmers who make the adjustment and use the most efficient technology and research findings have a bright future, believe agricultural leaders. Such adjustment may mean, for example, that a farmer concentrate entirely upon raising pullets for poultrymen or heifers for large superefficient dairy farms.

This increased efficiency not only benefits the farmer, but enables those living off the farm to live better. Today it takes only 20 minutes of labor to earn the money to buy a pound of rib roast; it took about 48 minutes a generation ago.

Other off-farm benefits of modern agriculture are the increases in related industries such as farm equipment, chemicals, fertilizers, containers, transportation, public services, and power.

MEAT PACKING TO EXPAND

Even more allied industries of the processing type are needed if Oregon is to share fully in its increased farm efficiency, say the experts. More livestock feeding in the State could mean expansion of the meatpacking and processing industry for distribution to rapidly growing west coast markets.

Canning and freezing of fruits and vegetables from more irrigated acres is another Oregon industry being eyed for expansion. Production of potato starch—used in pulp, paper, and fiberboard manufacture—is another possibility.

Oregon farmers now spend $200 million a year—one-third more than they did 10 years ago—for hired help, gas and oil, fertilizer, feed, seed, machinery repairs, and similar expenses.

Fortunately, these new allied industries and other off-farm job opportunities are providing employment for man-and-woman power no longer needed on the farm. There are now 4 million fewer jobs on U.S. farms than 20 years ago, but there are 20 million more jobs off farms.

These trends of expanded agriculture and associated industries promise to pump still more farm money into the Oregon economy this centennial year.

Incentive To Discover

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1959

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, in a recent issue of Air Review, published by the American Legion National Security Commission, there appeared the following article, entitled "Incentive To Discover," which should be of interest to not only Members of Congress but also to the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The article follows:

INCENTIVE TO DISCOVER

"To promote the progress of science and useful arts, by securing for limited times to authors and inventors the exclusive right to their respective writings and discoveries." (Article 1, section 8, Constitution of the United States.)

The first patent legislation was enacted by Congress in accordance with the Constitution in 1790, and it has been modified and refined over the past 169 years. But the laws have all been directed toward one prime objective: Provide incentive to ingenious individuals and business for development of new products and the improvement of existing products.

Certainly no one can dispute that these wise and equitable laws have been a major factor in the spectacular economic and technological growth of this Nation, a growth unequalled by any other Nation.

Inventions made in the course of weapon research and development programs are properly governed by different rules than those for commercial products. These rules are simple and fair to both the inventor and the Government. Briefly, they permit the retention of title to an invention made in connection with a defense contract, with the Government holding license rights only. Again, these regulations have retained the all-important incentive clauses, and protected the Government. Inventive progress in defense industries, particularly the aircraft and missile industry, has been dynamic.

The historic policies enunciated in the Constitution, and by the Congress over the years have been completely reversed in a section of the Space Act of 1958 which created the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for the direction of our civil space efforts.

This section reverses accepted incentive features that have been the guiding principles of previous patent legislation. The patent section states, in effect, that any invention—with minor exceptions—made in the performance of any work under any contract with NASA is the exclusive property of the Government. And the law goes even further. It states that any person, whether under contract to NASA or not, making an invention which might have significant utility in the space program must declare under oath that his work was not related to any NASA contract before he can obtain a patent on his own invention.

The problem is further compounded by the fact that most of the firms holding contracts with the NASA are also contractors for the Defense Department. The delays and confusion possible in space and weapon programs caused by working under two widely different Government policies are limitless.

Although NASA has no plans at the present time to amend the law, the problem was recognized by NASA's general counsel, John A. Johnson, who recently said that "it must be obvious that such a difference in the legal position of two agencies of the Government, both dealing with the same segments of industry on substantially the same kind of business, is undesirable as a matter of public policy and not in the best interests of the Government's procurement program."

The patent section of the NASA was written late in the last session of Congress without public hearings. Perhaps the motivating factor was to insure absolute protection for the Government in administering the space programs. But it also induces a sterility of effort by eliminating important incentives for private business.

It has been said in some quarters that Congress should give further study and consideration to this section of the Space Act. Application of patent laws in weapon development during the past have been most successful. Might it not be well to determine whether these same principles could be applied to our present efforts in the space field? In any event, the main concern of the American Legion is that private incentive for inventors be encouraged consistent with our national security needs.

Dictatorship Close at Hand?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 11, 1959

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the following letter from Lord

Macauley to Hon. H. E. Randall, written in London on May 23, 1857, will be of interest to the House:

LONDON, *May 23, 1857.*

Letter to Hon. H. E. Randall of New York. From Lord Macauley.

DEAR SIR: You are surprised to learn that I have not a high opinion of Mr. Jefferson and I am surprised at your surprise. I am certain I never wrote a line and never in Parliament, in conversation, or even on the Hastings, a place where it is the fashion to court the populace—uttered a word indicating the opinion that the supreme authority in a state ought to be entrusted to the majority of citizens told by the head; in other words, to the poorest and most ignorant part of society. I have long been convinced that institutions purely democratic must, sooner or later, destroy liberty or civilization, or both.

In Europe, where the population is dense, the effect of such institutions would be almost instantaneous. What happened lately in France is an example. In 1848, a pure democracy was established there. During a short time there was a strong reason to expect a general spoliation, a national bankruptcy, a new partition of the soil, a maximum of prices, a ruinous load of taxation laid on the rich for the purpose of supporting the poor in idleness. Such a system would, in 20 years, have made France as poor and as barbarous as the France of the Carolingians. Happily, the danger was averted and now there is a despotism, a silent tribune, an enslaved press, liberty is gone but civilization has been saved. I have not the smallest doubt that if we had a purely democratic government here, the effect would be the same. Either the poor would plunder the rich and civilization would perish, or order and property would be saved by a strong military government, and liberty would perish.

You may think that your country enjoys an exemption from these evils. I will frankly own to you that I am of a very different opinion. Your fate I believe to be certain though it is deferred by a physical cause. As long as you have a boundless extent of fertile and unoccupied land, your laboring population will be far more at ease than the laboring population of the Old World, and while it is the case, the Jeffersonian policy may continue to exist without causing any fatal calamity. But the time will come when New England will be as thickly peopled as old England. Wages will be as low and will fluctuate as much with you as with us. You will have your Manchesters and Birminghams. Hundreds of thousands of artisans will assuredly be sometimes out of work. Then your institutions will be fairly brought to the test. Distress everywhere makes the laborer mutinous and discontented, and inclines him to listen with eagerness to agitators who tell him that it is a monstrous iniquity that one man should have a million, while another cannot get a full meal. In bad years there is plenty of grumbling here, and sometimes a little rioting. But it matters little, for here the sufferers are not the rulers. The supreme power is in the hands of a class, numerous indeed, but select; of an educated class, of a class which is, and knows itself to be, deeply interested in the security of property and the maintenance of order. Accordingly, the malcontents are firmly yet gently restrained. The bad time is got over without robbing the wealth to relieve the indigent. The springs of national prosperity soon begin to flow again; work is plentiful, wages rise and all is tranquility and cheerfulness.

I have seen England three or four times pass through such critical seasons as I have described. Through such seasons the United States will have to pass in the course of the next century, if not in this. How will you pass through them? I heartily wish you a good deliverance, but my reason and my wishes are at war and I cannot help foreboding the worst. It is quite plain that your Government will never be able to restrain a distressed and discontented majority. For with you the majority is the Government and has the rich, who are always a minority, absolutely at its mercy. The day will come when, in the State of New York, a multitude of people, none of whom has had more than half a breakfast, or expects to have more than half a dinner, will choose the legislature. Is it possible to doubt what sort of legislature will be chosen? On one side is a statesman preaching patience, respect for vested rights, a strict observance of public faith. On the other is a demagog ranting about tyranny of capitalists and usurers and asking why anybody should be permitted to drink champagne and to ride in a carriage while thousands of honest people are in want of necessities. Which of the two candidates is likely to be preferred by a workingman who hears his children cry for bread?

I seriously apprehend that you will, in some such season of adversity as I have described, do things which will prevent prosperity from returning; that you will act like people in a year of scarcity, devour all the seedcorn and thus make the next year not of scarcity, but of absolute distress. The distrees will produce fresh spoliation. There is nothing to stay you. Your Constitution is all sail and no anchor. As I said before, when society has entered on this downward progress, either civilization or liberty must perish. Either some Caesar or Napoleon will seize the reins of government with a strong hand, or your Republic will be as fearfully plundered and laid waste by barbarians in the 20th century as the Roman Empire was in the fifth; with this difference, that your huns and vandals will have engendered within your country and by your own institutions.

Thinking this, of course, I cannot reckon Jefferson among the benefactors of mankind.

Military Reorganization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of the Members of the House a copy of a letter which I have addressed to the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, Raymond J. Saulnier, regarding the need for forceful actions toward unification of military supply activities. It has been my strong belief for many years that the enormity of the military supply activities has a tremendous effect on the entire economy. Furthermore, from my personal knowledge of the overlapping, duplication, and waste in and amongst the many military supply systems, there is an urgent need to bring about corrective measures at the earliest possible time.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., April 28, 1959.

Hon. RAYMOND J. SAULNIER,
Chairman, Council of Economic Advisers, Washington, D.C.

DEAR DR. SAULNIER: I am sure that you recall the recent discussion at the hearings of the Joint Economic Committee concerning the impact of military supply and service programs on the national economy.

It has been my strong belief for many years that the enormity of the military supply activities has a tremendous effect on the entire economy. Furthermore, from my personal knowledge of the overlapping, duplication, and waste in and amongst the many military supply systems, there is an urgent need to bring about corrective measures at the earliest possible date.

Enclosed is a report of the House Government Operations Committee which, at page 65 and following, details the extent of the military supply inventories. When one considers that the inventory of personal property is almost $120 billion and that in the supply systems alone there is $47 billion, it is no wonder that annual declarations of surpluses run at $8 to $10 billion and will continue to do so. I am sure that the attached monthly list of excess military property I am enclosing as a sample is convincing that factors other than obsolescence are responsible for generating much of the excess military property. If you will analyze the reported inventories of the individual departments and services I am sure that you will agree that much needs to be done to integrate common supply activities. But despite a long history of efforts to do just that, the military bureaucracies have always managed to remain intact.

The proponents of the National Security Act of 1947 intended that the Air Force would continue to obtain supply and service support from the Army. Despite this, the Air Force has worked diligently to become completely independent. In 1951–52, the Bonner committee, of which I was a member, held extensive hearings on military supply management and as a result of the hearings and reports, the O'Mahoney amendment to the 1953 Military Appropriations Act called for the establishment of an integrated military supply system. Some steps were taken by Secretary Lovett, particularly in setting up a coordinated medical supply activity known as the Alameda Medical Supply Test.

This test, though successful, was discontinued despite the recommendations of the Hoover Commission and others who had studied it. More recently, the Department of Defense has set up single manager systems for subsistence, clothing, medical supply, and petroleum products. This effort, though apparently successful, is being stubbornly resisted by the military departments who fear loss of autonomy through any steps that tend toward unification.

The last Congress passed the DOD Reorganization Act of 1958 and included the so-called McCormack-Curtis amendment which gives the Secretary of Defense wide authority to operate supply and service activities through such an entity or entities as he deems appropriate to bring about economy and efficiency. Despite this broad authority there has been but small progress in accomplishing what to me is one of the most fruitful areas for economy. I know of no one who has objectively studied this matter who had a different opinion.

It seems to me that the time is long past when the common inventories and operations of the military services should be brought under unified control so that existing stores are taken in account before additional purchases are made. As a matter of fact, we have expended at least $150 million in developing a catalog system in order that this could be done.

I am sure you are aware that each military department spends hundreds of millions of dollars annually for the operation and maintenance of its own supply and depot system. Furthermore, the services compete against each other in many ways in the procurement of supplies, equipment, and per-

sonnel. Since most of the procurement is by negotiation the net effect of these methods is to accelerate an inflationary spiral in my opinion.

It seems to me that some forceful actions toward unification must be taken not only for the sake of defense itself but to relieve the economy of the inflationary pressures which are now being exerted upon it. Since the legislative framework appears to be adequate, I think that the executive branch is vulnerable in not vigorously pushing this matter. I cannot understand why the Budget Bureau condones this situation while it is simultaneously the management arm of the President, is responsible for reorganizational plans and has the primary duty of screening the various appropriation estimates within the framework of a balanced budget. It is the belief of many people on the Hill that the Bureau has become a prisoner of the Pentagon and that the joint hearings on the military budget do not give the Bureau the control status it should have.

From what I can learn, the Budget Director is doing an excellent job and has the fortitude to do what is necessary. However, it is impossible for anyone to grasp the complexities of the Federal budget within a period of several years and he must rely upon his assistants. I think, however, that time is running swiftly and that some topside decisions must be taken in this area.

I am sending a copy of this letter to Mr. Stans and will appreciate any comments you or he may have with respect to this letter.

Sincerely,

THOMAS B. CURTIS.

How Can World Law Be Achieved?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter I received from Donald Harrington, president of the United World Federalists, enclosing a copy of the speech Vice President NIXON delivered on April 13, 1959, before the Academy of Political Science on the subject of how world law might be achieved.

Mr. Harrington believes that this subject merits immediate public discussion and debate. I agree with him. Certainly Vice President NIXON's speech and the comments of the highly respected Columnist James Reston deserve to be read and considered by as many people as possible. Therefore, I am placing them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I want to commend the United World Federalists, Inc., for calling this important matter to the attention of all the Members of the Congress. I have always had a high regard for this organization because, unlike so many organizations we have today with ideas and a mission, they have remained open-minded on the subject. They have not resorted to attacking the motives of those who disagree with them. Indeed, their primary objective seems to have been to keep the subject of world law and how we achieve it open for discussion.

I agree with their basic premise: the question is no longer whether world law is desirable but how world law can be achieved. The problem is extremely difficult and the answers will not be found immediately, or probably in our generation, but certainly we should start seeking for the answers in a more determined way and there are some forward steps than can be achieved immediately:

UNITED WORLD FEDERALISTS, INC.,
New York City, April 28, 1959.

Hon. THOMAS B. CURTIS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CURTIS: Enclosed herewith is a copy of a speech delivered by Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON, April 13, before the Academy of Political Science, together with a letter of comment and congratulations which we have written to Mr. NIXON.

We feel that this is a really historic address which at last brings to sharp focus the central issue of this time. The question is no longer whether world law is desirable but how world law can be achieved.

Although President Eisenhower and other prominent members of both political parties have many times called for world law, Mr. NIXON's speech is the first time that a high official of our Government has proposed specific action leading toward the rule of law. Since it was reportedly proposed as a trial balloon, it seems to us most important that Mr. NIXON receive as much reaction as possible to his proposals.

Whether or not this highly desirable public debate takes place may well depend on a few individuals like yourself who have the influence and interest to lead it. I hope you will do so, and will be interested in hearing from you.

Sincerely yours,

DONALD HARRINGTON,
President.

The text of Vice President NIXON's address proposing World Court rule in East-West disputes follows:

TEXT OF NIXON'S ADDRESS PROPOSING WORLD COURT RULE IN EAST-WEST DISPUTES

An invitation to address this distinguished audience is one of the most flattering and challenging a man in my position could receive.

Flattering because the very name of this organization at least implies that the profession which I am proud to represent can properly be described as a science rather than by some of the far less complimentary terms usually reserved for politics and politicians.

And challenging because I realize that an academy of political science expects a speech of academic character. I hasten to add, however, if it is proper to quote a Princeton man at a Columbia gathering, that in using the term "academic" I share Woodrow Wilson's disapproval of the usual connotation attached to that word.

Speaking on December 28, 1918, in London's Guildhall, he said:

"When this war began, a league of nations was thought of as one of those things that it was right to characterize by a name which, as a university man, I have always resented. It was said to be academic, as if that in itself were a condemnation, something that men could think about but never get."

In my view, the primary function of the practicing politician and of the political scientist is to find ways and means for people to get those things they think about; to make the impractical practical; to put idealism into action.

It is in that spirit that I ask you to analyze with me tonight the most difficult problem confronting our society today. It is, as I am sure we will all agree, the simple but overriding question of the survival of our civilization. Because, while none of us would downgrade the importance of such challenging problems as the control of inflation, economic growth, civil rights, urban redevelopment, we all know that the most perfect solutions of any of our domestic problems will make no difference at all if we are not around to enjoy them.

CHALLENGE TO SURVIVAL

Perhaps at no time in the course of history have so many people been so sorely troubled by the times and dismayed by the prospects of the future. The almost unbelievably destructive power of modern weapons should be enough to raise grave doubts as to mankind's ability to survive even were we living in a world in which traditional patterns of international conduct were being followed by the major nations.

But the threat to our survival is frighteningly multiplied when we take into account the fact that these weapons are in the hands of the unpredictable leaders of the Communist world as well as those of the free world.

What is the way out of this 20th century human dilemma? For the immediate threat posed by the provocative Soviet tactics in Berlin, I believe that to avoid the ultimate disaster of atomic war on one hand, or the slow death of surrender on the other, we must continue steadfastly on the course now pursued by the President and the Secretary of State.

May I say that before boarding the plane in Washington, I talked at the hospital with the Secretary of State. I am happy to bring the greetings of one of the most heroic and bravest men produced in our country in this generation.

In the record of American policy, as it has unfolded since the time of Korea, our national resolves to stand firm against Communist aggression are clearly revealed. This has particularly been the case since the policy of containment matured into this policy of deterrence. In the recurrent post-Korean crises of the Formosa Straits, the Middle East, and now Berlin, the President and Mr. Dulles have given the Soviet leaders no possible cause to misconstrue the American intent.

I believe, moreover, that the Soviet leaders are equally on notice that regardless of which political party holds power in Washington these policies of resolute adherence to our principles, our commtments and our obligations will prevail. I specifically want to pay tribute to members of the Democratic Party in the Congress for putting statesmanship above leadership by making this clearly evident in the developing situation of Berlin.

ADEQUATE MILITARY POWER

We can also take confidence in the fact that at this moment the United States possesses military power fully adequate to sustain its policies, and I am certain that whatever is necessary to keep this balance in favor of the free nations and the ideals of freedom will be done, by this administration and by its successors regardless of which political party may be in power.

What this posture of resolute national unity taken alone must mean in the end, however, is simply an indefinite preservation of the balance of terror.

We all recognize that this is not enough. Even though our dedication to strength will reduce sharply the chances of war by deliberate overt act, as long as the rule of force retains its paramount position as the final arbiter of international disputes, there will ever remain the possibility of war by miscalculation.

If this sword of annihilation is ever to be removed from its precarious balance over the head of all mankind, some more positive courses of action than massive military deterrence must somehow be found.

It is an understandable temptation for public men to suggest that some "bold new program" will resolve the human dilemma—that more missiles, more aid, more trade, more exchange or more meetings at the summit will magically solve the world's difficulties.

The proposals that I will suggest tonight are not offered as a panacea for the world's ills. In fact, the practice of suggesting that any one program, whatever its merit, can automatically solve the world's problems is not only unrealistic, but, considering the kind of opponent who faces us across the world today, actually can do more harm than good in that it tends to minimize the scope and gravity of the problems with which we are confronted, by suggesting that there may be one easy answer.

But while there is no simple solution for the problems we face, we must constantly search for new practical alternatives to the use of force as a means of settling disputes between nations.

INDIVIDUALS LIKE NATIONS

Men face essentially similar problems of disagreement and resort to force in their personal and community lives as nations now do in the divided world. And, historically, man has found only one effective way to cope with this aspect of human nature—the rule of law.

More and more the leaders of the West have come to the conclusion that the rule of law must somehow be established to provide a way of settling disputes among nations as it does among individuals.

But the trouble has been that as yet we have been unable to find practical methods of implementing this idea. Is this one of those things that men can think about but cannot get?

Let us see what a man who had one of the most brilliant political and legal minds in the Nation's history had to say in this regard. Commenting on some of the problems of international organization the late Senator Robert Taft said:

"I do not see how we can hope to secure permanent peace in the world except by establishing law between nations and equal justice under law. It may be a long hard course, but I believe that the public opinion of the world can be led along that course, so that the time will come when that public opinion will support the decision of any reasonable impartial tribunal based no justice."

We can also be encouraged by developments that have occurred in this field in just the past 2 years.

Not surprisingly the movement to advance the rule of law has gained most of its momentum among lawyers. Mr. Charles Rhyne, a recent president of the American Bar Association, declared in a speech to a group of associates in Boston a few weeks ago that there is an idea on the march in the world. He was referring to the idea that ultimately the rule of law must replace the balance of terror as the paramount factor in the affairs of men.

NOTED MEN SPOKE

At the time of the grand meeting of the American Bar Association in London in July 1957, speaker after speaker at this meeting—the Chief Justice of the United States, the Lord Chancellor of Great Britain, the Attorney General of the United States, and Sir Winston Churchill—eloquently testified that the law must be made paramount in world affairs.

One hundred and eighty-five representatives of the legal professions of many nations on earth met in New Delhi last January and agreed that there are basic universal principles on which lawyers of the free world can agree.

President Eisenhower, you will recall, said in his state of the Union message last January:

"It is my purpose to intensify efforts during the coming 2 years * * * to the end that the rule of law may replace the obsolete rule of force in the affairs of nations. Measures toward this end will be proposed later, including reexamination of our relation to the International Court of Justice."

I am now convinced, and in this I reflect the steadfast purpose of the President and the wholehearted support of the Secretary of State and the Attorney General, that the time has now come to take the initiative in the right direction of establishment of the rule of law in the world to replace the rule of force.

Under the Charter of the United Nations and the Statute of the International Court of Justice, institutions for the peaceful composing of differences among nations and for law giving exist in the international community. Our primary problem today is not the creation of new international institutions, but the fuller and more fruitful use of the institutions we already possess.

The International Court of Justice is a case in point. Its relative lack of judicial business—in its 12-year history an average of only 2 cases a year have come before the tribunal of 15 outstanding international jurists—underlines the untried potentialities of this Court.

While it would be foolish to suppose that litigation before the Court is the answer to all the world's problems, this method of settling disputes could profitably be employed in a wider range of cases than is presently done.

As the President indicated in his state of the Union message, it is time for the United States to reexamine its own position with regard to the Court. Clearly all disputes regarding domestic matters must remain permanently within the jurisdiction of our own courts. Only matters which are essentially international in character should be referred to the International Court.

But the United States reserved the right to determine unilaterally whether the subject matter of a particular dispute is within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States and is therefore excluded from the jurisdiction of the Court. As a result of this position on our part, other nations have adopted similar reservations. This is one of the major reasons for the lack of judicial business before the Court.

CONGRESS ACTION PLANNED

To remedy this situation the administration will shortly submit to the Congress recommendations for modifying this reservation. It is our hope that by our taking the initiative in this way, other countries may be persuaded to accept and agree to a wider jurisdiction of the International Court.

There is one class of disputes between nations which, in the past, have been one of the primary causes of war. These economic disputes assume major importance today at a time when this cold war may be shifting its major front from politics and ideology to the so-called ruble war for the trade and the development of new and neutral countries.

As far as international trade is concerned, an imposing structure of international agreements already exists. More complex and urgent than trade, as such, is the area of international investment. For in this area will be determined one of the most burning issues of our times—whether the economic development of new nations, so essential to their growth in political self-confidence and successful self-government, will be accomplished peacefully or violently, swiftly or wastefully, in freedom or in regimentation and terror.

We must begin by recognizing that the task of providing the necessary capital for investment in underdeveloped countries is a job too big for mere Government money. Only private money, privately managed, can do it right in many sectors of needed development. And private investment requires a sound and reliable framework of laws in which to work.

Economic development, involving as it does so many lawyers and so many private investors, will tend to spread and promote more civilized legal systems wherever it goes.

Already, in its effort to encourage U.S. private investment abroad, the U.S. Government has negotiated treaties of commerce with 17 nations since 1946, tax conventions with 21 nations, and special-investment guarantee agreements under the Mutual Security Act with 40 nations.

What has been done is for the most part good, but there are several areas where additional action is called for. The countries that need economic development most are too often least likely to have the kind of laws, government, and climate that will attract investment. The political risks of expropriation and inconvertibility against which ICA (International Cooperation Administration) presently sells insurance are not the only political risks that investors fear. Three U.S. Government commissions, as well as numerous private experts, have recently recommended a variety of improvements in our machinery for fostering foreign investment.

I select three for particular endorsement. Our laws should permit the establishment of foreign business corporations meriting special tax treatment, so that their foreign earnings can be reinvested abroad free of U.S. tax until the U.S. investor actually receives his reward.

In addition, more tax treaties should be speedily negotiated to permit tax sparing and other reciprocal encouragements to investors. The ICA guarantee program should be extended to include such risks as revolution and civil strife. Finally, a concerted effort should be made to extend our whole treaty system into more countries, especially those in most need of development.

The great adventure of economic development through a worldwide expansion of private investment is bound to develop many new forms and channels of cooperation between governments and between individuals of different nations.

We need not fear this adventure; indeed we should welcome it. For if it sufficiently engages the imagination and public spirit of the legal profession and others who influence public opinion, it must be accompanied by the discovery or rediscovery, in countries old and new, of the legal principles and the respect for substantive law on which wealth and freedom alike are grounded.

There are encouraging signs at least that we are on the threshold of real progress toward creating more effective international law for the settlement of economic disputes between individuals and between nations.

Turning to the political area, we have now come far enough along in the great historic conflict between the free nations and the Communist bloc to know that negotiation and discussion alone will not necessarily resolve the fundamental issues between us. This has proved to be the case whether the negotiations took place through the very helpful processes of the United Nations, or at the conference table of Foreign Ministers, or even at what we now call the summit.

FACTS WITH SOVIET CITED

What emerges, eventually, from these meetings at the conference table are agreements. We have made a great many agreements with the Soviet leaders from the time of Yalta and Potsdam. A major missing element in our agreements with the Soviet leaders has been any provisions as to how disputes about the meaning of the agree-

ments in connection with their implementation could be decided.

Looking back at the first summit conference at Geneva, for example, we find that it produced an agreement, signed by the Soviet leaders, which elevated the hopes of the entire world.

It should be noted, however, that the President and the Secretary of State repeatedly warned both before and after the holding of the conference that success could be measured only in deeds. One of the announced purposes of the conference was to test the Soviet sincerity by the standard of performance.

The summit conference has since been characterized by some as a failure, but in terms of agreements, as such, it was a success.

Let me quote briefly from that agreement:

"The heads of government, recognizing their common responsibility for the settlement of the German question and the reunification of Germany, have agreed that the settlement of the German question and the reunification of Germany by means of free elections shall be carried out in conformity with the national interests of the German people and the interests of European security."

In other words, those who participated in the conference, including Mr. Nikita S. Khrushchev, agreed at Geneva on a sound method for dealing with the German problem—the very same problem from which he has now fathered the new crisis at Berlin. But while the agreement seemed clear, as events subsequently developed, Mr. Khrushchev's understanding of its meaning was ostensibly different from ours.

The crucial question remained—how was the agreement to be effective when the parties disagreed as to what it meant? This is typical of a problem that can arise wherever any agreement is entered into between nations.

In looking to the future what practical steps can we take to meet this problem? I will not even suggest to you that there is any simple answer to this question. But I do believe there is a significant step we can take toward finding an answer.

We should take the initiative in urging that in future agreements provisions be included to the effect: (1) that disputes which may arise as to the interpretation of the agreement should be submitted to the International Court of Justice at the Hague; and (2) that the nations signing the agreement should be bound by the decision of the court in such cases.

Such provisions will, of course, still leave us with many formidable questions involving our relationships with the Communist nations in those cases where they ignore an agreement completely apart from its interpretation. But I believe this would be a major step forward in developing a rule of law for the settlement of political disputes between nations and in the direction all free men hope to pursue.

If there is no provision for settling disputes as to what an international agreement means and one nation is acting in bad faith, the agreement has relatively little significance. In the absence of such a provision an agreement can be flagrantly nullified by a nation acting in bad faith whenever it determines it is convenient to do so.

While this proposal has not yet been adopted as the official U.S. position, I have discussed it at length with Attorney General William P. Rogers and with officials of the State Department and on the basis of these discussions I am convinced that it has merit and should be given serious consideration in the future.

The International Court of Justice is not a western instrumentality. It is a duly constituted body under the United Nations Charter and has been recognized and established by the Soviet along with the other signatories to the charter.

There is no valid reason why the Soviets should not be willing to join with the nations of the free world in taking this step in the direction of submitting differences with regard to interpretation of agreements between nations to a duly established international court and thereby further the day when a rule of law will become a reality in the relations between nations.

And, on our part, as Secretary Dulles said in his speech before the New York State Bar Association on January 31:

"Those nations which do have common standards should by their conduct and example, advance the rule of law by submitting their disputes to the International Court of Justice, or to some other international tribunal upon which they agree."

We should be prepared to show the world by our example that the rule of law, even in the most trying circumstances, is the one system which all freemen of good will must support.

In this connection it should be noted that at the present time in our own country our system of law and justice has come under special scrutiny, as it often has before in periods when we have been engaged in working out basic social relationships through due process of law.

It is certainly proper for any of us to disagree with an opinion of a court or courts. But all Americans owe it to the most fundamental propositions of our way of life to take the greatest care in making certain that our criticisms of court decisions do not become attacks on the institution of the court itself.

Mr. Khrushchev has proclaimed time and again that he and his assolcates in the Kremlin, to say nothing of the Soviet peoples, desire only a fair competition to test which system, communism or free capitalism, can better meet the legitimate aspirations of mankind for a rising standard of living.

The world knows that this is the only kind of competition which the free nations desire. It is axiomatic that free people do not go to war except in defense of freedom. So obviously we welcome this kind of talk from Mr. Khrushchev. We welcome a peaceful competition with the Communists to determine who can do the most for mankind.

Mr. Khrushchev also knows, as we do, that a competition is not likely to remain peaceful unless both sides understand the rules and are willing to have them fairly enforced by an impartial umpire. He has pointedly reminded the world that Soviet troops are not in Germany to play skittles. The free peoples passionately wish that Mr. Khrushchev's troops, as well as their own, could find it possible to play more skittles and less atomic war games. But we remind him that his troops could not even play skittles without rules of the game.

If the Soviets mean this talk of peaceful competition, then they have nothing to fear from the impartial rules impartially judged, which will make such peaceful competition possible.

The Soviet leaders claim to be acutely aware of the lessons of history. They are constantly quoting the past to prove their contention that communism is the way of the future. May I call to their attention one striking conclusion that is found in every page of recorded history.

It is this: The advance of civilization, the growth of culture and the perfection of all the finest qualities of mankind have all been accompanied by respect for law and justice and by the constant growth of the use of law in place of force.

The barbarian, the outlaw, the bandit are symbols of a civilization that is either primitive or decadent. As men grow in wisdom, they recognize that might does not make right; that true liberty is freedom under law; and that the arrogance of power is a pitiful substitute for justice and equity.

Hence once again we say to those in the Kremlin who boast of the superiority of their system:

"Let us compete in peace, and let our course of action be such that the choice we offer uncommitted peoples is not a choice between progress and reaction, between high civilization and a return to barbarism, between the rule of law and the rule of force."

In a context of justice, of concern for the millions of men and women who yearn for peace, of a constant striving to bring the wealth abounding in this earth to those who today languish in hunger and want—in such a context, competition between the Communist world and the free world would indeed be meaningful.

Then we could say without hesitation:

"Let the stronger system win, knowing that both systems would be moving in a direction of a world of peace, with increasing material prosperity serving as a foundation for a flowering of the human spirit."

We could then put aside the hatred and distrust of the past and work for a better world. Our goal will be peace. Our instrument for achieving peace will be law and and justice. Our hope will be that, under these conditions, the vast energies now devoted to weapons of war will instead be used to clothe, house, and feed the entire world. This is the only goal worthy of our aspirations. Competing in this way, nobody will lose, and mankind will gain.

I also want to include an article by James Reston, "Search for Rule by Law," which appeared in the New York Times, April 14, 1959:

SEARCH FOR RULE BY LAW—DOMESTIC FACTORS AS WELL AS WORLD ISSUES LED TO TRIAL BALLOON BY NIXON

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, April 13.—Vice President NIXON sent aloft in New York tonight a fairly important trial balloon on how to negotiate future agreements with the Soviet Union.

Why not, he suggested to the Academy of Political Science, let the International Court of Justice at The Hague settle all differences of interpretation of future United States-Soviet agreements? The background of this suggestion is as interesting as the proposal itself.

It arises from the fact that almost every United States-Soviet agreement since the war has failed wholly or in part because it was interpreted in one way by Washington and another by Moscow, and there was no legal way of resolving these differences.

Accordingly, the Justice and State Departments have been talking for years about trying to take these questions of interpretation out of the political sphere and placing them in the realm of international law before the World Court or some other court.

Attorney General William P. Rogers and Arthur Larson, former Presidential assistant, have been talking with Mr. NIXON about this for several years. The Vice President, in turn, recently discussed the proposal with Acting Secretary of State Christian A. Herter, and with the President, who knew and approved of the Vice President's decision to discuss the matter publicly tonight.

FUTURE IS EMPHASIZED

It was emphasized here today that the Vice President was not talking about trying to apply the principle of compulsory arbitration to the interpretation of past treaties and international agreements.

He was, instead, proposing a procedure for future agreements so that each agreement could be considered on its own merits. For example, if the forthcoming talks with the Big Four foreign ministers should reach a new agreement on Berlin, or Germany, or atomic testing, that agreement, under the Nixon proposal, would contain a clause stating two things:

1. That any disputes that may arise as to the interpretation of the agreement should be submitted to the World Court.

2. That the nations signing the agreement should be bound by the interpretation of the World Court in such cases.

The proposal was put forward in this way for several reasons. For example, there is still considerable opposition on the Republican right and in the Democratic South to any move that might, even in remote cases, extend the authority of the World Court to matters some people regard as wholly within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States.

The administration would like to repeal the so-called Connally amendment of 1946, which insisted that the United States had the sole right to determine whether cases involving the United States should be subject to the jurisdiction of the World Court.

In the last few years, the administration has with difficulty defeated the so-called Bricker amendment, which would have placed further limitations on the jurisdiction of the United Nations and its associated organizations. And while the supporters of the Bricker amendment have been weakened in recent elections, the State and Justice Departments do not want to get involved in another battle on this issue.

Before the end of this week, the State Department will send to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee its ideas of how the Connally amendment should be modified, but there is some doubt whether any modification will take place in this session of the Congress.

The administration is more hopeful about winning acceptance for the more specific idea of letting the World Court decide disputes arising out of the interpretation of future agreements with the Soviet Union and other nations.

This would enable the Congress to look at one case at a time. It would force the Executive to draft future international agreements in careful language that could, if challenged, be examined by the World Court, rather than leaving them vague, as in the past Big Four agreements on Western access to Berlin. Finally, it would, if accepted by the Soviet Union, provide one way of resolving the interminable arguments over what United States-Soviet agreements mean.

It is pointed out here that, even if the Soviet Union did not agree to submit the interpretaton of future agreements to the World Court this in itself would make clear Moscow's insistence on being the sole judge of its own actions. Whereas, if it did accept, at least some progress could be made toward substituting the rule of law in a limited field for the present rule of force.

There will undoubtedly be opposition to Mr. NIXON's trial balloon. Some Senators feel that the United States, like the Soviet Union, cannot afford to let any court decide matters that might affect its security.

Some for example, would be opposed to letting the World Court sit in judgment on Panama's claim to sovereignty over the 12-mile sea limit beyond its shores. This would take in most of the critical approaches to the Panama Canal and is thus regarded here as vital to the security of the canal and the United States.

Finally, there are some legislators who think that any extension of the powers of the World Court might, at some future date, enable citizens of the United States to claim that they were not enjoying the human rights spelled out in the Declaration of Human Rights under the United Nations.

Thus, Vice President NIXON, in his scholarly address tonight, has opened up, not only some fundamental legal questions, but quite a few important international and national political questions as well.

This is why his World Court idea was put forward as a trial balloon rather than as established administration policy.

The High Cost of Past Wars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEWART L. UDALL
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 4, 1959

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, one of the continuing problems confronted by the Congress involves a sound and balanced program which will provide care and assistance for those who bore the brunt of our military conflicts. In a current issue of Reporter magazine its able Washington correspondent, Douglass Cater, discusses some aspects of this problem in thoughtful fashion. It will hardly surprise our colleagues to learn that the chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee of the House, Representative OLIN TEAGUE, receives commendation by Mr. Cater for his firm stand for programs that put first things first and provide the greatest aid for those who have been the real casualties of past wars.

For the benefit of those who are interested in this problem I present herewith the Reporter article:

THE HIGH COST OF PAST WARS

(By Douglass Cater)

For the veteran, as for only a few other organized interests such as Irish patriotism and agriculture, the Congressman is capable of astonishing tenderness. And even when emotion does not rule his reason, the icy logic of political expediency is apt to do so. Take, for example, the last time a veterans' pension bill came up in the House of Representatives in 1956. It was a modest little thing, calculated to cost $129 billion over coming years. On a standing vote, which is, of course, semianonymous, the House decided to return the bill to committee. Then someone demanded a rollcall. Fifty-one Representatives were willing to go on record against the bill. But 365 others, liberals and conservatives alike, joined to send it triumphantly on its way to the Senate, where, thanks to the custodial prowess of Finance Committee Chairman HARRY FLOOD BYRD, Democrat of Virginia, it died quietly.

This spring, for the third time in a decade, a veterans' pension bill is destined to slide down the committee skids into the House. The result may easily be a new legislative leviathan that could swamp efforts at budget balancing for years to come.

The situation is serious enough already. In the little pie-shaped chart prepared by the Budget Bureau to show how the Government's dollar is being spent, veterans' benefits now account for the fourth largest slice. If you add this veterans' program to the cost of the farm program—the third largest item after national security and interest on the national debt—nearly a sixth of the Federal budget goes for direct subsidies to individuals.

What's more, the veterans' programs can be expected to grow a great deal bigger without a single change in the existing laws. The increase is coming, not in the service-connected compensation program, but in pensions, which have nothing to do with battle wounds or other service-connected afflictions. Already more than 870,000 veterans and 510,000 of their dependents are on the pension rolls; others are joining at the rate of 10,000 a month. Getting on isn't very difficult. At the age of 65, a veteran must prove only a 10-percent disability—fairly normal for that age—and, if he is married, an annual income of less than $2,700. He need not count his savings, property, or his wife's income. As a recent General Accounting Office survey revealed, substantial numbers of fairly affluent veterans were taking advantage of the loopholes. One pensioner, drawing his full $78.75 a month, had, with his wife, $7,171 of other income each year and more than $15,000 in liquid assets. Another had liquid assets of $51,540, plus a total family income of $3,037 a year. Seventeen percent of the pensioners, it was found, have assets of more than $10,000.

This spring, as the median-aged veteran of the First World War has just passed his 65th birthday, formidable forces are at work to open the public purse still further. One recently formed organization, the Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A., is demanding a flat $100-a-month pension for anyone who wore a uniform in 1917–18. The "Wonnies," as they have come to be known on Capitol Hill, state their claims in fairly elemental terms. As a staff member of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee expressed it wryly, "They argue that Congress has given aid to India, arms to Tito, and a Cadillac to Joe Martin. Why isn't the vet getting his share?"

The veterans' lobby can certainly claim that history is on its side. Ever since 1836, when Congress voted pensions for any surviving Revolutionary soldiers who were disabled or in financial need, the cost of war's aftermath has mushroomed far beyond the cost of war itself. The Spanish-American War, according to a recent study by a Presidential commission, cost this country $570 million; the benefits to its 381,000 veterans will total, it was estimated, $4.8 billion. The military costs of the First World War amounted to $26 billion; its veterans' benefits will probably exceed $60 billion.

PROLIFERATION OF THE FITTEST

Few questions are raised about the money that goes for veterans' hospital services, for compensation payments to those who sustained in-service injuries, and for the various rehabilitation programs. But the pension is strictly a non-service-connected benefit. It can be claimed by any soldier who served for 90 days during wartime. He need have got no further than the nearest training camp.

It is a curious paradox of past-war politics that as the memory of fighting fades, the politicians lose their ability to discriminate among the veterans as a class. Concern for veterans in general mounts in inverse ratio to concern for those who actually suffered in the Nation's cause. It is probably a matter of numbers. Wounded and crippled veterans either die or fade away from the political scene; the more able bodied linger. The Congressional Medal of Honor Society of the U.S.A., an elite and honored group, has sought but has never been granted a congressional charter, but the Wonnies, whose only avowed purpose is to lobby Congress, were given one with alacrity last year.

Compensation payments to handicapped veterans and war widows have been squeezed drastically by the rising cost of living. Yet the Wonnies' bill would award the same monthly payment to the able-bodied pensioner that now goes to the war widow with two children to support. Even more venerable veterans' organizations such as the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars have shown greater interest in pensions than in the compensation program.

Politics, of course, plays its part in the veterans' groups as well as in Congress. As a matter of fact, the ambitious organization leader more often than not is seeking to enter the larger political arena, and therefore appeals for the widest possible support.

MR. TEAGUE AT THE DIKE

Measured in terms of pressure politics, veterans' affairs have always enjoyed special privilege in the House of Representatives. By some ancient logic, pension bills are granted access to the floor without the usual necessity of a special rule from the Rules

Committee. The Committee on Veterans' Affairs, like other special-interest committees, tends to attract members who enjoy dealing with a special-interest lobby. If they don't, they get off the committee at the first available opportunity. Furious pressures buffet them. The last time a pension bill was in preparation, Chairman OLIN E. TEAGUE, Democrat, of Texas, received an average of 2,000 letters daily. Membership turnover on the House Veterans' Affairs Committee has run over 55 percent for each of the last three Congresses. It's obviously a hot seat.

Considering all their advantages, the professional veterans must wonder at times what cursed fate caused a man like OLIN TEAGUE to blight their lives. They certainly cannot complain that TEAGUE, who took over the committee chairmanship in 1955, lacks interest in veterans' affairs. A combat officer in the Second World War, he was many times wounded and decorated. He still limps from a shell explosion that ripped away part of an ankle, resulting in the shortening of one leg. Unlike many newcomers, when he came to Congress in 1946, TEAGUE voiced a preference for the Veterans' Affairs Committee. His rapid rise to the chairmanship was accelerated by the rush of less interested Members for softer berths.

But it took even less time for TEAGUE to revolt against the state of affairs he found on the committee. He had drafted a simple bill to give orphans of men killed in service the same educational help their fathers would have received under the G.I. Bill. But no one was interested. The chairman was the late John E. Rankin, Democrat, Mississippi, who, playing veterans' politics as callously as he played race relations, was pushing a flat $90 monthly pension for all veterans.

When Rankin's bill came to the floor in 1949, the two Southerners clashed head on. The young Texan, who bears the nickname Tiger, lived up to his reputation for toughness. He made the motion that returned the pension bill to committee by a vote of 208 to 207.

Since he has acquired the prerogatives of chairman, TEAGUE has not hestitated to use them to hold back the pressures that beset his committee. In 1956, after an assault from the lobbyists caused the committee to override him and report out a pension bill, TEAGUE resorted to desperate parliamentary maneuvering to put his colleagues on the spot. First he loaded the bill with a variety of additional benefits that ran its price still higher into the stratosphere. Then he maneuvered the sequence of votes in a way to differentiate clearly between the desire to help the needy and the merely greedy veterans. As TEAGUE walked dejectedly back to his office after the fantastic turnabout on the rollcall vote, a succession of shamefaced congressmen came up to apologize for their cravenness.

For TEAGUE, who represents a purely rural constituency, the perils of defying the professional veteran interests are not so great as for others. Despite numerous threats of political retaliation, he has so far been returned to office without even a contest since his initial election in 1946. But there is further evidence to indicate that the veterans' lobby may not be an accurate spokesman for the twenty-two million veterans in this country. Of the fifty-one representatives (41 Republicans, 10 Democrats) who voted to kill the pension bill in 1956 not one failed to be reelected that fall. In the 1958 elections, though several retired, none was defeated.

Perhaps the most dramatic argument for voting one's convictions was supplied by Congressman WILLIAM H. AYRES, Republican, Ohio. AYRES, who helped Teague lead the fight against the 1956 bill, represents the heavily labor-organized and generally pro-Democratic district of Akron. Directly challenged by a veterans' committee organized to support his opponent, he met the issue without equivocation and won the largest majority of his career. (Rankin, incidentally, was defeated in 1952 by an opponent who kept asking why, if he was such a friend of the veterans, he had failed to get them a pension.)

It is more than pressure from veterans' groups that has prompted the decision to bring a new pension bill into Congress this spring. As pension costs continue to mount under existing laws—assuming no future wars, they will triple by 1985—there has been increasing recognition at both ends of Pennsylvania Avenue that something must be done to keep the program within limits.

In 1956 a Presidential commission headed by Gen. Omar Bradley produced a voluminous report that pointed out many inequities of the veterans'-benefits program and recommended that nonservice-connected pensions be retained for veterans and dependents only as "a 'reserve line of economic defense' until such time as their minimum income requirements are met through the basic OASI [Social Security] program or through any other source of regular income." For his pains, General Bradley was vilified by a number of professional veterans. An American Legion official branded the report as "an insidious effort to discredit the veterans' class as a whole."

The Bradley report also attached the all-or-nothing principle that awards the same $78.75 monthly benefits to the man who earns $2,700 a year as to the man who doesn't earn a cent, but nothing at all to the man who earns $2,701. The commission called for a graduated scale of payments that would make the pension a bona fide supplement to social security and other income in order to assure the aged veteran and his dependents a minimum standard of living. The commission obviously hoped that social security would eventually eliminate the necessity for any distinctions between veterans and nonveterans.

In spite of the persuasive reasoning of the Bradley report, President Eisenhower failed to act on it for 3 years. Finally, on April 15 of this year, his new Administrator of Veterans' Affair, Sumner G. Whittier, dispatched to Congress a bill to modernize the pension structure. It was welcomed by Chairman TEAGUE, who, in a not-so-veiled warning, promised hearings "provided that there can be substantial agreement reached between all of the veterans groups and various Government agencies concerned." As TEAGUE made clear, he was not going to allow another situation like the one that developed in 1956, when the lobby took control of the committee away from him.

The bill has been designed with calculated cunning. A savings provision guarantees that no beneficiary now on the Veterans' Administration rolls will be cut off or have his benefits reduced. Instead, 55 percent of the 1.3 million now receiving pensions will get an immediate increase in benefits. The cost of "sweetening" the reform measure will run an additional $100 million annually for the first few years, to the anguish of Mr. Eisenhower's budget makers.

But over the long run, the graduated scale will go far to ensure that need is the real criterion in fixing pension payments. There will be a much stricter definition of income to include a veteran's entire estate as well as his wife's income. Despite increased payments to those in genuine need, the bill will effect an economy by scaling down payments to the future pensioner who has other income. By the turn of the century, when the peak load of the Second World War veterans has passed, the cumulative saving over the present program is estimated at $48 billion.

ONE-HALF OF A NATION

TEAGUE is shrewdly weighing the political prospects of this bill. He is already engaged in the endless diplomacy of bluff and compromise. So far, the heads of the major veterans' organizations are showing unusual caution. They have much to lose by recklessness. One misstep and they know that TEAGUE, backed by the Veterans' Administration, will slam the door against any change. To make this alternative even less appetizing, TEAGUE may add a few more sweeteners to the bill. He wants to be certain that the pensioners who stand to gain immediate benefits make up a substantial majority of those now on the rolls. They, he reasons, are the ones who will swing the most votes.

TEAGUE's gamble is an important one. It represents a chance to inject reason into a program that has become a political monstrosity and has every prospect of becoming a greater one. It could well be the last chance. In a few more years, HARRY BYRD may no longer be around to serve as a second buffer in the Senate when TEAGUE is overridden. Senator ROBERT S. KERR, Democrat, of Oklahoma, who stands next in line on the Senate Finance Committee, has always been notably easy going on money matters. It is hardly likely, either, that any future President will have a more persuasive voice on veterans' affairs than the former Supreme Commander of the Allied Forces in Europe. As one of TEAGUE's staff members has expressed it, "If Eisenhower and Bradley can't sell this reform, who in hell can?"

Unless someone can sell it, the future management of veterans' benefits present a curious prospect indeed. For the aging veteran population of America can no longer be reckoned as the valiant few who charged up San Juan Hill to earn their Nation's undying gratitude and largesse. The veterans of past war, along with their dependents, will soon total nearly half the Nation's population. With each year that goes by, the millions of Second World War veterans move toward pensionable age.

Is half a Nation to be subsidized by a jerry-built program full of loopholes and inconsistencies, and subject to nearly limitless expansion? Except for a few brave men like TEAGUE, legislators are strangely complacent about this radical, if discriminatory, step toward the total welfare state. In an era of unparalleled prosperity, congressional conservatives and liberals alike seem bent on backing into a tin-plated version of the Townsend plan, which even in the depths of the depression they had the courage to fight off.

Safety Patrol Delegation for 1959 From the First Congressional District of Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD T. FLYNN
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1959

Mr. FLYNN. Mr. Speaker, it is with pride that I rise to advise this honorable body of a civic project in my hometown of Racine, Wis., in which a large number of manufacturers, individuals, and private organizations have cooperated. This civic and community project has made it possible for the city of Racine to participate annually in the grade school safety patrol program. Racine, Wis., was one of the pioneers in this move-

ment; the first unit of the school safety patrol program in Wisconsin was organized in the city of Racine on January 11, 1926. It was one of the first such units organized in the Nation. Racine realized then and knows now the value of such a program in protecting the lives of schoolchildren at school crossings adjacent to elementary schools. In the 33 years since Racine has been extremely fortunate in that there has never been an accident involving a schoolchild at a school crossing where these safety patrol youngsters have been on duty.

A distinguished Racine citizen, Dr. George Walter, now deceased, gave of his time for many years in the promotion and development of this project. In his memory the group of industrialists, individuals and private organizations above mentioned have created a memorial fund, a nonprofit organization dedicated totally to providing finances through voluntary donation of funds, which are used to defray the annual expenses of sending one safety patrol boy or girl from each school in the city of Racine to Washington to participate in the annual safety patrol parade. These schoolchildren are accompanied by several civic-minded citizens and officials. The result of this trip spurs the young boys and girls on to dedicated service to the safety patrol. The result is that Racine is developing character in its young people, safety at its school crossings and has a program of which all can be proud.

It was with pride that I witnessed these boys and girls march in Saturday's parade. It was a happy occasion for me to visit and have breakfast with them while they were in Washington. The boys and girls selected this year and the school from which they came are:

School, Racine, Wis.: James Blake, St. John's Lutheran; Gary Bosak, Garfield School; Dale Dow, Winkler; James Esser, Holy Trinity School; Donald Fowler, St. Rose; Stephen Heisa, Stephen Bull; Marvin Johnson, St. Charles', Burlington, Wis.; Dale Ketterhagen, St. Mary's, Burlington, Wis.; Sigmund Kizirnis, St. Joseph's; Robert Knotek, St. John's Nepomuk; Lawrence Kraus, Lincoln Elementary; Craig Monroe, Our Father's Lutheran; John Morgan, Jerstad-Agerholm; Daniel Panyk, Rapids; Jerry Pusch, Trinity Lutheran; Ronald Rasmussen, Howell; Charles Retert, Roosevelt; Robert Richards, Jr., Wadewitz; John Schatzman, Franklin; David Wenszell, St. Mary's; James Stratman, St. Edwards'; Charles Wittkowski, Holy Name School; John Zimmerman, Epiphany Lutheran; Daniel Zuehlke, Washington; Theodore Zukewich, Sacred Heart; Kenneth Burns, Elkhorn School, Elkhorn, Wis.; Dick Pollak, Elkhorn School, Elkhorn, Wis.; Jack Zwieg, Elkhorn School, Elkhorn, Wis.; Lois Dandeneau, St. Patrick's School; Wendy Jane Dibble, S. C. Johnson; Jane Gutknecht, Franksville; Charlene Mae Harlow, St. Stanislaus; Ellen Ihrman, Winslow; Annette Jardina, St. Rita; Jane Mutschmann, James; Susan Oravetz, Fratt Elementary; Joyce Petersen, Gilbert Knapp; Marilyn Schetter, McKinley Elementary; Sally Shookman, Beebe; Mary Teut, St. John's Evangelical Lutheran, Burlington, Wis.; Pauline Walsh, Waller School, Burlington, Wis.; Sandra Weiss, Mitchell Elementary; Nancy Wtipil, Jefferson; Kathie Zabit, Trautwein.

The chaperones caring for these boys and girls were: Harold A. Schink, Racine County Safety Council; Officer Edward Kirt, Racine Police Department; Sgt. James Anderson, Racine Sheriff's Department; Mrs. Bertha Halliday, R.M. Racine Health Department; Miss Grace Piskula, physical education consultant, Racine Public Schools.

I commend both the children and their chaperones for the fine display they put on in Washington and for a job well done. I commend their schools for adequately preparing them for the trip. The chaperones said they were the finest behaved group of children that they had yet taken to Washington and I commend the civic-mindedness of the group and the individuals contributing to the Dr. Walter memorial fund for this most worthy project.

Robert L. Cummings, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ISIDORE DOLLINGER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 29, 1959

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, the following article appeared in Business/Commercial Aviation of April 1959. It is most interesting and informative, and I am including it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that all Members of Congress may have the opportunity to read it:

ROBERT L. CUMMINGS, JR.

Ever since "Bob" Cummings became New York Airways' first president back in 1951, he and his company have been leaders in the airline 'copter field. On October 15, 1952, New York Airways' became the first airline to offer scheduled passenger service by 'copter. (The pioneer 'copter airline—Los Angeles Airways—had been operating for nearly 5 years, but only carried mail and air express.) Less than a month ago, New York Airways' carried its 250,000th passenger.

Bob Cummings is modest about New York Airways' success. "We've had the best opportunities," he says. "We have the biggest city in the world and the best financing of any small airline anywhere. Operating in the New York area puts us in the limelight. If we can't succeed with this background we ought to be shot."

Those who know Cummings well say it's not quite that simple. They credit Cummings with a major share of the responsibility for New York Airways' success. His chief assets, they point out, are his knack for getting to the heart of a problem, his vision and his capacity for getting people to work together as a team.

An excellent example of Bob's ability to get to the core of an issue is the concept of direct service, provided by steep-gradient aircraft, that he recently laid before the CAB. This concept offers the first real opportunity for aviation to crack the short-haul travel market—now dominated by surface transport. It points the way for today's 'copter airlines to take their place alongside trunk and local service airlines—as a major element of our national air transport system.

Nowhere does Cummings' foresight show so clearly as in NYA's well-developed equipment plans. Considerably along on plans to retrofit turbine engines to its Vertol 44Bs, the airlines technical staff is hard at work evaluating the 44B's sucessor—"Ship X," as Cummings calls it. At the same time, NYA has protected its delivery position for the replacement of Ship X with the recent letter of intent for five Fairey Rotodynes. Of this action, Cummings says "It's an indication of what we think of the future. We have to protect our busines for the future—we don't want to get caught short for lack of vision."

Long ago, Cummings realized that a 'copter airline—buying five aircraft every 5 years—couldn't arouse much interest among manufacturers turning out 30–40 ships a month for the military. Ever since, he's been working quietly with 'copter airlines—both here and abroad—to develop common requirements to present to manufacturers. One important payoff has been worldwide agreement—both in the United States and abroad—on the size 'copter needed for airline operations. Developed in the IATA Helicopter Group, this agreement is also backed by the U.S. military.

The NYA management team is made up largely of "pros" with years of fixed-wing airline experience. All were hand-picked by Bob Cummings—himself a former manager of Pan Am's Atlantic Division. The way this team has stuck together since NYA began is one indication of the effectiveness of Bob's leadership. Many have been offered better paying jobs elsewhere, but they all chose to stay—held together by the challenge of the operation and their devotion to Bob Cummings.

In his dealings with his staff, Cummings gives each man the authority that should go with his responsibility. Observes an associate, "You get help from Bob, you don't get interference. He's never insisted I do something I didn't really want to do—even though I later proved to be wrong."

Small wonder New York Airways looks expectantly toward the future. Biggest hurdles at present are getting CAB recognition of the concept of direct service, with steep-gradient aircraft, and making the airline's temporary certificate a permanent one. Once these hurdles are overcome, Bob Cummings and his team will be climbing out on a steep gradient.

One Citizen's Comment on the Farm Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLAN HAGEN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 11, 1959

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I represent a district which is reputed to be the most productive farm congressional district in the United States in terms of dollar value of farm products raised. Authority for this statement is a survey made by the Congressional Quarterly approximately a year ago. Primarily because of this fact I have an acute interest in the farm problem and a proper farm program. Since my service on the House Agriculture Committee I have endeavored to inject some consideration of the laws of economics—in a modern context—into all farm legislative proposals.

My particular point in addressing you here today is to invite attention to the fact that the current farm program,

whether under the present Secretary of Agriculture or his immediate predecessors, has been productive of a large degree of antifarm rancor. Typical of this reaction is a letter I have received from one of my constituents, who, I assume, is not a farmer. The letter reads as follows:

TAFT, CALIF., *May 7, 1959.*

Congressman HAGEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: This Congress has spent a lot of time on labor legislation but I don't hear you doing anything about the rotten farm program.

You've never seen anyone get rich working and you know it.

You talk about balancing the budget then spend $8 billion on the rich farmers. Who do you rich farm lovers think you're fooling? I'd like to know who puts the farm pressure on you birds and I'd like to know the justification of the farm program.

What hold do they have on you fellows? I actually believe if those farmers met you downtown and told you to stand on your head you'd do it. The Farm Journal says the farmers don't want a Government program and the majority of the people hate the farmers' insides. Now you tell me why the $8 billion on them. It must be the big fellows that are putting the pressure on you.

You tell why an outfit like Westlake Farms of Stratford should get $125,942 on the soil bank. I got the list from the Department of Agriculture. Also the loans in 1957: Kern County land, $531,362; Westlake Farms, $508,667; Mettlers, $414,608.

The farm programs were started to help the poor farmers and look at it now. As long as I live I'll never forgive the U.S. Government for taxing me to near poverty to give it to those rich farmers and I know some of them are foreigners.

How about all the Government money that has been given to the Greeks to build tankers? You stand up and do right. We'll vote you all out; that's the solution.

I believe that any man of your integrity knows right from wrong and you know the rotten farm program is not right. I just went down and registered Democratic for one reason—to vote you farm lovers out next election. Every day I campaign—vote all incumbents out until the rotten farm program is done away with completely. We voted out some last election. We'll vote some more of you farm lovers out next election.

E. H. RANSOM.

If sentiments such as these are not uncommon in an area where agricultural activity is the principal source of income, not only of farmers but also those whose chief customers are farmers, I can imagine the depth of feeling in such urban areas as New York and Boston and Los Angeles.

Dr. Slichter on Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, an article by Edward H. Collins in the April 27, 1959, New York Times, on Dr. Slichter's economic views has been brought to my attention. Dr. Slichter was the first witness to appear before the Joint Economic Committee in its studies into the question of maximum employment, economic growth and price stability which the Congress authorized in January and voted $200,000 to finance. After listening to Dr. Slichter testify and after interrogating him I came away with somewhat the same general conclusions on his views that Mr. Collins records in his article:

POSITION OR DEFENSE—A VIEW THAT SLICHTER FORMS OPINION TO CONFORM WITH PREVIOUS SPEECHES

(By Edward H. Collins)

An economist who is qualified to hold the chair of Lamont University professor at Harvard is entitled to his own opinion on any issue, even if that opinion puts him in the small company of experts who profess to regard a condition of perpetually rising prices not only as potentially nontoxic but as an invaluable source of the energy-building vitamins that every growing economy needs.

Nevertheless, the more this wirter, for one, samples the steady flow of speeches and articles of Prof. Sumner Slichter dealing with this theme, the more strongly he is tempted to ask himself one question. That question is: Is he (Professor Slichter) trying to convince his audience of the rightness of his views or is he really trying to convince himself? For the picture he seems to present at this point is that of a man who, finding himself in a position of dubious tenability, has redoubled his efforts to reassure himself, and in the process is inflicting more damage on himself than on his critics.

To get away from broad generalizations, let us consider a recent representative example of Professor Slichter's efforts to defend his position on inflation by what is essentially the technique of simple reassertion. That example is the address he delivered at Boca Raton on April 13 before the Association of Reserve City Bankers. True, one will find here the array of assorted statistics that are the hallmark of a typical Slichter dissertation. Moreover, like most statistics employed by the Harvard professor, the reader will find these decidedly interesting.

STATISTICAL PLAY

He should perhaps be warned, however, against permitting himself to be confused by what may strike him as strange discrepancies between the Professor's statistics and the conclusions that their author draws from them. As someone once remarked, "Slichter sometimes gives the impression that he doesn't think of statistics as tools of his trade; he just likes to play with them."

Of several persons with whom this writer made it a point to discuss the Boca Raton speech the majority opinion seemed to be that it reached a plateau in section II, "The Course of Inflation," established its peak in subsection II(3) "The Effects of Higher Labor Costs," and been degenerated into a hodgepodge of speculation, irrelevancies, and non sequiturs.

Few economists with more orthodox views than Professor Slichter have drawn up a more impressive indictment of the "wage push" as the prime mover in the price inflation of the past decade.

"The period 1947–58," he points out, "was a period of declining profit margins." This fact is important because it shows that the initiative in raising prices was not being taken by employers. From an average of 4.45 cents per dollar of sales after taxes in the years 1947–50, the corresponding figure fell to 3.3 cents in the 3 years 1955–57.

During 8 years of this 11-year period of declining profit margins, he goes on to observe, "the rise in hourly compensation for all workers in private industry exceeded the gain in real production per man-hour, and for the period as a whole that rise was 66.7 percent, or practically twice the gain of 33.6 percent in real production per man-hour. Noting that in 1957 a consolidated income statement of American business showed that labor costs represented about two-thirds of the income originating in business and four-fifths of the income originating in corporate business, he concluded:

"When labor costs are this important and when, year after year, hourly compensation of employees outruns output per man-hour, some increase in the price level is obviously necessary."

CONTROL URGED

Appearing before the Joint Congressional Committee on the Economic Report on March 25, Marriner S. Eccles, former Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, emphasized this very same point. He then proceeded to add:

"It should be apparent that unless the Government and the Congress have the courage to control the rapidly growing monopolistic poser of organized labor, further inflation is inevitable. The only alternative is to stop the growth of the money supply, which would ultimately bring unemployment and idle facilities."

Compare this forthright and logical proposal by Mr. Eccles with the floundering attempt of Professor Slichter to provide a solution that would avoid doing violence to his frequent statement in which he sought to minimize the importance of inflation. Having diagnosed the recent condition of rising prices as "the tendency of wages to outstrip productivity," one would expect that he would prescribe for their particular ailment.

Indeed, for a brief moment, he actually seemed to be teetering on the edge of such action.

"Since the cause of the trouble was clear," he declared, "the central attack on inflation should be directed to curbing the power of trade unions." But for the information of those who may have applauded his remarks at this point, the present might be a good time to call attention to the fact that one should never applaud any statement in a Slichter speech, because one can never tell what is coming next. What came next in this case was this observation by the speaker:

"Depriving the unions of some of their extraordinary privileges would remove some of the glaring injustices, but would have little effect on the bargaining power of most unions." Thus does Professor Slichter, within the space of a single sentence, propose and dispose. While the professor subsequently introduced a variety of amiable but purely speculative suggestions for solving the inflation problem without touching its heart, that was as near as he came at any time to a frontal attack.

The fact seems to be that the Harvard economist is not nearly as nonfearful of inflation as is popularly believed. A perusal of a number of representative speeches and articles by him on the subject suggests that unless he is attacked or taunted into reckless statements he is apt to confine himself largely to the thesis that inflation is not as serious a threat as most people think. Sumner Slichter, one is forced to conclude, is somewhat less than the menace to orthodox thinking on this subject that he is widely pictured. By the same token, it should be added, it is probably largely a wasted hope to believe that much help can be expected from him in solving the inflation problem. One reason for believing this is that his economic philosophy is largely a philosophy of improvisation. A more important reason is Professor Slichter's addiction to gratuitous prediction.

The study of economic theory and economic problems is a difficult one even for the economist who has submitted to a disciplined spirit of detachment and objectivity. The economist who constantly makes a practice of taking a position with respect to the economic outlook has forfeited the most valuable asset that any scientist can boast. He has become a prisoner of his own public pronouncements.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer, plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Raymond F. Noyes is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Appendix

Lee's Spirituality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN STENNIS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 13, 1959

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, on May 3, 1959, our colleague, the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], delivered an address at the annual meeting of the Robert E. Lee Memorial Foundation, at Lee's ancestral home at Stratford, Va.

This address, entitled "Lee's Spirituality," not only analyzes some of the strong spiritual qualities of the great Virginian, Robert E. Lee, but it reflects also the outstanding spiritual qualities of our colleague, also a worthy Virginian.

Through this emphasis on Lee's spiritual qualities, the Senator from Virginia has rendered a service in making the true character of General Lee better known to the American people.

That there may be further circulation of this worthy address among the people of the Nation, I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEE'S SPIRITUALITY

(Address by Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON at annual meeting of Robert E. Lee Memorial Foundation, Stratford, Va., May 3, 1959)

It was on such a spring day as this that Gen. Robert E. Lee was called upon to make the most trying decision of his life. The grass was green at Appomattox, the fragrant arbutus was opening its chalice of perfume among the drifted leaves, the white flowering dogwood would soon be in full bloom. All nature seemed to be proclaiming "God's in his heaven—all's well with the world." But Lee's heart was heavy with the realization of the fact that future resistance to the overwhelming might of Grant's army would be futile. In the bloody battle of Sayler's Creek he had lost one-third of his fighting strength, and to prevent the needless sacrifice of what remained of his brave men, Lee, the professional soldier, must suffer the public humiliation of surrendering his army and admitting that he had lost the war. "How easy," he said as his soul was being tried by the implications of that decision, "I could be rid of this and be at rest. I have only to ride along the line and all will be over. But it is our duty to live. What would become of the women and children of the South if we were not here to protect them?"

In those simple words, "it is our duty to live," Lee expressed the keynote of a character so sublime and so secure in the halls of eternal fame that his memory could not be lifted to any new place of distinction by any man's words of praise. * * *

In the shadows of the historic home at Stratford in which Lee was born, preserved by the unselfish patriotism and loving care of the Robert E. Lee Memorial Foundation, we may well recall the reference to the Lee family by Woodrow Wilson when in a speech on Robert E. Lee, he said: "We like to remember all the splendid family traditions of the Lees, but we like most of all to remember that this man was greater than all the traditions of his family; that there was a culmination here that could not have been reached by the mere drift of what men remember, but must be reached by what men originate and conceive."

In the opinion of that great scholar and statesman, what Lee had conceived, in a superlative degree, was a sense of duty. In the performance of that duty he was a singular contradiction—"a gentleman who loved his fellow men and sought to serve them by the power of love, and who yet won the imperishable fame of a great soldier."

Woodrow Wilson, in the address to which I have referred, explained this apparent paradox by saying: "The lesson of General Lee's life to me is that it is not the immediate future that should be the basis of the statesman's calculation. * * * Even a man who saw the end from the beginning should, in my conception as a southerner, have voted for spending his people's blood and his own, rather than pursue the weak course of expediency. There is here no mere device, no regard to the immediate future. What has been the result?—ask yourself that. It has been that the South has retained her best asset, her self-respect."

Senator John Warwick Daniel, in his oration at the unveiling of the Valentine recumbent statue of Lee in Lexington in 1883, said that the life of Lee taught the grandest lesson: How manhood can rise transcendant over adversity and is in itself alone, under God, preeminent.

"At the bottom of all true heroism is unselfishness," Senator Daniel said. "Its crowning expression is sacrifice."

After years of study, the great historian and brilliant writer, Dr. Douglas S. Freeman, compressed into one sentence his impressions of Lee: "What he seemed," Dr. Freeman said, "he was—a wholly human gentleman, the essential elements of whose positive character were two and only two, simplicity and spirituality." To that we can appropriately add Wilson's appraisal of Lee's life when he said, "Lee spent himself not in his self interest but for the interests of mankind." "It was," said Wilson, "not only moral force, but it was a moral force conscientiously guided by interests which were not his own."

Constituted as he was, Robert E. Lee could not have been true to himself except by spending himself unselfishly for others. He revealed his personal creed when, asked for a word of advice at the christening of a friend's child, he said simply: "Teach him to deny himself." He revealed it again when he wrote down among the maxims which he carried in his saddlebags during the war: "There is a true glory and a true honor: the glory of duty done, the honor of the integrity of principle."

But the self-sacrificing faith of Robert E. Lee was revealed in deeds even more clearly than in words. He showed it when he declined the command of the Federal army, preferring to fight the unequal battles and share the hardships of his own people; at Gettysburg when he took upon himself the blame for a disaster which he might have attributed to his lieutenants; after Appomattox when he walked under the yoke of conquests without a murmur of complain; and at Lexington when he refused large financial offers to devote the last years of his life to training the youth of his country.

Lee's services as an educator at Washington College (later to bear the joint names of two of Virginia's greatest sons) in training the youth of his Southland to successfully meet the challenge of a bitter Reconstruction period—a stain on our democracy which, let us hope, in the final day of judgment, the recording angel will blot out with a tear—was no small part of his contribution to his day and generation. But typical of his great humility, Lee said shortly before his death: "Life is gliding away and I have nothing to show for mine. I pray I may be spared to accomplish something for the benefit of mankind and the honor of God."

Avoiding the forms of discipline which he had known in his military education, General Lee established at Washington College the honor system under which the boys were required to be gentlemen in all things, to study faithfully, to hold high moral standards and to remember their Creator.

Part of that system, which avoided compulsion and stressed moral responsibility, was abolition of compulsory chapel attendance, but Lee himself set the example by faithfully attending religious services at the college and in his own church. He invited the ministers of the town to take turns acting as chaplain. He sent each Lexington pastor a list of boys in the college of that pastor's faith and encouraged the clergymen to keep in touch with them. He carefully selected only Christian homes for students who lived in the town and on one occasion he said: "If I could only know that all the young men in the college were good Christians, I should have nothing more to desire. I dread the thought of any student going away from the college without becoming a sincere Christian."

The point I want to emphasize here is that Robert E. Lee was not merely a man of high ethical and moral principles, but he was a Christian in the fullest sense of that term—one who believed in the Bible, tried to the best of his ability to follow its teachings and who put God first throughout his life.

* * * * *

There was, for example, the occasion when General Pendleton, who was a minister before the war and afterward, had lunch with General Lee in his tent. Afterward each sought to apologize for the fact that no blessing was said before the meal. General Pendleton said he had waited for his commanding officer to suggest it, but Lee said he waited because he felt the suggestion should have come from the clergyman. Then Lee added the significant statement that when nothing was said, he said the blessing silently, as he always did when he ate alone.

In General Lee's home morning prayers were a regular routine, with him reading from a worn pocket edition of the Bible he carried throughout the war, and he referred to the Bible as "a book which supplies the place of all others and cannot be replaced by any other."

Indicating the nature of his personal faith, General Lee said: "There are many things in the Old Book which I may never be able to explain, but I accept it as the infallible word of God and receive its teachings as inspired

by the Holy Ghost. * * * I prefer the Bible to any other book. There is enough in that to satisfy the most ardent thirst for knowledge; to open the way to true wisdom; and to teach the only road to salvation and eternal happiness. It is not above human comprehension, and is sufficient to satisfy all its desires."

On this Lord's day when we meet as it were to give thanks to a Gracious Providence for giving to us in the times of greatest need spiritual as well as military leaders like George Washington and Robert E. Lee, I will feel that my halting efforts to interpret to you the real meaning of Lee's life will not have been in vain if you can leave this meeting with the feeling that the true significance of Lee to our day and generation is contained in Dr. Freeman's summation when he wrote: "Of humility and submission was born a spirit of self-denial, that prepared him for the hardship of war and, still more, for the dark destitution that followed. * * * Had his life been epitomized in one sentence of the Book he read so often, it would have been in the words, 'If any man will come after Me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross daily, and follow Me.'"

"I have fought against the people of the North," Lee once said, "because I believed they were seeking to wrest from the South her dearest rights. But I have never cherished toward them bitter or vindicative feelings and have never seen the day when I did not pray for them."

We must strive for mutual tolerance because the rights for which Lee fought are threatened not only by internal friction at home but by the alien forces of an anti-God ideology. I shall never cease to give thanks for the work of the United Daughters of the Confederacy and of the Lee Memorial Foundation, who keep green the memory of a great spiritual as well as military leader, Robert E. Lee, and who have demonstrated to the Nation and to the world that the fight for a principle of self-government, known as the rights of sovereign States, in which the red blood of the flower of the South was shed on far-flung battlefields, was not a lost cause because in that fight the South saved her most precious heritage—her self-respect.

And so today we can proudly say of Robert E. Lee, as did Pericles of the young men of Athens: "They gave their bodies to the Commonwealth and received, each for his own memory, praise that will never die, and with it the grandest of all sepulchers, not that in which their mortal bones are laid, but a home in the minds of men, where their glory remains fresh to stir to speech or action as the occasion comes by. For the whole earth is the sepulcher of famous men; and their story is not graven only on stone over their native earth, but lives on far away, without visible symbol, woven into the stuff of other men's lives.

A Generous Acknowledgment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE HOLT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 12, 1959

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to call attention to the following editorial from the Los Angeles Times of Tuesday morning, May 12, 1959. Our country's foreign policy deserves more compliments than we get throughout the world:

A GENEROUS ACKNOWLEDGMENT

A handsome acknowledgment of U.S. economic aid to the world has been voiced by britain's Chancellor of the Exchequer, Derick Heathcoat Amory. Her Majesty's chief money man told a group of American bankers in London that the "calm and intelligent" financial policies of the United States forestalled a serious worldwide recession.

Moreover, he went on, from the same source of wisdom came economic cooperation which is the basis of whatever success Western nations have had in solving postwar problems. About the only thing more he could have said was that West Germany may have taken better advantage of these American policies than have his own people.

Looking forward to more of the same enlightened policies, Mr. Amory rounded out as fine a compliment as the United States has yet received, in a world where real or fancied American ineptitudes are more often remarked.

Nomination of Admiral Strauss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 13, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the hearings on the President's request for confirmation of Admiral Strauss have occasioned a great deal of comment.

Some of this discussion, I feel, has clouded the issue. However, Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, our able and distinguished colleague from Wyoming, has clearly painted the true picture in a letter to the editor of the Washington Post and Times Herald. This letter offers a plain explanation of the reasons for the Senate's actions in this matter.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the letter to the editor by Senator O'MAHONEY, published in the Washington Post and Times Herald for Tuesday, May 12, 1959, under the heading "Grasping at Strauss."

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GRASPING AT STRAUSS

May I not take the liberty of suggesting taht your editorial of May 2, "Grasping at Strauss," seems to be based upon a mistaken constitutional premise, namely, that "The President, we believe, ought to be entitled to be entitled to have in his Cabinet the persons in whom he has confidence."

This is not what the framers of the Constitution believed. They were of the opinion that the President should be required to have the advice and consent of the Senate not only to the appointment of Ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls and judges of the Supreme Court, but also "all other officers of the United States, whose appointments are not herein otherwise provided for, and which shall be established by law."

Is there any present reason to support this view of the members of the Constitutional Convention? Yes. It is to be found not only in the traditional American principle that this is a government by law, not a government by men, but also in the words of your editorial. You said:

"This newspaper has not been by any means an admirer of Admiral Strauss. It has differed with him strongly in the Oppenheimer case, on his defense of the Dixon-Yates contract, on excessive secrecy in nuclear matters and on a number of other important policy questions."

Let me add, it is more important now that we have a President who delegates to others so much of his power that the Senate should not waive its constitutional right to deny confirmation in the case of a nominee whose record amply establishes the charge that he aspires to have his own way in matters of public importance, the Congress and even the President to the contrary notwithstanding.

The battle that is being waged now in the United States is a battle to transfer to private management the powers granted by the Constitution to the Congress to regulate interstate and foreign commerce. It is not necessary in a case like this to find "evidence of serious misconduct or some similar compelling disqualification," as your editorial asserts. It is only necessary to insist that a man nominated to be a Cabinet officer shall have a record which justifies the belief that he will support a government by law instead of a government by men.

This constitutional view was never better exemplified than in the case of Charles Beecher Warren, of Michigan, nominated on March 5, 1925, to be Attorney General of the United States. He was rejected on March 10, 1925, by the Senate by a vote of 41 to 39. President Coolidge renominated him 2 days later and the Senate again rejected him, this time by a vote of 46 to 39.

He was opposed by both Senators from Michigan—James Couzens, a Republican, and Woodbridge N. Ferris, a Democrat. The burden of the argument against him was made by Senator Thomas J. Walsh, of Montana, whose qualifications as a constitutional lawyer no one will deny.

Senator Walsh, in opposing the nomination of Warren, made no personal attack upon him and did not oppose him for any interior office. He said he was not qualified to be the Attorney General because of his association in the activities of the American Sugar Co., which was then generally known as the Sugar Trust.

These activities, Senator Walsh contended, were such that he could not be entrusted with the enforcement of the antitrust laws. Thus the President's nominee, under clear constitutional authority, was rejected because, in the belief of a majority of the Senate, public policy required his rejection.

This is the situation that exists now in the case of Mr. Strauss. Public policy requires his rejection as Secretary of Commerce. Surely the President can find another nominee in whom he has equal confidence who will be qualified both from the President's personal point of view and from the public policy point of view.

JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
Senator From Wyoming.

WASHINGTON.

Israel Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 11, 1959

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, 11 years have passed since the State of Israel was

declared independent in 1948. In that short period of time Israel has evolved from an infant state barely able to survive into a strong and capable country. Its growth can be described only as phenomenal.

Opening its doors to the Jews of the world Israel has absorbed more than 1 million immigrants and has thus trebled its population. The country's agricultural production has doubled and 65 percent of Israel's food needs are now met by its own farmers. The arable land has been increased by well over half a million acres and the near-miracle of transforming the arid Negev desert into green farmland continues.

But Israel is not solely an agricultural nation. Actually it is the most industrialized country in the Middle East. In general, the country has progressed so remarkably that the standard of living of most of its people is on a level with many West European countries. In fact, given a breakthrough in any one of the scientific fields presently being explored in the country—atomic energy, desalinization of sea water, and the harnessing of solar energy—Israel could speedily become one of the world's most technologically advanced countries.

Self-improvement alone, however, has not satisfied Israel. For the past few years it has been providing technical assistance to African and Asia countries, notably Ghana and Burma. Many new African and Asian nations have found in Israel a state capable of extending assistance, entering into trade, and providing capital and technicians without encountering the danger of economic domination or military commitment. Also, the dynamic spirit of Israel and its visible accomplishments provide an attractive example for the Afro-Asians. This is one of the most promising aspects of the relationship between them. Israel's democratic system, rather than that of the Communists, may serve as a model for the underdeveloped areas.

On this, Israel's 11th Independence Day, therefore, it is with great pride that I congratulate its citizens and wish them all peace, prosperity, and continuing progress in the coming years.

Three Hundred and Fiftieth Anniversary of the Founding of Cape May County, N.J.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 13, 1959

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement prepared by me regarding the 350th anniversary of the founding of Cape May County, N.J.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CASE

This year, Cape May County in New Jersey is celebrating the 350th anniversary of its founding, and I am happy to call this historic fact to the attention of my colleagues.

Cape May is a delightful area in the southern part of New Jersey and has long been famous for its excellent recreational facilities. For more than 150 years vacationers and sportsmen from every part of New Jersey as well as from other States have been enjoying the limitless sports and recreational opportunities which abound in this tract of great natural beauty.

But what is more significant is the role of Cape May County in the early history of our country. Henry Hudson was the first to come upon it in 1609 and claim it for the Dutch. Thereafter a succession of navigators were sent from Holland to explore further the area of the Delaware Bay and River. In 1623 the first settlers arrived from Holland (a group of Walloons under the leadership of Cornelius Jacobsen Mey) and soon afterwards colonists from the surrounding territories migrated to the Cape May area, either in pursuit of religious freedom or for economic purposes.

Thus, the same factors which motivated the settlers of our great land were responsible also for the early growth of what is now known as Cape May County.

This is a very proud moment for the residents of Cape May County and I am happy to have this opportunity to express my felicitations to them.

Atlantic Congress—A Break in the Clouds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 13, 1959

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, as the time draws near for the most important Atlantic Congress meeting in London, I think it fitting to call the Senate's attention to an editorial which appeared on April 12 in the Denver Post. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The editorial shows a keen insight into the importance of this meeting on June 5 and points up how vital the deliberations can be to the people of the free nations of the world.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ATLANTIC CONGRESS—A BREAK IN THE CLOUDS

If the principal reason the United States joined the North Atlantic Treaty 10 years ago was the immediate need to stop Russian expansion, there was another longer range aspect appealing to many Americans.

They hoped NATO might prove to be a cornerstone for a truly effective Atlantic Community.

Many who were weary of war recognized that, in the long run, peace must be based on international law administered by some body to which individual nations, renouncing force, would surrender some part of their sovereignty.

The United Nations had been one great focus for these idealistic hopes.

But the cold war, and its symptoms, the Russian walkouts and vetoes, soon indicated that at least for the present the U.N. could not be all they had hoped it might be.

Some wise statesmen, looking for a solution, pinned great hopes in regional organization, where common ties of language and common institutions, such as parliamentary democracy, could provide a firm foundation for international cooperation.

Much of this faith in the regional approach has been borne out by the experiences of NATO, as the article on page 1AA indicates.

It is therefore comforting, at a time of crisis and much bad foreign news, to report that NATO is about to be reappraised by leading citizens of its member countries.

An Atlantic Congress on an inspiring scale will convene in London June 5 to search for ways in which the NATO nations can draw more closely together.

Some 650 people, some of them legislators, but many of them leaders in all varieties of private occupation, will be delegates to this Congress.

It is vital that NATO's impetus toward a common Western policy be maintained as new world problems strain the alliance.

The fact that the organization must live and grow with its times is more important, in the long perspective, than a strategic argument of the moment over troops in Germany or a spat with France over national prerogatives.

The Atlantic Congress should give NATO a new confidence that it enjoys wide support among private citizens who see in the treaty more than just an alliance.

For NATO is, above all, a genuinely hopeful experiment pointing toward that broader international community of law and order which we hoped for at the end of the last war, and which has become an even more compelling necessity in the nuclear age.

The Pendleton East Oregonian and the Development of the Columbia River System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 13, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, for many years the foremost advocate in our State of the development of the mighty Columbia River for hydroelectricity, navigation, and flood control was the late E. B. Aldrich, editor and publisher of the East Oregonian. The East Oregonian is published in the famous roundup city of Pendleton.

It is no exaggeration to stress that the great McNary Dam, named in tribute to Oregon's eminent Senator Charles Linza McNary, is a monument to the tireless efforts of Senator McNary, E. B. Aldrich, and a small handful of farsighted and influential men of their caliber and character.

When others felt the cause was hopeless, E. B. Aldrich insisted fervently that some day there would be a vast dam at Umatilla Rapids, tapping the Columbia's surge of power, and sending tugs and barges far into the fastnesses of the inland empire. McNary Dam is that fulfillment.

Mr. Aldrich's successor at the helm of the Pendleton East Oregonian is J. W. Forrester, who continues this heritage of faith and belief in the development of the Columbia River system, the second greatest in the land—second only to "Ol' Man River" itself, the Mississippi. In the East Oregonian of May 7, 1959, Mr. Forrester has described vividly how the Columbia can be to the Pacific Northwest a second St. Lawrence Seaway, with particular emphasis on kilowatts and in land navigation. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the editorial by Mr. Forrester, entitled "Those Twin Benefits," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The editorial is of special significance right now, because the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Public Works soon will consider funds for the great John Day Dam, which is downstream on the Columbia from the McNary project.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THOSE TWIN BENEFITS

Those who really understand the importance of development of the water resources of the Columbia Basin never separate two benefits, navigation and the production of hydroelectric energy. Most will refuse to say that one benefit is greater than the other.

Movement of commerce on the Columbia River is in its infancy by comparison with the scope of navigation on the Mississippi River. But at the rate at which shipping on the Columbia is growing it can be seen that that river will someday mean as much to the Northwest as the Mississippi does to the rich area it serves. When navigation is possible on the Columbia to Wenatchee and on the Snake River to Lewiston the potential of waterborne shipping in the Columbia Basin will be recognized, we think, by those who have doubted its potential.

There is another area of the United States that is reaping the great benefits of abundant, low-cost hydroelectric energy and low-cost river transportation. Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER spoke recently of what those twin benefits are doing in Northeastern United States. We have come upon his remarks printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which we offer here. We regret that the Wall Street Journal story of which he speaks is too lengthy for reproduction here. We think a significant part of the story is that which tells that bank deposits in some communities served by the St. Lawrence Seaway have tripled. Senator NEUBERGER said:

"It is unfortunate that many people in the great Pacific Northwest still do not realize what low-cost waterpower and cheap river transportation can mean to the development of a vast region like ours in the Columbia River Basin.

"An example of the prosperity which can come to an area by these methods is being created in Northeastern United States on the St. Lawrence Seaway. There, the huge Moses-Saunders Dam is about to generate 1,880,000 low-cost kilowatts, which will make it second in the Western Hemisphere only to our own colossal Grand Coulee Dam on the Columbia. In addition, the slack water navigation and locks produced by the Moses-Saunders Dam will make possible oceangoing shipping all the way to the Great Lakes in the very heart of the American breadbasket.

"An illuminating article in the Wall Street Journal for April 24, 1959, entitled 'St. Lawrence Valley Booms as the Seaway Lures Industry, Tourists,' details just what this development can mean to important sections of both the United States and Canada.

"I commend a thorough and careful reading of the Wall Street Journal article to my own constituents in Oregon. There, we have had to struggle for 5 years to obtain construction appropriations for the great John Day Dam, over the opposition of the Republican national administration. Now we are about to begin our efforts to secure adequate funds to keep the construction of John Day Dam on schedule in the years ahead. Furthermore, we seek to implement the 308 report of the Corps of Army Engineers, which recommends an expenditure of some $63 million to provide effective and safe navigation all the way up the main stem of the Columbia to the orchard city of Wenatchee, Wash., a citadel of the inland empire. Any resident of the Pacific Northwest who reads this Wall Street Journal article about the prosperity brought to Northeastern United States by cheap power and inland navigation on the St. Lawrence Seaway will inevitably become a booster for the same type of development on the Columbia River system."

Operational Ballistic Missiles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 13, 1959

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, there was published in the Huntsville Times, of Huntsville, Ala., on May 1, a very interesting editorial entitled "Waiting for the Concrete To Set," which relates to the use of the IRBM missiles such as the Thor, which has been deployed to the United Kingdom, and the Jupiter, planned for use in Italy. This is a thought-provoking editorial, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WAITING FOR THE CONCRETE TO SET

The U.S. Army could well wag an "I told you so" finger at the Defense Department and the Eisenhower administration, which has just suffered considerable international embarrassment over operational readiness of the Thor IRBM.

Some time ago Air Force Gen. Nathan F. Twining, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, reported to Congress that Thor IRBMs were sitting "ready to go" in England.

But Senator STUART SYMINGTON, although a former Secretary of the Air Force, shook off usual defense excuses and pointed out on Tuesday at the National Press Club in Washington that he had just visited England and had found nothing ready to go.

Yesterday Secretary of Defense McElroy confirmed that Thor missiles in England are not operational, and apparently will not be for some time. The elaborate firing positions required for the Thor are still under construction.

Rivalry between the Jupiter and the Thor, as intermediate range ballistic missile weapons, is a thing of the past, since the decision apparently has been made to discontinue production of the missiles as weapons when present contracts expire. Efforts will be concentrated on intercontinental range missiles instead.

However, the current situation in England points up one basic difference in the two systems, as well as the danger of allowing politics and selfish interests to influence decisions concerning the quality of our military resources.

The difference, of course, is that the Thor requires permanent and complex fixed bases for firing—bases which require weeks to construct and which can be zeroed in by the enemy. The Jupiter is mobile and can be fired from almost any position accessible by truck. Firing sites can be established in a matter of minutes and moved as soon as the weapon is launched.

This factor alone, assuming the missile systems otherwise equal, should have dictated choice of the Jupiter as the Nation's No. 1 IRBM. But Air Force and aircraft industry politics decreed otherwise. That decision was not influenced by the merits of the proven Jupiter.

And instead of being ready, as is the case with Jupiter, we sit and wait, hoping and praying that the need for the weapons does not come until the concrete sets.

Necessity of Controlling Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. CURTIS
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 13, 1959

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I am pleased to offer for the reading of my colleagues in the Senate the fine editorial which appeared in the Omaha, Nebr., World Herald of May 7, 1959, stating the great public interest in controlling inflation. Since publication of this editorial, I have received thousands of letters from sincere Nebraskans petitioning Members of the Congress to cope with this problem.

I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THIS IS THE GREAT PROBLEM: YOU CAN HELP TO SOLVE IT

The greatest issue in America this year is inflation.

President Eisenhower says that. Secretary of the Treasury Anderson agrees. So do a host of other thoughtful Americans.

This is not a far-away issue involving only politicians and economists. It is a local issue, an individual issue. It affects the well-being, present and future, of every one who lives in the United States.

What is inflation?

It is the process of destroying the value of the dollar, so that it will buy less this year than it did a year ago.

And what is the basic cause of inflation?

It is the constant increase in the supply of money. This is brought about chiefly by too much spending by the Government in Washington out of an empty Treasury.

Secretary Anderson recently explained the problem in these simple words:

"Now suppose I wanted to write checks of $100 million starting tomorrow, but the Treasury was out of money. If I called up a bank and said, 'Will you loan me $100 million at 3½ percent for 6 months if I send you over a note to that effect?' the banker would probably say yes.

"Where would he get the $100 million? * * * He would merely create that much

money, subject to reserve requirements, by crediting our account in that sum and accepting the Government's note as an asset. When I had finished writing checks for $100 million, the operation would have added that sum to the money supply."

This process, the Secretary went on, is about the same as if the Treasury had issued $100 million worth of greenbacks.

And how does constant, continuing inflation harm the American people?

It takes away from them what they gain in wage increases and profits. It robs them of a substantial share of their pensions. It makes the future uncertain and perilous for everybody.

This is not a new problem. The outcome of uncontrolled inflation should be known to all.

Germany has been through it. There the inflationary smash led to Hitler, defeat in World War II, and partition.

Hungary has been through it, and Hungary today is a Communist satellite.

China has been through it, with results that need not be detailed here.

Everywhere, in all ages, uncontrolled inflation has led to unlimited disaster.

But perhaps you say that if the President and the Secretary of the Treasury are aware of this danger, what is there to worry about?

The President and the Secretary do not make the appropriations. Congress does that. A great many Senators and Representatives seem utterly ignorant of the peril, and have set out to wreck the President's budget. If they are successful, they will cause more inflation in the way that Secretary Anderson described. They may cause the inflationary spiral to spin so fast that no one will be able to stop it.

That is where the issue is today—in Congress.

That is where good Americans can and should use their influence.

If our readers agree that this is the most urgent problem of the times, we suggest that they write at once to their Senators and Representatives, urging them to stop foolish spending, to stay within the President's budget, and to make sure that there will be no deficit in the next fiscal year.

To aid those who wish to take part in this campaign, we are publishing on page 9 today a map of the area in which the World-Herald circulates. It shows the congressional districts, gives the names of the Representative of each, and gives also the names of each of the Senators.

This is not a partisan matter. No matter whether your representatives in Washington are Democrats or Republicans, no matter whether they have already taken a stand on this issue, we think it will be wholesome for them to learn directly from you how you feel about it.

If you agree, please send a postcard or letter or telegram to your Representative and your two Senators, expressing your views as plainly as you can, in your own words.

And for the good of your country, do it today.

Eleventh Anniversary of the State of Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 29, 1959

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

ELEVENTH ANNIVERSARY OF ISRAEL

We honor the courage and industrious people of Israel on the occasion of the 11th anniversary of their independence as a state. Many times in those years they have been compelled by circumstances to reassert their independence by word and deed. Surrounded by dictatorships, they have become the exemplars of freedom and democracy. They have progressively strengthened their democracy in the face of extraordinary natural and man-made obstacles. Hostile nature and hostile men have seemingly conspired—fortunately in vain—to defeat this young nation, and the consequence after 11 years has been a victory of the human spirit which may well be a source of inspiration for all mankind.

The United States can be proud of the fact that its help has been a major contributing factor in Israel's achievement and its ability to keep its doors open to the homeless and persecuted Jews in foreign lands. We can also be gratified that Israel has taken a leaf from our book of deeds, and now in turn has become an aid and guiding spirit for the new underdeveloped nations of Asia and Africa, teaching them the way to healthier, more complete lives without sacrifice of their rights and liberty. Israel's struggle to conquer the desert, make room for the homeless and bring peace to a tense, striferidden region must be waged for many more years. The Middle East is also one of the major arenas of the East-West conflict, and this factor must be reckoned with in any assessment of Israel's future. America must, therefore, continue its aid and support to the end that peace and well-being may be brought closer to achievement in this second decade of the State of Israel.

Rich Historic Heritage of Padre Island, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 13, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, in urging the establishment of a national park on Padre Island in Texas, I have pointed out the various factors which make this site so desirable.

The subjects of recreational facilities, wildlife preservation, and scenic beauty have been discussed at length. In addition, the island is rich in history. Here the Karankawa Indians, according to legend, committed racial suicide rather than submit to the rule of the white man. Here explorers blazed the paths which brought the settlers. Here soldiers fought in several wars. And a rich portion of the history of the island recalls the days of buccaneers and plunder on the high seas. Some of these colorful stories were recently collected by Ed Kilman for the Houston (Tex.) Post.

Mr. President, as an example of the color and history of Padre Island, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Ed Kilman which appeared in the Houston Post for Sunday, May 10, 1959, under the heading "Texas Heartbeat—Padre Island Boasts More Buried Gold Per Square Foot (Anyway More Treasure Tales) Than Any Other Place."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXAS HEARTBEAT—PADRE ISLAND BOASTS MORE BURIED GOLD PER SQUARE FOOT (ANYWAY MORE TREASURE TALES) THAN ANY OTHER PLACE

(By Ed Kilman)

Padre Island hasn't had such a publicity play since the Spanish crown gave the island to Padre Nicolas Balli in 1800 and he founded the Rancho Santa Cruz there, as it has received these last few years.

Next thing you know, the treasure hunters will be flocking over the island again, searching for Lafitte's chests of gold and other buried troves and—Hey, maybe they're already there.

There is more hidden treasure to the square foot on that 117-mile-long narrow sandbar with its smooth packed beach and shifting dunes, than in any other area of Texas. At least, more stories of hidden treasure; but a good deal of it has actually been found. Under the thin fictional disguise of a treasure-hunting character named Walt Conger, my friend Dee Woods of Corpus Christi beguilingly tells the true and the legendary tales of Padre Island treasure, in her book, "Blaze of Gold." It is virtually a history of the island.

First, there is Money Hill—one of the higher sand dunes, on Mustang Island, a continuation of Padre, separated by a shallow pass. Oldtimers call this Big Hill, to distinguish it from a Little Money Hill, down on Padre.

"At the foot of this dune silver coins have been found. There, a rotting chest of old money was dug up many years ago. Certain islanders will whisper the name of the person who found the chest."

For several miles up and down the gulf beach from Little Money Hill, coins have been washed up by the waves like shells upon the shore.

"I've seen as many as 100 kegs of coins loaded on a dray being driven from the bank to the wharf," said Mrs. Royal Givens of Corpus Christi. "There it was loaded on a ship. * * * Sometimes they didn't even bother to count the money, but weighed it—62½ pounds of silver coins were a thousand dollars."

In about 1860, N. B. Hamilton of Mustang Island recalled, a crew of men were unloading the cargo from a schooner washed up on the breakers of Padre Island opposite Murdock Landing. The men forgot their salvage operations when one of them noticed silver coins being washed up on the beach by the waves. They picked up more than $600.

Red John Dunn, an old Padre settler, told of an English sailor called Buttermilk Bill who picked up a couple of half-buried gold coins on Padre, in 1867 or 1869. He said nothing to a companion, but later got a garden rake from Corpus Christi and raked up some $4,000 in gold coins from the sand near the place where he had found the first ones.

Capt. Ed Cotter of Aransas found 30 Spanish silver coins stamped King Carlos and dated in the 1770s, near Money Hill dune. And a fisherman named Charlen Quantan found many coins there.

Capt. Andrew Anderson, who settled at Corpus Christi in 1852, once told Dee Woods of an old man named Sisal, who poured a shot bag of coins out on a table at Jim Dunn's place, for him to look at. Most of them were the size of American dollars and 50-cent pieces and were dated in the 1600's and 1700's. Some were marked five francs, some were Spanish.

"It is not strange that coins washed like shells up on the island beach, with the practice of carrying cash to pay for cargo, and the many shipwrecks of those days. Everything afloat in the gulf has a tendency to wash ashore on the beach of Padre and Mustang Islands."

The Singer family was wrecked on Padre Island in 1847, and took over and rebuilt the long-abandoned Balli rancho. John V. Singer of this family was a brother of the inventor of the Singer sewing machine. Philip Singer said nearly $80,000 was buried there by his father and grandfather when they fled from Padre during the Civil War. After Appomattox, John Singer returned to the island and dug up the money. Taking $2,000, enough to buy a small boat, he reburied the rest between two trees. In 1869 he came back for the buried money, jewelry, and other buried valuable. A hurricane had blown the two trees away and shifted the sand dunes around so that he could not find the treasure. In 1926, it was said, the wind uncovered Singer's box of ancient coins, and two Mexicans from Port Isabel supposedly found it. One of the Mexicans killed the other, and retired to Matamoros to enjoy his wealth.

Robert L. Mercer, of Aransas Pass, told of a muletrain load of pay for Spanish soldiers which was buried at False Live Oak Point to keep Indians from getting it. The Indians killed nearly all the men, and long afterward, "old man Dean of Rockport searched for the buried money. They say he found it. Anyway, he suddenly possessed money, and no one could account for his getting it otherwise."

There is a legend of 16 galleons of Cortes' treasure flota wrecked at the Devil's Elbow on Padre Island in the 16th century. In modern times, Alexander Meuly found documentary evidence of a wrecked treasure ship on Padre, presumably one of those Spanish galleons. He said he knew there was more than a million dollars in gold in the sunken ship, but he had to raise $25,000 for equipment to recover it. At last reports he had not raised the money.

In 1933 the wife of a highway engineer who was working on Padre Island scraped a shell-encrusted gold jewelry box out of the sand. It contained half a dozen gold rings, one set with a huge pearl, and numerous other articles of fine jewelry.

In 1875, the steamer Paisano left Brazos Santiago with $200,000 in canvas bags, being shipped from Mexico to Galveston. The ship disappeared and was never heard of again. It is thought that some of the coins found at Money Hill came from the wreckage of this vessel.

The spot where Jean Lafitte's shipwrecked pirate crew supposedly buried the chest (or three chests) of gold and jewels on Padre Island was said to be marked by a silver spike driven into the heart of a Spanish dagger tree. In 1880, Frank Rodriguez, boss of a Mexican loading crew, found a half-inch copper belt driven into the bole of a Spanish dagger, on the mainland about 40 miles down Laguna Madre. An ancient gold coin was found nearby. It was recalled that the rotting hull of an old ship lay half buried in the sand, some 15 miles down the lagoon—possibly one of Lafitte's rakish craft.

The Mexicans dug and dug all around the place, but found no treasure chest. Maybe the indefatigable Walt Conger, who was still hunting when Dee Woods' book was published several years ago, will find it yet. If so, maybe he can then afford to buy the island and give it to the government for a park.

TVA Extension

SPEECH
OF
HON. FRANK W. BURKE
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 7, 1959

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, it seems pertinent to comment upon the definition of area of operations of the Tennessee Valley Authority as contemplated under the provisions of that act.

During the consideration of this legislation by the Committee on Public Works considerable testimony was heard concerning exchange power arrangements between the Tennessee Valley Authority and other utility systems. Under the bill, as passed by the House, economically feasible exchange power arrangements are preserved, and obviously, under the language of the bill, it is not only specific existing exchange contracts which are preserved, but the right to contract in the future for exchange of power is preserved in the Tennessee Valley Authority with respect to any other utility systems with which the corporation had any exchange power agreement on July 1, 1957.

It is a fact of the utility business that exchange power arrangements have been and are mutually beneficial to the Tennessee Valley Authority and its neighboring utility systems, both public and private. It should be very clear that within the geographical area of service of the Tennessee Valley Authority and at its boundaries, the right and the power to execute exchange power arrangements with other utility systems is preserved.

Wellsprings of the Nation's Soul

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 13, 1959

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, Edward J. Meeman, editor of the Memphis Press-Scimitar, is widely known for his personal and professional devotion to the causes of justice and freedom wherever they are at issue. Mr. Meeman has written and published in a recent issue of his newspaper some remarks which clearly demonstrate the broad scope of these topics and his understanding of them.

Next month, citizens from our Nation and from the free nations of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization will meet in London at the Atlantic Congress. They will talk and work for these very things that Mr. Meeman writes about.

I think, therefore, that it is most fitting to place Mr. Meeman's article in the Appendix of the RECORD and ask unanimous consent that this be done.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AT WILLIAMSBURG, ONE OF THE WELLSPRINGS OF OUR NATION'S SOUL

(By Edward J. Meeman)

WILLIAMSBURG, VA.—At least once a year the editors of the various Scripps-Howard newspapers get together to discuss international, national, and their own affairs and decide broad lines of policy.

We find that a quiet place, away from the distractions of a metropolis, is best for this purpose. Williamsburg, which John D. Rockefeller, Jr., giving his personal interest and his millions, has restored to the appearance which it had when it was the colonial capital of Virginia, proved to be an ideal place for such a meeting. It is quiet—sometimes the only sound you hear is the song of the mockingbird or the robin from his perch in the dogwood tree outside the 18th century windows.

And here you find the spirit of the great days when our Republic was being created. Because men dared to form a great Union, our editors could come from San Francisco and New York, from Birmingham and Cleveland, from Houston and Cincinnati, Memphis and Pittsburgh and find a common interest in the welfare of a "nation one and indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

* * * * *

SPIRIT OF OLD DAYS

We were prepared for such consideration of the problems of the present day by imbibing the spirit which had animated the men who made history in the old town where we met. "The future may learn from the past" is the motto on the flag of Colonial Williamsburg. We had seen, as every visitor to this restored community may see, the thrilling motion picture made by Paramount of those bold days of 1775 when Thomas Jefferson and Patrick Henry dared to think of a union of the 13 colonies. "What do we of Virginia have in common with the men of Massachusetts?" the doubters asked. "Homes, children, the love of freedom," was the answer.

I thought of the men of Holland, Belgium, France, West Germany, England, with whom I will sit in the Atlantic Congress in London in June. What do we have in common with them? "Homes, children, the love of freedom." The Communist tyrant who would oppress us makes Lord North look like a kindly uncle. We had better hang together or we will hang separately.

Tribute to Gov. Mark Hatfield, of Orgeon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 13, 1959

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I have just read an article entitled "Oregon's Golden Boy" in the May 9, 1959, issue of the Saturday Evening Post. This is the story of how Mark Odom Hatfield became Governor of Oregon last fall at the age of 36, surmounting many adversities. This article should be an inspiration to all young people. In my own State of Massachusetts the youth just out of our high schools and colleges are among the hardest working and most loyal of our political workers. They are motivated only by the highest ideals and they work to increase the effectiveness of their party in serving the public good.

I am pleased also that Governor Hatfield has agreed to come to Massachusetts to speak at a dinner on June 4. Based on what I have read about him in this article, I know that his visit to our Commonwealth will be a great inspiration.

I join the Saturday Evening Post in saluting Mark Hatfield.

And so that this story may be more widely read by others who want to encourage the participation of young people in politics, I ask unanimous consent

that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OREGON'S GOLDEN BOY

(By Milton MacKaye)

No one could have had a bigger or more fruitful year than handsome Mark Odom Hatfield, the new political golden boy of the Pacific Northwest. First of all, after a stubborn and almost habit-forming bachelorhood, he became engaged to a beautiful girl. Then, in a matter of months, he won a contested Republican primary, married the girl, was elected Governor of Oregon at the age of 36, and figuratively won the Irish Sweepstakes when he was able to make a postelection announcement that his wife, Antoinette, was expecting a baby in June.

This breathless pace was new even to Hatfield, who has never been laggard to seize opportunity in a firm and adhesive grasp. Romance, of course, is not answerable to the laws of logic, but politics is something else again. Long ago the clear-minded Hatfield charted his course in public life, a careful step-by-step advancement. Subsequently, events ran away with the blueprint. It was with some understandable surprise, then, that he finds himself today not only a happy family man but also potentially a national political figure.

From the horrific massacre of the Republican Party in the country last fall two attractive and magnetic personalities emerged with their scalplocks intact. Both achieved personal triumphs. Nelson A. Rockefeller defeated Averell Harriman in New York and put the Empire State back in the Republican column. Across the continent, in Oregon, Mark Hatfield won the statehouse in the face of a Democratic sweep, and became the second youngest of our new crop of Governors. J. Howard Edmondson, of Oklahoma, is, at 33, the youngest.

Statistics provide the most eloquent measurement of Hatfield's victory. Once a Republican stronghold, Oregon has become increasingly in recent years a Democratic playing field. Both U.S. Senators are Democrats, as are three of four Members of the lower House of Congress. As a portent of things to come, registration in 1958 showed Democrats leading Republicans in voter enrollment by 56,000. The portent was accurate enough: In the election itself Democratic candidates, for the first time in many years, captured control of both houses of the legislature. Yet, swimming upstream, Mark Hatfield won by 65,000 over the incumbent and likable Democratic Governor, Robert D. Holmes.

What occurred? It is interesting to examine similarities in the campaign techniques of Rockefeller and Hatfield, who lucubrating independently, with no personal acquaintanceship, arrived at the same fundamental conclusion: To win, they must ignore party lines and ancient loyalties and appeal to all voters who could be coaxed under the wide and billowing good-government tent.

Both Rockefeller and Hatfield were charter members of the group in the Republican Party which, 7 years ago, managed the defeat of Robert A. Taft, after his years of striving, and the victory of novice Dwight D. Eisenhower. Both were admirers of Wendell Willkie, who won a Presidential nomination against the will of the party bosses and as a result of a revolt of the rank and file in a national convention. They will be thinking about Willkie a lot in the months to come; both have said their earlier conservative political attitudes were modified by Willkie's doctrines.

In Hatfield's case this seems reasonable enough. Although born in the small town of Dallas, Oreg., he was a feudin', fightin' Republican by inheritance; his mother came from the hills of eastern Tennessee where, because of Civil War bitternesses, a Bible-reading population tended to look a little more kindly on Pontius Pilate than a professing Democrat. Mark was first politically active in the Presidential campaign of 1932, when he carried Hoover literature from one place to another on his coaster wagon. Since Mark was then 10, his enthusiasm may have been more representative of his mother's political zeal than his own. But the party branding happened early and burned deep. His admiration for Herbert Hoover increased rather than lessened in the process of growing up—and his subsequent work as a graduate student at Stanford University was importantly influenced by the Hoover legend and the Hoover career.

Rockefeller and Hatfield, sharply contrasted as are their bank accounts and early environments, were both brought up in homes where there was strict parental supervision—and an inculcated code of personal obligation to the family and social obligation to others. People who knew the Governors in childhood have come up with independent recollections which indicate there was a time when both could have been considered by approving elders as—in a phrase from the forgotten Rollo books—"serious little men." That's about as far as the comparison goes. Nelson Rockefeller's grandfather was probably the richest man in the world, and Mark Hatfield's grandfather was a blacksmith. So was his father.

Charles Dolen Hatfield retired a couple of years ago after 35 years with the Southern Pacific Railroad. He came to Oregon from Indiana with his father, who was an accomplished wagonwright as well as blacksmith. Many early pioneers were indifferent to family background: C.D. simply doesn't know whether still-earlier Hatfields participated in a celebrated West Virginia feud. He does know that when his son wins an election someone is certain to remark, "Oregon hasn't got enough McCoys." Today, at 71, the elder Hatfield is a man of physical well-being who can touch his fingers to the floor without bending his knees, a devout football fan—"Mark as a boy just wasn't interested"—who dreams up his own pass patterns and plays. He is also a man of tenderness and kindness and gentle speech. During his active life, his work hours were spent with section hands, gandy dancers and back-country loggers, but he taught Sunday school classes throughout those years and is still a Sunday school song leader.

Times were hard when Mark was a little boy. Families coalesced—the considerable number of Odoms and the fewer Hatfields—and made a communal living as best they could. In Oregon it was an era of layoffs and intermittent employment; the Governor's mother recalls a period when only two adults in the family tribal confederacy were working regularly and keeping rations in circulation. When Mark was 5, his mother went off to Oregon State College at Corvallis, and the boy and his father lived with Grandmother Odom. When she was graduated 4 years later—her husband put her through college—Mrs. Hatfield taught 2 years in Dallas and then moved the family to Salem, Oregon's capital, where she taught for 13 years in a junior high school. Not long ago I interviewed the elder Hatfields at their pleasant but modest home on Waldo Avenue, where the Governor continued to live until he married.

I drove there without warning on a Saturday afternoon and found both in work clothes, transplanting garden flowers. Blacksmith Hatfield had his hand-lettered sign on the front lawn: Saws Filed and Sharpened Here. Mrs. Hatfield quit teaching some time ago to go to work for the State income tax department. "In my civil-service job," she told me, "I am not supposed to talk politics, but when somebody criticizes Mark, I get just as mad as I did in Tennessee when a Democrat came up to our house to argue with my father."

That evening I came back for a dress conversation. Mrs. Hatfield's given name is Dovie. When I asked her about it, the Governor's mother laughed. "When my mother was a girl of 17, she attended a traveling show where there was a blond midget of doll-like appearance who utterly charmed her. The midget's stage name was Dovie. My mother promised herself that if she married and had a daughter, she would name her Dovie. And she named by sister Birdie." In the Waldo Avenue house I saw the piano Mark once played—he also tootled the clarinet in the Salem High School band—saw the vials of sand he filled from the beaches of Iwo Jima and Okinawa, examined the typical memorabilia preserved by parents of an idolized only child. When I left, carrying a piece of Mrs. Hatfield's gingerbread, I was convinced that—after those first depression years—the Governor had had a protected, strongly guided, somewhat lonely childhood. It is often driving parental ambition, rather than a spontaneous sense of destiny, that pushes smart but obedient boys into careers.

Today's Democrats in Oregon still wonder just what happened to them in the last campaign. Some of them speak harshly of Hatfield, but few refer to him—as did a Republican lumberman from Sweet Home—as "that damned Boy Scout." Instead they regard him as the most persistent, the most untiring, the most effective campaigner they have encountered. Harry J. Hogan, attorney from The Dalles and Democratic State campaign manager, put the following on record in a postelection letter:

"We Democrats won in 1954 with DICK NEUBERGER. We won in 1956 with WAYNE MORSE. We were stopped dead in our tracks by President Eisenhower in 1956 and again in 1958 by Mark Hatfied. These elections demonstrate our ability in slam-bang campaigns to defeat classically reactionary Republican candidates. We have not, however, successfully solved the problem of changing our pace so as to defeat Republican candidates who are personally attractive and who, superficially at least, me-too programs. We have 4 years before we get a chance at Hatfield again. Meanwhile, we must learn to counter the peculiar fighting style at which he has proved himself adept."

For a future public official, Salem was a built-in training ground. The population today is about 50,000, but in Hatfield's boyhood it was considerably smaller. It is 50-odd miles south of industrial Portland in the lush, sweet Willamette Valley, and the State government has always been its principal industry—with Willamette University, a Methodist-connected institution of about 1,000 students, in second place. Oregon dedicated a fine new capitol in 1938, and Mark learned his way around at once. He helped work his way through school serving as a guide there weekends and summers and doing other odd jobs in rush times for the late Earl Snell, then secretary of state. Mark and his Young Republicans later put a lot of grateful energy into Snell's successful race for Governor.

Oregon politics in those earlier days had seasonal limits—like deer hunting and trout fishing. Hatfield got his first conception of politics as a full-time operation when, as a member of the school band, he took part in the dedication of a new Salem post office. On hand to give the principal address was Postmaster General James A. Farley. After his speech—in a driving rain—the redoubtable Jim shook every available damp hand in the audience and then personally thanked the members of the band. But that was not all. After Farley returned to Washington,

each of them received a graceful, personal letter of appreciation.

A 15-year-old Republican clarinetist got a big thrill from this surprising courtesy from a man of national importance, and he treasured the letter. That, Hatfield decided, was the way the real professionals did their jobs. Mark had his first personal triumph when he was elected student-body president in junior high school; he defeated Shirley McKay, daughter of Douglas McKay, then mayor of Salem, eventually Governor, and Secretary of the Interior in Eisenhower's first term. He had his first—and last—ballotbox defeat when he ran for student-body president at Willamette University. He majored in political science there, excelled in debate, racked up good grades. He completed his course in 3 years and was called to the Navy in 1943.

Hatfield went at once to Plattsburgh, N.Y., for amphibious-attack training and later embarked for the Pacific on the U.S.S. *Whiteside*, an attack cargo ship. The Governor now speaks of his military interlude as a process of growing up—both physically and menbarked for the Pacific on the U.S.S. *Whiteside*, he was 6 feet tall, weighed a skinny 128 pounds—he now weighs 165—and there were no work pants to fit him. So much taking-in was necessary, he remembers, that his two hip pockets ended up side by side. In addition to his duties as landing-craft officer, his skipper assigned him the chaplain's job. He led Sunday services, presided over burials at sea, and, when in port, often acted as defense counsel at courts-martial.

At grim Iwo Jima and bloody Okinawa, Hatsfield commanded 10 landing craft which ferried troops ashore and brought back the wounded. At Iwo Jima he made 14 trips from the offshore fleet to the beaches and was in action for 5 days and 4 nights, saw the flag go up on Mount Suribachi. Casualties were tragically heavy at Iwo Jima and Okinawa, but he went unscathed through both campaigns.

After the Japanese surrender the U.S.S. *Whiteside* took part in naval-transport maneuver which has never had much publicity—the removal of Chiang Kai-shek's troops from Indochina to Chinwangtao in northern China. The world was supposedly at peace, but American landing craft again hit the beaches under fire—from the Chinese Communists who were ultimately to drive Chiang to Formosa. On liberty time Hatfield was able to see Tientsin, adventure up the Whangpoo and visit Peking.

"Let's face it," the Governor said not long ago. "I went into the Navy a small-town boy and a convinced isolationist. That was before I saw the want and waste in the world, before I saw men and women in Asian streets literally dying of hunger. I know I could never be an isolationist again, and it was a painful awakening."

Mark had been at sea for 18 months when he returned to this country. He received a rugged Navy assignment—duty with the shore patrol in San Francisco. There were often 50,000 to 75,000 sailors in town in those days, and they gave Mark and his associates plenty of rough and tumble.

Hatfield left the Navy as a lieutenant junior grade and entered law school at Willamette. He resumed his Young Republican activities, crossed the street from the campus often to talk politics with Governor Snell at the capitol, but found himself impatient with the disciplines of legal education. What he wanted to do, he decided, was to teach political science as a preface to public service. At the end of the school year in 1947 he abandoned the law and enrolled as a graduate student at Stanford.

Hatfield's 2 years at Stanford were broadening. He studied public administration, political theory, the history of political parties, government organization and international relations. He chose as the subject of his master's thesis the labor policies of Herbert Hoover, and the completed job brought encomiums from the former President. As a write-in candidate Mark was elected to represent the 2,000 graduate students on the university council and, to help pay his way, he took a job as counselor to Stanford's freshmen.

The day after the national election in 1948, boisterous freshmen festooned Mark's room in Encima Hall with crepe. Like many other Republicans, Hatfield had believed that Tom Dewey would win in a walk, and he had been articulate about it. Mark grinned, but he took the defeat hard. He believed that his party, as a result of overconfidence, had kicked away the chances of victory. He made certain rules for his own political future: (1) Never take an election for granted. (2) Present your case to the people instead of the politicians. (3) Remember that no audience that will listen is too small.

It was at about this time that another political neophyte began to help him plan his future. Travis Cross was a Stanford undergraduate, a newspaperman of some experience and a native of Salem. There in Encima Hall the two young men—Hatfield was 26 and Cross 23—formed a career partnership, which has never been dissolved. And there, boldly and confidently, they charted the steps by which Mark was to progress from modest beginnings to the Oregon Statehouse. Cross is now Governor Hatfield's press secretary.

Another good friend was consulted when Hatfield decided to postpone further graduate study. Dr. G. Herbert Smith, president of Willamette, promptly stretched his budget to appoint Mark to a $2,700-a-year instructorship in the university's political-science department. Mark began his classroom work in the fall of 1949 and soon started a radio discussion series, "The Political Pulse." When some of his radio auditors suggested he put his ideas into practice, Hatfield announced himself as a candidate for the legislature. His actual filing for office had a touch of unpremeditated Joe College comedy about it.

When Hatfield walked across State Street, he found himself accompanied by a ragged German band from the Phi Delta Theta fraternity house which sounded off with what was meant to be The Battle Hymn of the Republic. Hatfield knew this was a good-natured rib on a faculty member—and a Beta Theta Pi—whose Republican ambitions were no secret. He was at first embarrassed and then pleased. Later the band accompanied him on his tours around the county and really fetched the customers.

There was nothing of Joe College then, or later, about his campaigning. He hit every dusty road and dusty hamlet; he sought advice from weekly newspaper editors and from laboring men; he was unwearying. In the Republican primary there were 12 candidates for 4 legislative posts; Hatfield topped the ticket in the primary and in the general election. Things have gone on that way ever since. Hatfield served two terms in the lower house of the legislature and one in the State senate. These, of course, were part-time jobs; he continued his work at Willamette, where he became, at the tender age of 28, dean of students. His role as the professor in politics was a dramatic one, and he was frequently offered speaking engagements. He took them all.

It was in February of 1951 that Hatfield, in two addresses, urged Americans to draft Dwight Eisenhower for the Presidency. He did more than that. In July of the same year he began circulating petitions to place Eisenhower's name on Oregon's presidential preference ballot, thus becoming the first Republican to make a serious effort to enter Ike in a primary. The next year he served as executive secretary of Oregon Citizens for Eisenhower, was a delegate to the Republican National Convention—where he celebrated his 30th birthday—and a member of the platform committee. Eisenhower carried Oregon handsomely, but it is interesting that Hatfield, running for reelection to the legislature, got more votes in his own Marion County than Eisenhower did.

Yet many of the old pros in Hatfield's party unaccountably continued to regard him as a well-dressed, well-spoken, pipe-smoking—he doesn't smoke any more—amateur. During legislative sessions he was not invited to the hotel-room meetings where strategy was hammered out. He was not a backslapper, and, because of college duties, he had no time after sessions to stand around swapping bucolic stories. What the party wheelhorses did not realize was that Hatfield, beginning with the circulation of the Eisenhower petitions, was attracting to himself a group of dedicated, selfless followers who believed implicitly in his future.

The Governor told me recently that in 1954 he went through a period of self-examination and self-doubt. As a dean of students he was called upon to resolve the problems of the young when he had not resolved his own. One problem was religion. Mark had grown up in a devout household; he now wondered whether he really attended church out of conviction—or because he had been reared that way. Conforming, he decided, was not enough. For him at least, religion could not be a part-time thing; there had to be total commitment. Hatfield said that his thinking was influenced, to a degree, by leaders of the interdenominational movement who came to the Willamette campus to address student groups. It seemed to him, as it seemed to them, that a great deal of heart and spirituality had been lost to formalism in Americans' religious life.

Mark continued his active interest in Salem's First Baptist Church—he served as moderator for three terms—but he also affiliated with such groups as Youth for Christ, Campus Crusade, World Vision; he became a member of the board of the Western Baptist Theological Seminary, which is located in Portland. In one year alone he spoke before 17 different religious denominations, either as a lay preacher in the pulpit or before conventions. One convention was the national meeting of the fundamentalist Assemblies of God, in Cleveland. On another occasion he and R. G. Le Tourneau, Texas industrialist, conducted the interdenominational Easter sunrise services in Pasadena's Rose Bowl.

Politically speaking, the partnership of Hatfield and Travis Cross hit the big time in 1956 when Mark first sought statewide office. Hatfield believed that 4 years or more as secretary of state would give him administrative experience and a practical understanding of the problems of State government. He won in the primary easily, resigned from Willamette's faculty and then defeated Monroe Sweetland, former Democratic national committeeman, in the general election. Here was the crazy-quilt pattern: Oregon voters chose Eisenhower for President, Democrats WAYNE MORSE and Bob Holmes for U. S. Senator and Governor. It was plain the once-dominant Republicans were in trouble. Hatfield received this telegram from Herbert Hoover:

"Being an itinerant citizen of Oregon [the former President lived in Salem as a boy], I read the election returns with complete dismay until I arrived at your election. You are the only future hope for us."

There is ample evidence that Hatfield had no intention of running for Governor in 1958; he felt that more administrative experience would be useful and that he was young enough to wait. Sig Unander, himself only 44, had been reelected as State treasurer and was considered by many leaders to be the logical candidate. But now evidence of Hatfield's popularity began rolling in; a nonpartisan poll of voters showed him an

overwhelming favorite. So did a poll of the Republican members of the legislature. There was still another factor which led him to take a new reckoning on his political timetable.

One of the State's most experienced political strategists came privately to see Mark. He said his own inquiries had persuaded him Unander could not beat Governor Holmes and that only Hatfield could prevent a Democratic sweep which might keep Oregon Republicans out of power for years to come. Hatfield filed in the primary and received more votes than Unander and Warren Gill, another candidate, combined. Then he went on to wrestle down the Governor.

Campaigners for Holmes knew they were in difficulties almost at once. Mark's acquaintanceship around the State had become prodigious; in his first year as secretary of state he not only ran a busy office but also made 118 full-length addresses, appeared at head tables at luncheons and dinners 252 times, declined 400 speaking engagements. He had become an adept, incisive campaigner and a master of the electric smile and the quick handshake. His impeccable dress and good looks charmed the women. A complaint frequently heard at labor temples was, "Holmes gets my vote, but I can't keep my old lady in line." His appeal to independents, new voters, and nonpoliticals was too evident to be denied.

Actually, Hatfield and Holmes were not far apart on most issues. Hatfield had made very clear his divorcement from the conservative wing of his party. His voting record in the legislature had been liberal; he had voted against an antipicketing law, he opposed all right to work legislation, he had sponsored—without success—a bill providing for State-constitution revision. From most of his political literature, it was impossible to determine whether he was running as a Republican, a Democrat or a Greenbacker. Democrats charged that his metooism was strictly opportunistic; unhappy conservative Republicans came up with ample campaign contributions because, in the wistful words of one, "He's all we've got."

Just before the election race began, Mark married 29-year-old Antoinette Kuzmanich, counselor for women at Portland State College. It was a dramatic storybook match: The son of a blacksmith married the daughter of an immigrant—Antoinette was—and is—a dark-haired beauty with dark, alive, oriental eyes. Her family, like Mark's had known early adversity. Her father, Vincent, came to this country from what is now Yugoslavia. He worked as a deepsea fisherman, as a Portland longshoreman, then operated family-type taverns until he had a competence.

Hatfield and his wife met 6 years ago at a Willamette military ball. A graduate of the University of Oregon, she was teaching English and counseling at Parrish Junior High in Salem. The two had mutual friends and saw each other frequently. During summer vacation in 1954, Dean Hatfield, under the auspices of the Student International Travel Association, led 15 college and graduate students on a 2-month political-science tour of Europe. Antoinette was one of the paying customers as was, she particularly remembers, a pretty psychotherapist from New York. Mark beaued the two ladies on alternate Saturday nights and played fair by taking them together on a moonlight gondola ride in Venice.

When Antoinette took her master's degree in education at Stanford, they did not see each other for 2 years, but occasionally corresponded. Courtship began in earnest after that. They were married in Portland's Hinson Memorial Baptist Church—Mark's best man, 18 years his senior, was President Smith of Willamette—on a warm July evening. There was an overflow crowd and a good many gate crashers; some of the interest was undoubtedly occasioned by the knowledge that Antoinette, before her betrothal a Roman Catholic, had left her church.

Religious issues had no discernible effect on the results of the election, but it would be untrue to say that Hatfield's churchly activities were popular with his opponents. A tiny tempest was created when Governor Holmes, who attends the Episcopal Church, but is not a member, remarked before a Presbyterian men's club that he believed that religious beliefs should not be used to further personal ambition. The Governor mentioned no names, but a press release from his headquarters gave the impression his remarks had been directed at Hatfield. Holmes disavowed the release. Editors seeking Hatfield for comment were amused to discover him eventually in Des Moines, Iowa, where he was in the process of making a speech to the International Sunday School Convention.

However tepid its begininngs, the campaign had its final burst of melodrama. Senator WAYNE MORSE was responsible. A onetime Republican, a brilliant former dean of the University of Oregon Law School, always a powerful vote getter, the current MORSE is an enigma to friends and former friends. He quarreled bitterly with NEUBERGER, his colleague in the Senate, and his intemperate correspondence was made public. Five days before election MORSE exhumed from old headlines and court files a tragedy in which Hatfield had been a participant.

It was a story most Oregon politicians knew, and it was a sad one. When Mark was 17, he was driving the family car near Salem at dusk. He had just attended band practice and was on his way to pick up his parents at a church picnic. A little girl darted across a country road, Mark's car struck her, and she died in the hospital. There were no criminal charges, but the girl's family brought civil suit for $5,000 against the Hatfields' insurance company. Mark testified that the child was concealed by a mailbox and high clumps of grass at the roadside, and that he did not see her until the moment of impact. The trial court awarded damages, and the award was approved by the Oregon Supreme Court. MORSE's viewpoint was that the trial court had refused to accept Hatfield's story. "A man who lies to a jury," he said in a speech at Klamath Falls, "cannot be trusted with public office."

One of the first to answer MORSE was former Chief Justice J. O. Bailey, who had listened to the appeal. Conflicting testimony, he said, was a commonplace in trials of automobile-accident cases, and there was no question of perjury or "lying to a jury"; in split-second glimpses at an accident site, witnesses honestly saw things in different ways. Hatfield had foreseen that the agony of his boyhood might sometime be revived. With only a few changes to bring it up to date, he issued a statement which he had long before prepared:

"The entire case is a matter of public record, and the Supreme Court Reports in every law library in the State have the final chapter of the tragedy. To have brought it up at this particular time will bring on a recurrence of great grief to all who were involved in the horrible accident of 18 years ago. Those who conspire to profit thereby have my compassion."

Senator MORSE's attack backfired. The reaction of former Gov. Charles Sprague, onetime alternate to the United Nations, distinguished editor of the Oregon Statesman in Salem, was typical of the reactions of many. Sprague, though a Republican, thought Holmes had been a pretty good governor and that Hatfield was inexperienced; he had announced that the Statesman would watch the election from the bleachers. After the MORSE blast, the Statesman endorsed Hatfield. Wrote Sprague, "We are out of the bleachers now."

Governor Hatfield has taken office in Oregon's 100th birthday year; a centennial exposition and trade fair will open in Portland in June. Obviously he has cares and crises ahead of him, but he is convinced that, even working with a possibly hostile legislature, a worth while governmental program can be effected.

Oregon's problems are many, and taxation is not the least of them. The State has the highest income-tax rate in the Nation, and yet every recent legislature has balked at enacting a sales tax. The State urgently needs more revenue, but at present does not know where to turn to get it. The State constitution by general agreement is obsolete and ambiguous; in his inaugural address Hatfield again urged a constitutional convention. Public power versus private power has been a subject for bitter wrangling in the Pacific Northwest for years; the Governor hopes that moderates will be able to work out compromises.

From a national standpoint the Governor is an interesting figure. As a politician his shrewdness and energy are difficult to overestimate. He is also bold. Even before he took office he did not hesitate, at a meeting of western Republicans in Hawaii, to criticize the way his own party had conducted last fall's campaigns; he included the White House in his criticism. He is not unaware that Nelson Rockefeller and RICHARD NIXON may be pitted against each other for the presidential nomination in 1960—and that the Governor of New York and the Governor of Oregon might make appealing running mates. His friend, Evangelist Billy Graham, said some months ago, "I predict that if Mark Hatfield stays humble before the Lord, he will hold positions of national responsibility."

But when I breakfasted with Mark and Antoinette recently, the Hatfields were thinking about the more immediate future. They have purchased a square, yellow 87-year-old house on a large open area in Salem known with nostalgia as Bush's Pasture, and they intend to remodel; until that job is done, they will continue to live in a pleasant, small apartment near the capitol. Antoinette was looking forward, over the scrambled eggs, to an event of singular importance to her. "When June 10th comes around," she said, "I'm wondering whether Mark will be cutting the ribbon at the centennial exposition or holding my hand in the hospital labor room."

The Polish Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 13, 1959

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution adopted by the eastern Massachusetts division of the Polish American Congress which recently held a meeting in the historic Faneuil Hall on May 3.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CASE FOR POLAND

The Polish American Congress of Eastern Massachusetts held a patriotic meeting in historic Faneuil Hall in Boston, Mass., commemorating the adoption of the 3d of May Constitution of Poland. This bill of rights, proclaimed in 1791, was the first democratic

constitution to be adopted by any European nation. A glowing tribute was paid to the authors of that constitution and to Poland. Realizing the present tragic national and political situation of Poland, the assemblage unanimously voted that:

"Whereas the United States of America and the Western Powers agreed to come to the defense of Free Poland in 1939; and

"Whereas at no time was there a question that this aid was only against Germany; and

"Whereas this did not exclude the defending of Poland against Russia; and

"Whereas Stalin's cunning and treacherous maneuvering had confused the West so as to have the Western Powers thrust aside into oblivion the cause of Free Poland; and

"Whereas Poland was betrayed by her Allies, who consented to cede to Russia half of Poland's territory and place the rest of that country under the occupation and domination of the Soviets; and

"Whereas Poland lost more than 6 million people on the battlefields, in gas chambers and forced labor camps and in the prisons in Germany and Russian Siberia—

"We therefore call upon the United States of North America and the Western Powers to liberate Poland from foreign domination as solemnly promised in 1939; and

"We further ask that our country and the Western Powers recognize the present boundary line between Poland and Germany as permanent, and the Oder-Neisse border as inviolate; and

"We also demand the return of the territories taken by the Soviets in 1939 and which were ceded by the Yalta agreements.

"We finally plead that inasmuch as the Western Powers are responsible for the presence of the Russian troops in Poland, that they request that the Soviet troops be withdrawn from Poland immediately."

Democratic Poland has faith in America. Poland places her hope in the leadership and statesmanship of the United States of America.

JOHN J. TWAROG,
President, P.A.C.;
City Councilor, Salem, Mass.
Rt. Rev. LADISLAUS A. SIKORA, P.A.,
Honorary President, P.A.C.
JOHN SIDERSKI, *Secretary, P.A.C.*

Tribute to J. C. Dykes, a Texan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 13, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, Mr. J. C. Dykes, a native of Dallas County, is largely responsible for the development of the 5-year-old small watershed program.

This former Texas A. & M. professor, in his post as Assistant Administrator of the Soil Conservation Service of the Department of Agriculture, is in charge of the vital program to fill the gap between the flood control programs on the major waterways and the soil conservation projects on farms and in forests.

Mr. President, a description of Mr. Dykes' public service was carried in a recent "Texans in Washington" column by Tex Easley of the Associated Press, one of the very able correspondents in Washington. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD his column printed in the Hereford (Tex.) Brand on May 7, 1959, under the heading "A. & M. Professor Responsible for Watershed Program."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXANS IN WASHINGTON—A. & M. PROFESSOR RESPONSIBLE FOR WATERSHED PROGRAM

(By Tex Easley)

WASHINGTON.—A onetime Texas A. & M. professor, now Assistant Administrator of the Soil Conservation Service in the Agriculture Department, is largely responsible for the development of the 5-year-old small watershed program.

He is J. C. Dykes, 58, Dallas County native and a teacher of vocational agriculture in Stephenville and McAllen High Schools before joining the Aggie faculty in 1929.

As a boy Dykes watched torrents roll the topsoil down the tributaries of the Trinity and thought something ought to be done. He studied the problem at A. & M. Since 1935 he has been with the Soil Conservation Service. Fort Worth was his headquarters before he came to Washington in 1942.

The small watershed program itself is set up under a legislative act sponsored by Representative W. R. (BOB) POAGE of Waco as vice chairman of the House Agriculture Committee.

Testifying recently before the House Public Works Commitee, SCS Administrator D. A. Williams said:

"We believe the watershed program is soundly conceived and that it will continue to be an integral part of the Nation's program of conservation, development and efficient use of the land and water resources."

He pointed out it is designed to fill a gap betwen the flood control programs on the major rivers—where the big dams are built, and the programs on farms and forests where contour plowing, terracing and check dams retard the runoff.

Projects under the act are initiated by the people in the area concerned. They are financed about 45 percent by the Federal Government. Local interests pay the remainder of the costs.

Last year Congress appropriated $25½ million for the upstream watershed program. The House Appropriations Committee is working on the Department appropriation bill for the fiscal year starting July 1, and POAGE estimates the Budget Bureau recommendations at about 22 percent under last year's figures.

"This is an example of cuts which I consider unwise," said the Congressman. "I think we need these upstream projects, and we need them now. I am sure that we are ultimately going to build them. They will cost no less a generation hence."

As of April 1 almost 1,300 organizations in 47 States and Puerto Rico had applied for assistance under the act, and formal agreements had been signed by the SCS to aid in preparation of plans in 425 watersheds. The actual planning had been completed for 154 watershed projects and authorized for development in conjunction with the sponsoring agencies.

The SCS uses experience gained in various test watershed programs in recent years in drafting plans under the new act.

Pointing to results from watershed treatment, it notes 1957 floods in Texas and says that on Green Creek in Erath County two storms in April and May flooded 489 acres and caused $6,000 damage. Rush Creek, 25 miles away, had 12,000 acres flooded by the same storms with $493,000 damage. The dams and other structures built on the Green watershed were credited with prevention of destruction in that area. The Rush Creek watershed lies in Comanche, Eastland, and Brown counties.

Moisture penetration studies made in Texas on watershed lands by the Service in April and May of 1957 showed the average insoak was twice as great on protected land as on unprotected.

Texas upstream watershed projects so far approved—already cleared by the congressional committee as required under the act, include: Alamo Arroyo, 83,603-acre watershed, Hudspeth County; Auds Creek, 31,670 acres, Lamar County; Cummins Creek, 204,896 acres in Lee, Fayette, Austin, and Colorado Counties; Diablo Arroyo, 40,992 acres, Hudspeth County; Chiltipin-San Fernando Creek, and San Dieto-Rosita Creeks, covering nearly a half million acres in Duval, Jim Wells, Nueces, and Kleberg Counties.

Dry Devils River and Lowrey Draw, 149,120 acres in Schleicher and Sutton Counties; Johnsons Draw, 101,760 acres in Crockett County; Knob Creek, 23,870 acres in Bell County; Langford Creek, 25,030 acres in Red River County; Lower Brushy Creek, 138,240 acres in Williamson and Milam Counties; Sulphur Creek, 85,120 acres in Burnett and Lampasas Counties; Turkey Creek, 18,880 acres in Fort Bend County; Upper Brushy Creek, 191,360 acres in Williamson and Milam Counties; Upper Lake Fork Creek, 45,472 acres in Hopkins, Rains, and Hunt Counties; York Creek, 93,824 acres in Guadulupe, Coman, and Hays Counties.

A Moral Equivalent for War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LISTER HILL
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 13, 1959

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, Mr. James Free, the Washington correspondent for the Birmingham, Ala., News, has written an article for his newspaper entitled "A Moral Equivalent for War." This article not only represents sound and thoughtful journalism but is an especially timely and able comment upon the impasse that now exists between the free world and Soviet Russia.

I ask unanimous consent that this excellent article and splendid editorial comment made upon it by the Methodist Christian Advocate be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Birmingham (Ala.) News, Apr. 19. 1959]

A MORAL EQUIVALENT FOR WAR

(By James Free)

WASHINGTON.—Two events the last week give a clue to at least a partial solution for the free world impasse with Russia. And the Western foreign ministers, meeting in Paris this month, surely need to find some common-front proposals to make to the Soviet leaders at the summit conference that is likely to follow.

The events in mind here were the resignation of Secretary of State John Foster Dulles and the dedication on Capitol Hill of the memorial bell tower to the late Senator Robert A. Taft.

In the first instance, the spreading cancer that felled the oxlike Dulles had advertised once again to the world that science is yet to conquer this dread disease. And the United States in particular got another poignant and permanent reminder of the

same unsolved challenge to mankind in the Taft memorial—for all who see it and hear it in the future will recall that it was cancer that struck down the seemingly indestructible Taft.

JOINT WAR ON CANCER MIGHT THAW COLD WAR

Behind the Iron Curtain specific causes of the death of public figures often are not matters of public record. But beyond question every adult Russian knows of the scourge of cancer within his own circle of family or friends.

What this suggests, of course, is that the free world might make progress toward prevention of a threatened future war with Russia by proposing a joint all-out war on cancer and perhaps other boundless foes of humankind.

A start on this kind of international approach to thawing the cold war through combined research programs has been advocated by Senator LISTER HILL, Democrat, of Alabama, and others. But think of the gigantic boost the idea would get from a formal endorsement by the Western ministers.

Acceptance of common, peaceful objectives—however limited they might be—should help get our minds, and those of the Russians, off constant preparations for war.

Many have said it differently, but few better than William James, when he wrote that, to end wars, man must find a "moral equivalent for war."

This, too, is one of the themes of Lewis Mumford in a well worth reading article in the current issue (April 18) of Saturday Evening Post. It is called "How War Began," and Mumford says that one of the ways was that some of the early kingdoms sent out raiders to capture outsiders for sacrifice on the altar to appease the gods. Then the victimized kingdom retaliated for revenge, or for sacrifice victims for its own altars. Thus, as Mumford relates, "what was at first a preliminary, one-sided raid before the sacrifice became the essential sacrifice itself." And that sacrifice was, and is, war.

Mumford points out that modern nuclear weapons, possessed by both the free world and Russia, reduce the prospect of a token sacrifice in war nowadays. "There would now be a total sacrifice," he writes, "merely to bring an end to our neurotic anxieties."

SUCCESS MIGHT MEAN THE END OF WARS

The moral, he adds, is not that we must catch up with the Russians but that we must accept the duties and demands of living in an open world among our equals; that we must try to protect and cherish life. The only alternative, according to Mumford, is the all but fatal shock treatment of war sooner or later.

We must have proposals for political problems, such as Berlin, to be sure. Yet we must somehow get at common health and moral problems, too.

Why not begin at the highest possible official level, and say to our friends abroad and to our potential enemies as well: "We can't seem to lick cancer, so why don't we try to lick it together?" Success in this kind of fight could show the way to victory in the war to end war.

[From the Methodist Christian Advocate, Apr. 18, 1959]

INSPIRING SUGGESTION

James, Free, Washington correspondent of the Birmingham News, has made a truly inspiring suggestion—one worthy of our best spiritual leadership.

Noting the recent tragic inroads of cancer on world statesmen (Taft, Dulles, et al.), he wonders if the time has come when "the free world might make progress toward the prevention of a threatened future war with Russia by proposing a joint all-out war on cancer and perhaps other boundless foes of mankind."

He adds, "A start on this kind of international approach to thawing of the cold war through continued research programs has been advocated by Senator LISTER HILL and others. * * * Acceptance of common, peaceful objectives, however limited they might be, should help get our minds, and those of the Russians, off constant preparedness for war."

Such an international project might furnish the needed moral equivalent of war which William James said is the surest road to peace, Free insists. And if the Western foreign ministers in their upcoming meeting at Paris would declare themselves in favor of such a united effort, the idea would get a gigantic boost which might put it across.

It is a thrilling dream that even Communist nations might be willing to unite in peaceful pursuit of the moral and physical welfare of mankind. Alas, there is little reason to believe that Russia at this time could be diverted from her aims at world conquest by such a benevolent objective. In the meantime the fight against cancer must go on.

Targets for the 20th Century

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 13, 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Targets for the 20th Century," which I delivered at the 12th annual convention of Americans for Democratic Action, in Washington, D.C., on May 9, 1959.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TARGETS FOR THE 20TH CENTURY

(Address by Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY to the 12th annual convention of Americans for Democratic Action, Washington, D.C., May 9, 1959)

We hear a great deal these days about firmness in our international affairs, and especially in our dealings with the Soviet Union.

I am for being firm. There is no way to deal successfully with Khrushchev and company except to be constant in principle and resolute in purpose. But a policy of firmness does not require us to stand pat and to stand still while our principal adversary carries on a campaign of maneuver and subversion against the free world. To sit tight behind a maginot line of stubborn complacency while our adversary grows stronger and bolder is not firmness; it is folly and suicide.

And make no mistake about it: the Soviet Union is growing stronger—and therefore bolder. The evidence is abundant, not in the windy boastfulness of Comrade Khrushchev but in the fine print of the solid and substantial performance and plans of the Soviet economy and the Soviet military.

Just 3 months ago, while we Americans were listening to the latest unemployment figures and fighting the battle of the balanced budget, the 21st Party Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union was proclaiming the Soviet goals—economic, political, and ideological—in the cold war. To any who bothered to listen, this was sobering news.

The Soviet goals were stated, of course, in the propaganda-tinted phrases of the Communist jargon. In plain English they add up to a declaration of Soviet strategy for the cold war.

In plain English they mean that the Soviet Union has set out to arm itself with such massive economic, political, and military power that it will be able to force an end to the cold war on terms of its own choosing. This is the Soviet version of victory without nuclear war.

Their chosen instrument for this victory is the expanding Soviet economy, controlled and directed by the Communist hierarchy for this overriding purpose.

The Soviet economy must provide the material base for continued expansion of Soviet arms.

It must provide the base for the economic invasion of the underdeveloped neutrals, for yoking them to the Soviet economy.

It must provide the means of persuading the political and intellectual leaders of poverty-stricken Asia, Africa, and Latin America that communism is capable of lifting them by their economic bootstraps.

The 21st Party Congress has put us on notice: "The fundamental problem of the coming 7 years," it said, "is to make the most of the time factor in socialism's peaceful competition with capitalism. Fast rates and the necessary proportions must be insured in developing the national economy."

"Fast rates and the necessary proportions" like these:

Increases in the capital goods industries of 85 to 88 percent in 7 years.

Increases in consumer goods industries of 62 to 65 percent in 7 years.

Raising the productivity of industrial workers 50 to 55 percent in 7 years.

Increasing total output 86 percent in 7 years.

Let's not kid ourselves that they do not mean this, or that they are incapable of doing it. They may not fully meet these goals; but they mean business, and they have enormous resources and a record of getting things done.

We have laughed off 5-year plans and 7-year plans in the past—and to our sorrow. We will laugh this one off to our peril. We have it on the authority of the Chief of the CIA, Mr. Allen Dulles, that for the past 7 years Soviet industry has grown at the annual rate of 9.5 percent. This is about four times the rate of growth of our own economy in the same time.

We have little cause for comfort in comparing our own economic progress with the spectacular performance of the Soviet Union.

While the economy of the U.S.S.R. has been growing at an annual rate of 9.5 percent, the economy of the United States has been growing at an annual rate of 2 percent. And the gap in total output has been steadily narrowing.

While the U.S.S.R. has been racing forward, we have been wallowing in our second unnecessary recession in 5 years. During one quarter of last year, for the first time, steel production in the Communist bloc exceeded production in the United States.

While the U.S.S.R. speaks of increasing the productivity of labor by 7 or 8 percent a year, our productivity has been increasing by less than 2 percent.

The Russians are laying their bets on the proposition that our production will continue to grow at the rate of 2 percent a year while theirs will grow at the rate of 8 or 9 percent. If this happens, as Mr. Allen Dulles says, "the United States will be virtually committing economic suicide."

The answer rests not with them, but with us.

I am not arguing for a competition of keeping up with the Soviet Joneses. It may or may not be necessary to match them stride for stride, industry for industry.

But, I do say that we need to know our goals as clearly as they know theirs. And

we need to manage our affairs as effectively for our purposes as they manage their affairs for their purposes.

And moreover, we must do it by the means of democracy, and to take full advantage of the enormous productive potential of our enterprise economy.

I have dwelt in some detail on the economic competition because it is basic. But this is not the only field in which we have failed to set our goals high enough, or where we are in danger of falling behind in the competition.

In spite of the President's soothing words, there are well-documented doubts about our military strength, now and in the future.

In international politics and diplomacy, by our dogged defense of the status quo we have allowed ourselves to be outmaneuvered in Europe, leapfrogged in the Middle East, and seriously challenged in Asia and even in our own hemisphere.

In the ideological competition we have frittered away the priceless assets of our heritage. We have been silent on the revolutionary implication of our Declaration of Independence and our Constitution, with their universal appeal to mankind. Because we have been so inept in translating these timeless principles into the times and places of the 20th Century, we find ourselves on the defensive against the glittering sophistry of Marxism and Leninism with its perverted appeal to those who have never really known freedom.

Whether we talk in terms of economics, or politics, or arms, or ideas, the conclusion is the same: It is not for want of resources and capacity that we are falling behind in this competition, but because we lack a sense of purpose, a sense of direction, a sense of disciplined action. And this is the massive failure of our national leadership.

We all remember that it was this same failing which cost us so dearly in the days of the great depression of the 1930's. Franklin Roosevelt's greatest service to this country was his gift of leadership, his ability to understand the capacity of the country, to express its purposes, to set its goals and to marshall the richest of our resources—our people—for their fulfillment.

There is much that we need to recall and to learn from the history of those years. Arthur Schlesinger's latest volume of the "Age of Roosevelt" recounts how in 1933 the President and the devoted team who drew their inspiration from him faced the country's terrifying problems frankly and without illusion, and how they set themselves to rebuild the country's resources and put them to work.

There were false starts and mistakes. But over all there was a sense of purpose and direction, as they sought not only to relieve the ills of that depression but to make another one impossible. Before they were finished, they had laid a foundation for national and individual security; they had reshaped the banking system; they had built the framework of a social security system; they had established the rights of labor and safeguarded the rights of homeowners and investors. And most important, they had restored to the country its confidence, its vitality and its belief in the ability of free people to use the processes of democracy to rescue themselves even from the depths of chaos.

We should recall, too, that in the war against facism, F. D. R. once again saw clearly where the destiny of the American people lay and called them to meet it. And once again the country responded.

The contrast with the present is inescapable. Where is the vision now, and the leadership that is both dramatic and realistic? Now, when we should be doing more, we are restrained by timid cautions.

Just this week it was my privilage to take part in a most important conference on India, which brought together many experts on the massive problems confronting that country. We discussed ways in which the United States could cooperate in the solution of these problems. At the climax of the conference, what does our leader say? He is "massively interested" in India, he told the press, but "fearful" of a massive program of aid. If this is the attitude at the top, how is the country to understand that these are times when massive problems required massive solutions?

How different it was with F. D. R.

Who can ever forget his goal of 100,000 planes, which all practical people knew was impossible. Only the visionaries like Bob Nathan knew how to plan and bring them into being.

Even during the war, with its stern military priorities, the President kept before us not only the military but the economic and the political goals. Beyond the goal of military victory he raised the banner of the Four Freedoms and the vision of the United Nations. The American people responded with sacrifice and discipline and on outpouring of energy and devotion. This is what made victory possible, even though Franklin Roosevelt himself did not live to see it.

"Well," you may say, "that was different. We were in a war." Well, my friends, let me tell you this: like the war against fascism, the contest with communism is a total competition for the survival of our system of freedom and our existence as a free nation. It is not a shooting war, thank God. But in its totalness, in its perils, in the imperative tasks it lays on us, and in the frightful consequences if we lose—it is a war.

Fifteen years ago we were in a war and we knew it. Now we are in a war but we don't want to believe it. Those who should summon us to its tasks refuse to recognize it. Instead they dope us with tranquilizing pap which dulls us to the dangers and saps our strength to defend ourselves.

The war against fascism was bloody and tragic and filled with sacrifice. But it was our salvation that it was the kind of war which gave us time to mobilize resources which in the end proved decisive.

The cold war is a different kind of war—a mortal struggle between two ideological and political systems. In this war also our resources can be decisive, but only if they are mobilized in time. And that time is now before there is any shooting. After will be too late.

Our national leaders warn us of the evils of international communism. They profess to recognize its dangers. But when it comes to fighting this war, they tell us we can fight it with one arm tied behind our backs. They propose to fight the balance of terror with balanced budgets, with business as usual, with politics as usual.

Those who are in a positon to make the decisions of leadership shrink from decisions. They refuse to acknowledge that this struggle requires more than we are putting into it, that it should have first priority on our energies and resources.

"If the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself to battle?"

Comrade Khrushchev says, "We declare war upon you in the peaceful field of trade. We will win over the United States." He boasts that our grandchildren will live under his brand of socialism.

I say we should take up that challenge, not only in trade, but in ideas; in works for peace, and in food for peace; in showing by example that the ways of freedom can build more stately mansions for soul and body than tyranny ever could.

I propose that we launch a grand design for peace—a 7 year plan of our own—beginning right now, or if that is too much to hope, then on January 20, 1961.

I propose that we set the goals which are the price of survival and that we set ourselves to meet them.

I do not propose that we imitate the Soviet Union—either its goals or its methods.

I propose that as they have set their goals for the triumph of communism, we set our goals for the preservation of peace and security and for the extension of human freedom and individual welfare everywhere on earth.

They have set authoritarian priorities by dictate. We must set our goals by consent through democratic processes.

We must demonstrate the superiority of the methods as well as the goals of freedom and democracy.

The highest goal is the winning of a just and durable peace.

But, my friends, this is not a goal that can be reached by wishing, or by recoiling from the unspeakable horrors of war in the nuclear age. It requires cool nerves, but also endless patience and the ability to keep ourselves at the peak of our strength for decades—perhaps for a generation.

We have had enough of nerve-wracking take-offs and crash landings. We need to gear ourselves to a fast cruising speed.

We must seek the way to disarmament, to remove the terror of nuclear extinction and release the productive energies of the world for the works of peace. But even as we seek it, we must maintain our defenses at the peak of efficiency and effectiveness. There is no future for those who undertake to negotiate with the Soviet Union from a position of weakness. They understand and respect power.

Strength for us is not strength of the United States alone, locked in a fortress America, but strength in a community of free nations—with our allies and friends. Our contribution to that strength is not only the strongest military defense of which we are capable, but equally the strongest political, economic and ideological counter-attack against international communism.

We should make and take every opportunity to negotiate agreement with the Communist bloc. There is only one test of the usefulness of an agreement: Will it enhance the strength and security of the free world and the chances for peace? We should encourage and seek opportunities to relax tension by working together on matters like health and science, and through cultural and personal exchanges.

We should move steadily to build the United Nations as an instrument for nations to work effectively together and as a framework of international relations in which law and order are respected.

Our second goal is to realize the American dream of dignity and well-being—life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness—for every American.

I propose that we dedicate the decade of the 1960's to the realization of that dream.

This unfinished business of democracy is necessary to do for its own sake. It is even more imperative now because the rest of the world is watching to see whether democracy can really do it. We must succeed.

To make equality of rights and opportunities for all Americans a living fact. To wipe out the last vestige of discrimination under color of law.

To end forever the poverty which still afflicts, young and old, one-sixth of the richest Nation that is or ever was. To erase slums and banish hunger from our land.

To bring the best of education to every American child. To bring the blessings of medical knowledge and medical care within the reach of every American.

To secure the future of small farmers and small businessmen.

By these fruits shall we be known.

Our third goal is to cooperate with free people anywhere in technical and economic progress—in industry, in agriculture, in health, in education.

In this "only war we seek" food and science, medicine and education, and skills are our megaton weapons of massive rehabilitation.

For this "war" we should plan to set aside $2 billion each year, and as time goes on, maybe even more, for as long as the need persists—for years certainly, maybe for decades.

We must export our know-how carried by a peaceful army of technical missionaries.

We must export our capital, because without it, the revolution of rising expectations may be frustrated and violent, instead of peaceful and beneficent.

We must use the blessings of our agricultural abundance in the war against hunger and malnutrition.

Instead of the ugly American, we must turn the face of America the beautiful, through our art, our music, our books, our theater, our orchestras.

If we do not do these things, it is possible, even likely, that some nations, including some which hold the key to the future, may turn to the Communists in desperation. But that is not our sole reason for doing these things.

We must do them because they are required in this war of interests and ideologies. But we must do them also because this is our mission in this last half of the 20th century. This is our call to greatness, our call to leadership. If we were to fail in this, we would forfeit our claim to greatness; we would forfeit democracy's appeal to mankind.

These goals are no idle dreams. They are the stark necessities of our times. But they will not come easily. And if we choose to live in fat and comfortable complacency, they will not come at all.

They will test our moral and political fiber. They will test our leaders and our capacity for self-government. And they will test our economy.

If we continue as we have for the past 6 years, our economy will grow just about as fast as our population. We will just about stand still.

If that happens, only by rigorous controls of our economy will we be able to give priorities to national defense, to foreign economic development, to education, health and welfare here at home.

On the other hand, if we reach and maintain the 5 percent rate of economic growth that is necessary and possible, there will be enough for the priority purposes and for the free functioning of the enterprise economy.

In our purposes, too, the national economy is basic. Khrushchev is betting everything that we cannot make it. I am betting that we can and will.

The Soviet goals are directed to Communist domination of the world. Ours are directed to the regin of freedom throughout the world.

We are called on to show that a democratic society can mobilize its resources and that a free people can accept the rigorous disciplines of planning and performance without losing their freedom. We are called on to show that a free people can compete successfully with a totalitarian system that uses the disciplines of dictatorship to achieve its ends.

We demonstrated this once before, in the competition with faccism, but not until we had been forced into a shooting war. The challenge is much greater now than it was 20 years ago. Communism, with its massive military and economic power and its sugar-coated ideology, is a more formidable enemy than fascism ever was. Moreover, this time the fate of mankind rests on our being able to win without falling into a shooting war.

This kind of challenge requires the concentrated efforts of all areas of our national life, dovetailed together in coherent, well-planned whole.

I have proposed that the Congress create a Joint Congressional Committee on National Strategy, to consider overall our national goals, our national resources, and our national strategy.

And I have proposed that the executive branch of the Government have a national policy planning staff, responsible for devising and recommending plans to express the national purposes in terms of the realities of the world situation and our own capabilities. The Department of State has long had such a staff to advise the Secretary on foreign policies. We have a Council of Economic Advisers to the President. We have a maze of interdepartmental coordinating committees. We have competing and conflicting policies and priorities—from State, Defense, Commerce, CIA, Treasury, and the Budget Bureau, which often mistake control of the purse for control of policy. Nowhere is there a staff of competent thinkers and planners, undistracted by administrative responsibilities, able to think through plans and priorities of national goals and an integrated strategy for the total of our national effort in all its aspects. I propose that such a staff be created. It is time we took planning out of the doghouse and put it in the White House.

My friends, this country has a glorious future. It has an opportunity which history has offered to no other people, anywhere, anytime. But it is an opportunity that only liberals can grasp. We have seen for 6 years that the conservative mind and the conservative spirit are unequal to it. At best the conservative is dedicated to the constructive preservation of the status quo. At worst he is mired down in the dogmas of things as they were. This kind of challenge takes the boldness, the inventiveness, the imagination, the creative political and economic risk-taking which has been the characteristic of liberals in this country from the times of Jefferson, Jackson, and Lincoln to the days of Wilson, the two Rooseveits, and Harry Truman—whose diamond jubilee we joyfully celebrate this week.

It is a job for you and me. Let's get on with it.

Dedication of Research Center in Wilmington, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 13, 1959

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, tomorrow, in my home State of Massachusetts, Avco Corp. is dedicating its new $23 million research center in Wilmington, which will employ 800 citizens.

This is still another valued new enterprise to spring up along our circumferential highway around the city of Boston, now often referred to as the "golden arc" because of the new industries which have been attracted by it.

Avco Corp. refers to this suburban area of Greater Boston as "the most highly developed research climate in the United States." We are grateful for this tribute from one of the country's pioneering research and development companies, and this accolade which is equally deserved by our great universities which have produced the scientists, and our great cities like Lowell and Lawrence and Cambridge which have produced so much of the skilled labor that is required.

Labor and industry, sparked by the genius of our scientists, have produced dramatic results which are vital not only to the economy of Massachusetts, but to the safety and welfare of the Nation as well.

I ask unanimous consent that an article in the May 12, 1959, edition of the Wall Street Journal, describing this development, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BOSTON'S ACADEMIC AIR WINS RISING NUMBER OF SCIENCE-MINDED FIRMS—AVCO DEDICATES NEW UNIT ON THURSDAY—MIT, HARVARD PROVIDE MANY CONSULTANTS

(By Paul Lancaster)

WILMINGTON, MASS.—This Thursday a swarm of notables—including TV personality John Daly; Dr. T. Keith Glennan, Director of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration; and Nobel prize-winning physicist Dr. Isidor Rabi—will descend on this rural community just north of Boston.

The occasion: The dedication of Avco Corp.'s new $23 million research center. The steel-and-glass structure, already in use, houses scientists and engineers seeking new materials and methods for missiles and other space-age paraphernalia.

The Avco affair is noteworthy because it points up the wholesale proliferation of research labs and research-oriented manufacturers in the area around staid old Boston.

ELECTRONICS, INSTRUMENTS

The Massachusetts Department of Commerce calculates about 250 of these outfits have set up shop in the vicinity of Boston, more than 100 of them in the past 5 years. They operate chiefly in the fields of electronics, nucleonics, and precision instrumentation. Some of the facilities are research and development arms of big corporations, such as Avco or Radio Corp. of America. Others are consulting firms and small companies that develop and manufacture highly complex equipment, often for military use.

What lures them here?

This is "the most highly developed research climate in the United States," claims Avco, whose major effort here right now is the development of missile nose cones. Though Californians probably would argue their State, with its missile and electronics work, boasts an equal concentration of research activity, Bostonians claim even the Golden State can't surpass some of the benefits Boston offers researchers.

Among the claimed advantages: A rich supply of scientific and technical skills, stemming in part from the presence of Massachusetts Institute of Technology and Harvard; an intangible, but nonetheless important, atmosphere of creativity; and a cultural and recreational environment that the companies believe keeps scientists and engineers happy.

MODERNISM VERSUS COLONIALISM

Many of the research-minded companies are strung out along a recently built expressway that describes a semicircle starting near the coast north of Boston and running around the city to the south shore. Housed in low-slung, angular buildings clinging to the hilly New England countryside and frequently bearing fanciful, futuristic names—Dynametrics, Trans-Sonics, Itek, Tracerlab—they strike a strange note in a region where old colonial homes and names linger on.

The role of MIT in Boston-area research is everywhere evident. Glance down rosters

of company officials, and again and again you note that executives are MIT products. Numerous firms have been organized by MIT scientists who decided to strike out on their own—"spinoffs from MIT," one research official terms them.

High Voltage Engineering Corp., located on the semicircular expressway at Burlington, just south of Avco's new lab, is a prime example of a company spawned by MIT. The concern was formed shortly after World War II to produce atom smashers invented by Dr. Robert J. Van de Graaff, an MIT physicist. Dr. Van de Graaff is now the company's chief physicist, besides continuing to teach at MIT. Dr. John G. Trump, professor of electrical engineering at MIT, is chairman of the board and technical director of High Voltage, and many lower level engineers and physicists were formerly connected with MIT.

RESERVOIRS OF CONSULTANTS

Besides serving as sources of full-time talent, MIT and Harvard provide invaluable reservoirs of consultants who can be called in on a moment's notice to help solve prickly problems. Professors generally earn $100 to $200 a day for consulting services, though occasionally fees run higher.

"I'm a native New Englander and I may be prejudiced, but I don't think we could get the really top-grade consultants across the board that we have here if we were located someplace else," comments Frederick H. Greene, Jr., vice president and director of commercial development for National Research Corp., a Cambridge firm specializing in high-vacuum technology. National Research, headquartered on "Research Row," a strip along the Charles River where several research organizations have settled, regularly calls on five consultants from the nearby universities—two physicists, two aeronautical engineers, and a nuclear engineer.

Describing a typical instance in which expert advice from outside might be needed, Mr. Greene notes national research sometimes achieves such high vacuums that measuring the low pressures becomes a problem; this might occur in an attempt to simulate outer space, for example. When this difficulty arises, the company beckons Prof. Wayne B. Nottingham, a physicist from right next door at MIT. Professor Nottingham, who is an authority on measuring low pressures and who has devised extremely sensitive pressure gages, can usually aid National Research scientists in finding the best measurement technique.

Research executives claim the wealth of university and industry research talent here makes for a stimulating, idea-generating atmosphere for scientists to live and work in. "We wanted to be near other research," observes Dr. Robert W. Johnston, a physicist who recruits professional personnel for Avco. "We wanted interaction with universities and with other organizations like ours."

Though companies call on each other for assistance now and then, much of this stimulating exchange of ideas occurs in an informal way, when researchers chat over the hedge or perhaps at social affairs. "More of this takes place over cocktails than during the business day," suggests Dr. Marvin G. Schorr, towering executive vice president of Technical Operations, Inc. Technical Operations is a consulting firm which does everything from studying ways to speed up weather reporting for the jet era to developing a land mine for war games that halts a tank passing over it by electronically putting its gears into neutral.

An official of a company responsible for many advances in the field of electronics sounds a sour note in all this, however. There's too much emphasis here on scientific creativity in an abstract sense, argues Bernard M. Gordon, the intense, hard-driving 32-year-old president of Epsco, Inc., a firm which develops and manufactures complex electronics systems, such as specialized computers and telemetry devices to collect data from missiles. Though spokesmen for other concerns strongly disagree with him, Mr. Gordon says local scientists and engineers conceive brilliant theories and compose superb reports, but are often lax when it comes to meeting deadlines and carrying projects through to the hardware stage.

Says Mr. Gordon of the Boston area: "If you're trying to build a production organization, it's not a good place. There's a negative attitude toward producing a working piece of equipment."

Mr. Gordon, who holds over 100 patents, says this frame of mind carries over into a negative attitude toward material things in general and has a marked impact on the communities where research personnel live. Of Concord and Lexington, where many scientists and engineers reside, he observes: "There's a kind of reverse materialism in these towns. If you buy a new car, you apologize to your neighbor."

Lt. Gen. S. T. Williams, U.S. Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, toward the end of last month I took advantage of the privilege granted me and inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 20 a statement in which I expressed my high regard for Gen. Samuel T. Williams, Chief of the U.S. Military Assistance Advisory Group for Vietnam.

Last fall I had the pleasure of revisiting Vietnam, having been there in 1955 for the first time. On the occasion of my earlier visit General Williams was just taking over as Chief of our Military Advisory Group. He is one of America's greatest soldiers and has done a remarkable job in that country, as I outlined for my colleagues.

A copy of the March 20 RECORD found its way to the desk of Mr. Ed P. Williams, business manager of the Fort Worth, Tex., Independent School District and brother of General Williams. This is not strange. But the sequel is worth recording.

Mr. Ed Williams wrote our beloved Speaker of the House of Representatives the following letter:

FORT WORTH INDEPENDENT
SCHOOL DISTRICT,
Fort Worth, Tex., April 7, 1959.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SAM: Back in 1920, I lived in Van Alstyne, Tex. Our late mutual friend, Sam Pattie, bless him, operated his drygoods store next to the bank where I worked.

At this time, the boys were returning from World War I and being mustered out. My brother Sam was located at Camp Pike, Ark.

One morning I received a phone call from Sam in which he told me he was in trouble and needed help quickly. He said there was a mixup of names in his outfit and that he was being mustered out when really it was another Williams who wanted out. He, Sam, wanted to stay in and the records would have to be straightened out in Washington.

I told him I would see what could be done. Sam Pattie was next door and I told him the story. He said, "I know what to do. I'll wire SAM RAYBURN." He did wire you and in a few days brother Sam advised that his troubles were over and that he was to remain in the Army where he wanted to be.

SAM, please refer to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for March 20, 1959, page A2506, which contains an extension of remarks by Representative GEORGE P. MILLER.

The soldier referred to by Mr. MILLER is the Sam T. Williams you befriended in 1920.

I am calling this incident to your attention in order that you may know your assistance to this young man in 1920 was not misplaced.

With very best regards, and good luck, I am,

Sincerely,

ED P. WILLIAMS.

A tragic error which could have robbed America of the services of a man who has proved himself to be one of her great military leaders was averted by the interest manifested by the then young Congressman from Texas, SAM RAYBURN.

Incidents like this have marked the long career of our Speaker and have endeared him to the hearts of all of us.

It is interesting to note that since my remarks on March 20, the New York Herald Tribune published an article on Sunday, April 12, by Mr. S. L. A. Marshall on General Williams that confirms that which I told the House.

I include that article as part of these remarks:

OF ARMS AND MEN: "HANGING" SAM'S MEMORIES

(By S. L. A. Marshall)

"Hanging" Sam Williams must have a smile on his face these days. The newspapers say the allies have a neat top-secret plan for undoing the Russians should there come a military showdown West of Berlin.

If the word that everything is peaches in the Western camp travels, as far as Saigon, Vietnam, where "Hanging" Sam holds forth, it could either give him a chuckle or cause the raising of a questioning eyebrow.

Now a three-star general of the U.S. Army, and one of the better-loved and saltier characters of the Army, Sam is chief of MAAG operations in the southeast Asia rice bowl region, maybe taxed with problems, but at least happily remote from the Berlin dilemma.

There was the other time, though, when Sam carried most of its weight on his own square shoulders. In 1948, there were other Americans on the pivot, but it was Sam's nose which was to be used to bulldoze a way into Berlin, if the Russians got tough. While sweating out how to discharge this minor chore, Sam read a few stories from the home press carrying the good news that the U.S. Army was prepared for any eventuality. It's a national habit.

Much water has flowed under the Elbe bridges since he told the story, but that's all to the good, since it might have fulled and ripened with the years. What follows is a reasonable facsimile thereof.

In the late spring, 1948, when the threat of blockade loomed heavy, Sam was commander of the 26th Infantry, the Blue Spaders of the big Red One Division. It was his second tour as such and he felt right chesty about the prime condition of his regiment.

Stationed at Bamberg, just north of Nurnberg, the Blue Spaders spent much of their time training on the ranges at Grafenwohr. There they were visited frequently by the

divison commander, Maj. Gen. "Shrimp" Milburn, whose fame was made more lustrous in later years by his flawless leadering of U.S. I Corps during the worst days in Korea.

At Grafenwohr there suddenly descended on Williams and regiment a party of senior officers from stateside. Gimlet eyed, they looked the Blue Spaders over. The intensity of this inspection, left unexplained, built up a mystery which baffled Sam wholly.

One four-star general said to him: "These men don't look like they are afraid of Russians." Sam was proud of his outfit; he felt it was bursting out all over with esprit. So he answered: "Why should they be?" We don't think every Russian is 9 feet tall and weighs 300 pounds." He thought that crack reflected unit sentiment but it caused a certain lifting of the eyebrows.

The visitor departed. Then Milburn came over to unbag the kitten. If troops had to be used to break the Berlin blockade, Sam's blue spaders would be the main body. With the column would ride some division engineeds and part of its organic tank battalion. To give the venture an allied flavor, one company of British rifles and one of French would also start. What other plans were afoot, or what hand would hold the overall responsibility, Sam heard not.

But Sam, like the namesake McGee, stayed cool and calm in the heart of the furnace roar. Being tagged meant first of all rounding up every bit of information which might help with the problem.

Right off, he was told that the blue spaders would have a 20-kilometer-wide corridor to move through. That wasn't too bad; there is some elbow room within such latitude.

So Sam immediately requested higher headquarters to supply him with maps which would show down to the last meter the boundaries of the strip over which he would be allowed to maneuver.

In due time, back came the reply that there was no 20-kilometer on the ground, but only in the air. By land, the corridor was limited to the pavement of the autobahn and the few feet of earth shoulder on either side.

Said Sam, in words not intended to be a classic of understatement: "Quite naturally, the extraordinary conditions complicated my tactical problem somewhat."

He forthwith instructed his battalion commanders that the first movement of any man or vehicle off the autobahn would enable the Russians to claim that the movement had violated their territory. Put in that straitjacket, he had less time to worry about what he would do if the Russians blew their bridges in his face, and none at all to become confused because his engineers couldn't round up enough materiel to span the possible water spaces.

"I remember," said Sam, "telling 'Shrimp' that when the regiment started, I wanted to go and go fast. I couldn't be looking over my shoulder all the time for orders. I wanted a clear unequivocal directive before crossing the border that I should make Berlin come hell or high water. If the Russians tried to stop us, that would mean war. I didn't relish having some second guesser saying later that Sam started it all on his own.

"'Shrimp' agreed. He said: 'I'll have several copies struck and placed in bank vaults back home for future reference and the sake of history.'"

So ends Sam's story, which has no moral. The airlift, which also developed happenstantially, relieved him of the necessity of having to save resolute national policy by the seat of his pants.

Israel Independence Day Greetings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 11, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the anniversary celebration of Israel's independence has become a memorable holiday.

It is observed not only in Israel but throughout the world by friends and sympathizers. Since the rebirth of the State of Israel by the attainment of its independence, Israeli citizens as well as Jews everywhere have been living in a new age, ideally and spiritually.

Having seen their 2,000 years old dream come true, by recreating Israel in their ancient homeland as an image of their ancestral kingdom, and seeing it prosper, and register impressive advances in every phase of their national life, on May 13, the 11th anniversary of Israel's independence, they all join hands and celebrate that event in due solemnity.

For nearly 2,000 years Jewish people were practically barred from what had been their homeland. Events at the end of the First World War introduced startling changes in all parts of the world, and historic Palestine was no exception. That part of the old Ottoman Empire was placed under British mandate, and the Jews were allowed to work for the reestablishment of a national home there. At the time the Jewish population of Palestine was about one-tenth of the total. By 1940, they constituted about a third, or about 450,000.

At the time the new state was set up early in 1948 the Jews were numbered close to if not an actual majority of the inhabitants of that area of about 5,000 square miles. Today the State of Israel boasts of more than 1,800,000 inhabitants.

Thus in 11 years the small State of Israel has provided homes and safe haven for more than 1 million homeless Jewish refugees. If Israeli leaders and Israel's citizens had accomplished nothing else, the performance of this daring and difficult task alone entitles them to our admiration. But they have done more, much more than that. They have made the new Israel a living and growing entity as a dynamic and democratic state, a powerful force in the Middle East.

What is more important than the mere counting of numbers of people is the fact that all of the people now living there, Moslems, Christians and Jews, are all first class citizens with equal rights, accorded the same privileges and subject to the same duties. All of them have the right to vote. All of them have the right to hold public office. All of them are covered by the same labor laws, receiving the same compensation and the same benefits for the same work, and none being required to do more onerous or more menial tasks than others. Every child must receive an education and all but the parochial schools are maintained at the expense of the Government.

Not only is religious freedom an accomplished fact but the jurisdiction of the religious courts is preserved by law in connection with matters concerning the marital and family status. The deep religious sentiments of all of the people give emphasis to their universal desire to advance the divine principle of brotherhood in order to accomplish world peace.

For all of these superb accomplishments we salute the State of Israel and all its people and wish them well on this anniversary of their independence.

A Jacksonville Teenage Club Gives Encouraging Proof of What Can Be Done for Florida's Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the House Education and Labor Committee is giving consideration to the possibility of enacting legislation to provide assistance to States in developing research projects in the field of combating juvenile delinquency. I think that most of us who have children would conclude that any overall analysis of the various ways of combating delinquency, juvenile or adult, should put in a prominent spot the effectiveness of worthy and enjoyed activity. The old adage that "an idle mind is the devil's workshop" is just as true today as when it was first said; and it applies just as much to adults as is does to youngsters.

I recently read a very interesting and constructive article in All Florida magazine, the May 10 edition, in which well-deserved tribute was paid to Lt. Col. Franklin Hibel, Ed Bell, and a number of others who took leadership in starting a teenage club in Jacksonville's southside section. I believe that the article, which I include herein, may be of help to others who are seeking solutions and opportunities in this field:

A JACKSONVILLE TEENAGE CLUB GIVES ENCOURAGING PROOF OF WHAT CAN BE DONE FOR FLORIDA'S YOUTH

In the newspapers and magazines, there is much talk of juvenile delinquency. It is a national problem, but Florida has its own share. Many authorities believe that one of the leading causes of juvenile delinquency is a dearth of wholesome opportunity for youth to blow off steam, coupled with a super abundance of opportunity for unwholesome activities.

A number of Florida communities have concerned themselves with reversing this unhappy status quo. If there are few avenues of attack open to them on the latter aspect of the situation, they have sometimes found the former more vulnerable. Sometimes it has been the community itself, which has carried the ball in this direction—and at other times it has been an interested group within the community. In either case, the results have proven encouraging.

At Lake City early this year, action was taken on a communitywide scale. With the slogan, "Today's youth is your tomorrow," the town set out to build a youth center that they call "Teen Town." To raise funds for the project, one civic club held prefootball game banquets and contributed the proceeds. Other civic clubs joined with a local radio station to bring the Glenn Miller Orchestra to town for a dance. The profits were turned over to the teenage project. Townspeople responded generously to the program. Teenagers responded happily to the efforts in their behalf. Lake City boasts now that it looks after its own teenagers.

In Jacksonville recently the initiative was taken by one individual—and enthusiastically supported by a local group. The results were just as encouraging as those at Lake City, if on a smaller scale. But because it was an individual effort, the response was, if anything, even more dramatic.

The Jacksonville story began with a complaining comment from the 14-year-old son of the commanding officer of Jacksonville's Air Reserve Center. Young Bruce Hibel bemoaned the fact that on all of Jacksonville's well-populated southside, there was no place for teenagers to dance. Other than infrequent high school proms and church socials, local youth had nothing to look forward to in the way of regularly scheduled dances. Bruce's chance remark was enough to arouse the concern of his father.

Lt. Col. Franklin Hibel, a former New York newspaperman and veteran Air Force public relations officer, hit on the idea of a teenage dance club. Through his efforts, the wheels began to turn. He knew that the Air Reserve Center, always eager to further community relations, would make its classroom facilities available for a monthly teenage "hop." He talked up the idea to Ed Bell, a popular local disc jockey. The turntable idol enthusiastically agreed to emcee, and spin the platters for the teenagers.

To arouse interest, Colonel Hibel then sent letters to the principals of several southside high schools, requesting their cooperation in publicizing the projected club in school papers and on bulletin boards. Releases in local news media helped the idea to gain momentum. Letters from teenagers started to pour into the Center. By the time the initial dance was ready to start, over 100 eligible teenagers had requested membership in the club. Attractive cards, with Ed Bell's picture and a jet aircraft superimposed, certified the typed-in names of teenagers authorized to attend sponsored dances.

Colonel Hibel began to worry when the first 50 youths shot in their letters. Nearly 40 of the requests were from girls. Hibel consulted Maj. Ellis Lanquist, a reservist who is an instructor at Bolles School, a southside military academy. Lanquist took up the challenge. He told his cadets of the many girls who would be available as dance partners, and the cadets galloped to the rescue. Within a few days some 30 of them became bona fide members.

There was another roadblock, however, even more worrisome. Previous teenage dance clubs had aborted, due principally to the undesirable element of young hoodlums. Obviously, this is always a source of concern to parents. When a few parents queried the center commander about the club, Colonel Hibel assured them the dances would be well chaperoned. He stressed that they were to be held at an Air Force installation, where no nonsense would be tolerated.

The date of the inaugural hop approached, and with it, more headaches for the harried Hibel. It was not enough that Southside's Englewood High—the school attended by about half of the club members—was having one of its own infrequent dances that night, and five Southside schools, including Bolles, were having basketball games, but the Jacksonville area also had been alerted for a tornado. The tornado didn't develop, but rain came down in torrents. In spite of the complications, a third of the youngsters showed for the hop—a fact that the colonel felt was richly rewarding.

That the dance was a success was evidenced in the comments of the teenagers, themselves: "This is a swell thing. It's recreation that's tops with us and I'm happy to be with it from the start." And from another: "Excellent. Count me as a regular," or "Golly, I'm glad you convinced mother. It gives the kids a chance to get together and keep out of trouble."

Disk jockey Ed Bell also was delighted with the results. "I've spun platters for hundreds of dances here and at Pensacola," he said, "but I've never seen a better-mannered lot of teenagers, or a better organized teenage club." And to top off the teenagers' delight with the affair, Bell gave away top-40 disks to winners of dance contests.

Parents, too, responded to the idea—skeptically at first, but enthusiastically after they had a look for themselves. "I admit that I was skeptical, and that was why I wanted to see for myself," said businessman Harry Rocus, who escorted his teenage daughter to the first dance. Rocus liked what he saw—so much so that he vowed to personally solicit the support of his fellow businessmen for door prizes, and he immediately signed up his other two teenage daughters—twins.

The final outcome of the Jacksonville story was that what started as a disgruntled remark by an Air Reservist's teenage son, resulted in a well-chaperoned, biweekly dance with the happy approval of parents and teenagers alike. It shows that even one individual's initiative can go a long way toward curbing juvenile delinquency in a locality. And when the efforts of people like Colonel Hibel, and of communities as a whole, such as Lake City, are added up throughout the State, the results are bound to make a noticeable dent in teenage mischief. Everybody benefits—from teenager to citizen on the street.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer, plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Raymond F. Noyes is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

Appendix

Responsibility of the American Businessmen as Leaders of the Free World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 14, 1959

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, on May 8, 1959, Mr. Thomas S. Nichols, chairman of the board of the Olin Mathieson Chemical Corp., addressed the members of the Investment Bankers Association at White Sulphur Springs, W. Va.

Mr. Nichols, a prominent business executive himself, presents a thought-provoking challenge to businessmen across the country—that they recognize and assume their responsibility as leaders of the American economy.

I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Nichols' address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY THOMAS S. NICHOLS, CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD, OLIN MATHIESON CHEMICAL CORP., BEFORE MEMBERS OF THE INVESTMENT BANKERS ASSOCIATION, WHITE SULPHUR SPRINGS, W. VA., MAY 8, 1959

Today happens to be V–E Day—Victory in Europe. I am afraid that the fruits of that so-called victory have not been too well preserved.

As an industrialist, I realize that I am in sophisticated company in this group so I will proceed with at least a moderate amount of caution.

However, as one who has spent a lifetime in the world of business, I have strong convictions that Lord Chesterton was right when he wrote to his son that "few people do business well who do nothing else." Stated bluntly, I believe that today the business community bears frightening responsibilities—burdens we dare not lay upon the future.

We are confronted by an international Communist Goliath and we need a far greater arsenal than slingshots to fell the menace. Our future lies in our own strength, and this in turn rests on a foundation of fiscal responsibility at home, and what I believe to be a new concept of responsible trusteeship by the business leaders of the free world.

However heavy our personal preoccupation with other duties, we can no longer be casual about this matter.

Our Nation is confronted by a unique situation—one that we have never faced before. World history records such events as "The 30 Years War." But the longest armed hostility our country ever faced was the 8½ years of the American Revolution.

Today is different. We are now in a type of war that will probably continue for as long as anyone in this room lives, and may well span our children's and grandchildren's lifetimes.

Any discussion of our Nation's future must start from this premise: "We are up against a problem that has no fixed or definitely foreseeable termination. As long as the Communists insist that their aim is to dominate the world, we have no choice but to adopt measures that will prevent this from happening." Khrushchev stated in May 1957: "We think capitalism should be destroyed not by means of war and military conflict, but through an ideological and economic struggle."

In this continuing fight against communism the free world businessmen has a special role. To the extent that the Communists have challenged us economically, it is up to the businessman to defend us. We must be the merchants of both peace and prosperity. Yet it would be almost true to say that we enter the fray with one hand tied behind our back. For on the economic level the real Communist threat arises from their system of coordination and planning. The Communist state plans economic development according to a system of priorities and assigned productive tasks and for purely political purposes. A market can always be captured by absorbing a loss. On the other hand, the Western businessman plans his individual development on the requirements of competition and the possibilities of profit in the market.

We have the skill and the industrial plant to outstrip the Communists on their own terms. This has been demonstrated by our tremendous war efforts when our very survival depended on rigid business cooridnation. But we would not institute such controls except under the most dire emergency conditions. For we know full well that a regulated economy would destroy the very way of life we are trying to preserve.

In essence, this is the great challenge to free enterprise—a challenge far greater than anything faced in wartime. For we know that our present peace is partly a myth and that a very real cold war exists. Thus American business must meet wartime conditions—or cold wartime conditions—without wartime coordination. Moreover, we must match the productivity of a nation which does have the equivalent of wartime controls.

We confidently accept the challenge. We welcome the opportunity to put the free enterprise system into world competition with state-planned communism, for we know that we can stand the test.

This is not mere patriotic rhetoric. By way of documentation, I cite the following examples:

For years, the Labour Party of Great Britain proudly called itself the Socialist Party. Yet in its most recent publication, "Plan for Progress" (issued last December), which is in fact their blueprint of the future, there is almost nothing said about socialism.

All emphasis is on running a capitalistic society more efficiently than their opposition, the Conservative Party. Furthermore, the Labourites even warn against "damping the vital impulses of economic expansion."

In other words, here are the results from one battlefield where capitalism was pitted against state socialism, and the free enterprise system withstood the assault and proved its superiortiy.

It would be presumptuous for me to outline a comprehensive program for the Nation's businessmen to meet this continuing crisis. But I would like to pull together some guidelines for the journey further down the road.

POINT 1. NATIONAL FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY

Since we will be compelled for many years to live in the shadow of aggression, our own internal solvency becomes even more important. We must buy defense this year. We must be equally able to afford it next year and the year after.

Every businessman knows that you cannot remain fiscally sound if you fail to balance your books year after year. You can operate in the red for awhile, but sooner or later the only answer is to go out of business.

The same rule applies to the financial management of our National Government. That is why the President's fight for a balanced budget is so important. The Government operated with a deficit last year because of the recession. Now all economic indices point to a good business year and so it becomes vital that we return to sound and businesslike procedures.

While it is true, as one has remarked, that the United States can afford to devote as much resources to its own survival as the Soviet Union can to our destruction, some programs will have to be sacrificed to maintain the high defense level.

We cannot afford every pet project plus high defense costs. We know that another unbalanced budget will undoubtedly increase the inflationary pressure.

Since the cost of living has been reasonably steady for several months, those who favor cheap money have been insisting that inflation is a phony issue brandished by reactionaries to fight social spending programs. However, it is just this continuous counterpressure—this public opinion marshalled by the President—that has done so much to arrest the inflationary spiral.

Inflation is an insidious intoxicant. And now is exactly the time to be concerned about it. If we wait until we are caught up in a runaway inflation, it will be too late. And we need not be fatalistic about it—inflation can be checked. Your own private actions and the pressure you can put on the Congress are very potent weapons in this fight.

POINT 2. A NEW LOOK AT WORLD TRADE

We are all in business and I have not come here to plead for a charity or to ask you to deny your own interests. But there is definitely something called "enlightened self-interest." I would define this as an act that helps both your business and the Nation.

Freer world trade can be enlightened self-interest.

It is said that American business has not progressed far enough from the isolationist position on tariffs and world trade of the first part of this century, and perhaps that is true, but business between United States of America and other countries should not and cannot be a one-way street. We must, of course, guard against drying up our own industries by having our markets flooded with foreign goods, but we must also give much more serious consideration to the possibilities of expanding our own business by encouraging other nations' industries to make large enough profits to afford our products. Indeed, in the final analysis, no

political alliance between any two nations can long survive unless there also exists between the two nations a mutually satisfactory economic alliance.

POINT 3. A REAPPRAISAL OF LABOR

The reappraisal I am referring to has nothing to do with the proven personal corruption of certain labor bosses. The question of corruption is important, but it is basically a side issue. We have had corruption in business and in Government. Every decent person opposes corruption. The Nation's responsible labor leaders, as well as intelligent Government action, must clean up this mess.

Out of labor's bigness has resulted some corruption, but far more significantly it has produced a new force which neither business nor labor has fully analyzed.

The situation has changed drastically since the thirties. Organized labor is no longer in its infancy. The Federal Government has recognized the change of labor from an underdog—needing special protection—to labor as a coequal when the Taft-Hartley Act replaced the Wagner Act. Perhaps business and labor will only face up to this when the old leaders on both sides who lived through those turbulent years are replaced by a younger generation.

Today when a president of a union meets with the president of a corporation, they meet not as a man from the shop with the boss, but as one high-salaried executive with another.

The steel industry has recently said that "if we are to combat inflation we must first deal with the primary cause, namely, employment cost increases."

The Committee for Economic Development has written that the Nation tends to deny "that labor is the main economic resource and that wage rates are the main element in costs and therefore in prices."

As an infant is not responsible for his actions and an adult is, so labor must now share responsibility with management for rises in the cost of living, the threat of inflation, the growth and stability of the economy, our economic position vis-a-vis Russia and our free world allies.

Labor and management must together work out a philosophy that defines this new responsibility of labor as coguardian of the Nation's economic future. This cannot be done at the bargaining tables alone. It must be done in the classrooms and over the dining room tables.

POINT 4. A NEW POLITICAL ROLE FOR BUSINESS—A NEW TRUSTEESHIP

In approaching this subject I realize I am dealing with combustible materials. But to do otherwise would be unconscionably neglectful of the overriding mission of enlightened business leadership.

All of us have contributed thoughts on this subject—but not too much thought, I'm afraid.

Now I want to make it clear at the outset that I am not appealing to the businessman to enter politics as a counterweight to labor's expanded political operations. Neither am I asking for a new or revamped business pressure group. In my experience I have observed a number of so-called pressures. Indeed, when I had occasion to serve the Government in one capacity or another, I have been appalled by the inconsistency of some of our fellow businessmen who vigorously complained about Government interference in business only to see them in Washington a few days later exerting every effort to obtain special help or treatment from the Government. Don't forget that a Government big enough to give you everything you want is or may be big enough to take everything you've got.

I am talking about businessmen entering politics in the broadest sense, not in terms of supporting one political party or simply to secure advantages for business.

My point is this: Our problems today—our country's and the free world's—are primarily political. Today it would be ludicrous to have business interests demand that China be divided into trading areas and have nations go to war over business concessions. This is in our past. When we talk now of spheres of influence, we are referring to political, not economic influence.

In a sense it could be said that business is a tool in our cold war fight. We are of course trying to convince others of the rightness of our free enterprise system, but primarily we are trying to sell our system of freedom and democracy.

The era of imperialism and colonialism was an era of economic warfare—overtly and covertly. This is an era of ideological warfare.

Yet almost paradoxically, still today in the United States our brightest young people, as well as the most creative and imaginative of the older generation, go into business. This is a natural result of our Nation's business-oriented heritage; it is also because the greatest monetary rewards lie in the business field.

But to our country it also means that the area of the greatest need for leadership is being denied many of our most gifted people.

This does not mean that I expect every investment banker to become a precinct leader—although some might really enjoy this experience. But what I hope to see is more of our businessmen thinking broadly about national and international questions and not being afraid to offer their opinions and advice.

Moreover, businessmen should be readily on tap as consultants to government; they should be cheerfully available for a term of duty as a public official; and their firms should cheerfully cooperate; they should increase their intercourse with our political leaders through conferences and private conversations; they should take a more active interest in local politics on the theory that there is a very definite trickle up in public affairs and that their local actions can and do affect national actions.

What does all this mean?

Simply this:

We in business have a responsibility for seeing that our Nation maintains a sound fiscal policy; business has a responsibility for reappraising world trade in the light of enlightened self-interest; business has a responsibility with labor of redefining an economic philosophy for the future; business has a responsibility to devote time and thought to national and international political questions.

I think it can be boiled down into a phrase written over 25 years ago in an essay on the businessman, "A great society is a society in which its men of business think greatly of their functions."

Fellow businessmen—or more happily stated, I believe—fellow trustees of the future—here is our summons to greatness. We can do no less. And if we are faithful to these tenets, America will never become a brooding fortress of despair, but will continue confidently on a course that carries her ever onwards and upwards to new peaks of achievement.

Newspaper Boy Values

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, for the past 18 years the Boston Daily Record-American and Sunday Advertiser—Hearst newspaper—have sponsored a radio program known as the "Boston Daily Record-American and Sunday Advertiser Newspaper Boys Radio Show." This program is intended primarily to give youngsters who sell newspapers an opportunity to develop their talents and to focus the attention of the people on other activities of these boys, whose only contact with the public is as a newsboy on the corner or in the delivery of newspapers to the homes of their customers. Throughout the years men and women in business, finance, and politics, and other walks of human activity have been invited to make remarks appropriate to such a program, which program is now under the direction of Charles Mungie, circulation director of the Boston Daily Record-American and Sunday Advertiser, and produced by Thomas Shulman of the Boston Daily Record-American and Sunday Advertiser.

I was invited to participate in this program on April 27, 1959. It was a pleasure for me to participate in this program which is constructive in nature and productive in excellent results. In my extension I include the remarks that I made on the Newspaper Boys radio show on April 27, 1959:

[From the Boston Daily Record, Apr. 27, 1959]

NEWSPAPERBOY VALUES TOLD BY MCCORMACK

(By Tommy Shulman)

Congressman JOHN W. MCCORMACK, majority leader of the U.S. House of Representatives, praised newspaperboys on the Newspaperboys' Radio Show Sunday morning at 9:30 over NBC's WEZE. We are pleased to publish Congressman MCCORMACK's radio address:

"I am very happy to appear on the Boston Daily Record and American-Sunday Advertiser Newspaperboys Radio Show. Newspaperboys have always held a spot close to my heart. Busy boys who are devoting their spare time to learning and earning.

"Most gratifying to me is the knowledge that the only newspaperboys regular weekly program in the country originates in my congressional district. Many times have I heard the praises of your songs, fine instrumental music, educational and patriotic dramas.

"BECOME SUCCESSFUL MEN

"I assure you that well deserving is the nationwide recognition and the many citations and awards that have been bestowed upon this program.

"For every newspaperboy is a businessman. He is a builder—the size of his route—or the sale of his papers depends a great deal on his ability, his determination and his personality.

"I have never known a newspaperboy who has not been a success. We find the newspaperboys of my days now professional men, leading businessmen. We find them in the arts and the sciences, that is due to the fact that in their early years, they had the determination to go ahead, in a sense to be a Horatio Alger and with that determination, they built themselves, studied, educated themselves and took the journey of life into higher positions of responsibility, enjoying also a position of confidence and respect in the minds of their fellow men.

"WIDE RECOGNITION

"As I have said, I have never known a newspaperboy who was not a success. I have never known one who was not a leader in his community. I feel it would be fitting and proper that your fine Record, American and Sunday Advertiser newspaperboys program, be recognized as widely as possible

and I intend to see that this is called to the attention of my colleagues in Congress.

"The newspaperboys of today, like those of yesterday, typify the real American boys with the interest of God, the interest for his Nation and his family at heart. Many of you boys, newspaperboys of today but leading citizens of tomorrow, will inherit the responsibility of guiding the destiny of our great country.

"I have never known a newspaperboy who did not love his mother and his father or who failed to make contributions to his family, turning in his earnings to his mother in order to enable her and his father to keep the family going. I have seen so many of them myself when I was a youngster and they all made good.

"With such boys as these destined to assume the responsibilities of the future, I have no misgivings for the welfare and the national interest of our country."

Agricultural Abundance: Blessing or Evil?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STUART SYMINGTON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 14, 1959

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from this week's isue of the Saturday Evening Post, entitled "Must Our Food Surplus be Treated as an Evil?"

This article presents, in concise capsule form, one of the most important problems facing our Nation today, that is, how to use our agricultural abundance as a national and international asset instead of continuing it as an economic burden on farmers, consumers, and Government.

The food for peace bill which I recently joined in sponsoring with the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and other Senators, is a positive, dynamic approach to this grave question and problem which has been presented in such excellent fashion in this editorial.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Saturday Evening Post, May 16, 1959]

MUST OUR FOOD SURPLUS BE TREATED AS AN EVIL?

(By John Bird)

Science fiction utilizes a mysterious nerve gas which destroys the victim's sense of reality, rendering him aimless. The hot air surrounding the farm problem has much the same effect.

Certainly, the hodgepodge of Federal farm programs, which are costing taxpayers $5,400 million this fiscal year, can't claim to have solved the farm problem. Surpluses of corn, wheat, and cotton mount higher and higher. Contrary to a popular impression, the farmers' net income from all sources, including Government payments, has declined; in 1958 it was 23 percent less than in 1947 in terms of a stable dollar. Per capita income of farmers is only about half that of nonfarmers. In many respects the outlook of the people on the land is as uncertain as ever.

The Federal farm programs have but slight actual bearing on the challenges the farmer faces today, as a great technological upheaval swiftly changes the face and foundation of rural America. The programs fail to answer the increasingly urgent question: How can the nation use the bounty that its agriculture provides?

The systematic application of research to agriculture has resulted in break-throughs which vastly increase the ability of the farmer to produce food and fiber. Last year on the smallest acreage in 40 years, United States farmers harvested the largest crop output in history. Within the past generation the amount of food that a farmer can produce from an acre has increased 70 percent. Our agriculture has become superproductive.

Like nuclear fission, our explosive farm productivity can bring disaster if not wisely guided. Any realistic national farm policy must recognize that U.S. farmers aren't farming half as well as they know how.

For example, the average milk cow now gives more than 3 tons of milk a year—a great improvement over a generation ago, but still far from the 8 or 10 tons that the best cows, scientifically bred and fed, can yield. Through the use of artificial insemination, the inheritance of the most productive dairy animals is being widely distributed. The average U.S. corn yield now is around 51 bushels an acre, but science has made it possible to double or triple it.

Meanwhile, researchers are unlocking more of nature's secrets through the use of new scientific tools. Where plant breeders in the past relied on rare accidents in nature to produce sports with new characteristics, they now bombard seeds with radioactivity to create mutations in a hurry.

As yet, our patchwork of farm laws has given no answers to questions such as the following:

1. How can agriculture become even more productive—as it will—without repeatedly putting farm people through an economic wringer? Theoretically, the laws of supply and demand eventually would bring farm output into balance with effective markets—but this harsh kind of "adjustment" can bring all of agriculture close to bankruptcy, a price this country no longer is prepared to pay. At the same time, the present so-called control programs have been overridden by rocketing yields.

2. Is the family-type farm going to be abel to maintain its traditional key place in the new kind of agriculture that rapidly is evolving? If so, how? The tide of mechanization and specialization means, as a rule, that small farm units must consolidate into larger ones to utilize modern machines and methods. Capital investment and costs per farm unit continue to expand. A Corn Belt farm, which represented a prewar investment of $29,000, now stands at $97,000. Perhaps just as the small, independent craftsman disappeared from industry, so the small, independent farmer is doomed to disappear from our agriculture, to be replaced by large, industrial-type operations. In any event, within the past 10 years alone the farm population has shrunk by more than 5 million.

3. Must national farm policies continue to be negative in concept, designed only to fight rearguard actions against advancing technology? The most urgent need of agriculture today is a positive means to move its booming output into useful consumption. If a positive attack on the problem requires subsidy, the taxpayers' money might be more effectively employed for the expansion of consumption, aiding needed improvement of the U.S. diet, rather than futile acreage control. In addition, the vast supplies of dried milk, flour, soybeans, butter, and rice that are sterile surplus can become highly useful capital when transferred to backward, hunger-ridden nations. The United States now is disposing of some surplus commodities to such nations, but the times call for a much bolder approach, such as large-scale loans of surplus commodities to friendly countries, wherever these can become sources of energy for self-development.

We can, of course, drift along, risking a farm depression and the sorry spectacle of the leading capitalistic nation smothering in its own plenty. Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson has urged that Government price supports to farmers be made flexible, so that they could be used to discourage, rather than encourage, the output of surplus crops. No doubt this would lessen the heavy drain on the Treasry, but it will take far more than a rejiggering of price supports to convert our farms' superproductivity from a liability into the national and international asset that it should be.

Your Stake in Inflation Fight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALLACE F. BENNETT
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 14, 1959

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Provo Daily Herald of May 6, 1959.

The editorial outlines very effectively the inflationary pressures at work in our economy, and calls attention to the things we must do if we are effectively to combat the wage-price spiral and the inflationary effect of further deficit spending.

I recommend this editorial to every Member of Congress.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YOUR STAKE IN INFLATION FIGHT

You central Utahans have watched inflation shrink the dollar in your pocket year after year.

Like people throughout the Nation, you've seen it siphon money from your pocketbook, wither the value of your savings, your insurance, your bonds. You've seen it blight your pension and your social security reserve.

Some months the insiduous eating-away process of inflation tapers off or even stops. In recent months it's been like that. But today the threat of a new inflation hangs over you.

New big union wage contracts have to be talked out and agreed upon in the days and weeks ahead. If higher wages are followed by price boosts, as so often happens, then the corrosion will begin anew.

There's more. If the Federal Government, deep in the red this year, should run a sizable deficit next season, big borrowing will be needed. That will add to the inflationary pressures.

President Eisenhower called Tuesday for mobilization of public opinion against any steel industry wage agreement that would be clearly inflationary. He appealed to both management and labor to use good sense, wisdom, and economic statesmanship, and hinted the Government might step in should they fail to do so.

Both sides pledged sincere efforts to reach a noninflationary pact, but their positions were so far apart that many observers are forecasting a strike when the present contracts, covering half a million workers in the basic steel industry, expire June 30.

Does the public have a stake in the present union-management contract negotiations? It certainly does. Anybody who thinks otherwise has another guess coming.

The public is getting sick and tired of the same song-new verse pattern of prices being raised after a new wage contract, further corroding that already anemic dollar.

Almost everybody recognizes the painful pointlessness of the wage-price spiral. The same goes for a strike, which can do everybody concerned—the workers, the companies, and the public—great harm.

Samuel Lubell's newest researches for United Features claim that across the Nation most steelworkers don't want another pay raise if it will touch off another round of price increases.

Most of us recognize, too, that our pocketbooks are going to get thinner if Government steadily spends more than it takes in.

We understand that a big country can't be run by a small Government. You can't power a tractor-trailer with a bicycle motor. We're aware also that as we grow, our needs will go on multiplying.

But bigness is not and never was an excuse for inefficiency, wasteful duplicating, unnecessary spending of your money. You have a right to demand that every dollar be well spent and fully accounted for, and to ask that the unneeded dollar be left in your pocket.

Because essential spending today is so immense, it becomes daily more urgent that the executive agencies of Government and the watchdogs in and out of Congress carve from the budget every last unessential penny.

At this time, it appears that the most significant thing anybody can do in holding the line is for both sides in the steel industry contract negotiations to follow President Eisenhower's advice and come up with an agreement, within the deadline, that will not result in a new inflation-triggering steel price.

With an attitude of give-and-take, it should be possible to negotiate a compromise, without Government intervention, that will prove satisfactory without upping steel prices and touching off a new round of price increases across the country.

What can you, Mr. and Mrs. Average Citizen, do in the overall war against inflation? You can take a cue from the President and do your part in mobilizing public opinion against a new damaging wage-price spiral.

You can do something else, too. You can let your representatives in Washington know that you expect Government to eliminate useless spending—to cut out needless junkets, avoid duplication, end payroll padding, insist on strict efficiency, etc.

Make use of your citizen's privileges to be heard. Maybe some sharp prodding from you and fellow citizens throughout the country can impress the watchdogs of the Treasury to do more than bark at the shadows. Public opinion can be a powerful tool. The trouble is, the people too often don't use it. They're too complacent.

Inflation is everybody's problem. Let's stir the public on this matter as it's never been stirred before. We must not sit idly by while wage-price spirals and excessive Government spending push prices higher and higher.

If everybody would take an interest, then we'd really get somewhere in the continuing battle to preserve the value of the dollar.

Soil Conservation Is Vital to Our Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 14, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, our Nation's soil is one of its most vital resources. We can see in other parts of the world what will happen if we do not care for our soil. Where once crops grew thickly and luxuriantly, improper use of the soil has caused the present barren condition. We cannot afford to allow this to happen here.

Soil Stewardship Week serves to point up the need for soil conservation and proper agricultural management.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial on soil conservation which was printed on May 7, 1959, in the Sherman (Tex.) Democrat, an outstanding daily newspaper in Texas, under the heading "Soil Conservation Vital."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOIL CONSERVATION VITAL

Stewardship of the soil is an especially live topic this week. It is national Soil Stewardship Week.

Highlight of the local observance is the staging of the annual banker's dinner at Gainesville for the Upper Elm-Red Soil Conservation District, in which most of Grayson County belongs.

Soil conservation districts of the Nation also have invited churches and civic clubs to devotes attention to the important matter of saving the soil.

The Democrat today is issuing a tabloid edition devoted to soil conservaiton and this paper, together with the loyal advertisers who are saluting the conservationist farmers of the area, join in the national acknowledgement of the importance of agriculture to the American economy.

People who live in the city, though they may never see a harvest, have a direct interest in the soil from which they receive many of the products they use. The shelf or bin in the grocery store is only a step from the soil in which the food was produced. No one is far removed from the soil, its blessings and demands, though he may dwell in an apartment or in a crowded city.

The contribution of the city family in soil and water conservation may come mainly in support given the national effort in soil and water conservation. City dwellers who own agricultural land have an obligation just as those who live on the farms and ranches, to use and keep the land according to the Creator's design. Their responsibility is to encourage good soil stewardship on the part of those to whom they rent or lease the land.

In some nations of the world, famine is the ever-present danger. Men and women live their lives without knowing how it feels to have enough to eat, and lives of families hang in the balance between existence and starvation.

In many of these starvation-plagued countries, the land once yielded bountifully. Unwise use of the land, which permitted erosion to steal away the productive power of the soil, changed abundance into want.

When the soil's precious resources are destroyed, it takes a long time to return the soil to its useful state. It is much wiser to prevent the destruction, to conserve the land and to build up its productivity for the future. In our generation we have seen the cost of neglect of soil, thousands of acres that once produced for family needs now lying idle and unproductive.

With intelligence and foresight we can prevent the tragedy that has befallen other areas of the world.

Tribute to J. Edgar Hoover

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 14, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, today I rise to pay tribute to a great man, Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

For 35 years, Mr. Hoover has served as our Nation's No. 1 G-man. During that period, he has—by foresight, dedication, tireless devotion to duty, and pursuit of well-founded objectives—created for our country the most efficient and effective investigative agency in our history.

In protecting our citizens, and our country, from criminals, subversives and other such dangers, the FBI has established for itself a unique reputation, deserving the respect of all men.

The record of service to our country by Mr. Hoover and the FBI, is unmatched in history, defies description and evaluation. Like my fellow Americans, I can only warmly pay tribute to the dedication, heroism, devotion, and unique qualities of the constructive work by Mr. Hoover and his fellow members of the FBI, much of which will forever remain a secret from the world.

Recently the Milwaukee Journal published a detailed article entitled "FBI Chief 35 Years; Still Zestful," reviewing our No. 1 G-man's outstanding contribution to law enforcement in this country.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Milwaukee Journal, May 8, 1959]

FBI CHIEF 35 YEARS, HOOVER STILL ZESTFUL—NO. 1 G-MAN SHOWS SAME SPIRIT IN JOB HE DISPLAYED ON TAKING IT WHEN 29

(By Jack Adams)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—The Nation's No. 1 G-man reaches an important milestone Sunday—35 eventful years as boss of the FBI, and the longest tenure for a Federal agency head in the country's history.

But there is every evidence that John Edgar Hoover has the same drive and zest

for his job that marked his wonder boy era in the roaring twenties.

That era had its start when Hoover, just 29, was placed in charge of a discredited, scandal ridden organization of political hacks whose staff reputedly included some ex-convicts. It is history now—the story of how he cleaned out the Bureau with a stern hand and went ahead to make it one of the world's most renowned and most respected investigative agencies.

HE WAS 64 ON JANUARY 1

Hoover, who passed his 64th birthday January 1, has no thought of retiring.

A few days ago he told me: "Old age will have to run mighty fast to catch up with me."

The FBI director serves at the pleasure of whoever happens to be Attorney General. Hoover, who has no political affiliation, has held the job under five Presidents and a dozen Attorney Generals, Democrat and Republican.

Attorney General Rogers laughed off a question about a possible Hoover retirement and said:

"I am the 12th Attorney General who has had the privilege of working with Mr. Hoover in the 35 years he has directed the FBI. This is a demonstration of the working of the immutable law of the survival of the fittest. I am sure each of my 11 predecessors have felt as I feel, that without Edgar Hoover his task would have been immeasurably harder."

POSSIBLE SUCCESSORS

Who would succeed Hoover if he should retire? One rarely hears talk about a successor, but two names are mentioned occasionally: Clyde A. Tolson, the associate director who has worked at Hoover's side for 31 years, and Edward A. Tamm, who was assistant to Hoover for 20 years before accepting a Federal District judgeship in the District of Columbia.

A bachelor, Hoover lives in a modest home in a fashionable Washington neighborhood with his two Cairn terriers—and raises roses in his leisure hours.

He believes in keeping fit. Just under six feet, he watches his diet and keeps his weight at 175 pounds. Weather permitting, he daily dismisses his car a mile short of his office in the Justice Department building and strides the last lap at a gait that frequently winds companions.

Hoover reads several newspapers every day—including the comic strips and everything in the sports section. His favorite books are the biographies of great Americans.

GIVES SOME ADVICE

At the office, he maintains constant personal touch with everything of importance that is going on at the moment. There is a standing rule that any employee who wants to see him has only to ask.

I asked Hoover what kind of qualities a young man of today should have to make a success of an important job. He said:

"Most important, to my mind, is humility—to remember that he is not trying to build his own reputation but is serving his fellow man. Many careers are wrecked when individuals forget the role of service and follow their own personal desires, whether for money, social position, prestige, etc. In our society today, the greatest opportunities are those of helping others.

"Next is integrity—that is, being a man of your word. If you say one thing and do something else—well, that is the way to undermine your reputation among others. Stand for what you think is right, regardless of criticism.

"Also, there is hard work. Over my 35 years I can truthfully say that there is no substitute for hard work. To guide your career just by the clock is to lose the true meaning of a job. Give your job your whole heart. If a job is worth doing, do it well."

BEST REMEMBERED DATE

Out of a treasure trove of memories as gang buster, crusader against communism, constant champion of better trained, better paid police, what does Hoover remember best?

May 10, 1924, of course. That was the date Attorney General Harlan Fiske Stone, later Chief Justice of the United States, called him in to take over the FBI. Hoover recalls: "The tone of his voice was such that I knew he was depending on me and I had to do the job right. When a man puts confidence in you, you simply have to live up to that trust. Over the years I've found that this is indeed a good guide to life. That decision put me on the spot. I had to succeed."

May 1, 1936: Hoover flew to New Orleans and personally arrested Alvin Karpis, the No. 1 bad man of his day, who had been boasting that he planned to rush Hoover's office in Washington and kill him.

HE RECALLS PEARL HARBOR

"I remember that day well," says Hoover. "We in the FBI had a deep feeling of satisfaction in finding Karpis. He was a badly wanted fugitive. His arrest helped us defeat the criminal gangs of that day."

December 7, 1941: Pearl Harbor day. Says Hoover: "When the Japanese bombs hit Pearl Harbor, we in the FBI placed into immediate operation previously prepared plans for guarding the Nation's internal security. I was proud of the way FBI employees responded to the challenge—working around the clock to do their job. This was typical of their loyalty to duty."

And finally, May 22, 1950: That was the day that Harry Gold, master Russian atomic spy, confessed his activities after being picked up by the FBI. That confession broke the back of atomic spying in this country.

"Those were busy days at the FBI," Hoover recalls. "Atomic bomb secrets had been stolen by the Russians. The spy was here in the United States—somewhere. We had to find him. We did—a chemist in Philadelphia, Harry Gold. This meant that one of our most important cases had been solved."

Gold, who pleaded guilty to an espionage charge, is now serving a 30 year prison term.

National Parks Increase Tourist Trade and Traffic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 14, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, hearings have been started on the Indiana Dunes National Monument bill authored by the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

The Subcommittee on Public Lands, headed by the able senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], is conducting these hearings.

We hope for similar hearings on our Oregon Dunes national seashore bill and other legislation to create reserves for recreation and rest and relaxation in the vast American outdoors.

Now, the Eugene (Oreg.) Register-Guard of May 3, 1959, has published a most informative editorial entitled "Park Impact," demonstrating how such areas as the Great Smoky Mountains National Park has increased tourist trade and traffic by many times over.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial from the Register-Guard of Eugene be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PARK IMPACT

Some who object to the proposal that a National Park Service preserve be established south of Florence object because of what to them seem to be economic reasons. Figures on the economy of communities around the Great Smoky Mountains National Park should be of interest. That park, on the Tennessee-North Carolina border, is much bigger than the proposed sand dunes area and it is much closer to the population centers. But in one important respect it is similar. No tourist facilities are operated by the park. Lodgings, meals, souvenirs, etc., are sold on the park boundaries by private operators.

Since 1947 traffic on North Carolina highways has increased 88 percent. But in the Great Smokies traffic increased 140 percent. In 1956, 1,559,703 people entered the park. Of these 87 percent were on pleasure trips. They spent more than $26 million that year in the immediate park area. Some were 1-day visitors; others stayed overnight, either at private accommodations on the park fringe or at camps inside the park.

Since creation of the park, the report of the two States' highway commissions asserts, the tourist business has become the economic backbone of the area. Resources are not depleted. The money that is spent there is money made elsewhere.

The two States look forward to an even bigger volume in future years. More than 4 million visitors are expected annually by 1966. In the park area itself, the park has proved popular with the natives who see the wisdom in that old slogan of southern hospitality: "A tourist is worth two bales of cotton, and he's twice as easy to pick."

Challenge to a Basic Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALLACE F. BENNETT

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 14, 1959

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial published in a recent issue of the San Francisco Chronicle.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHALLENGE TO A BASIC FREEDOM

The U.S. Supreme Court, which traditionally guards against temptations of emotion, prejudice, or any lesser considerations than the ground rules imposed by precedent and the Constitution, veered dangerously close to expediency last week. A precedent-shattering decision would allow health inspectors to enter homes without a warrant.

The decision was based on a Baltimore, Md., ordinance which permits inspectors to enter houses where there are valid grounds for believing unsanitary conditions exist.

The entry must be in daytime and inspectors must not use force.

Justice Felix Frankfurter wrote the 5 to 4 majority opinion for the Court. After citing "the increased awareness of the responsibility of the State for the living conditions of its citizens," he asserted that health inspection "would be greatly hobbled by the blanket requirement of the safeguards necessary for a search of evidence of criminal acts."

Dissenting were Chief Justice Earl Warren and Justices William O. Douglas, Hugo Black, and William Brennan. In his dissent, Justice Douglas charges the majority opinion "greatly dilutes the right of privacy which every homeowner had the right to believe was part of our American heritage."

In the Constitution this right is spelled out in the fourth amendment, which prohibits "unreasonable searches and seizures.'"

Justice Douglas argued that "one invasion of privacy by an official of government can be as oppressive as another." He said:

"The fear that health inspections will suffer if constitutional safeguards are applied is strongly held by some. Like notions obtain by some law enforcement officials who take shortcuts in pursuit of criminals. The same pattern appears over and over again whenever government seeks to use its compulsive force against the citizen." There is no reason, he declared, why health inspectors, like policemen, should not be required to obtain warrants before entering homes.

Or, as the elder William Pitt said long ago: "The poorest man may in his cottage bid defiance to all the force of the crown. It may be frail; its roof may shake; the wind may blow through it; the storm may enter, the rain may enter—but the King of England cannot enter; all his force dares not cross the threshold of the ruined tenement."

The Supreme Court, in the school segregation decision in 1954, and again in the historic Jencks case in 1957, made it clear that neither expediency nor public approval is a proper yardstick. In the health inspection verdict, the Court teetered towards expediency. We join Justice Douglas and his colleagues in dissenting from the majority.

The American Way of Life and Its Comparison to Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 14, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, as a great thinker once said, each generation and individual must realize again for themselves and himself the blessings of freedom and liberty.

These wonderful privileges were won for the United States by our forefathers, who were willing to fight and die for them. I feel our modern generations have also shown they understand the magnificent heritage their ancestors have handed down to them.

Miss Wanda Brinkley, a student at the Houston, Tex. Vocational-Technical School, recently wrote an editorial for the school paper which, I feel, interestingly compares our heritage of freedom with the Communist inheritance of fear.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the editorial by Miss Brinkley, which appeared in the Reporter for March 27, 1959, under the heading, "Why Is Our American Constitutional Way of Life Incompatible With Communism?"

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY IS OUR AMERICAN CONSTITUTIONAL WAY OF LIFE INCOMPATIBLE WITH COMMUNISM?

(By Wanda Brinkley)

The Constitution of the United States is unique in that certain powers are given the Government, certain powers are denied the Government, and individual personality and rights are assured the people. There is no discrimination between one who is capable and one who is not. Each person is treated as an equal in the eyes of the law.

The communistic way of government is "all for the government and nothing for the people." The people live for their state and die for it. They don't have enjoyment and recreation such as baseball, television, radio, or any other free-from-government pleasures. The Communist people are limited in their participation in sports, engaging only in those that would bring glory to the state. They are not to think, but to perform.

The Americans have the liberty to do almost anything they want that is not outside the law. They are informed on all governmental issues by the free press and other media of communication, whereas the Communists are not allowed to listen to certain speeches of governmental procedures, or to print uncensored newspapers. The Communist government keeps its progress and defeats a secret.

In America the men and women who want to enlist in the military services may do so when they reach the age of 18. The Communist people are sometimes compelled at an early age to leave their homes and family to be trained in the science or military fields.

Education in the Communist-dominated countries is restricted to those who have a superior intellect, and their education is highly restricted as far as subject matter is concerned.

In the United States all children have an opportunity for at least a high-school education, even though they be of below normal intelligence.

Look around you. How many luxuries do you have. Look in your refrigerator at the various assortment of different foods. Look in your cabinets and observe the amount of canned goods and cooking utensils. Do you think all Communist people have these?

In the United States even the lowest class of people have a moderate amount of luxuries; compared to the Communist people they would seem like a heaven on earth. Most American families have at least three good meals a day and the items used in preparing these meals are not rationed. They did not have to stand in line from dawn till dusk to purchase the food, only to hear, "Sorry, but we are sold out." How do you think the people under Communist rule would react to these luxuries? Do you think that they are able to walk into a store like we do and purchase them without opposition?

The wages of the Communist people are not sufficient to provide them with money to purchase the necessary items that are essential to everyday life. The working class of people make barely enough salary to survive. There is no going to driveins, rodeos, carnivals, or dances to break the built-up tension of monotony in their everyday life. For most of them, it is eat, sleep, and work, but most times there isn't enough to eat.

Have you ever seen pictures on how people dress in the communistic countries? Does it look dowdy compared to our highly fashioned clothes? The Communist people have, if they are lucky, only four changes of clothes to last them a year or more.

In America, people don't have to wear ragged clothes or unsoled shoes; they dress nicely because the price of these items are not half as high as in the communistic countries.

Communist people have no choice as to the variety of their religious life, whereas, the American people have the freedom to worship as they please. There are no commands as to the church or the religion they may worship. In our country, this subject is left entirely to the people themselves.

So you can see why our American constitutional way of life is incompatible with communism.

Spirit of Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 14, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, as we face the challenges of the future, we recognize that our country will depend not only upon national programs, but upon the strength and spirit of individual States in our Republic, to meet these challenges.

During a brief lifetime, we in Wisconsin are proud of the progress and accomplishment attained by our Badger State.

Today Wisconsin is the leading milk producing State in the Union, with an output of about 18 billion pounds annually. Our Wisconsin cheese is famous among lovers of "good food" everywhere.

Wisconsin, too, has pioneered in social legislation—providing pensions for the blind in 1907, aid to dependent children in 1939, and old age assistance in 1925. In 1932 our State enacted the first State unemployment compensation law in the country. In addition, we adopted the first statewide primary election law.

In reviewing these marks of progress, it would be only reasonable to also include the enthusiastic, constructive, farsighted support which Wisconsin citizens have given the St. Lawrence Seaway project—the greatest inland waterway development program on the North American Continent.

In addition, our Badger State has a splendid record of progress in development of industry and manufacturing, agriculture, conservation, reforestation, education, and many other cultural fields.

We recognize, of course, that the spirit of a State is more than land, water, and facts and statistics in the record book; rather it is the spirit, ideals, integrity, dedication of its people.

As a State, Wisconsin has shouldered its burdens, fought its way, contributed its share to an ever-greater progress for our Nation.

In the May edition of Wisconsin Alumnus there is a splendid article entitled,

"What is Wisconsin?" written by Lindley J. Stiles, dean of the School of Education at the University of Wisconsin.

In a beautiful portrayal of ideas, Dean Stiles has touched the pulse of Wisconsin, revealing poetically and dramatically the spirit of what is Wisconsin.

I ask unanimous consent to have Dean Stiles' article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Wherever man is, there too is the University of Wisconsin. Its boundaries are exceeded only by its influence; its influence is surpassed only by the devotion accorded it by alumni and friends throughout the world. What is this university? How may its personality be described? Why has it been imitated the world over, but never duplicated? What does Wisconsin symbolize in American higher education?

The University of Wisconsin, above all, is a spirit, a philosophy of life and learning, an idea. An idea as simple as it is potent. Yet, too, the university is a song, played briskly by a fast-stepping marching band, sung with deep feeling and reverence in a far away land, or intoned softly by the chimes of the carillon tower. A poem, painting, statue, concert, dramatic production, newspaper—ah, yes, Wisconsin is all of these.

For many the university is such a parcel of interwoven personal memories that only a sigh and a quiet smile can do justice to their complexity. They remember a boy and girl kissing goodnight in front of Elizabeth Waters Hall or strolling gaily along the lake to Picnic Point. They recall a girl on skis falling down on Bascom Hill, a can of beer, a glass of milk or a cup of coffee with a friend—and classes. These recollections surely are Wisconsin, but they are other universities as well.

What is Wisconsin?

Wisconsin is milk cow, eating the finest foods that chemistry can grow, in the shade of an elm tree.

Wisconsin is a circuit rider carrying the word of truth to farm, village and city, that all may better live.

Wisconsin is a laboratory where dedicated men and women search to know that others may benefit.

Wisconsin is a lake, a hill, some trees—and controversy, especially controversy.

Wisconsin is a teacher, wise, inspired, dedicated, learned, human, helping students set facts and principles to ideas.

Wisconsin is a Street of State, lighted by the lamp of learning, with the approving countenance of Mr. Jefferson clearly visible from the clouds above. It is a student on a soap box impatient with the times arguing that others have a better way, with few listeners, but all ready to defend his right to express his views.

Wisconsin is a library filled with books—all open.

Wisconsin is a meeting place of ideas, cultures, religions, races, nations; but mostly of people.

A quiet man studying Greek, a doctor kneeling at the bedside of all the sick, an engineer planning a bridge across the world—these are Wisconsin.

Wisconsin is an atom—split asunder.

Yes, Wisconsin is a woman, too; a pioneer woman unafraid of work, a homemaker, a scholar and teacher holding high a torch, quietly moving toward equality; a lady, splendid and wise, dressed in purple with a bird of fire circling around her shoulders; a bathing beauty, lounging on a pier with one pretty ankle dangling in the cool waters of Mendota, reading a treatise on American foreign policy. Wisconsin is a statute of Mother and Child.

Wisconsin is a true record of the past married to the present to bring forth the future. It is a giant enterprise that operates at a profit for all.

A monkey teaching a professor; bankers and businessmen going to school; a lawyer reading from his books in the State legislature; and controversy, sharp, sincere, and at times bitter debate—these are Wisconsin.

In another land, the University of Wisconsin is a happy child free from pellagra.

Wisconsin is work before play, mind before the material, character above all.

Controversy is the university. It is eternal conflict between fact and opinion, error and truth, prejudice and tolerance, rights and responsibilities, with newspapers and citizens rallying forces; professors with cap and gown aside mixing in the common brawl—and an editor.

Wisconsin is a week in January between semesters; a stateman pleading that all should rule, and be ruled; a machine testing butterfat. It is an athlete with strong and agile muscles running a race with a Bucky Badger between classes.

Wisconsin is an invigorating climate, both physical and human, that challenges all to play over their heads. It is the itch of curiosity and creativity with unlimited ability to scratch. Wisconsin is both a tender mother encouraging the weak and a stern father admonishing all to do better.

Wisconsin is Christianity and all other religions, all denominations and faiths. It is a priest, a rabbi, a minister talking quietly with a group of students away from home. Wisconsin is equality, democracy, freedom, opportunity, humanity. It is a statue of Lincoln; a flag and a plaque on Bascom Hall.

Yes, Wisconsin is a spirit that encircles the world and reaches into space. It is an idea: that truth in the hands of people is the end of education.

What is Wisconsin? Touch a human being any place in the world and you will feel its image. Listen to the wind and you will hear its song. Watch a shooting missile and you will feel its power. Take a walk in the sun; you will feel its energy. Sit quietly in the shade of a tree by a lake; you will feel its beauty. Search your soul and you will find its values. Recall the passage, "Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free;" and you will catch its spirit and know its mission.

Revelry in the Face of Danger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 14, 1959

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a recent column by Ralph McGill. Mr. McGill has this month been the recipient of the Pulitzer Prize for distinguished editorial writing. Mr. McGill not only serves as editor of the Atlanta Constitution, but his column is now carried by papers over the country. Mr. McGill is one of the ablest modern writers of short essays. This column is but one example of his gifted pen and mind.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Atlanta Constitution, May 9, 1959]

REVELRY IN THE FACE OF DANGER—THOUGH MANY SEEK TO ESCAPE CRISIS BY IGNORING IT, HOPE IS SEEN

(By Ralph McGill)

A friend of mine from New York, whose trade is to work in that nebulous but exacting field called public relations, and whose further chore it is to entertain various clients whose bents run often to night clubs and the like, came to see me.

He looked haggard and there was no bounce in his step, and the bounce, as one and all know, is a necessary attribute of a man whose task it is to bring sweetness and light and mutual admiration where none, or little, before existed.

"I never saw such a frantic season," he said. "Night clubs in New York are doing well and in New Orleans the Bourbon Street strip and jazz joints are jumping with persons energetically seeking recreation. It fretted me because they were working so desperately hard at it."

He paused and sighed from way down deep.

"I wrote something down for you," he said, and took from his pocket a sheet of folded paper. He read from it:

"With the enemy's approach to Moscow, the Muscovites' view of their situation did not grow more serious, but on the contrary became even more frivolous, as always happens with people who see a great danger approaching. At the approach of danger there are always two voices that speak with equal power in the human soul: one very reasonably tells a man to consider the nature of the danger and the means of escaping it; the other, still more reasonably, says that it is too depressing and painful to think of the danger, since it is not in man's power to foresee everything and avert the general course of events, and it's better therefore to disregard what is painful till it comes, and to think about what is pleasant. In solitude a man generally listens to the first voice, but in society to the second. So it was now with the inhabitants of Moscow. It was long since people had been as gay in Moscow as that year."

"I won't ask you to be a quiz kid," he said. "That's from Tolstoy's 'War and Peace,' and the antics of myself and my fellow man over the weekend impressed it upon me."

I reached over to a shelf and got Byron's poem, "Waterloo," which deals also with a latter event in the history of Napoleon. It begins:

"There was a sound of revelry by night,
And Belgium's capital had gathered then
Her beauty and her chivalry, and bright
The lamps shone o'er fair women and brave men;
A thousand hearts beat happily, and when
Music arose with its voluptuous swell,
Soft eyes looked love to eyes which spake again,
And all went merry as a marriage bell;
But, hush, hark! A deep sound strikes like a rising knell!"

It was the beginning of Waterloo and the destruction of the Napoleonic power.

This human, but nonetheless curious, effort to escape from the reality of a situation was never better illustrated than in the Confederate capital city of Richmond in the last anguished months before it fell. Mrs. Mary Boykin Chestnut's "Diary From Dixie" reports its frivolous, almost frantic, attempt to disregard what is painful until it comes.

Today many Americans are heeding what Tolstoy called "the second voice." They squirm away from the reality of the sacrifice in taxes and goods which must be made. They try to find an escape in criticism and doubting.

But there are enough who will face the issues to solve them. There is within the Republic the will and intelligence to find ways and means to meet the threat which is of war, yet not war alone, but war plus a fanatic ideology appealing to millions long without food, direction, education, information or any concept of order. Those who insist on listening to that second voice are just the extra weight we must carry into the fight.

The Citizen and His Living Faith

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 14, 1959

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, in a very particular sense, the citizens of New Jersey have suffered a tremendous loss in the untimely death of Deputy Defense Secretary Donald A. Quarles.

Our State was proud indeed to claim him as our very own, since it was in New Jersey that he chose to make his home. Before his entry on the national scene, he served his home city of Englewood as president of the common council and as mayor. We therefore knew him well, and we followed his career with great personal interest and a deep feeling of pride.

Although we have lost a great citizen, we have the honor of having a living monument to his memory in New Jersey: the elementary school which bears his name. New Jersey will not soon forget Donald Quarles.

I have before me an editorial from the Bergen Evening Record of May 9, 1959, entitled "The Citizen and His Living Faith." It seems to me that no other title so aptly describes him and I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Bergen Evening Record of May 9, 1959]

THE CITIZEN AND HIS LIVING FAITH

When the Englewood Board of Education decided by unanimous vote last October to name the new Davison Place elementary school for Donald Aubrey Quarles it did a just and graceful thing which, as was suggested at the time, should be explained to the children who will swarm into the school this fall. Mr. Quarles, who returned to Englewood in November to lay the school cornerstone, was not only—if "only" is the right word—an eminent and honored citizen of the republic. Here it was noted (and we're glad now we could say it while he was with us to hear it):

"He is also the very symbol of an educated man, a scientist at home in the remote reaches of research and theory and at home too in the application and use of pure science's findings. He is, yet again, the very symbol of the intellectual as citizen: member of the board of adjustment, president of the common council, chairman of the board of school estimate, mayor, and servant of his city and county and State in other, often humble, offices. He is the citizen as soldier, from field artillery captain in World War I to his present assignment in charge of defense research and development."

Mr. Quarles, as it turned out, did not at the school ceremony speak on the credo he lived by. We had hoped he would: "It would give any of us, student in Quarles School or adult citizen, a version of democratic responsibility to live up to." Don Quarles, sensitive and articulate as he was, never did get around to talking credo. He lived credo. In the sudden death of its Deputy Secretary of Defense the Nation has lost a public servant of the highest, which is the selfless, kind. We whom he was first to serve have lost a good neighbor and a humble and dedicated friend. From us cannot be taken the clear and tranquil image of the philosopher who was soldier and statesman, in his person a working version of democratic responsibility who understood his faith and kept it.

The GTA Daily Radio Roundup

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 14, 1959

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the GTA Daily Radio Roundup dated May 12, 1959.

There being no objection the roundup was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GTA DAILY RADIO ROUNDUP

What about the wheat referendum? That is a question a lot of wheat farmers are wondering about. They want the answer, and so far the Secretary of Agriculture has been as mum as a clam. But on Friday, May 15, the Secretary must show his hand—unless Congress gives him more time to make up his mind. And wheat farmers want to know what kind of a wheat referendum the Secretary of Agriculture will unfold at the last minute. So does Congress.

What the Secretary of Agriculture does will be watched closely because the chances are 10 to 1 that it will be part of the crowbar technique of tearing down the present farm program of production control and price protection. That we know, because the Secretary of Agriculture already has announced that he wants to eliminate any of the New Deal farm programs that are on the books before he steps out of office, maybe next year. This is part of the Secretary of Agriculture's party politics.

But that does not mean that every Republican in Congress backs the Secretary of Agriculture or the White House in this scheme. Some of the Secretary's severest critics and most outspoken opponents are Republicans from these spring wheat States. They want a strong, sound, workable farm program that gives farmers protection (and protects consumers from high food prices) such as the Democrats do.

But the trouble with the Republicans is that they are stuck with what is called the Benson tag and it is guilt by association. These Republicans know it and know there is not much they can do about it no matter how hard they try.

The Secretary of Agriculture is on the same team with them and is calling the signals for dismantling the price support program.

We want to talk about the politics involved because GTA's general manager, M. W. Thatcher, was in Washington last week.

There were a lot of important matters to discuss, such as co-op taxes, the faked scandal about grain storage, the big noise about the Secretary of Agriculture's newest mess, and the need for farm groups to get together on a farm program and farm prices.

The farmers know that the situation is not as hopeless as the papers make it out. With a little more hard work on some of the Republicans who have been whiplashed by the Secretary of Agriculture, there can be enough Republican and Democratic votes to override any veto the Secretary can get from the White House. Four little votes is all that it will take in the House.

So that means getting four more Republican votes in Minnesota, Wisconsin, and the Dakotas to support a good farm program and keep the Democrats in line.

Can it be done? Well, it may be hard but, says Thatcher, it is not impossible.

The Senate override of the White House veto on REA has shaken the confidence of the Department of Agriculture and strengthened the rebellion of the Republican farm Senators.

And it was only the terrific effort of Minnesota Congressman ANCHER NELSEN that whipped up the necessary four Republican votes to support Secretary Benson. Maybe next time there will be a change.

Now, some city people may well ask why a co-op such as GTA, which handles grain for the farmers who own it, is concerned with such matters—as farm prices being made in Washington. The reason is obvious to farmers. They own GTA and want GTA to speak up for them both in Washington and in the grain markets. As a matter of fact, GTA had an opinion poll taken in the Dakotas to find out how many farmers wanted GTA to keep on doing everything it can to help get a better farm program and better farm prices. Well, 12 percent said "We should just stick to our business." Sixty-eight percent said "Get out there and pitch. Do everything you can. Just marketing grain is not enough." Twenty percent said they were undecided but maybe GTA was doing right.

So, for the thousands of farmers who want GTA to do everything it can to help farmers, we remind you that this is GTA the Co-Op Way.

Charles Howard Silver: School Humanitarian

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 14, 1959

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, Charles H. Silver, the chairman of the school board of New York City, is an outstanding and able public servant.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a thoughtful article about Mr. Silver and his work, which was published in the New York Times of May 13.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SCHOOL HUMANITARIAN—CHARLES HOWARD SILVER

When Charles Howard Silver was a boy on the lower East Side around the turn of the

century, there were two professions that were held in particularly high esteem by the Jewish immigrants who then largely inhabited the area.

One was education and the other was medicine. Mr. Silver, who left school at the age of 15 to help support his family, did not enter either field, but he has since made his mark in both. Yesterday he was elected to his sixth term as president of the city's board of education, which oversees a school system of nearly 1 million pupils. And he is serving his 13th year as president of Beth Israel Hospital.

Impressive in appearence, Mr. Silver stands 5 feet 11 inches tall and weighs 190 pounds. He has silvery white hair and a ruddy complexion.

RETICENT ABOUT HIS AGE

A friendly, voluble person, he is reticent about only one thing—his age. He professes to be 70, although he looks years younger. Intimates, however, think that he has subtracted 1 or 2 years from his age and that he intends to remain 70 for as long as Jack Benny stays 39.

Whatever his age, he is a man of extraordinary vitality and enthusiasm for work, and his daily activities often tire much younger associates. He is an early riser—one of his first chores is to read the morning newspapers (and he is not adverse to reading about himself). He usually arrives at the board of education offices in Brooklyn shortly after 9 a.m.

He spends almost a full day at the board or working on school matters—when his schedule permits he likes to visit schools and chat with teachers and pupils—and around 4 p.m. he goes to Beth Israel Hospital. He has been a trustee of the hospital for 30 years, and in 1954 a new clinic was named in his honor.

After he takes care of administrative matters, he likes to visit the wards and talk to patients. He has been known to spend hours at the bedside of critically ill or elderly patients who have no relatives or friends, in an attempt to bolster their spirits.

Around 7 o'clock he goes home to dinner in their Central Park West apartment with his wife, the former Hannah Bernstein. They have three children and six grandchildren.

In recent weeks, however, the hospital strike has played havoc with his schedule.

Born in Rumania, the youngest of six children, Mr. Silver came to this country with his family when he was 30 months old. While attending public school, he worked afternoons and weekends for his father, who made suspenders in a little shop.

After being graduated from elementary school, he went to work full time as a $2.50-a-week office boy for the American Woolen Co. When he retired 5 years ago, he was a vice president of the company and a member of the board of directors. His annual salary was more than $100,000.

AIDS OTHER FAITHS

Mr. Silver over the years became active in scores of philanthropic and other organizations. An orthodox Jew—he is president of Congregation B'nai Jeshurun and vice chairman of the board of Yeshiva University—he has also been active on behalf of causes of other faiths.

He is a close friend of Cardinal Spellman and is vice president of the Alfred E. Smith Memorial Foundation, which helps support St. Vincent's Hospital. He has also headed fund drives for the Salvation Army.

Although he disclaims any political aspirations, Mr. Silver has been active—largely behind the scenes—in Democratic politics. At various times it has been reported that he turned down offers of nomination for such posts as mayor, city council president, Manhattan Borough president and Lieutenant Governor.

Although he never went to high school, he has received several honorary degrees, including doctorates from Fordham and Yeshiva Universities. He was appointed to the nonsalaried board of education in 1952.

A National Park on Padre Island, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 14, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, a sixth grade class in Houston, Tex., recently studied the proposed establishment of a national park on Padre Island, Tex.

Since another part of their study concerned their ability to express themselves in writing, their teacher, Mrs. James T. Reynolds, assigned them to write their opinions of the establishment of a national park on Padre Island.

Mr. President, the letters I hold in my hand are from tomorrow's citizens, and, as they themselves point out, the establishment of such a national park would preserve the beauty, history, and recreational and wildlife facilities of Padre Island for them and for their children and succeeding generations.

I ask unanimous consent to have these letters printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEAR SIR: I am glad that Padre Island is becoming a park. I hope they will not be too much boat racing. I hope my whole family can see Padre Island.

Yours truly,

MIKE MATHIS.

DEAR SIR: I am glad you are taking part of Padre Island and making a park of it. Then people can spend the night and stay there in the day.

Yours truly,

DENNIS WILSON.

DEAR SIR: I hear you are helping out on Padre Island. I think it is nice of you. It should be cleaned off around the water. They should have places to stay at night.

Yours truly,

TOMMY BROCK.

DEAR SIR: I am so glad that you and the other Congressmen are going to make Padre Island into a national park. People from all over Texas can visit Padre Island and have lots of fun.

Sincerely yours,

LOYD WILKERSON.

DEAR SIR: I am writing you about Padre Island. I am going to go to Padre Island when I get old enough. I think half of it should be for wild animals and the other half for a park like Big Bend.

Yours truly,

WILLIAM HOLCOMB.

DEAR SIR: I am writing to you about Padre Island. I think you are doing a nice job on Padre Island.

Yours truly,

NORMA ENAX.

DEAR SIR: I am writing to you about Padre Island. I think you should put wildlife in Padre Island. I hope your idea is right. When I get old enough I will vote for you.

Yours truly,

THELMA LOFF.

DEAR SIR: I have heard that Padre Island is going to be used for a national park. I very much like the idea.

Yours truly,

SANDRA ELLIS.

DEAR SIR: I am writing about Padre Island. I think it should be made into an animal kingdom and shelter spot. We always need more room for animals.

Yours truly,

WAYNE TRUSS.

DEAR SIR: As a future voter I say we should dedicate Padre Island as a national park. I request this because we need it for a national park and a wildlife conservation area. It may not be a necessity, but I think it would help our country. I think you have a good idea.

Yours truly,

WANDA GRAYSON.

DEAR SIR: I am glad that you are working for building a park on Padre Island for scientists to study sea creatures and animals.

Yours truly,

MICHAEL LARRY MCGRAW.

DEAR SIR: I want to tell you that I think it is a good thing for Padre Island to be a national park. I will soon be a future voter, and I will vote for Padre Island. It is a nice island to have things put on it. When it is finished maybe I will be married and my children will get to play on the things.

Yours truly,

MARY LOU CLUBB.

DEAR SIR: We appreciate what you have been doing to help make Padre Island a new national park. My class thinks that it would be a good thing. So please keep working on it.

Yours truly,

RICHARD UZZELL.

DEAR SIR: I think having Padre Island as a sanctuary is a right smart idea. As I will soon be a voter I believe I would vote for it.

Yours truly,

JAMES MEADOWS.

DEAR SIR: I am writing to you about Padre Island. I think it would be very nice to have part of Padre Island as a national park. It would be something different and better. I am a future voter and if I could vote I would vote yes to have a national park.

It would be very nice for camping grounds for the tourists. It would be nice for wild sea creatures to be in the national park, too.

Yours truly,

CAROL ANN FITE.

DEAR SIR: I am writing you about Padre Island. I think you should put animals in Padre Island. I think a park would be good where people can eat and enjoy the scenery.

Yours truly,

LENDA SIDES.

DEAR SIR: I hear we are going to make a national park of Padre Island. I like that idea very much. I think we could use it for a wildlife conservation, a tourist park, and a laboratory for scientist. If I could I would vote for it.

Yours truly,

JANE ANN SMITH.

DEAR SIR: I think Padre Island should be turned into a place where wild animals should be kept, and a place where sea creatures could be seen. It would be nice for tourist could see the sea creatures and animals.

Yours truly,

DARLENE HALL.

Money Back on Price Supports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 14, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we recognize that the Nation faces serious, unresolved problems in agriculture.

Despite high costs, the farm program has not succeeded either in reducing surpluses or in solving the basic economic problems in this field. In effect, efforts to enact legislative remedies have not succeeded in curing economic ills. However, the continuation of the price support and other programs, until a better farm program can be established, has been deemed desirable.

However, I believe it is important to put the picture—particularly of farm costs—into proper perspective. For example, a recent report released by the U.S. Department of Agriculture reveals that the Federal Government—during the years in which the price support program has been in effect—has recovered 84 cents for each dollar spent for supporting prices of farm products.

We recognize, of course, that we have a responsibility for attempting to keep the cost of such a program as low as possible. However, I believe that it is important that the Nation be given the picture of farm expenditures in proper perspective so as not to reflect unfairly on the American farmer.

A recent issue of the Farmers' Union Herald, of St. Paul, Minn., contained an article entitled "Uncle Sam Has Recovered 84 Cents on Each Dollar Spent on Farm Supports." I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNCLE SAM HAS RECOVERED 84 CENTS ON EACH DOLLAR SPENT ON FARM SUPPORTS

The Government will get back at least 70 cents of each of the approximately $9 billion it currently has invested in farm commodities, according to recently released USDA statistics.

Seventy cents on the dollar has been the recovery rate in recent years and, prior to time flexible supports entered the White House in 1953, the recover rate was even greater; so that the overall average for the entire 25 years that the price support program has been in effect is 84 cents on each dollar.

These facts explode completely the impression administration spokesmen are attempting to create with city people that the money the Government has tied up in farm commodities is money tossed down the drain.

Arthur W. Stockdale, editor of Agribusiness Outlook, emphasizes in a recent issue of that publication that the $9 billion the Government has invested in farm commodities is a good investment.

"The $9 billion has been pumped directly into the economy," Stockdale writes. "Most of it went to farmers who, in turn, spent it in their local communities thus helping to stimulate business. Hundreds of millions were paid to processors, rail and truck companies, the storage industry, etc. These expenditures fanned out through the entire economy and affect such things as industrial production, city employment, and consumer incomes."

Transfer Freedmen's Hospital to Howard University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STUYVESANT WAINWRIGHT
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 29, 1959

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill to transfer Freedmen's Hospital to Howard University, with provision for construction of a new teaching hospital. I hope that Congress will give swift approval to this legislation, which will make possible the construction of urgently needed new facilities for Howard University's medical teaching program and for proper care of the patients at Freedmen's Hospital.

Action on this bill would not only help alleviate the national shortage of medical and allied personnel, it would end the anomaly of the Federal Government's operating a community hospital. It would make the hospital an integral part of the university, with the advantages of unified responsibility and control. Under private control and with new facilities, it could become progressively more self-supporting, without impairment of its teaching function.

This proposal has been drafted by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. It is similar to the bill which the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of the other House reported favorably last year, but which was not acted upon in the final rush of adjournment. It includes provisions to assure continuation of equal pay and benefits to the employees who will be transferred, and gives them all the security it can without continuing them as Federal employees. I understand in addition that Howard University has recently expressed its willingness to accept and operate Freedmen's Hospital in accordance with the provisions of the bill, and has spelled out the undertakings it is prepared to incorporate in the terms of the agreement.

Federal Food Stamp Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 14, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I recently introduced legislation to establish a Federal food stamp program for distribution of surplus foods to needy families through the State welfare programs.

The purpose of that legislation is to make food stamps available to State welfare programs for distribution to needy persons within the State certified as eligible for welfare under the program. These stamps are to be redeemed through the regular retail outlets within that State for surplus foods.

In contrast with the present system of dispersal of surplus foods, the needy would have an opportunity to secure regular brands, packaged and handled through the regular channels of distribution and trade.

The present system of Government processing of bulk surplus is unwieldy, and subject to enormous amounts of waste and pilferage. It is so extremely expensive for communities that many refuse to participate in it, despite great need. Indeed, stores participating in the program have urged enactment of food stamp legislation. Other stores refuse to handle some commodities.

Over and above this, under the present system the foods made available have been processed in unwieldy lots, and are often unavailable to many properly certified persons at the appointed time for distribution. Distribution points are unhandy to recipients, and times of distribution often are equally inconvenient to them.

It was interesting to me to note a recent release of the U.S. Department of Agriculture indicating how poorly the program has worked to date.

I insert below a table distributed by the Department of Agriculture for the years 1953 through the first half—projected, I assume—of 1959:

Surplus foods distributed in the United States

Fiscal year	Quantity	Cost
	Pounds	
1953	161, 100, 000	$68, 700, 000
1954	417, 800, 000	155, 200, 000
1955	492, 500, 000	167, 700, 000
1956	789, 100, 000	234, 600, 000
1957	1, 061, 900, 000	236, 400, 000
1958	871, 600, 000	185, 400, 000
1st half 1959	558, 400, 000	113, 700, 000
Total	4, 352, 400, 000	1, 161, 700, 000

The year 1958, which I assume was one of recession in other parts of the country as it was in my own city of Detroit, actually saw some 190 million pounds less of surplus foods distributed than were distributed in the year 1957, supposedly one of the most prosperous years in American history.

Equally interesting is the distribution of our surplus foods abroad, under Public Law 480, under which many commodities, like meat, fruits, and vegetables have been sent abroad, and sold for worthless, or blocked currencies, while our needy have been denied the benefits of our own surplus food.

Despite protests to the contrary our disposal of surplus foods abroad under Public Law 480, is nothing but a foreign giveaway where American surplus foods are dispersed to foreign countries for soft foreign currencies which by agreement are kept in the country of origin, mostly for domestic purposes, such as loans and grants within the country for development projects of various sorts. This is literally a foreign aid program. The people of the recipient country often never learn of our generosity, so it wins few friends, but it alienates to the brink of enmity other food exporting countries like Canada.

A certain amount of these funds are maintained for use by the United States for payment of support of American personnel and American projects within the country in question, but more are either forgiven or used as foreign aid.

From the table below it can be seen that dispersal abroad of American surplus foods has been running very close to double dispersal at home. In terms of dollar value the cost of foods distributed abroad has exceeded domestic distribution from 1955 through the end of 1958. And the total aggregate of the cost of distribution abroad, as well as the quantity for the years 1953 through 1959, has exceeded distribution at home by a substantial figure.

Surplus foods distributed in foreign countries

Fiscal year	Quantity	Cost
	Pounds	
1953	24,132,000	$4,260,000
1954	183,938,000	69,616,000
1955	531,985,000	197,195,000
1956	1,220,490,000	302,488,000
1957	1,728,800,000	253,719,000
1958	1,973,000,000	272,500,000
1st half 1959	904,500,000	109,600,000
Total	6,566,845,000	1,209,378,000

It is high time that we remembered that charity begins at home. Feed our own hungry, and any surplus after that should be used to help others abroad.

From the table below it can be seen that items denied our own hungry, such as meats, edible oils, condensed milk, at times butter, dried, fresh, and canned fruits and juices, vegetables, and potatoes have been going overseas while our own citizens are limited to cheese, dried milk, rice, occasionally butter, and cornmeal, and flour:

Title I, Public Law 480, shipments by calendar years, beginning of program through Dec. 31, 1958—Quantity and estimated market value [1]

Commodity	Unit	Calendar year 1955		Calendar year 1956		Calendar year 1957		Calendar year 1958		January 1955–December 1958	
		Quantity	Value	Quantity	Value	Quantity	Value	Quantity	Value	Quantity	Value
GRAINS		*1,000 units*	*1,000 dol.*	*1,000 units*	*1,000 dol.*	*1,000 units*	*1,000 dol.*	*1,000 units*	*1,000 dol.*	*1,000 units*	*1,000 dol.*
Wheat	Bushel	58,425	98,262	123,450	200,589	212,637	347,491	196,869	333,095	591,381	979,437
Wheat flour	Pound			160,082	5,630	35,174	1,514	65,831	2,674	261,087	9,818
Wheat bulgur	do							7,457	239	7,457	239
Corn	Bushel	5,259	7,472	13,849	20,525	11,441	15,278	31,132	40,160	61,681	83,435
Barley	do	10,189	11,597	14,041	16,541	8,877	9,137	27,601	27,856	60,708	65,131
Oats	do	4,746	3,960	815	588	140	101	693	387	6,394	5,036
Grain sorghums	do	2,707	2,739	2,284	2,145			15,471	15,954	20,462	20,838
Rye	do							4,738	5,887	4,738	5,887
FATS AND OIL											
Cottonseed oil	Pound	131,095	19,805	303,340	48,882	47,190	7,952	79,545	15,148	561,170	91,787
Soybean oil	do	46,650	7,390	338,019	56,600	412,193	67,749	745,618	103,951	1,542,389	235,690
Linseed oil	do	2,239	398	1,272	216	3,979	624			7,490	1,238
Lard	do			114,349	14,742	65,728	10,411			180,077	25,153
Tallow	do			44,129	3,986	132,739	12,158	8,111	760	184,979	16,904
DAIRY PRODUCTS											
Nonfat dry milk	do			12,284	1,127	17,503	1,642	61,944	5,755	91,731	8,524
Dry whole milk	do			359	164	2,218	1,264	472	200	3,049	1,628
Evaporated milk	do	3,340	430	7,340	968	6,550	886	6,648	844	23,878	3,128
Condensed milk	do			1,260	277	7,084	1,537			8,344	1,814
Anhydrous milk fat	do					37	20	743	439	780	459
Cheese	do			2,568	631	5,182	1,261	11,069	2,707	18,819	4,599
Butter	do	2,453	962	4,744	1,854	654	255	21,198	8,941	29,049	12,012
Butter oil	do			1,630	851					1,630	851
Ghee	do			1,942	1,063	2,411	1,320	4,087	2,196	8,440	4,579
Whey	do			2,001	130					2,001	130
MEAT AND POULTRY											
Beef	do			28,947	9,519	61,263	18,563			93,210	28,082
Canned pork products	do			661	350	19,330	9,593			19,991	9,943
Poultry	do			4,297	1,133	245	64	19	8	4,561	1,205
FRUITS AND VEGETABLES											
Canned fruit and juices	do			42	5	3,594	483	24,799	3,362	28,435	3,850
Fresh fruit	do			1,101	75	24,998	1,904	14,780	921	40,879	2,900
Dried fruit	do			8,767	1,288	704	143	32,798	5,131	42,269	6,562
Potatoes	do			50,882	1,392					50,882	1,392
OTHER											
Cotton	Bale	362	65,647	847	134,653	1,043	155,780	735	115,329	2,987	471,409
Cotton linters	do					7	299			7	299
Tobacco	Pound	43,801	30,849	71,206	48,446	36,300	25,718	38,622	28,601	189,929	133,614
Dry edible beans	Hundredweight			41	275	3	17	23	193	67	485
Seeds	do			9	349	1	45			10	394
Rice	do	2,148	13,794	10,605	64,319	10,312	70,324	4,809	31,610	27,874	180,047
Total value			263,305		639,313		763,533		752,348		2,418,499
Total quantity	Metric ton	2,371.61		5,300.20		7,396.86		8,178.31		23,246.98	

[1] Quantity is based on tonnage shown on ocean bills of lading. Value is estimated export market value, basis U.S. port of export. Estimates are revised to reflect actual amounts financed by CCC when this information is obtained for completed P.A.'s. These revisions account for most differences from amounts shown on previous reports.

That is why a food stamp bill is needed now.

Factors in Price-Wage Patterns of the Steel Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 14, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, a great deal of interest in wage-price patterns has been generated since negotiations got underway recently between steel companies and union representatives. This industry is basic to our economy; the price of its products tend to be influenced by factors other than supply and demand; and its workers are among the best paid in the Nation. Thus, the situation in the steel industry gives us a classic example of some forces in our economy which have major consequences on the trend of inflation.

These aspects of the steel industry negotiations have been the subject of an article which appeared recently in the New York Post. This article by Mr. Malcolm Logan, long-term staff member of that newspaper, is an especially lucid analysis. As a further recommendation, it is free from economic dogma generally utilized by both sides in such controversies to justify their bias.

The author, Mr. Logan, mentions some of the findings of the Senate Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly and of the work by its distinguished chairman, the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] in his study of administered prices. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD with my remarks, the article which was published in the New York Post on May 4, 1959, under the title: "The Price-Wage Merry-Go-Round."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PRICE-WAGE MERRY-GO-ROUND

(By Malcolm Logan)

If the United Steel Workers and the country's dozen largest steel companies do not reach quick agreement on a new contract when they start meeting here tomorrow, it will not be for lack of advice.

Seldom have as many offered so much free counsel in any labor negotiations.

President Eisenhower has exhorted both sides to act likes statesmen. To avoid inflation, he said, their differences must be adjusted "in such a way that the price is not compelled to go up."

Senator KEFAUVER, Democrat, Tennessee, has warned big business and big labor that they are getting "their last chance to police themselves without controls" imposed by the Government.

One local financial editor, taking the companies' word that they cannot raise pay without boosting prices has called on USW President David J. McDonald to be a hero and a patriot by refusing to accept any wage increase.

The Democratic majority of Senator KEFAUVER'S Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly, on the contrary, has accused the steel industry of using wage increases as a pretext for unjustified price rises.

There is good reason for the way everyone is getting into the act.

During the past year the inflation that has been with us since World War II ended has slowed down to a crawl.

In the past decade the purchasing power of a dollar has dwindled to about 83 cents. During the past year, however, the loss has been only a fraction of 1 cent. That is the closest thing to stability we have seen in any 12-month period of those 10 years.

This delicate equilibrium could be upset by an increase in steel wages and prices.

Steel is the basic raw material of our economy. About 40 percent of our industries use it in their products and most of the others need machinery made of steel.

So when steel prices go up, the makers of autos, refrigerators, machine tools, tin cans, tractors, toasters, bulldozers and hundreds of other manufacturers generally pass along this increased cost to their customers. And usually they add a little more, to maintain their percentage of profit.

As a price rise sets an example for business, so a wage increase sets a pattern for other unions, particularly in manufacturing. The consumer, in the end, pays for these higher wages, too.

So the steel negotiations are a matter of concern to all of us, as consumers.

They are important in another way, too, for they raise a number of questions regarding inflation that are fiercely argued among businessmen, labor leaders, economists and Government officials.

Have wages driven up price in steel and other industries as management spokesmen say?

Or have wage increases been used as an excuse for unwarranted price increases, as labor leaders charge?

Are prices in steel, autos, machinery, tobacco, rubber products, and other important parts of the economy administered, so they rise even when demand slumps

Are wages also administered in these industries?

Have high prices retarded the country's economic growth by driving away customers and holding down production?

Why, with business rapidly recovering from the recession, is unemployment so high and widespread?

How much unemployment is the result of automation and other improvements in production methods?

DISAGREEMENT: TOTAL

To get back to the steel wage negotiations, the steel workers and the basic steel producers disagree on the answers to practically all those questions.

When President Eisenhower urged them to negotiate like statesmen, Clifford Hood, president of United States Steel Corp., interpreted this as a mandate to refuse any wage increase.

Steel wages are now about $3 an hour for a work week that last year averaged 37.6 hours. Since then, steel production has been hitting new peaks every week, and the work week now is probably above 40 hours.

Hood said steel wages were already so high that he could see no reason why there should be "any more employment cost increases and more price increases again this year."

"We will make every effort to avoid both," he assured the President.

McDonald angrily replied that Hood had made it clear the companies were "hellbent on fomenting a strike."

The union, he said, would enter negotiations with "a deep sense of our responsibility" to the public. But he did not retreat from his position that he expects a "general contract improvement."

He added that since 1946, "for every dollar of wage cost added in the steel industry, prices have been boosted $3."

On April 10 the 12 steel companies followed up with a letter to McDonald. In order to combat inflation, avoid further unemployment and encourage the growth of the industry, they said, the USW should continue present basic wages for a year.

Also, they said, the union should give up its contract clause providing for cost-of-living increases when consumer prices go up.

A COUNTERPROPOSAL

As expected, McDonald rejected this suggestion promptly and vigorously. Three days later he made a counterproposal—no price increases during the term of the new contract starting July 1; and "increases in wage rates and other benefits earned and justified by the increased output per man-hour of your employees and by the industry's profits."

For the industry, Joseph L. Block, chairman of Inland Steel, replied:

"Holding the line on steel wages would enable us to hold the line on steel prices, and the two cannot be separated from each other despite some statements to the contrary."

That was just what United States Steel's Hood had said in March. Again, as it has for years, the argument had gone around in a circle.

The USW gave its final answer to President Eisenhower's appeal for moderation last Thursday when its Wage Policy Committee adopted contract demands for pay raises, a shorter workweek, and other benefits.

Amid cheers, McDonald predicted the union would win "an even greater agreement" than the 1956 contract. That cost 62½ cents an hour, the union estimated, or 81 cents an hour, according to industry figures.

Industry spokesmen tirelessly try to convince us that all steel price rises have been necessitated by wage raises extorted by a powerful and selfish union.

Just as assiduously, the USW has repeated that the greedy companies could have absorbed almost all the wage raises if they were content with reasonable profits.

As long as this basic quarrel remains unsettled, no one can expect any "statesmanship" in the contract negotiations. The dispute will, as usual, end in an old-fashioned, knockdown battle between two heavyweights of industry.

All the skirmishing now going on has just one purpose. Each side is trying to convince the public that it is the other fellow who will be to blame for any price increase following the new contract, and for any strike that may shut the mills on June 30.

Both have spent a lot of money in the propaganda battle.

Early this year the USW began publishing newspaper ads that dangled before various groups of businessmen vision of the increased sales they might expect from "an extra billion dollars" in pay for steelworkers.

To this appeal to the profit motive, the American Iron & Steel Institute replied with its own ads, based on fear of inflation. The theme was: "Inflation robs us all."

The union argument in essence was this:

Steel workers are producing more steel per hour of work than ever before. This means fewer jobs but greater production and bigger profits for the companies. The USW wants a fair share of these profits, so its members can buy the goods the Nation produces.

The Institute's reply was that one of the most important causes of inflation is "rising labor costs without a corresponding increase in the Nation's productive efficiency."

Each side has its economists, armed with graphs and charts, to support its position, and the result, as far as the layman is concerned, is utter confusion.

The fight over pay prices and productivity will be examined in some detail in later articles. For the present, let's just note one fact:

In the contest for public support, the companies are well ahead, though not so far in the lead as they once were.

Most of the country's financial and editorial writers, newspaper columnists, economists and others who are presumed to influence opinion have long accepted it as axiomatic that wages have pushed up prices.

In the past couple of years, however, doubts about the industry's claims have been spreading, particularly in Congress and even in the Eisenhower administration.

What happened during the 1957–58 recession is difficult to ignore.

Production of steel fell to a low point of 47.8 percent at the bottom of the slump and during all of 1958 it was only 60.6 percent of capacity.

But steel prices were raised $4.50 a ton that year.

The increases came in August and the companies said they were only enough to cover the cost of a wage increase, which had been written into the 1956 contract. This raise, the union said, was 13 cents an hour. The companies said it amounted to 16 cents.

The union, as usual, contended that prices needed to be raised only one-third as much as they were—or $1.50 a ton—to pay for the wage increase.

Thanks to the fact that prices went in the opposite direction from demand, the companies made comfortable profits in a recession year.

Those steel workers who remained on the job also got bigger pay checks, but hundreds of thousands went on part time or were laid off entirely.

This left the steel makers in a position to sit out a long strike, if one comes. It also left them vulnerable to the charge that their prices are not governed by demand but are maintained by tacit agreement among their top executives.

New Englanders Lose U.S. Fish Markets to Big New Foreign Fleets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 14, 1959

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article published in the Wall Street Journal of May 13 regarding the fishing industry in New England. This detailed analysis of the problems faced by the fishermen of Gloucester illustrates the need for legislation to modernize and to improve the competitive position of our fishing industry. This article takes note of the able leadership of the Massachusetts Fisheries Association under the guidance of Mr. Tom Rice in bringing these problems to the attention of the public and Congress.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal of May 13, 1959]

IMPORT INVASION—NEW ENGLANDERS LOSE U.S. FISH MARKETS TO BIG NEW FOREIGN FLEETS—HADDOCK, PERCH QUIT NEARBY WATERS; COSTLIER VOYAGES, HIGHER PAY BURDEN YANKS—A TIPSY PARSON GROWS OLDER

(By John D. Williams)

GLOUCESTER, MASS.—Vito LoGrasso's swarthy face wrinkles into a frown as he moodily contemplates the scratched hull of his aging fishing boat floating emptily at wharfside here.

"Last year was slowing down," he grumbles. "This year it stinks. * * * There's no fish. * * * We're staying in."

A mile away, beside a steel and concrete dock, the Blue Trader, a well-kept Canadian freighter which is more than 10 times the size of Vito's boat, is busily unloading more than 1 million pounds of foreign-caught fish, frozen into rectangular blocks. Nearby processing plants, highly automated, will slice, cook, refreeze and package the fish into fish sticks and precut portions for sale in supermarkets around the country.

Vito's black pessimism and the Blue Trader's visit reflect Gloucester's finny paradox: U.S. fish consumption is rising as population increases; foreign fish imports also are setting new records, and yet the local fishermen, by and large, are barely able to make ends meet.

BIGGER, BETTER FOREIGN BOATS

A trick of nature is partly responsible for the fishermen's dilemma; there's a declining supply of commercial fish in nearby waters, forcing the Gloucestermen to go farther out into the northwest Atlantic for their catches, a costlier operation which also puts them in direct competition with bigger, better equipped foreign boats. But generally their problems are not much different from those of a growing number of American industries—machine tools, automobiles, cameras and even boys' clothing—which are finding that lower wages, increasing technological progress, and, in some cases, Government subsidies in foreign countries make for increasingly tough competition.

New England's fishermen have little to counter with. Their trawlers—ships like the Tipsy Parson, Our Lady of Tears, and St. Peter III—are hoary with age, averaging about 22 years. Since little new capital can be lured to this costly, risky business, practically no new trawlers have been built in the United States since 1948. The domestic fleet, meantime, has shrunk to less than 800 vessels, 25 percent fewer than 6 years ago.

Now the remaining trawlermen, who think nothing of risking their lives in the treacherous North Atlantic (their insurance premiums are among the highest in U.S. industry), are looking to Washington to bail them out of some of their economic risks. They think their problems all would be solved if they could get more modern boats and shore installations and higher prices for their catches. They are asking for Federal aid on all these fronts.

TROUBLE FROM A 1792 LAW

"Either the Government should give us a ship construction subsidy or repeal the present law which dates back to 1792, preventing us from buying foreign ships for domestic fishing," declares Thomas D. Rice, executive secretary of the Massachusetts Fisheries Association.

New England accounts for more than 80 percent of U.S. production of ground fish fillets (the boneless slices off the sides of fish). Ground fish, or bottom fish, are so-called because they feed near the ocean's floor. They include ocean perch (also called redfish or rosefish), haddock (or scod, in smaller sizes), whiting, cod, flounder, and many other kinds. Imports of these semiprocessed fillets, mainly from Canada, Iceland, Norway, and Denmark, now hold a 62-percent share of the U.S. market. Eight years ago foreign fish fillets accounted for less than a third.

Gloucester, the Nation's second most important fishing port (only the big tuna center at San Pedro, Calif., handles more tonage), is feeling the brunt of the import problem, but it's shared at Boston and New Bedford, Mass., and Rockland and Portland, Maine (other big fishing centers), as well. These Atlantic ports send their fleets into one of the world's most important fishing grounds—a 260,000-square-mile area stretching 1,000 miles from Long Island north to Newfoundland. The competition in these waters is awesome; at least 14 other nations, including Russia, have trawlers there.

THEY LIKE COLD WATER

Ground fish thrive in the cold water of the area, feeding on plankton (floating living plants and animals) found in the comparatively shallow water, 180 to 300 feet deep, over the submerged plateaus, or banks.

In recent years the fish supply has dwindled in the waters closest to the New England ports, such as Georges Bank, off Cape Cod, or the Gulf of Maine. Haddock supplies, particularly, have been hard hit. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service scientists admit they are somewhat baffled about the reasons. One theory is that strong northwest winds may have carried many haddock eggs into warm Gulf Stream waters further south where they perished. Or the species may have been overfished.

The slim haddock hauls were the primary reason why total landings at Boston's huge fish pier last year, at 123.8 million pounds, were the lowest in 36 years. The U.S. Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, which sent its research vessel, the *Albatross III*, out over Georges Bank last year, came back with gloomy news. Probably no increases in haddock supplies will take place before the middle of 1960. The big problem is a big shortage of 2-year-old fish, the most prolific breeding age.

While there's no danger of extinction of the major fish species, the New England fishermen are being forced into longer and longer (and thus more expensive) trips, over Browns Bank near Nova Scotia and even up to the Grand Banks, off Newfoundland, for volume catches of such species as ocean perch.

"We're like the old buffalo hunters who had to go farther and farther west to make their kills," says bull-necked Salve Testaverde, as he runs a thick finger over a map on the wall of his dockside office here. For example, less than a quarter of the ocean perch (Gloucester's main fish catch) landed last year was landed off U.S. shores, compared with 30 percent the year before and more than 50 percent a few years ago.

Some folks around Gloucester are hoping for a miracle to pull them out of their current business slough. It has happened before. In 1933, the town was at low ebb because foreign fishermen had robbed it of its eminence as the world's largest salt cod fishing port. Then, it was discovered that folks around Chicago liked the taste of redfish, a species which up to then had been used largely as lobster bait or thrown as trash to the everpresent seagulls. It had some of the mild flavor and texture of lake perch, so they named it "ocean perch" and started shipping it in large quantities to the Mid-

west. Today, it's New England's biggest food-fish catch.

A few years later, whiting or silver hake, not too highly regarded in New England, was found suitable for fried fish sandwiches in St. Louis and Kansas City. Now, fishermen are pondering the commercial possibilities of pollock, still fairly abundant in close-in waters and unexploited.

NO GOOD FOR LONG HAULS

If pollock proves out, the trawlers could stay closer to U.S. shores. The majority of the Gloucester boats are wooden-hull draggers, about 60 feet long with a fish-carrying capacity of about 95,000 pounds—not suitable for the long trips to the Grand Banks. Such trips are limited to a small number of domestic steel trawlers, 100 or more feet long, which carry up to 300,000 pounds of fish and a crew of 17.

Both types of vessels drag big conical-shaped nets along the ocean floor. Metal-bottomed wooden doors keep the net open and weighted down. Buoying up the upper net edge are hollow metal balls; and the lower edge bounces along on rollers. The whole rig is hauled aboard at intervals by winch-operated cables and the fish are dumped onto the slippery deck.

Foreign fishing boats operating off Newfoundland are similar, but newer, more efficient, and tend to be larger. Iceland boasts some with 1 million-pound capacity. New England fishermen complain bitterly that it was Marshall plan money that expanded the Icelandic fleet. They've got another bone to pick—they claim U.S. dollars supporting our airbases in Newfoundland indirectly support that Canadian province's big fishery growth.

Vessels from Newfoundland, New England's prime competitor, put into their home ports and unload their catches on conveyors to be quickly processed in shore plants. The heads, tails, and skin are cut from the fish. Sliced off the sides are the fillets, which are then pressed and frozen into blocks of about 13½ pounds each. Finished and wrapped, these blocks (also called slabs) are about a foot wide and 16 inches long, and some 2 inches thick.

Stacked like lumber in the freezer holds of large Canadian and Norwegian-flag vessels, these frozen fish slabs move to the United States for further processing. The import increase has been so great that Gloucester's Quincy Market Cold Storage & Warehouse Co., which only 3 years ago built a new warehouse and cold storage plant here, already is planning to increase its storage capacity by 22 million pounds.

The big users of these fish blocks here in Gloucester include the cooking and freezing plants of such firms as Gorton's of Gloucester, Inc.; the Birds Eye division of General Foods Corp., and O'Donnell-Usen Fisheries. These firms and others convert the raw material into packages of fishsticks and frozen dinners for national distribution. Huddled up to Boston's fish pier are the plants of A. & P. and Fulham Bros., Inc., which conduct similar operations.

These seafood kitchens operated by American companies are buying the foreign material because it's cheaper. In block form it costs about 25 cents a pound, despite a duty of from 1⅞ cents to 2½ cents a pound. Domestically landed haddock, though it sells for only 7 cents a pound, costs 30 cents or more by the time it is processed, with the head, guts, tail and bones removed. It takes three or four pounds of fresh fish to make one pound of fish usable for a fish stick plant.

"If we didn't import fish, it would be so high priced no one could afford to eat it," says the manager of a seafood plant of a big supermarket chain.

THE PAY DIFFERENTIAL

Canadian processing plant workers earn roughly 40 cents an hour less than those in the United States. And the take of nonunionized Canadian fishermen also tends to be less than here. Vessel owners over the years have had many wrangles with the Atlantic Fishermen's Union over prices and shares of the catch.

As a measure of this union's strength, it now operates one of the principal selling markets here. Members of the union are not paid on an hourly basis, like organized workers in other industries, but instead have a setup whereby the crew members take a 60-percent share of each catch, leaving 40 percent for the owners. The union is especially strong in Boston.

In contrast to the New England picture, Canada's fisheries industry along the Atlantic coast is growing. It has 500 processing plants there, supplied by 400 large, well-equipped vessels and 15,000 smaller boats. Five years ago it had only 300 big trawlers and 14,000 smaller ones.

To get their equipment more nearly up to the level of the foreign vessels, U.S. fishing fleet associations are lobbying for more financing help from Uncle Sam and special measures that would equalize the costs of the foreign producers with those of the domestic fishermen. Responding partially to such pressure, the Government in about 2 months is scheduled to work out the details of a new fishing vessel mortgage insurance plan, which would guarantee repayment of 15-year mortgages or up to 75 percent of a new vessel's cost. A Gloucester banker figures it costs $225,000 to build a new trawler here, compared with $150,000 in Canada—which was about the U.S. cost 10 years ago.

This new aid would be in addition to the Fisheries Loan Fund, set up late in 1956 to provide long-term loans for repairs and upkeep of fishing vessels. New England boats account for by far the largest share of the $7 million already loaned under the program. Another $3 million has been appropriated for the current fiscal year.

The U.S. fishermen argue they could upgrade their fleets much more economically if they were permitted to buy vessels abroad. But Mr. Rice of the Massachusetts Fisheries Association thinks the chances for repeal of the 1792 prohibition on such purchases are practically nil. Because of the decline of the U.S. fishing industry, fishing boats now are realy built in the United States, but there still is strong support in Congress for the old law. Although the administration favors repeal, Mr. Rice says a number of Congressmen "have shipyards in their areas, and shipyard labor is strong in Congress."

Funds Restored to the 1960 VA Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 14, 1959

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, on Monday last I was happy to play a part, under the leadership of the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs in having restored to the VA 1960 budget, funds which had been reduced by the Appropriations Committee.

Three important items were restored to the full budget estimate by the action of the House in approving the amendments offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE], chairman of the committee.

The next item was for general operating expenses which is in the nonmedical field, and was an increase to the full budget allowance of $163,373,000 for the fiscal year which begins next July 1.

Perhaps the most important item to be increased was the inpatient care program which was increased from $777,500,000 to $792,079,000. This item is $5.3 million more than the budget provided and represents the best thinking of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs which sought to increase this item because of the need for additional money for deferred maintenance.

The last amendment involved funds for outpatient care. These moneys are used for service-connected cases only, and in this case, $866,000 was restored.

The Committee on Veterans' Affairs, in a questionnaire to all VA medical stations, learned that the overall system needed approximately $16 million to meet the backlog of deferred maintenance. The budget estimate only provided $3.1 million and the action of the House in approving the amendment of Mr. TEAGUE will make approximately 50 percent of the overall deficiency in this field available beginning July 1. This sum, apparently, is all the money which the VA could effectively spend during the period. I was particularly interested in this item because of its direct application to our VA hospital in Buffalo. In the fiscal year 1960 the manager had listed projects involving roads and parking facilities of $26,000 for which funds were not presently available. In 1961 the total of $90,000 had been recommended for tuck pointing, replacement of screens, and the installation of storm sashes. With this extra amount set aside for deferred maintenance, and if additional funds can be obtained in the fiscal year 1961, the VA hospital in Buffalo will be able to maintain its plant in a satisfactory manner and in accordance with sound maintenance procedures.

I was very interested to review the statistics of the committee provided the House in connection with the increased cost which all hospitals across the country are experiencing. In the case of our own hospital in Buffalo, the total cost has risen from $5,178,000 in 1955 to $6,445,000 in 1959. Obviously, by far the greater portion of these funds go for payment of salaries of the staff but there have been sizable increases in the expenditures for drugs and medicines, which in 1955 totaled $176,000 and in 1959 had risen to $208,000. These figures, which are similar to those found throughout the VA medical system, indicate very clearly the necessity of providing full and adequate funds for the operation of our VA hospitals.

I am very happy to have had an opportunity to support this important legislation which restored the budget for the VA hospital and medical program. I am firmly of the opinion that the veterans' hospital and medical benefit is the finest service we offer in our veterans' program. I believe that we should take steps to see that the hospital and medical program functions adequately and

receives proper financial support before giving attention to the many proposals before us which would pay pensions to persons with little or no need.

I was particularly pleased that the House added additional funds to become available to remove the backlog of deferred maintenance in VA hospitals. We should not allow our fine VA hospital system to deteriorate. I am listing below a summary of deferred maintenance items which have accumulated in VA hospitals located in the State of New York. I hope that these additional funds which we have provided will permit the hospital managers of these hospitals to proceed to promptly place these hospitals in a current state of repair.

	Backlog of maintenance and repair					
NP STATIONS						
Canandaigua, N.Y.	0					
Montrose, N.Y.	0					
Northport, N.Y.	$70,400	Paint buildings 2 and 4, and water tower.	$11,800	Modernize toilets	$10,000	New doors, personnel garages	$3,000
		Replace deteriorated windows	10,000	Asphalt tile flooring	5,000	Construct deep freeze	7,500
		Condition tile floor, operating suite.	1,000	Replace doors, ward buildings	5,000	Install fluorescent lights	3,500
				New floor surface, gymnasium	4,000	Hoods over grilles and dishwashers	5,600
						Install intercommunication system	4,000
G.M. & S. STATIONS							
Albany, N.Y.	0						
Bath, N.Y.	14,000	Repair and resurface roads, cemetery.	14,000				
Bronx, N.Y.	128,000	Fume hood for clinical laboratory	2,000	Replace kitchen and dining room equipment.	3,400	Dressing sterilizers	3,700
		Sprinkler system, paint shop and storage.	2,000	Air condition units and wiring, ward 2C and dental laboratory.	8,250	Air condition units, dental clinic, medical illustration laboratory, radiation physics laboratory, gastroscopy and photo clinic.	3,450
		Sprinkler system, pharmacy	1,800	Replace laundry equipment	12,500	Metal partitions, serving kits	1,000
		Condenser, refrigeration system	6,500	Renew cold water lines	30,000	Replace floor covering	10,000
		Renew cold water lines	20,000	Relieve electric overload	6,000	Weatherstripping	8,000
		Replace floor covering	10,000				
Brooklyn, N.Y.	63,100	Air condition, rooms N-110 and N-111.	5,000	Air condition, bacterial section	8,000	Install stainless steel pipe, main kitchen.	5,000
		Replace drainage trough, 2d floor kitchen.	3,600	Replace window screens, ground to 3d floor, Building 1.	11,000	Alterations to service buildings	3,400
						Ventilation control system (central office letter, Sept. 10, 1956).	15,000
						Construction parking areas	6,800
						Alterations to recovery room area	5,300
Buffalo, N.Y.	116,000			Repairs to built-up roofs	6,000	Tuckpointing	30,000
				Resurfacing roads and parking	20,000	Replace screens	20,000
						Storm sash	40,000
New York, N.Y.	0						
Syracuse, N.Y.	24,700			Repair concrete roads	19,750		
				Repair sidewalks at main entrance	4,950		
TB STATIONS							
Batavia, N.Y.	11,287			Sidewalk replacement	1,900	Replace sidewalks and areaways	1,850
				Replace floor covering	3,800	Resurface roads	1,750
				Automatic sprinklers, Building L	1,987		
Castle Point, N.Y.	85,570	Air conditioning unit, surgery	10,000	Tree topping	1,200	Mop sinks on all wards	3,250
		Hot water tank for laundry	3,500	Replace primary feeder cable	7,970	Resurface parking areas	3,000
		Waterline, building 17 to building 49.	4,000	Electrical work, housekeeping quarters.	19,900	Rehabilitate lighting service, building 18.	2,490
		Powerline repairs	3,000	Aluminum screens, building 7	2,110	Resurface concrete pavement	7,800
		Catwalks over boilers	2,000	Weatherstripping, building 7	3,000	Door screens, building 44	250
		Repair gutters and downspouts	1,200	Storm drains, buildings 2-5 inclusive.	3,500		
		Waterproof walls, various buildings.	3,400	Replace beveled siding, 7 buildings	4,000		
Sunmount, N.Y.	105,600	Conductive flooring, surgical suite	7,850	Hardware for buildings 4, 6, 7, 8, 11	2,000	Ceramic tile floors	15,000
		Replace laundry equipment	12,000	Rehabilitate showers and water sections.	5,000	Replace porches, housekeeping quarters.	8,000
		Hardware for buildings 4, 6, 7, 8, 11	2,000	Replace cold waterlines, buildings 5, 10, 12.	2,500	Resurface roads and parking areas	15,250
		Rehabilitate showers and water sections.	5,000	Replace porches, housekeeping quarters.	16,000		
		Replace cold waterlines, buildings 5, 10, 12.	2,500	Aluminum edging, all buildings	10,000		
				Replace laundry equipment	12,000		

Have Administrative Agencies Kept Pace With Modern Court-Developed Techniques Against Delay?—A Judge's View

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 14, 1959

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an address delivered by the Hon. Irving R. Kaufman, judge, U.S. District Court Southern District of New York, at the 12th anniversary dinner of the Federal Trial Examiners Conference, at the Indian Spring Country Club, Silver Spring, Md., May 7, 1959. The text of the address follows:

I would like to say initially that I considered your invitation a high honor. I am extremely pleased to be here this evening.

At a recent meeting of the judges of the court in which I sit, we discussed the feasibility of having a full-time staff of special masters associated with the court to supervise the pretrial preparations in the so-called big cases. We were fairly enthusiastic about this idea until we began to receive comments from attorneys and judges to the effect that we were dreamers if we thought we could get lawyers with sufficient stature, ability, and experience to command the necessary respect of the litigants who would be willing to accept what would probably be a thankless and difficult task at a Government salary. This jolted us for a while until someone thought of you men. It was pointed out that somehow those alphabet agencies down in Washington were able to attract people as hearing examiners with all of the qualifications we thought essential—high competence, integrity, judicial temperament, and a magnificent dedication to public service. Even apart from the renewed hope for our little project which this fact permitted us, it made us proud to remember that there are people with your selfless devotion to the well being of this country, I am very pleased to have this opportunity to meet you personally.

Since the rewards for your services are certainly not lavish, you should at least be entitled to the satisfaction of knowing that you are performing an important task well, and that your work is appreciated. Unfortunately, you would be justified in feeling that even these gratifications of public service have been denied to you. The agencies and the administrative process have been subjected to such incessant and scathing attacks of late, that it wouldn't be surprising if you were not only demoralized but even somewhat shellshocked. Only the latter would account for your inviting an outsider to address you who might find the tempta-

tio to take another swipe or two at the administrative process irresistible.

Unfortunately, the agencies have been an excellent target. Even the poorest marksmen, while perhaps not scoring any "bull's eyes," still find it hard to miss entirely.

While there has been enough truth in almost all of these charges to cause concern, it is necessary to be wary of the inevitable flood of "easy" solutions. The cure-a-headache by cutting-off-the-head people continue to advocate the elimination of all administrative agencies and the placing of their adjudicatory functions with the courts. Of course, on alternate days, some of these same people argue that since so many of the courts haven't yet been able to cope with the enormous volume of automobile accident cases, these cases should be taken from the courts and given to an administrative agency. But they tell me that consistency is the hobgloblin of small minds and these people are accustomed to thinking "big." Since they seldom get very specific, it isn't clear whether they contemplate the transfer of the hundreds of thousands of applications before the Veterans' Administration, the Social Security Board, or the Bureau of Old Age and Survivors' Insurance, three of the clearest cases of pure adjudication, to the courts. Heaven forbid.

Now, despite the temptation, I am going to try to avoid heaping more logs on the bonfire of attacks on the agencies and the administrative process. And, if this is some consolation to you, I would like to say that I don't see any elimination of the administrative agency phenomenon. While there may be some reshuffling and possibly the return of certain limited types of cases to the courts which were removed at a time when people were worried about the conservatism of the court—a complaint which isn't heard too often these days—the trend unmistakably points to the further mushrooming of administrative agencies and their powers. The inevitability of this trend was recently illustrated when, at the peak of dissatisfaction with the agencies, while one congressional committee was exposing L'affaire Goldfine, another committee down the hall was preparing to establish a new administrative agency with broad discretionary powers to regulate explorations into outer space.

This illustration points up, I believe, the futility of searching for villains to explain the agency phenomenon. If there is any villain, it is our industrial civilization with its rapid and vast scientific discoveries and technological marvels. Virtually every major technological advancement has created problems which could not be solved by the traditional processes of legislative enactment and judicial enforcement. Even where direct regulaiton of scientific developments, such as in the atomic energy, radio, television, and airplane cases, is not essential, the problems resulting from the giant industries which have sprung up to furnish raw materials and to finance, manufacture and sell the products of technological advances, have required the establishment of such agencies as the Federal Power Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, the Securities and Exchange Commission, the National Labor Relations Board and many others. Consider the enormously complex ramifications of a scientific development as modest as the horseless carriage. Its heirs, to mention just a few, have included not only the enormous automobile, oil, rubber, and steel industries, but also a vast network of traffic and highway regulations, State motor vehicle bureaus, licensing systems, traffic courts, and Federal control of interstate bus and truck operations through the ICC. All of these developments were inconceivable a century ago.

With the pace and complexity of scientific progress continuously accelerating, the problems which must be dealt with have vastly increased. Congress, fully cognizant of the dangers involved in granting broad discretionary powers with only slight control over their exercise, and equally cognizant of the operational failings of the agencies, has been reluctantly compelled, time after time, to place these problems in the hands of the agencies.

The predicament facing Congress is perhaps best illustrated by the treatment accorded the problems of atomic energy development. Without more than the most general guiding standards set forth in the law, Congress gave to the Atomic Energy Commission vast discretionary powers, broader than those given any other administrative agency in this country. In discussing this, one commentator noted:

"There is, indeed, no escape from conferring such powers—from relying largely upon the wisdom of the men who are chosen for these important posts. It is simply not possible, at this stage of the atomic energy game, to write in careful detail the applicable rules of law. Congress knew what it was doing, but it simply could not do differently." (Stason, "Law and Atomic Energy," Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science 96 (1947).)

It is time the critics of the administrative agencies disabused themselves of any notion that the agencies are a passing phenomenon. Not only are they here to stay, but if modern science continues its irrepressible forward surge, and there is certainly no reason to expect otherwise, the agency institution is likely to play an ever greater role in our society. Any constructive effort to remedy the defects in the administrative process must begin with a realization of this fact.

The second step, it seems to me, is to concentrate less on the search for all encompassing panaceas, and more on improving the day-to-day mundane details of administrative procedures. While these matters are less exciting, catch fewer headlines, and may even seem trivial, they determine not only whether the entire system will work but whether it will work justly. It took the courts a long time to shift their gaze from the absorbing substantive issues to the problems of providing a procedure which would make sense and give meaning to the abstract substantive rights. While the agencies are still in their infancy, they can't afford to be as long about it as the courts were.

Now I am certainly not in any position to propose definitive solutions to your procedural problems. It would be presumptuous of me to try. Not only are there basic differences between the courts and the agencies which may necessitate different solutions, but there are vast differences in function among the various agencies. Despite these differences, however, there are many problems common to both the courts and the agencies. And to the extent that our problems are similar, the efforts that have been made by the courts to solve them may suggest possible approaches that will be useful to you.

I would venture to say that the greatest procedural problem of both the courts and the agencies is definition of the issues to be tried. Absent such definition, trials will be unduly protracted and will not proceed in an orderly manner; records will be voluminous and will be cluttered with a good deal that is extraneous; and, most significant, the attention of the trier of the facts will not be focused on the real issues in dispute, so that he will be sorely taxed to arrive at a just and intelligent determination. Any hearing where the issues are not well defined is bound to be an inefficient hearing; it is also bound to be unnecessarily expensive and time consuming for all involved.

Neither the courts nor the agencies can or should look to more stringent pleading requirements as the answer to this problem. Under your administrative procedures, as under our Federal rules, pleading requirements are extremely liberal. In the words of the Advisory Committee on the Federal Rules:

"The intent and effect of the rules is to permit the claim to be stated in general terms; the rules are designed to discourage battles over mere form of statement and to sweep away the needless controversies which the codes permitted that served either to delay trial on the merits or to prevent a party from having a trial because of mistakes in statement."

These words could be applied equally to pleadings in administrative litigation. Indeed, Professor Davis has commented that "[t]he most important characteristic of pleadings in the administrative process is their unimportance."

While the policy underlying general fact pleading is a most salutary one, the pleadings often shed little light on the real issues in dispute. In those proceedings which are initiated by a complaint and answer, for example, the allegations and denials are sometimes broad and vague. The agencies not infrequently set out their allegations in general form, perhaps in statutory terms, thus failing fully to apprise the respondents and to permit them adequately to prepare their defenses. Similarly, in the proceedings which are begun by applications, the applicant is put to his proof on such broad issues as public interest, convenience and necessity, although in fact the ground upon which the agency doubts the propriety of a grant may be narrow.

In the face of such imprecise delineation of issues, the old "let them go to trial and everything will come out all right" theory of litigation is about as practical as inviting a group of people to participate in an athletic event without designating whether they will be playing baseball, football, or ice hockey. The litigants are forced to wait until the contest is in progress before they can discover what game is being played. And if this is hard on the litigants—think of the referee.

The Federal courts have sought a cure for these ills in the fields of liberalized discovery procedures, judicial control during the discovery phase, and pretrial conferences. For many years, intensive study into the problems of streamlining and expediting litigation has been conducted by the Federal judiciary through the agency of the National Pretrial Committee of the Judicial Conference of the United States, of which committee I have been a member. Particular attention has been focused upon the problems of the protracted case, and a special committee has been appointed to undertake a study of those problems.

Again and again the committees studying these problems have pointed to increased judicial control during the pretrial stages as the sine qua non of efficient judicial administration. In particular, the pretrial conference has been heralded as the greatest single weapon against delay and inefficiency in the litigation process.

Actual experience has more than vindicated these conclusions. In my own court in the southern district of New York, for example, we have found in pretrial the best answer to a seemingly insurmountable problem. Located in the greatest financial and industrial center in the world, complicated commercial litigation and important criminal cases naturally tend to gravitate to our district. We handle annually one-fifth of all copyright cases, one fourth of all government civil antitrust suits and one-fifth of all private antitrust suits. In addition, New York being the largest port in the Nation, 35 percent of

the admiralty and maritime litigation in the Federal courts is filed in the southern district, as are more than one-half of all Jones Act suits involving injury to seamen. Because of this heavy caseload we found ourselves, a few years ago, facing serious calendar backlogs. Litigants were required to wait for as much as 3½ years before their cases came up for trial. Then on October 3, 1955, we initiated sweeping calendar reforms which performed near miracles. In a relatively short period of time the deadwood had been cleared away and the calendar had been brought up to date.

But our battle did not end there. We soon learned that the likelihood of a speedy trial encourages new filings. Since 1955 there has been a 50 percent increase in annual new filings in our court. In the court year ending June 30, 1958, for example, the number of new cases filed per judge in the southern district of New York was 374 as compared with the national average of 259. Thus, in order to fend off calendar backlogs our judges must each dispose of about 1½ times the number of cases yearly as the national average.

In view of this deluge of new business, you may wonder how we managed to keep from being swamped. The answer is that we are able to dispose of our cases far more expeditiously than ever before. And the pretrial conference is the key to this new-found success. All cases are exposed to at least one pretrial conference before our calendar judge, shortly after a note of issue has been filed. The conferences are usually very informal in nature, and are best suited to the needs of the simple case. Larger and more complex cases are subjected to more formal pretrial and the extremely large, or so-called big case is assigned at the outset to a single judge who supervises discovery and usually conducts several pretrial conferences.

It has been our experience that many cases dissolve under the bright light of the pretrial conference. Not only does the frank atmosphere of give-and-take at the conference lead to many settlements, but oftentimes the issues of fact are stripped away, so that only questions of law remain, which may be resolved on a motion for summary judgment.

The achievements of the southern district of New York do not constitute an isolated example, but are merely illustrative of the excellent results which are being achieved throughout the Federal courts by the use of pretrial techniques.

But what have the administrative agencies been doing during this era of great progress in the courts? I can only repeat the answer which one hearing examiner gave to that question:

"The uncomfortable truth is that whereas the processes of the courts were being rapidly improved and expedited, the hearing processes of the agencies and departments of the Federal Government generally remained virtually at a standstill." (Bond, "The Use of Pretrial Techniques in Administrative Hearings," 73 FCC Bar. J., 55, 56–57 (1953).)

This lack of progress hasn't been because pretrial was unknown to the Federal agencies. Virtually every agency has some form of prehearing conference rule. Nor has it been due to a lack of encouragement. As far back as 1941 the report of the Attorney General's Committee on Administrative Procedure stated:

"[P]erhaps the most fruitful probabilities for expediting and simplifying formal administrative proceedings lies in the field of prehearing techniques."

Through the years this exhortation has been repeated by the President's Conference on Administrative Procedure, by the Hoover Commission, and by a host of others who have studied the problems of administrative procedure.

Why then this failure fully to embrace a procedural weapon which holds out such promise? Are the hearing examiners so foolish that they wish to travel through unknown lands while deliberately eschewing a road map?

The answer is that some few brave pioneers from among your ranks have ventured to experiment with pretrials. And as with all pioneers they have not always found the going easy. Indeed, some of these pioneers suffered serious setbacks which disillusioned them with the pretrial procedure. Because of these failures some hearing examiners have come to believe that the pretrial conference is simply not applicable to the administrative process. I can only say that the courts, too, have had their disappointments with pretrial. In my own court there was a time, not too many years ago, when pretrial was abandoned completely in the run-of-the-mill cases. The belief that pretrial was not workable in a district as busy as ours began to gain fairly wide acceptance. But there were some who felt that pretrial—a more flexible pretrial, tailored to the needs of the individual case—deserved another try. Experience has justified their faith.

When we reinstituted our pretrial calendars many attorneys were heard to moan: "Oh no—not that again." But these moans soon turned to chortles of joy as the attorneys realized that our new procedures helped them to dispose of more business than ever before and helped to clear the calendars for the cases which had to be tried. The reason that we succeeded where previously we had failed was flexibility. We had come to realize that pretrials must not be conducted like the old trials by compurgation—according to an invariable rigid ritual. We hearkened to the words of Judge Murah of the 10th circuit, chairman of the National Pretrial Committee, who described pretrial as "a commonsense method of sifting the issues and reducing the delays and expense of trials so that a suit will go to trial only on questions as to which there is an honest dispute of fact or law."

Within the framework of these guiding principles, the pretrial conference may assume varying forms, depending on the circumstances of the case and the forum.

What is important is that the attorneys get together with the judge some time in advance of trial, and, in an atmosphere of free give-and-take, lay all of their cards on the table. The judge wants to know, and he wants both sides to know, just what is in contention and how it is expected to be proven—witnesses and all. Where this is done under the guiding hand of a conscientious, competent judge, the end product will be an orderly, simplified trial.

To achieve this result in a large, complex case may require lengthy and frequent full-dress conferences in open court with a reporter taking down every word. On the other hand, the small, run-of-the-mill case may only require what Judge Medina likes to call a powwow, an informal talk in his chambers where we can visualize him saying to the lawyers:

"OK, boys, let's cut out the nonsense and talk turkey. What's this case all about?"

The precise form of pretrial conference best suited to your individual situation may not be readily apparent. But I can assure you that the efforts expended in searching for that optimum procedure will be richly rewarded.

They tell me that Thomas Edison achieved a successful dry-cell battery on his 500th try. When a friend remarked that it was a great shame that all that time had been lost on unsuccessful experiments, Edison replied:

"Oh no, not all. Now I know 499 ways not to make a dry-cell battery."

In our efforts to improve the administration of justice, we must adopt Mr. Edison's philosophy. Achievement does not thrust itself upon us. It is almost always the product of much work and some failure. But if we know that the solution to our problems can and must be found, then each failure only brings us closer to success.

I am firmly convinced that with a certain amount of tenacity and willingness to experiment, you will find the answers to the problems that have plagued your attempts at pretrial. It is my firm conviction that the administrative agencies, as the courts, will find in the pretrial conference their most important procedural weapon. I know that in many instances the pretrial is time consuming and difficult for the participants, but I know also that ultimately it will save time and expense and produce a more orderly hearing, and that these benefits will flow in a measure far in excess of the time and effort expended. I urge you to embrace pretrial and to encourage it, and I assure you that, if you do, the time between complaint and decision will be narrowed and the hearing itself will be truly a search for the truth instead of a contest between combatants.

Now I believe that in some cases your disappointments with pretrial may have been due to an inability to secure the necessary cooperation and advance preparation on the part of the litigants. Where this cooperation cannot be secured, the conference is doomed to failure.

Our experience with pretrial has taught us that a successful conference requires hard work and diligence on the part of judge and lawyers just as much as does the trial itself. The pretrial conference is not a job for errand boys or a young clerk fresh out of law school, as some lawyers seem to think; it is a job requiring the utmost skill and ingenuity of experienced counsel and experienced judges. Therefore, if you wish to obtain the rewards of pretrial you must insist that the lawyers do a good deal of work in advance of the conference. Ideally, they will have had a preliminary conference among themselves. And I might note here that in protracted or complex cases I send the attorneys what I call an order governing pretrial preparations, which, among other things, requires them to do some spade work and to meet with one another in advance of the pretrial hearing.

My experience has taught me that you can and will secure the desired cooperation if you make it clear at the outset that you will accept nothing less.

A hearing examiner with the Federal Trade Commission recently summarized his experience with pretrial in this manner:

"I have found the prehearing conference very, very valuable in a lot of cases. The difficulty I have found, and I experienced this more when we first instituted the prehearing trial conference procedure, was that the respondent came in, having had experience with the pretrial practice in the courts, prepared to lay his cards on the table and come to some definite conclusions.

"Counsel in support of the complaint would come in and discuss the matter generally; you could get no frank statement out of him. And after the pretrial conference he wanted to take the matter discussed back to his superior officer to find out what he could do.

"Well, under circumstances like that, a pretrial conference is futile." (Cox, 11 Administrative Law Bull. 146 (Winter 1958).)

I frequently encountered the identical problem in the beginning, but only once, I believe, with any one law firm. Occasionally a firm would send down a young associate without any real authority to discuss the case because they didn't want to waste the partner's time. When, during the course of a conference, it became apparent that this was the case, I would have the associate call his partner and tell him that I wanted him to come to court immediately.

When he arrived I would ask him why he felt he could waste the court's and his adversary's time. This always elicited a promise that it wouldn't happen again and to the best of my recollection it never did. Now the same thing would occasionally happen with the Government attorneys. I would tell them that if they didn't have authority to discuss the case openly and negotiate stipulations, I wanted them to have whoever had the authority in Washington to be in my chambers at the next scheduled conference. This usually resulted in a hurried call with the assistant returning and saying that he now had the proper authorization. A similar situation sometimes developed where the lawyer would say that he agreed fully with a certain point but that his client refused to authorize it. I would then tell the lawyer to bring the client into court. I remember one instance where the lawyer represented a railroad and said that he would have to clear the matter with their claims department which in turn would have to clear it with the house counsel who in turn would have to clear it with someone else. I asked him if the President of the railroad would have the proper authority to give me a definitive answer. When he answered yes I told him to have the President in court at the next conference. Again there was a telephone call and again the lawyer returned with the proper authority.

After a few months of this, word spread around and the lawyers came to the conference properly prepared and with full authority. I don't see any reason why you shouldn't insist on the same both from the agency counsel and the respondent. Where the result of your not insisting is interminable delay, and a waste of your time, it is your obligation to do so. As another hearing examiner noted recently:

"At the present schedule of pay rates, I can't say that our time is valuable, but it certainly is scarce, very scarce." (Hier, "Prehearing Procedure at the Federal Trade Commission," 11 Administrative Law Bull. 140 (Winter 1958).)

In addition to demanding preparation and cooperation on the part of the attorneys, the hearing officer must play an active role in the conduct of the conference. While he must at all costs avoid coercing stipulations, he should actively probe and analyze the case with the attorneys to determine what are the real issues in dispute and what is surplusage. This will call for a high degree of skill on the part of the examiner. It is, in the words of Chief Judge Clark of the second circuit, "the perfection of the judicial art."

Where feasible, the names of witnesses, both factual and expert, should be exchanged at the conference. Often, during such an exchange, stipulations as to the witness' testimony can be obtained, thereby obviating the need and expense of calling the witness. Each side should be permitted to inspect the documentary evidence which the other side intends to offer. In this way needless technical objections may be eliminated and the need to call authenticating witnesses avoided and the hearing will not be delayed while documents are inspected prior to admission.

The end product of such a conference is a streamlined, orderly hearing at which the issues are sharply drawn, many extraneous procedural and evidentiary matters have been eliminated, and the pattern of the hearing is clear to both the hearing officer and the litigants. Compare this to a matter which proceeds to a hearing without the benefit of a prehearing conference. The hearing officer is confronted with a vast array of testimony, documents, pleadings, and technical arguments which is reminiscent of that famous definition of a lawbook—"chaos with an index." He may well sympathize with the English justice, who after presiding over a protracted case for several weeks, leaned forward to ask the attorneys, "Counsel, do you really think my life expectancy is sufficient to enable me to conclude this case?"

There is another reason why you may have had trouble with your prehearing conferences. I refer to the absence of any meaningful discovery procedures. How can you ask anyone to lay his cards on the table when he feels the cards haven't been dealt yet? He doesn't know what his defense is, because he's not sure of what he's really accused. Your prehearing conferences are frequently the only available discovery procedure rather than, as is generally true in the Federal courts, the final discovery procedure. Not only must the usefulness of these conferences suffer, but much more important, the absence of discovery converts any normally lengthy hearing into an endless one.

In place of discovery procedures, there is substituted what one examiner referred to as the gimmick of trial-at-intervals. (Cox in In the matter of Gulf Oil Corp., FTC, docket No. 6689 (order granting motion requesting disclosure).) This procedural gimmick is the complete antithesis of the ideal trial as envisioned by the Federal rules and virtually all State procedures. It is based on the proposition that at least one and frequently both parties will have little or no idea of what they expect to prove and how they expect to prove it when the hearings commence. Trial-at-intervals is predicated on the belief that surprise will be the rule rather than the exception. It would require a great deal of ingenuity to devise a system which would result in a greater waste of the time of the hearing examiner and the litigants. Where the hearing is interrupted for many months to permit the parties to assess the testimony thus far given and to prepare for cross-examination, it is necessary to devote a substantial part of the next session to refreshing everyone's recollection as to where they left off. Huge amounts of repetitive testimony are admitted and it is extremely difficult to rule on questions of relevancy. The stenographic records which are reviewed by the hearing examiner and ultimately by the Commission or Board are of such fantastic proportions that the private parties frequently doubt whether it is humanly possible for the agency to review it with any degree of care. While these proceedings frequently are brought to curb actions which are detrimental to the public interest, and one would therefore imagine that speed would be of the utmost importance, the ultimate decision is generally not made for many years.

I ask what is the crucial value in concealment which requires the sacrifice of all of these other important public-interest benefits? Davis, in his recent "Administrative Law Treatise," states:

"Probably no sound reason can be given for failure to extend to administrative adjudication the discovery procedures worked out from judicial proceedings." (Davis, "Administrative Law Treaties." 589 (1958).)

I have also been unable to find any sound explanation for this situation. The only explanation that I have seen is the old bugaboo rejected by the Federal rules, that all litigants should be treated as though they were Al Capone; that they are not to be trusted with the names of adverse witnesses in advance because they will intimidate them and force them to withhold testimony or to perjure themselves. It is assumed that the criminal sanction is not enough to deter these litigants or their attorneys. Even if it were true that this danger is more than the remotest possibility, although the absence of criminal prosecutions and the experience of the Justice Department in civil litigations against these same defendants suggests that it is no more than that, I would still think that the public value involved in the prompt disposition of the majority of cases and in having an aboveboard procedure, would far outweigh the value of concealment. When a hearing examiner who subscribes to the concealment philosophy admits that to accommodate this view he is forced to follow a procedure which is both stupid and cumbersome, that is almost reason in itself for abandoning it. (Hier, supra, p. 142.)

The use of stupid and cumbersome procedures which result in inordinate delay, vast expense to both the Government and private parties, and a huge record which renders sound and careful judgment virtually impossible, for the sake of avoiding some remote danger, illustrates the rigidities into which the administrative process has settled.

Lastly, your attempts at procedural advancements have been hampered by the absence of any agency to conduct continuing studies into this area and to operate as a clearinghouse for information. Improvement in techniques requires a constant exchange of ideas. Only in this way can each examiner build upon the experience of his fellows. Our procedural advances in the Federal courts were in no small measure furthered by the fruitful work of the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts. Virtually every group which has made a careful study of administrative procedure has recommended the creation of a similar agency to conduct a continuous study of administrative procedures in action. The time is long since overdue for these recommendations to be taken out of the discussion phase and brought into fruition.

Now, gentlemen, a few moments ago, I spoke of the differences between our respective functions. Certainly, those differences exist but they are as nothing compared to the similarities in our work. For in my trials and in your hearings we seek after the same elusive prize—the truth. We seek the truth when we try to determine which of several contenders for a precious license will best serve the community. And when we strive to set a rate that will be fair to all, we are again attempting to distill the truth from masses of argument and data.

Our professional kinship goes deeper than this because if we are good judges and good hearing examiners we seek to find the truth with the least possible delay and at the least possible expense to the litigants. Frequently the hearing examiner like the judge holds the power to delay justice or to give it speedily. He holds the power to deny justice by permitting costs to pile up.

I must confess that in declaring that the hearing examiner holds the power to give justice speedily, I may have overstated my case. While advanced procedural techniques can work wonders, and are essential to the speedy and just disposition of the caseload, the ultimate disposal of the work is frequently delayed by the fact that there are simply too few hearing examiners. Serious study must be given to the need to increase the ranks of the hearing examiners in many of the agencies.

And, perhaps, even more important, consideration should be given to the creation of a position similar to that of law clerk to aid the harried examiners in their basic research. Such a post could perform the additional function of providing excellent experience for well-qualified law school graduates, and may even prove a fertile training ground for future hearing examiners. The additional payroll expenditures necessary to effectuate these proposals will be modest when compared to savings in time and expense which they will bring about.

Above all, every effort of the members of the bar, the reviewing courts, and particularly the agencies themselves must be expended to increase the prestige of hearing examiners.

They are conscientious men of high integrity, performing an extremely important function. Those who practice before them must never be permitted to lose sight of that fact. The willingness of attorneys to cooperate and to enter into stipulations before a judicial officer is often measured by the esteem in which they hold the position of that officer. Respect for the office of hearing examiner is thus a necessary climate for the germination of procedural advancement.

The battle to provide speedy justice in the administrative hearing, as in the courtroom, is a continuing one. Our warfare against the menace of delay must be all out. For delay is the most insidious of enemies; insidious and terribly dangerous because it can almost always be rationalized away. Some shadow of a right that may be lost through expedition, some fancied danger lurking in efficient disposition is enough to self-justify the granting of extensions, adjournments, continuances, rehearings, ad nauseum.

Gentlemen, the right to be heard promptly and have one's cause decided swiftly is a substantive right—often it is the most important substantive right in the case and one attainable without sacrifice of other rights. If we fail to recognize it as such we also fail those who rely on us.

There was some excuse, feeble as it was, for the damn-the-expense and damn-the-time attitude on the part of judges. They were weighed down by libraries of precedents from other and more leisurely days. The spirit of *Jarndice* v. *Jarndice* was much upon them. But you hearing examiners should suffer from no such mental encumbrances. It would, indeed, be ludicrous if men entrusted with the stewardship of atomic energy, channels of communication and outer space, were to be guilty of 18th century thinking; ludicrous and tragic, because the welfare of tremendous numbers of people rest in your hands. It is you who supervise the awarding of the most valuable busines rights that the Nation can bestow on private citizens and upon you depends the success of the regulatory legislation that keeps us from falling into utter chaos.

If there is anything which symbolizes the disillusion of the proponents of the administrative agency it is the factors of delay, expense, and volume of record. The agencies, it was proclaimed, would avoid the outmoded rigidities of the courts; they would do what it was believed the courts could never do—have flexible procedures which would afford speedy determinations. The courts took these criticisms to heart and they went and proved that they could meet the challenge of modern-day litigation. The shoe is now on the other foot and we are all waiting to see whether the agencies can rise to the challenge.

If you fail us there is no acceptable alternative. If that should happen then we would know that the need for expeditious administration of our most important laws and the concepts of fair play implicit in a full hearing are irreconcilable. That would be a realization of catastrophic effect.

However, I believe that efficiency and an end of unnecessary delay can be achieved within the framework of the present system. I believe it can and will be done by you gentlemen. Not by radical procedures or elimination of agencies but by the utilization and adaptation of procedures already developed in the courts and in some of the agencies. It is a job only you can do and I am confident that you will do it because you must.

Action Needed To Save Small Businessmen in the Dairy Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 7, 1959

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago the National Independent Dairies Association held its annual convention in Washington, D.C. Even the small businessmen who participated in that convention were surprised by the large attendance from all parts of the country. The convention was about two and one-half times larger than it was in 1958. Mr. D. C. Daniel, the executive secretary of the association, is continuing to receive applications for membership and, therefore, the prospects are that the convention of that group will be even larger next year. Also, it should be noted that at the convention this year approximately 150 Members of the House of Representatives and several Senators attended one session of the convention in the evening of April 14, 1959.

In view of these circumstances one is prompted to ask the question, "Why do these small businessmen consider it important for them to travel at the individual expense of each from all parts of the country to Washington in order to participate in a convention?" The record of the proceedings during the course of their convention provides the answer to that question. The answer is that the small businessmen in the dairy industry apparently are facing extinction unless there is action by the Congress in the near future on legislative proposals to restrict the use of price discrimination and other monopolistic practices.

The House Small Business Committee has made and is continuing to make extensive investigations and studies into the use of trade practices prevalent in the dairy industry. Overwhelming evidence has been accumulated showing the appalling effects of price discrimination in destroying free competition and leading to the creation of monopolies in the dairy industry. At this time, I and other Members of the Congress are besieged with appeals from some businessmen in the dairy industry that something should be done to stop destructive discriminatory pricing practices.

Our colleague, the Honorable TOM STEED, Democrat, of Oklahoma, a member of the House Small Business Committee, is serving as chairman of a special investigating subcommittee, which is directing its attention and efforts to these trade practices in the dairy industry about which complaints have been made. Much evidence has been received showing that some large nationwide processors and distributors of dairy products are selling milk at prices below cost, while in other situations they are selling essentially the same products at a much higher price, thereby subsidizing their below-cost sales. Some small businessmen, attempting to compete against such situations in given localities, are finding it most difficult to survive.

During the course of the recent convention of the National Independent Dairies Association in Washington, D.C., our colleague, Mr. TOM STEED, addressed that group. In his address he stated:

I am as convinced now as I ever have been, perhaps more so, that, unless some relief in the legislative field is forthcoming, the day of the independent dairyman is numbered in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that I be permitted to extend and revise my remarks by inserting at this time a copy of the address which was made by our colleague, the Honorable TOM STEED, Democrat, of Oklahoma, before the National Independent Dairy Association in Washington, D.C., Monday, April 13, 1959.

The material referred to is as follows:

REMARKS OF HON. TOM STEED, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA

Representative STEED. Thank you for your very kind and generous presentation. Like all politicians, we know we do not deserve so many nice things to be said about us, but we would always be disappointed if they were not said.

I am especially happy and delighted to be here today and to have with me two very able men who work on the staff of the Small Business Committee and who are devoted to the assignment that we have before us this year.

I know that many of you had the opportunity to read the report and to have some experience with the work that the subcommittee on the dairy industry problems did last year. I must say that we have received very favorable reaction throughout the industry and throughout the government on this report.

While I have gotten most of the credit for it, the fact is that the report is the work of Mr. Everette MacIntyre, general counsel of the committee, without whom it would have been impossible for us to have made any progress at all. I want today to publicly give him the credit for the very excellent and fine staff job that he did.

The work has increased, so I am very happy today to have my longstanding personal friend, Brooks Robertson, a man with long government experience, on the subcommittee staff. We learned last year, Mr. MacIntyre and I did, that this is a field in which you need a lot of help to get very far along. The truth is, as Scott Daniel, your executive vice president, told you, I got into this milk thing completely by accident. I had no desire to be heading up such a job as I am doing, but I got interested in it and we were happy to have the opportunity to meet so many of you, to have had your cooperation in our task of finding facts about this industry to present to the Congress.

But actually, when we finished our work last year and filed our report, I really

thought that I had finished with the milk business. You can understand why, then, today I have some feeling about the fact that I have twice as much milk business now as then.

We have what might be called a two-headed subcommittee on milk this year. This afternoon the subcommittee will have a conference on a special assignment, to decide what, if anything, we think should be done in regard to the milk situation here in the District of Columbia. We are intrigued with that problem because it involves several subdivisions of government in the same metropolitan area.

I don't think a similar political situation exists anywhere else in the country. There has been a considerable amount of pressure brought on the Small Business Committee for public hearings to be held in order for these confusing and complicated facts about the situation in the District of Columbia to be made of record and to be made available to the consuming public.

Personally, I hope the subcommittee decides that we should have these factfinding hearings.

In addition to that, the subcommittee then becomes the Permanent Milk Subcommittee of the House Select Committee on Small Business. We find that there are a number of current trouble areas throughout the country in which some very extensive staff research work needs to be done, and perhaps public hearings held.

The purpose of public hearings is twofold. It is one method we have of getting a lot of information, and it is also a way of making that information available to the public generally. Sometimes our task is not only to find out the facts so we can make recommendations to the legislative committees of Congress themselves, but also to help the public have a better understanding of the problems confronting us.

We expect that the committee will have a heavy workload throughout the remainder of this year and into 1960. As you know if you read the report, we made certain specific recommendations to which we thought Congress should give attention in terms of additional legislation. We felt that we had found enough facts to justify our saying that the dairy industry is in dire need of some legislative relief.

We still feel that way, and we are sure as we go into this problem more extensively that we will be able to make that case even more strongly than it has been made up to now. There has not been any indication anywhere that has come to my attention which would indicate that the problems besetting the dairy industry have eased up or have found any solution.

I am as convinced now as I ever have been, perhaps more so, that, unless some relief in the legislative field is forthcoming, the day of the independent dairyman is numbered in this country. I don't know whether many people or anybody agrees with my view.

As I have said before, this is a deep-seated conviction with me. I have traveled in some foreign countries, and have convinced myself that the real thing that makes America great is what we call our great middle class, which is another way of saying our small business community. Since I am convinced of that, I think that the future of this country will depend on how well we can keep the small business community in this country not only alive but flourishing.

When we see the trends that have been so dramatic in the last 20 years, and especially the last 10 years, the trends that begin to squeeze out of industry whole segments of the small business community, commonsense would tell us that such trends permitted to exist very long eventually mean there will be no small business community.

If it can happen in one industry, it will spread to other industries.

We have to learn some of the answers by trial and error as we go along. Many years ago, because of the fact that the free enterprise system is susceptible to exploitation and to monopoly, Congress saw fit to pass certain laws called antitrust laws to protect the American businessman against monopoly and exploitation.

A lot of litigation has come out of these acts, and I think any man who will give even a casual study to the situation will realize that a tremendous lot of good came out of these laws. As time goes on, and as the nature of our economic life changes with modern times and trends, we find that these laws sometimes no longer suffice. That is why we propose amendments to them, to meet problems as they come along.

Many problems that are current in your industry also exist in others. Of course, we must always legislate not for class or special interest, but for the general interest. That is why we think that not only can some of the difficulties your industry faces be solved, but that these same problems in all industries can be met if certain amendments to the law can be achieved.

That is why we have recommended to the legislative committees of Congress that the Sherman and Clayton Acts be amended to give the enforcement agencies more power to prevent continuation of what we think are illegal and unfair practices.

There is one recommendation we made about which I personally feel very strongly. We believe that we must find some legislative means to give the law-enforcement agencies the power to grant immediate relief on a temporary basis so that the economic damage being done through unfair competition can be stopped in its tracks and held in abeyance until these agencies have an opportunity to find out what the facts are and to make final and permanent determinations. There are too many cases, because of the nature of the litigation, that take a lot of time to reach final decision, and too often by the time the wheels of justice have turned, the victim long since has passed from the scene.

We would like to find some way, those who feel as I do, to give faster relief, at least on a temporary basis, so that the very passing of time itself will not work to the advantage of those who violate the law.

We also think that these "good faith" parts of the law that are used now for evasion and loopholes should be tightened up. We have specific legislation pending in the Congress today to accomplish this purpose. Those are matters before the legislative committees. We are urging these legislative committees to proceed with the amendments. That is one field in which you can help now because your problems have been reduced to proposed legislation and are now pending before committees where, if the will of the public becomes strong enough, action will automatically result.

In addition to that part of this problem that you are familiar with, we feel on this committee that there is another way that the small business community, as such, in this country can and should receive a great deal of assistance. That is what we choose to call a revision and reform of our tax laws, with special reference as to how these laws apply to small business.

This committee, the House Select Committee on Small Business, has been working on this subject for a number of years. We think we proved in our original hearings, and in the surveys and research on the subject since, that there is no question but that the tax structure, while making a burden on all business, makes a much heavier burden on the small firm than it does on the large firm.

I think that the very fact that the small businessman is cut out from many of the opportunities for capital and financing—that are open to big business—in itself will prove our case.

Because of that, we have insisted that amendments to the Internal Revenue Code be adopted which would give a little bit more breathing room for the small businessman in this country. It has been truly said by those who know that if Henry Ford were trying to build up the Ford Motor Co. under today's laws, it could never become the great corporation that it is. The Ford company is a typical example of how a little business in this country could, under old tax laws, grow to be big business.

I think that epitomizes the free enterprise system, what we call the American way of things. I think that we make a serious mistake when we permit tax laws, even though they were adopted during time of great national danger as emergency measures, to continue on the books interminably, to the extent that they themselves begin to snuff out, to squeeze out, and starve out this great middle class of our economic life called small business.

We have bills pending with 11 points or revisions which we are convinced would help small business.

The Committee on Ways and Means, which is our legislative committee on taxes, saw fit last year to adopt three of these ideas, and to add one or two of its own, which we were glad to see done for two reasons: first, it will help some phases of small business, and second, it got Congress to adopt the idea, the basic idea, that there is justice in granting tax concessions and revisions to small business. We are now in the process of revising our proposed legislation this year, which we will urge before these committees in the hope that we can get additional tax revision to make the burden on the backs of the small business a little less heavy.

I believe that through tightening up our antitrust laws we can make it more difficult for a big corporation with nothing but sheer, ruthless financial power to destroy competition. Once we can protect the small businessman from that type of unfair trade practice, then if he does find himself in a profitable situation where the free enterprise and tax systems let him live and breathe, he can retain enough of his profits to become strong and to grow and expand.

I think when that is done, the economy of the country generally will reflect a very remarkable improvement. I think you will be surprised, that by revising some of these tax laws downward, in the long run the Treasury of the United States will receive more income than it is now able to obtain. There are a number of records to prove that.

In West Germany, they have made some five tax reductions, revisions, and reforms since World War II. Yet the Treasury of the German Republic receives more income than it ever did, because removing these tax burdens caused the economy of the country to grow, to expand, and flourish. It is only under those terms that the Government can hope to get the revenues it must have to carry on the people's business.

I think that is the real, permanent, sound road to what our country needs. We live in a time when the demands for funds to operate the functions of Government are at an all-time high. There are many reasons for that, and the biggest, of course, the most

overwhelming of all, is the dangerous world we live in and the tremendous cost of our national defense.

In this space age, research and development costs are almost unbelievably high. Therefore, even if we have what we choose to call very prosperous times, we see our national debt going up, the cost of Government going up, and the burdens on the people becoming heavier. I think part of the cost is because of the fact that we have tried to make permanent, in effect have made permanent, many of these emergency burdensome tax laws that were adopted in time of actual war.

Congress imposed some of the wartime levies we now operate under, not so much to raise revenue, as to cut down the demand for some things.

Certainly in these times, we are trying to increase demand. Therefore, it would seem completely illogical to me that we continue tax levies which have, as their basic purpose, to curb demand. The best way to expand demand is to remove any and all of the roadblocks that prevent expansion. That is one field, I think, which is very important to the small business community of the Nation. It is one thing to fix it so that the businessman has a chance to make a profit; it is another to make it possible for him to use at least some of that profit to strengthen his business, to let it grow, and to expand it.

We have more people needing jobs all the time. It always has been, and I hope it always will be the case that the small businessmen in the country provides most of these jobs. It is only through increasing his numbers and prosperity that we can hope to create the employment opportunities in every nook and corner of the country that so many hundreds of thousands of our people are now needing and will continue to need.

These are some of the overall and broad things that I feel motivate those of us in this committee work, and which spell out the basic purpose at which we are aiming.

I know that it is a little grand to talk about it in broad terms, and it is a little prosaic to think about it in the humble little means that we use to accomplish it, but it is high time, I think, that some of these steps are taken.

The facts are all too clear that unless this sort of thing is accomplished, very soon there will not be very much little business to save.

I hope that Congress can get around to enacting these proposals while there is still some of it left. Even though it may be on the anemic side, I still hope we can act before there is too much loss of this segment of our industry. Like all other outsiders, I sometimes would like to come up with a magic answer to your troubles or anyone else's, but I know that it isn't that easy.

We can only deal with your problems on the governmental level, and that largely confines us to the field of the rules by which the game is played. We can liken this whole thing to a football game. We can set the boundaries, we can make the rules, and we can have a referee. Then it is up to the players to see which side wins.

If the game is fair, if the rules are fair, that is about as far as you can go if you want to keep the Government in what I think is its proper place.

We think that there is little need for clipping and stripping, that evidence shows there is altogether too much of this fouling going on at the expense of the small business community. That is why we are trying to get a few more rules adopted that give our referee a bigger club so that he can make more people play more fairly in our commercial life.

I hope that as the next few months unfold, if it becomes our sad responsibility to come into some of your communities and hunt for the facts that are troubling you, we can continue to have the same cooperation and assistance you have given us up to now. I know you are a young organization, but in this field of milk our committee is young, too.

Again, I would like to thank and commend Mr. Daniel, as your representative, for the tremendous cooperation and help he has given us. Without him and without many of you, the work we have tried to do would have been mostly wasted effort.

We are going to continue to give you a forum where your problems can be brought, and where the attention of the Congress can be focused on them. We think they are worthy, that they deserve attention. We hope that in doing that we carry out the main purpose that Congress had when it created the Select Committee on Small Business; that we are truly being the eyes and ears of the House in the field of the needs and the problems of small business so that the Congress will have a wiser way of approaching its solutions to those problems.

Gentlemen, I thank you again for this opportunity to participate in your program. I hope that we can meet together some day and talk about the good work that has been done and the problems that have gone, instead of the problems we have and how we are going to meet them.

Thank you. [Applause.]

Israel's Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1959

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, 11 years ago today the State of Israel was proclaimed. In the brief period of time that has elapsed since 1948 Israel has faced many grave problems. It has been at war with seven Arab States and has been subjected to constant harassment. Its destruction has been attempted by military action, economic boycott, and even by a barrage of propaganda. Nevertheless, Israel has survived and grown. It has absorbed and integrated an average of about 100,000 immigrants every year—a task comparable to the absorption by the United States of 10 million new citizens a year. In addition Israel has raised its agricultural production, increased the amount of cultivable land, extended the social services available to its citizens, and further expanded its industry. In the face of almost insurmountable obstacles the people of Israel have strengthened their democracy and made their country a viable state. Furthermore, not content with just improving its own lot, Israel has given technical assistance to the new Afro-Asian nations and has provided them with a successful alternative to Communist economics.

For all of these achievements Israel deserves our admiration and praise. We can be proud that this young republic is our friend. I can only hope that other nations will follow the example of Israel and that peace will soon reign once more in the Holy Land.

Ruinous Effects of Failure to Enact a Housing Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEMENT W. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 5, 1959

Mr. CLEMENT W. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, builders in the San Francisco area are extremely concerned about the failure to secure passage of a housing bill. This has a serious effect on business generally because of their importance to our economy. It also raises costs to the consumer—the homebuyer. This is illustrated in the letters below from Mr. John Tolan, of Barrett Homes, a large developer of the bay area:

APRIL 30, 1959.

Hon. CLEMENT MILLER,
House Office Building,
Washington D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: It was a pleasure to talk with you yesterday about the crisis in home production which we face in the metropolitan San Francisco Bay area due to failure by the House to act on the housing bill, S. 57.

During our conversation you asked for our views of what will happen to consumer living costs due to the increase in housing costs if S. 57 is defeated.

Here is what would happen:

1. Real volume construction of homes would be halted in 6 months. This high level building production is critically needed to maintain keen competition and existing value, quality and current price levels.

2. New housing payments would increase from 5 to 20 percent due to higher interest on the loans and increased financing expense to the builders. Creditwise, this would disqualify thousands of homeseekers.

3. Average downpayments on economy houses would jump from 3 percent FHA to as high as 30 percent conventional.

4. Volume sales would be impossible due to high downpayments. Most lower and middle income buyers have about $1,000 to $3,000 maximum to get into a new home. Closing costs (insurance prepayment, tax prepayment, title insurance and loan fees) will average $500 and essential appliances, drapes, furniture and some landscaping normally run another $1,000.

5. Sales of older homes will drop off drastically because of the lower turnover. New building stimulates sales of older homes.

6. The risky, high discounted, and inflationary second mortgage would be back. Contingent sales and installment contracts (without title passing) would increase.

7. Unable to buy, the new family would be forced to rent and not get personal income tax credit for that portion of their rental which involves real property taxes and interest.

8. Thousands of skilled homebuilding craftsmen would be lost to the homebuilding industry as they turned to other occupations.

9. Thousands of businesses related to homebuilding, repair, gardening, etc. would suffer.

10. Hundreds of cities with properties off the tax rolls in urban renewal and redevelopment sites would find their rehabilitation program delayed and threatened with abandonment.

As I told you yesterday our city of Richmond, outside its redevelopment areas, has to rent or take a second mortgage and, in many spot lots 25 feet by 100 feet which cannot obtain FHA prior comitments to insure a loan. They sell conventional. They illustrate what is happening today where FHA is not available. Attached is a schedule with detailed compartive figures.

The schedule on home No. 1 shows that if we were forced to drop FHA and GI financing (75 percent of our sales are GI) monthly payments would jump $35 to $40. Buyers now qualifying to purchase with $550 per month incomes would be out in the cold. We would have to find a new market—people earning $700 per month or more. Result: increased marketing cost, fewer sales, higher overhead, higher prices.

The schedule on home No. 2 shows $116.40 per month for a $11,950 house. This is $5 a month more in initial payments than our $14,950 first quality home, and for 400 square feet less living area. We are sold out, can't risk building more. Home No. 2 is being built at a rate of one or two a month and they are slow to sell. But they will be all that would be available for middle income families if FHA is killed.

The schedule on home No. 3 shows a typical house for sale without an FHA prior commitment. Here you have the effect of high downpayments—no sale in 6 months after completion. The builder will finally have any event, leave his capital and profit in the job and soon be out of the homebuilding business. The buyer, should he be required by an emergency to sell, would be caught with an almost impossible resale—too much equity demand. Result: all real estate business seriously affected.

Well, that's part of the story—at least that part where the consumer gets the sharpest blow ever. Don't let that Democratic squabble with the Rules Committee earn a reputation for the House leadership that they are heedless of this little fellow.

Warmest personal regards.

Sincerely,

BARRETT HOMES, INC.
JOHN H. TOLAN, Jr.

Home No. 1: Typical FHA 203 or 220 loan on homes now produced by Barrett Homes, Inc.; Town House (row), 4 bedrooms, electric kitchen, fenced yard; first quality construction; 1,383 square feet, 30- by 100-foot lot

Typical homes financed by savings and loan and local capital, Richmond, Calif.

As now being sold—		If we were forced to go conventional	Home No. 2: Minimum construction standards; 3 bedrooms, 1½ baths; 950 square feet; 25- by 100-foot lot			Home No. 3: Minimum construction standards; 3 bedrooms, 1 bath, electric kitchen; 950 square feet; 25- by 100-foot lot		
			If these homes could be sold—		As now financed and being sold conventional	If these homes could be sold—		As now financed and being sold conventional
FHA	GI		FHA	GI		FHA	GI	
30 years	30 years	20 years	30 years	30 years	20 years	30 years	30 years	20 years.
Sale price: $14,950	$14,950	$14,950	Sale price: $11,950	$11,950	$11,950	Sale price: $11,500	$11,500	$11,500.
Loan: 5¼ percent; $14,300.	4¾ percent; $14,950.	7 percent; $11,950.	Loan: 5¼ percent; $11,500.	4¾ percent; $11,950.	1st: 7.2 percent; $7,000. 2d: 7 percent; $4,350.	Loan: 5¼ percent; $11,100.	4¾ percent; $11,500.	7.2 percent; $7,500.
Down payment: $650.	None	$3,000	Down payment: $400.	None	$600	Down payment: $400.	None	$4,000.
Monthly payment:			Monthly payment:			Monthly payment:		
I. & P.[1] $79.08	I. & P.[1] $78.61	I. & P.[1] $119.39	I. & P.[1] $63.87	I. & P.[1] $62.83	I. & P.:[1]	I. & P.[1] $61.38	I. & P.[1] $60.47	I. & P.[1] $79
MI[2] 5.92	Tax 25.00	Tax 25.00	MI[2] 4.78	Tax 20.00	1st $63.00	MI[2] 4.60	Tax 20.00	Tax 20
Tax 25.00	Insurance 1.80	Insurance 1.50	Tax 20.00	Insurance 1.60	2d 32.00	Tax 20.00	Insurance 1.50	Insurance 1
Insurance 1.80			Insurance 1.50		Tax 20.00	Insurance 1.50		
					Insurance 1.40			
Total 111.72	Total 105.41	Total 145.89	Total 90.15	Total 84.43	Total 116.40	Total 87.48	Total 81.97	Total 80

[1] Interest and principal payments.

[2] Mutual mortgage insurance.

When putting the letter and data on home financing together yesterday I did not compare relative value when FHA financing is replaced by high interest, high downpayment, or second mortgage financing.

The diminution on value can be related to the square foot of living area cost per month of each home (irrespective of construction quality loss).

Home No. 1 and home No. 2 on our schedule show only about 4 percent increase in monthly cost. But I made no adjustment for living space.

Here is the comparison:

Home No. 1, 1383 square feet at $111.72 per month; 8.1 cents per square foot per month. (Barrett-FHA financed.)

Home No. 2, 950 square feet at $116.40 per month; 12.3 cents per square foot per month.

My point is that if we were to lose FHA, home No. 1 would cost $145 per month instead of the present FHA $111.72. Increase, 30 percent.

Further, in order to find qualified buyers we would have to shrink size to hold down monthly payments. This is what the builder of home No. 2 has done. When we compare what the FHA buyer can now obtain from us at 8.1 cents per month per square foot with that same consumer would get for about the same monthly cost without FHA, his increase cost per square foot of living area per month would be 52 percent. Some people might argue about this extrapolation, but when you come out and look at the two houses, you will see that the figures make sense.

NOTE.—The risky second mortgage matures in 5 years—so this agony partially terminates then.

Sincerely,

BARRETT HOMES, INC.,
JOHN H. TOLAN, Jr.

MAY 8, 1959.

If the bill isn't passed by July, we might as well close down our Richmond redevelopment job for this year. We are laying out a great deal of money (so is the Redevelopment Agency) getting ready to build again. We can't go on making large commitments for small action by this Congress.

Sincerely,

BARRETT HOMES, INC.,
JOHN H. TOLAN, Jr.

The Desperate Situation Facing Our Domestic Glove Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 14, 1959

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, since becoming a Member of this distinguished body, I have spoken out on several occasions with regard to the serious problems facing the domestic glove industry in America, much of which is located in my own congressional district in New York State, in the face of the staggering growth that has taken place in low-cost foreign glove imports. Hardly a day passes without my mail bringing to me further evidence of the damage which these fine independent businessmen in my district are suffering and pointing up the grave impact which these developments have on the livelihood and income of the thousands of fine American men and women who have made their careers in the glove industry.

I have already introduced in the Congress legislation designed to reduce the impact of this unfair foreign competition by the establishment of suitable quotas, and I hope it will soon be favorably acted on.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to enclose a letter from one of the outstanding glove companies in my district, the Serfis Glove Corp., of Northville, N.Y., which points up in simple and graphic form the increasingly tremendous handicaps which these American businessmen are working under.

The glove industry, Mr. Speaker, may be a small one compared with some of the larger companies in our land, but the battle which they have long been waging against foreign imports, backed by low wage scales, is a battle which, I predict, many more segments of American industry will soon be waging too. I believe, therefore, that the circumstances outlined in the letter from Mr. Herman J. Serfis will be of profound interest to every Member of this Congress.

The letter follows:

SERFIS GLOVE CORP.,
Northville, N.Y., March 26, 1959.
Congressman SAMUEL STRATTON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We are in receipt of bill H.R. 5445 you introduced March 9, and which was referred to Ways and Means Committee. To us this seems to be a step in the right direction and hope that something really can come out of this.

In new release on imports, leather glove imports went from 84,855 dozen in 1950 to 327,613 dozen in 1957, and 278,457 dozen in 9 months of 1958.

Japan went from practically nothing, or 71 dozen in 1950, to 137,273 dozen in 1957, and 137,525 dozen in the first 9 months of 1958. With the very cheap labor it cannot help to hurt in a big way.

The writer has been around this glove manufacturing in Fulton County since 1922 in this popular priced field, but along with many other small industries around the country it will be a case of being forced out of business.

We do not want to sound pessimistic but we cannot see any thing good over the next couple of years unless there is relief.

Many thanks for your effort in behalf of the industry.

Very truly yours,
SERFIS GLOVE CORP.,
HERMAN J. SERFIS.

Don't Give Another Inch to the Russians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 14, 1959

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, the American Press, an independent magazine for hometown newspapers, published in Stanton, N.J., has taken a most interesting poll. Weekly newspapers throughout the country have shown an almost unanimous approval of facing up to the Russians and keeping an open avenue to Berlin, even at the risk of war. The answer to this and other related questions is appended:

[From the American Press, May 1959]

"DON'T GIVE ANOTHER INCH TO THE RUSSIANS," SAY EDITORS POLLED ON BERLIN SITUATION

"We mustn't give another inch to the Russians."

Over and over again that view was expressed by newspaper editors from all parts of the Nation, who, in response to a survey on the Berlin situation, conducted by the American Press, made it clear that they would choose war rather than condone further appeasement.

In answer to the question: "Do you believe the Western Powers should insist upon open passage to and from Berlin, even at the risk of war?" the vote was an overwhelming "yes." Ninety-two percent of the 310 editors replying answered in the affirmative; only 5 percent answered "no" and 3 percent didn't answer the question.

"If the Russians won't back down we might as well fight now as later," said Frieda J. Monger, of the Duluth (Minn.) Publicity. Her attitude was echoed by many of the editors. But the ready-to-fight sentiment of the editors was somewhat tempered by the answers to a second question: "Is it your guess that the Russians will back down if we take this stand?"

To that question, 89 percent answered "yes," indicating that the editors, although willing to back war as against appeasement, do not anticipate that war will be the result of "holding the line" in regard to Berlin.

Perhaps the best summary of the views of the editors was expressed by Guy W. Paul, of the Bentleyville (Pa.) Courier, who said:

"I think we have gone as far as we can go. Americans have historically stood on principle and backed their stand with every drop of red American blood. This generation owes all it has to that doctrine. Never let it be said that we were unwilling to follow in that tradition—come what may."

An Army general, who fought with Patton during the European conflict, and is now publishing a newspaper in Gering, Nebr., as well as commanding the Nebraska and Iowa National Guard division, said: "The most dangerous thing America faces today is a get-soft attitude and reliance on push-button warfare." Maj. Gen. Warren C. Wood added: "I am for General Eisenhower's draw-the-line and that's it policy in Europe and Far East."

There were, of course, some editors who did not agree that we should be adamant in our stand on the Berlin question. T. C. Merchant, of the Madison (Fla.) Enterprise-Record said that it would be a crime against civilization for the governments involved to get their countries into war.

James Towery, of the Ripley (N.Y.) Review, objected to the rigidity of the administration and expressed his views by quoting the following statement made by Senator MORSE:

"We cannot in this age of total atomic destruction say to the world that we have only one policy in Germany and we are prepared to commit suicide and take the world with us if we do not get our way. We can surely talk about a possible new agreement even as we insist that Russia shall not violate the existing one."

But, in general, the attitude of the editors was that any concessions made to the Russians would just lead to more demands—and that the time has come when we must call a halt.

This was brought out in answer to a question as to whether the President should meet at the summit with Khrushchev. Although 62 percent voted for such a meeting, a large number of those who so voted indicated, by accompanying statements, that they didn't expect anything to come from it—that it would just be used for Russian propaganda. Many stated that the only thing the Russians understood was force or military power and that a meeting as proposed would probably be just a waste of time.

Some believed that any such meeting should be held under the auspices of the United Nations and several expressed the opinion that the whole Berlin situation should be put in the hands of the United Nations. "Now that the United Nations is a functioning organization," said E. E. McCarthy, of the Orlando (Fla.) Corner Cupboard, "such things as the uniting of Germany should be handled there. If a new Germany is to be born, it should be delivered by the world group."

A number of editors felt that a meeting at the summit would do us more harm than good. Ken Byerly, Jr., of the Franklin (Va.) News feared that such a conference would "lull us into a sense of false security."

A number of compromise plans which have been suggested were included in the American Press questionnaire, but all were turned down by a heavy vote. It was clear that the editors are in no mood for further compromise. "The compromise proposals you asked about are all weak kneed and unrealistic in view of the Communist menace," said Louis Gellerman of the West St. Paul (Minn.) Booster. Many other editors echoed his view.

Many brought up the uselessness of trying to have any agreements with the Russians on the grounds that their leaders cannot be trusted to stick to an agreement. The threat to break the agreement regarding the Berlin corridor, they believe, indicates the uselessness of making other agreements.

A question on the advisability of partial mobilization brought forth the opinion that further mobilization does not seem necessary at this time, or that the decision on this should be left in the hands of those government and military leaders who are closer to the situation. A majority voted against partial mobilization, while some pointed out that we have been partially mobilized ever since the last war. But a sizable number of the editors, although a minority, voted for further mobilization now.

Asked whether they favored increased expenditures for defense even though it would mean an unbalanced budget, the majority opposed this proposal. Some pointed out that more should be spent for defense but it should be taken out of other parts of the budget. Others felt that such decisions must be made by the military leaders and the President. Quite a few questioned the inference that the budget would be balanced anyway. Said Tom Tock, of the Dwight (Ill.) Herald: "A balanced budget is one fight that must be won."

Several editors expressed the view that increased expenditures might ruin us economically and that we would be playing into the hands of the Russians if we let them scare us into multiplying the Government's financial woes.

Gordon Spielman, of the Trimont (Minn.) Progress came up with a solution to the Berlin situation which, he believed, would be acceptable to all concerned. He summarized it this way: "(1) A unified Germany; (2) that the unified Germany be permanently neutralized and allowed to be allied with neither east nor west; (3) that both Allied and Soviet troops be withdrawn to the French and Polish borders; (4) that free elections be held in all Germany to establish a central government."

A summary of the questions and answers in the American Press survey follow:

Question 1: "Do you believe the Western Powers should insist upon open passage to and from Berlin, even at the risk of war?"

Answers: Yes, 92 percent; no, 5 percent; no answer, 3 percent.

Question 2: "Is it your guess that the Russians will back down if we take this stand?"

Answers: Yes, 89 percent; no, 3 percent; no answer, 8 percent.

Question 3: "Do you believe the President should meet 'at the summit' with Khrushchev?"

Answers: Yes, 62 percent; no, 20 percent; depends on developments, 13 percent; no answer, 5 percent.

Question 4: "Some of the compromise proposals follow. Please check how you feel about each."

(a) Prime Minister McMillan's proposal that we temporarily recognize the Communist regime in East Germany in order to be able to negotiate with that group? For, 18 percent; against, 77 percent; no answer, 5 percent.

(b) Senate Foreign Relations Chairman FULBRIGHT's suggestion of a slight military withdrawal by both Soviet and Western forces in Germany as a means of easing tension? For, 36 percent; against, 60 percent; no answer, 4 percent.

(c) Polish Foreign Minister Adam Rapacki's proposal to establish a zone in Germany free of nuclear weapons as a means

of inducing the Soviet to withdraw within its borders? For, 28 percent; against, 66 percent; no answer, 6 percent.

Question 5: "Do you think we should consider partial mobilization now to be ready for trouble?" Yes, 44 percent; no, 44 percent; we are partially mobilized now, 4 percent; if leaders deem it necessary, 5 percent; no answer, 3 percent.

Question 6: "Do you think we should increase expenditures for defense even though it means unbalancing the budget?"

Answers: Yes, 27 percent; no, 53 percent; increase for defense but cut down domestic, 8 percent; if President or military leaders think so, 9 percent; no answer, 3 percent.

Federal Support for Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT P. GRIFFIN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 14, 1959

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, in a recent newsletter to my constituents, I indicated my opposition to the so-called Murray-Metcalf bill (H.R. 22), which is now pending before the Committee on Education and Labor. In today's mail, there came a memorandum from the education department of the National Catholic Welfare Conference which contains an excellent statement of sound reasons why H.R. 22, in its present form, should be defeated. Under leave to extend my remarks, the memorandum is reprinted below:

PROPOSALS FOR FEDERAL FUNDS FOR EDUCATION

The department of education of the National Catholic Welfare Conference is firmly convinced of the validity of the American principle that education in the United States is best served when it is locally controlled and locally supported. When questions of Federal assistance have arisen in the past, the department has held that Federal assistance, if it is to be granted, should be granted for specific purposes, and for limited periods in areas of proven need. It has urged that the assistance should be granted democratically to all without distinction of race or creed.

Most of the Federal aid to education measures considered by the Congress since the publication of the report of the Roosevelt Advisory Committee on Education in 1938 have considered Federal aid as a temporary measure, and have been careful to exclude Federal control of curriculum or administration. Some measures now before the Congress incorporate another concept of Federal assistance promoting the idea of continuing support for that of temporary Federal aid.

There is an essential difference between the idea of support and of aid; support is permanent, aid is temporary. Any bill considered by the Congress should carefully distinguish between these choices. Otherwise a bill authorizing a permanent Federal subsidy might well carry in its wake Federal control and permanence which all agree would be harmful to education.

Specifically, the proposal for a Federal grant for teachers' salaries must as a practical matter be a permanent subsidy; it can hardly be considered compatible with the idea of temporary aid. Even should a terminal date be set, it would be almost impossible to shut off that source of financial supply without seriously disrupting local school systems. Furthermore, such a subsidy would give to school maintenance and custodial employees, to firemen, policemen, and other civil servants an equal claim on the Federal Government.

The department is acutely aware of the needs of teachers and is not opposed to the improvement of their position. It questions only the proposal that the Federal Government should subsidize teachers' salaries by means of financial grants.

Federal grants to meet existing emergencies for schoolhouse construction are a type of aid that can, and should, be temporary in nature. The department of education, however, calls to the attention of Congress the heavy financial burdens of parents who choose to send their children to private, nonprofit schools. If Congress determines to aid the parents of public schoolchildren by means of Federal assistance, it cannot in justice be indifferent to the parents of these nonpublic schoolchildren.

Congress can easily avoid an inequity by granting to private, nonprofit schools long-term, low-interest loans for school construction. This is not a new proposal, nor is it outside the framework of existing laws as interpreted by the courts. Rather it is a means devised by Congress itself when it passed the National Defense Education Act of 1958 to provide in an emergency way for the needs of both public and private education. It seems to the department of education that this statesmanlike approach to the question of Federal assistance should be the basic considerations for temporary Federal aid to education.

Private and public education are partners on the American education scene and their welfare should be advanced simultaneously in any proposals for temporary Federal assistance. Such action on the part of Congress will maintain the pluralism which is a cherished feature of the American way of life and avoid reducing educational effort to a common mold.

The department of education of the National Catholic Welfare Conference affirms (1) its traditional opposition to outright continuing Federal support for education; (2) its opposition to the use of Federal funds for teachers' salaries; (3) its contention that Federal assistance, if there is to be any, should be granted on a temporary basis for specific purposes and to areas of proven need; and (4) the claim of private, nonprofit education to that measure of justice permitted by law and suggested by legislative precedent.

Regarding the Snail's Pace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 14, 1959

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, for the past several Congresses the average age of Members of both Houses has gone down a bit. That means more and more of our colleagues have school-age children. I note that one of our freshman colleagues has 6 youngsters. Obviously, it is impossible for Members to share vacations with their school-age children except during the period of the summer school vacation. Equally obvious is the fact that Congress has a habit of conducting great amounts of activity during these summer months and Members must be on hand for it. Columnist Walter Ridder became bold enough to describe some probable causes for the situation in his column last Sunday as follows:

HOUSE HAS BAD CASE OF "WEEKENDITIS"
(By Walter Ridder)

WASHINGTON.—The House of Representatives is suffering from an acute case of "weekenditis" and a number of Congressmen are not at all happy about it.

The lower Chamber is running at what amounts to a Monday-to-Thursday schedule, and over the weekend the Members take off in all directions. The weekend now in effect extends from adjournment Thursday afternoon to convocation Monday at noon.

A number of western legislators are piqued about the situation. They claim that eastern representatives want to go home to their constituencies, a trip which most westerners cannot afford either in time or money, and they are left twiddling their thumbs here in Washington, while the easterners romp around their home districts.

A look at the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will fully support the complaint of the western Congressmen. The House of Representatives' work schedule for formal House meetings on recent Fridays has been as follows:

March 13, in session for 5 hours and 1 minute.
March 20, in session for 2 hours and 46 minutes.
March 27, not in session, Easter recess.
April 3, not in session, Easter recess.
April 10, in session for 25 minutes.
April 17, not in session.
April 24, not in session.
May 1, not in session.

The above schedule does not mean that no work has been done in the House of Representatives on Fridays. Committees and subcommittees have held hearings and have worked on reports. Nor does it mean that the absentee Congressmen are necessarily playing golf or otherwise spending their time away from their duties. But it does mean that no bills have been passed and inevitably the lack of formal work on Fridays will take its toll in the form of a longer session in July and August and it will no doubt increase the already great confusion of Congress' closing days.

The practice of knocking off on Fridays has grown up largely as a convenience for those Representatives who have home offices near to Washington. With airplane service being what it is these days, many Congressmen who formerly went home only occasionally can now bounce to their constituencies within a few hours. Congressmen from Maine to Florida can now pop home for the weekend, speak to their constituents, make a few speeches, and be back in Washington Sunday night or Monday morning. As the majority of Congressmen come from the heavily populated eastern part of the country, they can outvote the westerners when it comes to a matter of having or not having Friday sessions.

The westerners have not the easy means of getting home as do the easterners. The flight to the west coast is relatively long and above all relatively expensive. Thus the westerners are now being left sitting around Washington on Fridays with nothing to do and they are understandably irritated at what they consider the waste of time. But whether they can muster enough votes to do anything about it is, at best, highly uncertain.

The Influence of Foreign Markets on Your Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 14, 1959

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Hon. James A. Farley, chairman of the board of the Coca-Cola Export Corp., at the American Society of Sales Executives dinner held at the Westchester Country Club, Rye, N.Y., on May 7, 1959:

THE INFLUENCE OF FOREIGN MARKETS ON YOUR BUSINESS

(Address by Hon. James A. Farley, chairman of the board, the Coca-Cola Export Corp., American Society of Sales Executives dinner, Westchester Country Club, Rye, N.Y., May 7, 1959)

You have assigned to me a subject which normally will empty any hall. Few speakers have become popular and few politicians have ridden to success on discussions of foreign trade. But we are professionals in that field and we also are by necessity observers of the vast international struggle which is now worldwide. So we know that foreign economics is not a dismal abyss of figures. It is a major front in a world power struggle.

To untrained observers this is not always apparent. It looks as though American foreign trade was an affair of steel or sugar, Coca-Cola, my own company, or of cotton goods, of oil and of radios—a host of humdrum items. We, of course, know better. The exports we sent abroad and the imports we must take into our own market, represent life or death, progress or depression, comfort or starvation, in many parts of the world. They also represent, in the United States, full employment, or men without jobs; communities at work, or communities in distress. Taken both ways, they represent the growth of world economy—or possibly its recession.

As political observers, we know that recession means trouble anywhere. And in countries which are not advanced and are always close to the hunger line it may mean disorder, revolution, killing. Don't ever tell me that foreign trade is a dull subject.

We are just entering a new and difficult phase in this business of world trade. The bases of it are not unhappy. But they do require some very solid and heavy headwork, and we all have to help.

Briefly, what happened was this. When World War II ended, practically the entire world was in distress—except the United States. We emerged with nearly double our war productions, in fact, we produced about half of the manufactured products of the entire world though we have only 6 percent of the population. Every other country was engaged in trying to get a level of consumption which made it possible for them to begin. Their plants were destroyed, the organizations in bad shape, their production in distress. The vision of General Marshall, then Secretary of State, under the leadership of former President Harry S. Truman, initiated the Marshall plan of foreign aid, primarily, as it turned out, to Western Europe. You will recall that he had hoped that the Soviet Union would collaborate and incidentally get some of the aid. Stalin decided against that. He was not collaborating with anyone; he consciously began the Cold War; he refused to allow foreign aid to the Iron Curtain countries. By consequence, the bulk of our foreign aid went to Western Europe, with some portions left over for Asia and India and an unfortunately tiny fraction for Latin America.

The plan worked. Germany, France, Italy, Great Britain particularly benefited. They rebuilt their factories, they retooled their plants, in some cases they learned American methods of production. In other cases they invented new methods themselves. As of now, we can say, substantially, that the Western European nations are better equipped economically than they ever have been in their history. Now they are beginning to produce, not merely for their own consumption but for export as well.

This means, of course, than in the hour of their success and ours, for it is in considerable part an American achievement, Western Europe now becomes our competitor. There is nothing wrong about this. It was foreseen by every student of the Marshall plan operation. It was assumed that the problem of worldwide production and competition would have to be met when it arose. Now it has arisen.

The standard of living in these countries has improved to a point where it is at least comparable to the United States. If you go to France, Germany, or even Italy in the summertime you will see that steadily increasing numbers of European families now have their little cars; they go on vacations and travel; they send their children to summer camps; they do very much what Americans do. This is what an increase of production has meant to them. But while they are doing that they are casting about for means to export, partly so that they can import, chiefly raw materials which they need. So, they seek markets for their exports and, of course, the greatest market is the United States.

This is why, in mid-1959, we see an uncompleted wage and hour negotiation between American labor and the American steel industry with a new factor added. If the price goes above a certain level, Belgian, French, German, and English steel and manufactures based on it will come here and sell at a price cheaper than our own. We are moving, in other words, into a complex where the American level is not the only thing to be considered.

But while all this was going on a much larger area of the world, with a great many more people in it, was not going ahead so fast. This is partly perhaps because the American Marshall plan flow was not so great in these countries. It was also because many of these countries were not well organized politically and because they were not yet prepared by public education to become productive, and to distribute their income widely enough so that they had large markets of their own. In some cases, we were dealing with countries who by geography or by custom had only a single product, as Chile depends on copper, as Cuba depends on sugar, as Brazil depends, principally, on coffee. The growing production in Western Europe and the high level of production in the United States did not affect them. They could consume a great deal more of European and American production than they do but they did not have an effective way of paying for it. They therefore do the only thing they can from their point of view; they severely limit their imports, which is another way of saying that they will not buy our exports, or Europe's either. They prefer to manufacture, frequently at a far higher cost, in their own countries rather than buy at a lower cost from us. They do that because they haven't the foreign exchange to pay for imports in the first place and, anyhow, their people want jobs in factories. So, as the saying goes, the underdeveloped countries want to industrialize. But then they discovered that even to industrialize means that they have to import, at least for a while. They do not have foreign exchange to pay for these imports so they have to seek credit.

Then comes the next development with which we all are familiar. American, and now European, companies come to these areas and offer to establish plants. These proposals are usually well received, at least at first. The next best thing to having a motorcar company of your own, which is difficult without capital, is to have a foreign motorcar company build and operate a plan in your country. This gives jobs. If the company can use local materials it means an added local market in the country. This is the first great phase and it is here that we can be of solid use. Brazil, for instance, cannot import coffee for everything she needs—people do not drink that much coffee. Brazilian capital plus the know-how may not be available at the time to build let us say, a chemical plant. An American or European company, having the capital can, however, build a chemical plant in Brazil, employing local people and using local products and can sell these products in the Brazilian market which, by the way, is one of the largest and most rapidly growing in the world.

There are some who contend that this is bad for the American export trade. If Brazil, for instance, either builds a chemical plant of her own or accepts building of such a plant by an American company she will not buy as much American chemicals as she did before. So, say some, you are cutting your own throat when you help to industrialize another country.

This is simply not true. Brazil, of course, will have more chemicals if she manufactures some of her own. But if she did not manufacture them she still would not buy American chemicals, for the simple reason that she could not afford to. The top limit on American exports is what the countries to whom we sell can pay and there is no way out of it. Or, rather, not much of a way out. The United States can lend Brazil a certain amount of money for exports, which increases her capacity to buy for a while. But, obviously, this does not go on forever. Also, the U.S. Government is slowly coming to the point where it is going to need its resources here. So it is far sounder for us all to help Brazil, or any other country you choose, to get a good industrial system of its own. The statistical fact is that it is the highly industrialized countries that are the best customers for the export trade.

This, I think, is the first lesson we have to learn. Wherever any of us can assist a country to produce manufactured goods in its own region we have helped them and have helped ourselves. This is particularly true where we help a one-product country like Cuba with its sugar, or Brazil with its coffee, to diversify its product. It is why foreign aid, so-called, if properly handled should leave the countries where it is used with more industrial production than before. They will be stabler, more prosperous countries and, over the years, they will be better customers of ours.

Now I am past the stage where I swallow platitudes whole. I have been told, you have been told, that we always ought to let markets seek their own level and let natural balances work out. This is a splendid trick if you can do it. But the fact is that in my lifetime it has not happened. We had these balances before World War I; for practical purposes we have not had them since, save for very short intervals. Today we cannot have them at all, because half the world is not run on a free market basis. The Soviet Union and China have a planned economy, not a free market economy, and between them they account for more than one-third

of the whole population of the world. Most of Western Europe operates on a planned economy—a fact which few Americans really understand. Rightly or wrongly, in the year 1959, more of the world would rather trust its life to planned economy than to the chances of a free and fluctuating market. Time may prove them wrong, but so far it has not. The United States, Canada, and a few other countries still believe or claim they believe in a free market system, but they are in the minority.

This is why you have in Europe a highly planned economy in coal and steel—they call it the Coal and Steel Community. It is why the European common market is planning its economy today. It is why the Latin American countries are meeting and demanding a planned economy in their region.

Let us face it, we don't want a free market economy either. At this point, I expect you will want to try me for heresy. But my company has a great deal to do with sugar and in the United States sugar is planned under an act of Congress so that domestic producers will have so much, and we are allowed to import an added amount from Cuba and other countries to the end that the sugar produced and imported shall about equal the consumption demand. Face it again, the oil industry is one of the most highly planned in the United States, if not in the world. The Bureau of Mines estimates the consumption; the American oil wells are allowed to produce about enough with imports to supply that consumption—and import quotas have just been imposed so that the total supply of oil in the country and coming into it will equal the demand.

If this isn't planned economy I don't know what is. If the sugar industry and the oil industry here will not risk a free market economy why should you expect that the European steel industry or the Brazilian coffee industry will accept a free market? The point that I make is that we are living in a world which in great measure has been planning its economy and proposes to go on doing that. The highly producing countries do it because they cannot stand alternate times of boom and bust. The underdeveloped countries do it because they have not enough resources in the first place and want to steer more of these resources into industry and capital construction, and away from mere consumption. You and I may not like this planned economy movement. But I am too old and you are too smart not to face facts. Anyhow, none of us can change those facts. We had best learn to live in a world that does exist instead of crying because the 19th century came to an end nearly 60 years ago. This is the main thrust of the point I wanted to make here. I wanted to drive in the fact that we are living as exporters in a world which is increasingly planned, and that Americans, though they deny it, are doing as much planning as anybody else, and that we should, therefore, be more hospitable to the idea of economic planning than has been the case thus far. But I cannot close without going a little farther. What do we do with this situation besides thinking about it?

Well, the first thing we do is to take a good long constructively critical look at the policies of the U.S. Government. You will find, if you examine it, that slowly the U.S. Government is moving toward planning in international economics. It proposed a measure of planned economic development in the Near East after the crisis when our marines were in Libya. This was a major change in policy. It changed the entire atmosphere of the Middle Eastern discussion. Again, under heavy pounding, a measure of economic planning was proposed for Latin America, and a committee of the Pan American bloc has been working on this task during April. We ought to get behind that policy and help it along. When the agreements proposed to the Organization of American States, this is the present name of the Pan American Union, come up for review in the Congress, in my judgment, we ought to support them. When we are called on, as some day we will be, to follow up on our initiative in the Near East we ought to support that. This is one tangible thing we can do.

Next, we are in for a rakeover of our foreign aid program. I personally believe in foreign aid, but I also think it could be done a great deal better. Foreign aid is not a handout here, there, or elsewhere, to buy a friend, you don't buy friends. It is not even a device to fight the Communists—though it should work that way too. Foreign aid is really a method by which we supply capital and facilities for underdeveloped countries to increase their own productivity, in the belief, very nearly a certainty, that as they increase their own production the exchange between their countries and ours will increase. There is a committee under the chairmanship of Ambassador Draper working on that and expecting to report to President Eisenhower sometime this summer. One hopes that committee will do a good job. If not, the job will still have to be done by someone, I think, in the administration or in the Congress. Since this business of exporting goods and getting something done with them is our precise business we ought to have as good informed judgment on what is done as anyone else.

Finally, we can think about our own particular lines of business, the Coca-Cola Co., with which I have a great deal to do has systematically tried to have as much manufacture in foreign countries as possible. Many American businessmen can explore that possibility. While we are doing it we can also explore the possibilities of creating markets here for the goods which these countries must export to pay their debts and to pay for what they buy from us.

I think some commonsense applied to this problem will not be wasted. We are, in theory, in business to make money for our stockholders and ourselves. But, in fact, we can make and have a right to make those profits only if we can arrange to do something solidly useful for our country and for the countries overseas, whose needs we supply. If we put our heads together and combine our thinking and our resources and are not scared to death of the thinking done in the rest of the world I think we shall discover that the growing problems of international trade are not insoluble.

We are, if you like, traders. But the business of trading is the business of seeing that the production of the world meets the needs of the world. If we do that we can face our consciences as well as our balance sheets.

Economy in Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD G. WOLF
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 15, 1959

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, like many of my colleagues I have received scores of letters which say no more than the slogan "balance the budget" or "stop spending." A great historian of the 19th century, Jacob Burckhardt, once said that the 20th century would be the age of the simplifier and the slogan. His prediction has certainly come true. It is not only the totalitarians who have used the slogan and the simplification as a tool to deceive the people. It has also become an advertising and political tool to deceive the people in our society. This has certainly been the case in the present budget conflict.

Eminent economists have pointed out that the present inflation is not an ordinary one. It is not caused by excessive supply of money or greater demand for goods than we are capable of producing. This inflation is a much more subtle one. It is what Gardiner Means calls an administrative inflation. This kind of inflation involves a spiraling in prices in certain basic industries where oligopoly is king. The producers in these industries are noncompetitive. They are able to raise prices at will. They are able to raise prices even though the level of demand for their products has dropped.

In the competitive industries according to the price index from June 1958 through March 1959, there has been somewhat of a stabilization in price. Many economists feel that stability has been achieved because food prices have declined—a decline borne by the farmer in a falling share of the consumers' food dollar—while prices of transportation and medical care have increased.

On the other hand, over this same period of time, wholesale prices of very important groups of oligopoly oriented markets—where the market is controlled by a few great producers—iron and steel, nonferrous metals, hardware, agricultural machinery and equipment, construction and general purpose machinery and equipment, and motor vehicles, have continued to increase. These facts support one interpretation only: The possibilities of further price increase are to be found, if at all, only in the prices of manufactured products that are determined administratively and noncompetitively.

This inflation is the direct result of certain efforts on the part of economic royalists to increase profits to hitherto unbelievable heights, without lowering prices, expanding, or competing. The fact that the national budget is balanced for 1 year on the ledger books will in no way change the action of these men nor will the dollar be worth any more, nor will we have solved our present inflationary problems.

Another part of the Eisenhower economic program is the tight money policies of the Federal Reserve. Theoretically this policy is to discourage spending in the community in order to encourage competition among sellers and lower prices on goods. The results are exactly the opposite. We have had greater unemployment and more business failures than ever before. The reason why prices have climbed steadily is not hard to understand. A small businessman is destroyed by tight money policies. He is unable to compete because he cannot get credit or capital to either expand or stay in business. On the other hand, big business oligopolies are not sensitive to the policies of the Federal Reserve. Companies such as General Motors and Du Pont, have fantastic credit lines and fantastic reserves.

Consequently, the upshot of this is that we depress competition and small business while strengthening monopoly and big business. The policies of this administration have made the American Government the prisoner of the big selfish economic interests in this country. Perpetuation of the present policies by the administration will do no more than strangle national growth and increase economic unemployment while raising prices.

Let the record show that I am for economy in government. I believe that our entire defense budget should be examined. I believe that we are going to have some startling discoveries from the Hébert Subcommittee on Weapons Systems Contracts, and the Price Subcommittee on Manpower Utilization. I firmly believe that closer analysis of our defense budget will eliminate billions in waste.

I submit that we overhaul our farm program. I submit that the greatest spender of them all is Secretary Benson. He has spent over $30 billion of our money to prove a theory that was doomed from the start. Mr. Benson has spent more than the combined total spent by all of his predecessors since the beginning of that office in 1862.

When we talk about budget balancing, we should remember that President Truman balanced the budget 6 years out of his 7 years in office while paying $27 billion on the national debt. Furthermore, President Truman did this while saving Europe from famine and chaos through the Marshall plan, a so-called spending program.

And finally let me state that the House has a long record of showing more concern for a balanced budget than is shown by the President. We may take as examples the years 1954 to 1959, the terms of the 83d, 84th, and 85th Congresses. The reductions for 1954 and 1955 below the President's estimates of appropriations totaled $14.6 billion; for 1956 and 1957, the reductions totaled $2.3 billion; for 1958 and 1959 the reductions below the President's estimates totaled $5.7 billion. I am sure that the committees and the leadership of this Congress will continue throughout this session and the 1960 session to find more economic and effective ways of putting this Government's resources to use than the methods outlined in the President's budget.

The issues facing this Nation are much graver than this one—especially when we know that the kind of balancing the President calls for will work against the best interests of this Nation while strengthening the hand of the economic royalists.

Byrd Warns Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAMER H. BUDGE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 20, 1959

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, there follows an editorial from the May 10 issue of the Times-News published at Twin Falls, Idaho. It is certainly time, as indicated by the Times-News, that this Congress heed the warning voiced by a prominent Democrat:

BYRD WARNS AMERICANS

The American people may be getting tired of discussing taxes and inflation. But unless they face up to their responsibilities as citizens and crack down on unnecessary Government spending—local, State, and national—they're going to pay a terrific price for their indifference.

It should be significant that the country's leading magazines and industrialists are warning what is in store for us if this rising tide of Government extravagance and deficit spending is not checked.

We commented recently on how the Chicago Tribune is crusading to awaken the American people to the dangers facing this country unless it changes its ways.

Those still courageous enough to challenge the spendthrifts are to be commended for trying to bring the average citizens to his senses—to impress upon him the importance of taking a personal interest in fighting those forces which rapidly are undermining the country.

Perhaps no one man in the United States has fought the forces of waste and extravagance more diligently than has Senator HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia. He has served in the Senate since 1933. Long an advocate of economy in Government, Senator BYRD has pointed out time and time again how the Federal Government could save billions of dollars without serious impairment of any essential service.

If Senator BYRD were a conservative Republican, motivated by political thinking, his warnings would carry less weight. But he happens to be a Democrat with the welfare of his country at heart. That makes his stand highly significant.

With that in mind, Senator BYRD's most recent appraisal of this country's present predicament comes at an opportune time, while Congress is in session and an effort is being made to arouse nationwide indignation.

In an address before the annual meeting of the National Taxpayers conference in Washington, Senator BYRD summarized the situation somewhat as follows:

1. The Federal Government's fiscal situation has deteriorated faster in the past year than in any comparable peacetime period.

2. We have allowed ourselves to grow weak in the requirement for solvent Government and sound money. "Assurance of fiscal soundness in the future does not now exist."

3. The epidemic of the Federal Government's inflation-breeding spending and taxing policies has spread to State and local governments.

At the outset of his speech, Senator BYRD clarified a popular misconception. Contrary to general understanding, he said, recent great increases in Federal spending have not been for defense or foreign aid. "The tremendous increases have been for domestic-civilian programs."

Since 1954, he explained, expenditures outside of defense, atomic energy, and foreign aid categories increased from $19.1 billion to $34 billion estimated in the current year. This is an increase of $14.9 billion, or 78 percent.

"There is terrific pressure in the current session of Congress for enactment of more nonessential spending programs," said BYRD. "Almost invariably these new spending programs involve multiyear or permanent commitments for heavy spending in the future.

"Much of the domestic-civilian spending is for subsidies—and by subsidies, I mean nearly all kinds of loans, grants and payments out of the Federal Treasury to special beneficiaries. Many of these subsidies are bottomless pits for Federal spending and contribute to sky-high inflation.

"The Federal Government of the United States cannot now pay its bills except by increasing debt and inflation," BYRD emphasized. "Revenue at present tax rates does not meet our commitments. Interest on the Federal debt is taking approximately one-tenth of all taxes collected. Chronic inflation has reduced the purchasing power of our money 52 percent. The American dollar is now worth 48 cents by the 1939 index. Inflation destroys fixed incomes, provident investment, prudent business, sound financing, national security, and democratic government.

"The Federal Government is now subsidizing business, industry, private finance, agriculture, transportation, power, health, education, States, localities, individuals, etc. By the process of cheapening our money and centralizing power in the Federal Government, we have descended to a level of state socialism which is obvious, if not admitted. Social democracy is a subterfuge for sound government and constructive enterprise. Its evils are historically documented wherever nations have stooped to it.

"The situation will continue to grow worse unless there is drastic action in the immediate future. In the process of centralizing power, the Federal Government is usurping State and local revenue sources. At the same time it is encouraging greater spending at all levels. And through expanding paternalism, great segments of business, labor, agriculture, and taxpaying individuals are being brainwashed with Federal subsidy.

"Nearly 40 million people will receive direct payment from the Federal Treasury this year. With their families these 40 million people could reach a number equivalent to half the population of the United States.

"Drastic action should be taken immediately. I believe the best interests of this Nation and our allies would be served if the $77 billion expenditure estimate for the coming fiscal year were reduced by $5 to $6 billions, or between 7 and 8 percent. I know this could be accomplished without the impairment of a single essential function. From long experience I know public demand could force such reductions."

Jean Dalrymple: A Tribute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 14, 1959

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, when I sat in this Chamber and listened to the King of the Belgians, Baudouin, deliver to America the message from his country, my thought wandered back to the great Brussels World Fair in Belgium. And when I thought of the Brussels' Fair I could not help but think of Jean Dalrymple and the great effort she put into it as coordinator for the U.S. performing arts program.

Listening to King Baudouin and thinking of the Brussels' Fair and Jean Dalrymple, I suddenly realized that even at this late date there has never, to my knowledge, been paid a proper and fitting tribute to Jean Dalrymple for her

great accomplishment when the eyes of the world were focused on America and its exhibitions.

Mr. Speaker, it is never too late to pay tribute to anyone who should have received tribute long before.

A public and just tribute to Jean Dalrymple, coordinator for the U.S. performing arts program for the Brussels' World Fair is long overdue.

I pay it now.

Although the fair has ended and the once heavily populated aisles of the great exhibits have been vacated the amazing job done by Jean Dalrymple continues to be reflected with the passing of each day.

Of course like thousands of other Americans I knew Jean Dalrymple before she went to Europe on this venture. Today Jean Dalrymple is internationally known and American theatrical art and culture is better known and better understood because of Jean Dalrymple's great contribution.

It is most significant that from an original requested, but not provided budget of $2,500,000 Jean Dalrymple staged this gigantic program on an appropriation of $500,000. In addition the Belgian Government has accepted the American Theater Building as a monument to the Americans who performed there and the programs which were presented there. This acceptance saved the American Government an estimated $10,000 which would have been required to demolish the building.

I should like to call to your attention that at the American Theater of the U.S. Pavilion at the Brussels World's Fair this past summer of 1958, over 40 live attractions were offered to the public at prices which everyone could afford: $3 top to $1, and for more than 75 percent of the attractions, $2 to 60 cents.

The following large attractions were given at the higher price of $3 top:

"Carousel," by Richard Rodgers and Oscar Hammerstein II.

"Wonderful Town," by Leonard Bernstein, based on the play "My Sister Eileen."

"Susannah," the American opera by Carlisle Floyd.

"Maria Golovin"—world premier—by Gian-Carlo Menotti.

Philadelphia Orchestra with Ormandy conducting, Isaac Stern, soloist, July 2, 3, 4.

Philadelphia Orchestra with Ormandy conducting, Van Cliburn, soloist, July 5.

Harry Belafonte.

Benny Goodman and his orchestra.

American Ballet Theater Co.

Jerome Robbins Ballet Co.

Juilliard Orchestra.

Newport Jazz Festival.

"Time of Your Life," by William Saroyan, with all-star cast, including Franchot Tone, Susan Strasberg, Dan Dailey, Myron McCormick, Ann Sheridan, Scott McKay, Arnold Moss, Paula Laurence, George Mathews, and Larry Blyden.

Andre Eglevsky's Petit Ballet with stars from the New York City Ballet Co., including Mellissa Hayden, Patricia Wilde, Edward Villella, George Tobias.

Also, a music program of recitals which gained the Gold Medal as the best program of music offered by all 50 countries at the world's fair, which included, at a $2 top: Yehudi Menuhin, violinist; Leontyne Price, soprano; George London, baritone; Blanche Thebom, mezzo-soprano; Byron Janis, pianist; Robert McFerrin, baritone; Rosalyn Tureck, pianist; Jose Iturbi, pianist; Ralph Kirkpatrick, harpsichordist; Leon Fleisher, pianist; William Warfield, baritone; Eleanor Steber, soprano; John Browning, pianist; Sylvia Marlowe, harpsichordist; Berl Senofsky, violinist.

Also "J. B.", the famous Archibald MacLeish drama, now a great hit on Broadway, and recently awarded the Pulitzer Prize, was given by the Yale University Theatre Company under the regional drama division; also "Waiting for Godot," was given with great success by the San Francisco Actors Workshop.

And the following music and choral groups appeared with great success: Massachusetts Institute of Technology Choral Society, Manhasset Pilgram Fellowship Choir, Concordia Seminary Chorus, Yale University Glee Club, Smith College Glee Club, Knox College Choir, Apollo Club of Minneapolis, University of Tulsa Radio Choir.

There was also an extraordinary program of films, including more than 60 documentaries, which covered every phase of American life, all given free in the American Theater, and a "Cavalcade of Great American Films," also shown free, which drew such great crowds, that very often the films had to be shown several times.

The American Theater was open to the public from 11 a.m. each morning until almost midnight, every day from May 1 to October 16. All morning and afternoon performances were free to the public. Only the evening performances were charged for and the theater was crowded from morning to night.

The selection of Jean Dalrymple as the coordinator for the U.S. performing arts program for the Brussels Worlds Fair was a natural one. She has devoted almost an entire lifetime to the performing arts, and in recent years has poured her energies into helping in the operation of the New York City Center of Music and Drama, a semicivic, nonprofit enterprise devoted to the fostering of popular-priced theater, ballet, and opera.

Miss Dalrymple has been with city center since its beginning in 1943, at one time acting as director of public relations, and as a member of the board of directors. As director of the City Center Theatre Company, she has produced revivals of 16 famous plays at city center with all star casts.

In the spring of 1957, as the new director of the Light Opera Company, she produced five popular musicals. "Carousel" was produced in September of 1957, and this spring, in addition to Marcel Marceau, Miss Dalrymple put three more musicals on the stage of city center:

Miss Dalrymple was responsible for bringing Charles Boyer to Broadway in his first stage appearance in America, in Jean-Paul Sartre's "Red Gloves" and she staged the record-breaking revival of "Burlesque," starring Bert Lahr. "Hope for the Best," starring Franchot Tone, was another of her Broadway productions.

Miss Dalrymple produced "Reunion in Vienna," for the coast-to-coast TV program "Producers' Showcase." Indeed, she has been in all branches of "show business" since she was 17 years old, when she was a star in her own comedy sketch on the famous Keith-Orpheum vaudeville circuit. She then went to work with the late John Golden. Eventually, she opened her own publicity and management office, and represented such famous personalities as José Iturbi—she is still his personal manager—Lily Pons, Leopold Stokowski, Nathan Milstein, Bidu Sayao, Tallulah Bankhead, Nanette Fabray, Jan Kiepura, Marta Eggerth, and others.

She also has been associated with numerous Broadway hits, and also the Ballet Russe de Monte Carlo and the New York Philharmonic-Symphony concerts at New York's Lewisohn Stadium. In 1951, when she handled the Berlin Arts Festival for the U.S. State Dapartment she met and later married Col. Philip de Witt Ginder. He is now major general, Deputy Commander, U.S. Army, stationed on Governor's Island.

As the coordinator for the U.S. performing arts program she has assembled a wide variety of attractions in her effort to display the finest available examples of what is indigenous to American culture and achievement in the arts.

Included in the Americans for whose friendship King Baudouin yesterday in this chamber, expressed appreciation is Jean Dalrymple, who was so vital a part of the contribution to the American participation in the Brussels World Fair.

Jean Dalrymple, I salute you.

Navy Secretary Thomas S. Gates: Modern Navy's Architect

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1959

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, so quietly, effectively, and efficiently has Thomas S. Gates worked during his 6 years in the Navy Department, first as Under Secretary and then as Secretary of the Navy, that little note has been taken of the magnificent progress his leadership has inspired and directed.

The Nation, men everywhere who love freedom, and all who recognize in seapower a prime guardianship of that freedom, owe Mr. Gates a lasting debt of gratitude. Navy, the magazine of seapower, recently carried a warm profile

of Secretary Gates by James C. Elliott which highlighted some of the Secretary's contributions. It is as follows:

PROFILE: THOMAS S. GATES, JR., SECRETARY OF THE NAVY

(By James C. Elliott)

One of the most startling periods in the Navy's history has unfolded in the past 6 years. Never has there been such a transition in weapons systems. In that amazing period, man has harnessed nuclear power to seapower, not only developing the submarine *Nautilus* and others that followed, but also incorporating them into the fleet as a full-fledged member of the team. With them, new horizons of underwater endurance, Arctic operations and remarkable new submerged speeds have brightened the Navy's future. In that period, the first giant aircraft carrier, the *Forrestal*, joined the fleet, too, and so have her sister ships. Angled decks, mirror landings systems, supersonic jets—all have become as part and parcel of the Navy as John Paul Jones. New concepts for antisubmarine warfare have been developed, and new forms of employing them show promise beyond all expectations of only a year or two ago. The Marine Corps has grown into a more compact, more mobile, more powerful force. Ships' profiles now carry the outline of new missiles. Polaris—a completely new concept of naval warfare—has been started and will emerge as one of America's most elusive, powerful, and frightening deterrents to war.

In those 6 years of fantastic changes, one man has played an important role in every new development, first as Under Secretary and later as Secretary of the Navy. That man, of course, is Thomas S. (Sovereign) Gates, Jr.

And when he steps down from his top civilian echelon in the Navy next month, Gates will be able to look back upon these developments with more than casual pride.

In bowing out of public life after 6 years in the Pentagon, he will have served in a strictly Navy secretariat position longer than any man in modern Navy history.

Gates, a tall and handsome Philadelphian who has gained a tremendous reputation for his fair play and understanding in Washington, quietly declines credit for the tremendous transition in naval weapons, warfare, and doctrine. Out of modesty, he customarily belittles his own efforts in anything. In glancing back over those 6 years, however, Gates candidly admits that his work has been one constant challenge to balance modernization with readiness.

Sitting in his smartly appointed Pentagon office, he recalled the difficult periods of the Suez flareup, the crisis at Lebanon, and the fears at Formosa.

"It has been extremely difficult," he explained with candor, "to keep our forces deployed and to maintain high morale at the same time. It has been difficult to maintain our strength and to keep a program of modernization. This balancing has been the most challenging part of the job."

In reminiscing through the past 6 years, however, the dark-haired Secretary brightened to talk about the Navy's leadership program, a plan to bring along the Navy's younger officers and a move which Gates has taken a personal interest in supporting. He discusses the new reorganization plan recommended by the Franke committee with enthusiasm and thinks it will help the Navy in its long-range planning. And he is tremendously impressed with Rear Adm. John S. Thach's ASW outfit, task group Alfa.

"It's one of the greatest things we've ever done," he chimed up. "The morale there is one of the greatest things I've ever seen."

And he stands a dedicated supporter of Adm. Arleigh A. Burke, Chief of Naval Operations. As a matter of fact, the Gates-Burke team is regarded by many as the strongest civilian-military team in Washington.

"It has been a wonderful partnership," Gates said. "I don't know how it could have been any stronger. We have never disagreed on any fundamental issues. And that goes for the entire Navy civilian-military team, as well."

Evidence of the camaraderie existing between Gates and Burke is no better typified than in the story circulating the Pentagon not long ago. Gates and Burke, it seems, were engaged in a knotty problem one night, working late in Gates' office and struggling diligently for an answer, unmindful of the hour.

Suddenly, with an embarrassed gulp that registered a deep sense of desperation, Gates leaped to his feet and shouted:

"My gosh, Arleigh, it's 8:25. And I was supposed to be at some damned fool black tie dinner at 8."

The fact that Gates made the frantic admission does, indeed, point up the hard-working spirit that drives the two men. Although he probably expected it, Gates found no sympathy, however, from his four-star friend, who appeared fully as desperate as Gates. Nevertheless, he managed a pious smile and blurted out:

"Well, you know I have an idea it's my damn fool black tie dinner you're talking about, and we're both late."

It was a dinner at Burke's home, and both Mrs. Gates and Mrs. Burke had come to expect such tardiness from this hard-driving pair.

In his Pentagon tour, Gates has become known as a man who, in addition to his insatiable appetite for work, has a broad sense of humor, a remarkable talent for making everyone feel he has won the argument and a modest, considerate and warm personality that has won for him, and the Navy, friends in all branches of the service.

He takes a personal interest in his staff. Only recently he won the hearts of his aide's two teenage daughters. While Gates was visiting at the aide's home one day, the girls explained they had organized a Navy club and were fast decorating a clubhouse. Gates visited the clubhouse and soon realized it was without a pennant.

"Design one," he advised the girls, "and I'll have one made for you."

Time passed and he soon received a drawing of the pennant from the girls, complete with stars—silver ones for the members and one big gold one representing the Secretary, who obviously had become an honorary member.

Gates was so impressed he ordered not one, but two of the pennants from a New York flagmaker. One, he presented to the girls. The other? He's keeping it himself and will use it for his personal signal aboard his private yacht, the *Jericho*.

This sincere understanding and consideration of others leaves his staff honestly ready to brag about the boss at any time.

"You start with the adjective 'terrific' and go on from there in describing that guy," one said proudly. "He's tops in all categories."

Gates' charm and compelling fairness go back farther than his Pentagon days, however. His well-rounded personality showed up in his college days at the University of Pennsylvania, an institution of which his father once was president. There, Gates' eagerness and esprit de corps won him the managership of the football team. His intellectual strength brought him a Phi Beta Kappa key.

The youthful appearing broad-shouldered Navy Secretary is an only child, his mother having died when he was born.

He was married in 1928—the same year he was graduated from college—to the former Millicent Anne Brengle. They had four children, three daughters and the late Thomas S. Gates III, whose death in a Canadian ski lodge fire a few years ago is one of the most vivid tragedies in Gates' life.

Gates, 52, dislikes formality, particularly in his office. One reason for that attitude, of course, might be found in his now famous statement about Pentagon offices.

"They gave us such nice offices," he mused, "because they never let us out of them."

His door has always been open to old friends. And to visitors he has never met before, he will always step out from behind his big desk, walk to them with his big warm hand extended and smile "I'm Tom Gates."

Friends who knew him as a youngster still call him "Tommy." In his modesty, he prefers to be called Mr. Gates rather than the proper Mr. Secretary. His most popular description of anything, be it favor or scorn, is "fabulous."

Gates almost missed a Navy career completely. Before World War II, he had risen in 9 years to the obscure rank of private first class in the Pennsylvania National Guard. "The depression was rougher than you think," he laughed. In spite of his slow progress, however, he still had decided to join the Army. He was practically on his way to the recruiting station, as a matter of fact, when he ran into an old friend. One thing led to another. Gates recalls, and before he knew it, the friend had convinced him that the only way he would stay alive would be to join the Navy.

Gates holds several decorations for his work in the war. Once, when he was commanding officer of a Naval Air Intelligence School in Norfolk, he virtually wrote his own ticket to combat. While almost everyone thought he was in Norfolk establishing the school, Gates was getting first-hand war experience aboard the *Ranger*. "All I did," he recalls with a twinkle, "was to write out orders from the commanding officer, to the commanding officer. Naturally, they were approved."

Gates was brought into the Navy hierarchy by former Secretary of the Navy Robert Anderson. As Gates recalls the situation, he was right in the midst of an important business transaction when Anderson phoned him and told him to come to Washington.

"I was flabbergasted," Gates said.

Later, he explained, he was impressed with the careful screening that goes with the selection of a Navy Under Secretary or Assistant Secretary. "It's no mere selection of someone," he explained, adding that in one recent case as many as 74 persons were interviewed before one was selected.

Gates hardly had assumed his post as Under Secretary, however, when he began to wonder whether he should not have stayed in Philadelphia. The ceiling lights in his office had the devastating habit of becoming overcome by gravity and falling smack-dab on anything below them. One time they caused untold damage to his mahogany desk. And another time, his office aides arrived one morning to find they had landed with a crash right in the middle of Gates' empty chair.

Some jokingly referred to the lights as the conspiracy that moved Gates into the Secretary's office, where the lights do not fall. Whether the lights in the Under Secretary's office are still falling or not has not been disclosed. But, some theorize, that certainly could be the case. After all, they reason, William B. Franke, the current Under Secretary, is moving out, too, and into the very same office Gates did.

Poison in Your Water—No. 76

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 14, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the Portland (Maine) Express on June 4, 1958, entitled "Cape Beach Use Delayed by Pollution":

CAPE BEACH USE DELAYED BY POLLUTION

CAPE ELIZABETH.—It's swimming time again, but not at Maiden Cove Beach.

Pollution has caused Cape Cottage Beach Association directors, sponsors in the past, to postpone opening until steps can be taken to decontaminate it.

Source of the trouble, says William D. Monie, association president, is the Maiden Cove outfall sewer. It serves about 35 families. It empties into the cove.

In a letter to the association's 200 members, a hike in dues is proposed by June 16 to set up a modest chlorination plant to kill bacteria in the sewage.

Bacteria content of the cove's water was found to be 11 times above the State's upper health limit for safe bathing. This was disclosed by the Edward C. Jordan Co., Inc., Portland, during a survey for the town's sewer study committee.

SECOND TEST

In the wake of this disturbing report, the beach association's directors called in the State water improvement commission which found conditions even worse.

The commission reported bacteria 12 to 13 times above the safe limit. Their sampling was done last month. Warmer water probably accounted for more bacteria in May than when the Jordan sampling was done in December, Monie said.

Normally, the beach is opened around June 9–10. The date has been set back to July 1 contingent upon approval of sewage chlorination.

To date, the association has made no attempt to hire a lifeguard, organize swimming classes, or clean up winter beach debris.

"We don't want to sponsor anything that would be unhealthy," Monie explained.

Meanwhile, he said, the association doesn't have the power to post the beach as unsafe; that would have to come from the town health officer.

Dr. George W. Hallett, Jr., the town health officer, is away on vacation until June 16.

That the date the association hopes to have its problem resolved one way or another.

If members can't come across with the dues hikes immediately, they're being asked if they will pay later. If not, directors would like an expression of opinion, so they'll know how the association stands on the matter.

Monie wouldn't disclose the amount of the proposed dues increase. He said it's a matter only between members of the association, which is a private organization.

MAY COST $1,800

However, offhand, he estimated cost of installing and operating a chlorination system at $1,800 for the first year. Thereafter, it would run about $450 annually during the bathing season.

Monie was chairman of the recent Cape Elizabeth sewer study committee. He is chief engineer of the Portland water district. The committee recommendation for setting up a sewer district was turned down at a special town meeting last month.

Among proposals resulting from the Jordan survey was extending the Maiden Cove outfall sewer 1,000 feet out to sea. That would take care of beach pollution. However, the Maiden Cove extension wouldn't have come for some time, even if the town had approved a sewer district.

Monie said that the only other polluted beach area in Cape Elizabeth, from his study of survey reports, is Ship's Cove at Fort Williams. That's on Government property. It's posted as off limits even to Army personnel, he said.

Scenic Maiden Cove beach, sheltered and popular for family relaxation by the sea, offers between 400 and 500 feet of sand beach.

Today, unsafe despite its grandeur, it stands as proof of the axiom that beauty can be only skin deep.

King Baudouin's Visit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 14, 1959

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply moved by King Baudouin's speech in this House on Tuesday, May 12.

He spoke of the difficulty of achieving peace, when the new imperialism seeks the mastery of our minds and of our very personalities.

I have seldom heard a more moving phrase—

Youth is the first victim of war, the first fruit of peace. It takes 20 years or more of peace to make a man; it takes only 20 seconds of war to destroy him. * * * Where better can the free peoples of the world look for the averting of war and death than to your Nation so vibrant with the love of life?

Recently I introduced legislation to provide for the utilization of Ellis Island by the Secretary of State as a training center for Americans going abroad, and to keep this great landmark as a living memorial to American freedom and the contributions made to the United States by the immigrants who have come to these shores. More eloquent than the statements of most others was King Baudouin's regarding the promise which is America's:

America has been called a melting pot, but it seems better to call it a mosaic, for in it each nation, people, and race which has come to its shores has been privileged to keep its individuality, contributing, at the same time, its share to the unified pattern of a new nation.

I include here a fine editorial on King Baudouin's visit, from the Journal-Every Evening, Wilmington, Del.:

[From the Journal-Every Evening, May 12, 1959]

KING BAUDOUIN'S VISIT

Royalty as an institution has many things about it that Americans, living under a republican form of government, do not like. But it has its uses, as we are reminded by the presence in this country of a royal visitor who should be particularly welcome.

Baudouin, King of the Belgians, is a tall and reserved young man who looks every inch the monarch but who would agree with the suggestion that the protocol associated with his position can be burdensome. He has shown that he doesn't like to be stared at—and he has indicated that if he could avoid it he would not go through the New York ticker-tape welcome that is planned for him.

Yet he will go through with it, just as he has gone through with the business of being chief of state of his small but populous country since his father abdicated in his favor. He was only 20 then, and he would have preferred to have his father keep the throne. But at that time the royal question was tearing the country apart. He saw it as his duty, to his country and to his line, to accept the responsibility laid upon him.

Belgium has been so tranquil, and so prosperous, since then that there is no question of the rightness of his decision. Since then, too, she has been a strong as well as enthusiastic member of the North Atlantic Alliance. Against that history, King Baudouin's visit here is a happy occasion—and a happy augury of firm friendship between his small kingdom and our great Republic.

183d Anniversary of Our Nation's Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. BARRETT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 14, 1959

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include Resolution 352 passed by the Philadelphia City Council, Philadelphia, Pa., on April 22, 1959, inviting a delegation from the Congress of the United States to attend the ceremonies commemorating the 183d anniversary of our Nation's independence on July 4, 1959, at Independence Hall.

The celebration this year will honor our new State of Alaska and the new 49-star flag will be raised for the first time.

Philadelphia and her people are indeed honored and pleased to extend this invitation and it is their hope you will accept.

RESOLUTION 352

Resolution urging members of the State Legislature of Pennsylvania and of the Congress of the United States to form a delegation of distinguished legislators to come to Philadelphia to attend the ceremonies on July 4 at Independence Hall

Whereas this Nation observes the 183d anniversary of its independence on July 4, 1959; and

Whereas the city of Philadelphia, where the Founding Fathers created the historic document of liberty, the Declaration of Independence declaring the 13 Colonies a free and independent Nation, will observe this occasion with appropriate public ceremonies in Independence Hall at 11 a.m.; and

Whereas this celebration will salute the new State of Alaska and will feature as its keynote speaker the Honorable ERNEST GRUENING, U.S. Senator from the State of Alaska; and

Whereas an unduplicated historic moment will be shared at this observance when the 49-star flag will be raised officially for the first time in accordance with the law that the new flag does not fly officially until the Fourth of July following the vote of the people for statehood; therefore be it

Resolved by the Council of the City of Philadelphia, That we hereby urge the mem-

bers of the State Legislature of Pennsylvania and of the Congress of the United States to form a delegation of distinguished legislators to come to Philadelphia to attend these ceremonies on July 4 at Independence Hall, as an inspiration to their constituents all over America to join also in the national pilgrimage to this hallowed shrine; and be it further

Resolved, That the city representative forward invitations and certified copies of this resolution to Hon. David L. Lawrence, Governor of Pennsylvania; Hon. John Morgan Davis, Lieutenant Governor; Hon. Hiram G. Andrews, speaker of the house; and Hon. M. Harvey Taylor, president pro tempore of the State senate; and to Hon. Sam Rayburn, Speaker of the House of the Congress of the United States; Hon. Carl Hayden, President pro tempore of the U.S. Senate; the Representatives in Congress from Philadelphia, and the U.S. Senators from Pennsylvania, with the request that they bring this ceremony to the attention of their illustrious colleagues.

California Defense Contracts Vital to Nation's Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 14, 1959

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the business of defending the Nation is a vital one and intrusted, from the hardware standpoint and a number of others to the military departments of the Government. These departments should be let free to do their job on the principle of getting it done most effectively and most economically. This principle is reiterated in the two following editorials:

[From the Long Beach Independent-Press-Telegram, May 10, 1959]

STATE HAS WHAT IT TAKES TO DELIVER ON DEFENSE CONTRACTS

Though not imbued with the spirit of brotherly love, the congressional delegation from New York State at least has an admirable quality of directness.

New York's Congressmen are launching a movement with the stated purpose of getting more aircraft and missile projects for New York and reducing the number of such projects for California.

We think it commendable that New York wishes to better its position. But the effort to do so at the expense of California and the defense effort is greedy, malicious, and myopic.

However, several factors assure California a substantial portion of defense contracts as long as such contracts are written.

World War II drew a large supply of skilled workers to southern California, and the supply has been continuously replenished since.

The same thing that draws most of them here—the excellent year-round weather—provides a maximum number of productive days for industry.

Also, vast amounts of open country are available in adjacent desert areas for the immediate testing of aircraft, missiles, and other defense products.

These advantages make southern California a natural center for defense production. We trust that the Government does not tend to deprive itself of such a valuable asset merely for the sake of satisfying the desire of New York Congressmen to make points with their constituents.

[From the Los Angeles Examiner]

POLITICS VERSUS SECURITY

Members of Congress from Eastern States are self-righteously pitching for legislation guaranteeing that a larger share of defense contracts will be awarded to the areas they represent.

This is an irresponsible proposal that would unquestionably weaken the Nation's security.

To award these contracts on the basis of geography would lower the quality of the products, whether aircraft, missiles or electronic devices, and at the same time boost their cost.

These short-sighted easterners refuse to recognize that California's defense industry resulted from the most careful and intelligent planning over a period of many years.

They refuse also to take into account the fact that we have the skilled workers, the specially-equipped plants and the brain power that are demanded and that no act of Congress can bestow all of this on some other area.

The unemployment problem in sections of the East that has given rise to this proposed legislation is regrettable but this is not the way to solve it.

As Harold Wright, general manager of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, says, "We must not tolerate making a WPA out of our Nation's defense effort."

We note that Wright will confer today in San Francisco with the managers of the San Francisco, Oakland and State chambers to organize a united program against these threatened raids.

In this effort, they should have the support not only of all the people of California but of the entire country.

Downright politicking of this kind cannot be allowed to enter into the building of the defenses of this Nation against the ever-present danger of annihilation by enemy attack.

Mountain Laurel Proposed as a National Flower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 14, 1959

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, in the battle of the flowers during the current campaign to name a national flower, one important flower has been forgotten and that is the Mountain Laurel, State flower of Connecticut.

I have today introduced in the House a resolution designating this flower as the national flower of the United States of America.

As further explanation of my motive in filing this resolution, I include herewith a letter which I have written to the Honorable JESSICA WEIS, Congresswoman from New York, who is the sponsor of another entrant in this floral race:

Hon. JESSICA WEIS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JESSICA: I have watched with interest your campaign to have the rose made our national flower and I applaud your efforts, but I disagree wholly with your contentions.

I cannot agree that the rose, which is the national flower of England and the symbol of delicacy and fragility, should ever be designated as the floral symbol of the United States.

I believe that the flower which stands as the embodiment of the American character should have qualities of hardiness, of firmness, and of strength that are not present in the rose.

My candidate for our national flower is Connecticut's own Mountain Laurel (Kalmia Latifolia). This lovely plant strikingly contains the American qualities of those hardy settlers who first recorded its discovery in 1624. Like the early colonies, it flowers in the wilderness and spreads its charm in spite of rocky and inhospitable surroundings.

No one who has ever driven through the Connecticut woods late in June can ever forget the glory of the Mountain Laurel with its white and pink blossoms forming a magnificent contrast with the dark green of surrounding trees and bushes.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN S. MONAGAN,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the Congress will favorably consider my resolution.

Ireland's Frank Aiken Offers a Proposal for Nuclear Disarmament

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, nuclear disarmament has become almost a prerequisite of peace. It is important to note, therefore, the outstanding efforts being made by Frank Aiken, Ireland's Minister for External Affairs, to check the spread of nuclear weapons to country after country. For, he reasons that the greater the number of nations that possess nuclear weapons, the less likely nuclear disarmament becomes.

The diplomatic staff of the Manchester Guardian appraised Mr. Aiken's proposals in an article appearing in that paper May 7, 1959. It is well worth reading and thinking about:

IRELAND AND THE BOMB—INITIATIVE AT THE ASSEMBLY

"We shall continue our efforts," Mr. Frank Aiken told the Dail one day last week, when speaking of Ireland's initiative on nuclear disarmament. Mr. Aiken, the Minister for External Affairs, was responsible for that initiative at the last United Nations Assembly. His effort then did not receive the publicity it deserved, because it was overshadowed by East-West disagreement on tests. His proposal is simple. It is that the nuclear powers should undertake to refrain from supply nuclear weapons to states which do not possess them—and that the non-nuclear nations should undertake to refrain fro mmanufacturing or acquiring such weapons. In this way the Irish Government hopes that the dissemination of atomic and hydrogen weapons may be prevented.

The proposal, when put to the Assembly's first committee as a draft resolution, received 37 votes in favor and none against, with 44 abstentions. Mr. Aiken then withdrew it, so as not to prejudice the chances

of further progress this year. But the vote was in itself an achievement. Initially the great powers had been unfavorable to the proposal, but in the end none voted against it. Sweden, although already considering the manufacture of her own weapons, voted for the resolution. Canada, New Zealand, and Australia, while abstaining, spoke with sympathy towards it. Most of the Afro-Asian bloc and six of the Latin American nations supported it. And, in spite of an earlier cold comment by Mr. Sobolev (U.S.S.R.), the Soviet bloc in the end followed a Polish lead in voting for the resolution.

IN REVOLUTIONARY HANDS

Mr. Aiken put his case in public and in private. One novel point concerned the danger that, as atomic weapons were developed in small sizes, they might eventually get into the hands of revolutionary movements. (Who, it may be asked, is better qualified to speak on this than one who was chief of staff of the I.R.A. in its prime?) As he said to the Political Committee:

"Nothing, except international measures to prevent the dissemination of such weapons, can prevent them from coming, ultimately, not merely to small and poor States but also to revolutionary organizations. All through history portable weapons which are the monopoly of the great powers today become the weapons of smaller powers and revolutionary groups tomorrow. And since local wars and revolutions almost always involve some degree of Great Power patronage and rivalry, the use of nuclear weapons by a small State or revolutionary group could lead, only too easily, to the outbreak of general war. One obsolete, Hiroshima-type bomb, used by a small and desperate country to settle a local quarrel, could be the detonator for a worldwide thermo-nuclear war, involving the destruction of our whole civilization."

Another of his points was that the danger will increase greatly when weapons are in the hands of less highly developed countries. The present possessors are countries with great urban populations, who have much to lose and litle to gain in a nuclear war. Their potential adversaries are of similar character (if we omit the possible use of such weapons in another Suez or another Hungary) and have the means to retaliate. But as nuclear weapons become simpler and cheaper they are likely to pass into the hands of States with less to lose. Further in their hands such weapons may give a temporary but enormous advantage—one that they may be sorely tempted to exploit.

A LAST CHANCE

These, however, are subsidiary arguments. The chief reason for trying to prevent the spreading of nuclear weapons is that, unless action is taken, nuclear disarmament may be placed permanently beyond reach. Already it is impossible to detect existing stocks of bombs. As has been said elsewhere, "The only instrument for discovering a bomb in a crate is a screwdriver." Thirteen years ago the opportunity of putting all nuclear weapons under international control, while only the Americans had them, was lost with rejection of the Baruch proposals. The aim of the Irish initiative is to use the limited opportunity that still remains while nuclear weapons are controlled by only a few countries.

Even now these weapons are directly controlled by only three nations—Russia, the United States, and Britain. Soon another two are almost certain to be added—France and China. It is technically feasible for countries such as Sweden and Israel to make their own bombs within, say, the next 5 years. The farther these weapons spread, the less chance there is of ever effectively controlling them. And, of course, the farther they spread the greater the chance that sooner or later they will be used.

Mr. Aiken, however, had to temper his approach to practical diplomacy—or so one must assume. Last autumn the United States had begun its preparations for distributing nuclear weapons—though always under American lock and key—to certain of its NATO allies. Consequently, in one of his expositions, Mr. Aiken said that his proposals would leave the great powers free "to hold nuclear weapons anywhere in any allied territory that wished to hold it." This may have accounted for some mellowing in the line taken by Mr. Lodge, the American representative, who after the assembly reported the Irish initiative in not unfriendly terms to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Sympathetic critics may feel that Mr. Aiken has here an unresolved dilemma. Although Congress requires that these weapons be kept under American control it may not continue to insist on this. And, even while formally it does insist, in practice the American key may not be too firmly turned in the lock of every store. Where weapons are being located near a possible battle area they have to be ready for swift use in an emergency. As a result it might not be difficult for the German, Italian, or other allied teams to take control of them. The same must apply as and when the Russians distribute weapons in support of the Warsaw Treaty forces.

If, then, the Irish proposal is to be effective it must provide some safeguard—perhaps not at the first stage but at a later one. At the beginning an undertaking by the Americans (and Russians) not to let these weapons out of their own hands would be useful. Later, perhaps in conformity with inspection now being discussed, nuclear weapons might be withdrawn from the central area in Europe.

WITH OR WITHOUT CONTROL

At present the British Government apparently does not like the Irish proposals. Its objection is that control of the agreement is not practicable. Why not? It may be impossible to detect violations by the nuclear powers of their undertakings (when given) not to supply weapons to others, but it is possible to see whether nonnuclear nations are training units for their use. Ships are fairly simple to inspect for nuclear-bearing missiles, and land-based missile units (other than for short-range antiaircraft weapons) will not be formed by any country that does not expect the use of nuclear warheads.

But Mr. Aiken himself has argued that even if control is not attainable the agreement is still worth having. The absence of control, he says, does not vitiate the scheme. In his view it is in the plain self-interest of the nuclear powers to keep the weapons to themselves, because in parting with them they part with a measure of their own power and influence. It seems likely, therefore, that this year Mr. Aiken will press for adoption of his proposals, whether or not there is to be any system of control.

Remembering the Canadian comment that the wider dissemination of nuclear weapons can lead only to "uncontrollable anarchy," one may hope that the Irish Government is able to rally many more than 37 votes in its favor this year. There might be value in a declaration by those nations who support the Irish proposal that, if the great powers will give the pledge asked of them and if two-thirds of the Assembly will join in, they will individually regard themselves as bound not to obtain or manufacture nuclear weapons. It would exert some moral pressure on the hesitant.

"The Big Red Lie"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD G. WOLF
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 11, 1959

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, considerable publicity has surrounded the article in True magazine, called "The Big Red Lie," by Lloyd Mallan. The charges by Mr. Mallan that the Soviet lunik or mechta did not in fact exist, and that the Soviet Union is incapable of building an ICBM now or in the near future involve serious enough issues as to deserve close scrutiny. If in fact Mr. Mallan is right, then a great hoax has been staged with acute political damage to the United States, and our national treasure might be wasted with the present level of defense activities. On the other hand, if Mr. Mallan is mistaken, his article could cause serious damage to the United States by adding to public confusion, bringing a lack of confidence in serious conclusions of Federal authorities, and creating a false sense of self-confidence at a very critical time in the race for scientific and military superiority on the part of the United States.

The expression "snow job" has come up in connection with the Mallan article, and some commentators question whether the Soviets did a snow job on Mr. Mallan, or whether Mr. Mallan is doing this to the American public. There is no reason for not being charitable to Mr. Mallan, and crediting him with sincerity. But there is real reason to doubt that he is in a position to give a very good judgment despite his having written popular books about space personalities and having made a tourist visit to the Soviet Union.

The House Science and Astronautics Committee, of which I am a member, has now spent 4 days in hearings, some public and some executive, on the points raised by Mr. Mallan and on related matters. We have not yet concluded these studies, and there will be no committee judgment until all the evidence is in and carefully evauated. At the same time, we have now heard enough to be able to see generally what the probable conclusion is likely to be. I will touch on a few of these points.

It is the definite conclusion of top Government scientists, military leaders, and administrators based on all the evidence, both open and classified, that the Soviet probe did approximately what the Soviets claimed; namely, it traveled to the vicinity of the moon, sending back signals on the way, and at some point beyond the moon entered into an independent orbit around the sun. That it orbited the sun is only a tribute to the very powerful rocket motors used. That it came near the moon and broadcast back signals along the way is a tribute to the overall high level of technical competence, including abilities in guidance, computing, and related areas.

Mr. Mallan's visit to the Soviet Union on which he based his view of Soviet technical backwardness brought errors in his judgment for a number of reasons. Although he met some notable Soviet scientists, there is no evidence that he met the teams actually working on the space program. From photographs and oral testimony to the committee, it is clear that he did not get to see the best Soviet equipment in telescopes, miniaturization, or computers. One must remember that the Soviet Union classes all foreign journalists as spies, and it is hardly likely that they would make it easy for him to see the people and the facilities which would lead to any real insight into their highly classified space activities. Mr. Mallan assumes that for propaganda reasons the Soviets would show him their best. Actually their goal would be to convince the lay public that they are the most advanced country in all respects, as their propaganda mills illustrate. At the same time, it would be a superb victory for their counterintelligence people if through visitors like Mallan, they could convince United States decision makers in high places that the Soviet Union lagged behind, and that the United States could slacken its pace.

This statement cannot be long enough to discuss point by point every comment by Mr. Mallen. In summary, our committee learned that a consistent pattern of U.S. observations, many beyond all known techniques of faking, established that the Soviet device did travel to the moon and beyond. Having gone that far, there was no particular feat in entering into orbit around the sun. The committee also heard that Soviet technical skills are respectable, and that the pace of development there is so great as to pose a rising threat to this country.

Our report, when it is issued, will support these generalizations in a more specific way.

New Frontiers for America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1959

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, on the evening of April 24 of this year in Los Angeles, Calif., I had the distinct pleasure to be among the many hundreds who heard a most lucid, inspiring and seasoned address by Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, of Minnesota.

On the occasion of the annual Franklin D. Roosevelt Dinner, sponsored by the Democratic Central Committee of Los Angeles County, Senator HUMPHREY, in addressing himself to the thesis on "New Frontiers for America," spoke with clarity of thought and conviction about the need and challenge to spark our national thinking toward improved goals and objectives.

It is with pleasure, Mr. Speaker, that I insert in the RECORD the text of his address because I am confident that those having the opportunity to read it will find in it that valuable ingredient of good common sense grounded in liberal and sound philosophical concepts and principles.

Senator HUMPHREY'S speech follows:

NEW FRONTIERS FOR AMERICA

(Remarks of Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democratic Committee Roosevelt Dinner, Los Angeles, April 24, 1959)

We gather here tonight to draw inspiration from the life and works of Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

An ancient philosopher of freedom said that a man whose work is nearly done is sometimes gifted with prophetic vision. So it was with Franklin D. Roosevelt. The last words he ever penned, to the San Francisco Conference of the United Nations which he did not live to attend, said, "We must move forward with strong and active faith."

How well these words sum up his own life and works. How well they state our tasks for today and tomorrow.

No man ever had more justification than Franklin Roosevelt, in April 1945, to look backward with satisfaction.

The greatest of depressions had been routed.

The most far-reaching economic and social reforms had been built into the permanent structure of our Nation.

The most powerful oppressors in the history of mankind had been challenged, and their defeat and surrender were clearly in view.

A new concert of nations—the United Nations—was in the making.

Yet the last written words of Roosevelt were not words of contentment. They were a call to action. They summoned us—they summoned the world to which he spoke—to move forward.

To Franklin Roosevelt, moving forward did not mean reliance on the momentum of forces already in being. He said that we must be strong and active. He knew that there was no strength in waiting for events to take their course. He demonstrated that events must be shaped. He knew that neither domestic nor international problems could be solved by sporadic and desperate reactions to crisis. He demonstrated that leadership depends upon holding the initiative, that leadership means positive action.

And he knew that this action must be guided by faith. Not the unreasoning faith that all will turn out right, if we but close our eyes to all that is wrong. But a reasoned faith in the capacity of free peoples and free institutions to solve their problems by seeing the truth, by trusting themselves, and by limitless devotion to human progress through human endeavor.

Today, those looking backward rather than forward, those who are passive rather than active, and those who substitute unfounded fears for reasoned faith, may find much discouragement in the world around us. But for those of us who reject the doctrine of despair, who are propelled by the Roosevelt tradition, the challenge of our times is bright with hope.

In the years ahead, three great goals confront America: the winning of an honorable and lasting peace; the fulfillment of our economic potential; and the attainment of full dignity and liberty for every American.

The winning of the peace means this: it means unfailing pursuit of the goal of universal disarmament, so that men can devote their energies and resources to constructive purposes, to bettering the lot of their fellow men.

But until we attain that goal, the pursuit of peace means superiority in arms—a shield of defense—not only to deter those who would make war, but to negotiate disarmament from strength, and not from weakness.

And finally, the pursuit of truly lasting peace means a long, hard struggle to improve the lot of the oppressed, the poor, the hungry, the sick, and the illiterate.

For the Communists will never cease their appeals to these people; and unless we wish to yield the world to their domination, we cannot relax our efforts to help those who are less fortunate than we.

These totalitarian states, first Russia and now in increasing measure China, recognize no ideal but power. Yet they know where they are headed, and they have the blueprints for attaining their goals. Year by year, the masters of the enslaved people are driving them ruthlessly and relentlessly forward, in the most gigantic program of military and economic development the world has ever seen.

Within their master plan, though, they are flexible, agile. They blow hot and cold. They push forward and pull back. They belong to the United Nations, but they do not respect it. They seek to use it as a tool for their own designs, not as a means toward international harmony.

In ultimate purposes, we in the United States represent the opposite pole.

We regard the United Nations as a mechanism through which we and other peace-loving nations can build an international order of law, morality, and peace.

We seek to build no mpires, but only to build freedom and plenty.

We seek to impose no will upon anyone, except the will to live and let live.

We have no satellites, no unwilling allies.

None need fear us, except those who fear resistance to wrongdoing.

Our shortcomings, unlike those of the totalitarians, are not in ultimate purposes. But we have not yet equalled them in the steadfastness of our purposes; nor in our willingness to dedicate our full resources to the attainment of our goals.

We properly believe in a military shield of unequaled strength; but this administration tells us that we cannot afford to maintain it.

Through the Marshall plan, the point 4 program, and in other ways, we have recognized that economic participation in the strength of the free world is the ultimate weapon of freedom; but we are not now matching the size of our purposes with the size of our deeds.

Too many of our actions are improvised and disconnected, instead of being purposeful and long-ranged. Too often we blunt the effect of fine words with meager deeds. And too often we blur the effect of fine deeds with foolish words.

In this quest for peace, we are too much on the defensive.

Where we should be actively branding the Soviets before the United Nations with contaminating the atmosphere with their nuclear explosions, we are silent, for our own hands are not clean.

Where we should have taken the initiative in calling for nuclear test suspensions, for too long, we allowed the Soviets to hold the offensive.

Where we should be boasting of our efforts and desire to help other nations with economic and technical assistance, our Government seems to apologize for these efforts. We seem to be ashamed of being Christian in our behavior—of helping our fellow man because he is our brother and he needs our help.

The challenge of the Soviets is total. Their dedication is total. They have stolen from us our very own idea of helping other nations to help themselves, and they are pursuing it with a zeal and an energy which today we are not equaling.

We cannot answer this challenge of the totalitarians merely by unmasking its malevolent intent. We cannot answer it by false statements that they do not have the power to accomplish their asserted goals. We cannot answer it by soothing statements. We can answer it only by superior deeds.

We are the true originators of help to others, not because we need their help, but rather because they need our help. We are the true originators, not of the idea of helping others for political or even economic reasons, but rather of helping others for human and moral reasons.

The Indian peasant, the longshoreman in an Indonesian port, the miner in Ghana, do not care a whit about political contests between great powers. They do not care whether the American economy or the Russian economy grows faster. They do care about their own daily struggles to keep alive and to move forward. They do care which of the powerful economic and political systems will do the most in a practical way to help them along. And they are eternally right in their preoccupation with these matters.

Dollars are important, but they alone will not do the job. We need to tell the world better what we are trying to do. We need to distinguish more carefully between impressing our ideas upon others, and making others aware of our ideals. An expanded Voice of America cannot take the place of expanded actions by America. To have good things to say, we must have good deeds.

The second great goal before America is the fulfillment of our economic potential here at home.

In pursuing this goal, we must look upon our economic system as something bigger than the dollar sign, and something warmer than the stone walls of factories.

We seek not only to build machines, but also to improve men; not only to provide work opportunity, but also to provide leisure for self-development; not only to achieve security, but also to stimulate initiative and daring; not only to be efficient, but also to do justice.

With the resources, technology, and inventiveness that are ours, we can within a short space of years bring to pass in America the prophets' dream of abolishing any remnant of poverty in a land of limitless plenty. And by reducing to secondary importance the satisfaction of material wants, men and women can turn more effectively to those higher values which are the mark of men and women created in the image of God.

But in order to move forward with strong and active faith toward this goal, we must recognize and dispose of one primary obstacle. The obstacle is a Republican administration which is satisfied with stagnation.

Let me illustrate the difference between the Eisenhower Republican administration and the inheritors of the Roosevelt tradition:

Picture, if you will, a Republican and a Democrat examining the latest statistical report card on the progress of the American economy.

The Republican looks at the report card and exclaims: "Let's grade this A-plus in everything. This will make the parents happy and confident; in fact, it will make everybody happy and confident; and if everybody is happy and confident, there is nothing in the world to worry about."

The Democrat is more likely to say, "Let's face the facts. Let's tell the truth. The economy is not doing as well as it should."

The Republican is likely to make strange use of the law of averages. When he finds that the youngster's blood pressure is 25 percent too high and his respiration 25 percent too low, he may well say that the average is perfect.

But we Democrats do not derive an average of economic stability from the record-breaking profits of a few giant corporations and the record-breaking failures of small business.

We do not derive an average of economic justice from more families with incomes above $400,000 a year and more families with incomes below $4,000 a year.

We do not derive an average of national well-being from more investment in cars and iceboxes and less in roads and schools.

The Republicans take great pride in telling us that the economy is bigger than ever—as if this solved everything.

But when the Republican press agents tells us that we are now higher than ever before, we want to know who is higher, and how much higher. The 4½ million unemployed are not better off than ever before. The farmer is hardly enjoying unique prosperity. The homeowner is hardly being helped by higher and higher interest rates. The small businessman has not reached his millenium.

The truth is, the economy has been dragging along in the last half decade.

From 1953 through the end of 1958, we have lost more than 10 million man-years of job opportunity. Unemployment has more than doubled.

The income of the average American family has been penalized to the tune of almost $3,000 in real buying power.

Net farm income has been about $31 billion less than it should have been, and wages and salary income almost $100 billion too low.

Private business investment opportunity has been almost $40 billion too low.

The excessive idleness of plant and manpower from 1953 through 1958 caused us to lose more than $150 billion in total national production.

As a result, even high tax rates have yielded to all levels of government about $25 to $30 billion less revenues than full prosperity would have yielded. These deficits in public revenues have meant deficits in national security and international economic cooperation. They have meant immense deficits in education and health services, housing and resource development, social security improvement and income protection to the unemployed.

None of these things has happened by accident. Every basic economic policy of the Republican administration—the tight money policy, the regressive tax policy, the penny wise and pound foolish economy programs, the giveaway of our resources—all of these have resulted in substituting economic stagnation for full economic growth.

These Republican policies have not meant boom and bust in the old-fashioned sense. The protective Democratic legislation of the New Deal and the Fair Deal has saved us from this. But they have meant recession half the time and stunted growth all the time.

Where do we go from here; and first of all, where can we go?

If we fully marshal our economic potential, we can in the next 5 years lift our $460 billion economy to much better than a $600 billion economy.

We can increase the average annual income of American families, measured in real buying power, by about $2,000.

We can liquidate most of the private poverty, which still bears down upon millions of our people.

We can have prosperous farmers as well as prosperous industry; small business can thrive alongside the corporate giants. In short, we can lift those at the bottom without penalizing those at the top.

We can combine the American system of different rewards for different abilities and efforts with the American system of equal opportunity for all and social justice.

And on the productive foundation of this private economic progress, we can check the impoverishment of our vital public services, and put an end to the neglect of our greatest national and worldwide priorities of need.

We can, in a word, fulfill our economic potential and realize our dream of abundance.

The third great goal before America is the attainment of full dignity and liberty for every man, woman, and child within our borders.

We have made a start toward equality of opportunity for employment; you in California crossed one more barrier when your legislature acted so forthrightly.

We have made a start toward integrating our public schools.

We have made a start toward integrating our public facilities of all kinds.

We have made a start toward preventing discrimination in housing.

We have made a start toward assuring the right of every citizen to vote.

Yes, we have made a start in each of these areas. But there is still much more to be done.

And we are determined that from these small beginnings we shall one day build a land of tolerance that knows no bigotry.

The road toward understanding and tolerance, toward equality and justice may be a rough one. But we must travel that road and travel it surely if we are to survive in a world two-thirds colored. And we must travel that road and travel it courageously—not only because it is necessary for our survival—but because it is right.

As we would protect every American against discrimination because of race, religion or ancestry, so we must also protect him against all other arbitrary governmental action.

Away with test oaths that serve only to stigmatize.

Away with secret informants who too often speak from malice and ill will.

Away with public character assassination.

How proud every citizen of California must be of Chief Justice Earl Warren, who has done so much to make every American more secure in his heritage of freedom.

My friends, if we move forward to cross and conquer these three new frontiers, many of us may live to see the greatest era of accomplishment in the history of man.

During a large part of the 19th century, the Old World enjoyed a wide measure of peace and prosperity, scientific development, and practical reform. The outstanding characteristic of this period was faith in the future of man, expressed by a poet laureate of England who spoke of the gleam of the untraveled world ahead.

At this midpoint in the 20th century, mankind is again moving into an untraveled world. New problems, new danger, new uncertainties, confront us. But the new world into which we are moving is also gleaming with high promise. The free peoples of the world are infinitely stronger than they were in the 19th century. We have gained in knowledge of the physical world, in science and technology and communication. Above, all, we have come to appreciate the links which bind all free peoples together. We have found the instruments of cooperation which may forge these loose links into an unbreakable chain of strength.

So let us lead from strength. Instead of thinking that every great task is beyond our means, let us measure the greatness of our capacity.

Instead of filling the air with fear, let us fill men's hearts with hope.

Instead of being overwhelmed by the dangers of the world, let us be inspired by the challenge to surmount these dangers.

Instead of worrying about the future, let us labor to create it.

Again in the words of the poet, as the great world spins forever through the ringing grooves of change, we can bring an increasing

purpose into the lives of freemen, if only we do not close our minds to new problems, if only the thoughts of men are widened with the processes of suns.

Cubans Less Enthusiastic About Castro as They Watch Changes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 12, 1959

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, Raymond E. Dix, publisher of the Wooster, Ohio, Daily Record, maintains a lively interest in international affairs and has traveled widely to study the problems of other countries and our efforts to deal with them. Recently returned from a trip to Haiti, the Dominican Republic and Cuba, Mr. Dix has published an interesting account of Cuban attitudes toward the revolutionary government which I include with my remarks:

[From the Wooster (Ohio) Daily Record, Apr. 28, 1959]

WHAT'S HIS AIM?—CUBANS LESS ENTHUSIASTIC ABOUT CASTRO AS THEY WATCH CHANGES

(By Raymond E. Dix)

HAVANA, CUBA.—What does Fidel really want? People here need the answer to that question before they can evaluate the situation.

Public opinion is not almost unanimous as it was in January and even in February. Polls then showed 98 percent of the people were back of Castro. A poll taken in March showed that Castro had slipped to a 61 percent approval. Castro quit taking polls after that one.

Cubans are afraid to talk. They are afraid of reprisals. They fear the confidence boxes where anyone can drop in a complaint against anyone. Such complaints lead to almost immediate arrest, and once in prison you may stay there a long time. There is no such thing as habeas corpus under a government by decree such as the present government in Cuba.

Cubans are beginning to fear that Castro is improvising, making up his mind as he goes along. They believe he was sincere at one time. But they see that he loves adulation, that he can brook no opposition whatsoever. The elections that were to be held within a year of the downfall of the Batista regime are now being promised within 4 years. Fidel says he will name a date soon, but he hasn't yet set the date when he'll set the date.

"I don't like what is happening," said a taxi driver who must have been about 60 years of age. "He's too young a man with no experience whatsoever."

One prominent Havanan said: "They (Castro's people) don't want opinions from anyone over 22 years of age."

Cubans have an expression, "When a frog grows whiskers," which they use when they want to say something may never happen. They are using that expression today about the elections that have been promised at various times.

"We are afraid that all Fidel has wanted all along is power," said one student of the country's affairs.

If power has been and still is Fidel's goal, Cubans are in for a bad time.

The Communists intend to use the Fidel regime for all it is worth. Many important Communists occupy posts close to Castro. A man who calls himself David Salvador is running one of the major radio networks. He is a Communist.

The Communists are calling this our revolution. Their people are making many of the major decisions.

Our representatives here are trying to figure out just how the Communists intend to operate. Will they work just below the surface as they did under the Arbenz regime in Guatemala? Or will they stay out of positions of authority and try to cause the American Government and the Cuban Government all the embarrassment possible?

Just how is the Fidel Castro regime linked with the threatened invasions of the Dominican Republic and of Haiti, and possibly Panama? Fidel may have changed his position during his present trip in the United States. Before he went to the United States his enemies said he considered himself the Napoleon of the Caribbean with intentions of upsetting the Governments in the Dominican Republic, Haiti, Nicaragua, and possibly Panama.

Despite protestations to the contrary he knew about the abortive embarkation of Cuban revolutionaries for Haiti. He has succeeded in creating a state of jitters throughout the area, if nothing else.

Fidel has been articulate about three goals, agrarian reform, full employment, clean government. He is now saying that it wouldn't be a good thing to hold free elections until he has achieved these goals.

Agrarian reform means land for the landless. Whether or not he will partition his mother's hundred thousand acres is a moot question. His mother has reportedly told him to stay away.

Fidel was a fair student at the university, but by no means an exceptional one. His grades frequently ran from 70 to 79, not much higher. He spent much of his time playing at politics. He had the knack of going over a fellow student's notes before an examination and retaining enough facts to pass.

Raul, Fidel's brother, didn't graduate from high school. He is head of the army.

Historians of the country don't like the way Raul rewrites history to fit into his political thinking.

Sensitive people recoil at the continuous executions. Each new killing costs the regime hundreds of friends and further undermines the confidence of the people.

Rents have been reduced by one-half by decree of the government. Building has dropped 75 percent. Property has descended in value. All this has happened because people don't know what to expect next.

Castro just can't stand any opposition. Anyone who disagrees with him is labeled a counter-revolutionary.

Raul, who is feared and distrusted because of his ignorance, made a speech the other night during which he called one of the country's eminent patriots a traitor in the employ of the United States. He named him: Herminino Portell Vila who is the director of the American-Cuban cultural center in Cuba.

Portell Vila has been a frequent critic of the United States. He was strongly opposed to the Batista regime. He was one of Castro's early supporters.

Batista fell because his regime was corrupt from top to bottom. The people of Cuba had had all they could stand. They saw in Castro the person who could rid them of this corruption. The influential people joined forces, contributed their money, and paved the way for Castro. They were promised an immediate provisional government to administer the laws of the country and an election within a year. If Castro wants to regain the support of these people he will have to make his promises good.

Batista's fall came suddenly and as a surprise to most of the American people because they had not heeded the news and the warnings that constantly kept coming from the island.

UPI manager McCarthy went to Florida in December to telephone his office in New York to give the warning. He knew that the dispatches were not being interpreted correctly.

American embassy officials knew the end of Batista was at hand. They kept the Government constantly apprised. They had it timed within days.

How can conditions degenerate to such a state in this wealthy little country? The answer is partly because the country is so wealthy. Life is easy. Income is the highest of any Latin American country. Taxes are low. The Government takes in enough on import and export duties to run the Government profitably in spite of all the graft.

A corrupting influence has been the large subsidies given newspapers. Every month the Government has doled out a quarter of a million dollars to the city of Havana's 17 daily newspapers. This money goes to the newspapers and to some of the top reporters. The system of division is a rather informal one. Since the fall of the Batista regime the Government has substituted paid advertising for the direct dole. Every night in all the 17 daily newspapers some government agency has a large ad for which it pays a very high rate.

The thinking back of this system is that the newspapers disseminate the Government's information and are thus being paid for it. But the practice is completely corrupting. Of course this explains the 17 daily newspapers. A U.S. city of this size wouldn't support more than three and possibly not more than two daily newspapers.

But Cuba is stuck with Castro and Castro with Cuba for the moment. There is no machinery apparent which could change situations.

Cubans didn't want a political revolution. They wanted only a fair government, free from graft. Maybe Castro's sensitive ear by which he seems to be feeling his way will tell him that when he returns to Cuba. But maybe his new power has dulled his hearing. In that event we are due for a lot of trouble 90 miles off the American coast.

How Much Federal Aid Did the Pilgrims Get?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. MOELLER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 14, 1959

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I call attention to an advertisement inserted by a leading machine tool company in recent issues of several national magazines. The advertisement sounds a warning to America on the dangers we face through overdependence on Government and less dependence on self. It sounds a call for a return to the traits of character, work, and self-respect which made us the greatest Nation in the world because our people possessed those traits.

The advertisement may oversimplify the picture. The fact that I ask that it be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD does not mean that I decry all of the present-day programs and policies at

which it is apparently aimed. I do feel, however, that despite the differences between our present-day civilization and way of life and those in which our forefathers lived and worked, we can learn a great lesson from the basic though behind this advertisement. That thought is this: The great Nation which is America became what it is because the men and women who worked its soil and manned its factories were strong, self-reliant individuals. They did it themselves. That is the breed of men and women we need today if we are not to fall victim to our own weaknesses and become easy prey to the philosophies of socialism and communism which stalk the world. Strong men are not made strong by constant pampering and self-indulgence. They become strong through hard work, self-responsibility, and above all a determination to rise above circumstances and not to cringe before it. Let that be our aim as individuals and then as a united people we will continue to deserve the name of Americans.

The advertisement follows:

HOW MUCH FEDERAL AID DID THE PILGRIMS GET?

They were in a depressed area. No one guaranteed them high prices for anything. Their only roads and schools were built by themselves. For security they did their own saving, or starved.

All they had was character. All they did was work. All they wanted was self-respect.

The sum of those three traits became America.

But what's going to be the sum of the traits you see today—the traits of character, or, rather, lack of it, that demand more money for less work, put security above self-respect, pamper self-pitying criminals instead of punishing them, give away resources we desperately need to protect ourselves, listen to weaklings that want Government to take care of them when they should take care of themselves.

Long years of early-American self-respect and hard work built America, but the traits you see today can destroy it, in half the time.

Free Trade Wrecking Pottery Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. HENDERSON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 14, 1959

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, we have debated the merits and disadvantages of our Nation's trade policy in this Chamber on repeated occasions in the past. Each time the debate has been resolved in favor of sacrificing various domestic industries to obtain some international advantage. This is a calculated policy which I have opposed vigorously each time it has been debated here.

In my opinion, we have failed to comprehend the consequences of our tariff policy. Too little attention has been given to the actual issue involved—not alone of competing products in the marketplace, but of competing ways of life and standards of living. The standard of living we enjoy cannot compete with the subsistence standards of Japanese labor, for instance. The abstract arguments of free trade economics are ridiculously superficial and meaninglessly theoretical in evaluating the tariff issue today.

Southeastern Ohio, the area I have the honor to represent here, has felt the eroding effect of a trade policy which has opened our ports to an increasing flow of products produced abroad. The pottery industry is an excellent example of what has happened and will contine to occur throughout our economy as we persist in pursuing this policy.

Today I wish to call to the attention of the Congress an excellent editorial by Wilbur D. Matson, the publisher of the Morgan County Herald of McConnelsville, Ohio, as it was reprinted in the April 11 issue of the Times Recorder of Zanesville:

FREE TRADE WRECKING POTTERY INDUSTRY

Bill Gold, feature writer in the Columbus Citizen, carried a highly interesting article a few days ago, showing how the pottery business in southeastern Ohio is being wrecked by free trade. He quotes Mr. McClelland of Universal Potteries at Cambridge in the following illuminating statistics: In 1947, 26 million man-hours were worked in this industry. This was reduced last year to 8½ million hours. Eleven years ago, 27 million dozen pieces of dinnerware were shipped. This figure last year was cut in half. At Coshocton, Pope Gosser China Co.; the Crooksville China Co.; and, a few weeks since, the Dimond Pottery (since resold to an Akron firm); Roseville, Zanesville, East Liverpool, and other pottery centers in southeast Ohio, have been heavily hit by potteries which have closed their doors.

What is the cause? The ceramic industry, so important to this section of Ohio, was built up on a protective tariff. The men who ran this country 50 years ago had sufficient practical business sense to know that no potter could compete with his product on the market and pay the American standard of wages, currently from 5 to 7 times paid in eastern Europe and 10 times what the Japanese worker is presently drawing. The result of reciprocal and free trade policies is just a logical case of cause and effect. It is destroying American potteries and turning over the richest consumers market in the world to the foreigner.

To be sure, the wreck of the pottery industry is not entirely attributable to lack of protection—but that is the principal reason. Plastics, driving clay products from the field, are but a small contributing cause.

Not only have we thrown open our markets to the Japanese and other overseas competitors, but we have actually subsidized the potter abroad through foreign aid. The American potter has been taxed to help pay for foreign aid to build up his competitor. Were the American industrialists allowed to compete on an equal footing with the foreign potter, it would be different. But American industry has no monopoly on brains and business organizations. It is hopeless to compete with the Jap potter, his chief competitor, whose men draw but one-tenth that of the American pottery worker. So he gives up the unequal struggle and closes his doors.

We have heretofore in this column quoted Bismarck, on the tariff—Bismarck, the Iron Chancellor, who unified Germany and was one of the world's greatest statesmen. Noting that those nations which had adopted a protective tariff policy grew strong in industry and finance, while those who pursued free trade retrograded, he said:

"For the abstract teaching of science in this connection (referring to a protective tariff) I care not a straw. I base my opinion on experience, the experience of our own time. I see that protectionist countries are prospering, that free-trade countries are retrograding, and that great and powerful England, the mighty athlete, who, having hardened her sinews stepped out into the open market and said: 'Who will fight me? I am ready for any and all,' even she is gradually turning toward protection, and will in a few years adopt it in order to keep for herself, at least, the English market."

Exactly what Bismarck said would happen to Germany, is closing down American potteries and other industries which cannot compete with low wage scales and low costs of production abroad. Over here, closing down factories which produce wealth and taking men from productive jobs and placing them on relief or unemployment rolls, passes for statesmanship. Surely, we owe it to our potters to give them sufficient protection to equalize production costs and place them in a competitive position in the markets of the world. Any other trade policy is rank folly.

397th Anniversary Is Appropriately Memorialized at Jacksonville, Fla.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 14, 1959

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the beginnings of permanent settlement by Europeans in what is now the United States go back to May 1, 1562, when French Huguenots under Jean Ribaut and René Laudonnière first set foot on the banks of the St. Johns River near what is now Jacksonville, Fla. They then and there erected a beautiful monument on the south bank of the river and explored the coast for some distance. Finally, they returned in 1564 and 1565 to found the settlement Fort Caroline, near where the monument had been erected. There were then no other European settlements in what is now the United States. The success of this venture inspired Queen Elizabeth to undertake the Roanoke settlement some years later and required the Spanish to settle St. Augustine in 1565. At the present time, there are some exceptionally fine exhibits of the history of this period being displayed on the site at the Fort Caroline National Memorial, Jacksonville, Fla. These exhibits contain not only the things which are permanently there under the supervision of the National Park Service but a number of interesting temporary exhibits on loan from other museums.

Since the 397th anniversary of the erection of the column has just recently passed it seemed appropriate to me to have included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point an article from the magazine published by the Daughters of the American Revolution which gives some additional historical information. The article is particularly outstanding because of its inclusion of the excellent

talk by historian Albert Manucy when he dedicated a replica of the Ribault column at the Fort Caroline National Memorial late last year. The article and speech are included at this point:

FLORIDA DEDICATES THE RIBAULT MONUMENT

(By Mrs. G. Fildes Tresher, State historian of Florida)

The Florida Daughters dedicated the new site of Ribault Monument at Fort Caroline National Memorial on Wednesday, October 29, 1958, at 3:15 p.m. The inscription reads as follows: "Donated to Fort Caroline National Memorial by the Florida Daughters of the American Revolution, and moved from a site near Mayport, Fla." The earlier monument was erected in 1924 to commemorate the landing of the French in Florida with the Huguenot Capt. Jean Ribault at the St. Johns River on May 1, 1562. This shaft, bearing the arms of France, is a replica of the one erected by Capt. Jean Ribault in 1562 on the River May, now St. Johns River.

Because of the expansion of the U.S. naval installations at Mayport, it was necessary to move the 1924 marker, and it was moved to where it now stands, on historic St. Johns Bluff within the bounds of Fort Caroline National Memorial. This national memorial commemorates the French colony established at Fort Caroline.

Mrs. Jackson E. Stewart, State regent, presided at the dedication ceremony. Mrs. G. Fildes Tresher, State historian, was chairman of the event. The invocation was given by Rev. Clyde B. Lipscomb and the pledge to the flag was led by Mrs. Edward G. Longman. The main speaker of the afternoon was Albert C. Manucy, historian, National Park Service, and president, Florida Historical Society. Others taking part in the program were Mrs. James A. Craig, honorary State regent, who was State regent at the first dedication of the monument in 1924, and the Honorable CHARLES E. BENNETT, Congressman from Florida.

The monument, presented by Mrs. Stewart, was accepted by John R. DeWeese on behalf of Fort Caroline National Memorial.

TALK BY HISTORIAN ALBERT MANUCY FOR THE DEDICATION OF THE RIBAULT MARKER AT FORT CAROLINE NATIONAL MEMORIAL ON OCTOBER 29, 1958

France, in the middle of the 1500's, was full of discordant and struggling vitality. The leaven of the Reform was working. John Calvin was a foremost ecclesiastical leader of the new movement. Gaspard de Coligny, Admiral of France, was foremost among the military nobles who embraced the reformed religion.

Coligny was not only a valiant and resolute soldier; he was a calm and sagacious statesman. In the conflict among Frenchmen, and in France's rivalry with powerful Spain, he knew that he saw a gathering storm, full of danger for France and its people.

There was another man, like unto Coligny in his concern for the welfare of his country and the souls of its people. Perhaps he lacked Coligny's calm balance, but this man, Nicolas Durand de Villegagnon, was also a proved soldier—a brave Knight of Malta scarred in battle with the infidels.

It was he who led a colony of Huguenots to the coast of Brazil in 1555, there to build Fort Coligny and the settlement that was called Antarctic France. This was a French challenge to the pope's division of the New World between Spain and Portugal. It was also a Protestant colony—a band of Huguenots who sought those opportunities which the Americas promised to any man who was brave enough to seize them. But Villegagnon was not the leader for this colony. The settlement grew feeble, and in 1558 the Portuguese destroyed it.

Yet, it was a start. The next year, 1559, the Ministers of the French King officially set forth the first of the French plans for a systematic attack upon the American sources of Spanish treasure. By this date, Spain already had about 200 settlements in the tropical Americas. Cortez had found the silver in Mexico, and Pizarro had discovered the treasures of the Incas in Peru.

The French knew that Peruvian treasure was brought to Panama each year in May, so a strong squadron sent there could ruin the Spanish navigation at a single blow. On the way, they could sack Santo Domingo and Puerto Rico, which were poorly defended; and 1,200 troops could march across the isthmus and surprise the South Sea Fleet in Panama harbor. Sailing north, the squadron could attack the flotilla bearing the Mexican silver when it left Veracruz in June. Then, returning through the Florida channel, the expedition could destroy new fortifications that were under construction at Havana.

Out of Coligny's planning for a France that would lift herself above the increasingly bitter an unreasoning civil conflict between Catholic and Huguenot, out of this planning grew the idea of another colony—this one to be in North America, the continent which Jacques Cartier had penetrated 20 years earlier. This might be a city of refuge for persecuted Huguenots, but it would also be a foothold to challenge Spain's supremacy in the Americas, and a project that would redound to the glory of France. No one has told the story of Coligny's colonies better than Francis Parkman. Let me read you a few of the lines he has written:

"An excellent seaman and stanch Protestant, Jean Ribault of Dieppe, commanded the expedition. Under him, besides sailors, were a band of veteran soldiers, and a few young nobles. Embarked in two of those antiquated craft whose high poops and tublike proportions are preserved in the old engravings of De Bry, they sailed from Havre on February 18, 1562. They crossed the Atlantic, and on April 30, in the latitude of 29½°, saw the long, low line where the wilderness of waves met the wilderness of woods. It was the coast of Florida."

On the morning of first of May (1562) they found themselves off the mouth of a great river. Riding at anchor on a sunny sea, they lowered their boats, crossed the bar that obstructed the entrance, and floated on a basin of deep and sheltered water, "boiling and roaring," says their leader Ribault, "through the multitude of all kind of fish."

Never had they known a fairer Mayday. The quaint old narrative is exuberant with delight. The tranquil air, the warm sun, woods fresh with young verdure, meadows bright with flowers; the palm, the cypress, the pine, the magnolia * * * cedars bearded from crown to root with long, gray moss; huge oaks smothering in the folds of enormous grapevines—such were the objects that greeted them in their roamings, till their new-discovered land seemed the fairest, fruitfullest, and pleasantest of all the world.

They found a tree covered with caterpillars, and the narrative says: "Also there be silkworms in marvelous number, a great deal fairer and better than be our silkworms."

They named the river the River of May—this river now called St. Johns. "And on the next morning," says Ribault, "we returned to land again, accompanied with the captains, gentlemen, and soldiers, and others of our small troop, carrying with us a pillar or column of hard stone, to plant and set the same in the entry of the port; and being come thither we espied on the south side of the river a place very fit for that purpose upon a little hill compassed with cypress, bays, palms, and other trees, with sweet smelling and pleasant shrubs." Here they set the column, and then, embarking, held their course northward, happy in the benign decree which locks from mortal eyes the secrets of the future.

Preliminary exploration was the object of Ribault's voyage. But his men liked this new land, and when he reached the South Carolina harbor they named Port Royal, they decided to build a fort. They named it Charlesfort, and 30 of them were chosen to man it, while Ribault and the others went back to France for reinforcements.

The exact location of the 1562 fort is not known today. Some months ago, in connection with work on the Fort Caroline Museum, I visited the site of a fortification excavated a number of years ago on Parris Island, S.C. This site was believed by some to be the location of Charlesfort. However, today we are sure from the character of the site, as well as from the nature of artifacts recovered from it, that the Parris Island site is not French, but Spanish. The complex of artifacts is identical to what is found in known Spanish sites of the 1500's in the Caribbean.

The tragic fate of Charlesfort is a well-known story. Ribault could not return. The men he left at Port Royal were not colonists; they were soldiers and adventurers. In a land of plenty they came to the verge of starvation. Their leader, Albert, grew harsh and domineering. With his own hands he hanged a drummer who displeased him. He banished a soldier named La Chere and left him to starve on a solitary island. But Albert was overpowered and murdered, La Chere was rescued, and the men decided to leave this land. They built a crude boat and set sail. Far out in the Atlantic they were becalmed. Food and water ran out. They cast lots, and the loser was La Chere, the same wretched man whom Albert had doomed to starvation but they had rescued. Now they killed him, and his flesh kept them alive until an English vessel saw them and took them captive to Queen Elizabeth.

The news of Charlesfort came to Spain, but not the news of its failure. A trusted soldier of Havana, Capt. Hernando Manrique de Rojas, went under the Spanish King's orders to do certain specific things:

First, he would sail to Florida, and at the 29th degree of latitude he would find a stone column bearing the arms of France. He would either destroy it or fetch it to Havana.

Second, he would find another at latitude 30, and treat it the same.

Third, at latitude 32, at the St. Helena River, he would find another column to treat likewise. There he would also find the wooden fort of the French and learn what must be done to expel them.

Fourth, he was ordered to "expel them if you can, bringing prisoners if you can, and destroy the fort so completely that no trace of it shall remain."

I would like to read you some paragraphs from Captain Manrique's report on his voyage to Florida in 1564. The translation is by the late Dr. Lucy Wenhold, my good friend. So far as I know, this document has never before been rendered into English.

This is the declaration of Capitan Hernando Manrique de Rojas (I paraphrase it somewhat for the sake of brevity):

After Capitan Manrique left Havana, he sailed by day along the Florida coast up to a harbor at 29°. On May 23 he explored its shores and went to an Indian village on its banks. Nowhere did he find the column nor any evidence of Christians.

They sailed to a river at latitude 30. (The St. Johns is above 30° latitude.) On May 26 the capitan went ashore. There he found about 80 Indians and learned that Christians had passed through going northward. In one of the village huts he found a wooden box made by Christian hands, but no column.

On May 31 they entered a river at latitude 32, found signs of the French, and decided to search even farther north.

On June 11 they were in another harbor, and saw a pair of Indians in a canoe. Willingly the Indians came aboard and helped

them sail to the village, where they found iron axes, a mirror, some cloth, bells, knives, and other things of Christian manufacture. By signs the Indians told them that 34 men with a ship had been at the village, but 33 had gone. One man remained at a nearby village called Usta. Capitan Manrique sent two Indian messengers for this man, giving them a piece of wood marked with a cross as a sign that Christians were here. The next day at noon the man arrived. He was dressed like an Indian, but he said he was a Frenchman.

Under oath, the Frenchman said he was a Christian named Guillaume Rouffi. He told about his voyage to this land and said they had set up a stone marker bearing the arms of France in the place they had first explored and another 3 or 4 leagues south of where they now are. On this same bay they had built a house of wood and earth, roofed with straw. There was a moat around it, and it had 4 bastions and some cannon; 26 men stayed there while the others returned to France.

Of the 26 men, 2 were drowned while crossing a river in a canoe, and 1 was killed in a fight. The others built a 20-ton boat to go to France. The declarant, realizing there would be nobody in the boat who understood navigation, decided to stay with the Indians, where he has been now for the past 14 months.

The Frenchman declares himself to be about 17 years of age. He did not sign the deposition because he says he does not know how to write.

Capitan Manrique ordered him held aboard the frigate under close guard.

On June 13 the Frenchman led the capitan to the fort. In it was found nothing at all. Then the capitan ordered the building to be set on fire and burned, and he ordered me, the scrivener, to certify so in writing. I, the said scrivener, do hereby certify and declare that it was burned and destroyed in my presence.

Then the capitan went in the boat to another harbor, to the place where Guillaume Rouffi said the stone marker was. It was found on an elevation above an arm of the river of the harbor, somewhat back in the forest. It is of white stone, about the size of a man, and on the upper part of it is inscribed a shield with a crown above it, and on the shield three fleur de lys, and below these the character R. Below this are four arabic numerals which read 1561. By order of the capitan, this marker was taken down and thrown to the ground. Thereupon the capitan, in the presence of me, the scrivener, had the stone marker put into the boat to be taken to the frigate and carried to the Governor at Havana. This was done and witnessed.

Times does not allow reexploration of the coast in order to take away the other marker, because Guillaume Rouffi says he does not know what latitude it is in.

So the column at the River May was spared by Manrique's expedition. Because he did not find it, it has been preserved for all time in the drawing made by the artist Jacques Le Moyne de Morgues.

For when Laudonniere's colony came to the River May on May 25, 1564, the Spanish frigate was already some distance north of them. Fortunately for the French, the Spanish skipper decided to return to Havana via the Bahamas, in order to miss the adverse current of the Gulf Stream along the Florida coast.

Laudonniere's colonists landed on the south shore of the River May, at the very spot where Ribault had come ashore 2 years earlier. And there, after a warm and demonstrative greeting by his Indian friends, Rene de Laudonniere was taken to see the stone pillar that the Spaniards had failed to find. The Indians had crowned it with evergreens and placed offerings of food before it, and this is the way that Le Moyne shows it.

Meanwhile, a Spanish naval commander of first-rate ability had applied himself to the Florida problem, which after all was only part of a larger problem involving the safety of Spanish commerce on the great seaways. This man was Pedro Menendez de Aviles, the founder of St. Augustine. Menendez impressed upon his king the importance of strengthening all the American defenses, and especially did he point out the need for occupying the coast of Florida to police it against the French.

The resulting Florida massacre, in which Menendez destroyed the French in Florida, was a terrible lesson. It gravely embittered the struggle between France and Spain, which was now entering a new phase, wherein all the rancor of religious strife was added to the rivalry for trade and territory.

Nevertheless, Menendez achieved his aim. St. Augustine became a defensive bastion for Spain, and France was removed from Spain's path as a serious competitor in the New World for many years. Yet it was not the destruction of the French colonists that brought about the eclipse of the French rival, who alone had contested Spain's monopoly in the New World for two generations. For that eclipse, a momentous change in the political alinement in Europe was responsible; and here we have an important illustration of the truth that the fate of the outer lands is molded less by what happens within them than by what happens at the center of world affairs. France, heretofore unified and strong, was dissolved into warring factions, and its monarchy was forced to rely for help upon the old enemy, Spain. Leadership in the rivalry against Spain then passed from France to England.

But let us return to the stone marker which Ribault had erected on the south shore of the River May. Probably soon after Fort Caroline was captured by the Spanish, the Ribault column was found and destroyed. We may be sure that the other column, found at Port Royal and taken to Havana, was likewise destroyed, after the facts of its existence and removal were duly recorded.

On May 1, 1924, the Florida Daughters of the American Revolution erected another shaft bearing the arms of France to commemorate the landing of the French at this river on May 1, 1962. This shaft is a replica of the one shown in the Le Moyne drawing.

But, as with the original marker, military reasons made it necessary to move the 1924 marker away from the mouth of the river. Fortunately, there is no superior location for this monument than the ground where it now stands, on historic St. Johns Bluff within the bounds of Fort Caroline National Memorial.

For this national memorial commemorates for all time the French colony that was conceived by Coligny, planted by Laudonniere, and nourished by Ribault.

It is therefore with pleasure and gratitude that we of the National Park Service accept the custody of this monument from the Florida Daughters of the American Revolution.

This talk is based largely upon the following sources:

Francis Parkman, "Pioneers of France of the New World" (Boston 1891), pages 20–26, 34–38, 40–41, 44–47.

A. P. Newton, "The European Nations in the West Indies" (London 1933), pages 58–59, 74–75.

L. L. Wenhold (tr.), "Manrique's Report on French Settlement in Florida, 1564" (typescript in library of Castillo de San Marcos National Monument, n.p., n.d.).

Nonaggression 20 Years Ago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in my extension of remarks, I include an article appearing in the Washington Star, of May 11, 1959, objectively interpreting present world conditions, particularly with reference to the Foreign Ministers meeting about to start in Geneva, and the probable summit meeting later on. In his timely article Mr. Lawrence refreshes our minds of happenings of 20 years ago, which resulted in appeasement and then war. His article is a warning to representatives of free nations not to make the mistakes that were made only 20 years ago. Fear is the road to war. Firmness before the fact is the only road that might result in peace:

NONAGGRESSION 20 YEARS AGO—SOVIET BLANDISHMENTS TODAY VIEWED IN LIGHT OF WHAT FOLLOWED HITLER PACT

(By David Lawrence)

GENEVA, May 11.—Throughout Europe the people have just celebrated the 14th anniversary of the ending of World War II on this continent. But, strangely enough, the villain who really made that war possible goes unmentioned and unscathed.

For it was the Communist dictatorship in Moscow which just 20 years ago this year formed a nonaggression alliance with the Nazi dictatorship in Berlin. This protected Hitler's eastern front from any danger and permitted him a few weeks later to deploy his entire military force against the West.

Eventually, because the Nazi dictatorship was given a free hand, millions of Russians were slaughtered as the Nazis turned against the Soviet Union. Likewise, millions of persons across Europe were killed because that 1939 alliance made by the Communist dictator gave World War II its initial impetus.

Today a Communist government in Moscow is again propagandizing the world with proposals of nonaggression pacts and pious claims of peaceful intent. Its record, however, is one of opportunistic alliances with dictatorships in Red China and the Middle East. As the four-power Foreign Ministers' conference begins here, the Communists are aiming at concessions that will enable them to strengthen their military position in Europe.

For why do the Soviet chiefs wax indignant about the idea of free elections in both parts of Germany, and why do they balk at the reunification of that country? They have managed by their propaganda to scare many people in the West into believing that a reunited Germany would be a menace to peace. Actually a free Germany was never a menace. When the Weimar republic was overthrown by Hitler, the true will of the German people was ignored.

The Communists now, as in 1939, prefer dictatorships everywhere—they are easier for them to handle.

Today elections in both East and West Germany would mean a free and independent Germany, but this is not what Moscow wants. It seeks a divided Germany so that, through Communist stooges, it not only may continue a puppet dictatorship in East Germany but continue to infiltrate West

Germany. It plans to keep West Germany in a state of limited armament and wants to push the NATO military forces out of West Germany altogether.

In the face of this brazen effort to carry on its program of world conquest, the Communists are accepted in this conference on a so-called negotiating basis. Through out the free world many people have been deluded into believing that, by sitting at the table with the Russians, either here or at a summit conference, something can be done to assure world peace. But the record of the Communist Party, which believes in organized deception, belies any confidence that such a result can be achieved.

The Soviet game is succeeding in some important respects. Thus the worldwide scare about radioactive fallout has produced a public opinion that is demanding a suspension of nuclear tests. Once this is done, the same demand will arise that the use of nuclear weapons also be banned. This would leave the Soviets with a huge supply of troops more powerful than that of the Western allies. The process of dictating to the West would then be intensified.

What is going on here, therefore, must be appraised primarily in terms of military strategy. For when the Communists carry on a negotiation, it is what they seek in a military sense that is really important. Now they want ostensibly to change the status of West Berlin, but actually they seek acquiescence by the Western Powers in what is often referred to as the "status quo." This means confirmation of their conquest of East Germany, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Bulgaria, Hungary, Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania.

Oddly enough, one hears virtually nothing here at Geneva about freeing these captive States, and very little about the tragic plight of these enslaved peoples. One hears only of some plan or device that will placate the hungry dictatorship in Moscow which, true to form, has established an alliance with the dictatorship in Peiping and has helped to set up dictatorships in the Middle East. Billions of dollars are spent annually in Latin America through a Communist apparatus designed to make trouble for the United States and its allies.

One wonders when the western allies will begin to perceive that another Communist dictatorship such as encouraged Hitler to start World War II is today playing the same kind of game that can bring on World War III. To appease the men in the Kremlin by concessions that are supposed to be relatively unimportant is to tell the people of Soviet Russia that in reality the dictatorship in Moscow and its conquests are accepted as an accomplished fact and that the rest of the people in the world are willing again, as in the 1930's, to buy that kind of ephemeral peace.

The Rural Redevelopment Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. HENDERSON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 14, 1959

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, Secretary Benson recently made a statement which shows exactly why the rural development program is needed by many farm people. I believe the remarks of the Secretary of Agriculture are of vital interest to my colleagues.

Mr. Benson said:

Underemployment—not surpluses and markets—is their big problem. More of our resources—personnel skills and available funds—must be directed toward meeting the special needs of small farmers, part-time farmers, aged and disabled farm people, and those with limited land and capital.

Mr. Speaker, I know and all of us know that this is the group of farmers which has been neglected and overlooked by the present farm program. We are allowing valuable human resources to go to waste. This program opens to these people an opportunity to share in our national prosperity and still remain in a rural environment, which the great majority prefers. This is not a resettlement program, not a Government-inspired drive to move families, bag and baggage, off the land and into the city.

That movement has been in existence for a great many years, forced upon farm people by modern machinery and improved production methods. Small operators, finding it increasingly difficult to compete, have had to find a new livelihood.

The rural development program gives this group of people a new chance to stay in communities where they were born and reared. It is giving rural trading centers where the program is in operation a new lease on life.

Secretary Benson said the program is functioning in about 200 rural communities. Two of the pilot counties are located in the 15th District of Ohio which I represent here. I have had an opportunity to observe the program's operation over the past 2 years. I am sure that as its potential becomes more widely realized it will spread to a great many more throughout the Nation where rural people are in need of this type of help.

Helicopter Survey of Kansas Area Confirms Prairie Chicken Farm

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. FLOYD BREEDING
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 14, 1959

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, a very interesting survey conducted by Federal and State wildlife agencies, with the assistance of the U.S. Air Force, disclosed the presence of several hundred prairie chickens along the Cimarron River in Morton County, Kans. The area covered 100,000 acres of Government land—ideal for wildlife refuge. The report is as follows:

HELICOPTER SURVEY OF KANSAS CONFIRMS PRAIRIE CHICKEN PLAN

Favorable prospects for a prairie chicken research and management area of national significance in southwestern Kansas were confirmed by an aerial survey of some 100,000 acres of Government-owned land April 14, 15, and 16.

The land, lying along the Cimarron River in Morton County in an almost solid block, was formerly submarginal farming and ranch land. It was acquired by the Federal Government after drought and erosion had driven out most of the farmers in the Dust Bowl years of the 1930's. It is known as land utilization project KA–LU–21, and is in the category sometimes designed as "Bankhead-Jones Act, title III lands."

The survey, conducted by Federal and State wildlife agencies with the assistance of the U.S. Air Force, disclosed the presence of several hundred lesser prairie chickens. An actual count of 274 birds in 24 separate flocks or groups was reported by Dr. Adolph M. Stebler of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, leader of the cooperative wildlife research unit at Oklahoma State University, Stillwater. This was a considerably larger population of the interesting prairie grouse than had previously been estimated.

Since most of the birds were largely discovered on "booming grounds" where the males perform courting displays on spring mornings, it is believed a large percentage of those actually seen and counted were males.

The survey was made in a twin-roter helicopter (H–21 type) provided by the Air Force. The counts were made by biologists seated in the nose and tail of the craft as it cruised slowly over the rolling prairie at altitudes of 60 to 100 feet. The experiment also demonstrated the usefulness of the helicopter in making wild game counts and observations of habitat conditions, according to Dr. Stebler's report. In addition to its slow cruising speed at low altitudes, the 'copter was able to make frequent landings for closer inspections of display grounds and the vegetative cover. An estimated 189 square miles were systematically cruised.

Besides the prairie chickens, the observers saw and tallied from 71 to 90 ringnecked pheasants, 4 coveys of scaled quail, 1 bobwhite quail, 5 deer, and 31 coyotes.

The lesser prairie chicken is perhaps the most endangered of the prairie grouse species, with the exception of the Atwater's chicken of the Texas coastal country. The Atwater's, however, is considered not a distinct species but a subspecies, or race, of the greater prairie chicken. An eastern race, called the Heath Hen, became extinct several decades ago. The natural range of the lesser became the "dust bowl" of the Southwest. Continued overgrazing and farming have steadily depressed its numbers except in small islands of relatively protected grasslands. Remnant flocks are found now only in southwestern Kansas, southeastern Colorado, eastern New Mexico, western Texas, and western Oklahoma.

Since the "dust bowl" disaster of the 1930's, the sandy, erodible soil of the Morton County LU area has been anchored down by the restoration of grasses under the management of Department of Agriculture agencies. First supervised by the Resettlement Administration, a depression-era agency, and later by the Soil Conservation Service, the tract is now administered by the U.S. Forest Service. Limited grazing by neighboring ranchers is permitted.

The Kansas Forestry, Fish and Game Commission has signed an agreement with the Forest Service for a cooperative wildlife management project on the area. Director Dave Leahy of the Kansas commission has announced plans to assign a biologist to the project who will give special attention to prairie chicken problems.

Careful management of the Morton County area could assure the survival of the lesser chicken and perhaps restore the birds to the point where limited hunting might be permitted. At the same time research and management experiments on this large block of land might point the way to restoration of the species over much of its former range.

The helicopter survey was arranged by the National Wildlife Federation through the conservation office of the Air Force. Dr. Stebler was in charge of the field operation. Other individuals taking part or assisting included Maj. R. E. DeGroat, Maj. H. W. Densford, and Conservationist E. A. ("Woody") Seaman of the Air Force; D. C. Coleman, Dick Eggan, and Robert Niece of the Kansas Forestry, Fish and Game Commission; George Atwood of the Forest Service, resident manager of the LU area; Tom Evans and John Dustrude, also of the Forest Service; M. B. Fhrome of Washington, D.C., a freelance writer; and William L. Reavley, western field representative of National Wildlife Federation.

The helicopter crew, detailed from Vance Air Force Base, Okla., was composed of 1st Lt. R. L. Foster and James R. Lamoreaux, pilots, and A1c J. W. Blackwell and J. M. Casey.

Very Rev. Firmin Schmidt, O.F.M., Superior of Capuchin College, Washington, D.C., Named Mission Prefect in Papua, New Guinea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 12, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news article from the Catholic Standard of Friday, May 1, 1959, and a news article from the Washington Post and Times Herald of Tuesday, May 5, 1959:

[From the Catholic Standard, May 1, 1959]

CAPUCHIN COLLEGE HEAD NAMED MISSION PREFECT

The Very Reverend Firmin Schmidt, O.F.M. Cap., superior of Capuchin College, Washington, has been appointed Prefect Apostolic of Mendi, Papua, New Guinea, by the Sacred Congregation of the Propagation of the Faith in Rome.

The 40-year-old Kansas priest was ordained in 1946. Continuing his studies at Catholic University of America, Washington, Father Firmin received the doctorate of Sacred Theology in 1951. For the past 11 years he has taught Dogmatic Theology at Capuchin College and since 1953 has been superior of the Capuchin Monastery. In 1956 he was elected provincial counselor of the St. Augustine Province of Capuchins.

The Pennsylvania Province of Capuchin, of which Father Firmin is a member, was entrusted with the Mendi Mission in February 1955. Nine priests and a brother have subsequently gone to the territory, plus two newlyweds, Mr. and Mrs. Fidelis Miltenberger of Cumberland, Md. Mr. Miltenberger pilots the Cessna plane of the missionaries, dedicated to St. Joseph Cupertino, the flying Franciscan.

The mission territory, high among the treacherous mountains of the southern highlands in the interior of New Guinea, is practically speaking, inaccessible by land. A trip of 150 miles by air has been estimated as a 15-day journey by foot. When Father Claude Vogel, Provincial of the Pennsylvania Province of Capuchins, visited the mission last year and called the friars together, for several of them it was the first meeting on the island.

An official census of the territory expects to uncover 150,000 to 200,000 natives in the area. These natives, 12,000 miles from the United States, are also 10,000 years behind civilization. The Papuans, possessors of a stone age culture, have come under the influence of the white men so recently that Australia opens the new areas to missionaries only with the greatest precautions. In this way the Government insures to some extent the safety of the missionaries and other civil officials.

At present the missionaries in Papua are divided into three main stations, Mendi, Tari, and Ialibu. Each compound consists of a neat group of buildings comprising church, school, friary, boys' dormitory, living quarters for teachers and catechists, and workshops. Practically all these buildings have been erected by the Capuchin Fathers and Brothers with the help of friendly natives.

In connection with the three main stations, substations have also been established at various convenient centers. To reach most of them, the missionary must walk from 6 to 8 hours up and down hill, through jungles, and over streams. At the substation he has built his little house and also a school with accommodations for the native teachers who assist him in his work. Here he remains for 2 weeks at a time, supervising the teaching and contacting the natives so as to win them for the mission. After the 2-week period in the bush, he returns to the main station for rest and spiritual renewal.

A Prefecture Apostolic is a territorial division in mission countries, governed by a Prefect Apostolic in the name of the Holy See. The erection of a Prefecture Apostolic is the first step in a mission country in the development of a future diocese.

Although the Prefect Apostolic is usually not a bishop, he has the same ordinary powers of jurisdiction as a resident bishop, and is empowered by law to give episcopal blessings, to consecrate chalices, to confirm, and confer tonsure and minor orders.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald, May 5, 1959]

ROUGH MISSION AREA IS PRIEST'S NEW CLASS

(By Milton Viorst)

Father Firmin Schmidt, a Franciscan Capuchin priest who has taught the fine points of theology at Catholic University for the past decade, will return to the Stone Age soon to teach the fundamentals of civilization to the natives of New Guinea.

Father Firmin, 40, has been appointed by Pope John XXIII to head the Catholic mission in the jungles of Papua, where many of the natives have never seen a white man. As the mission's Prefect Apostolic, Father Firmin will hold a rank similar to a bishop's.

An 11-man Capuchin team has been in New Guinea for the past 3½ years, surveying the prospects for missionary activity. Until now, their findings haven't been too promising, Father Firmin said. No one has been able to communicate with the natives.

"Our big problem is language," Father Firmin said. "Anthropologists and linguists from Australia have been working on it. So far they've been able to devise only the most fundamental grammar."

The mission priests travel about their 23,000-square-mile domain only by airplane, Father Firmin said. The priests have their own plane, which is flown by a lay pilot.

As soon as an area is opened by a team of explorers from Australia—which is the mandate power for the area—the missionaries fly in to establish contact with the natives and attempt to teach the gospel, the priest said.

Father Firmin estimates it will take 7 to 10 years to make the first real converts; that is, those who know what Christianity means. Meanwhile, he said, the mission will use every means it can to bring the natives into contact with the religion.

Superior at the Capuchin Monastery at 4121 Harewood Road, NE., since 1953, Father Firmin said that he will probably spend the rest of his life in his New Guinea parish and that he considers his selection an honor.

Suggested Reading for Steelmen: Aesop, Plus Economic Statistics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL F. SCHENCK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 14, 1959

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Ralph Holsinger, Washington correspondent for the Dayton Journal Herald, has made considerable effort to obtain data which in his opinion relates some of the problems of unemployment to the wage-price situation. Mr. Holsinger's story has created considerable comment among the readers of the Dayton Journal Herald, including many in the Third District of Ohio. Many have written me to comment on his story; and thinking it will be of interest to Members of Congress, under unanimous consent I include it at this point in the Appendix of the RECORD:

[From the Dayton Journal Herald, May 9, 1959]

SUGGESTED READING FOR STEELMEN: AESOP, PLUS ECONOMIC STATISTICS

(By Ralph Holsinger)

WASHINGTON.—Suggested reading for members of the steelworkers' bargaining committee, now seeking higher wages from the steel industry: An Aesop fable and some economic statistics.

Aesop tells the story of a man who had a goose that laid one golden egg a day. The man became greedy. He wanted more gold and he wanted it now.

He killed the goose, but he found no store of gold inside it. Nor did he continue to get his golden egg every day.

Not long ago, Michael F. Widman, Jr., an economist for the United Mine Workers (UMW), told the Joint Economic Committee of Congress:

"A high wage level is the basis of prosperity. In the UMW we have always struggled for high wages. Our miner today is the highest paid production worker in the country."

A few days later, John L. Lewis, UMW president, won a 25-cents-an-hour wage increase for his union's members, raising their average pay to $3.25 an hour.

At about the same time, a senate subcommittee went into the coal towns of West Virginia. It saw there "a grim and disheartening picture of suffering."

It found one man in eight out of work. It found 278,000 men, women and children drawing monthly rations of flour, rice, cheese and butter from Federal surplus food stocks.

Eight years ago, 120,888 coal miners were employed in West Virginia. Today, there are 44,237.

STEEL FASTEST GAINER

The figures are a measure of two factors—mine mechanization, so that one expensive man can dig and load more coal than ever before, and a switch by fuel users from higher priced coal to lower priced oil and

gas. Coal output fell from 680 million tons in 1947 to 515 million in 1957.

The steel union was first to break the World War II wage freeze. With the help of President Truman, it won an 18.5-cents-an-hour increase that ended a four-week strike and set a pattern for many other industries.

Since then, steel wages have risen at a rate nearly 50 percent higher than that for other factory workers. The average now is 3.03 an hour.

But mechanization has been at work in the smoky valleys of the Allegheny, the Mahoning and the Cuyahoga, too.

This week, steel mills were scheduled to turn out 2,668,000 tons of steel. If they did, it was a new record—and it was done with 200,000 fewer men than were at work in the industry only 18 months ago.

BENEFICIAL TO ECONOMY?

Walter Reuther has taken his auto workers to third place in the wage derby with an average of $2.65 an hour. But the auto industry has laid off more than 200,000 of them since 1955. In Detroit, as many persons are receiving surplus food as in the entire State of West Virginia.

Rail workers enjoy pensions running up to twice those paid by the social security system. But railroad employment has dropped from 1.4 million in 1945 to 840,000 last year.

The figures all point in the same direction. And they raise a couple of questions:

Is a high wage level a guarantee of prosperity?

Are annual, general wage increases, sought and won by a few powerful unions, beneficial to the economy?

If the answer to both of these questions is yes, then the union that first wins a $100-a-day wage from a complaisant employer will be the Nation's savior.

Wabash Valley Association Deserves Praise for Efforts to Combat and Control Wabash River Floodwaters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED WAMPLER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 14, 1959

Mr. WAMPLER. Mr. Speaker, on May 1, 1959, I and a group of dedicated Hoosiers appeared before the Public Works Subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations to ask for Federal funds and assistance with which to combat the constantly flooding Wabash River.

Representing Indiana's sixth district flood-control interests were Mrs. Chauncey B. Baldwin, chairman of the Parke County Chapter of the Wabash Valley Association; Mr. Don Montgomery, editor and publisher of the Attica Ledger-Tribune; Mr. Maurice Hegarty, president of the Vermillion County Chapter of the Wabash Valley Association; and, Mr. Walker Robertson, chairman of the Vigo County Chapter, Wabash Valley Association; and, Attica, Ind., farmer-businessmen Mr. Ray Fix and Mr. Elbert E. Smith.

Others appearing in support of flood control construction funds were the following officials of the Vigo County Chapter of the Wabash Valley Association: Mr. John R. Donnelly, Mr. Robert Dunlap, Mr. Joe S. Francis, Mr. Kermit Flesher, and Mr. Carl I. Hale. In addition, Vigo, Ind., County Agricultural Agent, Mr. A. D. Luers was heard.

Each of those testifying presented the flood control needs of his particular area of the sixth district of Indiana, while I covered the overall district necessities, asking for $67,000 in preconstruction planning money to be spent at the West Terre Haute local protection project, the Sugar Creek Levee, the Clinton Levee, the Conover Levee at Terre Haute and for the Wabash River Basin study to allow the Army Corps of Engineers to continue working on Sugar Creek, Wild Cat Creek, and the Big Pine Creek survey projects.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly believe the Wabash Valley Association, association President J. Roy Dee, executive Vice President William Prather, and all officers and members, richly deserve the gratitude of the people of the States of Indiana and Illinois for unflagging efforts to combat and control the ravaging flood waters of the Wabash River so that the Wabash Valley will become a more bountiful, tranquil, and productive region.

One Battle We're Losing—And Why

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 14, 1959

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, the problem of communicating a worldwide understanding of the American way of life is one that all of us are concerned about. As an advertising man, I have taken a special interest in the activities of the U.S. Information Agency, which is charged with the responsibility of properly interpreting our activities to our friends and enemies over the world.

One of the most commendable programs carried on by USIA is the one known as IMG, or the Informational Media Guaranty program. This program enables publishers of books in this country to reach millions of people in foreign lands with approved technical, scientific, and educational publications.

In recent visits I have made to Japan, the Philippines, and other areas, I have been concerned about the quantity of Soviet books, magazines, and other publications available at low cost to the masses in those areas. The Russians are using the quest for knowledge and information as a means of propagandizing the Communist's philosophy. They underwrite the cost of such publications. We must meet this challenge in our own way. The IMG program is a logical and sensible means of meeting Russian competition.

I am concerned about the current efforts to reduce or eliminate this vital program. This is one area in which we must not fail.

The McGraw-Hill Publishing Co. recently issued a forceful statement about the importance of this program. It explains the workings of the program and the need for its continuation. Under unanimous consent, I include this article as a portion of my remarks:

ONE BATTLE WE'RE LOSING—AND WHY

The United States is losing an important battle—a battle of knowledge and ideas, waged with books. It does not have the excitement of competition in scientific achievement, nor the urgency of a diplomatic crisis, nor the obvious economic significance of a struggle for export markets. But our success or failure in this battle of knowledge and ideas may well have a decisive bearing on these more spectacular aspects of international rivalry.

The Russians know this. About a decade ago, they started a program to build up their export of books, the most durable and penetrating way of communicating knowledge and ideas. By 1957 the Soviet Union was exporting 30 million books, one-and-a-half times as many as the United States. Many of these books are printed in English, and all are in languages of the non-Communist world.

In the languages of the Near East alone, the Russians printed and distributed 413,600 books in 1957, as compared with 166,415 in 1956. In India, Russian textbooks on engineering are to be published in English under a technical aid agreement signed in Moscow last December.

TRADE FOLLOWS THE BOOK

Books are in the advance guard of the Soviet political and economic challenge to the free world. With books go ways of thinking—about government, about education, about management, about science and technology. If these books do their job effectively in the training of those who will become a nation's leaders, they will provide the basis for political and cultural understanding and also, in the future, for trade.

The Russians are not the first to discover this relationship. Britain, which lives by trade, has traditionally exported more of its book production than any other nation. Today it exports one book in every two produced. The British have a favorite dictum: "Trade follows the book." They have proved its accuracy. Now the Russians are trying to make this same principle serve their purposes.

Where does the United States stand in this competition for men's minds? In number of books, it trails far behind the Soviet Union—exporting roughly 20 million books, against the Russians' 30 million. As a proportion of our total output of books, our exports amount to only 10 percent—against Britain's 50 percent.

THE RUSSIANS' ADVANTAGE

U.S. book exports have grown in the years since World War II, from approximately $11 million in 1946 to $35 million in 1958 (both figures excluding Canada). But in expanding book exports, the American publishing industry faces two major obstacles:

1. The comparatively high cost of producing a book in the United States, which puts its price well beyond the reach of many students, teachers and businessmen in other countries; and

2. The shortage of dollar exchange in many countries, which means that importers can pay for books only in currencies that are of little use to American publishers.

The Russians have neither of these problems. Soviet publishing is state-subsidized, and exported books are sold for nominal sums paid in the currencies of the importers. As these books serve the political and economic purposes of the Soviet Union, they are cheerfully sold on giveaway terms.

The American publishing industry, on its own, is making vigorous efforts to increase the distribution of American books in other countries. Leading U.S. publishers and their agents have offices and salesmen in the major countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America. Several publishers have begun to reprint textbooks in Asia at one-half to one-third of their U.S. costs, thus making them available to the students in Asian countries at prices they can more nearly afford. And the American paperback has become a symbol of low cost in popular books. But neither of these devices is practicable for serious cultural, technical, scientific, educational and professional books, which require durable, hardbound and necessarily expensive editions. Despite their great importance to those who need these books, the demand for them is simply not large enough to warrant low-cost publishing methods.

Government agencies also have increased the availability of American books. The U.S. Information Agency and the International Cooperation Administration have placed American books in libraries overseas, donated them to educational institutions and presented them to key individuals in the industries and Governments of the developing countries of the world. But these programs are small in relation to the need.

A MODEST PROGRAM

An unusual and little-publicized Government program has helped American publishers overcome the other major obstacle to the export of books—the shortage of dollar exchange. This is the Informational Media Guaranty (IMG) program, administered by the U.S. Information Agency. It enables publishers of books judged to be worthy of the American way of life to sell their books, for local currency, in countries such as the Philippines, Formosa, Vietnam, Burma, Indonesia, Pakistan, Turkey, Israel, Poland, Yugoslavia, Spain and Chile, which would otherwise be unable to buy these books because of their shortage of U.S. dollar exchange.

The IMG program is not a giveaway. Publishers have to sell their books, and customers overseas have to want them enough to buy them at full prices. IMG merely guarantees that the exporting publisher receives in dollars the payments he collects from his customers in their currency. The program costs very little in terms of our total foreign aid program, or in terms of what it accomplishes. In 10 years it has made possible the sale of $150 million worth of books, magazines and films to countries of key economic and strategic importance at a cost of only $10 million.

The IMG functions through a revolving fund. Foreign currencies are exchanged for dollars, and the foreign currencies in turn are resold to replenish the supply of dollars. The net cost is the small but unavoidable loss on resale of these foreign currencies. Over the 10 years of this program, the IMG revolving fund has shrunk from its original $28 million to $18 million, $10 million of which is in unconverted foreign currencies.

If this modest but vitally important program is to be continued, Congress must appropriate the money necessary to rebuild the revolving fund. This would insure that any country approved by the State Department and willing to sign an agreement to buy American books, at their full price, with its own currency, could do so. Last August, Congress reduced a requested appropriation for this purpose from $7 million to $2½ million. To continue even at its present reduced level, an appropriation of $3½ million is needed. To realize the full potential of IMG, the fund must be restored to its original level.

If the IMG program is not continued, with adequate financial support, some countries whose friendship and understanding we seek today and with whom we hope to build a trading partnership in the future will have to reduce their purchases of American books to a trickle. These are countries where schoolteachers, college professors, students, engineers, doctors, and businessmen need and want to buy American books. The loss will be not only theirs, but ours as well. For it will deprive the United States of one of its most effective, and least costly, means of communicating knowledge and ideas and understanding of the American way of life.

Statement by Hon. Isidore Dollinger, of New York, on H.R. 2526

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ISIDORE DOLLINGER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 29, 1959

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I am including in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my statement to the Committee on the Judiciary in connection with my bill, H.R. 2526:

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee on the Judiciary, on January 15, 1959, I introduced H.R. 2526, a bill to prohibit certain acts involving the importation, transportation, possession, or use of explosives with intent to destroy or damage any communal building, residence, or place of business.

The outbreak of anti-Semitic violence last fall shocked every right-thinking American. The bombings and attempted dynamitings of Hebrew congregations, temples, and centers, which occurred in Atlanta, Peoria, Miami, Nashville, Jacksonville, Charlotte, Gastonia, and Birmingham, as well as threats to numerous synagogs throughout the country were indisputable evidence of a new wave of terror and hatred directed against Jews; we have proof of a substantial increase in anti-Semitic defamation by publications promoting religious hatred. Anti-Semitic defamation and violence against Jews and Jewish property constitute a serious problem; it must have our intelligent and effective attention, and a solution must be found.

The lawlessness rampant in communities where the acts of violence took place is a symptom of the general breakdown of respect for law in those areas; lawlessness is the inevitable consequence of disrespect for law. Therefore, any approach to the problem which does not reach the root of the evil—disrespect for law—will prove of no avail. Also, remedies must be sought within the framework of constitutional limitations.

I would also point out that the number of houses-of-worship bombings in the South is a relatively small one as compared to the scores of bombings of residences and business places owned by Negroes. Therefore, any legislation which seeks to impose Federal penalties upon vandals and unlawful users of dynamite must, if it is to have any significance, include in its compass those who use dynamite against private dwellings and places of business. My bill would represent an effective, if modest, step in meeting the problem and would give some protection to all those who are victims or intended victims of bombings.

When leaders of State governments express their defiance of the U.S. Constitution, they set an example for the entire community and then members of the community feel free to show their disrespect in any way they choose. Dynamiting is one result; lynching another. The Nation was shocked and outraged by the abduction of Mack Charles Parker who was tortured and lynched. This horrible act proves that respect for law is more important than ever; it also proves that the Federal Government must act without delay to prevent such unspeakable barbarism. Local leaders cannot be trusted to protect the rights of all those within State boundaries; the American people through Congress demand that all persons in our country be assured of their rights granted by the Constitution.

My bill being considered today covers only one factor and would help eliminate only one evil. I trust your committee will take favorable action on it or similar legislation, and that you will also proceed with dispatch to vote out other bills which concern civil liberties and protection of those now discriminated against, terrorized, and deprived of their rights.

Fete Spotlights State's Dramatic Past, Present

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 14, 1959

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, just a few days ago in Pensacola began the most significant and unusual celebration in the history of America. We are celebrating Florida's Quadricentennial—400 years of colorful history, romance, and progress. In no other part of the Nation can this be true. As you all know, Congress recognized the importance of this occasion by the passage of House Concurrent Resolution 117 which was approved by the President on August 7, 1957.

It is with much pleasure that I bring to the attention of my distinguished colleagues an editorial appearing in the May 11, 1959, issue of the Florida Times-Union on the opening of Florida's Quadricentennial celebration. I am sure that it will prove of interest to the membership of this great body. The editorial follows:

FETE SPOTLIGHTS STATE'S DRAMATIC PAST, PRESENT

The opening of Florida's quadricentennial celebration on Santa Rosa Island this week provides dramatic illustration that the State's eventful history extends across four centuries right up to the present moment.

For history has been and is being made in that Pensacola area in a grand manner, just as is the case over the State. Santa Rosa Island personifies it.

This island, which is the scene of the observance of the Spanish explorer Tristan de Luna's landing and establishing a settlement in the Pensacola Bay area in 1559, 6 years before the founding of St. Augustine and 47 years before the start of the Jamestown Colony, is also making current history in a big way. It is the location of a missile test center that is carrying on some important 20th century explorations. And the industrial activity in the Pensacola area is very much on the wave of the future.

De Luna's landing is just one chapter in the eventful history of the Pensacola area. Pensacola itself was founded in 1698 and the

transfer of Florida to the United States by Spain was arranged there. The city was the first territorial capital of Florida.

Fort Pickens, which is located on Santa Rosa, was Florida's "Fort Sumter"—where occurred the opening rounds in the Civil War fighting in the State.

Florida's history is so action-packed it is going to take 7 years to handle all the celebrations planned for the quadricentennial observances. And by no means are things of historical significance confined to Pensacola and St. Augustine. The Jacksonville area was the scene of some lively and important history.

Local celebrants will call attention to our area history that too long has been slighted. That includes the visit of the Frenchman, Jean Ribaut, to the mouth of the St. Johns in 1562 and the erection of Fort Caroline by the French in 1564, an act that led to the first conflict between the Spanish and French in a long struggle to establish a North American empire and which prompted the founding of St. Augustine.

On paper the plans for the local phase of the quadricentennial celebration in 1964 look dazzling. A historical-recreation park costing between $7 million and $10 million has been outlined. Much hard work will be required to bring such a dream to fruition. The significance of the history of our area warrants that it be treated in the grand style in which it was made.

Two Women

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 14, 1959

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in inserting in the RECORD the following editorial which appeared in the Portland (Maine) Sunday Telegram for May 10, 1959:

TWO WOMEN

One of the pleasant events of the week just past was new recognition for two women already nationally recognized for their distinguished careers.

The National Council of Auxiliaries of the American Medical Center of Denver gave their annual achievement awards to reporter May Craig and research scientist Wilhelmina F. Dunning.

Mrs. Craig, whose columns appear regularly on this page and six days a week in the Press Herald, Waterville Sentinel and Kennebec Journal, has long been known as one of the hardest working and most spirited reporters in Washington.

On occasion she has made some of our readers angry, which is the inevitable lot of a hard-hitting, candid columnist. But she is known by friend and critic alike as a reporter of honesty, straightforwardness, high principle and capacity for penetrating analyses.

Dr. Dunning is director of the Cancer Research Laboratory at the University of Miami. She was graduated from Brunswick High School, the University of Maine, and her mother, Mrs. Evelyn W. Hennessey now lives in Topsham.

Her achievements in science and medicine, like those of Mrs. Craig in journalism, radio and television would take pages to record. Suffice to say that as a research professor of experimental pathology and director of an important laboratory she has risen to the top in a profession where brilliance and performance are at a premium.

We in Maine dwell a great deal on our faults, spend much time discussing our shortcomings. Perhaps this is proper, provided it leads to improvement. But it can be a stimulating change of pace to pause occasionally to reflect on contributions being made to society by people with Maine connections.

The list is long, but on it are the names of May Craig and Doctor Dunning. We are indebted to the National Council of Auxiliaries of the American Medical Center of Denver for calling this to our attention.

TVA Robs Peter To Pay Paul

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. BATES
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 14, 1959

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to call attention to the following article by the noted writer and analyst, Richard D. Grant, of Boston, Mass., under the heading of "The New Bold Look of the Welfare State."

The author shows a keen insight into the importance of the TVA issue and the dangers of overtaxing business in order to pay for deficit operations in Government. I commend it to your reading. It follows:

THE BOLD NEW LOOK OF THE WELFARE STATE

For 25 years, people who appreciate the value of a dollar have been alerting the public to the dangers of overtaxing business in order to support deficit operations in government. It has been a losing battle, with setbacks only briefly counterbalanced by an occasional turn to the right. Taxes imposed to extend this basically unsound policy have reached the point of strangulation.

Clearest view of the progressive pattern is in the new objective of Tennessee Valley Authority, which seeks to be rid of public control while evading its huge public indebtedness.

From the standpoint of practical accomplishment TVA is the most colossal fraud ever perpetrated on the American taxpayer. It owes the people of the United States $1.2 billion in appropriations advanced by Congress since 1933, as well as nearly $500 million retained from sales of electric power. Part of the cheese-dream that created TVA was that public funds advanced for this project would be repaid over a period of 40 years. With all but 15 years of that term expired and nothing on the credit side but token payments in piddling amounts, TVA now wants out and stands a pretty fair chance of getting it.

The thing that disturbs practical-minded critics is not the loss of huge sums already buried but the effect on many other governmental agencies of TVA's bold bid for independence.

Under pending legislation that passed the U.S. Senate last year, TVA would be relieved of the obligation of asking Congress for money to carry out its commitments and would be empowered to go into debt up to $750 million through the sale of revenue bonds to the public. This switch is dressed up by the public power lobby as a desirable means of reducing the Government's financial load, with the further advantage of appearing to be a move in the direction of private operation.

The catch is that although the bonds would not be Government securities nor subject to Federal approval, they would be moral and practical obligations of the United States.

The disclaimer of Federal liability means nothing. Obviously, a government which creates an agency and retains uninterrupted status as sole proprietor is not in a good legal position to disavow responsibility for loans made to it in good faith by its own taxpaying citizens. Yet, under pending legislation, TVA can cell its bonds without any check by Congress and completely outside the control of fiscal agencies established to protect the people from abuse of public credit or misapplication of public funds.

FIRST 120 YEARS THE HARDEST

Any possibility of repayment by TVA of the $1.2 billion advanced to the Authority by American taxpayers during the last quarter century will be delayed by subordination of such repayments to payments due on the revenue bonds. Even assuming funds available from TVA's low power rates sufficient to pay back the funds received through congressional appropriations, such payments might be as little as $10 million a year, which could stretch the period of reimbursement of the TVA investment from the present 40-year term to one of at least 120 years.

When lawmakers refer to the TVA investment they completely ignore the fact that TVA has sold almost $500 million worth of electricity and used the revenues for its own purposes.

No provision is made in the new legislation for repayment of this half-billion, nor for paying any return on it to the taxpayers. Most of it has been expended without congressional authorization on plant and service facilities, just as the Authority plans to spend the $750 million it expects to borrow from purchasers of TVA revenue bonds.

WOULD RETAIN TAX EXEMPTION

Notwithstanding that in its revised status under the pending bill, TVA would be operated for the benefit of private investors—its dollar-conscious bondholders—it would not lose its vital exemption from Federal income taxes. There is no provision even for making any payments in lieu of taxes, as are presently made by TVA to State and local authorities. This priceless advantage would, of course, enable TVA to keep its power rates low, undercutting by a wide margin the taxpaying electric utilities, which must raise their new money at high interest costs by selling their securities in the free market.

From the public utility view, it was bad enough to have the Government as a tax-subsidized, price-cutting competitor, without having to meet private capital on these same terms.

Last July the Budget Bureau told the House Committee on Public Works that a wholly owned government corporation with a net of $1,200 million of Federal moneys invested in it ought to have the same rules of the game applied to it as does any other government operation. President Eisenhower long has taken the position that nothing should replace congressional control of the expansion of facilities. The Comptroller General, earlier this year in a TVA audit report, said, "We believe that Congress can most effectively control capital expenditures through appropriations. If, however, Congress wishes TVA to use power revenues, or funds obtained from non-Federal sources, to construct or acquire new steam-electric generating units, we recommend that TVA be required to obtain specific and prior authorization from Congress for such facilities.

Like everything else prompted by the foot-inside-the-door method, this drastic divorcement of TVA from visible channels of responsibility has serious and far-reaching implications. TVA admits the need of about $180 million a year in new money for expansion of facilities to meet a demand for power that is increasing in its service area at an annual rate of 10 to 12 percent. At least 65 percent of this amount—$120 million a year—will have to be obtained from outside sources; namely, from the sale of revenue bonds. This means that less than a decade from now, the original $750 million obtained from bondholders would be used up, creating a demand for raising the ceiling on the total of revenue bonds in public hands, or going back to Congress for another handout, asking the lawmakers to put the slug on the public for money enough to rescue the investment of the private bondholders. What a scandal that would be.

This TVA pitch has a lot in common with efforts of other bureaucratic agencies to escape supervision and the worst of it is they seem to be succeeding on many fronts.

Frankly, if TVA is permitted to get away with it, why should the privilege be denied other Federal departments? In this proposed change the debt incurred or service charges due from TVA would not appear in the Federal budget at all. Money owed by TVA would be completely detached from the total of the national debt. And if this legislation creates a precedent, as it very likely will, it is conceivable it will be adapted to many other agencies, the operations of which will then be of a clandestine nature, so far as any accessible public accounting is concerned. That, of course, would mean that the statutory limit on the national debt, could be evaded by adapting the TVA system to scores of activities now within the purview of Congress and the White House. Indeed, the possibilities are so grave as to warrant public consideration far beyond the attention the slick TVA scheme appears to be receiving at the present time.

Resolution on the Disclaimer Provision of the National Defense Education Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 14, 1959

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, on March 16, I introduced a bill to repeal title X, section 1001(f) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, because I feel that this requirement is a hindrance to the full realization of the purposes of the act.

On March 21, the Iowa conference of the American Association of University Professors, at their annual meeting at Grinnell, Iowa, adopted two resolutions with respect to the National Defense Education Act. One of these supports my bill and calls for the repeal of title X, section 1001(f)(1), and the other asks for the extension of certain aspects of the act to cover private schools as well as public schools.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I ask that these resolutions be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD:

The Iowa conference of the American Association of University Professors calls upon the 86th Congress to repeal title X, section 1001(f)(1) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958. This section reads:

"No funds shall be used to make payments or loans to any individual unless such individual (1) has executed and filed with the Commissioner an affidavit that he does not believe in, and is not a member of and does not support any organization that believes in or teaches the overthrow of the U.S. Government by force or violence or by any illegal or unconstitutional methods."

Our reasons for opposing the requirement of such a disclaimer statement are as follows:

"1. On grounds of principle, it is a violation of the American tradition of freedom of thought since it makes an individual's opportunity for educational assistance contingent upon his beliefs. It is also self-defeating in that a person momentarily seduced by antidemocratic ideologies is more likely to discover their fallacies through more rather than less education. We uphold the basic soundness of Thomas Jefferson's famous statement: "If there be any among us who would wish to dissolve this Union or to change its republican form, let them stand undisturbed as monuments of the safety with which error of opinion may be tolerated where reason is left free to combat it."

"2. On the grounds of utility, such an oath is totally ineffective, simply one more ribbon of redtape powerless to sustain our national security. Dedicated subversives who have already exposed themselves to the major charges of treason or sedition will not hesitate to take such an oath, with its relatively minor risk of perjury. Past experience has repeatedly demonstrated that the persons who refuse such a disclaimer statement are mainly idealists who sacrifice themselves to protest what they consider a violation of the Bill of Rights.

"3. On purely legal grounds, this vaguely worded oath, which is required under the criminal penalties of perjury, violates the legal principle that criminal statutes shall punish actions rather than beliefs, and shall define the proscribed actions in unmistakable terms. The law does not specify the organizations in which membership is proscribed, nor any procedure for specifying them. Neither does the law define what constitutes 'support' of such an organization, which could include a mere defense of its right to be heard. Again, the law does not provide any test by which a member can know when the organization is using 'illegal or unconstitutional methods' for bringing about a change in the government of the day. This broad wording could be made to extend to a member of a corporation or labor union which contributed financially to the Democratic or Republican Party or a candidate, in violation of the Taft-Hartley Act. Finally, this law could be used to expose to malicious and harassing investigation and perjury prosecution persons whose later utterances might be construed as retrospective evidence of previous false swearing. Such a threat can only intimidate the free inquiry and expression on which a vigorous democracy depends for its vitality.

"4. On grounds of public policy, this disclaimer oath directly contradicts our attempts to bring our best minds into teaching to offset Soviet educational and scientific gains. At the very time we are trying to raise the status, prestige, and income of the teaching profession, we single out its present and potential members as a target for popular suspicion. We require of them an oath which is seldom required of other groups receiving Federal assistance, or of other members of the general population. Such oaths reinforce the growing tendency of college students to avoid all independent thinking and discussion about values and goals for fear of some day being suspected of harboring beliefs disloyal to their country. This policy is worse than discriminatory and unfair. It is foolish and self-defeating."

RESOLUTION ON THE EXTENSION OF CERTAIN ASPECTS OF THE NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT TO COVER PRIVATE SCHOOLS AS WELL AS PUBLIC SCHOOLS

(Adopted by a vote of 16 to 11 by the Iowa conference of the American Association of University Professors, at the annual meeting at Grinnell, Iowa, March 21, 1959, with instructions that it be sent to the National Office of the AAUP and to Iowa Federal Senators and Representatives)

The Iowa conference of the American Association of University Professors calls upon the 86th Congress of the United States to amend the National Defense Education Act in such a way that teachers and counselors in private schools and colleges be made eligible for the same benefits as those in public schools.

Title II, section 205(b)(3) provides that up to 50 percent of loans made to undergraduate and graduate students in institutions of higher education shall be cancelled for service as a full time teacher in a public elementary or secondary school, at the rate of 10 percent for each year of such service. We strongly urge that this "forgiveness feature" be extended to teachers in private elementary and secondary schools, and to teachers in both private and public institutions of higher learning.

It seems quite obvious that teachers in colleges and universities and in private elementary and secondary schools are rendering as much service to society as teachers in public elementary and secondary schools. In terms of economic need it is often the case that the teachers in private institutions need this relief even more than those in public institutions. The national interest requires that we recruit teachers for education at every level and in both public and private institutions.

The same kind of amendment is recommended in Title V, part B, section 511, which provides stipends for individuals "engaged, or preparing to engage, in counseling and guidance in a public secondary school * * *" We urge that such stipends be made available on the same basis to persons engaged, or preparing to engage, in counseling and guidance in a private nonprofit secondary school.

Our Freedoms Versus Our Responsibilities in a Free Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. MOELLER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 14, 1959

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to include the winning essay among all those submitted by high school seniors in the State of Ohio in the recent American Legion essay contest. The winner was Stephen W. Miller, of the Lancaster High School in my hometown of Lancaster, Ohio. The title of Stephen's essay is "Our Freedoms Versus Our Responsibilities in a Free Society." This young man's viewpoint is a tribute not only to himself but to his teachers and the Lancaster school system. Stephen points out that if we are to maintain our prized liberties each citizen has the strong obligation to assume personal responsibilities which will enable us as a free nation to perpetuate democratic

freedom. The message he brings is one which we could all well ponder.

SUBJECT: "OUR FREEDOMS VERSUS OUR RESPONSIBILITIES IN A FREE SOCIETY

(By Stephen W. Miller, Lancaster, Ohio, 12th Grade)

Liberty—What does it mean? Is it the freedom of choice? Or the right of self-government? Or just the privilege of doing as one pleases? Certainly these represent a portion of our liberties. But what is the one mainstay of all these privileges? It is the freedom to perpetuate them. The ends and means of maintaining liberty in a free society must of necessity follow a path of responsibility. To keep self-government, to retain personal freedoms, and to support an equitable code of justice—these are the goals for which one must strive. But to attain these goals completely every citizen must exercise those rights that he has. To maintain these liberties each citizen must use these liberties.

Just as with every mountain there must be a valley, for every liberty there is a responsibility. For instance, freedom from attack is a liberty balanced by the responsibility of serving in the Armed Forces. Likewise, to maintain representative government, one of the simplest tasks is to vote, for the principal power of a despot is his withholding of this right. That voting is a duty is not always realized, since only half of our citizens vote; but those who do vote recognize that every vote cast is a vote for a democratic form of government.

Free education is one of our priceless liberties. Yet it is one responsibility that is usually overlooked. How can one choose correctly the best man for an office, or speak intelligently in defense of democracy, or write a letter to a Congressman if he has not an adequate education? Even though people under 21 are not old enough to enjoy the full rights of citizenship, they still have the obligation to prepare themselves for citizenship with a good education. It should not be one that is too narrow, but an education that contains not only a study of our Nation's language and its Government, but also a study of the despotism of other countries, for how can one fight somthing he knows nothing about?

Most people accede that voting, obeying laws, and acquiring an education are prerequisites for the liberties of citizenship. But there is one other responsibility of a good citizen—to be intolerant of intolerance. The repression of prejudice is the keystone of our country. What a great Utopia this country would be if there were no bonds of hatred of one another's religion or race:

Just as a seal when pressed on a sheet of paper shows ridges on one side and depressions on the other, so liberty, viewed from a different angle, shows that it is actually a responsibility. This country, because it realizes the interchangeability of liberty and responsibility, has more freedom than any other country in the world.

Senator Hennings of Missouri

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORGAN M. MOULDER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1959

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Speaker, we Missourians are proud of the great ability and outstanding record of our Senator THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR., of Missouri. His knowledge, statesmanship, and integrity is righly respected in the Congress of the United States. The history of our great Nation records the work of great Nation records the work of great Senators from Missouri and none excel the brilliant ability and record of Senator HENNINGS. An example of this appears in an editorial published May 1, 1959, in the Hunnewell Standard, as follows:

SENATOR HENNINGS AND INDIVIDUAL LIBERTY

Missourians who believe in individual liberty should take note and send a word of approval and encouragement to our senior Senator from Missouri, the Honorable THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR., for the unrelenting battle he continues to wage for this principle of democratic government.

Last week a bill known as the freedom of information bill, and introduced by Senator HENNINGS, was taken up for consideration by the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights. A special House subcommittee is also holding hearings on secrecy problems in Government, and both subcommittees are concerned with the repeated refusal of agencies within the Defense Department to provide the General Accounting Office with information it requests and is obviously entitled to receive.

In Washington, as well as in our State and local governments, there are numerous agencies and governing units who seem possessed with an idea they, who by chance or design happen to come into the administration of these agencies or units, are endowed with supernatural powers of judgment and discernment in directing affairs of state and the welfare of the people, not enjoyed by anyone outside their particular agency.

Senator HENNINGS, along with many of his fellow Americans, declines to agree with this assumption, and he has taken a firm stand against this practice, when far too many of his fellow Congressmen, cowering under bureaucratic domination in fear for their political hides, have faltered in their duty to the system of government under which they serve.

Senator HENNINGS wrote to all Federal agencies for their opinions on his proposed changes in the law that would insure a fuller accounting to the people on their handling of these agencies. The answers he received were in many instances weak and even amusing. For example, the Agriculture Department declared they would be unable to assure persons who gave them statistical data, that this data would not be made public, if such a law were passed. How funny. Most people have always held the notion that statistics were collected for the purpose of public dissemination. What is there about statistics in agriculture anyway, that would endanger our national security?

The Post Office Department had another reason for withholding information to other Government heads and to the people. It declared a law such as Senator HENNINGS proposes would require them to open its files of pornographic materials to everyone, even minors, who might decide to examine them. Now wouldn't that be too bad? Pornography is a bad word for adults, still considered by these agencies evidently, as too young to know; while for our minors who might decide to desert the comics and other vile books such as "Peyton Place," and "Mandingo," to go in search of Government files for a taste of this lurid entertainment, it would indeed be extremely inconvenient.

And funniest of all was the Justice Department's objections, who said such a bill would only encourage such popular slogans as "the people's right to know," which would turn prompt an expansion of this slogan into another that would demand "the right to know" every detail of the Congress' business.

Well, well, that makes us wonder if those details the Congress might not like to reveal could be the way the people's tax money is being spent; how many members of a Congressman's family might be on the public payroll while not ever near the scene of their remunerative employment more than the minimum time required to claim and collect these salary windfalls; or why certain individuals or groups might be accorded special favors, while others even more deserving may be getting the run-around.

Ironically many of these Government agencies created by the Congress itself, sometimes deny that representative body access to the information it requests, so powerful do they become once they are safely established, with their own set of regulations that gives them immunity to congressional interference.

Senator HENNINGS has denounced the practice of these agencies as a threat to freedom. Surely most people will agree with our Senator from Missouri.

This investigation and legislation proposed by Senator HENNINGS is only one of the important legislative chores he is presently engaged in to correct abuses that have reached formidable proportions.

He is chairman of another investigating group on the Juvenile Delinquency Code. It is to the credit of Senator HENNINGS' conscientiousness and courage that he is not wasting this investigation by reviving that shopworn performance of trying to find the cause for delinquency. That has been batted about since the problem began to attract national attention at least 10 years ago, and has never yet seemed to advance past the cause stage.

The Missouri Senator is not looking for cause. He is seeking a remedy. He admits the problem and wants a program or statutes that will cure it. His approach to this momentous problem is new and refreshing. May his tribe increase.

A Tribute to Ambassador Abba Eban of Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1959

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am honored to include the following address by our distinguished majority leader, Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK, delivered at a dinner held on Wednesday evening, May 13, 1959, at the Grand Ballroom of the Sheraton-Park Hotel, Washington, D.C. The dinner was given by the National Testimonial Committee for Ambassador Abba Eban of Israel and the America-Israel Society on the occasion of the 11th anniversary of Israel's independence and to bid farewell to Ambassador and Mrs. Eban prior to their return to Israel and was attended by many Members of Congress, officials of the executive agencies, and prominent citizens of the country:

When we talk about the distinguished guest of this evening, Ambassador Abba Eban, we talk about Israel—and of the faith, the prayers, the hopes and the sacrifices of generations of yesterday of Jewish blood, culminating through clear thinking and courageous action in the establishment 11 years ago tomorrow, of the new dynamic liberty-loving nation in the Middle East between

whose leaders and people, and the leaders and people of the United States, there exists close and fundamental ties from a governmental angle, and equally close and undying ties from the angle of friendship.

For over 2,000 years, despite the trials and tribulations that history records, of multitudes of inequities, discriminations and persecutions in many lands, and even death in some, those of Jewish blood in dispersion, faced their almost endless vicissitudes with exemplary fortitude.

Their spiritual and cultural heritage sustained their undying spirit of freedom and independence, and kept them spiritually bound together. Through centuries that unique heritage was carefully nurtured, jealously guarded, and actively kept alive. Finally, after centuries of waiting in suspense, many of Jewish blood of today in different lands were afforded the opportunity of returning to their ancient homeland at the end of the First World War. And in May of 1948, with the proclamation of Israel's independence, they launched once more upon an independent political existence under a government of laws.

During the past 11 years, a short time in the history of man, there has been miraculous progress in the new nation of Israel. Today Israel stands as a dynamic and powerful state as the embodiment of the centuries-old faith. After the establishment of Israel in 1948 as a new nation, and one of the best friends that America has throughout the world, and the citadel of democracy in the Middle East, more than 1 million immigrant persons of Jewish blood, through the sound policies and able leadership of the Israeli Government, have been provided opportunities for these refugees to become happy, industrious, and patriotic citizens of Izrael. The leaders of the Government of Israel have brought social justice to their people. We have seen the enthusiasm and energy that has turned much of the desert of the Negev into fertile and cultivable land, and the hills of Galilee into blossoming orchards. By the skillfull use of science and the technical abilities of their people, by the erection of hydroelectric power stations, by building canals, by installing petrol refineries and by laying oil and water pipelines, Israeli leaders have successfully transformed arid and inhospitable hills and desert plains into industrial centers and productive farm lands. And what is more important in these perilous and anxious days, all of the citizens of Israel are prepared to guard their newly found freedom and recreated and reclaimed homeland with extraordinary vigilance and uncommon bravery against all eventualities.

Today on the eve of the celebration of the 11th anniversary of its independence day the State of Israel is a new and encouraging phenomenon in the Middle East. It is fast becoming the most industrialized urban community in the underdeveloped rural communities in that region. Today the State of Israel can proudly claim the right to be recognized as an outstanding member of the families of nations. Under most hazardous circumstances and trying conditions, despite the mutiplicity of difficulties and dilemmas, economic and fiscal hardships, and sometimes baffling political uncertainties, the people of Israel face the future with justifiable pride and confidence.

The leadership of Israel during the past 11 years has been superb. Under Prime Minister Ben-Gurion, and those associated with him, progress has been made of an amazing nature. And one of the outstanding leaders of brave Israel is the distinguished diplomat and scholar whom we honor tonight.

It is with a deep mixture of feelings that I speak tonight about our guest of honor, Ambassador Abba Eban. In our sadness and regret in the departure of this fine gentleman, an outstanding diplomat and scholar, as well as world citizen, whose very name is a stimulant to a world depressed by international ills, is mixed with a sense of happy confidence in the future of our distinguished friend who has already made, and will in the years ahead, continue to make marked contributions to his country and to the world at large. Our distinguished guest, who has so admirably served for more than 10 years as Ambassador to the United States, and as Ambassador to the United Nations from Israel, has won a place in our affections, as well as in our admiration. In his own country, in Washington diplomatic circles, and in the United Nations he has become a figure of outstanding proportions. He has reflected credit upon the people of his liberty-loving country. He is known to millions of Americans for his extraordinary ability, for his outstanding accomplishments in the field of diplomacy, negotiating—but always firm and never retreating, for his frequent discussion programs, and particularly becaues he has endeared himself to us as a friend. In the United Nations he has won the respect even of his opponents, as an eloquent speaker and persuasive debater, possessed of a profound, logical mind. His training and experience have equipped him to play the very important part that he has in the establishment of Israel, and in protecting her against her enemies.

One could talk for hours about this distinguished gentleman who has already had crowded into his life decades of wisdom and experience, and yet whose life is still ahead of him to serve his country and mankind. As one biographer has expressed it, "throughout the prolonged and complex series of crises that has harassed the Middle East since the birth of Israel as an independent republic in 1948, no representative in the United Nations has pleaded more eloquently for the rights of his government than has Israel's Abba Eban." And I might go further and say that no one has pleaded more eloquently for the advancement of world peace than he has.

As another writer, in referring to Ambassador Eban, very recently said, "With Abba Eban's initiative in the United Nations, the government has attempted to break through the wall of silence and hostility which the Arab neighbors have built around Israell * * * Israel's readiness to take an active part in the solution of the problem * * * must be interpreted as the offer of an advance payment that one cannot simply ignore. If it should fail to impress the Arab neighbors, it will at least impress the nations interested in Israel's welfare."

As he leaves, for the time being at least, the diplomatic field, to enter into another important field of public activity in the service of his country, I remember well what this Ambassador par excellence said in 1953: "The voice of world opinion, together with the pressure of a situation fast becoming intolerable, would bring Israel and the Arab States together to confront the common destiny which awaits them in the region, which they have both illuminated by their radiant achievements in generations past."

And it is proper and fitting that we honor this distinguished gentleman on this occasion as he is about to leave us to enter into other fields of public activity in his country. And we know that with his extraordinary ability, his vast experience, his logical mind, and his eloquent voice, that he will continue to make his marked contributions to an Israel constantly growing stronger and stronger, and through his future services, a marked contribution toward the ultimate goals that we all seek—a world of peace.

And in saying "goodday" not "goodby" to Ambassador Eban, and speaking for those present at this wonderful banquet, and countless of thousands of friends throughout the United States, I extend to Mrs. Eban, the guide and the inspiration of the Ambassador, the real soldier in his life, our very best wishes for every future happiness and success.

An Open Letter to Congressman Canfield

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 14, 1959

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues an open letter to me which appeared in the May 7, 1959, issue of the Passaic (N.J.) Herald-News. The writer, Mr. Arthur F. Lenehan, puts in proper perspective the current debate in Congress about a national flower, and he suggests his own favorite flower—the dandelion.

In reading Mr. Lenehan's learned defense of the dandelion—a flower some unknowing people thing is a weed—I was reminded of Henry Ward Beecher's century-old tribute to the underdog of the flower world: "You cannot forget if you would, those golden kisses all over the cheeks of the meadow, queerly called dandelions."

The following letter is to assure that Mr. Lenehan's prose will not be "born to blush unseen":

[From the Passaic Herald-News, May 7, 1959]

AN OPEN (AND FLOWERY) LETTER TO CONGRESSMAN CANFIELD

(By Arthur F. Lenehan)

Dear Congressman CANFIELD: I see by the papers that the language in Congress is getting more flowery than ever.

I refer, of course, to the recent discussions about the selection of a national floral emblem.

They tell me that David Burpee, head of the seed concern and registered lobbyist for marigolds, has succeeded in having a bill introduced in the House of Representatives calling for his favorite to become the national flower.

That's all right, it's a free country.

But I also understand that there are proposals to make the daisy, black-eyed susan, columbine, poppy, carnation, corn tassle, the rose, goldenrod and even grass the country's botanical badge.

Now I don't want to take up your valuable time with a long discussion about the drawbacks of this collection of horticulture but as corresponding secretary of the Society for the Selection of Taraxacum Officinale as the National Flower of the United States, I cannot remain silent.

Taraxacum officinale, in case you are not horticulturally hep, is that Yankee Doodle Dandy of a flower, the dandelion.

What can compare with the dandelion? Certainly not that green scourag of suburbia—grass. After you break your back to sow it, you finally get to grow it and then you break your back again to mow it. Grass leads us all in a vicious circle.

Backers of the rose have a point. It is unquestionably a thing of beauty. But the rose has its points, too—all those thorns—and this is an issue that is thorny enough already.

The daisy and the black-eyed susan don't deserve consideration. Think of all the people they've disappointed in that "loves me, loves me not" game.

In regard to the columbine, let me point out that this is the name of President Eisenhower's personal plane. Let's keep this on a nonpartisan basis, please.

As for corn tassel, I have it on good authority that it is only the male part of the corn plant and is not a complete flower.

The older fellows also tell me that it is the prime ingredient in a beverage which is not universally accepted as the most beneficial brew around.

Carnations, I must tell you, are commonly known as "pinks." You put "pinks" up as the national flower and the American Legion will murder you.

And goldenrod. The hayfever people will have you all impeached.

This brings us down to the poppy and the unalterable fact that opium is derived from this inscrutable oriental blossom. Put that in your pipe and smoke it and see if you get elected again.

So we're back to the dandelion, the flower that has everything.

What other bloom has its staying power? It can survive floods. It can survive drought. It can survive small boys and large dogs. Name me another made of such stern stuff.

What other flower rallied to its country's cause in time of war? During World War II the American Government financed the planting of experimental fields of dandelions as a nontropical source of rubber. The dandelion has latex surging through its veins, you see. Fortunately, synthetics bounced us back in the ballgame, but the dandelion was there if needed.

And what other blossom makes such heavenly wine—wine that doesn't make your legs rubbery?

What other flower has leaves that make such wonderful salad greens?

What other little blooming idiot of a plant has covered so many bare spots in so many lawns and lined so many highways?

And what plant distrbutes its seed so beautifully? It has a parachute for every one. Now isn't that tailormade for getting behind the Iron Curtain?

We of the Sftsotoatnfotus are confident you will give some consideration to the little golden flower that is with us everywhere.

We won't go so far as to say we're trying to plant the seed in your head. But if you furrow your brow and keep an open mind, don't be surprised if you find the idea growing on you.

Postal Increase

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1959

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago, the Postmaster General addressed you, requesting consideration, by the Congress, of legislation to increase, by 1 cent, the postal rates on first-class regular and airmail.

Accompanying this communication, was a draft bill designed to put into effect, the higher rates which had previously also been recommended by the President in his budget message for 1960.

This proposal would mean an increase of 15 percent on airmail, and 25 percent on regular mail.

The Postmaster General estimates that such a proposed increase in rates would yield an additional $355 million per year in revenue, which, he says, will reduce substantially the current operating deficit of his Department.

Assuming efficiency of operation of the Post Office Department, any such deficiency can only result from losses sustained in performance, by the Department, of its "public services" as defined in the Postal Policy Act of 1958.

Less than a year ago, Mr. Speaker, we defined those public services in that statute, to include "the total loss resulting from the transmission of matter in the mails free of postage or at reduced rates," and from various other special and nonpostal services.

In the same legislation, it was "declared to be the policy of the Congress", that the cost "of such public service items" should be "paid directly out of the general fund of the Treasury"—72 Stat 134, sec. 103(c)(3)(A), 39 U.S.C. 270a(c)(3)(A).

Further, Mr. Speaker, in the same statute—the Postal Policy Act of 1958, enacted, I repeat, less than a year ago—we declared that "the Congress hereby finds that it would be an unfair burden upon any particular user or class of users of the mails to compel them to bear the expenses incurred by reason of special rate considerations granted, or facilities provided, to other users of the mails, or to underwrite those expenses incurred by the postal establishment for services of a nonpostal nature"—72 Stat. 134, sec. 102(5), 39 U.S.C. 270(5).

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, we called express attention to the policy of the Congress that "the postal establishment should be operated in an efficient manner," and that "it clearly is not a business enterprise conducted for profit or for raising general funds"—72 Stat. 134, sec. 102(5), 39 U.S.C. 270(5).

And now, I submit, Mr. Speaker, the Postmaster General, in his recent letter to you, suggests that we disregard that policy, so recently and so clearly expressed, to use our power of taxation, through an increase in first-class postal rates, to operate a part of the postal establishment at a profit to raise general funds to cover the cost of "public service items" which we declared, only last year, to be payable "out of the general fund of the Treasury".

As stated, Mr. Speaker, this suggestion on the part of the Postmaster General, follows the same request, in substance, made by the President in his budget message for 1960.

The President, in that message, does suggest amendment of the Postal Policy Act of 1958, by a revision of our declaration of policy, in order to "assure a more equitable sharing of postal operating costs between mail users and the general public."

But the President's budget message, I submit Mr. Speaker, simply recommends, as does the recent letter of the Postmaster General, an increased tax of 1 cent in first-class postal rates, to provide funds "to finance the postal deficit and the subsidized public service"—which we declared last year should be met "out of the general fund of the Treasury."

Lest there be any question in the mind of any Member of this House, as to the fact that the fixing of postal rates is an exercise of the power of taxation, let me remind them first, of the Supreme Court's pronouncement, over 100 years ago, that "the revenue of the Post Office Department, being raised by a tax on mailable matter conveyed in the mail, and which is disbursed in the public service, is as much a part of the income of the Government as moneys collected for duties or imports"—*United States* v. *Bromley*, 53 US 88, 97.

In 1859, H.R. 872 of the 35th Congress, to make an appropriation "for the service of the Post Office Department"—Congressional Globe, 35th Congress, 2d session, page 914, 1859—was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means, reported favorably, and was passed by this House.

The Senate amended the bill to provide increased postal rates, but this House adopted a formal resolution refusing to consider the Senate amendment, because legislation increasing postal rates "is in the nature of a revenue bill," which, under the Constitution, "shall originate in the House of Representatives" *Id.* at page 1666.

Mr. Speaker, I take the liberty of reminding the Members of this House that the postal increases of 1917—1917 act, 40 Stat. 300, October 3, 1917—and 1932—1932 act, 27 Stat. 285, June 6, 1932—were embodied in general revenue bills which originated in this House, and were referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Reference was made, in the debates on the floor of this House, to the increase in postal rates in the 1917 bill, as "a direct tax"—volume 55, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 2773—and as the laying on of "the heavy hand of taxation"—volume 55, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 2766.

In 1904, the Supreme Court again described the postal service as a "popular and efficient method of taxation"—*Public Clearing House* v. *Coyne*, 194 US 497, 506.

In recent years, we have sought to raise revenue by increasing postal rates on the advertising content of newspapers and other publications passing through the mails as second-class matter, on the assumption that the advertiser should bear a greater portion of the burden of governmental operations.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, in the Postal Policy Act of 1958 itself, in which we declared, as stated, that each class of mail should bear its own, and no other's cost of handling in the postal service, we levied a tax on the transportation through the mails, of the advertising content in second-class mail matter, up to several times that on the so-called news content thereof.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it must be perfectly obvious that it cannot possibly cost any more to carry through the mails, the advertising content than the news content of the same newspaper.

As early as 1793, in his annual message to the Congress, President Washington urged "repeal of the tax on the transportation of public prints"—Volume 12, Writings of George Washington Sparks Editorial 1837, page 42.

Mr. Speaker, I repeat that only last year, in the Postal Policy Act of 1958, we declared the policy of the Congress to be that "the total loss resulting from the transmission of matter in the mails free of postage or at reduced rates", was

a "public service", which should be "paid directly out of the general fund of the Treasury".

In the same enactment, we stated expressly that "the postal establishment should be operated in an efficient manner" and "clearly is not a business enterprise conducted for profit or for raising general funds."

I therefore submit to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the House, that when the Postmaster General now suggests, as did the President in his Budget Message for 1960, that the Congress, by exercise of its power of taxation, increase postal rates on first-class mail matter, he is suggesting that that part of the postal establishment be used—as are the postal rates on advertising content of newspapers in second-class matter—to raise general funds to cover the cost of "public services," instead of defraying them "out of the general fund of the Treasury" pursuant to the expressed policy of the Congress in the Postal Policy Act of 1958.

Radiation Hazards in Uranium Mining

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1959

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr .Speaker, under permission, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Radiation Hazards in Uranium Mining," by Duncan A. Holaday, of the U.S. Public Health Service, Salt Lake City, Utah, as reprinted from pages 104–106 of the April 1959 edition of the Mining Congress Journal.

Mr. Holaday in this article describes in an authoritative manner the hazards presented to uranium miners. Eventually, he points out, around 5,000 men will probably be employed in mining uranium ore.

On March 11, 1959, Mr. Holaday testified before a subcommittee of the Joint Committee Investigating Employee Radiation Hazards and Workmen's Compensation Problems, under the chairmanship of my good friend and colleague, Congressman MELVIN PRICE of Illinois.

Mr. Holaday points out in this article that proper ventilation in uranium mines is of great importance. I might add that thorough inspections by regulatory authorities would also appear necessary in order to protect the health and safety of the workers.

At the present time, the inspection of these mines is under the responsibilities of State governments.

Next week the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has scheduled public hearings on Federal-State relationships in the atomic energy field. We are scheduled to hear from many witnesses concerning the respective activities of Federal and State governments, including my good friend from Colorado, Dr. Roy Cleere, director of the department of public health in Colorado.

The safety of uranium miners is a subject of great interest to me, and I hope that improved safeguards and inspection procedures can be developed in the near future:

RADIATION HAZARDS IN URANIUM MINING

(By Duncan A. Holaday)

Uranium mining is at this time one of the more important segments of the American mining industry. In 1957, the processing rate was about 13,000 tons of ore per day, and present plans of the AEC call for a total refining capacity of about 24,000 tons per day. This ore is produced by a multiplicity of mines ranging in size from two-man operations to those employing several hundred men.

As part of a long-range health study which the U.S. Public Health Service is conducting, a census was taken of uranium miners in Colorado, Arizona, New Mexico, and Utah during the summer of 1957. This operation located 2,700 miners working in about 375 mines. The number of mines which shipped ore during 1957 was much larger, but we found only the ones operating during the survey period. A few hundred additional miners were employed in areas not covered by the census. Eventually, it is probable that around 5,000 men will be employed in mining uranium ore.

This is not a large group of workers, but it is an important one. The entire multibillion dollar atomic energy industry depends on the efforts of these relatively few miners, for there is no substitute for the uranium which they produce. It is vitally necessary that any hazards peculiar to this industry be evaluated and controlled to insure a flow of ore to the processing plants.

DIFFERENT TYPES OF RADIATION PRESENT

In many respects uranium mining is similar to other metal mining. All of the usual hazards such as exposure to silica dust, powder gases, and diesel exhaust fumes and gases, are present, and are just as significant here as in any underground operation. The hazards produced by these materials are known and need no detailed discussion here. In addition to these familiar hazards, uranium mines have problems produced by the radioactive constituents of the ore, a recognition of which is new to the mining industry.

Workers in uranium mines are exposed to alpha, beta, and gamma radiation, present both as external sources and as radioactive gas and particulates which can be inhaled and retained in the body. Such mixed exposures are difficult to evaluate completely and, therefore, what appear to be the most important items must be selected for study.

External gamma radiation is produced by several members of the uranium family which are present in the ore body. The threshold level for industrial exposure to this type of radiation is 300 mr (milliroentgens) per week. This level has been established by the National Committee on Radition Protection, and rules for using it are described in NBS Handbook 59. Gamma radiation dose rates can be measured by calibrated scintillometers, Geiger counters, or ion chambers, if the atmospheric radon and radioactive dust concentrations are not high enough to contaminate the instruments. The radiation rate will depend on the size and grade of the exposed ore body, and our measurements have shown levels ranging from a few tenths of an milliroentgen per hour to 10 milliroentgens per hour.

If a radiation survey indicates that the miners may receive a significant fraction of the threshold amount of gamma radiation, their exposure should be checked with film badges. In the instances where we have done such measurements, we have found that the film badge results agreed reasonably well with survey meter readings. In uranium mines producing average grade ore (0.2 to 0.3 percent), the workers received 35 to 50 milliroengtens per week, which is well below the threshold level. A few mines consistently produce high grade (above 1 percent) ore. In such cases, it is important to have the gamma radiation exposures measured as the men may receive more than the threshold limit.

External beta radiation is probably not a significant exposure, but it should be considered. Such operations as handsorting of high-grade ore could deliver large doses of beta radiation to the hands, and should be avoided. Good change-house facilities are also needed, so that the workers can clean up thoroughly at the end of their shift and remove any contamination that they might have acquired.

RADON GAS EMANATES FROM EXPOSED ORE

Uranium miners are also exposed to radon gas which is continuously emanated from the ore body and to air-borne dust containing all the radioactive constituents of the ore. The greatest radiation hazard and the most difficult one to control is due to radon. The situation is comparable to any gassy mine as there is a steady escape of gas into the working areas of the mine. The amount of radon produced will depend on the area of ore exposed, the grade of the ore, and the porosity of the host rock. We have measured emanation rates varying from 0.004 curie to 0.27 curie per minute per 1,000 cubic feet of mine volume, or roughly by a ratio of 70 to 1. Dust, however, will only be produced by active mining operations at a relatively few locations in the mine.

A detailed discussion of the radon problem is given in PHS publication No. 494, "Control of Radon and Daughters in Uranium Mines," which reports the results of this phase of our study of the uranium mining and processing industry. This bulletin points out (1) that there is a history of human exposure to radon in European mines which probably caused a high incidence of lung cancer in these men; (2) that the immediate daughters of radon are more important than radon in delivering radiation to the lungs; (3) that, without controls, the atmospheric concentrations of radon daughters in the majority of American mines would be in the same ranges as were those in the European mines; and, (4) that mechanical ventilation is the only feasible method of control. A working level for atmospheric concentrations of radon daughters is suggested for use until further information is available, and methods for measuring these concentrations are described. All of these data are useful to those who are responsible for the health and safety of uranium miners, and a study of this report is recommended.

Since 1956 we have maintained a record of radon daughter samples which were taken by State agencies, mine operators, and our own staff. A summary of the 1957 results are given in table 1. Table 2 lists the same samples by concentration ranges and type of ventilation in the location sampled. These results show the effectiveness of ventilation in reducing radon daughter concentrations. They also show that these concentrations vary considerably among the mines, and that many operations will require study by an expert in mine ventilation to develop adequate control measures.

PROPER VENTILATION IS OF PRIME IMPORTANCE

Because of the wide variation in radon emanation rates, and since dilution ventilation is the only feasible method of control, the quantities of fresh air needed will also vary widely. Fortunately, in mine ventilation the laws of radioactive growth and decay operate in our favor. Each of the

members of the radon decay series is produced by the transmutation of the preceding element. Therefore, the removal of radon, RaA and other members of the series by ventilation has a cumulative effect on the atmospheric concentrations of the later elements in the chain. The net result is that lowering the concentration of radon by a factor of two will reduce the alpha energy content of the mine air by a factor of approximately four.

In other words, if the radon daughter concentration in a stope is four times the working level, doubling the ventilation air will reduce the concentration to the working level. Such calculations are not exact because they assume that uncontaminated air can be introduced directly to the working areas, but they do assist in planning a ventilation program.

Similar calculations will also demonstrate the desirability of closing off unused areas of a mine, which may be large sources of radon, and the necessity of keeping the ventilation fans running continuously. With no air changes, the radon daughter levels can rise to fantastic heights overnight. In almost all mines, one air change every 4 minutes will maintain the radon daughter concentrations at or below the working level. In many mines, one air change every 10 minutes is sufficient for control. Most mines working well-defined ore bodies should have no unusual ventilation problems. However, those operators who are mining small, scattered deposits may indeed have difficulty in establishing adequate controls.

RADIUM MAY BE PROBLEM IN DUSTY MINE

There are many other radioactive elements in uranium ore which must be considered in evaluating the total radiation exposure of the workers. Of these, the one on which we have most information is radium. For this element, a maximum permissible body burden of 0.1 microgram fixed in the body has been set as a result of studies of human exposures. Atmospheric concentrations of radium should be maintained at levels which will prevent the retention and fixation of this amount of radium in a working lifetime. The National Committee for Radiation Protection has adopted a threshold level of 24 micromicrograms of radium per cubic meter of air, which seems to have an ample safety factor in it.

We have analyzed several hundred mine air samples for air-borne radium and found that about 10 percent of them were above the threshold level, which would indicate that radium was not a significant health hazard in those mines. However, it should be pointed out that these samples were all taken in small mines with little mechanization. In larger operations, with trucks and ore loaders operating, it would be advisable to measure the atmospheric radium concentrations. It is probable that exposure to silica dust will be the controlling factor, but the situation should be checked.

If the levels of air-borne radium are high, it is possible to estimate the amount of radium that a miner is retaining and absorbing by determining the urinary radium excretion, and as a final check the body burden can be measured in a whole body counter. This procedure will detect as little as five percent of the maximum permissible body burden, so there is ample time to correct any conditions that are overexposing the workers.

EXCESS URANIUM IN MINE AIR UNLIKELY

On a weight basis, uranium is much less toxic than radium. Uranium can produce both chemical and radiation injury, and the threshold levels will vary according to the characteristic that is being considered. The American Conference of Governmental Industrial Hygienists has adopted a level of 250 micrograms of insoluable uranium per cubic meter of air based on chemical toxicity, while the AEC regulations specify 150 micrograms of U–238 per cubic meter of air based on radiological hazard. It has been estimated that the radiation threshold level has a factor of safety below the injury level of from 10 to 25. The difference between the two threshold levels is probably due to the differences in the safety factors used in establishing them.

It appears to be very unlikely that air-borne uranium concentrations would be above the threshold level unless the radium concentrations were also excessive. We have run a limited number of mine air samples for uranium and have found none which exceeded either the chemical or radiation threshold levels.

Limitations of time and staff have made it impossible for us to study other elements, such as polonium, radiolead, and ionium which also occur in the ores. It would be desirable to have information on these elements, but we believe that we have obtained data on the most significant constituents.

The studies that have been made of radiation exposures in uranium mines show that the greatest hazard is probably produced by radon daughters, and that practically all mines will require mechanical ventilation to reduce the atmospheric concentrations of these elements to the working level. Simple field methods are available for measuring radon daughters and for estimating ventilation requirements. In a large majority of mines, if the radon daughters are controlled, other air-borne radioactive dusts will also be controlled. Gamma radiation will usually not be a significant hazard, but may be a problem in mines working high grade ores.

J. Edgar Hoover Credited With Saving Once Weak Law Enforcement Group

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. MAHON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1959

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, the American people for years have maintained an unwavering confidence in J. Edgar Hoover, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. It is good for our country that we can have in a position of such great responsibility a man in whom the rank and file of the people have such great confidence. We need always to hold high in this country respect for law and order. The great job which Mr. Hoover has done has been of incalculable value to our people.

Thirty-five years ago Mr. Hoover became head of the FBI. As one who has watched his work through the years and taken pride in his accomplishments, I wish to pay tribute to this great American.

Having received unanimous consent to do so, I now insert a portion of a United Press International story by Robert J. Serling which appeared in the press earlier this week.

J. EDGAR HOOVER CREDITED WITH SAVING ONCE WEAK LAW ENFORCEMENT GROUP

(By Robert J. Serling)

WASHINGTON.—Thirty-five years ago Sunday, a young, one-time night school law student became head of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

His name was John Edgar Hoover. Today, he still heads the agency that has come to stand for the finest in law enforcement.

When Hoover took over, the FBI had the lowest morale, poorest personnel and worst reputation of any agency in the Federal Government. It was loaded with political appointees who couldn't have solved the theft of a 5-cent candy bar in broad daylight.

LONG POLICE RECORDS

There were FBI agents with long police records. Ex-convicts carried FBI credentials.

Special agent badges were given to politicians; to a theatrical producer who brought a girlie show to Washington; and to a drunk who used to stand outside the Department of Justice at lunchtime and sing bawdy songs.

Hoover was only 29 when Attorney General Harlan Fisk Stone told him to "clean up the mess." He used more than a broom. He fumigated.

The ex-convicts were fired. The political hacks were treated even rougher. Hoover transferred them from city to city so often they finally quit. And gradually, he built the FBI into a symbol of efficient, honest law enforcement.

Hoover used to know every one of his agents by name, but the FBI has long since outgrown this personal touch. Yet the growing process never affected his greatest achievement—the esprit de corps that has made the FBI one of the most respected, and feared, investigative bodies in the world.

This respect reflects the character of Hoover himself. Like his coldly efficient agents, he is more of a symbol than an individual. Now 64, he never married—explaining to friends, logically, that any woman who married him also would have to marry the FBI.

He loves horses, dogs, gardening, art, popular music, sports, sculpture and above all, his job, which he treats with rigid concentration.

Under Hoover, the FBI has obtained convictions or pleas of guilty in more than 90 percent of the cases it has investigated. In 4 years of global war, not a single case of foreign-directed sabotage was reported, kidnaping has become one of the least likely to succeed major crimes.

AFTER FACTS ONLY

No man could have acquired the influence enjoyed by Hoover without also acquiring some enemies—racketeers, Communists and fellow travelers. But there also are some liberals who fear the FBI occasionally treads on civil rights, tags innocent people with Red labels and is by its very nature a potential Gestapo.

Such charges disturb Hoover, who has leaned over backward to keep the agency exactly what it was intended to be—a nonpolitical investigative agency which digs up the facts and lets someone else judge them.

St. Elizabeths Hospital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STUYVESANT WAINWRIGHT
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 29, 1959

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a bill drafted by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare "to amend the laws relating to St. Elizabeths Hospital so as to fix the salaries of the superintendent, assistant superintendent, and first assistant physi-

cian of the hospital, and for other purposes."

This bill is similar to H.R. 9416, which was submitted to the 85th Congress in August 1957 in order to meet a long-standing problem concerning the furnishing of quarters, subsistence, and other items of maintenance to the three top officials of St. Elizabeths, and to provide them with salaries which more realistically reflect their professional status and their responsibilities.

In his letter of transmittal accompanying the bill, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Arthur S. Flemming, describes the need for this legislation as urgent. As he points out:

In the interval between submittal of this legislation to the 85th Congress and the present date, the incumbent of the position of Assistant Superintendent has retired and accepted a more lucrative position outside the Government. In addition, the incumbent of the first assistant physician's position has died and only recently been replaced by a promotion from within St. Elizabeths Hospital of a physician who is nearing retirement. This bill is an essential step in placing the Department in a position where it can hope to recruit qualified persons for these very important posts.

Address by Hon. James A. Farley at the Annual Communion Breakfast, Rosary Society, St. Teresa's Parish, Woodside N.Y., at the Waldorf-Astoria, New York City, May 3, 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES J. DELANEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1959

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, on May 3, 1959, the Honorable James A. Farley addressed the Rosary Society of St. Teresa's Parish of Woodside, N.Y., which is located in my district. Fittingly enough, in view of the approaching Mother's Day, he paid a tribute to the mothers of our country. I am sure we all share the sentiments expressed by Mr. Farley:

To the mothers of America this is the month of May, which traditionally in the Christian world is dedicated to the honor of Mary, the Mother of Christ. A week from today, the second Sunday in the month is that day in May when America, by Presidential proclamation, pays its respects to the mothers of our Nation. And so, while today is not in fact Mother's Day I feel certain it will not be out of order for me, on this first Sunday in May, to talk about mothers. I greatly appreciated Father Haggerty's invitation to participate in the annual communion breakfast of the Rosary Society of St. Teresa's Parish of Woodside. I am delighted to be with you this morning.

In these days of national anxiety—and who is not apprehensive about the Berlin situation—we can well pause to make a silent prayer that divine providence will guide our Government and will continue to strengthen our Commander in Chief, to the end that our unity of effort will speedily achieve the inevitable satisfactory settlement of our common enemies' plans and culminate in a just and lasting peace.

I feel it is appropriate for me, at this point, to quote to you the advice the mother of Andrew Jackson, the seventh President of this country, gave to her son shortly before she died: "Andrew, if I should not see you again, I wish you to remember and treasure up some things I have already said to you: In this world you will have to make your own way. To do that you must have friends. You can make friends by being honest, and you can keep them by being steadfast. You must keep in mind that friends worth having will in the long run expect as much from you as they give to you. To forget an obligation or be ungrateful for a kindness is a base crime—not merely a fault or a sin but an actual crime. Men guilty of it sooner or later must suffer the penalty. In personal conduct be always polite but never obsequious. None will respect you more than you respect yourself. Avoid quarrels as long as you can without yielding to imposition. But sustain your manhood always. Never bring suit in law for assault and battery or for defamation. The law affords no remedy for such outrages that can satisfy the feeling of a true man. Never wound the feelings of others. Never brook wanton outrage upon your own feelings. If you ever have to vindicate your feelings or defend your honor do it calmly. If angry at first, wait until your wrath cools before you proceed."

These words were repeated by General Jackson on his birthday, March 15, 1815, at New Orleans, to three members of his military family, Maj. John H. Eaton, Maj. William V. Lewis and Capt. W. W. Butler. "Gentlemen," said General Jackson, "I wish she could have lived to see this day. There never was a woman like her. She was gentle as a dove and as brave as a lioness. Her last words have been the law of my life."

Mothers are instinctively—and we instinctively expect them to be—a fount of virtue and inspiration to their children. As a daughter, as a sister, or as a wife, a woman represents only herself; but as a mother she is an institution, a living source of man's beginning, a living symbol of mankind's destiny. A man may be steeped in cynicism and despair but still his mother's words will be for him a source of strength and a fortress of hope.

Many a man's wife who took the oath with solemn voice has withdrawn her support, but a mother always is constant in her support, "for better, for worse, for richer, for poorer, in sickness and in health, until death do us part."

That oath imposed in the marriage ceremony implies the expectation that those made one before the law will be one in spirit, too. Though often only a hope between spouses it is a fact between mother and son. No solemn soundings are needed to bind a mother to her son "for better, for worse, unto death." Nature herself forges the undying bond, for it takes her into the shadow of the valley of death to give him life at the risk of her own. Affection thus born is surely not a mere sentiment or an accident. It is a profound manifestation of nature and shows that though we may turn to our scholars for the answers to technical problems we would do better to turn to our American mothers when we seek fundamentals.

Long before the dawn of the Christian era, the reliability of a mother's instinct was recognized in all ages and places. The best known story goes back thousands of years to the time of Solomon. You recall, I am sure, the story of the two women who claimed the same child. As it is told in the Scriptures, one said to Solomon, "Oh, my Lord, give her the living child and in no wise slay it." But the other said, "Let it be neither mine nor thine but divide it." Then the king, turning to the first woman said, "Give her the living child and in no wise slay it; she is the mother thereof." How easy it was for him to be sure which of the two was the true mother.

In the Christian tradition, of course, the mother has always been the voice of virtue and the living star of truth. Dignity and honor have been hers, and her material welfare has been the proper concern of every self-respecting son.

Most mothers live obscure lives and die obscure deaths, their grace and inspiration enhancing the lives only of their offspring. It is significant, therefore, of the genius of motherhood as an institution that mothers as a class are so widely heralded throughout all literature.

Our own Washington Irving states simply but well: "The love of a mother is never exhausted, it never changes, it never tires."

A father may turn his back on his child, brothers and sisters become inveterate enemies, husbands may desert their wives, or wives their husbands. But a mother's love endures through all; in good repute, in bad repute, in the face of the world's condemnation, a mother still loves on and still hopes that her child may turn from his evil ways and repent; still she remembers the infant smiles that once filled her bosom with rapture, the merry laugh, the joyful shout of his childhood, the opening promise of his youth; and she can never be brought to think him all unworthy.

The life of Augustine shows how sound such a mother's faith can be. Augustine, contemptible before the world, was to his mother the soul of beauty and honor. She tirelessly pursued him, determined to convert him to the Christian life of which she knew he was worthy. When at last she had lifted him out of the mire and set him among princes she knew and said her life was done, and she was happy to pass on to her place in eternity—the great St. Monica.

Some writers have gone very far in their portrayals of the function of motherhood. The English novelist Dickens wrote, "I think it must somewhere be written that the virtues of the mothers shall be visited on their children as well as the sins of their fathers."

The philosopher Michelet: "It is the general rule that all superior men inherit the elements of their superiority from their mothers."

And our own Ralph Waldo Emerson contributes the concise remark: "Men are what their mothers make them."

It is almost trite to repeat that our wars have been fought for liberty, but in substance doesn't that mean that they are fighting for the sanctity, the security, and the importance of the home? And what is home without a mother? As James Lowell said, "Many make a household but only one the home."

These are thoughts it should not be necessary to dwell upon and you may well ask why it is desirable to cite testimony to such a well-accepted truth. Precisely because it is not so well accepted as we may blindly believe. While the overwhelming majority of the mothers of this Nation—and of the fathers, too—are busy doing their best to maintain and preserve our American way of life there are abroad within our midst groups and individuals who conspire for the success of their peculiar brands of philosophy which would make a mockery of the values upon which we have bred. The honest average citizens of this land work hard at home and in shop to make a living and to serve their country. When their day's work is done they quietly, and in good faith, turn their minds to the peaceful enjoyment of family life. They have little or no time for political activity. They can only have faith that their efforts and the efforts of their neighbors are expended in behalf of the fundamental principles which they

understand to be the essence of our constitutional government.

There seems to be a spirit growing among some in this country that is alien to our institutions. I have an uneasy feeling that the belief is spreading that the people are not capable of governing themselves, that the problems of today are so complex that the citizen at large must of necessity be detached from his own difficulties. The concept of the political elite is growing.

Some weeks ago I noticed the publication of a new volume in the reviews. It was widely discussed in book circles and given serious consideration. The author believed that mankind can be divided into a small class of the ruler type and a large class of the ruled type. "Political action," the author contends, "is confined for the most part to a small minority of men; the majority is and remains, whatever else happens, the ruled." This writer even dares to suggest that Machiavelli is an excellent sample of the elite.

We see clearly what the "intellectual" believes. He believes that the hardworking masses of this great Nation were meant to be just hardworking and were not intended to bother about the solution of their own problems, but were meant to leave them to be determined by a small group of "know-it-alls."

We have always had the social snobs who have no respect in any sense for persons of crude though honest habits, and we have always had the intellectual snobs who think an individual becomes an individual only after he has acquired certain facts or theories; who refuse to recognize that the individual has merit unto himself and in himself.

Mothers have always been an antidote to the influence of social and intellectual snobbery in our society because mothers by nature appreciate that a child has a basic dignity equal to or greater than an adult's. The substance of human nature is there; later social or intellectual attainments are mere accidents.

We have got to realize that over 175 years of liberty do not assure us an eternity in its enjoyment. We have got to rid ourselves of the fixed idea that liberty is imperishable in America. The American schoolboy's knowledge of history, limited as it has been, is concerned primarily with America. The numberless centuries of human bondage and exploitation, and the vast areas of despotism in the past are virtually concealed from the American schoolboy in his most impressionable years. References to eternal vigilance as the price of liberty are but amusingly hollow words in his ears because they have been unnecessary in a land where liberty without vigilance has been a free commodity. Perhaps our time has come. We can learn the price of liberty by alertness. If the choice is given to us of liberty or security we must scorn the latter with the proper contempt of free men and the sound judgment of wise men who know that liberty and security are not incompatible in the lives of honest men.

It is upon the mothers of America that this Nation depends to protect its institutions while their sons are guarding its sovereignty. The enemy is "fore and aft" and we must mount our guns in bow and stern. The mothers are the repository of the fundamental principles of our national structure. Should these principles be subverted the sacrifices of our patriots, present and past, will seem minor compared with the sacrifices of future generations to bring about the resurrection of those freedoms which have made America great.

The good people of America must learn well that 175 years are swift and brief. America is but a thin stream of light in the long black history of human bondage and the illusion of permanence abiding in the hearts of so many proud Americans is a disarming perspective. The warm enlightening flame of liberty must be kept alive with the twin fuels of intelligence and courage.

I cannot believe we have talked the meaning out of words that now trite with use bear no message to inspire our populace. Liberty and freedom as words become trite only at a price. I will not believe that Americans must suffer their loss to learn their value. The tragedy is that the process of rediscovery of their value seldom involves a recovery of their enjoyment.

We are always being measured and we will perform. I have faith that just as we and our allies slowly but surely ground Hitler and his coconspirators into the dust, never again to impose their ugly power and perverted theories upon innocent and honest people, alien philosophies at home will be crushed under the heels of free Americans and a prosperous democracy of the United States of America will go forward to greater accomplishments.

The titanic efforts and the copious bloodshed that went into the making of America, the sacrifices of Valley Forge, Bull Run, the Marne, Anzio, and the Normandy beachhead are matters of meaning, full and deep in this day of new trial. In years of peace and complacency we have heard their recital with pleased but semiconscious ears. We must now grasp their full import to be equal to the threat before us.

American mothers will always do their part. You who offered your own lives that your sons and daughters might live—and in times of peril have offered those son's lives that your country might live—are purged souls of this world, and it is into your hands and the ideals that guide them that we willingly and with faith entrust the future of our beloved Nation.

Remarks of Former Senator Herbert H. Lehman at Women's National Democratic Club Dinner, Washington, D.C., March 19, 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1959

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, all of us in Congress are interested, I am sure, regardless of our particular party affiliation, in the job of improving the procedures of our American democracy, in stimulating political activity in both political parties at the grassroots level, in encouraging younger people to become more active in the field of practical politics in the party of their choice, and especially in insuring the development of those political forms and procedures in both our parties that make our party operations genuinely reflect the views and opinions of the rank and file members of those parties.

In this connection, I believe that a recent address by a distinguished American and a former Member of the U.S. Senate, Senator Herbert H. Lehman, of New York, made recently at a dinner in Washington, deserves the attention of every Member of this body. Senator Lehman has a long and distinguished career of Government service both in New York State and in the Nation. At a time when many men with his distinguished record behind them have retired to comparative inactivity, Senator Lehman has been connected with a new and active political movement in New York State. Although, as a Member of Congress, I have personally not taken part in this movement, I know that the views of this great American on the working principles of our democracy will be of great interest to the people of our State and to the Nation, and therefore, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the text of Senator Lehman's address:

NEW YORK'S DEMOCRATIC PARTY MUST BE DEMOCRATTIZED

(By Former U.S. Senator Herbert H. Lehman)

This is a familiar forum. In these friendly and familiar surroundings it is hard to resist the temptation merely to reminisce on issues and events of the past. But tonight I am going to resist that temptation, in part at least, because I want to tell you about something very current—about the reform movement now going on within the Democratic Party of New York State.

Many people have asked why I, who seek no fresh honors or prestige, undertake at this point in my life to engage in this hard, thankless, and exhausting job, so alien to my general run of interests. My answer is very simple. I am doing so because I believe that this is one of the most important contributions that I can make to the Democratic Party and to the political life of our State and Nation. To carry on this fight, I have committed a major share of my energies.

If there are present here tonight some New Yorkers who are affiliated in one way or another with the New York State or city organizations and who, for whatever reason, may be opposed to the nature or direction of the efforts which my associates and I are making to rehabilitate the party, I ask their indulgence, for I am going to speak frankly, as is my custom. If I should, by mischance, offend any sensibilities, let me apologize in advance. I know I am a guest here and perhaps I should refrain from speaking on so controversial a subject. But I hope that even those who disagree with me will be interested in what I have to say.

This dinner is being given tonight under the auspices and direction of the New York members of the Women's National Democratic Club. I am proud of these auspices. While I am not quite a States-rights man, in the Dixie sense, I have always been very proud of my State, as most New Yorkers are. It is our home.

But, in addition to this feeling common to all Ameriacns, from whatever State or section, New York has in many ways a very special significance for the Nation. Tonight I will refer only to its political meaning. And since I am speaking to the Women's National Democratic Club, I want to refer to the meaning of New York for the Democratic Party of this country.

I do not really think it is necessary to tell this audience what an important role New York has played in the history—and the achievements—of the Democratic Party. Its leadership in the field of ideas, especially those called liberal, is well known. The great Democrats whom New York has given to the Nation include not only Al Smith and Franklin Roosevelt, but also, out of the latter part of the last century, Samuel Tilden and Grover Cleveland.

Indeed, it is interesting to recall that in 12 out of the 23 presidential elections since the Civil War, the Democratic candidate for the Presidency has been a New Yorker. In the last 10 presidential elections, from 1920 to the present, a New Yorker has been the Democratic candidate for the Presidency in

6. In 9 of the last 10 Democratic presidential conventions, a Democrat from New York was either nominated or was a major contender for the nomination. The sole exception was in 1948, when Harry S. Truman, of Missouri, was nominated by acclamation.

Hence I start from the pardonable assumption that what happens to and within the Democratic Party of New York is important to all Democrats, and to all Americans.

All this is preliminary to my explanation of why Mrs. Roosevelt, Tom Finletter, and I have associated ourselves with a major undertaking to change, among other things, the face and image of New York's Democratic Party as it is today. The present image—based largely on the public impression of the party organization of New York City—is one of bossism and of machine control of party affairs.

This image, as dramatized by the State convention of our party at Buffalo last August, makes it unlikely, in my opinion, that any Democratic candidate for statewide office who is named by the bosses under the present system can be elected in the foreseeable future.

Unless this image is erased, I even question how much influence the New York delegation to the 1960 convention can have in the major decisions of that convention.

These are by no means the only sad results of present-day boss rule of the Democratic Party of New York. The real evils run far deeper. Many New Yorkers have grown so used to some of these evils that they are unconscious of them. But they enter into the vague sense of distaste which many New Yorkers have for party politics, and contribute to the widespread public distrust of the machine.

It is my purpose—and that of my associates in this effort—to focus public attention on the evils of the boss system and thus hopefully to bring about their elimination. I am going to discuss some of them with you tonight.

In the first place, the Democratic Party organization of New York State is an anachronism. It is something out of the past which has survived—and indeed in recent years has grown much worse—while the Democratic Party organizations in most of the other States have followed the tide of the times.

In the New York organization, the power of major political decision has come to rest in fewer and fewer hands—and these hands are those of the party professionals who have no direct responsibility whatever to the registered Democratic voters of the State, not to speak of the general electorate.

In most other States, the Democratic Party organizations have become more and more democratic. In one State after another, the power of the old-line party bosses—the Hagues of New Jersey, the Pendergasts of Missouri, and the Crumps of Tennessee—has been broken upon the rock of public disapproval. From California to Maine, and from Nebraska to Michigan, a new generation of young and vigorous men and women, responsible and responsive to the electorate, has taken over the party organizations. To an increasing extent, party leadership in these States has passed from the old-style party professionals into the hands of elective and elected public officials. In many States today, key party officials are selected at the polls.

Not so in New York. In our State, a party professional, Mr. Carmine DeSapio, has emerged as the chief wielder of political power, the top boss of the entire State organization. In a State with almost 3 million registered Democratic voters, Mr. DeSapio's only elective post in the party is that of district leader of one-third of an assembly district in Manhattan in the Greenwich Village area, a post to which he was reelected in 1957 by the vote of 3,700 Democrats in a contested primary.

Now let me say a few words about Mr. DeSapio and the system over which he presides. In addition to being the district leader of the southern third of the first assembly district, he is also the county leader for New York County, which is the borough of Manhattan. Today Manhattan is actually the fourth in size of the five boroughs of New York City, the larger three being Brooklyn, Queens, and the Bronx. Yet Mr. DeSapio, as the leader of the Manhattan organization, which is Tammany, has achieved de facto supremacy in the party organization of the entire city.

Control over the city organization means, in effect, control of the State organization. The votes of New York City's five county organizations have constituted a clear majority of the votes in past State conventions.

The delegates to State conventions, who generally are nominated by the professional leaders, are not elected on the basis of a pledge, except in a few cases, is to follow pledge to support any particular candidate for public office. Their only pledge, except in a few cases is to follow the leadership of the professionals.

But at most past State conventions, except for the recent Buffalo convention, most decisions have been made in close consultation with the public leaders of the party—above all with the Governor, if there is an incumbent Governor—and also with the mayor of New York City and the U.S. Senators.

The tradition is, and always has been, as far back as I remember, that the publicly elected officials have represented the voice of the people in party decisions, and in the end that voice has usually been respected by the party bosses. From time to time a group of bosses—sometimes representing the majority of the convention votes and sometimes not—has tried to put over one candidate or another in defiance of the views of the public leaders of the party. On a few occasions, the bosses have won. Usually they have lost. I might add that on every occasion I can remember when the bosses have won, the results at the succeeding general election have been disastrous.

But at the Buffalo convention, Mr. DeSapio who in the past had always given careful heed to the public leaders of the party, for the first time used his growing power—not to follow but to oppose and defy the public leaders of the party—in such a flagrant way as to shock the voters of New York State and indeed of the Nation.

Mr. DeSapio was by no means alone in his fault. The other New York City bosses—and a few of the upstate bosses—went along with him in this public demonstration of complete boss control of the convention and of the party organization. The subsequent public reaction against bossism astonished the professionals—and quite a few other people—in New York and in the Nation. To this day, some New York politicians will not face up to the fact that the time is gone when the people will accept the domination of the elective process by party bosses who never were and are not now directly subject to public control.

Some professionals continue to cherish the outdated notion that the people can indefinitely be treated as objects of manipulation and control, rather than as the sovereigns of the political process.

At this point I want to emphasize that I have no personal animosity against Mr. DeSapio. He is a capable party professional, and rather more flexible and enlightened than some others. His defeat or replacement is by no means our major objective. If Mr. DeSapio's removal were to be our sole achievement, it would be a hollow victory. Mr. DeSapio might well be succeeded by somebody who was no better. But Mr. DeSapio is the symbol of bossism in New York today. He has made himself that symbol. Our attack is against the system including the man, not merely the man.

We advocate all the reforms in law and party regulations required to overhaul the system, and the replacement of the organizational leaders who are determined to preserve the system.

One of the bad effects of the system, which is not generally appreciated as being due to the system, is its discouragement of young, talented, and idealistic young men and women from entering public life. The fact that in 1960, for the first time but one since 1916, New York will not have a contender for the presidential nomination is a major reflection of this result of the boss system. In that system promising and capable young men and women simply do not get the chance to show their capacity for statewide and nationwide leadership.

How about Franklin Roosevelt and myself, you might ask. Weren't we "made" by the machine? The answer is "No." Franklin Roosevelt originally came to general public notice in New York and in the Nation as a result of his battle against Tammany in 1911 as leader of a group of Democratic insurgents in the State legislature who successfully opposed Tammany's choice for the United States Senate. In 1928 Al Smith persuaded Franklin Rosevelt to run for Governor. At the same time Al Smith and F.D.R. persuaded me to run for Lieutenant Governor; and in 1932 Franklin Roosevelt and Al Smith strongly supported me for Governor.

I wish I had the time tonight to tell you in detail how violently and desperately the bosses fought my nomination as Governor in 1932. In short, with the support of Franklin Roosevelt, Al Smith and Jim Farley I finally secured the nomination after a desperately hard fight against the leaders of Tammany and their cohorts.

Today the Democratic Party's arsenal of public personalities who could become candidates for top statewide offices is almost as bare as Mother Hubbard's cupboard. Mayor Bob Wagner is one of the very few of the younger Democrats with a statewide reputation. And in the beginning, he too had to be forced by the Liberal Party on an unwilling Tammany as a candidate for borough president. In general, the organization shows a very chilly attitude indeed toward any candidate who has not come up through the maze of clubhouse politics.

Unfortunately most of the clubhouses are closed corporations, which regard with cruel suspicion any young man who is more interested in the burning public issues of the day than in the soothing question of patronage. The pot of gold at the end of the average clubhouse rainbow is not an opportunity for public service but a good patronage job—best of all, a judgeship. Another clubhouse reward is easy access to patronage favors from elected or appointed officeholders. The most lucrative of these favors come from judges, many of whom consider it a routine obligation to receive the recommendations of the organization as to the distribution of receiverships, trusteeships, guardianships and attorneyships in the settlement of estates. In this I am referring to what is perhaps the most evil aspect of all in the machine system—the exposure of the judiciary to political influence.

The very idea of this is scandalously shocking. One of the foremost principles of the American system of government, and the chief bulwark of the rights of our people, is the independence of the judiciary from any control or influence by the executive and legislative branches of the Government. But in New York we have a system for the selection of judges which places the judiciary within the reach and frequently

the control, not of the executive or legislative branches of the Government, but of the professional party politicians—a reach and control far more vicious in its potentialities, and frequently in its practice, than any measure of control by the executive or legislative branches could possibly be.

The drastic reform of this system—of the system whereby judges are in fact selected by the professional politicians and are consequently beholden to them—is one of the prime objectives of our efforts.

I should state at this point that I do not mean to cast anly reflection upon individual members of the New York State judiciary. There are a great many fine, outstanding judges in the State and city of New York. But the system is evil. It must be remedied. We are going to press for the total removal of the judiciary from clubhouse politics. We are going to press for the opening up of the Democratic Party to the young, the ambitious, the courageous and the promising—to people interested in ideas and ideals as well as in personal advancement.

We are going to press for the repeal and amendment of the maze of laws which now makes it almost impossible for an independent or an irregular to run in a primary election unless he is flanked by a force of experienced political technicians versed in the intricacies of election law, to help him find his way past the legal pitfalls that have been dug to discourage political independence or irregularity.

We are going to press for the direct primary for statewide offices so that nomination of candidates for governor and Senator will be by the people rather than by the bosses in convention assembled. The primary system has its defects and shortcomings, but I am convinced that in the long run it is superior to the convention system. Finally, we are going to press for the direct election of key party officials such as county leaders and—in the cities—or the district leaders. Only in Manhattan are district leaders now directly and clearly elected by the party voters—and this is a recent reform. Yet—next to the county leaders—the district leaders are the most powerful figures in the party organization. The district leaders and the county leaders together are the major repositories of the power of the organization.

On that level—in Manhattan, at least, the attack on the machine has already begun. This year there will be primary contests in many of the districts of Manhattan. Groups of young insurgents have organized themselves to give battle to the antireform leaders of Tammany. Our problem is to convince the registered Democrats of New York that participation in the primary election contests for district leader is essential to advance the reform and the democratization of the Democratic Party as a whole.

It was in order to give this movement a citywide and statewide character, with a leadership whose views would command citywide and statewide attention, that Mrs. Roosevelt, Tom Finletter, and I formed the Committee for Democratic Voters.

We have no desire to set up a political organization to rival the present Democratic organization; our aim is to secure the democratization of the existing one. The aim of our committee is to hold up the banner for all to see, and to sound the clarion call for all to hear.

The rest of the undertaking is up to the people—to the young men and women; to the New Yorkers of all ages—from the sidewalks, the tenements, the shops, factories and yes, the farms. It is the people's job to arise and organize; to raise a people's army, that will take over the party and make it the people's organization. We are working and hoping for a young leadership to take over the party organization of New York State.

It is somewhat paradoxical for Mrs. Roosevelt, Tom Finletter and me to be among the leaders of the youth movement in New York politics. But in fact, our aim is to bring out and to develop those who are young in years and young in vigor, with a future ahead of them, to build the foundations of a new Democratic Party organization in our State.

There has already developed a ground swell of interest in this undertaking. Reform is in the air in New York. Many of the organizational leaders have now begun to talk about reform, about a little reform, that is. But we are not going to settle for a little reform. We are going to continue to fight for all the reforms I have enumerated, and to try to make the party organization the instrument of the public will.

This we must do; this we will do, no matter how long it takes us, for the sake of the Democratic Party, for the sake of New York State and of the Nation.

And when I say "we," I mean the people—not Mrs. Roosevelt or Tom Finletter or myself. We are just the voice of the trumpet. This is the people's job—the job of the rank and file of Democratic voters in New York State. And we are going to succeed.

Space Age Projects for the Military Engineer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER NORBLAD
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 11, 1959

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, the inevitable victory of science is our best guarantee of continuing national security. This fact has been driven home to me with increasing clarity. I was present at Patrick Air Force Base and Cape Canaveral at the time of the Titan testing in February 1959, and I availed myself of the opportunity to be present for some of the conferences and discussions on aerospace and flight at the World Congress of Flight held earlier this month in Las Vegas. What I saw on those visits is of national and international significance, as we are adding to the miltary power of the free people in a telling manner—in a world where Communist reliance upon force to achieve its ends yields only to clearly superior force which denies these ends.

Maj. Gen. B. A. Schriever, whose nomination for promotion to lieutenant general was reported favorably by the Senate Armed Services Committee only last week, recently met with the Society of American Military Engineers in Portland, Oreg. He discussed "The Military Engineer in the Space Age." General Schriever has served with distinction as Commander of the Air Force's Ballistic Missile Division and soon will head the Air Force's Air Research and Development Command. His authoritative presentation in Portland was extremely interesting, as he provided a summary of the Air Force ballistic missile program. Additionally, he discussed many of the engineeing problems which the Air Force has faced in readying sites for ballistic missiles. General Schriever clarified a number of questions which occur to one who has an interest in this vital program. From General Schriever's forthright approach, it is obvious that he is completely sensitive to the magnitude and complexity of the problems relating to ballistic missiles, and it is heartening to get a glimpse of the way in which the Air Force has tackled these problems. I recommend that those defense-minded citizens of America who did not have an opportunity to hear General Schriever at Portland, Oreg., be given an opportunity to read his manuscript. For this reason, Mr. Speaker, and under unanimous consent, I include his paper in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

THE MILITARY ENGINEER IN THE SPACE AGE

(Address by Maj. Gen. B. A. Schriever, Commander, Air Force Ballistic Missile Division (ARDC), to the Society of American Military Engineers, Portland, Oreg., April 10, 1959)

Members and guests of the Society of American Military Engineers, it is a pleasure to have this opportunity to talk to you this afternoon about the role of the military engineer in the space age. Before I get into some of the many interesting highlights of what the military engineer role is today—and what I think it will be in the future—I would like to tell you a little about the Air Force ballistic missile program.

The development of the Air Force's ballistic missiles—Atlas, Titan, Thor, and Minuteman—is the largest technical development program in the Nation's history, including the Manhattan project in World War II. Expenditures for fiscal year 1960 alone will approach $2 billion.

Thirty prime contractors are involved in the program—along with over 200 major subcontractors—and about 200,000 suppliers and vendors. The Nation's leading scientists have served as advisors on many intricate problems. These groups along with the people in our military management agencies comprise the unique government-science-industry team that was organized to develop the long-range ballistic missile from scientific theories to operational weapon systems.

The formation of this unprecedented government-science-industry team is characteristic of the Air Force's development philosophy in which a broad spectrum of the Nation's total human and industrial resources are focused on particularly challenging problems.

Our mission was more than the development of a new weapon—the intercontinental ballistic missile. It was also the development of the hardware, the skills, the facilities, the organization and the industrial base for a whole new concept of strategic warfare.

In the past few months, the years of planning and testing and building have begun to pay off. Here is a brief report on the present status of our major projects:

The ICBM Atlas successfully flew the full 6,000-mile distance several months ahead of its original schedule, and will be fully qualified for operational deployment at Vandenberg Air Force Base in California this summer. The Atlas is an intercontinental range ballistic missile—in what can be called the heavy class, since it is capable of delivering very large warheads at very long ranges.

A second and more advanced heavy class ICBM, the Titan, has begun its flight-test phase at Cape Canaveral with three completely successful flights in a row. These three successful first flights establish a new record in missile testing, and are testimony to the ever-growing confidence we have in your designs and our procedures. The Titan was designed at the outset to be stationed in underground silos where it will be able to survive a savage nuclear attack.

I want to emphasize at this point that both of these heavy-class ICBM's, Atlas and Titan, have tremendous growth potential. Their range can be greatly extended beyond the nominal 6,300 statute miles that is usually quoted.

What all of these future improvements add up to—and again I stress that they are already scheduled into our program—is the fact that our heavy-class ICBM's, Atlas and Titan, can have a long and extremely valuable life in the arsenal of the Strategic Air Command. And I am referring to a period of time extending through the entire 1960's.

Our third ICBM project is the Minuteman. The Minuteman will enjoy certain unique advantages: It will use solid propellants. It will be simpler than its forerunners. It will be operated and maintained by fewer personnel. Minuteman missiles will be placed in underground shelters and left unattended for long periods of time, ready to be fired from remote control centers on a few seconds' notice. The Minuteman, moreover, gives promise of being a major economic breakthrough. This missile, we believe, will mark the first case where a more effective weapon will be produced at a lower cost than its immediate predecessors.

It must be remembered, however, that the Minuteman is still in the research and development stage, although it is progressing at a highly gratifying rate.

The Thor, which is capable of delivering a heavy warhead to intermediate ranges of 350 to over 1,700 statute miles has already been deployed in the United Kingdom.

Now, I need not remind this audience that a weapon system is far more than just the missile that flies. In fact, only about 20 percent of a ballistic missile weapon system ever gets off the ground. The remaining 80 percent consists of the ground-support equipment, the personnel, and the technical and supporting facilities needed to operate and maintain the missile. Our approach to the design and development of the GSE and facilities is to regard them as subsystems of the overall weapon system, along with the missile subsystems, the personnel subsystem, the logistical support subsystem, and so forth.

Overlaid on the many unique technical aspects of ballistic missile weapon system development, was a completely unprecedented leadtime requirement. You all know how long it takes to build something. As I will indicate, we have had to build many things and still have much more to do. We haven't the time to perfect the missile and then build. We have had to do it simultaneously. From the outset we have proceeded with all aspects of our program simultaneously—that is, we have been moving forward concurrently with research, development, testing, production, the building of missile bases, crew training and everything else that goes into the making of a combat ready weapon system.

Under this concurrency concept, the construction of bases was actually begun before the first ICBM was launched on an R&D test flight. The construction engineers in our program have to prepare the training and operational bases long before the first missile arrives.

For example, prior to the first successful launch of the Titan test missile from Cape Canaveral on February 6 of this year, an operational suitability test facility had been designed, and its construction was well underway, at Vandenberg Air Force Base. In addition, the design of underground training launchers at Vandenberg and facilities for the first Titan operational squadron near Denver had been completed before the first test missile flew.

At the same time, we have been proceeding with the design and construction of other bases that will be used only as operational sites. This fall, an Atlas squadron base near Cheyenne, Wyo., will have been completed. Facilities for a second squadron of nine launchers at the same site were placed under contract in March, as were those for an Atlas squadron near Omaha, Nebr.

Construction of the first Atlas launchers in the Spokane, Wash., area will begin this month, and for other Spokane sites in June.

Construction will start this month on launchers for a Titan squadron at Lowry Air Force Base near Denver, with work on a second squadron in that area scheduled to begin in June.

Site surveys, soil investigations, and design of additional Atlas and Titan operational squadron facilities at Mountain Home, Idaho; Rapid City, S. Dak.; and Salina, Kans., are currently in progress. Construction work at those sites will commence early this fall.

To give you an idea of the financial scope of this effort, let me quote a few figures, which apply to BMD programs only:

By the close of this fiscal year, we will have placed under contract for construction nearly $900 million to support the production test, training and operational phases of the ballistic missile program. Of this amount, approximately $115 million has been contributed by the missile contractors for expansion of production facilities as an expression of their confidence in the program; $230 million represents the Air Force investment in production equipment and test facilities; and $550 million of military construction funds have gone into test, training and operational bases.

At the outset, it was recognized that the installations aspects of the program could not be accomplished under the normal administrative organization and procedures. In order to tie the designer of the facilities as closely as possible to the developer of the missile, it was decided that the Air Force would directly manage the design work. However, for supervision of the actual construction, we have used those experienced and highly competent construction agencies, the Army Corps of Engineers and the Navy Bureau of Yards and Docks. This arrangement eliminated the need for building up a new Air Force organization of sufficient size to handle the job. The major part of the construction is being very successfully accomplished by the Corp of Engineers, with the Los Angeles district engineer serving as the primary point of contact with BMD.

Colonel Leonhard, as my deputy commander for installations, is responsible for the design and construction of technical and supporting facilities at the test and operational sites. This encompasses the brick and mortar, concrete and steel, pipes and conduits—in short, anything that becomes permanently fixed to the ground. The normal base supporting facilities, such as housing, are provided by the using command.

The primary responsibility of Colonel Leonhard's installation shop is to establish the technical criteria for, and to monitor the work of, the architect-engineer firms retained by the Air Force to design the facilities. Finally, at BMD, we cooperate with the actual construction agency, furnishing guidance and assistance as required. Field offices are maintained at the various operational sites, to perform, among other things, surveillance of the construction.

Our contracting procedures are likewise tailored to weapon systems requirements and to the exceptional scheduling demands imposed on the program. As requirements are generated for a design, architect-engineer firms are selected to definitize the specifications. Selection of A. and E. contractors is made on the basis of ability to perform the type of work required, and to commit adequate talent to a project in order to complete it in the specified time.

After an A. and E. contractor has been selected, he is given a thorough briefing in all areas that are involved in the execution of his design. Briefing material includes Air Force construction standards and basic documents developed for the weapon system. In about 2 weeks he returns to submit his basic concepts of the facility. After these have been reviewed and approved, the next submittal is the preliminary plan, which is reviewed by the weapon system associate contractors for compatibility with the missile. The preliminary plan is also reviewed by SAC for conformity to operational requirements, and by our engineers for technical adequacy and construction feasibility.

The A. & E. contractor prepares final plans and specifications based on the comments of the various reviewing agencies. The final plans go through a review procedure similar to that for the preliminary plans, but not as detailed. This sounds like a long process, but it isn't.

To give you an idea of a typical schedule of a major project, let me take Squadron 2 at Warren Air Force Base near Cheyenne, Wyo., as an example. The A. & E. contractor was given notice to proceed on September 1, 1958; preliminary plans were received on October 10; and final plans and specifications were received on December 31. The programed amount for this facility is $20 million. It was placed under contract in March and will be completed in December of this year.

I hope that this brief review of the organizational and procedural aspects of the installations program gives you some idea of the kind of fast reacting management team we have organized to bring into being an ICBM operational capability at the earliest possible date. The same type of streamlined procedures are being applied in every aspect of the ballistic missile program.

Now I would like to take the few remaining minutes to mention some of the implications of these and similar space-age projects for the military engineer.

Like other professional fields, construction engineering has evolved from relatively straightforward tasks to the precise and complicated projects of today. Not so many years ago the military engineer was a man who built forts. Then, much of his work was simply moving dirt and erecting barricades. With the advent of the air age, the tasks of leveling off landing fields were added, and as the aircraft and their supporting bases became more complex, ever more elaborate facilities and ground equipment came under the cognizance of the military engineer. As you probably know, we Air Force types during World War II in the Pacific thought this was misplaced. Of course, we are aware that a magnificent job was done just as the corps is doing now in the ballistic missile field.

Today, in the missile and pace age, these requirements have multiplied in scope, complexity and—most important of all—in the close interrelationship of every element of the military unit operating on the base.

Today, each ballistic missile launching site must be precisely tailored to fit the particular weapon it is designed for.

As added complications, these installations must be built underground, and designed to withstand the overpressures, ground shock, and radiation associated with nuclear explosions. Launch chambers, control blockhouses, propellant storage and loading systems, radar emplacements, electrical, hydraulic and pneumatic supply lines—all of these facilities, and many more—are a part of the modern military engineer's responsibilities.

Consider the complexity of this in comparison with the design, construction and modification of an airbase—where dimensional requirements are relatively appropriate and flexible, and where the facilities provided will support several types of weapons.

As the military engineer's horizons broaden, his opportunities will increase correspondingly. These opportunities already exist, not only out in the field where his many skills are physically employed, but also in the management of large and complex projects such as the design of a weapon system base.

Those of us who are a part of this demanding present have a right to be proud of our achievements. Those who will have a share in building the future have good reason to be excited by the prospects.

Now finally, I think that these three main principles stand out as the guiding concepts of the Air Force ballistic missile program:

First, the weapon system approach, in which one agency coordinates the development of all the various subsystems—ground support equipment, facilities production, personnel and logistics, as well as the missile itself. This assures us that all of these necessary elements will fit together into an integrated unit.

Second, the concept of concurrency, in which all phases of the design-to-deployment cycle are undertaken simultaneously, rather than consecutively. This has enabled us to cut leadtimes into half of what they would normally have been.

Finally, the streamlining of management organization and procedures. We have established a unique government-science-industry team that has been able to focus a broad spectrum of American genious on the unprecedented problems we face. It is a credit to every government employee, every military officer, every scientist, and to everyone working in the private business firms participating in this team effort, that we have been able to meet or improve on every schedule to date.

The importance and urgency of this vital work is no less than the survival of this Nation and of the entire free world. The deterrent power we are building is a power for peace. We could dedicate our energies and our resources to no finer cause.

Colorado Launches Program Which Can Cut Millions From State's Welfare Expense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BYRON L. JOHNSON
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 14, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, on April 30, during the House discussion of H.R. 6769, the appropriation bill for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, I pointed out to the Members that my own State of Colorado had intiated a welfare program which included a $104,000 experiment to give welfare recipients incentive to find and keep work. I indicated that if a State legislature could be persuaded that this kind of program will pay off, certainly the Congress of the United States should likewise be persuaded.

To further support my statement I should like to bring to your attention a news item from the Rocky Mountain News, of Denver, Colo., dated May 1, which offers additional details:

DENVER TO TRY WELFARE EXPERIMENT

(By David Stolberg)

Governor McNichols Thursday approved legislation which ultimately could slice millions of dollars from Colorado's welfare program.

Happily, it is also aimed at restoring the dignity of self-support to many mothers and needy disabled now on relief rolls.

The law sets up a $104,000 experiment to give welfare recipients incentive to find and keep work.

New York City officials claim they're saving $1,713,000 annually through rehabilitation of 2,677 mothers of dependent children.

TO KEEP PART

In essence, welfare recipients will be allowed to keep a portion of money they earn from jobs.

Once their earning capacity reaches the point where they and their families are considered self-sufficient they will be removed from the welfare rolls.

Some 6,181 ADC families were involved in the 5-year New York City experiment. More than a third no longer depend on relief.

Colorado will be the first to conduct a similar test at the State level. Federal officials have endorsed the program and hinted its success here could lead to a nationwide program.

Under present U.S. law, any wages earned by recipients must be deducted from their relief checks.

The pilot program will be centered on between 50 and 80 Denver cases. The State will assume the share of their relief checks that otherwise would have been paid by Federal grant.

Miss Charline Birkins, director of the city department, said case workers are already selecting ADC mothers and needy disabled who'll be asked to participate.

Miss Birkins said State officials are reviewing a tentative plan to allow jobholders to keep the first $25 of their monthly earnings, plus a fourth of all earnings in excess of $25.

Under the plan, an ADC mother who earns $50 a month would be able to keep $31.25.

CUTOFF POINT

Miss Birkins said the incentive program could give an ADC mother an outside income of up to $225 before she is dropped from the rolls.

The average ADC family now receives $118.13 a month.

The State supports 7,175 ADC families, with about 21,500 children. The caseload has increased almost 10 percent in a year.

There are 5,571 Coloradans averaging $62.73 a month from the aid to the needy disabled program. They've increased 3 percent in a year.

Harry Allen, director of the legislature's joint budget committee, which originated the pilot program, said it represents the first time anybody here has tried to do something at all about welfare, which now costs $75 million a year in Colorado.

"Incentives may not be the answer, but it's certainly worth trying.

"The legislature felt that once you show people they don't have to rely on handouts they no longer will want to be on the rolls. They'd prefer work and independence.

"In so many ADC families," Allen declared, "the mother has no skills and is stranded. Her husband has deserted her. Yet living on $118 a month, which is no cinch, becomes a habit.

"She's afraid to take the first plunge because there's no incentive. Now we may be able to create one."

McNichols is expected to sign a companion bill soon. It will allow a new State rehabilitation department to subsidize job training for welfare recipients, as well as for persons who are physically or mentally handicapped.

Both programs start July 1.

Mr. Speaker, it is my earnest hope that the Senate Appropriations Committee will restore the $1,785,000 requested by the administration for a national program of social security training and studies, for if through cooperative research and study the program can be improved, or recommendations brought back to the Congress for the improvement of the laws with respect to the programs, the taxpayers as well as the recipients will gain immeasurably thereby.

Harry S. Truman: A Man Dedicated to a Better America and a Free World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM J. RANDALL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 7, 1959

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I am very mindful that nothing I may say could ever add to the already great stature of our former President of the United States, Harry S. Truman.

Instead, as the Representative in Congress of his home district, and speaking for all of the people of that district, it is a privilege, to simply say, "Happy birthday, happy diamond jubilee, and may there be many happy returns of the day."

The Fourth Missouri District includes not only Independence, Mo., made famous by its leading son, and home of the Truman Library, but at the southern end of this same district, four counties away is Lamar, Mo., the birthplace of Mr. Truman. There on Sunday, April 19, 1959, this restored home was made a State park. Thousands gathered that day to pay tribute, but in the years to follow this will, in my opinion, become a national shrine, visited annually by increasing thousands of admirers of our great citizen.

It has been my pleasure and distinction to have known him as long as I can remember. I had always known that he was held in high esteem near his home, as a county judge and throughout his native Missouri. When I arrived in Washington, I quickly learned from my colleagues and all those on Capitol Hill that he was loved and much respected by those who had served with him in Congress and those who were here while he lived at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue. Without exception, they speak praisingly of him.

But what always brings a quick reception is at the times when I may make

a casual remark that I am from Independence, Mo. to some men on the street—men without titles, such as the barber, the bellhop, the cab driver. Their faces light up with warm admiration and in their own unsolicited and voluntary way they say, "We like that fellow, Truman."

His appearance, denying the fact that today he is 75 pears of age, his morning walks, his youthful energy leave the impression he is a man 25 years younger than the birth records witness. Let us pray Harry S. Truman will continue, with his perennial enthusiasm as a teacher and counselor, to walk among us, now a statesman of international reputation, giving us freely of his wisdom and experience. A man of great stature and courage, history will increasingly emphasize President Truman safely piloted us through our most crucial times when communism was stretching its ugly tentacles in all directions. With President Truman at the helm, the United States successfully fought communism without involving the United States in war by several of his monumental decisions: Greece and Turkey were spared from the Communist peril by the Truman doctrine; the Marshall plan was the greatest single force in stabilizing the economy of Western Europe and thwarting Communist political victories; the Atlantic Pact added unity to the force against communism; the Berlin airlift saved Berlin from a Russian blockade which could have snuffed out forever her hope of ever attaining a free status.

In the face of bitter criticism and unfavorable popular opinion, President Truman steadfastly and courageously ordered the dropping of the atomic bomb to shorten the war against Japan, a measure militarily sound though not calculated to add to his immediate and unanimous acclaim. This is the test of the man—to proceed to do the right thing even though it may not be the popular thing.

Harry S. Truman is a man of decision—without which we might now be isolated in a Communist-dominated world. For these decisions we are thankful, and again we all hope that we have the benefit of his advice on the many decisions facing us in the future.

I am very honored and extremely fortunate to represent President Truman's district, the Fourth Congressional District of Missouri. To this man of Independence and to this great Missourian I am indebted for wise advice and sincere and valuable counsel. To this great American I take pleasure and pride in extending these birthday felicitations from his fellow Missourians.

U.S.S. "Leyte" Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. DORN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 12, 1959

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Speaker, on May 15, 1959, the gallant carrier U.S.S. *Leyte*—CVS–32—will be decommissioned and thus will close an illustrious and noteworthy career. In honor of the ship and the occasion of her decommissioning, the president of the Borough of Brooklyn has proclaimed May 15 as "U.S.S. *Leyte* Day."

PROCLAMATION HONORING THE DECOMMISSIONING THE U.S.S. "LEYTE" (CVS–32)

Whereas the gallant U.S.S. *Leyte* (CVA–32) was commissioned on April 11, 1946, and named in commemoration of the largest naval engagement in history; the battle of Leyte Gulf; and

Whereas the *Leyte* in the spring of 1951 at the outbreak of Korean hostilities was urgently dispatched from Beirut, Lebanon to the Far East, 18,500 miles distant and did report to the Commander, Seventh Fleet in record time ready for battle; and

Whereas the *Leyte* did operate for 108 days in the Korean area—of these 92 at sea and 52 consecutively, the record for any carrier in the conflict. Her brave crew supporting her pilots who flew 3,933 sorties from her decks for a total of 11,000 hours in the air inflicting awesome and telling damage upon the enemy; and

Whereas the *Leyte* returned home late in January 1951 proudly carrying the Navy Unit Citation and Korean Presidential Citation; and

Whereas in the spring of 1953 the designation of *Leyte* was changed from CVA (attack carrier) to CVS (support carrier) she being the first to be so designated and the first to engage in operations against a nuclear submarine resulting in tangible recognition of her ability and diligence by being awarded in August 1958 with the prized Navy battle efficiency pennant as the outstanding ship of her class; and

Whereas the *Leyte*, the oldest Navy carrier in active service with half a million miles behind her in which she launched and recovered 70,000 planes; and

Whereas Comd. Jefferson Kennedy, Jr., U.S. Navy, outstanding commanding officer of the *Leyte* will this date at the New York Naval Shipyard in Brooklyn, the traditional Navy city, decommission the leading *Leyte* to assume his new duty station with the Chief of Naval Operations;

Now therefore, I, John Cashmore, do proclaim May 15, 1959 as U.S.S. *Leyte* (CVS–32) day in the Borough of Brooklyn and do urge all the people of the community to display the National Emblem in honor and recognition of the gallant officers and crew—living and dead—who served United States and her grateful people so courageously on the great Fighting Lady—U.S.S. *Leyte* (CVS–32).

HISTORY OF THE U.S.S. "LEYTE" (CVS–32)

In the fall of 1944 off a small island in the South Pacific was fought the largest naval engagement of history, the Battle of Leyte Gulf. The turning point of the war in the Pacific occurred at Midway, but it was at Leyte Gulf that the backbone of the Japanese Imperial Fleet was irreparably crushed.

Shortly thereafter work began at Newport News, Va., on the construction of a giant new Essex-class carrier, which was to be named in commemoration of this battle.

The ship was launched in 1945 with Mrs. Alice Dillon Mead breaking the traditional bottle of champagne against her bow. On April 11, 1946, completed and ready for sea she was commissioned and officialy named the U.S.S. *Leyte*. Her side number 32.

The maiden voyage of the *Leyte* took her through the Panama Canal and hence to the west coast of South America for a good will tour on behalf of the U.S. Government. The proud new carrier flew the flag of Adm. Marc Mitscher, the task group commander. The years 1946 to 1949 were swiftly consumed with three Mediterranean cruises and numerous fleet exercises. During this time she served as flagship for COMCARDIV 4 flying the two stars of the division commander.

In the spring of 1950, the *Leyte* again put on her 7-league boots, stood out of her home port, Quonset Point, R.I., for another Mediterranean cruise which was to prove itself far different from others she had experienced.

The outbreak of Korean hostilities found the ship in Beirut, Lebanon. Upon urgent dispatch she immediately set sail for the Far East. 18,500 miles later covered at a record average speed of 23 knots, she reported for duty to Commander, Seventh Fleet.

The night was spent in refueling. The following day she was launching her jets at the advancing North Korean Army. For 108 days she operated in the Korean area. Of these 92 were spent at sea—52 consecutively—the record for any carrier in the conflict. Pilots from her decks flew 3,933 sorties for a total of 11,000 hours in the air, inflicting massive damage upon the enemy. Her planes were credited with one of the first kills of a MIG 15 aircraft and one of her pilots, Lt. (jg) Thomas J. Hudner, received the prized Congressional Medal of Honor. This was the job for which she was built, and impressively did she perform it.

The ship returned home in late January 1951 carrying with it the Navy Unit Citation and the Korean Presidential Citation. Next came a long overdue yard overhaul in Norfolk, Va. Following this she left again for her fifth Mediterranean cruise.

In the spring of 1953 the *Leyte* entered the Boston Naval Shipyard for extensive overhaul and repair in preparing her for a new role. The designation of the *Leyte* was changed from CVA (attack carrier) to CVS (support carrier). She was the first to be so designated.

During this yard period, disaster struck. On October 15 at 1515 there was an explosion in the port catapult machinery room killing 32 and injuring scores more. The *Leyte* crew began at once the process of repairing their torn and crippled ship. Three months later a still sad but proud *Leyte* stood out of Boston Harbor on its way to a new career as an antisubmarine carrier. The warrior had turned sentinel.

Following a shakedown cruise to Guantanamo Bay the *Leyte* loaded aboard the then brand new S2F type aircraft for their first operational employment. The rest of the year was spent learning her new field of antisubmarine warfare.

1955 saw the *Leyte* engaging in three fleet exercises and making her sixth voyage to the Mediterranean. During this time she was chosen to be the flagship of Commander Carrier Division 18, an honor she retained for the remainder of her active service.

Leyte used her final 3 years for continuous work in the ASW field. As a CVS her role was that of the nucleus of a hunter-killer force consisting of a squadron of destroyers, herself and embarked air group with the combined mission of detecting, hunting, killing enemy submarines. This she did with the proficiency and skill of a master of her trade. She was the first carrier to engage in operations against nuclear submarines and was the forerunner and major contributor in the evolution of the tactics of hunter-killer forces opposing nuclear submarines. Her diligence and ability were tangibly recognized when in August 1958 she was awarded the Navy's prized Battle Efficiency Pennant as the outstanding ship of her class.

In January 1959 *Leyte* entered the Brooklyn Naval Shipyard for decommissioning. On May 15 the proud leading *Leyte* having steamed approximately half a million miles in which she launched and recovered 70,000 planes, was finally retired.

But the preceding are just facts and statistics behind which lies a legend greater than her accomplishments. There are certain ships which for no apparent reason are selected by fate to hold a special place among those which go down to sea. And this was the lot of the *Leyte*. From the infancy of

her commissioning to her last days on the line, the reputation of the ship and her crew was that of one which regardless of the duty assigned would serve with distinction. Her crew always took pride in a very special manner, for they sensed, as only a sailor can, flexibility, the preparedness, and the consistent ability to perform the impossible that constituted the character of the leading *Leyte*. Their spirit is legend. Now her days are over, and as the oldest Navy carrier in continuous active service the rest to which she retires is well deserved. Her place is taken on the line by the great new supercarriers the fledgling *Independence* and still embryonic *Constellation* and yet her loss will be sorely felt. She was a fighter and a steamer. What more can be said of any ship?

The Great Menace to American Children: What You Can Do About It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 14, 1959

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by the Honorable Arthur E. Summerfield, Postmaster General of the United States, before the conference of women leaders of civic, educational, parent, and religious organizations and women Members of the Congress and Government agencies, Washington, D.C., May 12, 1959:

THE GREAT MENACE TO AMERICAN CHILDREN: WHAT YOU CAN DO ABOUT IT

I want to thank you for taking the time to join us today.

I know that your schedules are full and that you are very busy. But we have asked you to be with us because we want to discuss a very serious matter with you.

We know how intelligently, how tenaciously and yes, how successfully American women can organize to fight evil.

We know that, in your positions of leadership in important organizations, as parents, and as citizens, you can be of great help to us in meeting a problem of growing concern to all of us.

I want to discuss this problem with you frankly, tell you what we are doing about it, and ask for your personal support, and the assistance and cooperation of the organizations you represent.

There is flourishing in this country today a vile racket of huge proportions about which the public is not too well informed.

This racket involves the use of the U.S. mails for the wholesale promotion and conduct of mail-order business in obscene and pornographic materials.

I say it is huge advisedly. We can estimate at present that the sale of these materials through the mails is running at more than $500 million a year.

The especially vicious aspect of this racket is the fact that these purveyors of filth are aiming their attention more and more at the Nation's children—teenage boys and girls, and even younger.

With complete arrogance, they are violating the homes of the Nation in defiance of the Federal Government.

They are dumping pornographic sewage into the hands of hundreds of thousands of our children, through the family mail box—most of it material that has not been ordered—material intended to solicit the sale of utterly obscene pictures, slides, films, and related trash.

How do these merchants of filth obtain the names and addresses of children?

They have any number of ways. One of the most common is to offer, in a legitimate ad in a normal publication, the sale of a product of interest to a boy or girl. This would be stamps, or model airplanes, or doll clothes, and the like. These items are frequently offered at bargain prices.

The child, usually with the parent's assistance, sends for and receives the item. Now the smut dealer has the name on his list, and soon the child is receiving lewd solicitations through the mail.

These racketeers also buy prepared mailing lists of children's names, of which there are many. They even go to the extent of gathering up high school year books, from which they take names and match them up with addresses in city telephone books.

Recently, we conducted a raid in New York City in which we confiscated 17 tons of highly obscene printed and filmed materials. The producer of these materials had in his possession a mailing list of names and addresses of 100,000 persons, including many high school students.

If you were to read some of the solicitation material that these debauched persons send to the children, I believe you would be sickened.

You would also be deeply disturbed to read the letters our postmasters receive from parents. Such letters for example as one from a mother who write: "The enclosed material was received by my son, age 8 years, a few days ago. Is there anything that can be done to stop this?"

The material sent to the 8-year-old boy began with the statement: "I am writing to you as a person interested in collecting all types of art photography of nudes."

Or like the letter which read: "Is there anything that can be done about literature like the enclosed? This is a mother's plea to you to do all in your power to stop the flow of this filth from seeping into our homes. Thank you for anything you can do to protect my 10-year-old girl."

Or the letter which stated: "I am enclosing a folder sent to boys at our camp. Is there any way that this terrible literature and its source can be destroyed?"

It is apaprent that many children, without parental attention, do fall into the trap of ordering such material, for the filth merchants regard their traffic with children as a major and growing part of their highly lucrative business.

Most parents who intercept these solicitations in the mail are, of course, shocked and greatly concerned. Last year, our Postal Inspection Service investigated 14,000 complaints about obscenity in the mails. Nearly two-thirds of these complaints were from parents objecting to the receipt of lewd material by their adolescent children.

In the case of a single mailing by one purveyor of filth, over 5,000 complaints were received, and all but 3 were from parents protesting mailings to their children.

On the basis of all the facts we have, our inspection service estimates that probably 700,000 to 1 million children this year will receive such invitations to depravity through the mails.

This is big business. It thrives on the curiosity of adolescents. It has no boundaries based upon social position, religion, race or location. Your child, or the child next door, may be on a list. If not, he—or she—may get on one. For the lists are expanding. Nobody is immune. Obscene mail is addressed to both sides of the track. It finds its way into orphanages. It is addressed to children as young as 8 years.

Yes, their parents will be worried—and well they should be. For it is well known to law enforcement groups that juvenile delinquency stems in measurable part from the demoralizing influence of exposure to obscenity and pornography.

Consider this, if you will, in the light of a recent report on delinquency by a Senate subcommittee. The report states that one out of every five boys in this country, of ages 10 to 17, has a court record, charged with breaking the law.

Again and again, in the investigations of armed robbery, extortion, embezzlement, and forgery, authorities find that those guilty of these crimes were early collectors of obscene pictures and films.

And it is well known that almost all sex criminals and sex murderers prove to have a long record of addiction to pornographic and sadistic material. Your children may never be exposed to this material. But they could be victims of sex criminals who have been exposed to it.

Let us quote from the report of the Senate subcommittee that studied this problem:

"There is a peculiar resemblance to narcotics addiction in exposure of juveniles to pornography. There is the same pattern of progression. Once initiated into a knowledge of the unnatural, the impressionable young mind with the insatiable curiosity characteristic of those reaching for maturity inevitably hunts for something stronger, something with more 'jolt,' something imparting a greater thrill.

"The dealer in pornography is acutely aware of this progessive facet; his array of material to feed this growing hunger is carefully geared to the successive stages. Like the peddler of narcotics, his only interest is to insure that his customers are 'hooked', he knows that once they are 'hooked' they will continue to pay and pay."

It is clear the Congress is concerned with this problem. Much good should come from the hearings now being held by the House Post Office and Civil Service Subcommittee On Obscene Literature, headed by Congresswoman KATHRYN E. GRANAHAN.

I am sure you also will agree that this, indeed, is a problem that must be met. I personally am both revolted and incensed by this depraved, arrogant and poisonous attack on the minds of our children. These feelings are shared, I can assure you, by our postmasters around the country and by my associates in the Post Office Department.

We recognize that there is urgent need for positive action now. We are, therefore, in effect, declaring war on these purveyors of filth, big and little, high and low.

We are launching an intense and unrelenting effort to stop this monstrous assault on the Nation's children in every way possible.

And let me say we are confident that, with adequate public support, this job can be done.

I do not mean to imply at all, of course, that the Post Office Department is only now awakening to this problem.

The records show quite clearly that the Post Office, over the years, has diligently tried to keep the mails clear of indecent material. It has done so even while subjected to attack and ridicule by those who hope to benefit personally from obscene mailings, and by those who, confusing liberty with license, unwittingly give them assistance.

Investigations conducted by our postal inspectors, in fiscal 1958, caused the arrest of 293 persons. Our General Counsel issued 92 orders barring use of the mails.

The arrests last year were 45 percent above the previous year, and this year they will increase substantially again.

Congress, as far back as 1865, made it a Federal offense to mail obscene matter.

The Post Office has lent its fullest support to such legislation. But nevertheless, com-

mercialized pornography has continued to grow.

It has expanded tremendously since World War II.

It has doubled in just the past 5 years alone.

Especially, as I have pointed out, the effort has been to expand the market through sales to children.

There appear to be two basic reasons for this rapidly growing volume:

First, the huge profits realized from a relatively small capital investment; and second, the very broad definition of obscenity handed down by certain courts, notably in Los Angeles and New York, where the great bulk of the mail order business in obscenity and pornography originates.

These liberal rulings have established, over a period of time, virtual sanctuaries in which dealers of obscenity have operated with impunity and in defiance of justice.

We in the Post Office for several years have strongly urged legislation which would permit prosecution not only at the points of mailing of obscene material, but in the communities where it is received—where the real damage is done—and where citizens have an opportunity to express their standards of morality and decency.

Such legislation was passed by the 85th Congress and signed into law by President Eisenhower last year. It is, we believe, among the most important legislation adopted in recent years.

We have pressed, and are determined to press, its use to the fullest possible extent. The first case following this legislation was at Boise, Idaho, and it had to do with mailings made from California and Oregon. The offenders, a man and his wife, each received a 10-year prison sentence and a fine.

Similar cases are now pending. And I would like to say that a goodly series of stiff sentences of that kind can go a long way toward discouraging other such people from further mailings of their degenerate trash to children.

To make full use of this new legal weapon, however, the Post Office must have the cooperation of parents and decent-minded citizens everywhere. Without such cooperation on a broad and resolute scale, we are under great handicap.

As you know, the absolute privacy of the mail is one of our basic American rights. The Post Office Department cannot, and will not, violate this right, even when it has strong evidence that the mail is being used for unlawful purpose. I, for one, believe fully in this right.

The Post Office, therefore, can legally identify and take action against violators of the mails only on the complaints of citizens who receive such material.

Let me repeat that point: We can act only after the recipient of obscene mail has opened that mail, and the material has been forwarded to the local postmaster as evidence.

To achieve this cooperation on the largest possible scale, our intensified program for action is fourfold:

1. To draw maximum public attention to the menace of this racket.

2. To urge parents to help us apprehend the mailers of filth to their children.

3. To help mobilize community support behind adequate law enforcement of local ordinances or State laws when these purveyors are apprehended and brought to court.

4. To rally public opinion behind new and stiffer legislation on obscenity.

Obviously there is going to be less likelihood of putting dealers in obscenity out of business if they are not given the book when they are caught.

Unfortunately, giving them the book is not easy. Most of these smut merchants make such profits that they are able to retain high-priced lawyers who know all the tricks.

And these gentlemen all too often have used the tricks of hamstringing, delaying, and confusing action until their clients have gone free or received only small prison terms or fines. Unperturbed, the peddlers have been back in their racket under a new name within days.

They are also experts at raising a hue and cry about "censorshsip," "freedom of the press," and "civil liberties." And all too often they are able to find willing pawns to take up their cry and carry on their slimy battle for them.

This, of course, is utter nonsense. I would only ask any such misguided person these questions:

Is it a violation of civil liberties to deny the sale of liquor to a 10-year-old boy?

Is it censorship to prosecute those who sell narcotics to junior high-school girls?

Are we abridging civil liberties when we do not permit children to drive a car?

I am sure the answers, and the point to be made, are quite clear.

Peddling pornographic poison to children is a heinous crime. And that community which does not punish the criminal to the full extent of the law is failing its duty—failing just as surely as if it were to allow sales to children of liquor or dope.

Now, what is likely to happen if we do not rid ourselves of this social cancer?

First, we may as well concede that the obscenity business, with its vast revenue, will be taken over by organized crime, to a far greater extent.

It will become a gigantic organized racket far beyond even its present scope, with millions more of our children its principal victims.

The undermining of the moral fiber of the Nation's children will spread; with the poisoning of increasing millions of minds.

Sex crimes will be a spreading blight on our society, and will become far more prevalent than they are today.

And overall, we could expect an ultimate breakdown of order and decency in this country.

My friends, I am not asking you simply to "view with alarm." I am asking you to view with deep conscience, deep concern, and determination.

Thorough action must be taken now. I am asking you to take part. You have both the opportunity and—I would dare to say—the responsibility for joining with the Post Office in this drive.

Help us to alert parents across the country. Help us through your organizations, and your publications, and by your individual efforts. Let the parents of America know what to do on any day that obscene mail arrives in their home.

The process is very simple.

First, parents should save all materials received including the envelopes and all enclosures.

Second, parents should report the material immediately to their local postmaster and turn the materials over to him, either in person or by mail.

Finally, all citizens, whether or not their children have been touched with this filth, can help by backing up Members of Congress and local officials in their growing efforts to stamp out this evil.

I urge you to carry this message to the other officers of your organizations, and to your local chapters. Urge your local members to enlist the support of religious and educational leaders, newspaper editors, and citizen groups in their communities. The task calls for everyone who can, and will, contribute effort and dedication to it.

I pledge to you that the Post Office Department will lead the way. And if the American people are made properly aware of this challenge, I am confident—as I know you are—that the challenge will be firmly and successfully met.

Secretary Benson's Report on Rural Development Program Workshop Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARCH A. MOORE, JR.
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 14, 1959

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, by now it is quite evident to all that the present outmoded farm program, in existence since the great depression with few modifications, does not help the small farmer. Its major benefits go to the big operators.

What has been needed all these years is a program that will help the small family agricultural units which produce so little that they cannot obtain commodity loans or other assistance. Such a program is now in operation. It is the rural development program.

Through it rural communities are enlisting the cooperation of Federal and State agencies, business and educational groups, churches and civic organizations in a concentrated drive to help those on the lower rung of the economic ladder.

What it is accomplishing, where it should go, were pointed out in a speech delivered on May 11 by Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson at Jackson's Mill 4–H Camp, Weston, W. Va. Without objection I offer that speech to the RECORD, for I believe there is information here which will hearten every American who is interested in the welfare of rural communities:

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE EZRA TAFT BENSON, RURAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM WORKSHOP CONFERENCE

It is a genuine privilege and pleasure to meet with you this evening.

Let me say at the outset that I am attending this opening session of your extremely important and timely Rural Development Conference principally to meet as many of you as possible, and to learn your ideas regarding the rural development program.

You are a select group of people—you are in the true sense a pioneering group.

Several weeks ago the Nation paid deserved attention to seven young men of our Armed Forces selected as astronauts. One of these young men is expected to be the first American to rocket into orbit around the earth.

He and his colleagues are pioneers of the space age.

I say that, in a very significant sense, many of you in this room are pioneers also. You are pioneering new methods of solving farm problems. You are working to bring about long-needed adjustments in many of our rural areas. You are exploring better ways of helping rural people make the changes—the adjustments—they desire in their own best interests.

Problems of space travel are awesome. They stagger the imagination. They command the attention of the Nation and the world.

However, there's still a lot of pioneering to do right here on the ground. It isn't glamorous. It commands little attention. But it's tremendously important to the welfare of the United States. Some would question whether the problem of putting a manned satellite into orbit is so much

more challenging than the social and economic problems facing the Nation.

Day-to-day leadership in rural area development programs is one of the hard, unpublicized jobs so vital to the Nation.

Those of you working with these programs are performing one of the most difficult assignments in the entire agricultural area.

We commend the initiative and imagination all of you have shown in carrying forward this work. We commend you on your many accomplishments.

And I am sure you would agree that the wisdom, experience, and dedication of Under Secretary Morse and Dean Harry J. Reed have provided the spark and spirit to keep the program growing and national in scope.

In recent weeks, we have heard some criticism that the rural development program has not moved fast enough.

As usual, the best reply to such criticism is to examine the record.

In April 1955, President Eisenhower submitted to the Congress a report on underemployed farm families—a large problem segment in agriculture. The President also recommended a coordinated attack on the problem. As you know, this report, entitled "Development of Agriculture's Human Resources," was more than a year in preparation. It was prepared by the best Government technicians in the field, with the advice and aid of private individuals and organizations working in the field of agriculture.

Late in 1956 the administration finally received a small appropriation to begin the program on a pilot or test basis. The amount received was roughly half of what we requested. As late as the first part of 1957, less than 25 rural counties were going forward with organized programs. In quite a few States Rural Development was just in the planning stage at that time.

Today, some 2 years later, 30 States are participating. Twelve of these have broad area programs under way or planned. Some 200 rural counties are presently involved in the operation or planning of this work.

In addition, I am gratified to report, interest in rural, resource, and area development programs has spread to many States other than the 30 officially listed as in the program.

National awareness of the rural development program has grown apace.

There has been greater interest in this session of the Congress than at any time since the program started. It now has extensive bipartisan support. In my judgment this support will increase with the passing of time.

The farm press and the great newspapers of the Midwest, the South, and Midsouth, especially, have reported extensively on the program.

Growing numbers of national research groups are studying our experiences—your experiences—with the program.

Do not underestimate the value and importance of this national attention and discussion. Nothing gets accomplished in a democracy unless the people and their representatives know about it, and are persuaded to support it.

Only a few weeks ago, Representative WILLIAM H. NATCHER, a Member of the Kentucky congressional delegation and of the House Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations, called the rural development program in his district the true American dream of self-help, progress, and independence.

Congressman NATCHER has well stated the real meaning of the rural development program. It is indeed democracy in action, out where it counts, at the grassroots.

Your efforts to make this idea work can influence profoundly the future course of our Nation. By bringing local leaders to the fore, this program can help reverse the trend toward centralization in government, in economic development, in dealing with the vast problems that confront local communities, both rural and urban.

In recommending the rural development program, we were determined that rural leaders would have an opportunity to take the lead in program development at the local level. This was not to be just another government program, with Washington calling the tune. The aim is to encourage local initiative and enterprise, not to put a bridle on them.

Without a doubt, the record of the program in just two short years is remarkable.

I use the term advisedly. The record is remarkable in relation to the many difficult problems involved in getting this work under way.

I know of no other program on the national scene which involves so many different groups and interests. No other program is attempting to cope with such a chronic domestic problem as rural resource adjustment.

Results in just a short time are gratifying. I am especially impressed by the many sound projects already carried to completion in program areas throughout the Nation. The list is a long one:

A new health clinic in one of the Kentucky program counties.

Milk processing plant in northern Mississippi.

Hardwood industries in eastern Maine, Wisconsin, and other States.

Conservation and land drainage in a South Carolina county.

Construction of new manufacturing plants in several States.

A vegetable packing plant and shed in North Carolina.

Added educational and training opportunities in Washington and Missouri.

Swine improvement and marketing in northern Minnesota.

Tourist industry promotion in Michigan.

Expansion of livestock production in Louisiana.

And hundreds of other projects I haven't time to mention, all the result of action by local people, utilizing rural development program personnel and services.

However, we are attending a workshop session, not a pep rally. I am going to speak frankly for a few minutes about the great responsibility all of you bear to farm people and the Nation as a whole, as you help carry forward these rural development programs.

A campaign to promote balanced farm, industry, and community development cannot be a halfhearted operation. All leadership in rural areas must become involved. This most certainly includes the able, skilled workers who staff the county agent's office, FHA, SCS, ASC, local health, welfare, and education offices, county governments, and industry boards.

These latter agencies, working outside the strictly agricultural field, bear an important responsibility in the program.

It is understandable that rural people would turn to farming improvement as the principal method of adding income. But I am concerned that this aspect of the Rural Development Program, important as it is, may receive too much emphasis to the neglect of other opportunities.

In many areas, true enough, the field is wide open to improve incomes through betterment of agricultural production and practices.

But I would be remiss in my responsibility to you this evening if I did not caution that local leaders who force agricultural improvement to bear the whole weight of the Rural Development Program may be doomed to disappointment.

Promotion of rural inustries, off-farm jobs, and revised educational programs must also receive equal emphasis. Indeed, in some areas, these are the core of sucessful rural development programs.

Let's not put all our eggs in one basket.

In many rural areas, we still are not helping our young people prepare themselves for the wide range of opportunities they most certainly will encounter in a growing, fast-changing America.

Let me give you an example. One of the State universities cooperating with the Department of Agriculture recently completed an educational study in three rural development counties. Less than 20 percent of the boys interviewed in these areas intended to stay in farming. Yet, in the words of the study, "none of the boys and girls interviewed indicated they had ever taken a course in trade and industrial education in high school."

I cite this example because it illustrates very well a situation that is widespread. According to recent estimates, approximately 65 percent of boys and girls growing up in rural areas will not find opportunities on the farm—on any kind of farm.

We are not downgrading agriculture when we face up to this fact. A lot of young people in rural communities will be able to find jobs in industries related to agriculture. Handling, marketing, selling, processing, financing, and the like.

For example, about 15,000 new jobs for college graduates are created in agriculture each year. Our land-grant colleges graduate only 8,500 students to fill these openings.

Are the fine rural youngsters in your areas getting the counseling, advice, and education they need to meet the challenge of the future? Each of us here needs to face this question squarely.

As leaders in farming communities and rural towns, you have a duty and a mission.

Whether in the field of agriculture, or education, or industrial development, you have been trained to analyze facts, to develop sound plans based on conditions as they exist, not as you would like them to be. Facing facts is the mark of the leader, of the educated person, of the scientist.

I am concerned that in too many rural communities, local farm, business, civic, church, and other leaders are not getting the benefit of your analysis and insight.

It seems to me that what we need in rural development program areas, as well as throughout rural America, is more attention to broad national trends in agriculture affecting the local community, plus resource adjustment in the light of these trends.

We could not stop technological change in agriculture, even if we were foolish enough to try. But through neglect and through unrealistic programs we can hinder many of our rural communities and farm families in adjusting rapidly to these trends. Lack of information, misdirected assistance, a failure of imagination, all these can disarm our rural communities and leave them unprepared to meet future conditions.

There are many needs to be met: Encouragement of economic family farm units. Vigorous promotion of rural industries. Career counseling for young people. Sound programs of industrial training in schools. Zoning. Closer town-country cooperation.

Some of these activities may not be popular in rural communities. But those who see the need, and yet keep silent are simply not doing their duty.

All of you working in the Nation's rural areas know that the farm picture is far more complex than some politicians would like to have it appear.

Many farm families are doing well today. These are the families on the more productive, well-managed commercial farms and ranches. They help produce the 91 percent of farm products going to market.

Last year farm operators' realized net income rose to $13.1 billion, the highest in 5 years, and a gain of 20 percent over the previous year.

In the commercial sector of agriculture, we do have a rapidly changing, dynamic, and generally prosperous agriculture, which is undergoing an irreversible, technological revolution.

Our farm laws must be revised to cope with these current conditions.

In January, therefore, the President recommended to the Congress forthright changes in our farm price supports. He urged that price supports no longer be related to a standard 45 years old, but to a percentage of the average market price during the immediately preceding years.

If the Congress still prefers to keep existing parity standards, the President urged that the Secretary be given discretion to establish the support level for all commodities in accordance with guide lines fixed by law. This is now permitted for all of the 250 commercially produced commodities except the 16 for which supports are mandatory.

We definitely favor the first of these—price supports related to a percentage of the average recent market price.

Either of these changes would be constructive, however. Under either course, the surplus could be reduced, the cost cut, production controls relaxed and markets developed. Our farm people could make more of their own decisions. The Government could resume its proper function of promoting farm research, expanding and developing markets, protecting soil and water resources, improving farm credit, and promoting area economic growth. We would help stabilize markets, not price ourselves out of them.

Under the present, outmoded program we are trying to price abundant farm products as if they were scarce. This cannot be done without piling up surpluses.

The evidence of 25 years says that we cannot balance supply and demand by means of present acreage controls.

We cannot solve this farm problem by programs which destroy markets and which channel farm products into storage. A warehouse is not a market. A storage bin is not a customer.

The economics of the farm problem on our commercial, high-production farms is simple—we need less government in farming. We must quit trying to fix prices unrealistically. This is the source of the twin evils of production for Government warehouses and Government control over farmers. We must emphasize markets, increased efficiency, and competitive selling. We must eliminate Government's stranglehold on commercial agriculture.

Based on the mail we have received and on contracts from all over the country, I say bluntly that the overwhelming majority of agricultural economists and other students of this problem endorse what we are trying to do as sound and best for agriculture.

A recent survey of agricultural economists at our 49 land-grant colleges has just been published. Of the 37 economists replying, 4 out of 5 say that "any laws further hamstringing the free market will hurt the farmer, the consumer, and the Nation."

And farmers endorse it too.

One of the largest national farm magazines recently invited farmers to tell Congress what to do about price support programs.

This nationwide poll showed that 8 out of 10 of the farmers want greater freedom and less Government in farming.

In the referendum of December 1956, 61 percent of the corn farmers voted for lower support and increased acreage.

Last November corn farmers voted by almost 3 to 1 to eliminate corn acreage allotments and lower the level of price supports.

Even more recently, about 70,000 cotton growers chose the "B" program with 15 parity points less price support in exchange for a 40 percent increase in acreage.

Farmers want more freedom.

The early enactment of realistic, beneficial farm legislation would be of great value to commercial agriculture and the entire national economy.

It would give farmers the freedom they desire to produce for markets, instead of Government bins and warehouses.

However, I have been discussing programs that have their major impact in the commercial sector of American agriculture. As all of you know, at first hand, this is only half the picture.

The other half is made up of part-time farmers, residential farmers, those on poor soil often in isolated areas, those handicapped by age or illness, families with limited resources.

As President Eisenhower observed in 1954:

"The chief beneficiaries of our farm programs have been the 2 million larger, more productive farm units. Production on nearly 3 million other farms is so limited that the families thereon benefit only in small degree from the types of programs that heretofore have dominated our activities."

This broad segment of our farm and rural population have largely been neglected. These families cannot be served effectively by programs designed primarily for commercial agriculture. Most of them gain little, if any, benefits from price supports and Government commodity stabilization programs.

Underemployment—not surpluses and markets—is their big problem.

They need opportunity to obtain off-farm work to supplement farm income. They need adjustments which will permit able farmers to obtain land and other resources to do an adequate job of production. They need better and broader opportunities for their young people. They need educational programs to prepare them for a wide variety of jobs in an expanding economy.

It appears indefensible that this Nation should devote such a large increment of public programs and services in the field of agriculture to the benefit of less than half our farmers.

More of our resources—personnel skills and available funds—must be directed toward meeting the special needs of small farmers, part-time farmers, aged, and disabled farm people, and those with limited land and capital.

Why should publicly supported programs provide most of their benefits for the minority of farmers who need help the least?

More and more the public and the press are asking this fundamental question.

Recently, for example, the highly respected editor of the Atlanta Constitution, Ralph McGill, asked in his column, "Who are the farmers?" He discussed the two broad groups of farmers in the Nation, and termed the 56 percent producing little for market as the hard core of the farm problem. "But they are the human core, and as such, deserve a program," he wrote.

Let's concentrate our skills and services on helping the neglected majority of the Nation's farm people.

I am calling on all agency heads concerned in the Department of Agriculture to reappraise the role of their agencies in the rural development program, with a view to speeding and perfecting this work.

I also propose to explore with deans of agriculture their ideas on how to bring about closer State and National cooperation to move the program forward more rapidly.

Rural and resource development programs offer the best chance of preserving the rural environment and strengthening small-scale farming in this Nation.

As President Eisenhower has stated, "Such programs deserve the awareness and support of all Americans."

I urge you to utilize the opportunity of this conference to strengthen and improve the work now going forward, and just as important, to seek ways of expanding such programs and broadening their impact in rural America.

God speed your efforts.

Soviet Trade Offensive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1959

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, the Soviet trade offensive is a matter of grave concern to the entire free world for there is no doubt that the Soviets are going all out to further their nefarious plans.

As an indication of the scope of the Soviet economic campaign, they are reported to be readying an assault on the consumer market in the United States itself. Under leave to extend my remarks I am enclosing an article which appeared in the May 10, 1959, Washington Star discussing the Soviet plans to invade our markets. The article follows:

[From the Washington Star, May 10, 1959]

CONSUMER DRIVE HERE MAPPED BY SOVIETS

(By Neil R. Regelmbal)

A day may come when Russian consumer goods—watches, costume jewelry, pens, and lighters, even appliances and automobiles—will be displayed in U.S. store windows.

It won't come for several years. But the Russians are already casting a longing look at the American consumer dollar.

Top Soviet economic planners have filled their new 7-year plan with programs which add up to a massive economic war on the free world. For the first time, these include not only assaults on industrial markets throughout the world, but a calculated invasion of consumer goods into major countries.

Watches appear likely to be one of the first products which the Reds will send in large volume into world markets—and perhaps eventually to this country.

The Soviets are planning to boost their watch production by about 40 percent by 1965. Over the next 7 years, as production is stepped up, some 200 million Russian watch movements will be turned out. Most of these will be for export. The United States has no quota for such watch imports but there is, of course, a tariff.

The watch production boost was revealed in an article recently in "Moskovskaya Pravda," a large daily newspaper published in Moscow, by an N. Volkov, director of Russia's largest watch factory located in the capital city.

CHALLENGE TO THE SWISS

Volkov issued a direct challenge to the Swiss for leadership in watch manufacturing. The Reds are taking a typically direct approach to the problem.

First, Volkov said, the Russian watch industry will embark on an all-out drive to improve both mechanical and design features of its timepieces, particularly women's wrist watches. Training programs for workers to staff new watch production lines are being expanded.

The history of the Russian watch industry typifies the late but rapidly-moving industrial revolution in the Soviet Union.

Twenty-five years ago, there were no watches produced in Russia. In 1940, production amounted to 3 million movements. This year, Russia will turn out about 25 million movements. By 1965, this production will be boosted to 35 million. At Volkov's plant alone, production will be increased by 300 percent by 1965, he said.

This compares with present U.S. production of 7 million movements a year, and imports of about twice that.

Russia now trades with some 70 countries, including the United States. Soon, Volkov boasted, all 70 countries will be buying Russian-made watch movements. A French firm already buys large quantities of Red watch movements and puts them in French-made cases, the Soviet watchmaker said. A large Brussels department store, identified as the "Inovation," consistently promotes and sells Russian watches, he added. Several firms in Canada have just recently placed large orders too, he said.

In addition to these countries, Russian watches now are sold in large quantities in Egypt, India, Greece, Denmark, Pakistan, Afghanistan.

RUSSIAN WATCH PRICES

Russia's objectives in exporting consumer goods when most of her own people and the satellite countries are crying for just these goods are manifold.

For one thing, the Reds badly need the exchange currencies these sales would bring to help them plant heavy industrial machinery in the uncommitted areas of the world. Their ability to pick their own price at which these goods will be sold will permit them to disrupt foreign markets and in some cases probably cause industries in several countries to suffer serious economic damage.

And there is probably some propaganda value if they can put a watch with a Russian name in a U.S. department store, or a small car such as the Moskva on a U.S. foreign car showroom floor.

MARKETING SOVIET AUTOS

The editor of the English-language Russian magazine U.S.S.R., Enver Memedov, told a Detroit audience a few weeks ago that Soviet cars may be marketed in this country in a few years. Russia, he said, is challenging America's position as the world's No. 1 industrial power and we may reach your level or overtake you one of these days.

Immediate reaction in the U.S. auto capital was to scoff. Spokesmen for the industry and for the U.S. Commerce Department pointed out that while there is no embargo on Russian cars, there is a high tariff differential. Cars imported from Red countries pay a 10-percent tariff, compared with an 8½-percent duty for other foreign countries. Service parts would pay a 25-percent duty, compared to a 10½-percent levy on parts imports from friendly countries.

But some U.S. auto industry experts now are wondering whether this may be more than just an idle boast on Mr. Memedov's part. The tariff and transportation differentials could easily be absorbed by the Russian Government under its state ownership of production.

If the Reds could deliver a reasonably good car at a competitive price to this country, there's a good chance that many Americans would buy them—both as an oddity and for price reasons, these experts believe.

The same might well be true of other Russian products. If they reach any real volume, the U.S. Government could of course step in. But it would take time for our cumbersome bureaucracy to move, and in the meantime some U.S. business firms and workers could be hurt.

Tribute to Mr. Whitley C. Collins, Late President, Northrop Aircraft

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE HOLT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 12, 1959

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, our Nation has suffered a great loss in the passing of Whitley C. Collins, president of Northrop Aircraft. I have lost a personal friend for whom I had a high regard. Radioplane, which is a subsidiary of Northrop, is located in my congressional district. I know they will carry on as Whitley Collins would have wanted them to, doing an outstanding job for America and contributing to our community.

For the RECORD, I would like to submit the following letter I received this morning from the chairman of the board, Northrop Aviation:

NORTHROP CORPORATION,
Beverly Hills, Calif., May 12, 1959.

The Honorable JOE HOLT,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HOLT: It is with extreme regret that I must inform you that our president, Whitley C. Collins, died early today at Good Samaritan Hospital. His death followed surgery for a circulatory ailment.

I want to assure you that the policies and programs initiated during the past 5 years by Mr. Collins and the management team which he built up will be vigorously continued.

Northrop is deeply indebted to Mr. Collins for its present sound position. Thanks to his foresight the company today has an efficiently functioning organization and a strong management well able to carry forward the company's progress under plans already in existence. The board of directors assures you that this company is in a position to and will continue to carry out its obligation to our national defense.

I am sure that Mr. Collins would have wanted us to express our deep appreciation for your helpfulness and understanding.

Faithfully yours,
WILLIAM C. MCDUFFIE,
Chairman of the Board.

I am sure my colleagues will also be interested in the following editorials:

[From the Los Angeles Times, Wednesday, May 13, 1959]

WHITLEY CHARLES COLLINS

California's appreciative State legislature may not have so intended, but its official commendation a few months ago of the career of Whitley Charles Collins can stand as a fitting epitaph to the man whose death here yesterday ended a list of services far broader than the broadly diversified aircraft company he headed.

As president of Northrop Corp., he led in building a major company which would be an asset in any area at any time. His achievement becomes increasingly notable amid reports of efforts of other areas to take away from California what men like him have shrewdly and soundly built as pillars of southern California as we know it. Without his kind, a semiarid pueblo might still be choking its few visitors with dust stirred by their rare visits.

But Mr. Collins was not limited to one company or product; several in this area, from Lockheed to Menasco to Radioplane, have felt the benefit of his counsel and guidance.

Farther afield he was active in various industrial enterprises. Not the least was his service as chairman of the board of the Aircraft Industries Association, which more than ever is the keystone industry in our present efforts at peace and salvation.

His civic contributions could have ended with his achievements in helping to run several industrial organizations whose expanding payrolls are basic to any community. But he went further into civic affairs, serving on the boards of the California Institute of Technology, Claremont Men's College, Los Angeles YMCA, and the Boy Scouts.

Many will feel he reached his career's high point of activity and contribution as chairman of the Hollywood Bowl Association. There his loss will be deeply felt, for it has been exceedingly difficult to get able civic-minded executives to devote the kind of talent he demonstrated in his too-short tenure of responsibility in an organization that is a pacesetter among movements to promote culture.

From music to monorail, Mr. Collins was at the forefront of this community's activities. We can only hope others will arise to fill the voids he has left. If not, our present and future will be much the poorer.

[From the Los Angeles Examiner of May 13, 1959]

WHITLEY C. COLLINS

In many ways, Los Angeles has suffered a deep loss in the death of Whitley C. Collins, president of Northrop Aircraft.

He made his mark in this area, not only in the business, finance, and the development of southern California's vast aircraft industry, but in cultural growth and in the betterment of human relations.

Only last September he was elected chairman of the board of directors of the Hollywood Bowl Association in which both he and Mrs. Collins long had been active. He was active, also, in such organizations as the National Conference of Christians and Jews, and he gave generously of his business and financial acumen in many fields. As an aircraft manufacturer, he held the forward-looking view that "we must build tomorrow's planes today" to safeguard America.

Results of Questionnaire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. DORN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 12, 1959

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Speaker, the First Assembly District Young Republican Club of Brooklyn, N.Y., sent out a questionnaire on matters pertaining to New York State. The results are as follows:

1. Do you favor the New York State income tax being collected as a payroll withholding tax? Yes, 63 percent; no, 37 percent.

2. Do you favor: (a) off-track betting? Yes 65 percent, no 35 percent; (b) State lottery? Yes 70 percent, no 30 percent.

3. Do you think that the United States should extradite ex-Cuban officials now accused by Fidel Castro of war crimes? Yes, 15 percent; no, 85 percent.

4. Should domestic legal disputes be appealed to an International Court? Yes, o percent; no, 100 percent.

5. Should American correspondents be allowed to visit Communist China? Yes, 68; no, 32 percent.

6. In your opinion, should balancing the budget be the keystone in Federal and State spending? Yes, 74 percent; no, 26 percent.

7. Should the United States allow American firms to trade nonstrategic materials with Communist countries? Yes, 18 percent; no, 82 percent.

8. Should a man who serves on active duty be required to serve 2 years in the Active Reserve? Yes, 30 percent; no, 70 percent.

9. Are you in favor of a cultural exchange program between the United States and the U.S.S.R.? Yes, 75 percent; no, 25 percent.

10. (a) Do you believe that visits by Soviet leaders to the United States, such as Mikoyan's are beneficial to the United States? Yes, 22 percent; no, 78 percent. (b) Do you believe that visits by Soviet leaders to the United States should be offset by the President visiting Russia if he felt it would be in the interest of world peace? (Many people stated they had difficulty in answering this question due to the wording.) Yes, 40 percent; no, 60 percent.

11. Should the United States use force as a last resort to break another possible Communist Berlin blockade? Yes, 90 percent; no, 10 percent.

C. RAYMOND RADIGAN,
President.

A Role for Italy at Geneva

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 14, 1959

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, on June 2 Italy will celebrate another anniversary as a Republic. It will be great cause for rejoicing for a people who despite great obstacles and the threat of communism have come a long way on the road to economic recovery and have won a place in the family of free democratic nations.

It is, therefore, timely and significant to call to the attention of my colleagues, the following article which appeared in the Evening Star of May 13, 1959, by the noted political columnist and commentator, Constantine Brown, entitled, "A Role for Italy at Geneva":

A ROLE FOR ITALY AT GENEVA—ATTENDANCE OF NATO ALLY IS EXPECTED TO 'BALANCE' POLES AND CZECHS

(By Constantine Brown)

The foreign ministers conference at Geneva started out as a propaganda wrangle between the Soviet Union and the Western Powers. All the "shows" put on by the Kremlin's own Andrei Gromyko and his Western colleagues had been foreseen and their end agreed on before the meetings opened.

The question of the round against the square table, resulting in both the East and West German representative being seated at smaller tables as advisers, had been decided long in advance. It served the Soviet propaganda to show that the Soviet Union took to heart the case of Germany more than the West. And our side could boast that in the first encounter the East had to bow graciously to the unflinching will of the representatives of the Western Powers.

Similarly the matter of Poland and Czechoslovakia participating in the Geneva tea party was not only foreseen but also decided last February after the French objected strongly to the unilateral demand by Moscow. The solution agreed on is to permit Italy to attend some sessions of the conferences in which the Czechs and Poles will participate.

The Senate Democratic whip and senior member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, MIKE MANSFIELD, has insisted strongly in his talks with representatives of the State Department that Italy be given a more active role in the concert of free nations. The once decaying Italy has become in the last few years one of the pillars of the Western alliance. Her economic, moral and military renaissance is about as marvelous as that of war-devastated Germany although it took place a few years later.

At the end of the war Italy was riddled with communism, and there were serious doubts that she would be able to survive as a free, democratic country. Of course, it was realized that the Italian Communists were nowhere nearly as dedicated to the cause as those in France, and Communist infiltration in certain segments of Italy's intellectual life was even less than in the United States.

When the first Italian election was held after the war, with the late Christian Democratic leader, Alcide de Gasperi, as the standard bearer, the prospects for his victory looked slim. But it was realized that the cause of communism was strong at that time in the peninsula because the population was starving. We not only rushed food and supplies but also—the story can now be told—about $5 million in greenbacks of small denomination which were distributed to eager voters. De Gasperi won and in the decade which followed the Italians have not only been wedded to the cause of the West but have made enormous strides in their international trade and industry.

Today Italy is one of the pillars of Western resistance to the onslaughts of international communism. Much has been made recently of the fact that the Italian Government—despite the still large membership in the Communist Party—has accepted guided missile bases on its territory. Communist leaders Togliati and Longo tried to oppose it. But they gave up, since they realized that their followers were merely token Communists and would not obey orders for a general strike—the only Red weapon in democratic countries.

But the Italian Government's decision is actually less important than the surprising strides made by the Italian defense forces in the last 3 years. There was a time during and after the war when the Italian Army, Navy and Air Force were treated by the West as comic opera forces—more for show than for action. Then surprisingly, apparently because the Italians finally found themselves, the Italian national defense which we helped to bring into being became one of NATO's most reliable and imposing forces.

Italy's 9½ divisions are regarded by our professionals as a force as good as any of the other NATO members. The Italian Navy, recreated after we ordered most of its vessels surrendered to the Soviet Union at the end of the war, is regarded as a real force which is bound to give an excellent account of itself in the event of a showdown in the Mediterranean. It not only modernized all its units which deserved moderization, but is now building missile-carrying cruisers to be ready next year. The air force also has been brought up to date.

All in all, Italy is considered today as having in the Mediterranean and its assigned portion of the Western defense wall a military establishment superior to that of Britain or Germany. These, added to the moral renaissance after the fall of fascism, have decided Senator MANSFIELD, among others, to suggest that Rome be given a real voice in the forthcoming negotiations between East and West.

Norwegian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 14, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, Sunday, May 17, is Norwegian Independence Day. On this historic anniversary, the United States sends its congratulations to the stalwart and indefatigable people of the great nation of Norway.

From the time of Leif Ericson, who first discovered America around the year 1000, Norway has inscribed more names on world history than any other nation of its size. This country of only 3½ million souls has produced Trygve Lie, the first Secretary General of the United Nations, Fridtjof Nansen, the immortal explorer, scientist, and humanitarian; Roauld Amundsen, who discovered the South Pole; Edward Grieg, one of the world's greatest composers; Henrik Ibsen the prince of modern dramatists; Knut Hamsun and Sigrid Undset, novelists of international renown; and many others.

Ask a Norwegian to explain how such a small country can become so great and he is likely to reply: "Hardship is the strength of Norway."

Life certainly is hard in this mountainous, fjorded, but beautiful country. Although not blessed with natural wealth, Norway has the third largest merchant fleet in the world, and her fishing industries are prodigious.

Norway's valiant resistance to the German occupation during World War II was as dogged as that of any people in Europe. Jails and concentration camps were packed with courageous Norse patriots who refused to submit to the barbaric oppression of the Nazi tyrants.

But when liberation came, not one lawless act was committed against the few collaborationists. No traitor was condemned without trial and due process of law.

This fair treatment accorded to the quislings exemplifies the Norwegian trait of maturity in civil affairs. Norwegians seem to know how to live together in peace and harmony. They respect one another, and when disagreements arise they have a commonsense and well-behaved way of settling their differences. There is no race or caste division among them. As early as 1913 they extended the franchise to women by a unanimous vote of Parliament. Norwegians have grasped the basic truth that it is easier to enjoy life if all are given a chance to enjoy it.

Americans always feel a close kinship to the Norwegians. We inherit the self-reliant, hard-fibered, free-and-easy individualism of pioneers, and so do they, for to live at all on that rocky tongue of land has required the heart of a pioneer.

Norway is today making an important contribution to the defense of the North Atlantic Treaty area. A chain of radars, financed by NATO and manned by Norwegians, has been constructed to warn of Soviet bomber attacks against the West. Although Norway, which has 120 miles of common border with the Soviet Union, would gain only 3 minutes of warning time, this alert could be very important to her allies in NATO, especially the United States.

King Olaf, when he opened this year's session of Parliament, enunciated the principles of Norway's foreign policy. The King said that Norway will continue its efforts to strengthen political, economic, and social cooperation among the nations of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. He also promised that Norway would work to safeguard peace and reduce international tension by striving for a general reduction of armaments and an end to nuclear testing.

Norway has strong ties to the United States. One of the most important is the presence of so many of her sons and daughters in this country. Their enterprising and pioneering spirit has greatly enriched the life and culture of the United States.

It is a privilege to congratulate the brave and sturdy Norsemen on their Independence Day. Norwegians throughout the world richly deserve the honor and admiration which is bestowed upon them by the United States and the entire free world.

The People's English

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 14, 1959

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, words at best are imperfect vehicles of expression. Pronunciation of English words varies from place to place. Dictionanries in the past have given preferred pronunciations for varied words. The trend today in dictionaries is to set forth the various pronunciations without designating a preference. In the ultimate analysis the people decide pronunciation for American words. Gov. Alfred E. Smith's pronunciation of "raddio" did not gain many followers and today the pronunciation "radio" is popular.

One of my constituents, Dr. Grant H. Brown, has worked upon a dictionary which recognizes the accepted pronunciations in the various parts of the United States. We can be proud of Dr. Brown, who is the president of the American Book Co., the largest textbook publisher in the world. I, for one, am pleased to represent a district in which men like Dr. Brown reside. Many outstanding educators have hailed Dr. Brown's work as a significant contribution to our educational system and concepts since there is no tool more basic to our learning process than the dictionary.

In the May 4, 1959, edition of Newsweek, there appeared the following article under the caricature of a fruit with several grimaces. The article which I am pleased to present for the readers is as follows:

"E-ther" or "eye-ther"? Either is correct, according to Webster's "New Secondary School Dictionary"—the first dictionary that doesn't give a preferred pronunciation for English words. The new book ($4.75), published last week, also recognizes accepted pronunciations in various parts of the United States. Thus, the word "tomato" can be pronounced "toe-may-toe," or "toe-mah-toe." "We let the people themselves decide how to speak the language," says Grant H. Brown, president of the American Book Co., the dictionary's distributor. "We call it the people's English." Partisan purists of the King's English, however, were bound to choke on such proffered variants as "col-yum-ist" for "columnist"; and "i-dee" for "idea."

Prophets and Opinion Polls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 14, 1959

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Carolina Farmer, published at Raleigh, N.C., and ably edited by Mr. J. C. Brown, carries in its May edition a significant editorial directed at a poll of a few readers of another magazine which is being used by certain people in high places in an effort to discredit all national policies intended to enable farmers to adjust their production to their markets and to obtain a fair price for what they produce.

Under leave to extend my remarks I am including this editoroial in the Appendix of the RECORD, with the thought that other Members of the Congress may benefit from the knowledge of how farmers feel about this so-called poll:

PROPHETS AND OPINION POLLS

If Farm Journal has set out to make a prophet of Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson, we think it's going to have to come up with something more believable than the opinion poll reported in its April issue.

The Journal claims it received 10,000 replies from among its 3,100,000 readers, proving that—

Sixty percent of the tobacco farmers, 41 percent of the cotton farmers, 42 percent of the peanut farmers, and 43 percent of the wheat farmers do not want price supports.

Already Secretary of Agriculture Benson is parading around the country citing Farm Journal's poll as proof that American farmers want Benson's program, not what they have.

The quarrel we have with the Journal is for implying that its survey reflects American farm thinking.

Of course, it does not. The record of voting in farm program referendums refutes such a ridiculous claim.

According to Farm Journal's survey, 61 percent of North Carolina farmers are against any kind of price supports. The truth is that less than 5 months ago 99.6 percent of North Carolina's Flue-cured tobacco voters approved price supports at 90 percent of parity, acreage controls, and penalties for overplanting. The total vote was 133,000, or 56.9 percent of those eligible to vote, a turnout that makes our political elections look like pledge night at the lodge.

Obviously, the Farm Journal is shooting blanks; but it's interesting to see what the target is; and an item written in the editor's column by Wheeler McMillen gives a hint:

"Our more than 3,100,000 subscribers certainly represent an accurate cross section of American agriculture. We have no reason to doubt that the 10,000 replies fairly represent our readers. They will give the same answers to Members of Congress. Farmers are saying that help has become a liability. The politicos who insist on high supports and strict controls will find that farm thinking is leaving them behind." (Signed) Wheeler McMillen.

We don't believe North Carolina's Congressmen, with recent farm referendum results fresh in their minds, will buy McMillen's survey, copies of which are for sale, incidentally.

But it might appeal to some big city legislators.

An Event of Lasting Significance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 14, 1959

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, an anniversary is a time for celebration—a pause for reflecting on the progress of the past, for enjoying the excitement of the present, and for sowing the seeds of hope for the future.

Various communities in Maine are presently engaged in such celebration, and the following article from the editorial section of the May 8 issue of the Bangor Daily News serves to highlight these events.

[From the Bangor Daily News, May 8, 1959]

AN EVENT OF LASTING SIGNIFICANCE

As Bangor's 125th anniversary observance heads into a busy period of activity extending through the summer, several things about this and similar observances become clear:

First, they attract visitors to the State as well as to the celebrating community. This was emphasized by Commissioner Fred A. Clough, Jr., of the Maine Department of Economic Development, in a recent letter of congratulations to the Bangor anniversary committee. The State of Maine, Clough observed, has already received a considerable amount of nationwide publicity generated by the Bangor observance.

Bangor is the largest Maine community marking an anniversary this year but it is by no means alone. Caribou and Presque Isle are marking centennial years and Calais its 150th year, for example. The events increase tourist interest and are bound to bring thousands of additional visitors into the region.

A second notable point about community celebrations is the fact that some of the events and projects become fixtures. Lo-

cally, the Paul Bunyan statue, which has already proven its popularity, stands on its Main Street pedestal as a permanent sightseers' attraction. It may turn out that the free anniversary exhibition to open June 1 in the old auditorium will warrant permanent status. On the sports side, the Downeast Classic which ushered in the celebration is to be repeated.

A third product of community observances is the revival of civic pride. Young and old are discussing the anniversary, delving into books and old records to learn more about Bangor's famous past, and giving thought to the city's promising future. Commissioner Clough commented as follows on this point:

"In the long run, I believe that it is from an awakened and energized civic pride and community conscientiousness that you will gain the most. For this attitude, we in the department of economic development have learned by experience, can be the deciding factor in bringing new enterprise and economic betterment to a community."

Such programs, then, as Bangor's Quartqui Centennial, can be much more than a passing event. They can provide a surge of community interest leading to general improvement and development.

We would like to call attention to the largely thankless task being carried out by the Bangor 125th Anniversary Steering Committee. There has been some misunderstanding about this committee. Contrary to a misconception apparently held by a few people, the committee is a volunteer, unpaid group. Its members stand to gain nothing, other than the satisfaction of performing a worthwhile community service. The committee is made up of busy, civic-minded men. They are giving an incalculable amount of time and know-how to staging the ambitious year-round anniversary program.

Events and projects are financed or underwritten by private sources, including a $100,000 anniversary fund raised by the committee. The city's monetary contribution totals $46,700, spread over 3 budget years, 1957, 1958, and 1959. Thus the anniversary in the main is a private, public-spirited undertaking from which the city of Bangor and all its citizens stand to benefit.

And so—on with the show that is putting the Bangor area in the public spotlight from Maine to Hawaii and Alaska.

J. Edgar Hoover Marks 35 Years of Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. CARLTON LOSER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 14, 1959

Mr. LOSER. Mr. Speaker, on May 10, 1924, Mr. J. Edgar Hoover became Director of one of the most respected agencies in the Federal Government. The Federal Bureau of Investigation has been doing an outstanding and necessary work for our country and its Director is admired by all.

The Nashville Banner, a great southern newspaper, has published an excellent editorial commending Mr. Hoover for his years of service to his country. I am placing it in the RECORD in order that you may have an opportunity to read it. The editorial follows:

[From the Nashville Banner, May 11, 1959]

J. EDGAR HOOVER MARKS 35 YEARS OF SERVICE

For 35 years the Federal Bureau of Investigation has been scandal-free and politics-proof. And the man behind this miracle is J. Edgar Hoover who became Director of the FBI, May 10, 1924, by appointment of President Calvin Coolidge.

Hoover, only 29 years old at the time, had been with the Justice Department for 7 years, earning his law degree at night school.

The FBI was created in 1908 and in 1924 it was tainted with scandal. Its personnel was largely composed of political hacks, riffraff, and ex-convicts.

When Hoover accepted the appointment he did so with the proviso that the Bureau would be freed from its political yoke and would be responsible only to the Attorney General. His first act was to clean house. The undesirables were thrown out and replaced with young men of character, intelligence, and ability.

These were the special agents who became the scourge of the gangsters of the late twenties and early thirties. They were the "G-men" who eliminated the Dillingers, Floyds, and Bonnie Parkers. They were lawyers, accountants, and outstanding law-enforcement officers who were welded into the finest professional police force in the world.

Their Chief has served under five Presidents and an even dozen Attorneys General without becoming a political figure. And during this span of 35 years, the Bureau has become the world capital of scientific criminal investigation.

Hoover is the Nation's No. 1 law-enforcement officer, but publicly has fought against a national police force which could operate without regard to State laws or local law-enforcement agencies.

Five years ago on the eve of his 30th anniversary, Hoover was asked if he thought there was any danger of the FBI becoming a Gestapo. His reply was typical: "No, there is no danger * * * not if we have men of character in the organization and an alert public opinion." This attitude remains unchanged.

A calm and deliberate man, Hoover certainly could not be classed as a witch-hunter or a person given to flights of fancy, but he has told the Nation time after time of the imminent threat of communism. His best-selling book, "Masters of Deceit," is considered by many as the most authoritative works ever written on communism in America.

It has been said there is no such a thing as an indispensable man, but there are invaluable men and one of these is J. Edgar Hoover whose unstinting service to this Nation deserves the fullest recognition as he passes another milestone in his rewarding career.

North Dakota State Medical Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. QUENTIN BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 14, 1959

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues a resolution recently passed by the North Dakota State Medical Association in regard to our increasing traffic casualties. It suggests a special commorative stamp on the theme of traffic safety which, I believe, has a great deal of merit:

Whereas the State Medical Society of Wisconsin has passed and has asked our association to support the following resolution to wit:

"Whereas traffic accidents each year kill more than 37,000 persons and injure another 1,400,000 causing not only tragic suffering and loss of life but costs exceeding $5 billion in wage loss, property damage and medical services; and

"Whereas the attention of the Nation has been effectively directed to some of the great problems and philosophies of human living through the issuance of special commemorative stamps; Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Postmaster General of the United States be petitioned to issue annually, for 5 consecutive years, a special commemorative stamp on the theme of traffic safety, each year's stamp to receive its first day of issue from the capital city of each State of the United States."

Be it Resolved, That the North Dakota State Medical Association adopt said resolution and that copies of this resolution bearing the seal of the State Medical Association of North Dakota be sent to the Governor of North Dakota, the U.S. Senators and Representatives from North Dakota, the Postmaster General, and the President of the United States, the president and president-elect and executive vice president of the American Medical Association, as well as the president of the State Medical Society of Wisconsin.

Involuntary Partnership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK WESTLAND
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 14, 1959

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, on several occasions I have brought to the attention of this body my objections and the objections of the people of Snohomish County, whom I represent, to the Bureau of the Budget's decision to include this county in the Seattle standard metropolitan area.

I want to include in the RECORD an editorial from the Twin City News, published in Stanwood, Wash., which summarizes the attitude of the majority of Snohomish County residents. I agree that Seattle is a wonderful city, and that Snohomish County has been dragged into an involuntary partnership.

The editorial follows.

INVOLUNTARY PARTNERSHIP

Uncle Sam is forcing Snohomish County into a shotgun wedding with Seattle.

The Federal Government in Washington, D.C. has announced that for census purposes all of Snohomish County including the Twin Cities is being considered part of the Seattle standard metropolitan area.

It doesn't matter much right now, but eventually this deft bit of maneuvering may paralyze the ability of local communities to determine their own development. It is feared that the standard metropolitan area may later emerge as a huge sprawling metro armed with the power to take over planning activities, determine utilities development, influence industrial growth, etc. The center of such power would, of course, be at the heart of the metro—Seattle.

Reason for this county's inclusion in the Seattle district is that according to the bureau of the budget, 23 percent of the county's labor force is employed in Seattle. The Budget and Census Bureaus figure we are socially and economically integrated and might as well be considered one.

But our area has a future quite apart from Seattle and its uneasy dependence on the Boeing colossus. Trying to mesh Seattle's economy with such far-flung communities as our own will bring us little advantage and can take from us some fundamental decision making abilities.

Most of us like Seattle—for as cities go, she is still one of the most beautiful in the world. But we still don't want to marry her.

The 75th Birthday of the Honorable Harry S. Truman Recalls a High Moment in History, the Enunciation of the Truman Doctrine and the Reasons for Its Advancement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BYRON L. JOHNSON
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 14, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I do not want the occasion of the 75th birthday of the Honorable Harry S. Truman to pass into history without mention. In his message on aid to Greece and Turkey, given to the joint session of Congress on March 12, 1947, his closing paragraphs were these:

The United States contributed $341 billion toward winning World War II. This is an investment in world freedom and world peace. The assistance that I am recommending for Greece and Turkey amounts to little more than one-tenth of 1 percent of this investment. It is only commonsense that we should safeguard this investment and make sure that it was not in vain.

The seeds of totalitarian regimes are nurtured by misery and want. They spread and grow in the evil soil of poverty and strife.

They reach their full growth when the hope of a people for a better life has died. We must keep that hope alive.

The free peoples of the world look to us for support in maintaining their freedoms. If we falter in our leadership, we may endanger the peace of the world—and we shall surely endanger the welfare of our own Nation.

Great responsibilities have been placed upon us by the swift movement of events. I am confident that the Congress will face these responsibility squarely.

Mr. Speaker, it was my good fortune a few years later to have a bright young student from Turkey in one of my classes. In summarizing his report on the consequences of the Truman doctrine, he said:

I do not know what judgment the United States will render of President Harry S. Truman, but I can tell you this—he will go down in the history of my country as the greatest president the United States ever had.

Mr. Speaker, many Americans have been inclined to view harshly and to speak sharply about President Truman. Few men in history have had to face as many challenges as he faced in such swift succession after he became president. Few men have contributed more significantly to the institutions by which the human race may hope to build and achieve peace.

I should like to pay tribute to a great President, to a great American, to a great member of the human race—Harry S. Truman. Long may he live and enjoy the fruits of his handiwork. Generations yet to come will rise to bless his name.

Good News

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK WESTLAND
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 14, 1959

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, many individuals are inclined to speak of the economy as if it were on the brink of disaster. This is not true and I think more should be said about the bright future that lies ahead. It is refreshing to read good news such as presented in an editorial, "News We Enjoy," published by the Bellingham (Wash.) Herald on May 4, 1959. I want to include this editorial in the RECORD, because its content indicates not only what is happening in Whatcom County, Wash., but also in thousands of other communities across the Nation.

The editorial follows:

NEWS WE ENJOY

Convincing evidence that Whatcom County has licked the business downturn and is definitely on a road of greater activity and prosperity businesswise is seen from almost every source.

One of the important barometers is the state employment and security department office. Latest reports show that approximately 100 names have been stricken from the list headed "Out of Work," each week for the past 6 weeks.

And during the same period the number of claimants for unemployment insurance has dropped by 629 persons.

But there are many physical examples of activity. The opening of the new Seattle-First National Bank branch last week was an outstanding addition to Bellingham. Now the old structure is to be razed and replaced by a modern building.

The construction of the new home of J. C. Penney and F. W. Woolworth Co. on the site of the American Theater is underway. Work has been started on the new Albertson's Supermarket near the coal mine site. The Robinson Plywood & Timber Co. of Everett has reopened the old Larson Mill plant. More construction—an addition to the Haskell Building—will dress up Cornwall Avenue. The Leopold Hotel is well along on the construction of the new motel and swimming pool.

At Western Washington College two buildings are being erected and more work on the Bellingham Freeway should open up within the next 30 days. There are also some extensive sewer installation projects in the residential areas.

The city of Bellingham Water Department has started work on what ultimately will be an expenditure of about $1½ million expansion and diversion project. Work on the tunnel is well along.

Retail stores report a definite uptrend in sales and the many resorts in the nearby areas are making last minute preparations for what has been forecast as a recordbreaking tourist season.

In the residential areas numerous new homes are under construction and building suppliers report that business is good. All of this substantiates the figure from the employment office that definite improvements in the area's economy are noted. That should be good news to everyone in Whatcom County.

Proposed Amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. Y. BERRY
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 11, 1959

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a portion of my statement before the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee today on proposed amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act.

I appeared before the committee at the request of the South Dakota Press Association in opposition to the proposed removal of the existing exemption of smaller newspapers under the act. I sincerely believe that removing the exemption would sound the death knell not only for many small newspapers, but more serious, the opportunity for many young people to learn to do for themselves.

The excerpt from my statement is as follows:

As a former weekly newspaper publisher myself and a past president of the South Dakota Press Association, I speak from personal knowledge of the personal requirements of these small publications. To require them to meet minimum wage and hour provisions would, in many cases, force their discontinuance. Knowing the vital part these papers play in small communities, this would be a tragic loss.

Those of you who have never lived in a rural area where a 6-day week is a normal business week may not fully appreciate the problems involved. In addition, living costs are lower, as a rule, and the margin of profit of small business is smaller. To impose Federal regulation as suggested by the legislation under consideration would cut into that narrow profit margin to force a publisher out of business.

More important than all this, however, is the effect it would have on the public generally. I am thinking now of the high school kids that come into these small shops and work to supplement their income, earning a few dollars to buy the things their parents may not be able to provide for them, but more important, learning how to work.

I am thinking of several young men, besides my own son, who got their start and learned a profession in my own shop. One or two of them not only learned how to help make up forms and feed press, but in addition learned how to operate a linotype and later were able to work their way through college by operating a linotype in larger daily shops on Saturdays and evenings.

I am also thinking of the boys who got their start in the newspaper business by working part time and full time in the small shops in my State and then went on to college, taking advantage of the rural newspaper course taught at our State college, going out to become top-flight newspaper publishers, providing the people of their communities with local, State, and national coverage of the news.

I firmly believe that Government should place a protective floor under income, but I also believe with all my heart that we must be very cautious that this floor must never become a ceiling upon opportunity. This provision would place a ceiling upon opportunity for thousands of young people.

In my judgment it would be the most ill-considered and dangerous legislation this Congress could possibly pass.

I would also like to have included in the record of these hearings a telegram I received from the South Dakota Press Association, advising of the action taken at their annual convention on May 8, 1959:

MAY 8, 1959.

Congressman E. Y. BERRY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

South Dakota Press Association in annual convention assembled here today unanimously approved a resolution urging that you appear before the Senate Labor Committee in our behalf. We earnestly request that an amendment be made to Senate bill No. 1046 to retain section 9 of present law which applies to circulation exemption for smaller newspapers of the country. We consider such an amendment vital and necessary to the welfare and stability of the smaller newspapers.

SOUTH DAKOTA PRESS ASSOCIATION,
E. H. LIGHTER, *President.*
HOMER GIVENS, *Manager.*

Significant and Substantial Drop in Unemployment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. WALLHAUSER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 14, 1959

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, the news contained in the Labor Department news conference last Monday regarding the significant and substantial drop in unemployment, is certainly welcome and stimulating.

One of the major concerns of every thinking person in these United States should be the basic problem of providing employment for all Americans who are able to work.

More jobs in construction, summer resorts, farming, along with the pickup in the manufacturing industries, hardest hit by the recession, are generally believed to have contributed to the April improvement.

At 3,627,000, unemployment in the United States is now 1½ million below April a year ago. Just during the last 2 months unemployment has fallen by more than a million workers.

Realizing that there will always be a certain number of individuals unemployed due to various reasons, including infirmity, refusal to work, and others, it must be the constant aim of all to do whatever is necessary to provide employment for those who are willing and able to work.

My sincere hope is that the figures to be released in the months to come will continue to show the desirable trend that we are now in.

Testing of Nuclear Weapons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 14, 1959

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, last week I introduced in this House a resolution which seeks to put this body on record as supporting efforts to obtain international agreement to cease the testing of nuclear weapons.

Yesterday's newspapers indicated that there is a better than 50–50 chance that an agreement may be reached at Geneva to ban nuclear testing.

The language of this resolution is carefully drawn. It is the same resolution which has already passed the Senate. In addition, Mr. James Wadsworth, the U.S. representative at the current Geneva talks on nuclear disarmament, has presented this resolution to the conference where it has been publicly welcomed by the Russian representative, Semyon K. Tsarapkin.

This resolution urges no appeasement. It seeks no surrender nor does it press for any relaxation of our present firm line of resistance to the Communists.

It would solely and simply emphasize once again and with the authority of this House the urgent need for agreement on this vital question. Current reports show a 100 percent increase in this country of the concentration of strontium 90 in the bones of our children. Excessive amounts of this noxious substance can cause leukemia.

Thus, what we are talking about is the health of our future generations. Surely, with this priceless asset at stake, we cannot fail to make every possible effort to eliminate the threatened danger.

I hope that the House will pass this resolution promptly so that it may be transmitted to Geneva to provide added weight to American efforts to obtain Soviet consent to a reasonable agreement.

I add herewith an article from the New York Times of May 4, 1959, describing the receipt at Geneva of the Senate resolution:

SOVIET WELCOMES U.S. PLEA ON TESTS—DELEGATE AT ATOM-BAN TALKS SAID TO APPROVE SENATE'S STATEMENT URGING PACT

GENEVA, May 4.—The Soviet Union was reported today to have welcomed the support expressed by the U.S. Senate for a controlled ban on nuclear weapons tests.

James J. Wadsworth, U.S. delegate to the three-power conference that is attempting here to negotiate an agreement banning tests, read into the record a resolution unanimously adopted by the Senate last Thursday.

The resolution said that the Senators "support the efforts of the United States to continue to negotiate for an international agreement" to suspend tests. A ban "under an effective control system would provide an opportunity to ease world tensions," the declaration stated.

The chief of the Soviet delegation, Semyon K. Tsarapkin, generally expressed satisfaction with the Senate's resolution, a Western source reported. He was said to have welcomed the desire shown for the success of the negotiations.

The Senators had asked President Eisenhower to communicate the resolution to the Soviet Government "so that the desire of the American people speaking through their representatives in the Senate will be known and made clear for the successful outcome of the negotiations in Geneva."

Mr. Wadsworth emphasized that the Soviet Union should regard the statement as indicative of the will of the people and Government of the United States for a nuclear test ban, a Western spokesman said.

The U.S. delegate was clearly alluding to the fact that Mr. Tsarapkin has often quoted unofficial statements and newspaper reports to cast doubt on the sincerity of the U.S. intentions in the negotiations. Mr. Wadsworth observed that the expression of support for an agreement came from the legislative body that must ratify any treaty negotiated here.

In the only other business at today's 26-minute meeting, the conference delegate approved a routine draft treaty article covering the procedures for the signature ratification and entry into force of the proposed test ban agreement. It was the 15th section of the draft treaty to be adopted since the conference began last October 31, but none of them has dealt with a key issue.

David Ormsby-Gore, the British delegation leader, returned to Geneva after a prolonged absence to attend today's meeting, the 87th. He wanted to consult with the British deputy delegate, Sir Michael Wright, and with Mr. Wadsworth, a British spokesman said. He will return to London tomorrow.

Trophy Award to AMVETS Alabama State Commander Charlie Casmus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. GRANT
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 14, 1959

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Speaker, after the adjournment of Congress last year, Dr. Winston E. Burdine, national commander of the American Veterans of World War II and Korea, presented a Silver Missile Trophy to AMVETS Alabama State Commander Charlie Casmus of Montgomery, Ala.

Commander Casmus is an outstanding citizen who has rendered unselfish service, not only to his comrades, but to the community and State in which he resides. This honor was well merited by Alabama's State commander; and upon presenting him the trophy on December 7, 1958, in Washington, D.C., National Commander Burdine stated:

It is with great pleasure that I call to the rostrum the State commander from Alabama, Charlie Casmus, for the purpose of

presenting the AMVETS Silver Missile Membership Trophy.

I can think of no man who has done more for AMVETS, or for the American veteran than our good friend and fellow AMVET Charlie Casmus.

Charlie has served AMVETS with distinction as State commander from Alabama, as national executive committeeman, and as national vice commander. As you know, the Silver Missile Award was established 3 years ago for presentation to the State which is first to reach its membership quota. Charlie was State commander of Alabama at that time and the first year's trophy went to Alabama.

After a year's service as national vice commander for the third national district, Charlie was reelected State commander for Alabama, and today—just 97 days after the start of the new membership year—it is with pleasure that I announce that Alabama is the first State to reach its membership quota, and has won possession of the Silver Missile for the second time in its 3-year history.

Before presenting the trophy, I do want to say a few words about Charlie's other activities, since his many accomplishments in AMVETS would make you believe that his time is thus occupied.

In his home town of Montgomery, Ala., Charlie is executive secretary of the Press and Radio Club; is secretary of Elks Lodge No. 596; formerly wrote a newspaper column; and is active in many fraternal, civic, and veterans organizations.

On behalf of the national executive committee, and fellow AMVETS throughout the Nation, I extend my congratulations to Alabama AMVETS and to their State commander, Charlie Casmus.

Perhaps Blasting's Needed To Get A Good Labor Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. PAUL KITCHIN
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 14, 1959

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, a very timely editorial appeared in the Hamlet, N.C., News-Messenger for May 12, 1959. I believe it might well be considered by the Members of the House of Representatives. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the editorial in the RECORD:

PERHAPS BLASTING'S NEEDED TO GET A GOOD LABOR LAW

A very dejected and disappointed Senator MCCLELLAN has been quoted as saying with respect to the revelations of his Senate rackets committee: "If we don't get a good (labor) law on the basis of the record we have compiled now, Congress wouldn't legislate if we doubled the record."

Most Americans, we think, will agree with the Senator that his committee has developed a sufficiently lurid and shocking picture of union thievery, conspiracy, brutality, abuse of members and public alike and general skulduggery to spur the members of that body into effective action.

Instead, and in spite of the 150,000 letters received by the committee from rank-and-file union members on the evils of labor bossism, the dreary history of 1958 has been repeating itself with slight variations. Last year the Kennedy-Ives "sweetheart" bill was passed by the Senate. This year the Kennedy-Ervin bill, substantially the same flaccid measure—despite the heroic but futile efforts of Senator MCCLELLAN to toughen it with an effective bill-of-rights amendment—was passed by the Senate. Last year, a disgusted House defeated the original Senate-passed Kennedy bill, and the best thing that could now happen would be for the current Kennedy measure to meet the same fate so that the House could adopt the Barden bills, H.R. 4473 and H.R. 4474.

Between them, the Barden measures offer complete protection—including a puncture-proof bill-of-rights for the union member, and the end of secondary boycotts and blackmail picketing, against which management and employees alike are powerless, and to which small business must quickly yield or perish. Deprived of his present license to whipsaw members and business alike, the corrupt labor boss will be a Samson shorn.

But the labor dictator is still pulling down temples at will, cuffing around the dues-paying faceless people from whom his sinews derive, and thumbing his nose at the public at large. He is pretty sure of himself—and pretty sure of Congress. What else, when the protests of 150,000 of his minions are unheeded, and when the whole public is shocked at the fifth amendment hoodlums paraded before the McClellan committee—and still the solons are sharpening no shears?

Senator MCCLELLAN has a right to be dejected. He tried, through bills of his own and his subsequent efforts to amend the Kennedy palliative to get a good law. But millions of frustrated union members of citizens, whose businesses could be shut down tomorrow by secondary boycott or blackmail picketing, have not. At this 11th hour we have a right to be angry—and to be frightened. But, until we do something, we have no right to be dejected. If every Representative in the House were to find his desk stacked 2 feet high with demands for the Barden bills, the most vicious of our labor abuses would be ended.

It could happen. But that is what it will take.

Battery Additive VX–6

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 14, 1959

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I recently received a communication from Mr. Elliot A. Meyer, president of the National Dynamics Corp., of New York city, concerning the difficulties his firm has encountered in securing an impartial evaluation of a battery additive product manufactured by it, called VX–6. Mr. Meyer writes that unsupported charges have been made against this product through an organized effort to thwart its continuance despite its alleged beneficial value and the dollar savings which it provides to the public. And this, despite the fact that the product is used by the various branches of the armed services to effectively maintain the maximum of military effort as economically as possible.

The company possesses numerous statements commending the additive and sustaining its claim that VX–6 helps to prolong the life of batteries and fosters reductions in battery cost and upkeep.

Because the company is a corporation in the great city, a portion of which I have the honor to represent in Congress, and since many of its employees reside in my district, I ask that the letter from Mr. Meyer be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks so that proper significance can be given to it and fair evaluation accorded to it. If its contentions are factual, a serious blow to our system of free enterprise is being perpetrated. The letter follows:

NATIONAL DYNAMICS CORP.,
New York, N.Y., May 8, 1959.

Congressman SEYMOUR HALPERN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HALPERN: Because of your great interest on behalf of the small businessman, I would like to bring to your attention a matter which smacks of conspiracy. I am doing this on behalf of our distributors throughout the United States who are in reality independent businessmen.

Lead acid battery replacement sales are approximately $500 million annually, based on an estimate of $20 per battery. Consistently these sales have run parallel to tire replacement sales in the automotive industry. However, during 1958, according to figures and facts from 53 different sources and some 4,000 pages of such reports as compiled by a leading trade paper, tire replacement sales have increased 5 percent and battery replacement sales have decreased 5 percent. This means a drop in battery replacement sales of 1,250,000 batteries.

The reason for this drop in sales has not been clearly explained by the battery manufacturers. One leading manufacturer has blamed the 1958 weather in a report to their stockholders. Others have advanced such reasons as an increase in the efficiency of the manufacture of batteries. Another reason is possibly that the 12 volt system is responsible for this. At this time they have admitted no logical reason as to why their sales have fallen off. They only agree that battery replacement sales did fall off.

National Dynamics Corp., whose principal office is in New York City, is currently manufacturing and marketing a battery additive for which we claim the prolonging of a normal life of a battery and that it is effective on new as well as old batteries. The trade name of this product is VX–6.

Before releasing this product to the public, it had 5 years of road and laboratory tests on 10,000 batteries of various applications.

During 1958, National Dynamics sold enough VX–6 to treat, 1,500,000 batteries—coincidently about the same number of battery replacement sales that were lost.

The American Association of Battery Manufacturers has vigorously opposed the marketing and sale of this product. They claim the product to be innocuous, having no beneficial or harmful effects yet they admit they instigated an FTC investigation into the claims of National Dynamics. They also have so changed their guarantees to hamper the sale of VX–6 by voiding these guarantees if this product is used in their batteries. They have disseminated information both ridiculing VX–6 and implying that certain claims were false. As one specific example, they have implied that a claim made by National Dynamics that VX–6 was used by the U.S. Navy is untrue. Below please find quoted a letter recently received by National Dynamics Corp. from the supply officer, written at the direction of the commanding officer, of the U.S.S. *Forrestal*.

"This is in reply to your letter of 11 February which was forwarded to the USS *Forrestal* by the Navy Supply Center, Norfolk, Va.

"VX–6 has been used by this vessel. The users of this product report the product is satisfactory but have no special comments favorable or unfavorable."

It seems strange that if this product is as innocuous as the American Association of Battery Manufacturers claims that they are putting such effort to stop the marketing of VX–6 and to discredit it. Or, is it possible that they may feel, as the National Dynamics people do, that VX–6 is the reason for the big drop in battery replacement sales.

A letter from Fort Leonard Wood states that $24 worth of VX–6 resulted in a saving of $162 in discarded batteries to the Army. The civilian manager of the transportation department for the Naval Air Station at Memphis, Tenn., as a result of using VX–6, states that a 300 percent saving can be realized on battery cost and upkeep. The New York Department of Sanitation has found that VX–6 has cut down internal heating by 53 percent which same internal heating is the chief cause of their battery trouble.

There are some thousands of similar reports on the application and results of the use of this product.

The American Association of Battery Manufacturers has not come up with any tests or proof refuting any of the claims made for this product. In spite of all the evidence and testimony of the users of VX–6, and the big decrease in battery replacement sales since its introduction into the market, the National Better Business Bureau has apparently allied themselves with the big battery interests to discourage the sale of this product. The National Better Business Bureau has not made a single test but has sought, by implication, to discourage the sale of VX–6. They have evidently set themselves up as a judge and jury and without any investigation have attacked a product that would seem to be in the interest of the general public while opposed to the interests of the big battery manufacturers.

It would seem that VX–6 should be tested for possible use by every branch of the Government, especially in view of the favorable reception from those spots where it has been used.

Yours very truly,

NATIONAL DYNAMICS CORP.,
ELLIOTT A. MEYER,
President.

Why I Am Opposed to the Murray-Metcalf Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1959

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, in view of the great national interest in the Murray-Metcalf bill—the School Support Act of 1959—I ask leave to present to my colleagues the reasons why I cannot support this legislation. I hope each and every Member of the House will read this before casting his vote.

Enactment of the Murray-Metcalf bill would shift a major share of the cost of education, and thus of State and local responsibility for education, to the Federal Government. Such a shift of responsibility is clearly not in the national interest. Indeed the underlying philosophy of this bill is contrary to all Federal aid measures for education heretofore adopted by the Congress, including such programs as Federal aid for land grant colleges, assistance for vocational education, Federal aid in areas affected by Federal activities, and the recently enacted National Defense Education Act, all of which programs I have enthusiastically supported. These programs, and others in existence, have provided Federal funds for specific educational activities, the encouragement of which have had overriding national significance for the defense and welfare of our Nation. All the Murray-Metcalf bill would accomplish would be to shift a major and permanent responsibility to the Federal Government for the operation of our public elementary and secondary schools.

As originally introduced, the bill would authorize appropriations increasing from $1.1 billion in the first year of the program to $4.7 billion in the 4th year and for each year forever thereafter. This would entail a cost of $11.4 billion in the first 4 years alone. Even if these amounts were scaled down, I would feel compelled to resist the measure because of its basic philosophy and for the following reasons:

First. Under the United States Constitution education is, quite properly, I believe, a function of the States. In varying degrees the different States have delegated some of this responsibility to local school districts. No Federal program should ever be permitted to develop that would in any way lead to Federal domination of our educational system.

The fundamental principle of our Federal-State governmental organization is a division of authority and responsibility—not a sharing of every function by every type and level of government. In my judgment it would be completely naive to assume that Congress would appropriate the billions of dollars called for in the Murray-Metcalf bill without—sooner or later—attempting to assure through adequate controls that the sums are efficiently spent. Indeed, what justification can there be for vast Federal expenditures unless a definite product is purchased for the taxpayer's money? I think inevitably that H.R. 22, the Metcalf bill, drafted as loosely it is, would furnish the very impetus that would provoke throughout the Nation a demand for controls over the use of the Federal moneys. As the bill is drafted there is not even a requirement that the Federal funds be matched by State or local funds, nor is there any requirement that there be any increase in State and local spending over and above present levels. In my judgment this inevitably means merely a shifting of responsibility from the States to the Federal Treasury, with no assurance that the Federal expenditures will produce any better educational programs than we now have. As a practical matter such a shift in responsibility would tend only to perpetuate existing inequalities and inadequacies in education.

Second. The greater the amount of Federal aid going into our schools, not for specific purposes, but for overall financing, the less local school administrators would be dependent on their local boards of education, State legislatures, and communities. It seems perfectly clear that such circumstances would gradually but surely lead to whittling away State and local control over education.

Third. The bill would allot funds among the States without any regard to a State's need for Federal assistance. This is contrary to practically all proposals which heretofore have been considered by the Congress.

Fourth. In shifting major responsibility for education to the Federal Government, enactment of the bill would force the Federal Government either to boost its already burdensome taxes or to expand the national debt, thus further adding to inflation, which in the end would tend to defeat the presumed purposes of the bill.

Fifth. Some proponents of vast Federal aid for education appear to feel that school needs can be met and local taxpayers spared a boost in State and local taxes by shifting responsibility to the Federal Government.

This is a snare and a delusion. If H.R. 22, as introduced, were to be enacted, it would, in the first four years of the program, cost the citizens of Pennsylvania $158,537,000 more in Federal taxes than Pennsylvania would receive through Federal grants under the program. This just simply does not make sense as far as financing education in Pennsylvania is concerned. Pennsylvania cannot even support its own educational program at the present time.

Montana, on the other hand, would ride the gravy boat, getting $13,675,000 more in Federal grants than it would pay in taxes. It is quite understandable, therefore, why Senator MURRAY, of Montana, and Congressman METCALF, of Montana, are such strong advocates of the legislation; however, I cannot understand the reasoning of my teachers in Pennsylvania.

Is Montana going to be able to sell the eleven revenue—producing States in the Union—who pay 93 percent of the cost of running the Federal Government—this bill of merchandise?

Finally, in my judgment, the Federal Government should concern itself with specific educational problems, the solution of which is clearly in the national interest. To this end I intend to give full support to essential existing programs and to any necessary modifications of these programs that may become necessary as conditions change in the future. As a practical matter, the National Defense Education Act, which I supported in its enactment last year, is only now getting under way. I intend to support measures appropriating the necessary funds to make this National Defense Education Act effective. Until we get results from this important measure, I think it most untimely and unnecessary to give consideration to proposals such as the Murray-Metcalf bill.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Raymond F. Noyes is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

Appendix

Excerpts From Address by Hon. Alexander Wiley, of Wisconsin, To Be Broadcast Over Wisconsin Radio Stations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 15, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from an address I have prepared for broadcasting from Wisconsin radio stations.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS OF ADDRESS PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY SENATOR ALEXANDER WILEY, REPUBLICAN, CHIPPEWA FALLS, OVER WISCONSIN RADIO STATIONS

I welcome the opportunity once again to be with you. I want to discuss a subject that is of deep interest to Americans in every walk of life. The subject is taxes.

Briefly, now, I would like to take a look at the (1) scope; (2) the interrelationship of Federal, State and local taxes; and (3) possible steps which offer the best hope for meeting our financial responsibilities and easing the burden on the American taxpayer at the earliest time.

Although taxes affect all of us Americans differently, basically they mean a "take" out of our incomes.

EFFECT OF TAXES ON THE ECONOMY

Today, the taxpayers of the Nation—you and I—pay a great many direct and hidden taxes. These include income, partnership, corporation, gift, inheritance, capital gains, and numerous others. The tax percentage ranges from 1 percent to 91 percent—think of it folks; 1 percent to 91 percent.

What effect does this have on the economy? A terrific impact.

We recognize, of course, that it is important to allow the American worker the opportunity to retain as much of the fruits of his labor as possible.

At the same time the economic life of business and industry depends upon their being able to have enough money to carry on their operations; to have venture capital to plow back into the business for improvements and expansion; to support research for new and better products for the consumer; and to remain economically healthy to provide jobs for the American worker, of whom more than 65 million—an all-time high—are now working toward building an ever-better life for themselves, their families, and a better country for the future.

We recognize, too, that in this complex, intertwined system of taxes, Federal taxes often overlap or duplicate taxes imposed by the State and local governments.

EFFECT OF TAXES ON ECONOMY

Now, the big question is: How can we create greater justice and equity out of this complex, intermingled, overlapping system of tax laws?

In addition, we must also ask:

1. What is the impact of this complex, many-faceted tax structure on individuals, on business and industry, and on the general economy?
2. How is this affecting our economic development, growth, and progress?
3. Are individuals, partnerships, corporations, and others being treated equitably under the tax system?
4. What proper steps should be taken to assure that the taxload is distributed fairly in the economy and that our tax policies are not unduly restrictive to growth and progress?

ESTABLISHMENT OF A TOP-LEVEL TAX COMMISSION

To help provide the answers to these and other questions, I have recommended the establishment of a top-level Tax Commission.

The objectives of the Commission would be to plug loopholes; iron out inequities; eliminate unintended hardships or benefits; capture revenue that may now be escaping taxation; make adjustments in the tax structure to reflect the changing needs of the economy, the technological revolution, shifts in the pattern of consumer needs, and other national requirements.

The overall purpose would be to provide a more efficient, equitable, and just tax system to better enable our free-enterprise economy to meet its present obligations, as well as to promote expansion and progress for the future.

The Commission—composed of 12 members from public and private life—would be required to make its studies, accompanied by recommendations for tax changes, and report to Congress.

The tax structure, over the years, has developed through a complex process of enactment of new laws, repeal of old ones, and extensions or revisions of statutes on the books. The long tentacles of the tax system reach into every organ of society.

During this period, there have been tremendous economic, technological, industrial, and other changes in the country. The tax structure, I believe, should reflect these changes.

PRINCIPLES OF TAX REFORM

The principles which, I believe, should govern tax reform include:

1. Taxes should be based on ability to pay.
2. Taxes should allow reasonable incentive to earn, to grow, to expand, to enjoy the fruits of labor.
3. Insofar as possible, taxes should be nondiscriminatory.

NEEDED: LONG-RANGE TAX POLICY

In view of the revolutionary changes in the economy in the past—and we can expect more in the future—the Tax Commission, too, should also attempt to lay the foundation for a long-range tax policy that would make proper adjustments for changes; provide for an orderly revision of tax statutes as needed, instead of amassing tax laws in a hodge-podge manner; and establishing a tax policy that would encourage—not hamper—orderly growth and progress.

The objective, of course, is to promote efficiency, equity, and justice in the tax system.

The establishment of a Hoover-type commission, I believe, would help achieve these objectives.

I am, therefore, urging early and favorable consideration of the proposed legislation for establishing the much-needed tax reform Commission.

COMMISSION WOULD NOT DELAY IMMEDIATELY NEEDED TAX REVISION

Now, friends, you may ask: If we establish a Tax Commission—scheduled to make its findings and report its recommendations to Congress by January 1961—would this obstruct, or hold off, any justified tax revisions in the meantime?

The answer is: Definitely not.

Realistically speaking, the outlook is dim for any broadscale tax cuts at this time. However, as Congress has the opportunity to correct glaring inequities in the tax structure—while the Commission, if established, completes its investigation, this should certainly be accomplished.

Almost daily, a vast volume of letters, telegrams, and cards pour into my office urging reductions of one kind of taxes or another.

Let me say, frankly, that I deeply sympathize with such messages—from many of you listening—as you outline the burdens posed by high taxes. If it were fiscally responsible, I would be happy to urge my colleagues in Congress to cut all taxes now.

BUDGET CRISIS DIMS OUTLOOK FOR TAX CUTS

But can we do this?

Currently, Uncle Sam is about $286 billion in the red.

In addition, the 1960 budget now before Congress may further contribute to that indebtedness unless we can get responsible action in Congress—supported by folks at home—to assure the adoption of a realistic fiscal policy.

Today the Nation, despite its recent economic setback, is establishing new economic records. The gross national product is at an all-time high of $465 billion. The national personal income has hit a record of $365 billion. Retail sales have reached $212 billion, topping al previous volumes of retailing.

Yet, the United States and State governments are having difficulty paying their bills.

We recognize, of course, that some communities are still suffering business lags and too much unemployment. This poses particularly difficult problems for the jobless and their families, as well as economically depresses the involved community.

Recognizing the seriousness of this situation, the Federal Government, as well as States and local communities, must step up their efforts to wipe out these economic dark spots in the economy.

The adoption of an improved tax program, as well as establishment of a long-range policy, I believe, would help to promote economic stability and better enable us to deal with these local, as well as national, problems in the future.

STRONG ECONOMY—A "MUST" FOR PRESERVING FREEDOM

We recognize, too, that the maintaining of a strong economy is definitely in the interests of national security.

Time after time, the Communists have predicted that our free enterprise system will fail to meet the economic challenges; that we will not succeed in coping with the ups and downs in the economic cycles; and that eventually our economic system will fold up, so that dictatorial communism—under the guise of socialism—can take over the country.

This must not happen. It will not happen if we have the courage, foresight, and willingness to meet the economic as well as military challenges to our security; in fact, to our survival.

"NEW LOOK" AT SPECIFIC TAXES

Now, what are the areas of taxation that merit a "new look" in terms of the long-range needs of the economy. A few of these include taxes on job-creating businesses and industry, particularly those included in the small business category; treatment of retirement benefits; possible tax adjustments to help meet the increasingly high costs of education, and thus help to fill a national need; depletion allowances for oil, gas, and other similar resources; treatment of working mothers under the tax laws; deductions for business expense accounts; excise taxes continued long beyond their wartime purposes; capital gains taxes.

In addition, there are a great many other areas of taxation which deserve careful reconsideration.

CONCLUSION

In proposing such a top-level Tax Commission, I am well aware that such a body cannot provide a cure-all for our economic ills, nor can it solve all problems.

However, I believe that tax reform action along these lines would provide our best hope for helping local, State, and Federal governments to better meet their financial obligations; early easing the burden on the American taxpayer; and assuring an equitable sharing of the tax load.

Overall, I believe that achieving these objectives would serve the interest of Wisconsin, as well as of the Nation.

Whether you are a businessman, farmer, teacher, doctor, lawyer, parent of students, or one who toils in some other vineyard—you well know the big bite which taxes take out of our income.

Now, friends, as you have the opportunity, I would be glad to have your ideas on this approach to establish a more efficient, just, and equitable tax policy.

Now, once again, this is your senior Senator, ALEX WILEY, saying: "Thanks for listening."

Americans Rally To Give Relief to Tibetan Refugees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 7, 1959

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post and Times Herald of May 6, 1959:

TIBETANS IN NEED

A group of prominent citizens headed by Lowell Thomas, former Ambassador Grew, Justice Douglas, and Congressman Judd has offered a way in which Americans may demonstrate their compassion for the victims of Communist oppression in Tibet. The plight of the 18,000 refugees now in India, described in a letter to this newspaper, has a painfully familiar ring. These are the people who defended the autonomy of their country in much the same way as the Hungarian freedom fighters stood up to Soviet brutality. Although the two situations are not altogether comparable, it is important that the free world show the same concern for an Asian people that it voiced for the Hungarians. Drugs, food, and, most of all, fraternal support is needed for these refugees who have fled their homeland instead of bowing to the dictates of Peking. The response ought to be generous.

Economic Quackery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. RAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Wall Street Journal of May 13 needs no introduction. It is a thoughtful discussion of major problems confronting the country and this Congress. I hope it will be widely read:

ECONOMIC QUACKERY

The sharp drop in unemployment reported this week ought to teach some lessons about the way our economy works and what should and should not be done to make it work better.

All this year there has been a good deal of concern about the fact that employment was lagging behid the pace of the business recovery. While industrial production was regaining prerecession levels, the jobless totals were declining but still remained abnormally high.

The AFL–CIO answer to this problem was to stage a rally in Washington some weeks ago. The Senate's answer was to set up a study commission. Meantime, dark fears were expressed that instead of having between 2.5 million and 3 million technically unemployed in the best of times (because of seasonal work in some fields, among other factors), the country might have to accept a normal unemployment of 4 million.

Now, however, the jobless figure to mid-April is down to 3.6 million and total employment, at over 65 million, is a record for April.

So it's plain that neither the AFL–CIO nor the Senate wrought the improvement. Equally clear is that the fears of permanent high unemployment are not being borne out. And that means the people who have been demanding extensive and expensive Federal intervention as a cure for unemployment are mistaken.

Those demands will diminish in intensity now, but it is important to realize what is wrong with them. Such Government action—massive make-work projects or whatever—would at most be a temporary alleviation at some future time, for these things cannot be set up overnight. In fact, it is altogether probable that this type of action would lead not to help for the unemployed but to a worsening of the situation.

One reason is that any big new burst of Federal spending would inevitably be financed by inflation. And inflation, along with high taxes, is one of the big reasons many goods are so high-priced; if the prices were lower more people might buy and more people would have to be employed. In the long run inflation works against maximum employment.

Another kind of high price can have the same effect—the price of labor. When unions demand and get wage increases that are not economically justifiable, they force employers to do everything possible to cut costs. If employers can get along with fewer workers in order to keep going, they will do that, too. This kind of misguided union policy is one of the important reasons why unemployment is still as high as it is.

Thus the objection to the demands of unions and others for big Government action is not merely that it is a costly interference with the economy, but that it doesn't really do the job. Appealing to Government to cure unemployment is seeking a remedy that cannot deal with basic causes; it is a form of economic quackery.

The rapid new decline in the jobless rolls is a tribute to the resilience of the free economy despite various kinds of Government tinkering, and a tribute to the commonsense of the administration in resisting the pressures for even more grandiose tinkering.

But if we really want to reduce unemployment further, then we must demand that the Government avoid inflation, cut spending so that taxes can be cut, and remove the special legal privileges that give organized labor its monopoly power. And if we took those steps, we would cure more things wrong with our society than joblessness.

If the Government Cannot Be for Coal, at Least It Should Not Side Against It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT C. BYRD
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 15, 1959

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a recent editorial which appeared in the Charleston Daily Mail entitled "If the Government Cannot Be for Coal, at Least It Should Not Side Against It."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IF THE GOVERNMENT CANNOT BE FOR COAL, AT LEAST IT SHOULD NOT SIDE AGAINST IT

Toward hydroelectric power the Federal Government has long had a policy. It is to encourage and stimulate it even to the point of a direct subsidy.

The same is true, to some degree, of oil and gas whose fortunes are not left to the rigid application of economic law.

More recently, the Federal Government has gone into the production of atomic energy—again in accordance with a firm policy.

The one fuel (and almost the sole industry) for which the Government has no policy is coal. Indeed, it might be said that it has a policy against coal, so consistently does it favor coal's competition and wreck its markets.

Out of this has grown the National Coal Policy Conference, representative of the operators, the miners, the coal hauling railroads and the utilities which depend upon coal. Its object: To draw the attention of Congress and the administration to the mining industry and persuade them to show for coal the same degree of economic concern they exhibit toward agriculture, for example.

Not the same kind of concern, to be sure. No one in the coal industry is urging the Federal Government to compound in coal the follies it developed to deal with the farm problem. But if it is a matter of national concern what happens to the "family farm," and billions of dollars have been spent in this area, it may also be a matter of national concern what happens to the family which looks to coal for a living.

What is wanted is not the special favors of politics. Of that there is enough already. Rather is it the enlightenment which will compel the Federal Government in making

its economic decision elsewhere to consider their impact upon coal and the coal States.

As it is, coal is left to survive in a competitive struggle with the Federal Government serving, not as a neutral, but as an antagonist.

Commendation of Texas Senators and Representatives for Efforts To Eliminate Pollution of Rivers, Streams, and Water Courses in Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 15, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution passed by the Board of Commissioners of the City of Temple, Tex., on November 11, 1958, which expresses their appreciation, praise, and thanks to the distinguished majority leader of the Senate, the able and honorable Senator LYNDON JOHNSON; to me; and to Representative W. R. POAGE, on behalf of the citizens of Temple and the surrounding counties in central Texas, for our efforts in the U.S. Congress to have enacted legislation to prevent pollution and to eliminate pollution of the water in the rivers, streams, and water courses of the State of Texas.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION COMMENDING SENATORS LYNDON JOHNSON AND RALPH YARBOROUGH AND CONGRESSMAN W. R. POAGE FOR THEIR EFFORTS IN CONGRESS TO ELIMINATE POLLUTION OF THE RIVERS, STREAMS, AND WATER COURSES IN TEXAS, AND URGING THEM TO CONTINUE THEIR EFFORTS IN THIS REGARD

"Be it resolved by the Board of Commissioners of the City of Temple, Tex., That we extend our praise and thanks to Senators LYNDON JOHNSON and RALPH YARBOROUGH and Congressman W. R. POAGE on behalf of the citizens of Temple and the surrounding area for their efforts in the U.S. Congress to enact legislation to prevent and eliminate pollution of the water in the rivers, streams, and water courses of the State of Texas; and be it further

"Resolved, That said members of the Congress be commended for their untiring efforts to preserve the purity and sanitation of our streams and rivers and that they be urged to continue such efforts for adequate legislation covering this problem in the future; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH, and Congressman W. R. POAGE."

Passed and adopted on this the 11th day of November 1958.

C. A. WHEELER, Jr.,
Mayor.

Attest:

CLAUDE H. THOMPSON,
City Controller.

I, Claude H. Thompson, city controller of the city of Temple, Tex., do hereby certify that the above and foregoing is a true and correct copy of a resolution duly adopted by the Board of Commissioners of the City of Temple at a regular meeting of said board held on the 11th day of November 1958, at which meeting a quorum was present.

To certify which, witness my hand and the official seal of the city of Temple, on this the 20th day of November 1958.

[SEAL] CLAUDE H. THOMPSON,
City Controller.

Conservation in Baker County, Oreg.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 15, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a moving and thoughtful plea for conservation of natural resources which was voiced by the Honorable Lloyd Rea, county judge of Baker County, Oreg. Judge Rea's appeal was published originally in the Record-Courier of Baker of May 7, 1959.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EVERY CITIZEN SHOULD TAKE SOME INTEREST IN CONSERVATION, SAYS JUDGE REA

(By Lloyd Rea)

Our forefathers were farsighted in placing the land in the hands of its citizens.

It was the early belief in this country that the land was the owner's to do with as he believed. If he let it wash away, or if it were wasted in other ways it was his business. That concept has been changed in recent years.

We in America believe today that our natural resources belong to the present owner, but he must conserve it for future generations. We are taking stock, we are thinking deeply of the connection of the welfare of the people and the natural resources.

In spite of the fact that Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln were concerned over the loss of soil in their day and that Patrick Henry was reputed to have said: "He is the greatest patriot who stops the most gulleys," it is only recently that we have adopted national policies to save our soil, water, timber, forage, and wildlife.

For many years we as a nation acted as if we had a virtually limitless and inexhaustible supply of natural resources, more than we could ever use. We treated our resources like the end would never come. We gave away lands to encourage settlements, we stripped the timber and when it was gone, we moved the mills closer to the next best stand of virgin timber, we killed off the game with no thought to the future, then suddenly in the early 1900's, we realized that this vast expanse of land, water, game, and other resources were not limitless and that we have in fact crossed the last frontier. We began to realize that our careless use of these resources had in fact encouraged the deterioration and destruction of the things that are basic to our survival.

Every citizen must take an active interest in some conservation program. He might be interested in soil conservation, or flood control. He might be interested in protecting our public lands; whatever his interest, he should join some group and let his voice be heard. This is the only effective way our resources will be saved for future generations.

Every citizen must ask himself, "Am I doing my part in resource conservation?"

Western Nations 4-Stage, 32-Point Peace Package

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 15, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, yesterday, as we know, the Western Powers at Geneva unveiled a 4-stage, 32-step peace package. The plan, I believe, is a constructive, comprehensive, realistic effort to lay a foundation for peaceful settlement of problems relating to German and European security.

The West's peace package is a good one. However, I am under no illusions that the Soviets will buy this plan, in toto, if at all.

Rather, in the days ahead we can expect hard bargaining by the Soviets in support of their own proposals. From past experience we can expect that the Soviet efforts will be motivated, not toward serving the interests of peace and security but rather toward attaining their objectives of expansion of Communist influence and control over more land and people.

Despite this outlook, however, I believe that in creating the 4-stage, 32-point peace plan, the Western Powers have made a commendable contribution for, one, clarification of the issues involved in solution of the German problems; two, constructive recommendations for a solution of these problems; and three, broadscope planning aimed at eliminating threats to security in Europe.

The task now is to sell it—to get adoption of as much of the plan as possible.

I ask unanimous consent to have text of the West's 4-stage, 32-point plan printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the plan was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF WEST'S 4-STAGE, 32-POINT PLAN

WESTERN PEACE PLAN PRESENTED AT THE FOURTH SESSION OF THE FOREIGN MINISTERS, BY THE FOREIGN MINISTERS OF FRANCE, THE UNITED KINGDOM, AND THE UNITED STATES, MAY 14, 1959

The Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America are convinced of the urgent need for a settlement of the German problem. They desire to seek, in such a settlement, progressive solutions which would bring about German reunification and security in Europe. Moreover they believe that progress on each of the problems of general disarmament. European security and a political settlement in Europe affects the degree of progress possible in the solution of each of the other problems.

They accordingly propose to the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics an agreement between the four governments which would include the measures outlined below relating to a general settlement of the problems at issue. The measures envisaged are closely interrelated and the present proposals are therefore to be regarded as an inseparable whole. They would come into effect progressively at the stages indicated.

Stage I

1. The four powers would establish suitable arrangements for consultation among

the parties to supervise the implementation of the agreement and to settle any disputes which might arise before the conclusion of a peace settlement with a reunified Germany.

2. With regard to Berlin, the four powers would agree that:

(A) Berlin is one city and belongs to all of Germany. East and West Berlin should, therefore be united through free elections held under quadripartite or United Nations supervision. A freely elected council would be formed for the whole of Berlin until German reunification was achieved and as a first step toward it. Thus Berlin would be retained as the future capital of a reunified Germany.

(B) Subject to the supreme authority of the four powers, (with voting procedure as adopted by the Allied authorities in Vienna), the freely elected Berlin Council would be free to administer the city.

(C) The freedom and integrity of the united city of Berlin and access thereto would be guaranteed by the four powers who would continue to be entitled as at present to station troops in Berlin.

(D) The four powers would take the necessary steps to carry out during stages I and II of the phased plan the measures described in (A) to (C) above.

3. In a common declaration, with which other interested states would be invited to associate themselves, they would undertake to:

(A) Settle, by peaceful means, any international dispute in which they may be involved with any other party;

(B) Refrain from the use of force in any manner inconsistent with the purposes of the charter of the United Nations;

(C) Withhold assistance, military or economic, to an aggressor.

4. In order to facilitate further the solution of political problems and the improvement of international relations, the four powers would, in an appropriate forum, initiate discussion of possible stated and controlled comprehensive disarmament measures.

5. The four powers would arrange discussions to develop procedures for exchanging information in stage II on military forces in agreed areas of Europe.

Stage II

Reunification

6. Bearing in mind the complex issues involved in reunification, a transitional period would be agreed. The four powers would set up a mixed German committee.

7. The mixed committee would consist of 25 members from the Federal Republic of Germany and 10 members from the so-called German Democratic Republic. These members would be appointed by the federal Government and the authorities of the so-called German Democratic Republic respectively.

8. The mixed committee would make its decisions by a three-quarter majority.

9. The mixed committee would be entrusted with the task of formulating proposals:

(a) To coordinate and expand technical contact between the two parts of Germany;

(b) To insure the free movement of persons, ideas, and publications between the two parts of Germany;

(c) To insure and guarantee human rights in both parts of Germany;

(d) For a draft law providing for general, free, and secret elections under independent supervision.

10. The mixed committee would transmit any proposals made by it under subparagraphs (a) to (c) inclusive of paragraph 9 above to the appropriate authorities in both parts of Germany. Such proposals, if no objections are raised with respect of them, should be implemented as appropriate in both parts of Germany.

11. (a) Any agreed proposal for an electoral law in accordance with subparagraph (d) of paragraph 9 above would be submitted to a plebiscite in both parts of Germany.

(b) If within I year no such draft law had been formulated by the committee, the group of members from the Federal Republic on the one hand and the group of members from the so-called German Democratic Republic on the other would each formulate a draft law approved by a majority of its members. These two draft laws would then be submitted to a plebiscite as alternatives. The electoral area for each draft law would consist of both parts of Germany.

(c) If any proposal for an electoral law obtained a majority of valid votes in each of the two parts of Germany, it would acquire the force of law and be directly applicable for the entire electoral area;

(d) The four powers would, at the time of signature of the agreement, expressly authorize the competent German authorities to promulgate any electoral law so approved.

(e) The four powers would adopt a statute providing for the supervision of the plebiscite.

12. If all-German elections had not been held on or before the termination of a 30-month period beginning on the date of the signing of the agreement, the four powers would determine the disposition to be made of the committee.

Security

13. An exchange of information on military forces in the areas referred to in paragraph 5 above would be undertaken.

14. The four powers would restrict or reduce their armed forces to agreed maximum limits, for example, the United States 2,500,000, Soviet Union 2,500,000. During this same period, these states would place in storage depots, within their own territories and under the supervision of an international control organization, specific quantities of designated types of armaments to be agreed upon and set forth in lists annexed to the agreement.

15. The four powers would be prepared to negotiate on a further limitation of their armed forces and armaments to become effective in stage III subject to:

(a) Verification of compliance with the provisions of paragraph 14 above;

(b) Agreement by other essential states to accept limits on their armed forces and armaments, fixed in relation to the limits of the armed four powers;

(c) Installation of an inspection and control system to verify compliance with all agreed security measures.

16. Measures of inspection and observation against surprise attack, helped by such technical devices as overlapping radar systems, could be undertaken in such geographical areas throughout the world as may be agreed by the four powers and other states concerned.

17. Since in 1954 the Federal Republic of Germany renounced the production of chemical, biological, and nuclear weapons, the four powers would make such arrangements as might be appropriate to secure similar measures of renunciation in the remainder of Germany and in other European countries to the east.

18. Inspection systems would be worked out for insuring compliance with the appropriate security measures envisaged in stage III.

Stage III

Reunification

19. Not later than 2½ years after the signature of the agreement elections for an all-German assembly would be held in both parts of Germany under the terms of the electoral law drafted by the mixed committee, approved by the four powers and adopted by the German people in a plebiscite (in accordance with the provision in stage II above.)

20. The elections would be supervised by a supervisory commission and supervisory teams throughout all of Germany. The commission and teams would be composed of either:

(A) United Nations personnel and representatives of both parts of Germany, or

(B) Representatives of the four powers and representatives of both parts of Germany.

21. The all-German assembly would have the task of drafting an all-German constitution. It would exercise such powers as are necessary to establish and secure a liberal, democratic and federative system.

22. As soon as an all-German government has been formed on the basis of the above mentioned constitution it would replace the governments of the Federal Republic and the so-called German Democratic Republic and would have:

(A) Full freedom of decision in regard to internal and external affairs, subject to the rights retained by the four powers as stipulated in paragraph 23 below;

(B) Responsibility for negotiating as soon as possible after its establishment, an all-German peace treaty.

23. Pending the signature of a peace treaty with an all-German government formed on the basis of the all-German constitution, the four powers would retain only those of their rights and responsibilities which relate to Berlin and Germany as a whole, including reunification and a peace settlement, and, as now exercised, to the stationing of armed forces in Germany and the protection of their security.

Security

24. Implementation of the following security provisions would be dependent upon the establishment of effective control and inspection systems to assure vertification and upon the agreement, where appropriate, of the all-German government to the security measures called for in stage III.

25. Upon the establishment of an all-German government the four powers and such other countries as are directly concerned would agree that in a zone comprising areas of comparable size and depth and importance on either side of a line to be mutually determined, agreed ceilings for the indigenous and nonindigenous forces would be put into effect.

26. After conclusion of the peace treaty, no party would station forces in any country in this area without the consent of the country involved. Upon the request of the country involved, any party to stationing forces would withdraw them within a stated period and would undertake the obligation not to send forces to that country again without the consent of the government of that country.

27. Should the all-German government decide to adhere to any security pact:

(A) there might be special measures relating to the disposition of military forces and installations in the area which lies closest to the frontiers between a reunited Germany and countries which are members of another security pact;

(B) The four powers would be prepared to join with other parties to European security arrangements in additional mutual obligations, covering especially the obligation to react against aggression;

(C) the four powers would be prepared to join with other parties to European security arrangements herein described in giving an assurance that they would not advance their forces beyond the former line of demarcation between the two parts of Germany.

28. Providing that the limitations and conditions set forth on armed forces and armaments in stage II are met, the four powers would further limit their armed forces together with corresponding reduction on armaments to agreed maximum levels, for example: United States 2,100,000;

and U.S.S.R. 2,100,000. Reductions in the armed forces and armaments of other essential states to agreed levels would take place at the same time in accordance with paragraph 15 of stage II.

29. After verified compliance with the above limitations, and subject to the same conditions, negotiations would be undertaken on further limitations (for example United States 1,700,000; and U.S.S.R. 1,700,000) together with corresponding reductions on armaments. The levels of armed forces and armaments of other essential states would be specified at the same time through negotiations with them.

30. The measures provided for above would be harmonized with general disarmament plans so as to be included in a general framework.

31. All of the security measures of the "phased plan" would continue in force as long as the control system is operative and effective and the security provisions are being fulfilled and observed.

Stage IV

32. Since a final peace settlement can only be concluded with a government representing all Germany, it should be concluded at this stage. The settlement should be open to signature by all states members of United Nations which were at war with Germany. The settlement should enter into force when ratified by the powers and by Germany.

Metcalf Protests Ban on New Water Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 15, 1959

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial, appearing in the May 9 issue of the Great Falls Tribune, headlined "METCALF Protests Ban on New Water Development."

I commend to the Senate particularly the following paragraph which appeared in the editorial:

Water development, in fact, cannot be put down on the balance sheet as a drain on the public purse. It is a returnable and profitable investment for the Government as well as for the regional and national economy.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

METCALF PROTESTS BAN ON NEW WATER DEVELOPMENT

Leading a six-man delegation, Representative LEE METCALF appeared this week before the House Public Works Appropriations Subcommittee in opposition to President Eisenhower's policy of no new starts on water resources projects.

In a plea for three Montana water development projects, METCALF asked for $7½ million to get started in the next fiscal year. If approved, the major portion of the funds would be allocated to Yellowtail Dam in southeastern Montana.

To many in less arid sections of the country the policy of no new project starts may look like a happy way to strike a blow for reduced spending and budget balancing. But in the section of which Montana is a part, at least, it should be recognized that the no new starts gimmick has a blighting influence on the whole water development program.

Water development, in fact, cannot be put down on the balance sheet as a drain on the public purse. It is a returnable and profitable investment for the Government as well as for the regional and national economy.

METCALF and others pleading in Congress for a program of continuous water development growth are deserving of public support in their efforts.

Economy and the Conservation Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 15, 1959

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, we in Congress who are concerned with conservation of our natural resources occasionally restate what we believe to be the basic principles of conservation. Then we seek to apply them to the current legislative proposals and appropriation bills. Last year, I sought to restate these principles in two speeches on the Senate floor which subsequently were presented as Senate Document No. 121, entitled "Theodore Roosevelt and the Conservation Movement," by one of the truly great leaders and spokesmen of the conservation movement, the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER].

There has just come to my attention an incisive commentary on some of the current conservation issues. The May 1959 issue of Field and Stream carries an article, by its editor, Harold Titus, entitled "Economy and Your Outdoors."

The subhead of the article succinctly summarizes the justified fears of conservationists by stating:

President Eisenhower's economy drive to balance the budget may have grave effects on many of this Nation's important wildlife projects.

Editor Titus points up the need for expanding the Federal water pollution control program. He shows how the National Park Service Mission 66 program and the Forest Service Operation Outdoors program are stymied by completely unrealistic budget requests. As I pointed out in my testimony before the Senate Interior Appropriations Subcommittee earlier this week, the Congress—after years of prodding the administration—has before it a long-range program for the national forests for tomorrow, but a budget geared to yesterday.

Mr. Titus also points out that the wraps have not been removed from the 10-year program for the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, which was given great advance billing 2 years ago. I recently expressed to the Secretary of the Interior my hope that this program soon will be released.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the article from Field and Stream printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ECONOMY AND YOUR OUTDOORS—PRESIDENT EISENHOWER'S ECONOMY DRIVE TO BALANCE THE BUDGET MAY HAVE GRAVE EFFECTS ON MANY OF THIS NATION'S IMPORTANT WILDLIFE PROJECTS

For the conservationist it could not be said that all was quiet along the Potomac as Congress began to roll out its legislative record. Fortunately, alarms of the sort that have plagued the movement in some recent years were not sounding. For example, no mass assault on the public lands by stockmen seemed to impend, as it did in 1953, and threats like that directed against wildlife refuges by oil interests in 1955 were not manifest. Nevertheless there were enough pressing problems to keep the interested workers in constant action. And as is all too often the case, much of their effort was necessarily directed at holding the line rather than toward positive and progressive achievements.

Like all officials, natural-resource managers on the national level were confronted by the insistence of the administration that expenditures be restricted in the interest of budget balancing. To be sure, there were differences of opinion in both House and Senate as to where cuts should be made, and some Congressmen had plans to force through larger appropriations than the White House wanted, but even the most optimistic could find little hope that conservation interests were not going to be hurt here and there.

The one measure on which all national organizations of sportsmen were concentrating was Representative JOHN BLATNIK's bill to double the appropriation for Federal aid to pollution control. He wants to increase it from $50 million to $100 million annually for the next 4 years, thereby very definitely tangling with White House policy. This one is going to develop into a very good scrap indeed before the session ends.

The first Blatnik bill, passed 2 years ago, put the Federal Government into the chore of cleaning up the country's streams in a big way. It provided, among other things, a percentage of Federal aid for local sewage-reduction plants. The limit of help was $250,000 for any one installation. In the beginning it was not too enthusiastically received even by the officials who had been unable to stir their communities to action without outside help. But after 2 years of experience those local people are all for it, and vocally. Eighty-two percent of them, says Mr. BLATNIK, not only want the program continued but urge that the appropriation be increased so that more communities may get in.

This comes slambang against President Eisenhower's thinking. Months ago he singled out this project as one that should be abandoned and responsibility, if any, turned back to the States. This brought cheers from, among others, the National Manufacturers Association, but those of us who had been in this decades-long fight to clean up public waters knew well that the State agencies never could or would discharge that burden of responsibility. They've tried for many years and failed miserably. With Federal aid, construction, and enlargement of disposal plans stepped up from 300 or fewer a year to nearly 700, and if that isn't evidence of success I don't know evidence when it kicks me in the teeth.

I think the most potent argument against the President's recommendation on this one came from his own Water Pollution Control Advisory Board. On that board are Milt Adams of Michigan, I. T. Bode of Missouri, and Seth Gordon of California—all men who

have been known and respected by wildlifers for years. As late as February they met and reported to President Eisenhower that a poll of local authorities showed a doubling of Federal aid was favored by 38 States, with only 13 opposed. Two States or Territories wanted to throw the construction-grant feature back to the States, and only one thought well of the President's suggestion that a State tax on telephone bills be relied on for financing the work. In other words, the President's own committee told him he was dead wrong, but admonitions from topside about curtailing expenditures still carry weight.

With the outcome of this controversy will be is anybody's guess as I write these lines. Representative BLATNIK is working hard, and the big national conservation organizations are behind him, but there's always the gamble of the final vote to consider and, at the very end, the chance of veto. To those of you who want to help in this most necessary job of cleaning up public waters I'd say the very least you can do is write your Congressman a personal letter tonight, telling him you favor his plan and why. Water is our most necessary recreational resource, and good water is slipping away from the public so fast that it scares any understanding person stiff.

Other projects stand a good chance of going down the drain in whole or in part, because of this economy drive. Among the first of these is a considerable portion of National Parks Mission 66 for the current year. The lads in the outfit don't talk much about this one because budget says they shouldn't speak their mind after it has gone on record. But the proposed appropriations for new national park facilities and expansions have been cut by about $6 million. That's a lot of dough and means many fewer new facilities just when use pressure is piling up to a screaming pitch. So if we haven't the dough to spend we haven't the dough to spend, and you stay home, bud, and try to add your overcrowding to the overcrowded national parks. Of course, you could talk it over sometime with your Congressman. He'll be home some weekend before the voting is over.

Part 2 of the U.S. Forest Service's Operation Outdoors appears to be completely stymied unless a popular protest brings it to life. It will be remembered that the first section of this program called for repair and expansion of recreational facilities on the national forests and got off to a nice start in the current year. The second section was intended to do for wildlife what the other had done for humans; that is, make the forests nicer places to be. A number of State game departments had drawn plans for cooperating with the Service on habitat improvement, and the effort promised much to sportsmen. State officials who have been left high and dry in their planning don't like it a dime's worth, and some have protested vigorously, but if those protests get positive results I, for one, will be a surprised citizen.

Then there is the 10-year program of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, which trailed the other land-use agencies in planning but was so strongly heralded 2 years ago. At that time a task force of career men was assigned the chore of plotting a course for the Service to follow that might hasten attainment of some of its objectives. From time to time it has been rumored the plan was about to be announced, but, as I write, nothing definite has been released. The economy move seems to be the big obstacle here, and although some of this plan may be revealed to the public before too long, very little can be accomplished unless funds are available, and they simply aren't available now.

One of the anomalies of this situation is that in his budget message the President noted that receipts from public lands—the national forest grazing lands, Indian reservations, etc., would be $300 million in 1960, or an increase of $20 million over any other year. At the same time, President Eisenhower assured Congress that expenditures for the agencies controlling those properties would be somewhat lower. So here we have assets that are paying a big part of their freight, yet draw no special consideration for that virtue.

But even if the administration is all set to hold the management of natural resources to an appropriation level that will be a little hard to take, its own party members don't always go along. Representative BEN JENSEN, of Iowa, demonstrated this when staff members of the Fish and Wildlife Service were testifying at hearings on their budget requests. Under questioning by Mr. JENSEN, it was brought out that the Division of Sport Fisheries is no more than fractionally doing the job it is supposed to do because of lack of personnel, which, in turn, is due to lack of money. This is the branch that operates the Federal hatcheries, about 100 of them, and distributes the millions and millions of fish they produce.

We spend about $4.2 million a year on those hatcheries, and yet we appropriate only about $7,000 annually for the staff that decides where those fingerlings and fry and legal-sized trout shall be planted. It is no secret that qualified people suspect that an embarrassing portion of those fish never do any angler any good. It is one thing when the fisheries administration of a State concerned is competent and on the ball, and there is good cooperation with the Federals on stocking plans; but quite another when the administration is weak and the State staffs are not strong.

Too many fish are planted where they don't belong, or at the wrong time, or in improper numbers, or where they won't be caught. Representative JENSEN brought this out and didn't like it. He evidently wants more money for more qualified personnel to make the gears of State and Federal agencies mesh better and save us all dollars. What will come of his efforts remains to be seen.

More than a few persons in Washington are a bit dismayed at the way commercial-fishery interests seem to be dominating the Fish and Wildlife Service. Their appropriations keep going up while some others are cut; press releases from the Service have so much a commercial-fishery slant that sportsmen are coming to criticize it. Movements are shaping up to demand, for one thing, a Federal agency within the Service to conduct fishery research on the vast new impoundments that Army Engineers and Reclamation are constructing.

Many of these huge reservoirs are in States with limited conservation funds, so that the employment of technical staffs sufficient to tackle the biological problems sure to come up is out of the question. This magazine 6 years ago advocated a special research section for these reservoirs that might point the way to good management. It would be financed by Federal funds, of course. The idea was belted down most promptly in Washington, but here it is again and being discussed by interested Congressmen, and maybe it will get somewhere.

And still on this subject of fisheries: What we don't know about marine species that appeal to sportsmen would fill libraries. It's an astonishing fact that even the life histories of some important salt water game species are only sketchily known, and what is needed to keep these fish productive and thrifty is a complete mystery. Demands that this situation be rectified are snowballing. The Fish and Wildlife Service is, of course, the only agency to do the job, because the species we're talking about don't recognize State boundaries. The Bureau of Commercial Fisheries could if it would tie such a project right in with other activities. When will such a need draw official recognition? That is up to the individuals and organizations especially interested. Some call them pressure groups. A lot of you readers probably belong to one or more. Or should, for your own good.

Congressman HENRY REUSS is carrying on his valiant battle against the subsidized drainage of farm wetlands. He again has a bill to deny to farmers these benefits if the Secretary of Interior declares that the area to be drained is beneficial to wildlife. The absurdity of what goes on should be unmistakable; we tax ourselves to bring more farmland into the production of surplus crops that we tax ourselves to store and carry. I have yet to talk with a Congressman who doesn't shake his head in despair when the situation is summed up, and yet they keep voting these subsidies in. That's because almost nobody except those who get the farm-support money takes his pen in hand.

Aside from appropriations, the most controversial piece of legislation in which outdoorsmen and women are interested is the wilderness bill. The attempt to have Congress recognize and protect some sections of the native landscape has failed to come to a vote in two sessions but may get there this time. Vigorous forces are lined up in opposition, but from the arguments their spokesmen use it is evident that many of them have not read the bill. It puts no penalty on livestock men; it will not affect the timber interests. But these two groups insist they don't want any part of it, and they will control an alarming number of votes when the time comes. Supporters of the measure simply cannot relax.

Some apprehension exists in Washington over a threat to the amended coordination act of 1934 that was made as long ago as December by the powerful Mississippi Valley Association. This act, as revised in the last session, obliges construction agencies to consider all fish and wildlife resources in planning for river-basin developments. Not only must losses due to the project be mitigated, but enhancement of the potential must also be attempted.

The act was just coming into actual use at year's end, and the Mississippi Valley Association resented it. Made up of important financial, industrial and navigation interests, its leaders contend that work on important navigation projects will be held up indefinitely while fish and wildlife surveys are made. How they get that way is not clear, but in its December newsletter the association warned that unless there was prompt clarification of the intent and scope of the law—whatever that may mean—its repeal or amendment would be sought.

As late as March no move in this direction had been detected. Should it be, the ruckus would become a dandy, because wildlifers fought and bled for nearly 20 years to make the act what it is today and, in final form, it had the support of every State Governor in the land. In such a situation a last-minute assault in force is always to be anticipated.

One of the most perplexing administrative developments to confront wildlifers in years is the recent big-scale appropriation of water rights by stockmen on the public lands in Arizona. In late February strong protests were made to Assistant Secretary of Agriculture Peterson by a delegation from national conservation organizations, and it could be that action will be forthcoming at any time.

The situation involves so many complexities of law that a simple statement of facts is difficult. Suffice it to say here that old laws, from the Desert Land Act of 1877 on down, place responsibility for and authority over water in the Western States in State hands. This has been challenged recently by the U.S. Supreme Court, but as yet the issue is clouded for most of us, and for a lot of good lawyers, too. As is true elsewhere, the Arizona statutes do not recognize the use of water by wildlife as beneficial.

About 2 years ago the State's land commissioner suddenly relaxed requirements for filing on water, and at the same time stockmen were urged by their organizations to increase their claims for priority on springs, seeps, and waterholes. Observers naturally suspected teamwork. As a result, 1,202 applications for water rights were promptly made on national forests, Taylor Grazing District lands and State lands, all in the name of stockmen and for use by livestock.

The Arizona Game and Fish Commission protested 214 of these on the grounds of wildlife conservation, but the land office refused to recognize the protests because wildlife use is so far down the legally beneficial list. The Federal regional forester protested another block of applications on the grounds that he was responsible for the livestock on the descriptions. Again the commissioner said no, this time because the forester did not own the livestock ranging there but merely issued permits for its presence. It sounds silly, I know, but it's the law.

Under arid conditions, he who controls the water controls the use of the land. The land, in this case, belongs to the public, but the water belongs to the appropriator. For years stockmen have attempted to translate their grazing privileges into vested rights. To establish an airtight claim to water is another bar to the public on these public lands, and this appears to be the objective of the drive.

Thus far the movement has been confined to Arizona. Should it appear in other States, it would call for vigorous action. Action of some sort in Arizona by top echelons of the U.S. Department of Agriculture is surely to be hoped for. If it doesn't come there might and should be considerable disturbance. The delegation that put the matter before Mr. Peterson represented the Wildlife Management Institute, National Wildlife Federation, Izaak Walton League and Sport Fishing Institute. They spoke for many million Americans who are keenly interested in our out-of-doors.

Award to Henry Alaniz, Postal Clerk at Artesia, N. Mex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 15, 1959

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Artesia Postal Clerk Honored for Achievement," published in the Artesia (N. Mex.) Daily Press of May 6, 1959. The article refers to an award made by the United States Post Office Department to Henry Alaniz, a postal clerk in the Artesia Post Office.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARTESIA POSTAL CLERK HONORED FOR ACHIEVEMENT

Henry Alaniz, postal clerk in the Artesia post office, was recognized this morning by the U.S. Post Office Department.

Alaniz' immediate supervisor, Gilbert E. Perry, superintendent of mails, presented him a certificate signed by Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield and W. D. Brewer, regional operation director.

The award also included $50 cash and was presented for superior achievement above and beyond his day-to-day duties in the post office.

Alaniz, during recent "scheme exams," sorted and filed 330 cards in 5 minutes with one error, giving him an average rate of 66 pieces per minute.

Mrs. Marion Dunnam, postmaster of the Artesia office, has high praise for Alaniz. In a letter recommending him for the award she said, "I do not feel I can speak in too glowing terms of the far above average ability and dependability of this employee and I will appreciate your consideration in properly recognizing him."

This morning, during the presentation she told postal employees she is very proud that Alaniz has been selected for recognition, but she felt that all the Artesia postal employees are above average.

Library Service Act Funds Effective Aid To Extension of Library Facilities to Rural Areas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 15, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the Library Services Act passed by Congress in 1956 has stimulated a significant and beneficial expansion of library facilities in rural areas of the United States. Today persons living in farm communities across the Nation enjoy an access to books which was denied them prior to enactment of this law.

Despite the obvious advantages inherent in efforts to encourage extension of library services to all segments of society, the Eisenhower administration this year requested only $5,150,000 for matching grants to the States. The House of Representatives appropriated $6 million. A total of $7,500,000 is authorized for expenditure on the program during fiscal year 1960. I hope that the Senate will give careful consideration to the need to maintain the program at the maximum level. Certainly the experience of Oregon demonstrates the wisdom of such action.

My own State of Oregon has been an enthusiastic participant in the program. In the May 1959 issue of the Wilson Library Bulletin, Eloise Ebert, able State librarian at the Oregon State Library, recounts our State's experience in working with this law. Because her comments so effectively reveal both the operational questions faced and the benefits derived from this program, I ask unanimous consent that Miss Eloise Ebert's article be printed at this point in the Appendix of the RECORD, together with a brief summary of provisions and program highlights of the Library Services Act.

There being no objection, the article and summary were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NEW STATE GRANT PROGRAM

(By Eloise Ebert, State librarian, Oregon State Library, Salem)

"It is the policy of the people of the State of Oregon to provide a more equitable opportunity for all citizens of Oregon to have direct access to books and reading material for the furtherance of education. It is the purpose of this act to encourage the combination or cooperation of public libraries in order to extend the coverage and increase the efficiency of library service throughout the State."

This is section 1 of the bill passed by the Oregon Legislative Assembly of 1957 which culminated years of effort of members of the Oregon Library Association, the State library staff, and many library friends. The key to its success was William J. Griffith, library development chairman, and Mrs. Eugene Kelty, a dedicated library lobbyist who had formerly been a member of the State Legislature. It was to be the beginning of intensified demonstrations, projects and activities to encourage library cooperation.

A total of $154,078 was appropriated for the 1957–59 biennium to provide minimum funds required to match a $5 million congressional appropriation under the Library Services Act. The Oregon State Library Board of Trustees adopted the following goals to be considered in approving awards: The promotion of general understanding of what constitutes good library service, the establishment of adequate service to unserved or inadequately served areas, and the inauguration of modern services now lacking.

The rural library services program in Oregon can be roughly divided into two parts—services and activities carried on from the State library, and development projects in the field to be administered locally under a grant-in-aid. Areas requesting a project grant were not required to have voted any new or additional county or multi-county tax to become eligible. This was due to a legal stumbling block to library development in Oregon known as the 6-percent constitutional tax limitation. This limitation meant that no local tax base could be increased by more than 6 percent of the amount levied in any of the 3 preceding years without a special vote. Such an unrealistic limitation has necessitated placing special library levies on the ballot in almost every instance. Local budgets were adopted before final action was taken by the Oregon Legislature and the U.S. Congress, so it would have been almost impossible to have made new local funds a requirement for a local project.

OBJECTIVES AND MEANS

Policy is defined as "a series of objectives which a governmental body strives to attain and the means which it consciously plans to use in the pursuit of these objectives." The people in Oregon are agreed on the desired objectives of a library development program; it is the means upon which they disagree. Agreements between the State library board and the respective jurisdictions were drafted and redrafted. The attorney general, district attorneys, city attorneys, county courts, city councils, library boards, librarians, and the State library staff all got into the act. Some asked "What do you mean 'seek to encourage the continuance of library service established'? We do not like 'shall utilize our resources to supplement bookmobile service to rural residents.' 'Shall' must be changed to 'may.'" Budgets for the projects were part of the contracts; and local budget committees checked, criticized, amended, and scrutinized each item. Salaries suggested according to State civil service salary schedules were too high. Some county clerks were not agreeable about assuming the extra work load for local accounting, and quick adjustments were necessary to add to their salaries.

The press was not unanimous in its support of the local projects. While not actually opposing books and reading, the editors were not convinced that this Federal-State grant-in-aid program was the best way to improve library services. One editorial captioned "What You Pay for Libraries: That 'Match Money Gimmick'" referred to this program as a "thing of horror." Another editor in an adjoining town retorted.

"If there is a 'gimmick,' as they put, in the match money program, we regard it as a darn

good one. In this age when learning and education are of perhaps greater importance than ever, especially in the field of science, this program certainly is of real value. Even aside from this, it is important becaues it is an opportunity which should not be denied the small town or country boy or girl, man or woman simply because they can't afford to do it on their own. Let's forget the almighty dollar long enough to remember the value received but if you can't just stop and consider it is the rural folks tax money too, not only the city dwellers which pays for governmental expenditures. They often are helping foot the bill for benefits received by townspeople."

Five different field projects were approved covering the gamut from cooperative cataloging, bookmobile demonstrations, to a tricounty regional demonstration. Project directors are now preparing budgets for the 1959–60 fiscal period when Federal-State funds will diminish and local budgets will need to continue the services. Whether the demonstrations will become permanent and maintain the same level of service still remains to be seen in Oregon. The Oregon Legislative Assembly now in session will undoubtedly appropriate matching funds to continue the rural library services program. The State library in its budget requested funds to match the anticipated $7,500,000 congressional appropriation but this was reduced by the budget division to match $6 million. The Library Development Committee of the Oregon Library Association will work to secure the full amount of matching funds.

Oregonians would understand Ranganathan when he says:

"Library is like river. The water in the sea gets distilled and transferred to land; river collects it and feeds most of it back into the sea. So it is with library. The thought in the mind of man gets expressed and recorded; library collects it and feeds most of it back into the mind of man. This is an everlasting cycle. New uses are found for river—irrigation, navigation, hydraulic power, hydroelectric power, and so on; even so, an ever-increasing use is found for library. New canals are led out of river, and a river system is formed; even so, library is diversified, and library system is formed to serve an increasing purpose."

To establish new library systems can be as earth-shaking as the digging of canals for a new river system. All parties concerned may have different ideas as to where the canals are to be placed, how deep and wide they should be, what legal limitations must be adhered to, and once the river system is established how it will be developed to serve its many purposes. We are digging new canals in Oregon.

[From the Wilson Library Bulletin, May 1959]

LIBRARY SERVICES ACT, PUBLIC LAW 597, 84TH CONGRESS, JUNE 19, 1956

MAJOR PROVISIONS

The act authorizes an appropriation of $7,500,000 annually for 5 years for grants to the States for the extension and improvement of rural public library service.

Rural area is defined as any place of 10,000 population or less, according to latest U.S. census. However, funds may be utilized by urban libraries to extend service to rural areas.

The State library extension agency in each State prepares and submits to the U.S. Commissioner of Education a plan which will, in its judgment, assure the use of the funds to maximum advantage.

Funds under a State plan may be used for salaries, books, and other library materials, library equipment, and other operating expenses, but not for the erection of buildings or purchase of land.

Funds are allotted to the States on the basis of their rural population and are matched by the States on the basis of their per capita income.

To remain eligible for a Federal grant a State must maintain its expenditures for all public library service at least at the same level as in fiscal 1956; and State and local expenditures for rural public library service must not fall below the 1956 level.

The U.S. Commissioner of Education is authorized to make studies, investigations, and reports as to the values, methods, and results of the various State demonstrations under the act.

PROGRAM HIGHLIGHTS

Fifty States and Territories are participating in this public library development program.

Federal appropriations have been:

Fiscal 1957	$2,050,000
Fiscal 1958	5,000,000
Fiscal 1959	6,000,000

State funds for the extension and improvement of public library service to rural areas have increased more than 45 percent since 1956—evidence of the stimulating effect of the program.

Over 800 rural counties across the Nation are receiving new or improved public library service. Some 30 of these counties had no library service within their borders prior to the Library Services Act.

More than 120 new bookmobiles and other vehicles have been placed in operation in rural areas by State library agencies.

Over $7 million was expended under the program in the first 2 years to buy books and other informational materials for use in rural areas.

State library agencies have been able to strengthen their staffs by adding more than 70 field consultants, 100 other professional librarians, and 300 clerks, bookmobile drivers and other employees to improve library service.

State plans indicate that over 130 county and regional library projects have already been organized. Cooperation between libraries and areas without libraries plays an important part in this development program.

Reports reflect many accomplishments. One example from the Oklahoma State Library: "The passage of the Library Services Act meant the beginning of library development in Oklahoma."

La Salle College Centenary Fund

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 15, 1959

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement I have prepared regarding La Salle College, located in Philadelphia.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LA SALLE COLLEGE CENTENARY FUND

As the crisis of higher education approaches its climax, it is heartening to see that our independent colleges are exerting themselves to the fullest so they may be ready for the matriculation of the wave of youngsters born during World War II. Though our independent colleges are and have been operating under a severe financial and teacher shortage over the past decade, they have not been deterred in attempting to do all in their means to provide the opportunity for students who are ready for college.

An outstanding example of the never-ending struggle to meet the educational problems of today may be found at La Salle College, Philadelphia. This independent college is administered by the Brothers of Christian Schools.

The Christian Brothers brought their educational heritage to the United States in 1845. Their outstanding record of administration in the field of education may be observed in the growth and expansion of La Salle College under their tutelage.

From its original site, the college moved three times, due to the vigor of the Christian Brothers movement in meeting expansion needs.

When World War II finally ended, the veterans of our country turned to the colleges to finish or begin their college training. The brothers, in keeping with their philosophy of meeting the need, met the challenge though operating with virtually unchanged facilities. Veterans were admitted, with the result that the Day Division alone swelled to 400 percent above its prewar enrollment.

Since 1946, the Christian Brothers have increased the student body three times; the present enrollment is over 4,000.

Aware that college entrance demands will reach a new peak by the mid-1960's, the brothers have initiated a centenary fund raising drive to begin this fall and run to La Salle's Centenary in May 1963. The brothers plan to use centenary fund contributions to support the college's present and future expansion.

Private Financing Would Be Detrimental to Rural Electrification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 15, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the Farm Credit Administration has requested that Congress remove interest ceilings on Federal land bank bonds and loans.

The rural electric systems were built to serve families in rural communities and on the farms, where operating and installation costs are high because of the wide spaces between customers. Loans at low interest rates are the keystone of this program. We cannot let big financiers cooperate with big electric power companies to drive the vital systems bankrupt.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from Rural Electrification magazine for May 1959 entitled "Illusion of Private Financing."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ILLUSION OF PRIVATE FINANCING

A press wire service report last month contains a brief warning for rural electric officials. We have been told that some sort of private financing, patterned after the Farm Credit Administration setup, could be worked out for the rural electric program without

any severe increase in interest costs for REA borrowers. The report was:

"The Farm Credit Administration asked Congress today to remove interest ceilings on Federal land bank bonds and loans. R. B. Tootell, FCA Governor, told the Senate Agriculture Committee his agency feared that its money sources might dry up without removal of a 5 percent interest rate limit on its bonds.

"He said this will not result in farmers having to pay higher interest rates on their mortgage loans from the banks. However, he also called for a removal of the 6-percent interest rate maximum on land bank loans to allow them to increase the level of the new loans if the future cost of money should require such action."

This should destroy any illusion that private financing for the rural electrification program would prove either reasonable or stable.

With their confinement to service areas still averaging only three per mile, and other economic disadvantages and restrictions, is it any wonder that the rural electric systems are almost desperately determined to resist the farm credit type of program the administration wants them to accept?

Israel's 11th Anniversary

SPEECH
OF
HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 14, 1959

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to call the attention of my colleagues in the Congress to the achievements of the State of Israel on the occasion of its 11th anniversary. I do so because of our ties with that brave little nation mean so very much to the free world today. There, across the ocean stands the Holy Land, from whence came our Bible which is the rule and guide of our faith. There, democracy and freedom were reborn 11 years ago, and Israel stands as an outpost of our free world and as a beacon light against the dark and evil forces of international communism.

As Americans we salute this reborn nation and encourage her in her very brave stand. We recognize full well the strategic position of Israel in the vital and important Middle East and the essential part she plays in helping to keep the democratic processes alive. We must also acknowledge Israel's truly phenomenal development during the past 11 years and the valuable aid she is rendering to the other new and developing nations in Africa and Asia, thereby making more needed friends for America and the entire free world. Scientific and technological progress has been brought to a portion of the world that was most in need of it and as a result, natural resources are being developed, public health vastly improved, and the bright light of human rights shown to backward peoples.

After 11 years this young and vigorous sister democracy of ours has become a stable and important nation of the world despite almost insurmountable handicaps imposed by geography, prejudice, and international politics. Enlightened self-interest alone requires us to lend every possible assistance to the State of Israel since her achievements in this very brief time are impressive indeed. As Israel enters the second decade, we in the Congress of the United States most sincerely extend our felicitations and wish her well in her valiant fight for the right.

Preserving Our Natural Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 15, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, as a nation we face a serious challenge in the years ahead of preserving our soil, water, timber, and other natural resources.

Today, for example, there is the problem of supplying adequate volumes of water to meet the ever increasing needs of the population. According to statistics, it takes 200,000 gallons of water to grow a ton of alfalfa and 600,000 gallons to make a ton of synthetic rubber. Unless constructive action is taken to preserve, conserve, and reutilize our water, the Nation will find itself "water shy" in the not-too-distant future. In 1955 the quired 221 billion gallons daily. In 20 years, it is expected we will need 597 billion gallons. Fortunately, the U.S. Department of the Interior is moving ahead on legislation enacted last session for desalting water, and utilizing brackish and otherwise now unusable waters.

However, this is only one field in which constructive effort is needed to conserve a natural resource.

By recent estimates, the Nation's population is expected to double in the next 40 years from the present 175 million to a predicted 350 million people. Consequently, there will be an ever-greater demand for our resources.

To provide for sound conservation, we need an educational program. A recent edition of National Parks magazine carried an editorial entitled "The Three 'R's' and Resources." The editorial contains some thought-provoking ideas on instilling sound principles of conservation in our youth.

I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE THREE "R's" AND RESOURCES

"The great American public has grown up under an educational system which taught that America could feed the world; that our natural resources were inexhaustible and why Hannibal crossed the Alps, but not one hint as to the future which awaited a nation depleted of its natural resources."—Jay N. "Ding" Darling.

Plants and animals depend on soil and water for their existence. Unfortunately, man too seldom realizes that he is equally dependent upon these basic resources. Not only do they supply him with food, shelter, and clothing, but through their prudent use, he is permitted to enjoy the esthetic values of outdoor recreation, including those derived from national parks and wilderness.

To bring about conservation of natural resources in a democracy, large dependence must fall on education. As a prominent educational organization points out, "This is not something to be accomplished by fiat or decree. Instead, children now in school and grownups in the world of business and industry must learn the true importance of natural resources and acquire both the incentive and the know-how to use them wisely."

Resource conservation is so broad a field that it can be incorporated into most classroom subjects. Students of history can be taught that poor soil and water practices contributed to the downfall of once-great civilizations. Geography teaches that settlements of man were located on streams, lakes, or seas for reasons of transportation and commerce and that good soil and forest resources gave rise to rich farming and lumbering areas. Science and health have other obvious relationships to our natural resources, as do economics, politics, and current events.

In addition to inclusion of the subject in formal instruction, there are also many opportunities for teaching conservation outside of the classroom. In a Claiborne County school in Tennessee, children improved a terrace in the background of their play area with vines and grass. After heavy rains in Whittier, Calif., the grounds of a school showed signs of soil erosion. Fifth graders developed a rock garden to protect the soil and then established a bird sanctuary. In a Georgia school the students have planted a school vegetable garden. At a midwestern school students planted and cared for a windbreak, while Oregon youngsters are replanting a burned-over forest.

School grounds are not only places to play, but are the nearest real laboratory the children have for learning how to conserve soil and water. Sad is the schoolground covered entirely by concrete and asphalt, with no thought given for any natural outdoor study area or school forest.

A crying need during the past decade has been more materials for the classroom teacher to use—textbooks, pamphlets, pictures, photographs, charts, films, and slides. Now that a start has been made in this direction, there seem to be other limiting factors. One is a lack of teachers having conservation training. Teachers colleges can correct a part of this, but workshops and summer training should also be expanded. The most important failing, however, is lack of public support and understanding of the needs for conservation education. We must win the backing of community leaders and organizations. All the books and pamphlets in the world will do no good in a community whose leaders fail to sense the need for resource training.

"Conservation in the schools" is the goal of this year's National Wildlife Week, March 15–21, sponsored by the National Wildlife Federation. Each member of the National Parks Association can help in this year-long effort by: (1) Finding out if conservation is being taught in the schools of your community; (2) learning if children in your schools have an opportunity to take part in outdoor conservation projects or camp programs; (3) talking with your local newspaper, radio and television editors about the importance of this program and asking for their support; (4) urging the program chairman of your local civic organizations, women's clubs, and sportsman-conservation clubs to include speakers on the need for more adequate conservation education; and (5) aiding in the establishment of a conservation education committee in your community.

Such a committee should include as many civic and conservation agency representatives as possible—teachers and school ad-

ministrators, women's clubs, service groups, churches, and conservation agencies as well as farm organizations, PTA groups, youth groups and community planners. This group can be most helpful in interesting school administrators in appropriate conservation projects and in assisting them in securing materials and guidance from professional resource managers and specialists.

You can also help through your association. We are planning a special fall issue of National Parks magazine devoted to conservation education. It will emphasize the materials on national parks which will be useful to teachers in explaining the purposes and need for these great areas. Your suggestions of materials to be included are welcome.

The ultimate aim of conservation education efforts must be to develop a people in whom the attitude of conservation is as much a part of their personality as courtesy, good manners, honesty, and thrift. Your association's primary concern is the preservation of the national parks unimpaired for appropriate public use by this and succeeding generations. Only a public informed about conservation of all resources can insure such protection.—B. M. K.

The Corn Tassel Lady

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 14, 1959

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Nell Womack Evans in her column "Sweet and Sour" in the Free Press, of Colorado Springs, May 7, 1959:

SWEET AND SOUR
(By Nell Womack Evans)
DEDICATION—SACRED OR SILLY?

Margo Cairns, of Minneapolis, is a dedicated lady—to making the corn tassel our national floral emblem. Competition for her and the "male inflorescence of Indian corn" comes from Maine's Senator MARGARET SMITH; and the rose, Colorado's Senator GORDON ALLOTT; and the carnation, and maybe others unknown to me.

Arguments pro and con scheduled in the U.S. Senate for May 7 could be classed as trivia, a silly something to take time and taxpayers' money.

Such is not the case for Miss Cairns who has spent a lifetime crusading for corn. She has nothing to gain economically, and she is not, according to my Washington spies, a "dedicated nut." She just likes the corn tassel on the basis of logic and partiotism for our honored flower. She does not want America to forget its heritage.

In the first place, corn is of American origin, born in the Western Hemisphere and found nowhere else before 1492. That ought to speak well for its tassel. It has roots in every State, has sustained and strengthened people of each State when it was the only food available and as a tasty addition to menus in time of plenty.

As a floral emblem the corn tassel would not have mere prettiness, but possess the rare beauty of practicality and of productivity—just like our country.

Longfellow called corn "the gift of the Great Spirit." Thomas Jefferson ordered six graceful columns carved in the likeness of bundles of cornstalks and topped with open ears of corn at the entrance of the law library of the U.S. Supreme Court. They're still there, of course, as payment of "the great debt the Colonists owed corn."

These are some of the corn tassel lady's arguments for corn, the remarkable wonder food of antiquity. I'm not so sure her dedication is silly.

Strengthening Incentives for Freedom and Progress—Address by Don G. Mitchell, President, General Telephone & Electronics Corp.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRY GOLDWATER
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 15, 1959

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, Mr. Don G. Mitchell, president of the General Telephone & Electronics Corp., and chairman of the board, Sylvania Electric Products, Inc., addressed the U.S. Chamber of Commerce during its recent meeting in Washington.

Mr. Mitchell stressed, among other things, that automation creates jobs. He said we need not apologize for big business, that we should be proud of it. In other countries efforts have been made in that direction, and have not been successful.

He also called our attention to the fact that 95 percent of this country's businesses employ less than 20 people.

He also mentioned inflation, and, in this respect, among other things, he said that we cannot take more out of the economy than we put back in productivity. If labor takes much out of productivity increases, there is nothing to plow back.

Mr. President, because of the importance of this address, I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STRENGTHENING INCENTIVES FOR FREEDOM AND PROGRESS

(Address by Don G. Mitchell, president, General Telephone & Electronics Corp., and chairman of the board, Sylvania Electric Products, Inc., New York City, at the 47th annual meeting, Chamber of Commerce of the United States, Washington, D.C.)

I am very grateful for your asking me to be with you this evening not only because of my great respect for the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, but I also say it because you represent a true cross-section of American business—with all of its drive, its accomplishments, its public service, and its tremendous faith in this country.

It goes without saying that all of us in business have a great many problems and questions in our minds these days. If you happen to be an exception, I warmly congratulate you. However, most of us are in the other category, and I thought it would be in order for me to act tonight as a sort of catalyst for your thoughts, and first take a brief look at the current business situation and then make some predictions about the future.

I am going to direct my attention for the next few moments not only toward the opportunities that will be available to all of us between now and 1970, but also to the challenges that you and I will have to deal with if these opportunities are to be turned into real progress for this country. Ladies and gentlemen: Let's not delude ourselves. These opportunities can be missed. The choice is squarely up to us. Whether or not you and I succeed is entirely in our hands.

First, let's look briefly at how our economy is doing today, before we start thinking about tomorrow. Just a year ago, you will recall, the recession hit bottom, and here we are with the economy producing goods and services at a new record annual rate of $465 billion—think of it: a national output of nearly half a trillion dolars. Once again, the amazing resiliency of our free enterprise system has confounded the pessimists who felt that we were in for a long, hard pull, and it has disappointed the Communists who hoped that we would go into a state of collapse and demoralize the free world.

It is extremely important to bear in mind that this has been a steady, relatively solid recovery in most areas of our economy, and this has been achieved without any increases in consumer prices. There are soft spots, of course, particularly in the unemployment situation. At the same time, however, employment is at a high level, and unemployment should continue to show a marked improvement in the coming months, particularly as the automobile and capital goods industries get back into full swing. I don't think my namesake need worry about having to eat his hat on the steps of the Labor Department Building.

In other words, ladies and gentlemen, the American economy is once again pointed toward a decade of unprecedented growth and development on every front. We are approaching the soaring sixties, if you will pardon my enthusiasm, and the eyes of every American businessman should be fixed on the future more firmly and more piercingly than ever before. I don't know of any better way to express my confidence in the future than to tell you that General Telephone & Electronics is planning to double its capacity over the next 7 or 8 years—and that will mean substantially more than a billion dollars of new facilities and equipment.

There are enormous opportunities ahead for all of us businessmen in doing our basic job of satisfying human needs—and I mean satisfying them more fully, more effectively, and more broadly than any of us would have dreamed possible just a few years ago. During the next few moments, as I project into the 1960s some of the trends which already exist and which have clearly indicated that they are going to keep right on climbing, just ask yourselves this question: "Will I be ready for it, or will I muff the ball?"

First, let's look at our potential markets. Today, there are 180 million of us here in America, and that represents an increase of more than 30 million in the past 10 years, and now the trends are pointing to another 30 million in the next decade with our population easily exceeding 200 million before 1970. Families are getting bigger, people are living longer, and more women are getting married—and that may come as a surprise to this city of Washington where, I understand, there is a superabundance of unmarried young ladies. All of this adds up not only to more people but to more households, and the next 10 years will see the number of households rise from 51 million today to more than 60 million in 1970.

From the standpoint of sheer numbers of consumers, there will be a staggering growth in your markets in the years ahead. And then when you consider such additional major factors as a steadily rising standard of living, increased leisure time, broader

interest in travel, recreation, and hobbies, you begin to see what this will mean to the manufacturing industries, to housing, to agriculture, to transportation, to distribution, to communications, to entertainment, and every other segment of our economy. These enormously increased demands will require a greatly increased flow of new and better goods and services, new ideas and new ways of doing things, new methods of making our products, and new ways of getting them to the consumer.

If you would like to reduce all of this to numbers, our national total of goods and services should at least continue to increase at the present average rate of 4 percent per year, and should rise gradually to 4½ percent or even higher. That will mean a gross national product of more than $725 billion and probably $750 billion by the end of the soaring sixties, and would represent about $3,500 for each man, woman, and child in the country, against $2,600 today.

However, if you stop right there, and think only in terms of dollars and cents, you will be ignoring one of the most dramatic aspects of our way of life. I am referring to the expanding frontiers of technology—ranging all the way from the unearthing of new fundamental information about the laws of nature, to the application of that information to new products and new services to meet human needs.

The great expansion of research and development in recent years is demonstrated by the fact that the entire country's research and development expenditures have increased during the past 10 years from less than $3 billion to more than $10 billion last year—and that enormous effort reaches not only into the traditional fields but into some that are so new that we don't know how to describe them.

The time lag between laboratory and the marketplace is becoming narrower all the time, and today it ranges anywhere from 7 to 12 years, depending on the industry. I would guess that the average is about 10 years, but the point is this: If you were to interview a cross-section of leading companies today, they would tell you that from 50 to 75 percent of their sales are derived from products which did not exist or are basically different from the products of 15 years ago.

As we move into the 1960's, the spending for research and development will climb to $20 billion annually because our technology is becoming more and more complex with each passing day. Industry knows that research is its life-blood, and we must keep narrowing that gap between laboratory and market. "No research, no future" is our motto today, because we know from past experience that research has paid off at the rate of from 100 to 200 percent a year, and over a 25-year period that means $100 spent on research will bring back anywhere from $2,500 to $5,000, realizing that there will be variations from industry to industry and for different companies within an industry. Progressive management certainly doesn't need any more proof than that.

Here are some of the developments you can expect to see over the next few years: A single communications system in your home, combining telephone, television, and radio; your television screen will be a flat panel hanging on the wall; there will be radar steering on your automobile; machines will type spoken words directly on paper, and other machines will translate foreign languages as fast as they are spoken. There will be scores of new synthetic materials, and gas-turbine-powered automobiles, and the production of electricity direct from atomic energy. These are only a few high spots because the new products of the 1960's will extend across the entire spectrum of science.

Paralleling these achievements in the laboratories will be extremely significant technical progress in the manufacturing plants * * * and I am speaking about greatly increased mechanization and automation. Industry has no choice in the matter if our national output is to keep pace with the demands of our growing population. Although the working force will approach 80 million in the next 10 years, there won't be enough people in that working force to produce $750 billion of goods and services by 1970 unless we speed up our automation program. An enormous variety of new types of manufacturing equipment will be needed—not to throw people out of work, but to help them do their jobs, by extending the breadth of their minds and the skill and power of their hands.

There have been some rather emotional attacks on automation in some quarters, and some people try to portray the machine as a Frankenstein. But you and I know the truth of the matter is, as it always has been, that broader mechanization eliminates obsolete jobs and eliminates drudgery, and creates many more new jobs and better jobs than the ones it obsoletes. Certainly there are some short-term dislocations. I don't like to see them any more than anyone else does, and a major responsibility of management is to minimize those dislocations as much as humanly possible. But the fact remains that mechanization or automation, or whatever you want to call it, is part of that phenomenon known as progress, and it symbolizes man's eternal struggle and determination to improve his entire way of life.

Every so often, when someone sounds off about big business, I feel like calling him on the phone and asking him this question: "If it weren't for big business, where would all the impetus for billions of dollars for research and new products, and new manufacturing processes come from?" I have no quarrel with anyone who is seeking to correct the abuse of bigness—whether that abuse come from big business, or big labor unions, or big government. But all I can say is thank heaven industry was big enough to tackle those challenges in the past, and let's hope we're big enough for the challenges ahead of us.

This opportunity to do a little missionary work for big business is especially welcome to me, but I'm not going to apologize for our size. You don't grow big and stay big unless you produce something the public wants. We in industry should be proud of it, because there are all too many countries where big business is nonexistent, not because they don't believe in it, but because they haven't been able to produce it.

Big business means big opportunities and big progress—and it means enormous benefits to the shareowners who have invested their savings in our enterprise, and the employees, the plant communities, the customers, and the country as a whole. But we're not so big that we have lost sight of the fact that we are completely dependent upon millions of small businesses, and that we wouldn't get very far without them, any more than they would get very far without us. The person who tries to create an image of big business against small business is talking through his hat. We're inseparable, both ways, and down deep he knows it.

He should remember that 95 percent of this country's business enterprises employ fewer than 20 people. And he should read "David and Goliath" again, or attend one of our company's staff meetings where the boys describe how some smaller company is giving them a run for their money. Those small businesses may be small in sales or payroll, but in some lines of activity they can do a better job than any big company ever hoped of doing.

For the past few minutes, we have been looking at the opportunities ahead of us—and I want to stress that word "opportunities" again, because there is nothing that I know of that will deliver them on a silver platter or guarantee their happening. We will have to go out and work for them. This means we will have to face up to a number of extremely serious challenges during the next few years.

No. 1 on the list, of course, is inflation, and I want to say right here and now that I don't know of anyone who is more acutely aware of the dangers of inflation, and who is doing a better job of pointing out these dangers to the public than the President of the United States. Several weeks ago Mr. Eisenhower challenged you, and me, and every other businessman in the country to do something about it. And I want to repeat his urging to all of us to help assure a balanced Federal budget, and to let our Congressmen know how we feel about it. Let me repeat his words: "The need for a balanced budget is not an isolated issue but is inseparable from our national strength in all of its aspects. To indulge in the short-sighted luxury of continued deficit financing in the face of both growing prosperity and incipient inflation would be a denial of public responsibility."

And you, Mr. Vice President and your Cabinet committee, deserve the strongest praise for your anti-inflation program, especially in the area of price stability.

One aspect of this inflation problem is the feeling in some quarters that a little inflation is a good thing. Secretary Anderson effectively buried that argument when he pointed out the other day that you are only courting disaster when we let the demands upon our resources run ahead of our productivity. Let me repeat his basic theme: If we cannot live within our means today, when economic conditions are at record-breaking levels, when can we ever expect to do so?

It seems to me that we must bear constantly in mind that you cannot create prosperity out of thin air—you cannot take more out of our economy than you put in it. Some people are always tempted to try, however, and if they keep trying hard enough, this country certainly will end up with a recession that will curl your hair. If labor takes all of the productivity increases in the form of wage increases, there will be nothing left to plow back into the business. If industry simply passes along its increased costs by raising prices, inflation will go up still higher. If Government keeps on financing deficits, there won't be anything left for anybody. The danger is particularly strong in our international trade, because inflation will price us right out of the market, and will create a host of unhappy situations, both here and abroad.

There isn't any bucket of gold for labor, or management, or government, or anybody else. But if enough people think there is, we will end up the victims of a type of creeping socialism that will turn this country from the dynamic economy that it is today into a mass of mediocrity from top to bottom. Gone will be the challenges, the incentives, the competition, and the thrill of accomplishment.

Certainly, I am not unmindful of the fact that urgently needed advances in social legislation have been made in the past 25 years. At the same time, however, there are always those who would like to carry this further and further, until we would become an economy in which Big Brother leads you and me around by the hand. That kind of thinking isn't what developed this country in the first place, and it isn't the kind of thinking that will get us anywhere in the future.

Britain seems to have learned what creeping socialism can do to you. The tax cuts they announced the other day mean one thing: They have learned that a national budget must be the best budget for everybody. It must be a budget which increases the demand for goods by increasing the pub-

lic's real purchasing power. This is the kind of "pump priming" that really means something, and I think we should be tremendously encouraged by what we see going on over there.

As I read the newspapers these days, the whole spirit is that somebody is against somebody—that management is against labor, and labor is against management; that big business is against little business, and little business is against big business; and the Government is against everybody, and everybody's against the Government. There is an enormous danger in that philosophy. Why can't all of us be for something—why can't we take the positive approach and think in terms of everybody for everybody, and everybody for the entire country. Certainly, I realize that every group in our society has its own story to tell, and they are always going to try to put their best foot forward. But we're all in this together. Let's take that emphasis away from who is going against whom. The differences are really pretty trivial when you compare them with the enormous stakes we all have in attaining our common goals. Let's be statesmen in our respective fields, and take a broader and more constructive point of view, and do what is best not only for us but for everybody.

This, ladies and gentlemen, is what I am talking about: Every businessman in this country has to make up his mind that he cannot operate his business in a vacuum. He has to roll up his sleeves and do something about assuring that the businessman isn't required to approach the opportunities of the next decade with one hand tied behind his back. You and I must work vigorously for a better business climate. This doesn't mean simply a better climate for businesmen; it means a better climate for every segment of this economy—no special privileges, no undue influence—just a climate that works for everyone, in the best interests of everyone.

Other groups are campaigning, effectively tirelessly, and sometimes viciously for what they want. When are businessmen going to realize that they not only have the same opportunity and the same responsibility, but an even greater opportunity and an even greater responsibility to stand up and be counted—and to campaign for what you know is good and right for the entire country.

Does any other group know more about what is right for this country? Does any other group have a greater interest, a greater awareness of what is needed for the 1960's? Of course they don't but the answer is that some of them are doing something about it—and you and I are not doing nearly enough.

For many years, all of us have understandably been preoccupied with the day-by-day demands of running a business. We felt we were doing enough, and congratulated ourselves warmly—when we were able to get the goods out and sell them at a reasonable profit. If we were able to do some long-term planning in the bargain, that was a bonus—but most of the time we dealt with the problems that were staring us in the face, with little time given to thinking about problems that might arise in the future.

Then we began to learn the facts of life, and we saw that we had to look farther ahead and develop a long-range course for our ship, instead of being confronted with one series of uncharted reefs after another. Today, the challenge to every businessman is to think more and to plan more about the long-term—not only about such matters as scientific research, new product development, bigger and better facilities, and new ways of getting the goods to market, but about the entire backdrop for our business—the overall climate in which business operates.

Let me emphasize the basic principle upon which this entire better business climate activity is based. It is based upon the fundamental fact that when there is a healthy business climate in your community, every man, woman, and child in that community benefits from it. That is far more than a case of helping business; it is a case of helping the entire community—the people who own businesses, those who work in them, those why buy their products, those who sell to them.

Some of you here tonight are already engaged in better business climate programs, but for those of you who have yet to get started, let me reassure you for a moment. In this complex economy of ours, the idea of doing something about the conditions in which you and I do business might seem impossibly complicated. Where do you start? What do you do? Well, you will find to your surprise that instead of some vast complicated situation beyond your control, the business climate in your community can be broken down into identifiable, tangible situations that you can do something about. Just bear this in mind: What goes on here in Washington, and what goes on in your State capitals, reflects the active and expressed points of view in all of the hometowns across the Nation.

If you need one clinching argument to convince you of the job that needs to be done, let me remind you that Government at all levels—Federal, State, and local—is spending an amount equal to about one-third of this Nation's income. How can you help but be involved; you have no choice, because you already are. Your only choice is whether you are going to sit back and watch, or stand up and do something. To the businessman who says he hasn't time to be actively interested in what the Federal, State, and local governments are doing, I would like to point out that government certainly has shown it has the time to be actively interested in you.

Let me say this in conclusion, ladies and gentlemen. When you say to yourself: "I'm going to be ready for the soaring sixties, and I'm going to get out from under my bushel basket and not only stand up and be counted but go out and do some counting of my own"—when you say all that and mean it, then there won't be any roadblocks to worry about. There isn't a roadblock in the world that we American businessmen can't circumvent by imaginative, straight thinking, and applying our ideas and convictions with strength and determination.

If we work with others, if we work together, we can attain every goal we can ever dream of, but if we work against each other, we will muff those opportunities, and the soaring sixties will soar right out the window. The decision is entirely up to you.

Let me wish you and the folks back home minding the store the very best of success and good fortune in the years ahead.

Thank you very much.

Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 4, 1959

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to join with so many of my colleagues in observing the anniversary of Polish Independence Day. It is important that we set aside a bit of time each year to remind ourselves just how much the endeavors and achievements of this remarkable people has meant to the United States.

Their single-minded struggle to achieve and maintain independence has been an example and signal to oppressed peoples at many times and in many corners of the world. They are now engaged, as so often before, in an effort to throw off the schackles of foreign oppression. The dramatic Posnan revolution of 1956, and the successful achieving of some degree of equilibrium afterward, gives promise that Poland will again achieve its independence. I hope the United States will, as it always has, continue to befriend the Polish nation in this struggle.

"No Start" Policy Endangers Port

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 14, 1959

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, the world seaport of Baltimore, which last year was second in the Nation in foreign trade, is having its position and growth jeopardized because of lack of funds to implement the omnibus river and harbor bill of 1958.

The Congress in its wisdom passed the act which authorizes, among other things, the dredging of the Baltimore Harbor and approach channels to a controlling depth of 42 feet. However, no action has been taken to appropriate funds to carry out the projects in the act. The sum of $7 million is urgently needed to start work on the project.

I sincerely hope that the appropriations measure will soon be reported from committee and that the Congress will act speedily to approve the same.

The very capable editor of the Baltimore American-News Post pointed out the situation and commented thereon in the Sunday, May 10, 1959, issue of that paper.

The editorial follows:

"NO START" POLICY ENDANGERS PORT

A shortsighted budget policy of "no starts" in Federal engineering projects in 1959 may sesriously endanger the port of Baltimore's economic future.

Thirty Baltimore business leaders, 15 of whom testified before the House Appropriations Committee in Washington last week, showed conclusively that harbor dredging is an urgent need, not just another request for vague improvements.

Baltimore's harbor and approach channels are now limited to 39 feet, only 35 feet in two main branch channels to ore and oil terminals—limiting ship drafts to 33 feet in most instances. Second in the Nation in foreign trade in 1958, the port has less adequate channels in proportion to its tonnage volume than any other harbor in the United States.

The river and harbor bill passed by Congress in 1958 authorized dredging to a new controlling depth of 42 feet here. But there was no appropriation to begin the project, estimated at $30 million.

Because of the rapidly increasing size of bulk ore and petroleum carriers, the limited

harbor depth becomes a more urgent problem daily. One local ore terminal cites the loss of 236,000 tons of iron ore imports in 1958 because of a shift to super ore carriers exceeding channel draft limitations in the port.

Shipping experts have no way of estimating loss of a much greater volume anticipated this year and every year harbor deepening is delayed.

By the end of 1959, ships of 100,000 deadweight tons with drafts of 47 feet will be launched. Even superore carriers in the 63,000-ton class must come into Baltimore loaded light. Their operators won't tolerate our shallow harbor very long if they can unload full cargoes at Philadelphia or Norfolk.

Baltimore has earned her position as a world port through the diligence of her business community. Harbor terminal operators have already spent millions preparing their facilities in advance of the dredging authorized by Congress. To deny the Nation's second foreign port the $7 million needed to begin this urgent project would be the worst kind of myopic pennypinching.

Until the dredging appropriation is made, port leaders will do well to refrain from statements hailing Baltimore's well integrated, efficient port. In view of our seriously restricted harbor depth, we are already years behind the more progressive ports on the Atlantic seaboard and in Europe. The pity is that more and more ship operators are becoming aware of this deficiency—gravely endangering the city's world trade position.

Ore and petroleum cargoes, representing the major volume of Baltimore's shipping, aren't important to Baltimore alone. They have a national strategic importance Congress can ill afford to ignore.

Analysis by Edward P. Morgan, of American Broadcasting Network, of Federal Support of Medical Research and Medical Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 15, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, at President Eisenhower's press conference of May 13 the distinguished commentator of the American Broadcasting Network, Mr. Edward P. Morgan, asked the President about the whole question of Federal support for medical research through the National Institutes of Health.

The President's reply was extremely disappointing to many of us who are urgently interested in expanding this vital undertaking. In his network commentary of that evening, Mr. Morgan placed in perspective the whole question of further intensive inquiry into the causes and possible cures of such grim and serious diseases as cancer, heart disease, muscular dystrophy, and many other maladies. He also analyzed the vital problem of educating sufficient physicians and other scientists to maintain the health and welfare of our population.

I ask unanimous consent that this portion of Mr. Edward P. Morgan's news commentary of May 13, 1959, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the extract was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EDWARD P. MORGAN AND THE NEWS, MAY 13, 1959

One of the most somber problems of the Eisenhower administration, as the President himself hardly need be reminded, has been the health and welfare of its own top officials. The Pentagon's No. two man, Donald Quarles, died unexpectedly last week of a heart attack. John Foster Dulles is fighting a game but losing battle with cancer. The chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Twining, had a piece of lung removed yesterday.

At the President's news conference this morning, a reporter wondered if these and similar emergencies had inclined him to upgrade the importance of basic medical research and the need of more Federal support for it. Mr. Eisenhower replied that the mass of scientific conviction and opinion he had noted indicated we are doing a remarkable job in this field already. Indeed he saw both waste and danger in the possibility of moving too fast. One of his supporting arguments for making haste slowly was that if you steered too many medical men and others into research you wouldn't have enough left to care for the population from day to day.

Ironically, there is another mass of evidence to refute the President's whole concept and some of it comes from within his own administration. For fiscal 1960, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare had justified an expenditure of $337 million for NIH, the National Institutes of Health for research. The Budget Bureau cut this to $294 million, more than $100,000 below what Congress had appropriated for this fiscal year. As a matter of fact, every recent increase in research funds for NIH has been made over President Eisenhower's opposition.

A number of the most distinguished medical men in the country, including Boston's famous cancer specialist, Dr. Sidney Farber, Dr. Paul Dudley White, who treated the President after his heart attack, and Philadelphia's Dr. I. S. Ravdin, who assisted in his operation for ileitis, have all urged that a total NIH budget of $474 million is reasonable and necessary.

The argument that we can't afford to divert doctors to research is a poor one to use on Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER, Democrat of Oregon, a cancer victim who says he owes his life to developments made possible by NIH research funds. By the Presidential reasoning, it is conceivable that Dr. Salk would never have had time to discover his antipolio vaccine. The fact is, according to NEUBERGER, who scored the President's stand as ridiculous, we need more both of practicing physicians and researchers. He recalled a 1958 report of a blue ribbon committee of doctors appointed by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and headed by Dr. Stanhope Bayne-Jones, ex-dean of Yale Medical School which said we need 10 to 20 new medical schools in the immediate future to keep from falling further behind. NEUBERGER also cited the fact that Soviet Russia has proportionately more doctors than we have, 164 for each 100,000 of population, compared to our 130.

President Eisenhower complained of mounting hospital and nursing costs, said that problem should be the subject of some research, too. One realistic way of meeting it would be to encourage group medical insurance but the administration, like the American Medical Association, looks with suspicion and disfavor on such ideas.

There is, in the end, the matter of values. Medicine has indeed made great strides but it is still barely beginning discoveries in many fields. Nearly 900,000 persons a year die of heart disease just in this country, more than a quarter of a million of cancer. According to a vividly impressive brochure recently issued by the National Health Education Committee, the Federal Government is spending $34.2 million on heart disease research this year, against $720 million in research and development for the Air Force alone. There are similar gaps in values all down the line.

Congress will again boost the appropriation for Federal medical research. Of course, there is a limit to what we can afford. As the bill cleared the House it totaled $344 million. That's a little more than what Americans spent last year on greeting cards. And as one of those might say, here's to your health.

This is Edward Morgan saying good night from Washington.

Nuclear Power Is Miracle in the Making

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 14, 1959

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, speaking under the title "Miracle in the Making," Robert E. Ginna, chairman of the board of the Rochester Gas & Electric Corp., told several hundred brilliant young Americans of the Nation's progress and future in the development of nuclear electricity.

His address was made April 30 before the First National Youth Conference on the Atom. Conferees consisted of outstanding high school science students from all over the Nation. They were selected through stiff competitions which won not only them, but their science teachers as well, participation in the conference. The event, aimed at stimulating the will of young Americans to pursue careers in science, was sponsored by the country's privately owned public utilities.

Mr. Ginna is also president of High Temperature Development Associates, a nonprofit company financed by U.S. electric power companies, which is proceeding in combination with General Atomics, Inc., to build an advanced design nuclear electric central power station in Pennsylvania. The installation will incorporate improvements in the reactor art far beyond that of any ever before achieved and assure continued world leadership by the United States in peaceful uses of the atom. Mr. Ginna's authoritative knowledge and his leadership of America's fast growing nuclear power industry is well evidenced by the following extracts from his presentation to the conference:

MIRACLE IN THE MAKING

(Excerpts from address by Robert E. Ginna, chairman of the board, Rochester Gas & Electric Corp.)

Today is truly an age of miracles and perhaps the greatest miracle in the making is the harnessing of energy which has been locked up in the atom since the beginning of time. We, of my generation, will be passing on to you young men and women the bare rudiments of knowledge in this

field and it will be your challenge to develop the science to its full potential.

* * * * *

The human thirst for adventure, self-preservation and a better way of life motivates an ever-expanding search for new and more efficient sources and applications of energy in the form of mechanical power. To satisfy this thirst on a continuing basis, another form of energy is required—young minds, with the drive of youth, schooled in the more complex means of energy derivation and utilization.

It is hardly necessary to tell you that, without energy, the world's entire industrial machine would come to a standstill and we would revert to the Dark Ages. Our American economy is perhaps the most vivid proof of this statement. The constructive use of energy in this country has resulted in more and better housing, more and better food, and the almost complete elimination of drudgery from our industries, business establishments and homes.

A hundred years ago, 65 percent of the work done in the United States was accomplished through the muscle power of men and animals. Wind and water power accounted for 22 percent of the work, and only 13 percent was accomplished through the burning of various fuels such as wood, coal, and the limited amount of oil and gas then available. Today, less than 1 percent of the work being done in the United States is accomplished through muscle power, only 7 percent by wind and water power, and the remaining 92 percent is accomplished through the use of fuel power—that is, energy derived from burning fossil fuels, such as coal, oil and gas.

In 1946 the annual average use of electricity by a single industrial worker was just over 10,000 kilowatt-hours. Today it is over 25,000 kilowatt-hours. A man can only exert about 35 watts of energy in an hour, so each worker today has the equivalent of 357 electrical men working beside him.

Since an industrial system is merely an energy system, the amount of energy consumed in a country can be looked upon as a bench mark of its productivity. United States energy consumption from all sources has more than doubled in the 38-year period from 1920 to 1958. By 1975 it is anticipated that our energy consumption will be 3½ times that of 1920 and energy supplied by the atom is expected to equal the total usable water energy.

Since a significant portion of the total energy consumed is converted to electric energy, the United States power generation per capita presents an impressive picture of our industrialization and standard of living. Back in 1920, the total annual kilowatt-hours generated per person in the United States was a lowly 500 kilowatt-hours. By the end of 1958, this had grown to approximately 4,500 kilowatt-hours per year—a growth of 800 percent. In spite of recessions and major depressions, this growth has been constant with only minor changes in the trend line to indicate periods of economic instability.

To meet the tremendous increased demand for electricity in our country, the utility industry has increased generating capacity over 900 percent since 1920. Today we have in excess of 150 million kilowatts of electric generating capacity supplying our needs. Authorities in the electric field, when asked to predict the electric generating capacity required to meet the industry's load during the next 17 years, have computed varying amounts. But, regardless, of which crystal ball you use, it is anticipated that there will be a minimum increase of almost 200 percent in generating capacity to meet our Nation's needs over the next 17 years.

To supply these enormous quantities of electric energy requires equally enormous quantities of fuels. In 1958, coal provided energy to generate 55 percent of the Nation's electric requirements, gas and oil 25 percent and water power 20 percent. In that year almost 700 billion kilowatt-hours of electricity were generated and consumed. In 1975, it is anticipated that coal will provide approximately 57 percent of the electric industry's requirements, gas and oil will shrink to 15 percent, hydro also will drop to 15 percent and the 13-percent balance, we have every reason to believe, will be generated by nuclear energy. Thus, in 1975 we anticipate that nuclear power will be producing approximately 240 billions of the almost 2 trillion kilowatt-hours that will be consumed in our country.

* * * * *

In the brief 5 years since the atomic field was opened to private industry, an exciting story has unfolded. Since I am representing the electric power industry, my remarks will be limited to that field. I hope I can convey to you the drama and challenge in this new science—a science which in its modern application is just about as old as you are.

When we started out in 1954 to develop atomic power we had a lot of theory but very little practical knowledge. Theoretically, we knew there were many ways—and combinations of ways—to convert the heat given off by fissioning atoms into steam to drive turbines and generators. We knew reactors could be fueled with either uranium 235, uranium 233 or plutonium. The fuel could be solid, an aqueous slurry or a metal liquid compound. There were a variety of methods by which the heat could be carried off using water, organic fluids, or gases. But in practice we did not know, nor do we have any certainty today, of the one best way—the one method so efficient that it would render all other obsolete.

The objective of America's atomic power development program has been to find the best way of achieving economically competitive nuclear power. This called for building many experimental reactors, embodying many different principles.

* * * * *

Today, in this country, over 30 electric generating projects are underway by Government, industry, and other groups, to find the best means of generating electric power from atomic energy. Some of these projects are purely research, some are experimental, and some are full-scale atomic powerplants.

The United States has four civilian nuclear power reactors presently in operation. These include two small boiling water reactors—one at Chicago, Ill., and the other at Vallecitos, Calif.; a small sodium-graphite reactor at Santa Susana, Calif.; and the world's first large-scale atomic powerplant designed primarily for the production of civilian power at Shippingport, Pa.

Seven other nuclear powerplants are under construction. They include a medium-sized sodium-graphite reactor at Hallam, Nebr.; two boiling water reactors—one, a large unit at Dresden, Ill., and the other, a smaller one at Elk River, Minn.; two large pressurized water reactors—one at Rowe, Mass., and the other at Indian Point, N.Y.; a large fast-breeder reactor at Lagoona Beach, Mich., and a smaller breeder reactor at Idaho Falls, Idaho.

In addition, preconstruction development work is currently underway on six more reactors. These include two medium-sized boiling water reactors—one at Eureka, Calif., and the other at Sioux Falls, S. Dak.; a reactor at Hanford, Wash., designed primarily for the production of military plutonium but capable of being used for production of electricity; two heavy water moderated reactors—one of medium size in west Florida and the second, a smaller unit at Parr Shoals, S.C.; and lastly, a small organic moderated reactor at Piqua, Ohio. I will explain these different types of reactors in more detail later.

Finally, four other civilian power reactors are awaiting authorization by Congress, several more are in the planning stage, and well over a dozen design and development studies are underway.

* * * * *

Producing electrical power from the atom has called for mastering dozens of problems, many of which did not even exist as problems prior to World War II, and every day additional problems arise.

We have had to develop new materials, new ways of doing things, and change our thinking on many phases of metallurgy and engineering because we were confronted with a new set of rules, and many more which are still to be written.

We have developed new tools to handle radioactive materials such as a manipulator which can lift an egg without cracking it or grip with a force of hundreds of pounds and yet the feel to the operator at the control handle is as sensitive as if his own fingers were doing the work.

We have developed new standards of strength and tightness in joint welding and new kinds of welding alloys to join exotic new metals and to insure that radioactive gases and liquids do not escape from reactor vessels and tubing.

We have designed many new kinds of equipment to meet the demands of this new technology. Some of this equipment is destined to be buried under 6 feet of solid concrete for unknown periods of time.

We have achieved new peaks of percision in the fabrication of heavy equipment. The 300-ton pressure vessel destined to hold the uranium core of the Dresden reactor took 2½ years to design and build. It is over 12 feet in diameter and over 42 feet high.

New instruments had to be designed to operate with precision and reliability and be able to respond to an emergency not in seconds, but in thousandths of a second.

In the electric generating field a reactor simply replaces the firebox or furnace of the boiler. What kind of fuel you burn, how you design the fuel elements and how you transfer the heat generated by the fissioning atoms to the steam which will eventually drive the turbine at the conventional end of the plant are the keys to economical power. The scope of our problem is emphasized by the fact that there are over 1,700 different reactor concepts possible from various combinations of fuels, fertile materials, moderators, coolants, and the like. I would like to discuss with you only the eight major reactor concepts on which Government, industry, and others are presently working together in their search for the best and most economical source of nuclear power.

Our earliest work with specific reactor types was on the pressurized water reactor. This was because of the extensive research and development data available from the work carried out on the *Nautilus*—the first atomic power submarine. In this concept, heat is removed from the reactor core by water pressurized at about 2,000 pounds per square inch to keep it from boiling. The pressurized water is then forced through a heat exchanger where steam is generated.

The boiling water concept is another water cooled class of reactor. This concept differs from the pressurized water reactor in that saturated steam is formed by water boiling in the reactor core (rather than keeping the system under pressure to prevent boiling) with steam passing directly from the reactor to the turbine.

The heavy water moderated concept is a third class of water cooled reactor in which the heavy water moderates or controls the fissioning of the fuel atoms. One problem with this type of reactor is that heavy water is still very expensive, but the use of heavy water as a moderator is of interest to us be-

cause it permits high neutron economy. Neutron economy, in turn, means we can use natural or only slighty enriched uranium fuel, with the possibility of reducing the cost of the fuel cycle.

Organic cooled reactors hold some attraction for us since they provide a means of obtaining somewhat higher steam temperatures at relatively low reactor pressures thereby permitting the use of less costly materials and equipment. However, the advantages of a simple and relatively inexpensive system, must be evaluated with the disadvantages and problems resulting from the tendency of organic coolants to decompose under irradiation.

Gas cooled reactors hold out the promise of providing steam conditions suitable for use with modern electric turbines at costs which may be lower than those achieved with water cooled reactors. Temperatures of 1,000° F. and pressures of 1,450 pounds per square inch are essential unless we are to lose hard won turbine efficiency. Potentially, very high temperatures are obtainable from this concept. However, until recently, the high capital costs of gas cooled reactors made this type less attractive to us than other reactor concepts. Today we believe we have a high temperature, gas cooled reactor concept that will lick this problem.

The sodium-cooled reactors hold promise for the future because of the high boiling point of sodium. This means we can eliminate a high-pressure circulating system and at the same time derive steam at fairly high temperatures and pressures. However, containment of molten sodium, reliable pumps to circulate it, and the heavy shielding of radioactive sodium in the heat transfer system present very serious metallurgical and mechanical problems with which we are presently wrestling.

Fluid fuel reactors hold potential promise in the long-range future. Their attraction lies in the elimination of fuel elements which are costly to fabricate, in elimination of control rods, and other factors. It might even be possible to build into such a system the continuous chemical reprocessing of the reactor fuel.

Finally, we come to the general category of fast breeders. Fast breeder reactors hold great interest for us because they can produce more fuel than they consume. This is particularly important from the standpoint of conservation of our resources of fissionable material. The development of reactors of this type is a major objective of our long-range atomic program and currently we have an extensive program underway in the field.

These eight reactor concepts are not drawing board dreams. They are realities today, or will be, before you get your first college degree.

Shippingport, Pa., a pressurized water reactor, developed from the prototype of the *Nautilus*, was the world's first large-scale atomic energy plant devoted exclusively to the generation of electric power. This 60,000-kilowatt plant has been in operation since December 1957 and has provided us with much valuable data which will be incorporated in the improved 134,000-kilowatt Yankee atomic pressurized water reactor plant, presently under construction at Rowe, Mass., by a group of New England companies. Yankee is scheduled for completion in 1960.

Another improved, but still different, version of the pressurized water reactor is being constructed at Indian Point on the Hudson River, by the Consolidated Edison Co. of New York. This 275,000-kilowatt plant is scheduled for completion in 1961.

A 180,000-kilowatt boiling water reactor, known as the Dresden plant, is nearing completion at a site approximately 50 miles southwest of Chicago. Dresden is being built by the Commonwealth Edison Co., nuclear power group, a combination of private utilities, in conjunction with the General Electric Co. The major structures at the plant site have been completed, startup tests are expected to be finished by the end of 1959, and the plant should be in full operation by the middle of 1960.

The prototype of this plant, built by General Electric Co. and Pacific Gas and Electric Co. at Vallecitos, Calif., was actually in operation, generating electricity in October of 1957. Although the plant was only designed for 5,000 kilowatts of electrical capacity it has exceeded the design capacity and has provided tests facilities and invaluable information for the Dresden Plant design.

Elk River plant being built by the Rural Cooperative Power Association in Minnesota, is another variation of the boiling water reactor. This plant, which is scheduled for operation in 1960, is designed to produce 22,000 kilowatts of electricity.

Other variations of the boiling water reactor, which are under construction or contract, include a 60,000-kilowatt natural circulation unit by the Pacific Gas and Electric Co. at Humbolt Bay, Calif., that will be completed by 1962 and a 66,000-kilowatt advanced type reactor employing nuclear superheat, by the Northern States Power Co.-Central Utilities Atomic Power Associates group at Sioux Falls, S. Dak., also scheduled for 1962.

In the category of the fast breeder reactors, a 100,000-kilowatt plant known as Enrico Fermi, is being constructed near Detroit, Michigan, by a group of utilities, including my own. This plant is scheduled to go into operation in 1960.

These nine plants I have mentioned represent almost 900,000 kilowatts of atomic generating capacity that will be in operation by 1962, but it is by no means a complete picture of all nuclear plants under construction or ready to begin construction. I have barely touched on the tremendous research contributions of the Atomic Energy Commission, with their experimental and test reactors. There are a variety of other projects, underway by government and utilities which I have not discussed because of the limitations of time, but I hope these illustrations have given you some idea of the scope of our work and our many problems.

Today the electric generating capability in the United States amounts to 150 million kilowatts. By 1980 600 million kilowatts will be required, and it is estimated that the portion that may be atomic power will amount to as much as 135 million kilowatts—almost 25 percent of our total generating capabilities.

* * * * *

So far we are in the position where we know how to make electricity with the aid of the atom, but we have not yet been able to cut costs to the point where atomic power is comparable in cost to power produced from coal, oil, or gas. This cost figure will vary in different parts of the world and even in different parts of our own country, due to the large variations in the cost of conventional fuel. Thus, atomic energy will become economically competitive in England, which has very limited supplies of fossil fuels, many years before it will be competitive in the Ohio Valley, where there is plenty of coal, or in Texas, where they have high reserves of natural gas. Although at the present time England has more kilowatts of electric generating capacity powered by atomic reactors than we have in our country, it is due solely to economic pressures resulting from the lack of natural resources. Today, as a result of the broad program of reactor research and development undertaken by our Government, utilities, and manufacturers, the United States is the acknowledged world leader in reactor technology.

The Reign in Spain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, our policy in Spain needs a careful reexamination and some drastic changes.

The end of Mr. Franco's reign is in sight. Unless we change our ways immediately, the successor government is almost certain to be anti-American. Not only do we have a huge investment in Spain and an important military stake but we have an interest in sympathetic relationships with the Spanish people.

Recently a distinguished Spanish exile, Dr. Felix Gordon Ordas, president of the Council of Ministers of the Spanish Republic in Exile, came to my office and, at my request, prepared a statement presenting certain facts about the situation in Spain today. Under a previous unanimous consent, I am inserting a translation of his statement following these remarks.

The facts he presents show that we should not urge the admittance of Spain to NATO; that we should arrange for our radio broadcasts to be heard by the Spanish people; that we should not be fooled by the nature of the Communist danger in Spain; and, finally, that we should reexamine our whole program of financial assistance to Spain.

The statement follows:

[Translation (Spanish)]

1. The admission to NATO of the government of General Franco, supported so persistently by the Government of the United States, would be contrary to the spirit which governed the constitution of the international defense organization, which had been brought into being for the exclusive purpose of safeguarding the European democracy against possible attacks from Communist or Fascist totalitarianism.

Idealogically and practically, the government which usurped the power in Spain is Fascist and cannot honestly defend democracy in other countries when it prohibits its existence in its own country. Nobody is ignorant of the fact that in 1945 and 1946 some collective, conclusive, and very plainly stated proposals were underwritten to that effect in the United Nations. And in Spain the people were asking themselves with apprehension: If General Franco, because he is antidemocratic, cannot defend the democracy which he repudiates—what other purpose would the admission of his government to the above organization have?

There can be only one. Recognition by France and Spain of the independence of Morocco would in a very short time leave the troops of both countries, who are stationed on Moroccan soil, without anything to do. Spain would be left with a surplus of generals, chiefs, officers, and soldiers amounting to 80,000 men. Only a small number of them could be professionally placed in Spain. What, then, is to be done about the others? For a long time the Franquistas have been fondling the idea of offering this army to NATO to further their own ends. Wouldn't that be the price which Spain would have to pay so that its dictator might satisfy his great wish of being admitted to an organiza-

tion defending the democratic way of life, within which, ideologically, it could perform no useful duty?

If this were so, and that is what a large segment of Spanish public opinion is afraid of, it would be desirable for the governments capable of making an agreement of that type to know in advance that we liberal- and democratic-minded Spaniards, i.e., the overwhelming majority of the nation, feel that the Spanish army in Morocco would be transformed into an army of mercenaries, and that this offends the honor of our country which we would neither forget nor ever forgive.

2. The Spanish Communist Party is entirely free to make any number of radio broadcasts every day from a broadcasting station, supposedly Radio Pirenaica, but actually situated behind the Iron Curtain and supported by the Government of the U.S.S.R. and the governments of its satellite nations. In exchange, neither the Government of the Spanish Republic nor the parties of the Republic may carry on similar propaganda activities because no democratic government permits us to install and make use of a broadcasting station within its territory. The result is that inside Spain only the Communist voices are heard because it is not possible to hear the democratic and liberal republican voices of the Republic. That is to say, that the small Communist minority every day gives the false impression that all of us Spanish exiles are Communists, whereas the truth is that there is only a very small number of them; and that this may be due to the perspicuous aid given to these activities by the Communists governments, and to the lack of all aid for similar activities on the part of the republicans owing to the inconceivable blindness of the democratic governments.

3. The Spanish Communist Party may likewise flood Spain with all the printed propaganda that its heart desires, and bring into the country a great number of activist (militant) elements because the generosity of the Soviet Government is lavishly providing it with the necessary financial resources, while the Government of the Republic-in-exile and the parties of the Republic are receiving no financial aid from the democratic governments, owing to which its liberal and democratic propaganda activity on Spanish soil had to be forcibly stopped; and this monstrously contradictory behavior of the Government favors Communist propaganda and makes it difficult for freedom propaganda inside Spain.

4. The heavy financial aid given by the United States to the Franco Government has had no favorable effect on Spain. It engaged in stepping up industrialization, which necessarily had to fail, due to the lack of consumers (the plain truth, which explains the meaning underlying the following phrase, formulated by the director of a large bank and printed in El Economista, of Madrid, in its issue of January 1 of this year: "The Spanish industry, while not exporting, has nothing to do"), which is consuming enormous sums of money, as proved by these two figures: In 1957, 16,800 million pesetas, and, in 1958, up to 20,000 million pesetas were wasted on the mad industrial venture, while the primary and essential agricultural progress was completely neglected.

According to official statistics, Spain received in the 6 years between 1953 and 1958 from the U.S. Government the sum of $1 billion in economic aid, independent of the enormous amounts deployed for military, naval, and air bases, and for sundry bellicose material. A portion of the considerable loan was consumed by payments for the agricultural surpluses which North America had been selling to Franco. It should be stated that Spain, an essentially agricultural country, has never before had to make purchases of this nature, save for wheat every 3 or 4 years. Between April 1955 and January 1959, five economic agreements of this type were signed between the U.S. Ambassador in Madrid and Franco's Minister of State, which cost Spain some 15,000 million pesetas. Under the last of these conventions 415,000 tons of U.S. surplus food valued at $96,800,000 were sold to Spain. And among the products included in the sale were 153 million liters of vegetable oils—to Spain which has always been the principal world supplier of oil.

These figures suffice to show that Spain has ceased to be a country with a preponderantly agricultural economy, yet has not succeeded in becoming an industrial country, and to prove the misuse to which the Franco government has been putting the generous financial aid of the U.S. Government. There are many other figures that I might add, to put in evidence the incontainable deterioration of the Spanish economy under the Franco dictatorship. The following may suffice: The foreign trade deficit was 1,183 million gold pesetas in 1957, and 1,111 million gold pesetas in 1958; the drop being due to fewer imports and no increase in exports. In 1957, the ordinary budget estimate was 43,096,9 million pesetas, but since we should add to that sum the 29,842 million pesetas consumed by the 820 independent agencies established by the dictatorship, the total expenditures come to 72,-938,9 million pesetas, an appalling figure for an economy as poor as the Spanish. Then the costs climbed still higher in 1958; they had been estimated to read 48,004 million, but rose to 55,754 million pesetas; the difference being due to most naturally [likely] the amount consumed by the 820 independent agencies. This enormous misappropriaction of funds explains why Spain's public debt is now over 150,000 million pesetas, not counting U.S. loans; and it also explains the low quotations on the stock exchange since 1957.

These figures, which may seem insignificant to the powerful U.S. economy, are astronomical for the weak Spanish economy, and have brought Spain's economic and financial system to the brink of disaster. Because of its malpractice and immorality [corruption], the Government of Spain is irredeemably doomed, despite the "oxygen tanks" with which the U.S. Government is regaling it with a generosity so misplaced as to be becoming a responsibility.

FELIX GORDÓN ORDAS,
President of the Council of Ministers of the Spanish Republic in Exile.
(Address in Paris, France: 35 Avenue Foch.)

WASHINGTON, D.C., *May 8, 1959.*

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer, plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Raymond F. Noyes is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

Appendix

A Bill That Would Take Positive Steps To Correct the Farm Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EARL HOGAN
OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1959

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill that would take positive steps to correct the farm problem. Members of this House are fully familiar with the problem. I shall not dwell upon it.

During the past 6 years, the farm program has been so completely mismanaged that farm prices and incomes have fallen, retail prices of food have gone up, and the costs to the U.S. Treasury have soared. Thus, while farmers have been injured, so has the general public.

Farmers produced about a fifth more of the basic essentials of life but received a fourth less. But Federal policies of the executive branch have been so contrived that the general public paid more—more as consumers in higher grocery store prices and more as taxpayers in higher Government costs of operating the program.

The bill I am introducing is an attempt to reverse these adverse trends.

No farm program can be justified that does not contribute to the general welfare. Our Nation needs a new Federal farm policy that contributes to the fulfillment of the great basic national priorities of needs: long-term national security, full employment in a rapidly expanding national economy, the building of economic strength and moral spirit of the free world. To do this we need a program that will foster and improve the economic health and strength of the Nation's family farms.

Even more importantly, we need a program that will make certain that we shall have the strong resource base we need to insure an abundant and continuing supply of food for the future. We must provide a reserve of resources and a stockpile of strategic food commodities to insure against any national emergency. The program we need should provide the basis for the expanded use of food to build a lasting peace and provide the entire free world with the security of a strong and continuing base of ample reserves.

The bill I am introducing is my attempt to meet a part of these needs. Its provisions would, I think, be helpful if put into operation along with other parts of the needed national policy.

My bill recognizes that the population of the United States is increasing at one of the highest rates in the world; and the free world population is expanding at a rapid rate. Security, safety, and welfare of these generations yet unborn demand that our generation take the utmost care with the use and development of the precious soil and water resources that have been given us to utilize.

We have a magnificent soil and water conservation program in this country. Our progress along this line, beginning in 1933, has been tremendous. But, we still are not doing enough. We are still using up our resources at a faster rate than we are rebuilding them.

We need still further to emphasize and expand our national agricultural conservation efforts.

My bill would amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act of two decades ago to do this. My bill provides for the establishment of a national soil-building base on every farm of the Nation.

The soil-building base would be made up of two parts: one part contributed without payment by the farmer and the second part which would be rented by the Government. But to preserve our rural communities, and to prevent the further development of ghost county seat towns as the soil bank is now doing, no farm could be eliminated and no communities completely wiped out, as is now happening in some parts of the country.

Under the provisions of my bill each farmer would be required to contribute without payment 10 percent of his tillable acres above 20 on his farm to the national soil-building base; and he would be required to rent to the Government another 10 percent of the tillable acres, above 20, to be added to the soil-building base. No farmer would be allowed to put more than 60 percent of his tillable acres in the base.

All of the land placed into the soil-building base would have to be placed into its optimum soil conserving condition according to the highest land use and conservation standards. Such land could not be used for soil-depleting crops and practices.

On the Government-rental part of the base, the Secretary would arrange for the Government to share in the cost of this soil-building program along lines of familiar land restoration practices of the agricultural conservation program under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act.

Payment per acre would be at a rate equal to the farmer's net income plus overhead carrying costs plus the cost of conservational treatment of the land placed in the soil-building base, but not more than one-third of the value of the annual yield of the land and not more than $45 per acre. In lieu of cash payments, the farmer could elect to accept payments in kind out of Commodity Credit Corporation stocks. Since this would help reduce storage and carrying charges that the President has estimated at $1 billion per year, I have suggested that payments in kind per acre be made at a rate of one-half the acreage yield of the land.

My bill provides that until such time as the unnecessary surplus of Government-owned stocks, above a national security reserve, are worked down, the program would carry upward of 65 million acres in the soil-building base; this would be for 2 or 3 years. Following that the program would provide for about 40 million acres in the soil-building base.

Adoption of this program would be a great stride forward in developing a permanent land reserve to insure food for the future in our domestic policy even while the Nation is making maximum utilization of food for peace in our foreign policy.

My bill also provides that the Nation consciously and specifically establish a national security and safety reserve of food, fiber, and biological oils as a deliberate program on its own merits and not as a side-issue adjunct to the price-support program. My bill places the responsibility for decisions concerning the magnitude, nature, and geographic dispersion of this food security stockpile strictly on the shoulder of those other than the executive branch who have been assigned the responsibility to make such determinations and to provide for the national safety against national emergencies arising from natural causes such as drought and flood as well as enemy attack—the Defense Mobilization Administration and the National Security Council.

In return for requiring each farmer to devote not less than 20 percent nor more than 60 percent of his tillable acres to the national soil-building effort, my bill provides that all of our important tilled crops—corn, wheat, cotton, rice, peanuts, soybeans, oats, sorghum grain, rye, barley, flaxseed, cottonseed, dry edible beans, and potatoes shall be supported at 90 percent of parity.

Estimates of reliable farm economists indicate that if the excess of production over demand is removed from the farm picture, a 90 percent of parity program can be operated without little, if any, cost to the Federal Treasury, if the Nation maintains full employment.

To make certain that production would not be reduced to low in event of growing unemployment, my bill would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to use price support deficiency payments. Such payments could also be used to maintain to cotton producers' income while allowing market prices to drop to competitive level with synthetics and the world situation.

While I have been assured that placing of 60 million acres of tillable land into the soil-building base would make a 90 percent of parity program fully workable, my bill provides that for any

individual commodity that gets out of balance, the Secretary is authorized to place into operation whatever specific marketing regulations or additional soil-building base requirements as are necessary to keep the market supply of each commodity in balance with market demand at 90 percent of parity.

My bill does not repeal the existing marketing quota programs but builds on them to set up an improved and more workable operation.

Placing of the provisions of my bill into full force and effect would, I am confident, greatly reduce the Government costs of the farm program, better insure the future food supply of the nations, and improve farm income without requiring higher retail prices of food.

My bill applies exclusively to crops, to the direct products of the soil. I am continuing to study the deteriorating poultry situation and to take part in the efforts of the House to deal with their current emergency in broiler and egg prices. I am watching the hog situation carefully.

At the appropriate time, I shall wish to make suggestions to my colleagues of the manner in which we may prevent the deep drop, now predicted by the Department of Agriculture, in hog prices in 1960.

Mr. Speaker, I do not contend that the bill I am introducing is the last word. I know it does not cover everything that needs to be done. I offer it as a further contribution to the ultimate development of a workable comprehensive agricultural conservation and farm income program. I have been deeply impressed by and favorably inclined toward the suggestions made by my colleague, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. METCALF], the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL], the genlemen from South and North Dakota [Messrs. MCGOVERN and BURDICK], and my colleague who several weeks ago joined with the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. COAD], and other Members in the bills they have introduced. I hope to work with them and with the members of the Committee on Agriculture of which I am a member.

I shall welcome suggested improvements in, and additions to, the bill I am introducing. I hope that together we can develop a comprehensive Federal farm policy that will reverse the adverse and disastrous trends of the past 7 years. I offer my bill as a modest contribution to the broad effort that is being made in this direction.

Utilization of Military Manpower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD G. WOLF
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 18, 1959

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, our brilliant and courageous colleague, FRANK KOWALSKI, has given testimony before the House Armed Services Subcommittee on Manpower Utilization which should be read by every Member of Congress and the ranking officers in the Pentagon. Mr. KOWALSKI clearly shows that a better utilization of manpower, and an elimination of questionable servant and occupational duties would result in an increased combat force while strengthening the possibility of ending our outmoded military conscription system.

Congressman KOWALSKI does not come to this subject as a neophyte. He is a West Point graduate, a recently retired Army colonel, a former commandant of the Army Command Management School, and the former deputy chief of military government in Japan. We are indeed fortunate, and the people of this Nation are indeed fortunate to count as one of their Representatives a man who is so knowledgeable on matters of defense—an area which is truly a puzzle within an enigma. His testimony can be read in the RECORD of last Wednesday, May 13, page 7195, under the remarks of Mr. PROXMIRE.

Civil Rights Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 18, 1959

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, I am proud that the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey recently adopted the following resolution, urging prompt passage of the pending civil rights legislation. As the sponsor of this legislation in the House, I believe strongly that the time is long past due to secure for all citizens those rights and liberties guaranteed by the Federal Constitution. We insist this is a government of law, not of men or a coalition of men imbued with spirit of viciousness. The Congress has the duty to provide the statutory instruments that will command respect for law and order, and demand of every citizen protection for the unalienable rights of any other citizen.

The resolution reads as follows:

Whereas one Mack Charles Parker, a Negro, was kidnaped from the local jail and possibly murdered at Poplarville, Miss., on Friday, April 24, 1959; and

Whereas the FBI despite their swift arrival on the scene have been unable to unearth any clues as to the identity of the perpetrators of this hideous crime; and

Whereas this is the second such lynching that has occurred in the State of Mississippi in the last 4 years (Emmett Till) without bringing anyone to justice; and

Whereas mob rule has replaced the order of legal jurisprudence in Mississippi to the embarrassment of our country; and

Whereas the time has come for the Federal Government to exert strong positive action to protect the lives and rights of all citizens in this country: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this general assembly in executive session on the 4th day of May 1959, memorialize the Congress of the United States to quickly pass such legislation that is embodied in the Douglas-Javits bill (S. 810) to end once and for all times the rule of mobs in place of democratic court action; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to our 14 New Jersey Members of the House of Representatives and our 2 New Jersey Senators.

Pan American Round Table, San Antonio, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL J. KILDAY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 18, 1959

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an address, delivered by Hon. John F. Killea, American consul general, Monterrey, Mexico, before the Pan American Round Table of San Antonio, Tex., in celebration of Pan American Day, 1959.

The Pan American Round Table of San Antonio was organized in 1916. Consistently since that time, the Round Table has devoted itself to a study of the relations between the United States and its Latin American neighbors. It has accomplished a great deal in promoting good relations with Latin American countries.

As evidence of the interest of the Pan American Round Table and its work in cooperation with Latin American countries, present at the meeting at which Mr. Killea's address was delivered, were as honored guests, Mexican Consul General Lauro Izaguirre, Guatemalan Consul General Col. Mauricio Dubois, Mexican Consul Joel S. Quinones, and Nicaraguan Consul General Alonso S. Perales, as well as a number of honorary consuls of several Latin American countries, which do not have career consuls in our city. Also present were a number of local educators, a member of the Texas Good Neighbor Commission, military commanders, and three members of the State Board of Pan American Round Table Clubs of Texas.

Mr. Killea's address is as follows:

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY HON. JOHN F. KILLEA, AMERICAN CONSUL GENERAL, MONTERREY, MEXICO, BEFORE THE PAN AMERICAN ROUND TABLE OF SAN ANTONIO, TEX., IN CELEBRATION OF PAN AMERICAN DAY, 1959

The director, honored guests, members of the Pan American Round Table Clubs of Texas, it gives me considerable pleasure to be with you on this occasion and I am most grateful for the opportunity you have given me to address this conference of the Pan American Round Table and to meet personally so many of you who have done so much to improve relationships over the years between the United States and Mexico. I consider it a great honor to be asked to speak to you on this occasion.

While it is a distinct privilege and pleasure to meet with the Pan American Round Table, it is also a severe test for anyone to attempt to discuss American foreign policy, as it refers to Latin America, with a group so well informed as yours. I think it is most interesting to speak here in San Antonio and in Texas in view of the trail blazing that your organization has done in the foreign relations field. By your work over the years

since 1916 you have put into actual practice what is the now official policy of the United States and which as you know is embodied today in the President's people to people program. You and your organization are truly pioneers in the field of international relations.

I am sure that if our Ambassador to Mexico, Robert C. Hill were here today, he would say that there is no doubt in his mind that the closer the association of our Department of State with the informed public opinion which is represented here, that the more effective we shall be in coping with the multiplicity of problems that press on us today. He has asked me to convey to you here, his best wishes for the continued success of your organization and his hopes that the next 60 years will be as productive as your first 40 have been.

We have both watched with interest the work of the Pan American Round Table in Mexico and were both pleased to see that your newest club comes from Saltillo, Coahuila, which is in my consular district. Ambassador and Mrs. Hill recently entertained in their residence, the Pan American Club of Mexico City and recently Mrs. Killea was hostess to the first national meeting of the six Pan American Clubs of Mexico. You can see, therefore, that we in the Department of State are well acquainted with your organization and your work.

The basic objective of American foreign policy is the preservation and enhancement of the security of our country, our people, and our fundamental values and institutions. There is no doubt in my mind, nor I am sure in yours, that the principal threat to that security is found in the policies of the Red Soviet-Chinese bloc of countries. It is also significant to recognize that there is no such threat from our good neighbors to the south or in Canada to the north. As we face this highly competitive situation with the Soviet, it is clear that our central problem is to minimize this threat, to use all our resources and diplomacy, to maintain the peace, to provide the military and economic strength, to deter general war as well as more limited hostilities. We seek to build our economic, scientific, and cultural assets, to maintain our independence and our institutions, and to offer the leadership which the world is entitled to expect from us.

I would like to talk to you today about the importance of our relations with Latin America. In Latin America, we are, of course, faced with a series of active and interesting problems. The far-reaching social and economic changes which are now sweeping that area have intensified the aspirations in those countries for large scale development and prompt improvement of living standards. There is a sense of urgency on the part of many of our southern neighbors. "For the land of 'mañana,' mañana ya llegó. Es ahora el memento de trabajar." This drive manifests itself primarily in a pressing concern by several of the Latin American communities for adequate flow of capital necessary to finance their need for widespread economic development. There are acute problems of increasing trade and the overwhelming ones of foreign-exchange requirements. Of course, these problems are not new; they are merely more acute and have become so because of the threat of communism.

Your Government has appreciated for some time past the depth of the growing impetus toward urgent economic development and has long since been conscious of the area's impatience on that account. Thus, President Eisenhower proposed in 1956 that the Presidents of the American Republics designate personal representatives to meet and consider their mutual economic and social problems within the context of the Organization of American States. This act was designed to stimultae active interest and participation by all the American Republics in multilateral approaches to these problems. As a result of this proposal, there have been a number of tangible measures in many fields, such as public health, housing, agriculture, and technical training.

Our trade with Latin America in recent years has been greáter than that with any other area of the world except Western Europe. Some 22 percent of our total exports go to Latin American countries. Our direct private investments in the area are in the neighborhood of about $9 billion, and this has been increasing at a rate of over $600 million annually. In 1957, the increase was $1.3 billion, the largest for any area in the world.

In the past 10 years our Government's Export-Import Bank has loaned more than $2 billion to Latin America, representing more than 40 percent of all the bank's loans. These lending operations are in addition to those of the IBRD (International Bank for Reconstruction and Development), to which the United States provides more capital than any other participants. They are also in addition to the stabilization loans of the International Monetary Fund, to whose capital the United States is also the largest single contributor. Under our surplus agricultural commodities law, we have transferred in the neighborhood of $400 million worth of surplus farm products for local currencies, most of which has been loaned back to the purchasing countries for their economic development. As a concrete example of our policy of cooperation, of which I am reminded by the forthcoming visit to this country of our friend, President Lopez Mateos of the Republic of Mexico, we recently concluded with that country a loan program in conjunction with the International Monetary Fund and U.S. public and private sources of a total of several millions of dollars. Likewise, over $329 million has been loaned to Argentina.

The recently created Development Loan Fund is making an important contribution to the area's economic development. And our able Under Secretary of State, Douglas Dillon, has given yeoman support to the creation of the Inter-American Development Institution, the so-called Latin or Inter-American Bank. This project is being worked out within the context of the Organization of American States. We are proposing an institution that would make both hard and soft loans but with major emphasis on the former. Final steps are being taken with respect to this Bank during this month.

I think tribute should be paid to the role of U.S. private investment and enterprise in Latin America. U.S. private enterprise is carrying a payroll of somewhat over 700,000 Latin Americans. U.S. companies in Latin America are paying the equivalent of over $1 billion in annual wages and salaries and well over $1 billion in local miscellaneous. expenditures. Thus Latin America gains annually from the activities of U.S. private enterprise in the neighborhood of at least $3 billion. I think these facts are worthy of mention because so often, when the somewhat superficial question is asked, "What is the United States doing for Latin America"? the important role played by U.S. private enterprise is rarely mentioned. There is no doubt that Government aid is of great importance, but the bulk of the job of practical assistance to the area comes, and should come, from private-enterprise sources.

Thus briefly, you can see what is being done on this continent and in this hemisphere. You know from your readings, from discussion, with your friends south of the border that these accomplishments are coming about not because of threats, intimidations or show of military force but as a result of greater exchanges across the conference table, through the visits of Presidents, through the OAS, through exchange of professors and students, through tourism, through friendships built up over the years by organizations such as the Pan American Round Table. I must point out here the major role which our Ambassador to Mexico, Robert C. Hill, has done to promote friendship and understanding. There is hardly a city or state in Mexico which he has not visited. He has met Mexicans of high and low degree and he has won their hearts. Truly such an effort cannot go unappreciated.

Elsewhere in the free world we see cooperation and understanding. It is only when we face the realities of this cold war and the armaments race that we can recognize the basic difference between the free world and the Soviet bloc. Recall if you will, these statements from Messrs. Khrushchev and Mikoyan to the effect that they want better relations, and we hope they do. But weigh these words against relatively recent statements by Mr. Khrushchev as this:

"Whether you like it or not, history is on our side. We will bury you."

Or this: "We are convinced that sooner or later capitalism will perish, just as feudalism perished earlier."

Or this: "All the world will come to communism. History does not ask whether you like it or not."

I am confident that you do not or will not hear statements such as these from our responsible friends south of the border. Our neighbors to the south, like those of us in the United States, want to pursue the free way of life without the dread specter of communism hanging over them. We need only to look to the recent examples of the meeting between the President of the United States and the President of Mexico to recognize the differences which exist between our free world and the Soviet world. This meeting was a symbol of the historical and cultural ties of friendship, cordiality, and mutual confidence which unites the peoples of Mexico and the United States, as well as their two Governments. Let us emphasize again that the chiefs of state of our country and our great neighbor to the south, Mexico, met in an atmosphere of friendly cordiality and frank understanding which characterizes our diplomatic relations. Such a meeting is not only a heartwarming and encouraging sign but is a clear indication of what can be accomplished by men of good will.

Finally, I am happy to have this opportunity to share with you some thoughts on questions which are so vital to all of us. You may not be aware that San Antonio is my adopted home and that my wife is a third-generation Texan. In speaking to you today, I felt that I was home among friends in this splendid city of ours. It is the same feeling of home and friendship which I find in Monterrey and in my visits through northern Mexico in my duties as consul general, where the phrase "aquí tiene Ud. su casa" is more than a superficial courtesy.

In closing, let me say Mexico and Latin America have won my heart, and I know it has won yours or you would not be joining here today in observance of Pan American Week. Let us join to extend an invitation to others in the United States whose hearts will be won by Mexico and Latin America if they will study its history and visit it and to those in Mexico and Latin America who by visiting us and learning about us will reach the conclusions that our hopes, aims, and ambitions coincide. Your motto is as effective in Spanish as it is in English, "Uno para todos y todos para uno." Let us suggest to our fellow Americans the extension of friendship through organizations such as the Pan American Round Table, wherein exsts the true spirit and philosophy of our President's people-to-people policy.

I thank you for your kind attention. Muchas gracias.

Friendship Through Singing Week in Chicago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 18, 1959

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have the privilege today of inserting in the RECORD the proclamation issued by the mayor of Chicago, the Honorable Richard J. Daley, proclaiming the period beginning May 25 to be Friendship Through Singing Week in Chicago.

It is significant that this particular period should be so designated when the Polish Singers Alliance of America is meeting in convention in Chicago in observance of its 70th anniversary.

I have said on the floor of this House many times that America has drawn its culture from many countries of the world, and it is perhaps because this Nation has recognized all that is beautiful in the cultures of the rest of the world that our own Nation's cultural institutions are today being respected throughout the world.

The Polish Singers Alliance of America in its 70 years of existence has brought to our land superb music and song of Poland, the native land of Chopin, Paderewski, Moniusko, Szymanowski, and many others of great renown in the field of music.

Through their efforts, the members of the Polish Singers Alliance of America have made known to our own people of this country the depth and beauty of Polish music, and it is indeed fitting that the mayor of Chicago has chosen to single them out with this special proclamation. I join the mayor in his tribute to this wonderful organization.

Chicago can indeed be proud to be the host city for this dedicated organization on the 70th anniversary of the Polish Singers Alliance of America, and I am confident that my colleagues will join me in wishing this organization continued growth and continued success in its endeavors.

It is from organizations such as the Polish Singers Alliance of America that we in this Nation have found our cultural and intellectual strength. May they be blessed with many years of success in their efforts.

The proclamation follows:

Whereas the Polish Singers Alliance is this year observing its 70th anniversary; and

Whereas the purpose of the alliance is to promote better understanding and friendship among all people through Polish song and music; and

Whereas the alliance has a proud record of having performed for innumerable charitable causes; and

Whereas the alliance is composed of sixty active choruses in many States of our Nation, and representatives of these groups will be in attendance at the 32d international convention to be held in our city May 28 through May 31:

Now, therefore, I, Richard J. Daley, mayor of the city of Chicago, do hereby proclaim the period beginning May 25 to be Friendship Through Singing Week in Chicago, and call attention of all citizens to the special events arranged for this time.

Dated this 12th day of May, A.D., 1959.

RICHARD J. DALEY,
Mayor.

Two Awards to Hon. Harry F. Byrd of Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURR P. HARRISON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 18, 1959

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, on successive days recently, the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia, the Honorable HARRY F. BYRD, received the highest commendations of national organizations of business people and of farmers.

On April 27, Senator BYRD was honored in Washington by the Chamber of Commerce of the United States which selected him as one of seven individuals to receive the chamber's annual award to great living Americans.

The citation, as presented by Chamber President William A. Donnell, was as follows:

We are honoring this evening, a truly great statesman—a man of principle—a man who has always put the long-range good of America ahead of all else—a man who, because of his wisdom, common sense, understanding and character—is held in the highest esteem by all his colleagues in the U.S. Senate, even by those who do not always find themselves in complete agreement with his principles, and with his views on major legislative issues.

He has always stood firmly against wasteful and unnecessary Federal spending.

He has fought—often in the face of terrific opposition—to keep this country on a sound financial basis.

He has been in Congress since 1933—and, during all that time, he has been battling for economy—and against Federal deficits.

No one can say how much greater those deficits might have been—or how much higher our taxes might have soared—if this man of courage and conviction had not been in there, standing vigorously and tenaciously for fiscal integrity.

He began his career as a newspaper publisher, at an age when most of his friends were still in school.

He learned early that few people attain financial independence through borrowing.

As a businessman, he lived strictly by the policy of pay-as-you-go. And later, when he was elected Governor of his State, he continued to follow that policy.

He still believes in pay-as-you-go. He believes that the Government—like a responsible citizen—should pay its bills when they come due.

He is one of the few political thinkers in this country who was alert enough and astute enough to see at the outset that "liberalism"—so-called—was merely a pleasant-sounding name for statism and controllism.

In Congress today, he represents fidelity to public duty.

His front porch, ladies and gentlemen, is not for rent.

This great statesman of our day—this great living American—is Senator HARRY FLOOD BYRD, Democrat, of Virginia.

On the following evening, April 28, Senator BYRD was honored in his home community of Berryville, Va., when President Charles B. Shuman, of the American Farm Bureau Federation, presented him with one of its two distinguished service awards for 1958, the federation's highest recognition of public service.

Mr. Shuman read this citation:

Senator BYRD's long and distinguished record in the Senate of the United States has earned him the respect of all who are concerned over preservation of national solvency, the rights of States and individuals, and the traditional American liberties.

A foe of nonessential Federal spending and socialistic proposals regardless of the political party opposing them, Senator BYRD is one of the Nation's most forthright advocates of States rights.

Among those present for the ceremony were Roger Fleming, secretary-treasurer of the American Farm Bureau Federation, and T. T. Curtis, president of the Virginia Farm Bureau Federation. Gen. Pleas B. Rogers, president of the Clarke County Farm Bureau, presided.

The Logic of H.R. 3

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURR P. HARRISON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 18, 1959

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, if we view H.R. 3 in a nonpartisan, nonregional light, we can see the clear and unmistakable outline of its logic. The issue it presents should have the active, dispassionate interest of every citizen who subscribes to the principle of an orderly body of law within the constitutional framework.

In this connection, I include an editorial which appeared in the Wall Street Journal on May 14, 1959:

THE RECONCILABLE CONFLICT

It would be a great pity if the opposing claims about the virtues and vices of Representative HOWARD SMITH'S bill to clear up conflicts between Federal and State law should come to obscure the basic constitutional question involved.

What Mr. SMITH seeks to do is to have Congress make a clear, when it passes a law, whether Congress intends that law to override or limit or prevent State law on the same subject or in the same area.

The public is told, on the one hand, that if the bill becomes law neither Congress nor the courts will be able to further encroach on the rights of the States to pass their own laws. And on the other hand, the public hears that if the measure passes, the Republic is in the direst danger. The Justice Department, for example, calls the legislation the most hazardous bill before Congress.

We think these are overstatements. As to the wording of this particular bill, Congress will, we hope, comb it carefully to see that it does not open the Pandora's box of troublesome relitigation the Justice Department says it will. In doing so, however, Congress would do well to remember that the Justice Department is the agent of the Federal Government, and that matters would be much easier for the Federal Government if the only law were Federal law.

But as to the philosophy behind the proposal, we would like to ask a simple question: What is wrong with Congress putting everyone on notice that no one should read into a Federal law more than Congress intended should be read into it?

It seems to us that this philosophy, if enacted into law, would provide a guidepost all the courts should welcome. There would be no guesswork attached to the intent of Congress; unless a law passed by Congress specifically provided that the intent was to occupy a particular field of legislation to the exclusion of the States, then the States would be free to legislate on the same matters.

That was at least the intent of the drafters of the Constitution and the intent of the States that ratified the Bill of Rights. Certain grants of power were necessarily made to the Federal Government, but they were specific and article 10 reserved to the States or to the people the rights not granted. No place in the Constitution does it say that once Congress has passed a law, the States cannot pass the same kind of law.

In recent years, tough, a doctrine of preemption that holds that where there is a Federal law a similar State law only muddies the judicial waters, has come to be accepted more and more by the U.S. Supreme Court. And it has been in the execution of this doctrine that the Supreme Court has been accused of writing law rather than judging law. The Court is certainly not wholly to blame, for there are areas where Federal and State legislation may well come into irreconcilable conflict.

But it is unrealistic to say that there are no areas where Federal law and State law may consistently stand together, as in the taxing power, or even strengthen one another, as in the Federal and State kidnaping laws.

So Congress has not only the right to tell the courts that it is the intent of Congress that this Federal law should supersede State law and that this one should not. It seems to us that the Representatives and Senators have a duty to do so, unless it is the intent of Congress to shape the Nation's laws so that in the end the last word on a local law comes from Washington.

Israel's Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 14, 1959

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, Israel, now in its second 10 years of development deserves our sincere congratulations. Just 11 years ago a half million Jews in Palestine proclaimed their independence and established the State of Israel. At that time Israelis constituted only one-third of Palestine's population, and the country was surrounded by many foes. But the new state, faced with what appeared to be insurmountable obstacles, fought a life and death struggle and was victorious.

To simply relate the remarkable progress this little country has made in a decade is impossible. She has trebled her Jewish population, still wanting to bring in another million Jewish immigrants; her trade has expanded; her natural resources have been developed; and her public health vastly improved.

But most important of all is the strategic position of Israel in the vital and important Middle East. She has done a tremendous job in helping to keep the democratic processes alive.

In a short period of time this young democracy has become an important nation of the world. May our best wishes go to Israeli citizens for a peaceful and prosperous future.

Modern Mother Unprepared for Motherhood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. CARLTON LOSER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 18, 1959

Mr. LOSER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including an excellent sermon delivered on Mother's Day by Dr. Walter R. Courtenay, pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, Nashville, Tenn., and published in the Nashville Banner.

This very moving sermon on the subject of motherhood is one you will want to read. It follows:

[From the Nashville Banner, May 11, 1959]

MODERN MOTHER UNPREPARED FOR MOTHERHOOD

(By Dr. Walter R. Courtenay)

Is there a perfect mother in the house? If so, let her stand.

Is there present a mother who feels that she is all a mother ought to be? Let her stand.

Is there here a mother who feels that she deserves a halo-crown and a poem of praise because she has been so outstandingly successful as a mother? Let her stand.

Is there present one who prior to her marriage did all she could have done to be prepared for the tremendous task of homebuilding, mind building, body building, soul building, and community building? Let her stand.

NO ONE RISEN

I am relieved to see that no one has risen, and for that I am grateful. What would I have done if at some point in this series of questions someone had stood?

My point is made: There are no perfect mothers. As I have known my own mother and the mothers around me I am convinced of this:

Mothers are as earthy as cows' hoofs, and yet as heavenly as May mornings.

Mothers are as much flesh and bone as pork chops and mackerel, and yet are as unearthy as stars.

Mothers are as prone to fail as studyless students, and yet I marvel at their brilliant successes.

They are as stupid as morons; as insulated as thermos jugs, as explosive as firecrackers, as sputtery as hot green logs, as stubborn as messed-up zippers, as unpredictable as horse races, and as demanding as revenue agents.

And yet, being all of these, they are at times: As wise as Solomon, as outgoing as lovely trees, as receptive as gardens, as pliable as shoelaces, as dependable as salt, as knowledgeable as a high hill, as touchable as a ripe peach, and as constant as the North Star.

They are a strang combination of success and failures, smiles and frowns, praise and blame, aches and pains, hopes and fears, flesh and fancies, wishes and prayers. There is nothing on earth as down to earth as mothers when they are not "up in the air." There is nothing more natural, and nothing quite as supernatural. Mothers are people like the rest of us.

RUTH IN OLD TESTAMENT

No person in the Old Testament points up these observations more dramatically than Naomi's daughter-in-law, Ruth. When Naomi said to Ruth, "Your sister-in-law has gone back to her people and to her gods; return after your sister-in-law." Ruth replied in unforgettable words, "Entreat me not to leave you or to return from following after you; for where you go I will go, and where you lodge I will lodge; your people shall be my people, and your God my God; where you die, I will die, and there will be buried."

Ruth had what every woman needs and so few possess: Integrity, intelligence, poise, patience, loyalty, tact, honor, humor, perspective, resourceful love, and undying faith.

No wonder she was the great-grandmother of one of Israel's greatest kings and leaders, David. He who slew Goliath, who wrote the words, "The Lord is my shepherd," who sang, "the heavens declare the glory of God," who sinned as few men have sinned, and served as few have served, who extended the boundaries of his nation and blessed her with prosperity—a man after God's own heart was the great-grandson of a woman whose name was Ruth.

EQUIPPED BY MATURITY

I call attention to her on this observance of Mother's Day because she was equipped by maturity for marriage. So few are. The state demands that people reach a certain age, that they take a test to prove that they are not carriers of venereal disease, and that the marriage service be performed by a qualified person. That is all, and I say to you it is almost nothing. No test is given to see if the parties are emotionally mature, financially responsible, morally sound, socially compatible, and spiritually sincere.

The forces that destroy homes we never ask about before homes are formed. An applicant for a driver's license must prove he can drive, but an applicant for marriage needs nothing but an intent. A man must be licensed to operate a tavern and he must operate it within the law, but the State does nothing to set up regulations concerning the minimum requirements for the operations of homes.

MRS. NASH VISITS

It is reported to me that when Mrs. Nash visited Nashville recently she gave statistics that were startling. These I quote may not be exact, but they are close enough to be used:

"Among teenagers, one marriage out of three ends in divorce.

"Among college graduates, it is 1 out of 70.

"Among college graduates where the girl holds a bachelor of science degree in home economics, it is 1 out of 270."

I am startled at the figures concerning the latter group, but I can see the reason why: Home economic majors are the best qualified people for the task of homebuilding. In some respects, they are the only ones.

In terms of broad college training they are the best prepared people in the Nation. Oh, some of you who hold bachelor of arts degrees, who can read Latin and quote copiously from literature, look down your noses on girls who become home economics majors. You hold yourself as superior to them. But are you? Look at their courses:

Two years of liberal arts education which contains literature, history, languages, mathematics, and kindred subjects.

Two years of science, for example, physics, chemistry, bacteriology, nutrition, and biology.

Elective courses in music, art, creative writing, and so forth.

Two years of practical subjects, for example, home furnishings, home decorating, preparation and serving of meals, sewing, dress designing, the care and nurture of children, and may I add, the care and nurture of husbands.

When one analyzes the broad cultural and practical courses open to girls in modern home economics departments, one can only conclude that these people are among the select few who are being trained for the most important task in the life of our Nation, the task of creating happy, integrated, useful homes.

FINGER OF CRITICISM

This fact points the finger of criticism at universities and colleges which prepare girls for everything except this major task. We offer them a catalog of courses, few of which have any practical value in helping prepare them for marriage and the running of happy homes. We give them the same courses we give men, and in pretty much the same way. But women are not men, thank goodness, and most of them are not going to follow professional careers. What they need for their own sanity, security, and usefulness is a solid base of liberal arts subjects topped off by practical courses such as are included in a home economics major. Most of the girls graduating from our universities and colleges look toward the future as brides-to-be, and we do almost nothing to help them meet and fulfill their major role in the earth and the kingdom.

Nor are homes taking up the slack. It used to be that mothers in the homes of America prepared their daughters for marriage by teaching them the rudiments of house management, the preparation and serving of meals, sewing, decorating, flower arrangements, and so forth. Too little is being done in this area now. More needs to be done. It is to be regretted that in many instances neither mothers nor universities are helping prepare girls for marriage and the tasks that follow.

IN FARM HOME

Recently I sat in a farm home watching breakfast being prepared. The fried potatoes looked as a woman looks when she is well coated with cold cream. If the eggs had been dropped in the yard and then served they would not have been altered in appearance. Here was a girl of 19, the mother of two children, and she was absolutely lost in the kitchen and the nursery. I thanked God she was neither my wife nor my cook. No one could be less prepared for a major task. A friend of mine, rooming in that home, recently commented that it was truly tough when you ate three kinds of beans in the same meal and all of them cold.

Ah, you say, but she was a simple, untrained country girl. True. But would the case be different if I made a study of the graduates of most of our universities this June? Would they really know much more about their futures as wives and mothers? When a man gets around to marrying, he wants an attractive wife, a wife of intelligence and integrity, one who has some concept of culture and propriety. Every man wants to marry a woman with character, and not just character—one who is above all a wife, a mother, a house manager, a safe nutritionist, and a person who is fun to live with.

UNPREPAREDNESS

Nothing is more appalling about modern American life than the unpreparedness of men and women for marriage, homemaking, and the care and nurture of children.

I personally feel that I owe a double duty to life; a solemn duty to my ancestors, and a pressing duty to my descendants. To fail either is to fail. Homes are places where we ought to keep faith with those who have preceded us, and those who follow. When homes fail, where do you look for success?

So much has been written and said in a derogatory manner concerning those who peopled America and Great Britain during the last century, called the Victorian Period, that I get red in the neck just thinking about it. We accuse them of being authoritarian, indifferent to social problems, and ignorant where sex was concerned. Men and women have splashed that era of history over and over until it now looks like certain types of modern art which can only be characterized as the products of bewildered minds.

Two things the so-called Victorian era did: It taught children to respect authority, and it taught them manners. Now that we are all authorities on sex and freedom, what has happened to respect for authority, and what has become of good manners? And what, may I ask, are we to do with the fact that the Victorian era produced some of the finest men and women who ever graced the earth?

A recent writer in the British Weekly was contrasting the maligned period of Victoria and our own. In those depraved days children were taught manners. To enable them to learn what was expected of them they were taught this bit of verse:

"In silence I must take my seat
And give God thanks before I eat;
Must for my food in patience wait
Till I am asked to hand my plate;
I must not scold nor whine nor pout,
Nor move my chair and plate about;
With knife, or fork, or napkin ring
I must not play—nor must I sing;
I must not speak a useless word—
For children must be seen—not heard;
I must not talk about my food,
Nor fret if I don't think it's good;
My mouth with food I must not crowd,
Nor while I'm eating speak aloud;
Must turn my head to cough or sneeze,
And when I ask, say, 'If you please';
The tablecloth I must not spoil,
Nor with my food my fingers soil;
Must keep my seat when I have done,
Nor round the table sport or run;
When told to rise, then I must put
My chair away with noiseless foot
And lift my heart to God above,
In praise for all his wondrous love."

I know it sounds like prison life, but youngsters did learn the rules, and they did master good manners.

Now what of today? In Glasgow, Scotland, recently, children on buses became so rowdy and abusive that the drivers refused to work. Nelson Gray, the British Weekly commentator, remembering the bit of verse for children a hundred years ago, wrote one for this generation. Here it is:

"When in the queue, I musn't try
To trip, or push, the passer-by.
I must not chalk up words obscene,
Nor put slugs in the slot machine.
I must not fight to get upstairs,
Nor gamble for the unpaid fares.
I really must not slash the seat,
Nor on the upholst-ry wipe my feet.
I must not push folk off the bus,
Nor shout, nor kick, nor smoke, nor cuss.
I must not smash the window glass,
Nor spit upon the folk we pass.
I must not keep a chain or razor
In the pocket of my blazer—

But if you do, you need not fret,
A talking-to is all you'll get.
We can't deny the simple truth—
You're just a maladjusted youth,
You're really mummy's pride and joy,
Her mixed-up, teenage Teddy-boy."

We live in a day when our major attention is directed toward solving the gigantic problems of economics and politics on a worldwide scale. Conferences between free nations and the Communist lands grab headlines, and we wonder whether we can win the cold war that now exists and the hot one that may follow after. And while this goes on almost nothing is being done about the only basic defense we have against the atheism and brutality of Soviet lands—the American home.

EMPHASIZED SUBJECTS

We boast of the number of students graduating from colleges and universities, but are they prepared to become part of the great American team majoring on making marriages successful and homes secure? Have we done our job when we have emphasized subjects to be mastered, rather than life to be lived? If girls are not being adequately prepared for their main task on earth, that of wife and mother, whose task is it to prepare them?

Of one thing I am sure: If we do not do something drastic and thorough about preparing our young people for marriage, and our girls for the task of home making, mind making, body making, life making, community making, it will not make too much difference who wins the cold war, for America will already have been lost.

Awards Day Review, Air Force ROTC, Pennsylvania State University, State College, Pa., May 14, 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 18, 1959

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, in the presence of Dr. Eric A. Walker, president of the Pennsylvania State University, and Col. O. H. Rigley, Jr., USAF, professor of air science of the Pennsylvania State University, the annual awards day review of some 2,600 Air Force ROTC cadets was held on Beaver Field, May 14, 1959. In addition to presenting the awards to the year's outstanding cadets it was my privilege to deliver the following address on the subject of the Nation's ROTC and its contributions to our national security:

As a member of the House Armed Services Committee, I am particularly interested in every phase of our Military Establishment.

The ROTC training programs effective throughout our Nation today are an important part of our Military Establishment.

During the early days of the Civil War, the military reverses suffered by the Union Army staggered the North, which was wholly unprepared for war. To guard against a recurrence of this condition, the Congress, in July of 1862, enacted the Land Grant Act, which is the foundation of the whole ROTC program. This act facilitated the establishment in every State of at least one college in which military tactics would be taught.

In general reorganization of the Military Establishment in 1916, the Congress enacted the original National Defense Act. Provisions were included in this act for the establishment of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps as a source of officers for the newly authorized Officers' Reserve Corps.

In 1920, the Air Corps, then part of the Army, established ROTC units at the Universities of California and Illinois, Massa-

chusetts Institute of Technology, and Texas A. & M. The current program now includes 100,000 students at approximately 177 institutions in 46 States and in the Territories of Hawaii and Puerto Rico.

Historically, then, the ROTC became a part of the educational scene as an effective way to prepare citizens in time of peace for military leadership in time of war, as well as to benefit those who will remain civilians.

Here at the Pennsylvania State University we have the third largest AFROTC unit in the United States with over 2,600 cadets enrolled, and I am honored to have been invited to participate in your annual awards day review.

In congratulating the officers and cadets of the Penn State units I do so in appreciation of their great contribution in advancing the objectives of the Air Force ROTC.

At this time I should like to briefly discuss our overall military programs and to encourage your continued interest in maintaining for the Nation the highest possible degree of military preparedness. I have in mind three points.

First, the international challenge facing the United States.

Second, the responsibilities of our defense program in supporting our national policy and, finally, the Air Force program within the Defense Establishment.

In connection with our international challenges I am sure all of you have read or have heard that "the aim of Soviet-directed communism is to establish its ideology throughout the world." In a theoretical sense the purpose is to create a Utopian society, with everybody equal, and without government. Their real interest is world control.

Based on what we know, the Soviets are increasing the capabilities of their military forces with a vigor and zeal available only to a forceful dictatorship. Concentrated scientific, industrial, educational, and military programs now underway in the Soviet Union are primarily geared to the creation of an aggressive force. We must call it an aggressive force—it is not a defensive structure—for no one has indicated an intent to attack them.

As a guarantee of future progress, the Soviets are increasing the number of graduates in the technical fields.

Unlike our own programs which incidentally will produce 10,000 fewer engineers than were needed this year—their educational plans virtually guarantee as many as the state requires.

It appears, then, that on the homefront the Soviets are gearing their capabilities to continued aggresson, indirect or direct.

In discharging our responsibilities in meeting this challenge the pressure exerted by the Soviets against the free world has posed both political and military challenges to the United States. As a result, the Defense Department—which has the responsibility of equipping a force complex to counteract the military challenge—has created a versatile defense—offense capabilities in support of national policies.

These capabilities are inherent in our defense team that must be able to defend the homeland from attack, deter all-out war—or win such a war if deterrents fail—and maintain flexibility to cope with local crises whenever and wherever they occur. In all sincerity, I am convinced that we possess the ability to meet these requirements.

And when I say "We," I am referring to all the services—Air Force, Army, Navy, and the Marine Corps.

Time will not permit me to discuss in detail the Air Force program within the Defense Establishment. However, I want to assure you that the Air Force is ready to perform its assignments, and in a superior manner. Its integrated system that includes missiles, modern aircraft, radar warning lines, and the semi-automatic ground environment creates a formidable network ready to meet a potential aggressor. In a few words, our Air Force represents the air might we need within our Defense Establishment.

Again, let me congratulate the officers and cadets of the Air Force ROTC units here at Penn State because when we speak of the military might of our Nation we must include the ROTC cadets—college students today and officers of tomorrow's Air Force. Congress and the American people are proud of your fine contributions to the security of our Nation.

German Sudeten Day Celebrated in Austria

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE BROCK
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 18, 1959

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, the attention of the House is called to the annual Sudeten German Day, which will occur on Whitsuntide, May 17–18, in Vienna, Austria—free Austria.

On that occasion, several hundreds of thousands of people will gather, to reaffirm their dedication to the principles of democracy, the freedom and dignity of the individual, and the welfare of mankind.

It is significant that this testimonial should occur during the period that two other events of world interest have taken place. I refer you to the recent free elections in Austria, conducted without force or violence, when the last few seats held by the Communists in the Austrian Legislature were voted out of office. At the same time, the foreign ministers of the free world will be meeting with the representatives of the Soviet Union, in an effort to work out settlement of the German question and bring about reduction in the "cold war."

The Vienna gathering in the interest of democracy may not set too well with the Russian delegation at Geneva but should have a salutary effect on the foreign ministers of the free world, to hold fast in the determination that any negotiations must be concluded only on an honorable basis—without retreat from established principles and prior commitments.

Mr. Speaker, I, therefore, request permission to extend my remarks and include in the RECORD a copy of my letter to Dr. Walter Becher, Secretary General, Sudeten German Council, commending these people meeting at Vienna for their formidable stand in the face of adversity.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., May 4, 1959.

Dr. WALTER BECHER,
Secretary General, Sudeten German Council, Munchen, Germany.

DEAR DR. BECHER: This will acknowledge your letter of April 15, advising me of the annual Sudeten German Day occurring on Whitsuntide, May 17–18, in Vienna, Austria.

In these days of international stress and military and diplomatic uncertainty, it is refreshing to contemplate a gathering of several hundreds of thousands of willful people reaffirming their dedication to democracy and freedom of the individuals—at the same time expressing their opposition to the fallacy of communism, which fails to recognize the dignity and the welfare of mankind.

The Third Congressional District of Nebraska, which I have the honor to represent, has a majority population of native Germans, and German extraction. They are very substantial, law-abiding and God-fearing citizens. The majority belong to and worship in the Lutheran Church. The present division of Germany is very distressing to these people.

I recall we had a German-language newspaper, published in Omaha, Nebr., which had a wide circulation in the Third District and throughout the State of Nebraska.

It is encouraging to know that your people stand firmly for the reunification of the German nation, under democratic principles of self-government and will vigorously oppose any attempts to foster Soviet-dominated rule in it's stead.

May I take this opportunity to commend your people for their courage and determination and to restore their nation, free from totalitarianism, atheism, and Marxism.

Sincerely,

LARRY BROCK,,
Member of Congress.

On Keeping the Record Straight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD G. WOLF
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 18, 1959

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following brilliant editorial from the altogether exceptional pen of William Bohn, the distinguished editor of the New Leader.

This column is a satirically intelligent analysis of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and the Appendix. Knowing that institutions should be kidded, and many times are strengthened by such kidding, I am introducing into the RECORD, Mr. Bohn's "deathless piece":

ON KEEPING THE RECORD STRAIGHT

(By William E. Bohn)

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is both a record for the future and a source of information for the present. Though it is published only when Congress is in session, it plays a great part in the life of the Nation. There are few papers and fewer Washington correspondents who give their public any adequate picture of what goes on under the Capitol dome. You can read every word that is published in most papers without getting much of an idea of what really happened. I always reserve my judgment on deeds and events until I can get hold of the RECORD. There I get the exact wording of bills and the arguments on both sides.

I don't know how many copies are printed and distributed. I must find out. But it is obvious that thousands of copies cover the country and are read by editors, writers, scholars, and other people who need exact information about our Government.

Each issue of the RECORD contains a second chapter called the Appendix. This is a record only in the most general sense. It is made up of items of the most varied sort contributed by Members of the two Houses. Obviously there is no general consensus as to the purpose of this extensive and amusing

publication. Each statesman introduces his contribution with a modest preamble: "Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following brilliant editorial from the altogether exceptional paper published in my hometown."

Many of the speakers mention unanimous consent. In any case, it is taken for granted. If some opposing statesmen were to rise in wrath and say, "What this low-lived fellow proposes to print is beneath contempt," the man would be forced to sit down and pocket his contribution. But as far as I know this has never happened. Every Member of the Senate or House has as one of the perquisites of office the right to print, without expense, anything that takes his fancy.

In order to arrive at some sort of opinion about this strangely selected and edited collection of literary items, I have spent a good deal of precious time in recent weeks making an analysis of five issues of this Appendix. For no reason at all I picked on five consecutive numbers from March 16 to March 20. How typical the production for this week is I cannot tell. I feel sure, at least, that it is average in that it contains every sort of item that an imaginative man could think of.

My five numbers contained 312 pages, an average of 62. On these pages, tightly printed in small type, I found 385 items. Of these, 245 were contributed by Democrats and 140 by Republicans. These figures roughly represent the comparative strength of the two parties. Members of the House made 284 contributions and Members of the Senate added 101. It is obvious that Senators make more use of their privilege than do Members of the larger and theoretically more lowly House.

I take for granted that the purpose of this department of the RECORD is to furnish in ready and convenient form material which will be useful to Members of Congress in their lawmaking activity. I found in the issues of those 5 days 45 articles containing substantial material connected with public affairs. Some were reports of addresses, some were statements presented to committees of one of the Houses, some were the results of investigations carried on by groups of experts outside the Government.

The newspapers of the country naturally furnished a substantial proportion of the material reprinted. In the 5 numbers of the week which I chose as typical, there were 90 editorials and 50 news stories or newspaper articles—many of them in the form of columns.

Most Members of Congress make no demands on the space of this publication. On the other hand, certain others are constantly popping up and asking unanimous consent. For example, the doughty THOMAS J. LANE, a Democrat from Lawrence, Mass., injected nine deathless pieces which he obviously considered worth their space. Most of his contributions dealt with St. Patrick, whose gaily celebrated day came in the week I chose for my little study. In one case, LANE devoted more than 6 pages to a report of a friend's travels through Ireland.

I am not objecting. I am merely desirous of learning how such a charming and detailed report on the scenery of the old country can help our Congress attend to its business. Senator JACK KENNEDY, Democrat, of Massachusetts, shares with us a large number of editorials in support of himself and his proposals. Here and there is a Congressman with a hobby. JOHN DINGELL, Democrat, of Michigan, God bless him, brings in every item he can find which puts in a stroke for purifying our water.

There is a commendable effort to warm the hearts of the folks at home. If some high school boy has won a prize, if some preacher has observed his 100th birthday, if some constituent has sent in a letter in favor of lowering taxes and simultaneously balancing the budget, you may be sure that the event will not pass without mention.

Editorial Comments Preserved for History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM J. RANDALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1959

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I think it is fitting and appropriate that there be consolidated into one brief summation a sort of résumé or roundup of excerpts from editorials of a few of the great papers of America, along with some of the columnists and commentators, drawings together in this entry what they had to say editorially or in summary about our former President, Harry S. Truman, on and following the event of his 75th birthday, commemorated by the diamond jubilee in New York City and 16 other cities throughout the United States on Friday, May 8.

The New York Times said:

It is hard to believe that Harry Truman is 75 today. Those brisk early morning walks, the keen wit and alert mind he shows when testifying before congressional committees, the vigor of his pronouncements on matters domestic and foreign, all these contradict the calendar's testimony.

Mr. Truman's place in our country's history is for the historians to decide, but we can be sure it will be no small place. His place in the affection of his countrymen on this, his 75th birthday, is already secure and beyond question. May there be many more birthdays in good health and good spirits.

The Evening Star, Washington, D.C., commented:

Harry Truman, 75 today, wears his years well and proudly. * * * In a sense, Mr. Truman's is the American story—as Americans have believed it for generations. Of modest family heritage and preparatory background, he found his true metier in politics and stayed with it from the precincts of Kansas City to the White House. In his nearly 8 years as President of the United States, Mr. Truman carried responsibilities that were awesome in their bearing upon the safety and welfare of his country and indeed upon world history * * * likely to assure the Missourian a respected place among those who have held this Nation's highest office.

Columnist Doris Fleeson had this to say about Mr. Truman:

Wide acclaim and affection for a public figure are always easier when that person's ambitions are behind him. Harry Truman is seeing happen to him the same process by which his friend, Alben Barkley, once a truly controversial figure in Kentucky and national politics, was raised to eminence of a party saint even in Kentucky. * * * Mr. Truman's happiness these days is not the careless kind. He cares very much what happens to America and to mankind. What is remarkable about him is that with all his knowledge of what we face, with all his concern, he remains a happy man. He has risen triumphant from threatened defeat himself. The light of victory still shines for him in the dark hours.

Then from the Washington Post, Washington, D.C., which asks a question and gives its own answer:

Why is it that Mr. Truman has become so much an institution? There is great admiration, of course, for his courage in big decisions when he was in the White House. No President, we suppose, can be wholly immune to the thought of his ultimate place in history; but Mr. Truman seemed to approach many important issues with the simple objective of giving them the best evaluation and judgment of which he was capable—and then ceased to worry. Undoubtedly some of the admiration also stems from Mr. Truman's humble origin which lingers even in his metaphor, his self-education, his quiet willingness to shoulder huge burdens. He was the average man risen to uncommon heights. * * * But he emerged undaunted, and in the net his exaltation of the Presidential Office enhanced the dignity of it. More than anything else, however, we suspect that Mr. Truman's great zest is what gives him such a unique position today. He can be angry, but not mean.

Coming from the New York Herald Tribune:

Harry Truman is 75 today, or so the records say. Actually he doesn't seem a day over 60. * * * Vitality is one of Mr. Truman's great gifts to the American scene, and the astonishing thing is that he didn't lose it to the Presidency. During his 8 years in office he made many epochal decisions which would have sapped the strength and ruined the sleep of other men. These were decisions that helped end World War II, begin the atomic age, launch the United Nations, and contained the spread of communism by such dramatic steps, as the Berlin airlift, the Korean war, the NATO Alliance, and extensive foreign aid. Time is likely to judge these decisions well, just as it now favors Mr. Truman himself, giving him the zest to lecture and to write, to talk to countless students and scholars, to assemble at Independence a museum that will illuminate the Presidency for future generations.

The Chicago American in speaking of the birthday festivities said:

The general holiday air about the celebration emphasies a fact that has bothered many of Truman's critics. It is that Americans by and large like Harry Truman very much, whether it's because of his politics or in spite of them. (His) * * * energy and zest for living, his liking for a good fight, his unglamorous forthrightness, even his flat midwestern drawl, somehow project an image of themselves that Americans like.

From down at the end of the Florida Peninsula, and in the editorial columns of the Miami Herald, we read:

The man from Independence is 75 today. * * * It is good indeed to have his likes around, ever willing to sound off on any subject and giving it to the opposition at every opportunity except in matters concerning his Nation's foreign policy. * * * His birthday cake today might properly be spiced with ginger.

Drew Pearson, one America's most widely read columnists, who was at one time a strong critic, but now a stanch friend, writing from an Independence, Mo., dateline at the Truman Library just a few days before the birthday, found it very easy to say:

A guided tour through the Truman Library by the man who so vigorously molded American history is a fascinating experience. * * * It's like rolling back the pages of history.

After concluding the tour, Pearson pointed out that one of Mr. Truman's most prized possessions is a picture of Winston Churchill and himself which has a scrawled inscription by the Prime Minister:

To President Truman, whose decisive strike against aggression in Korea turned the fortunes of the free world to sure hope of peace.

Although the Christian Science Monitor did not say so editorially, in a prominent news article, one of its correspondents has this to say of the birthday:

The general theme of the tributes was that whether or not history ranks the 33d President of the United States among the greatest, he will be revered as a man of decision, energy, and full of deep respect for the high office into which he was catapulted by the passing of Franklin D. Roosevelt in April 1945.

The well-known commenator, H. V. Kaltenborn, who appeared on the closed TV circuit and who at midnight on election night in 1948 had forecast Mr. Truman's defeat, speaking from Boston recalled that night in 1948:

Mr. Truman went back to sleep while I waited for the Dewey votes that didn't come in.

And on the serious side, Mr. Kaltenborn summed up the Truman contributions to the world:

He led the free world in the fight against communism, launched the point 4 economic aid program, and helped Greece and Turkey defeat the Communist menace. Best of all he took the bold step of using force to defeat Communist aggression in Korea.

Along with some of the rest of us, Mr. Truman likes to refer to Kansas City, Mo., our large neighbor to the west, as just a suburb of Independence. There, the Kansas City Star which over the years has not always thought best to be enthusiastic about Mr. Truman in an editorial entitled "The Man of Independence Reaches 75," proceeded to observe:

On the night of January 21, 1953, * * * the former President began his latest career, retirement. * * * Few men during the busiest periods of their lives have been as active as Harry Truman in the recent years. As author, he has turned out his two-volume "Memoirs," and many articles on world affairs. Financing was completed on the Truman library project, the building constructed, and turned over to the people of the United States. * * * The role of university lecturer has delighted Dr. Truman (honorary doctorate, Oxford University). * * * As a senior guide at his library, he has amused guests of world fame and bus loads of schoolchildren with choice comments. * * * Men of good will in all parts of the free world will be wishing the man from Independence godspeed and many more vigorous years on this, his diamond jubilee.

Of all the great newspapers, perhaps some of the best comments came from the conservative Atlanta Constitution, and it devoted quite a lot of space to a review of his achievements, touching upon some phases of his career not mentioned by other papers when it said:

It is interesting to note that in the years which have passed since he left the White House the esteem and affection in which the people hold him still is growing. He is a remarkable man, Harry S. Truman. History will acknowledge he was a remarkable President. He has a sense of optimism, faith in the right, in himself, and his country. He possesses a great knowledge of history and reverence for the office he held. But he acted less like the image the Nation holds of the Presidency than perhaps any other. It was his responsibility and decision to usher in the atomic age. He brought the country into the United Nations. He did not hesitate to meet the Communist challenge headon in Korea. The cost was great as he knew it could be. But containment of communism's geographic advances began there. He did not falter in his duty to dismiss a popular and ambitious general who seemingly had forgotten that in the United States the President is Commander in Chief. He buoyantly and confidently won an election everyone said couldn't be won. * * * So today when there are so many weaseling words and so much of the legalistic "whereas and whereof" in our language, it is good to have Harry Truman around, speaking out of his heart and faith with no mincing of words. So, Mr. Truman, the Atlanta Constitution wishes to join in the happy birthday chorus and to wish you many more years of happiness and health.

Management Participation in Political Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 18, 1959

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a copy of an address made on May 6, 1959, by J. C. MacQueen, manager of employee and community relations, General Electric Co., Cincinnati, Ohio, before the 20th Ohio personnel institute at Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, on the subject of "Management Participation in Political Education." I am sure every Member of Congress will find Mr. MacQueen's address to be very interesting and informative:

MANAGEMENT PARTICIPATION IN POLITICAL EDUCATION

(By J. C. MacQueen)

I certainly appreciate your extending to me this opportunity to meet with you tonight to discuss one of the most serious challenges facing business management today.

One of the phenomena of our generation—and one that will have some of the most far reaching impacts of all history—has been the rapid expansion of Government.

For example, two decades ago our Federal Government had less than a million civilian employees with an annual payroll of about a billion and a half. Today, there are 2½ million civilian employees of the Federal Government with an annual payroll of more than $11 billion.

During those same 20 years, the Federal budget increased more than 800 percent. This expansion was more than twice as fast as economic expansion during that period as measured by the gross national product.

The figures would be even more impressive if we looked at them over three decades rather than just since 1939. Government mushrooming growth began well before 1939. For example, the per capita portion of the national debt has increased from about $140 three decades ago to almost $2,000 now.

With this expansion, Government has extended itself into areas long considered outside its orbit. It has grown with all the instinct of a vegetable, feeding like a tumorous growth on the rights of States and individuals and the vitality of free enterprise.

The Hoover Commission found a few years ago that our Government was engaged in about 3,000 different enterprises in direct competition with private business—usually small business. They range all the way from steamship lines to diaper laundries and include 20,000 business units.

The Federal Government is, today, our Nation's largest electric power producer, insurer, money lender and borrower, landlord and tenant, holder of grazing land and timberland, shipowner, and truck-fleet operator. It owns a sizable percentage of the total real estate in the United States. It is liable for the medical bills of one out of every five Americans. It can control the profit and loss of American business.

Business management has howled a bit about the encroachment of Government on its role, but generally it has gone back to business as usual without taking any action steps. It seems to have been a basic tenet among businessmen to consider that Government was not our business.

It has now reached the point that we can no longer ignore the plain fact that government is our business. Whether we like it or not, government is our not-so-silent partner at the shop. And, at the rate it is moving it will soon be firmly established as the senior partner.

Already it takes more than half our profits in a direct slice right off the top and lots more indirectly. In the day-to-day operation of the business, more and more business decisions that have been traditionally made in the competitive marketplace are being transferred to government bureaus and legislative halls.

Government policy has contributed to the inflationary forces that are infecting our entire economic system. They have contributed to a threatening growth of union monopoly and to a business climate that stifles growth and development.

The fact is, and we must face up to it, we have reached the stage where to have an effective voice in many of the major decisions that affect our business, we must make that voice heard through government. Our corporate survival is at stake and with it the blessings of the free-enterprise system that accrue to all Americans.

A relatively few businessmen will be able to have a direct voice in government as elected or appointed officials. But the great majority of us cannot play such a role. We must make our voices heard from back home. We can do this through politics.

Now this is easier said than done. Many people do not fully appreciate the need to take an active interest in politics. And many who do recognize the need do not know how to go about being effective in this field.

A vast segment of America is going to have to go back to school and study their lessons in practical politics. Business management is going to have to be ready and willing to be the schoolma'am.

The fact that you have invited me to come here tonight and discuss our experiences at General Electric in Cincinnati in political education shows that you do not need to be persuaded that action is necessary, but that you want to know what to do and how to do it (or at least how we do it).

Unfortunately, not all business management shares your recognition on this score.

The first step is going to have to be to motivate our business associates and the friends of free enterprise to take an interest—to build in them an appreciation of the role that politics plays in modern civilization—to impress upon them the vital importance of citizen participation in government through

politics—to tear down the all too prevalent idea that politics is a nasty word.

At General Electric in Cincinnati we have utilized every means of communication with our employees at our disposal to try to accomplish this phase of political education among our employees.

For example, our plant newspaper, distributed each Friday to 15,000 employees, has repeatedly discussed the need for citizen interest in government and, thus, in politics. One of the many full-page display-type features that we have employed in this effort was headed "Politics and You" and went right to the point. Under a picture of the Capitol Building in Washington, the feature read:

"Like the weather, many people talk about politics but few do anything about it. Beyond occasionally voting, they are content to be spectators as far as politics is concerned. They see no reason why they should be active in politics.

"Yet, there is hardly a facet of modern life that is not affected by local, State or National Government. Government tells us how fast we may drive on our streets and highways. Through taxation, Government decides how much of the money we earn we may take home. It builds dams to control floods and generates electricity and manufactures ice cream; it buys surplus farm crops. It stands guard over our freedom and preserves law and order.

"Yes; the course of government directs the course of our lives, and politics controls the course of government.

"That is the reason we should all be actively interested in politics—that is the reason we should not be content to be political spectators. Through political participation in support of the type government we believe best for our country, We can help direct the course of history as well as the forces that influence our lives."

The feature was supported by an editorial that attacked the idea that politics is a dirty business. Headed "Hands in Our Pockets," it stated:

"Some joker is reported to have said that one can always tell a Washington tourist from a politician because the tourist will have his hands in his pockets and the politician will have his hands in someone else's pocket.

"Actually," the editorial continued "this is very unfair to the many deeply dedicated men and women who take an active part in politics, often at great personal sacrifice. However, it reflects the all too prevalent feeling among many Americans that politics is a dirty business and that politicians are shady characters. This idea discourages many citizens from participating in political activity.

"If politics becomes a dirty business and shady characters get control of important positions in our government, local, State or national, it is the fault of those of us back home who have our hands in our pockets where politics is concerned. As Howard Crosby, an American clergyman of the 19th century wrote: 'To let politics become a cesspool and then avoid it because it is a cesspool, is a double crime.'

"It is not enough just to vote on election day. To take full advantage of democracy, we must take our hands out of our pockets and put them to work for the political philosophies we believe best for America—present and future—and in support of candidates who uphold these philosophies.

"The best way," the editorial concluded, "to be certain of having decent politicians is to be one."

These are only examples. We have repeated this idea time and time again in the Plant News. We have utilized our management memo and newsletter to direct more concentrated appeals to some 3,000 members of our management group. We have supplemented these with reprints of pertinent articles and speeches by national political and business figures, including top General Electric management.

Nor have we confined our efforts to just General Electric people. We think all Americans should take a serious, constructive interest in Government. We have used direct mailing to community through leaders, editorial comments on the radio, paid institutional advertisements and speakers who go before community organizations and groups.

But inspiring an interest and desire among citizens to be effective politically is not enough. Most of us just do not know how to go about getting into politics or how to be effective in that realm.

The practice of politics is an art. It is an intricate and complicated business. It is not just an election day activity—it requires constant attention. Success pretty much requires practical know-how. And, an amateur without understanding of its processes and know-how, can do more harm than good for the cause he would support.

Therein is found the second challenge to management in its role as a political schoolmarm—teaching the art of practical politics.

At our General Electric plant we have taken two long steps in this direction.

The first was last September. We held a 3-day seminar for about 25 of our top management and invited representatives of 5 neighboring businesses. It was conducted by Joe Eley and Cliff White, of Public Affairs Counsellors, Inc., both old hands in the give and take of politics. They are professional consultants on the subject. (Incidentally, there are a number of consultant firms in America now that are geared up to give management practical help in political education.)

On the first day of the seminar, the chairmen of the political parties in Hamilton County met with us. They discussed their organizations with us very frankly and drew on their years of experience to give us a firsthand insight into politics at work.

During the afternoon and all day the next day, Joe and Cliff led us in discussions of political organization and function from the precinct to the national level. On the third day, we rolled up our sleeves and worked out ways to multiply the information we had received and to put this new knowledge and insight to work.

In concert with this, a task force of five members of our management prepared a course in practical politics to be offered to a broader base of management and eventually to any employee who is interested.

They prepared a manual to serve as a basis for the course of study. It considers the structure of government from the local to national levels and shows how political organizations parallel this structure. It traces the histories of American political parties, considering the influences that have been exerted on them in their formation and development and the situations that they face today.

To supplement the manual, a number of booklets and pamphlets were selected from a wide variety of sources including political parties, government, and pressure groups. A textbook was obtained that presents the campaign experiences of its authors.

Participants in the course meet in a 2-hour session each week for 8 weeks. During these sessions they reported to their fellow participants on research projects that they have pursued. The entire course is built on the basis that we learn best by doing. It stresses practical participation.

During the 8 weeks, participants interview political figures including legislators and grassroots party workers. Each participant writes a Congressman or Senator and discusses a current issue of government; then the group compares the replies received. Participants also visit a session of a governmental body such as a city council.

The results to date have been excellent. The course was introduced early this year with maximum enrollment of 180. Now we are offering the second series of classes, broken down into 12 classes with 15 in a group. Before the end of 1959, about 850 members of our management at Evendale will have completed the 8-week series.

There is evidence that more political interest is being demonstrated by a broader base of citizens in Hamilton County today than for many years. Some of the local political organizations that had gotten sleepy at the switch have been revitalized into renewed action by the interest of these men. A number of the persons who took the course in the first term have been given positions of authority in the Republican and Democratic Parties of the county. Several are candidates for office in municipal elections this fall.

We feel that this course is a particularly valuable phase of our management effort for political education. I believe that other companies that follow suit will find this is true for them, too.

Incidentally, for those who cannot or do not want to prepare their own courses, there are readymade courses available from a number of sources including the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. Or, for that matter, the consulting firms I mentioned before are available to come in and prepare courses tailored to the particular needs and desires of your management. In some cities—notably, Syracuse, N.Y.—several companies have pooled their resources to prepare and offer such courses jointly.

The third phase of political education in which we are engaged down at Evendale is that of creating an appreciation of sound political philosophy and support for sound issues.

Here again, we utilize our employee communications media. Through them we discuss general political and economic philosophy.

We try to explain that Uncle Sam isn't Santa Claus, that there is no such thing as something for nothing from the Government. We try to explain with clear logic the stake each American has in free enterprise. And we discuss particular issues that are current. For example, last year we discussed the President's defense reorganization and we presented the facts as we saw them in the right-to-work controversy.

To help us monitor the actions and trends of Government, General Electric has recently established on a national level a government relations service. This organization maintains offices in Washington to keep a firsthand finger on the pulse of our National Government. Its staff of analysts issues regular bulletins to General Electric management in all parts of the country to keep us in touch with happenings in Washington so we can direct our attention to timely and important issues.

Here in Ohio, we have established a similar watchdog operation in our General Electric legislative council. This council is composed of representatives of the several General Electric operations in the State, each of whom keeps a close personal watch on a particular segment of the activity of our State government and passes on his information to the other company locations.

In the use of the communications media I mentioned earlier, we do not tell our people how they should feel on a particular issue. We present facts and urge them to study further if they wish, and then make up their minds and followup.

By followup, we explain that they are exercising good citizenship when they let their representatives in government have the benefit of their views on matters of public

interest. We urge them to let their representative government really represent them.

A word of caution: in communicating on political issues and philosophy, extreme care must be exercised to make certain that the wrong kind of reaction does not result. There are forces in our society that are only too anxious to interpret any business message on politics, regardless of the logic of the argument, as big business against the little man.

We must make sure that the words we use in carrying our message are so clear and so meaningful that there can be no doubt as to their meaning and intent. It is also important that we listen as much as we talk so we can tie our messages to the things that really interest our audience.

We must make ever certain that our audiences recognize that we are not trying to create a controlled pressure group that, on signal, will exert its influence for or against any particular party, candidate or issues. There are too many elements in society trying to do that now. We don't want that at General Electric even if we could have it.

Ours is the objective that should be common to any effort toward education—to get people to think for themselves. We want them to consider the issues of the day from the framework of a working knowledge of government and politics, to make up their own minds and then act to make sure we have good government.

We are trying to show them that the best way for them to be effective in doing this is to have a voice in the selection of sound candidates, to get out enough enlightened votes to elect those candidates and then to keep those candidates apprised of what they, as good citizens back home, are thinking.

This is not the end of our story. Our efforts to meet the challenge to management in political education will be a continuing effort. We hope that others will join us in this. If they do, we will probably learn from them, and we hope they will learn from our efforts.

We hope that all citizens—not just businessmen—will heed this call and assume the duty of good citizenship to be politically astute and active.

In that way we can have more responsive government—that will benefit the free enterprise system and thus all citizens, present and future—to assure a better America.

That is the objective of our management efforts in political education—a better America for all Americans. There is no more important objective. We feel that there is no more certain way to contribute to it.

Thank you.

San Luis Reservoir Bill, H.R. 5687

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JEFFERY COHELAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1959

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, typical of the growing interest and correspondence with reference to the San Luis reservoir bills, S. 44, H.R. 301, and H.R. 5687, is a telegram I have received from C. J. Haggerty, secretary-treasurer of the California Labor Federation, AFL–CIO, which I submit for the attention of my colleagues.

It is distressing that legislation of such great interest in the U.S. Congress which was the subject of 4 days of brilliant and extended debate in the other body should be receiving very little attention in the California press and particularly in the San Francisco Bay area press. It is hoped that before a final decision is made a full account will be available:

Hon. JEFFREY COHELAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

California Labor Federation, AFL–CIO, requests that House consideration of H.R. 5687, San Luis unit, Central Valley project, be postponed until report of House Interior Committee is published and distributed. Record of published information in California is so meager, inadequate, and in some cases inaccurate that publication of committee report is fully necessary so that people of California may know the truth about the issues involved. We, therefore, request that you read this telegram into the printed record of the House and use your influence to postpone debate until the committee report is printed and distributed to us and to other interested citizens. H.R. 5687 raises issues of such great principle that public interest demands the fullest possible publicity and ample time for analysis and consideration. We urge your cooperation.

C. J. HAGGERTY,
Secretary-Treasurer,
California Labor Federation, AFL–CIO.

Testimony of Hon. Leonard G. Wolf, Before Manpower Utilization Subcommittee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD G. WOLF
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1959

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extent my remarks I would like to insert in the RECORD a copy of my testimony before the Armed Services Subcommittee on Manpower Utilization:

TESTIMONY OF HON. LEONARD G. WOLF, DEMOCRAT, OF IOWA, BEFORE MANPOWER UTILIZATION SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE, MAY 12, 1959

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I consider it on honor to appear before this committee today. I consider that the duty of this committee is one of paramount importance. And it seems to me that the committee in order to a comprehensive job must undertake to investigate fully all aspects of our manpower procurement and manpower utilization programs. Hence, I suggest that the committee undertake a full and complete investigation and study of:

1. The operation of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, the Reserve programs and the programs of procurement of military personnel by the Amed Forces.

2. The alternatives to the system of induction of civilians for military training and service as a method of maintaining the personnel strength of the Armed Forces; and

3. Manpower utilization within the armed services in a way which will be the most efficient and give us maximum national security while protecting basic freedoms of the individual.

Clearly, this is a difficult task. I might suggest as you are already well aware, that there are going to be certain interests who out of a personal desire to potect themselves, will not necessarily help this committee in its task. On the other hand, there will be those who will honestly feel that no changes are necessary; that the present haphazard system is the best of all possible systems. Or some may be conservative in particular matters as, for example, Secreary Finucane was in his testimony before the Armed Services Committee. He stated that "conformity with habits of the past" governed much of the thinking on the draft issue, and in fact, seemed to be the reason that 4 years was chosen as the number of years for the draft extension. However, I do not wish to discuss this issue directly.

Clearly, the problems that will be considered by this committee will go to the very question of our defense posture and our methods of defense. It will be the task of this committee to shake out the cobwebs from the thinking on defense that has gone on in the administration in the past few years.

Because the title of this subcommittee is indeed "Manpower Utilization" is might be a good idea to start with a short discussion of possible ways to change the present armed service idea that almost every cook, bookkeeper, and warehouse employee who is not attached to a combat outfit must be given combat training. It should be noted that at present no more than 25 percent of the men in the Army are actually combat troops. The rest fall into the category of supply or support personnel. It seems clear to me that a great number of the jobs presently performed by soldiers could be better performed by nonmilitary or civilian personnel. Certain illustrations tend to prove that the size of the Army could be cut drastically and improved as an effective fighting force if certain steps would be taken along the lines suggested by other similar projects.

In Aviation Week, September 6, 1954, there appears a discussion of a project called Project Native Son, which the Air Force put into practice. This program is described as essentially the replacement of a military man by an indigenous civilian. "We would save military personnel in support-type activities." In turn, this makes an airman available for a new combat unit. "This project also reduced requirements for military housing and supplies, thus saving money. This project uses civilians of the country where the Air Force maintains bases. In 1954 the Air Materiel Command found it could reduce its size by using 14,000 civilian personnel." I suggest that if such a program can be undertaken with foreign nationals, an even larger program could be undertaken by employing American civilians in the continental United States.

It is certainly the task of this committee to examine the extension of such programs in the United States in those activities that may just as well be performed by a civilian. Obviously, there will be some close questions in this field, but this should not stop the Congress from making some policy determination on this matter instead of letting the problem continue to slide.

A second illustration showing the ways of replacing armed services personnel with civilian manpower is given to us by the Seabee example. Congressman THOMAS B. CURTIS, before the Seabee veterans convention in St. Louis back in 1954 made the following remarks. His thoughts on this subject are still relevant today. "When we examine * * * the work performed by men in uniform for the Military Establishment, we will find that at least 80 percent (and some even estimate higher) is not fighting nor will it ever be fighting. It has to do with supplies, transportation, warehousing, maintenance, overhaul, bookkeeping, housing, feeding, overhead. Nor am I referring to the borderline cases, such as field or frontline maintenance, or frontline feeding, and so forth. Obviously any work on the frontlines will involve the need for military discipline."

Now if 80 percent of the men in uniform are never going to be engaged in fighting, what in heaven's name are we talking about training 100 percent to fight? If indeed an analysis of the job requirements of these 80 percent reveals, as it does, that the skills needed in Seabees, then we had best follow the Seabees' formula in our personnel practices as it relates to the 80 percent.

The Seabees' formula was to take men of all ages and physical condition from civilian life and use the civilian skills without putting them through basic military training or into uniform or under the military code.

Representative CURTIS added: "The men in the Seabees were put into jobs they already knew. The guiding light of the personnel system was to utilize civilian skills * * * The military knows full well that they need civilian skills. What they have not yet learned is that the civilian enterprise is better equipped to train men in these skills than the military and incidentally at one-tenth the cost because we don't have to provide room, board, and wages for our civilian trainees. Following such a formula we need neither universal military training, socialism, nor destructive high taxes."

Another problem similar to this one is that of duplication of military activities. For example our Military Establishment has three supply systems, not counting the supply systems organized under the single manager plan. Needless to say, duplication in supply activity results in endless economic waste and manpower personnel. I suggest that this committee investigate the possibility of a civilian managed agency under the Secretary of Defense, to handle the procurement, production, warehousing, distribution of supplies and equipment, standardization of control and supply functions for common supply items. Coincident to this would be an authorization by the Congress to the Secretary of Defense to take such actions as are necessary to acheive economy efficiency and effectiveness in noncombatant services by the elimination of overlapping and duplication. Within this context I believe it is wise to authorize the Secretary of Defense to expand contractual and civil service arrangements with men who fall within the supply or noncombat category. The areas that I think this committee should look into could possibly result in the ending of our present conscription system.

With your indulgence I would like to take a few moments to discuss the constription problem.

It is my feeling that our national military security policy must be a fairly long-run policy, based on the assumption that the cold war may continue for an extended period. (Obviously, all of us agree that the military should not add to the tensions. And, for the most part, I do not believe that this has been the case.) While our security plans must provide for dealing with individual Soviet offenses, these plans will fail if they consist only of a series of crash programs designed to meet specific Communist challenges.

Our military manpower programs, a vital element of our security policy, have been piecemeal responses to particular cold war crises. They have not been related to the circumstances and requirements of military preparedness in an era of crises and nuclear weapons.

The heart of our present military manpower programs is conscription. Indeed, it would be more accurate to call conscription the crutch upon which American military manpower programs lean.

In a free society, conscription is not a good crutch upon which to lean, because conscription violates a fundamental democratic principle—the principle of voluntarism. Moreover, conscription—at least as it now operates in the United States—is highly discriminatory, especially against the economically underprivileged. It is they who are generally drafted into the Army because this group of men cannot avail themselves of the sixty different ways of avoiding the 2-year obligation.

Finally, even if conscription were not a weak crutch, it would still be an inappropriate crutch. It would be inappropriate, because our national military strategy assumes that an all-out war would be decided quickly by a rapid and decisive nuclear exchange between the Soviet Union and the United States. Thus, our military manpower requirement for total war will be relatively small and highly trained forces.

Conscription has no place in a modern Military Establishment. Even if conscripts can be trained to operate the complex instruments of modern warfare, they are separated from service soon after they are trained. If they are not taught to operate the complex instruments of modern warfare, what real contribution can they make to our military power?

With respect to limited war, our national military strategy assumes that nuclear weapons will be employed to meet most situations short of general war. It would seem, therefore, that our military manpower requirement—quality rather than quantity—is basically the same for both limited and total war. If, on the other hand, we have a limited nonnuclear war what is needed are strong and large reserve forces that are well trained. Such a program would not necessitate a large standing army.

Instead of paying the costs of drafting and training 2-year men, and instead of paying the costs of training and then losing conscription-induced 3- and 4-year enlistees, would not the Nation save money and produce a better nuclear age defense force, if we eliminated conscription and invested the money saved thereby in the kinds of salaries and benefits necessary to maintain highly competent, professional Armed Forces?

It seems clear that continued reliance on the crutch of conscription can only perpetuate our irrational military manpower policies. We should continue to lean on this crutch only for so much time as is necessary to make a fundamental reevaluation of our military manpower policies.

A basic reevaluation of our military manpower policies would have to include an examination of the extent to which maximum benefit has been obtained from the Cordiner Committee's recommendations and realization that pay incentives to enter the Army are much too low. But more than this, a reevaluation of our military manpower policies should consider the extent to which a solution for our manpower problems presupposes major changes in military philosophy, in military life, and in the military way of doing things. Because our Army is seemingly bulging with enough men we do not stop to consider whether or not the service of draftees or reservists is helpful to the national defense. Nor do we consider whether or not these men learn anything about modern warfare, or indeed, can learn anything about modern warfare and modern weapons in the short time they serve. We might openly inquire and examine whether these men (draftees and noncombatants) actually hinder in the functioning of a modern army. Furthermore, we must show that the ever-changing level of technology demands a new kind of soldier. Obviously, he must be one who is conversant with modern weapons. He must be someone who will make the armed services a career. He must be someone who will stay longer than 2 or 3 years of his own volition. He should not be someone who thinks only of the time he is wasting in the Army.

Our Nation's military manpower problems call for decisive and major action. We cannot afford to tinker any more with these problems. We can no longer delude ourselves into believing that the shaky crutch of conscription gives us real military security.

Decisive and major action on our military manpower policies, if that action is to be wise, must be preceded by a careful study and analysis of the needs and weaknesses of our whole Military Establishment. This kind of study and analysis, I am sure, this committee will do. Thank you.

U.S. Policy and Actions in High Energy Accelerator Physics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 18, 1959

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the Members of the House to a recent report to the President by a special panel of experts on "U.S. Policy and Actions in High Energy Accelerator Physics." One part of this report, namely, the proposal for constructing a $100 million accelerator at Stanford University, has received a good deal of publicity, but I call the attention of the House to the fact that there are other major recommendations in this excellent study which are deserving of our serious consideration.

For instance, the report states that in addition to substantially increasing our outlays for high energy accelerators in the years just ahead, "it is necessary to give particular attention to providing early support to plans for initial experimental facilities in order that these facilities be efficient, flexible, and available once an accelerator is operating."

We on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy have been hammering away at this point for the past several years in connection with the AEC basic research program. We have been particularly troubled by the tendency of the Bureau of the Budget to approve the large experimental machines themselves and then fail to follow up by approving funds for associated experimental facilities which are necessary to realize the full potential of these costly machines.

A good example of this can be found in this year's authorization bill for the AEC. The Commission, after due consideration by its technical experts, recommended to the Budget Bureau that a so-called high flux magnet facility be constructed at Argonne National Laboratory to permit maximum effective use of the large high energy accelerator currently under construction at the laboratory. This recommendation by the AEC was turned down cold by the Bureau of the Budget. It seems a pity that the Bureau cannot get together with the President's top scientific advisers who are recommending urgently that we proceed with such facilities.

Mr. Speaker, I think this report to the President is a highly significant document and confirms the findings of the Joint Committee in its hearings on physical research last year that this country

must continue to give such research adequate support in the future if we are to compete effectively in the race with the Russians for scientific supremacy. I include the full report in the RECORD at this point and urge that every Member of this House read it because of its important implications for the future of our Nation:

U.S. POLICY AND ACTIONS IN HIGH ENERGY ACCELERATOR PHYSICS

(Report by a special panel of the President's Science Advisory Committee and the General Advisory Committee to the Atomic Energy Commission).

(Panel members: SAC: Dr. Emanuel Piore, Chairman; Dr. Hans A. Bethe, Dr. L. J. Haworth; GAC: Prof. Jesse W. Beams, Dr. Edwin M. McMillan.)

BACKGROUND

1. High energy physics is one of the most active fields in contemporary science, and one which has attracted many of the best experimental and theoretical scientists throughout the world. In a sense, it is the most fundamental branch of physics, since its aim is to discover and investigate the elementary particles from which all matter is made. Many of these particles are now known, and the majority of them are unstable; in order to investigate their properties, the experimenter must have means for creating these unstable particles in the laboratory, which is done by converting the kinetic energy of accelerated protons or electrons into the equivalent mass of the new particles. Hence the need for high energy.

The exact energy needed depends on the particle to be produced, as well as the bombarding particle. The better-known class of pions and muons can be made at energies as low as 200 million electron volts, while the still very mysterious strange particles require energies starting at about 1 billion electron volts for electron bombardment and about 2 billion elcctron volts for proton bombardment. To produce some types of strange particles in pairs (in order to get the anti-particles, in analogy to the antiprotons) requires many billion electron volts. In our opinion, the importance of this field in understanding the basic nature of matter and its behavior cannot be overestimated.

2. Experimentation in high energy physics requires expensive devices to accelerate particles to the desired energy, expensive instruments to measure and control particles traveling at speeds approaching the velocity of light and large numbers of scientific and technical personnel. Thus, not only the construction of these high energy physics accelerators, but also their utilization require the expenditure of large sums of money.

3. Immediately after the war, the Federal Government encouraged and supported the construction of high energy accelerators in several universities and national laboratories and, at the completion of these accelerators, funds were provided for the operation of these machines to perform the necessary and desirable experiments. In addition to providing important research results, these accelerators also have provided the training ground for the group of young scientists who are now carrying the responsibility for the future of this field and for many who have since made contributions in other fields.

4. Later requirements were recognized for more and more powerful, and thus more expensive, accelerators. The Federal Government supplied support for these new accelerators, some of which are now operating, others still under construction. Funds for the construction and operation of all new high energy accelerators initiated since 1953 have been provided by the Atomic Energy Commission. Other countries throughout the world—Western Europe and Russia—also have development programs for construction and utilization of particle accelerators for the study of high energy physics.

5. There is now need to review the high energy accelerator program and needs at the Presidential level. This stems from: (a) the extraordinarily high cost of the construction and utilization of high energy accelerators; (b) the fact that all support in this scientific area comes from the Federal Government; (c) the interest of a number of Government agencies in the science and technology associated with both the construction and the experimental results; and (d) the desire to have an orderly national program taking full account of the activities abroad.

6. A number of groups within the Federal Government have studied this problem. The most detailed examinations have been made by the Advisory Panel on High Energy Accelerators of the National Science Foundation.[1] Other advisory groups which have also been concerned with this general area are the President's Science Advisory Committee, the General Advisory Committee to the Atomic Energy Commission, and the Defense Science Board. There is general agreement on the recommendations contained herein among the several groups listed above.

DISCUSSION

7. An adequate approach to high energy physics research requires well-rounded coverage of the basic accelerator parameters—most importantly, the type of accelerated particle (protons and electrons), the energy, the intensity, and the beam geometry. Progress in the field will require, in addition to full exploitation of existing accelerators, extensions of certain of these important parameters.

8. Current situation: The United States has 15 high energy accelerators in operation with energies above 200 million electron volts (table I); 4 of these have energies in excess of 1 billion electron volts and are capable of producing strange particles. The highest energy particles now available are 6.2 billion electron volt protons and 1.2 billion electron volt electrons. Four additional accelerators are under construction—a 6 billion electron volt electron synchrotron at Cambridge, a 25 to 30 billion electron volts proton synchrotron at the Brookhaven National Laboratory, a 12.5 billion electron volts proton synchrotron at the Argonne National Laboratory, and a 3 billion electron volts proton synchrotron at Princeton University that will greatly increase the intensity available at that energy. The Argonne and Brookhaven accelerators will be capable of producing all known types of particles.

9. Needed extensions of parameters: The most urgent additional needs at present are to extend electron energies, to improve both electron and proton intensities at the higher energies and, where feasible, to improve the beam geometries.

(a) Electrons: The important electron experiments requiring extended parameters are (1) electron-nucleon scattering at higher energies and especially at better beam geomitries than the Cambridge accelerator will provide; (2) electron- and photo-production of hyperon pairs. Fortunately, significant extensions of the energy with moderately high intensity and excellent beam geometry are feasible by the linear accelerator method.

(b) Protons: Although there appears to be no immediately compelling requirement for extending thep roton energy parameter beyond the 25 to 30 billion electron volts to be available at Brookhaven National Laboratory (and at CERN, the European center in Geneva), there is an urgent need for higher proton intensities. Although accelerators now in operation produce strange particles in sufficient numbers to study their production processes, their intensity limitations make very slow and difficult, and in some cases impossible, adequate study of the interactions of these particles with other particles. These limitations will be only partly remedied by the accelerators under construction. Interaction studies are indispensible to a determination of the properties of these strange particles and hence to an understanding of their nature and of the role they play in the structure of matter. Hence there is a need for a multi-billion-electron volts proton accelerator of much higher intensity than any in the present program, to produce adequate beams of strange particles, including antinucleons. Its energy should be at least 8 billion electron volts.

10. In addition to the need for extending the ultimate energy and intensity limits, the problem of understanding in a quantitative way the detailed processes involved in high energy interactions requires multiple beams of different energies and intensities and floor space to accommodate a large variety of experimental setups. Although present accelerators are properly operated as national assets and are made available to any qualified scientist to the fullest extent practical, the capacities of these instruments are limited both for research and for training even though operated on an around-the-clock basis.

The disruption of the teaching and other academic activities of university scientists makes it difficult for them to conduct experimental research programs on remote accelerators. The need for additional research space, experimental beams and accelerators accessible to university scientists justifies the construction of additional regional or university accelerators, not necessarily of the most advanced design.

11. Needs: The committee has carefully reviewed the present program (table I) in the light of the above factors and finds that the future U.S. requirements fall into four major categories.

(a) Presently operating accelerators: It is necessary to continue and to expand the support of presently operating accelerators to assure maximum exploitation. This requires continuous updating of facilities, expansion of research space, and the support of major efforts aimed at the augmentation of existing techniques for beam analysis, particle detection, and data reduction and analysis.

(b) Accelerators presently under construction: It is necessary that the accelerators now under construction be finished without undue delay and that adequate funds be provided to equip and operate them. It is nec-

---

[1] The following NSF Panel Reports have been issued:

Report of the NSF Advisory Panel on Ultra High Energy Nuclear Accelerators, MPE Study S-5, May 2, 1954.

Report of the Advisory Panel on High Energy Accelerators to the NSF, October 26, 1956.

Supplement to the Report of the Advisory Panel on High Energy Accelerators to the NSF, NSF 58-29, August 7-8, 1958.

essary to give particular attention to providing early support to plans for initial experimental facilities in order that these facilities be efficient, flexible, and available once an accelerator is operating.

It is clear that the Federal Government is committed to provide adequate support to those accelerators which are now in operation or under construction in order to fully exploit the capabilities of the instruments. Thus, regardless of decisions which may be made with respect to the construction of additional accelerators, high energy accelerator physics can be expected to be costing the Government about $75 to $80 million annually by 1963.

This figure must be considered as a base cost upon which any future forward steps must be built. The projected costs shown in table II and figure I have been jointly developed by the Atomic Energy Commission, Department of Defense, and National Science Foundation and reflect the present degree of diversity of support.

(c) New construction: There is a clear need for the construction and operation of additional accelerators both to increase the energy and intensity parameters and to increase the U.S. capacity for experimentation in this field.

(1) Extension of energy, intensity, and geometry parameters. There does not now appear to be a clear need for extension of the energy parameter for protons beyond the 30 billion electron volts now in sight at the Brookhaven National Laboratory and CERN (par. 9 (b)). As stated in paragraph 9(a) there is an immediate need for a moderately high intensity electron accelerator in the energy region of 10-15 billion electron volts. There is also a need for a high intensity proton accelerator at an energy of 8 billion electron volts or above. Accelerators to meet these needs will cost approximately $15 to $20 million each per year to build and operate. Thus, these two needs can be expected to increase the costs of high energy accelerator physics from $75 to $80 million to about $120 million per year in the course of the next 5 years.

(2). Increased U.S. capacity for experimentation: As explained in paragraph 10, the faculties and students of the Nation's universities must have increased access to high energy accelerators. The additional accelerators need not necessarily be unique or extreme in their energy or intensity characteristics in order to fully justify their construction at a site where they may exploit the unique capabilities of a single university or group of institutions. It is our best judgment that by fiscal year 1963 an additional $15 million per year will be required to meet these needs, thus raising the total cost of high energy accelerator physics to between $120 and $135 million per year by 1963.

(d) New accelerator concepts: Research and exploratory development of new accelerator concepts must be strongly supported without prejudice to a later determination of need for full-scale construction. In addition, in order to make optimum use of the accelerators, strong support will be required for advancing the techniques of particle detection, data reduction, and data analysis.

12. Policy considerations and conclusions:

(a) Need for expanded support: The basic importance of research in the field of high energy physics and its high cost, well beyond private resources, requires the Federal Government to continue to expand its support of this field consistent with valid scientific needs and the availability of qualified research personnel. Consequently, Government planning must be based on the need for an increasing level of support from some $59 million in fiscal year 1959 to approximately $135 million in fiscal year 1963, in accordance with the needs outlined in paragraph 11 (see fig. 1).

(b) Effect on other areas of basic science: Concern has been expressed that increased financial support for high energy physics may have an adverse effect on the support of other areas of science. In our judgment it should not.

It is not possible to assign relative priorities to various fields of basic science nor should they be placed in competition. Each science, at any given time, faces a set of critical problems that require solutions for continued growth. Sometimes these solutions can be acquired at little cost; sometimes large expenditures of funds are needed. Hence, the cost may not reflect the relative value but rather the need.

Each area must be funded according to these needs. The peculiarly high cost of high energy accelerator physics is due to the size and complexity of the research tools required to attack the fundamental problems of the field. The tools required are proposed by active leaders in the field anxious to devote their talent and energy to developing those tools. Hence, in high energy physics the necessary combination of qualified people with sound ideas for meeting widely recognized scientific needs does exist and the field should be supported.

(c) Priorities: Within the field of high energy accelerator physics, first priority should be given to fullest utilization of existing accelerators including their modification and the continuing provision of new instrumentation. Next priority should be given to adequate facilities for effective use of the accelerators now under construction. Next in importance is the construction of new accelerators required for the exploration of new scientific phenomena beyond the capabilities of existing accelerators and the provision of university facilities.

(d) Guidelines for implementing priorities: The following guidelines should apply in order to assure that the needs outlined in paragraph 11 are met:

(1) New accelerator construction to extend energy and intensity parameters: Construction should be recommended only when the accelerator is designed to meet a clear research need in physics and after the technical feasibility has been firmly established.

(2) University accelerators: A university accelerator need not necessarily extend either the energy or the intensity parameter; the accelerator and associated laboratories should be within the administrative and technical capabilities of the university.

(3) Regional accelerators: Regional accelerators need not necessarily extend either the energy or intensity parameters. The construction of conventional accelerators or accelerators of advanced design and established technical feasibility may be justifiable on the basis of an expressed regional need and a regionable capability.

(e) Diversity of support within the executive branch: It is important that the Atomic Energy Commission, the National Science Foundation, and the Department of Defense each support research in high energy physics because of their separate responsibilities for the support of basic research, because of the fundamental nature and significance of high energy physics and the corresponding need for each of these agencies to keep in direct and intimate contact with the scientists in this field and their research. Accordingly, the construction and operation of future high energy aceclerators should not be considered the responsibility of any single Federal agency.

The Atomic Energy Commission, Department of Defense, and the National Science Foundation should each maintain strong interests and contacts in the field of high energy accelerator physics. This can be achieved only through direct financial responsibility and participation in the construction of high energy accelerators. The budgeting for the total cost of construction and operation of a particular accelerator should be the responsibility of a single Federal agency, as sole agent on behalf of all, supplemented by appropriate coordination with the other agencies active in this field.

These large particle accelerators constitute a national asset and should be made available to competent scientists elsewhere in this country and abroad to the fullest extent practicable. The support of any given accelerator project by a particular Federal agency should not be construed to prevent or limit the financial support of outside groups using the accelerator by other agencies, public or private.

(f) Coordination: The parallel interest of several Federal agencies in the support of high energy physics and the impact of this support on national budget planning and programing require a coordinating mechanism to assure effective planning and review at the national level. An interdepartmental council on high energy accelerators should be established to assure coordination of budget and technical planning. The membership of the council should consist of policy level representatives from the Atomic Energy Commission, the Department of Defense, and the National Science Foundation. Technical assistance to the council should be provided by the scientific staff of the three agencies (Atomic Energy Commission, Department of Defense, and National Science Foundation) directly concerned with the administration of high energy physics research programs. The council should be responsible for continuing reformulation of national policies on high energy accelerator physics and the implementation of this policy. This should include the review and coordination of agency programs and plans in the field of high energy accelerator physics and the review of agency proposals for new accelerators.

(g) Review of contracting practices and prefinancing: There should be a review of contracting procedures by the Atomic Energy Commission, Department of Defense, and National Science Foundation to assure that such procedures properly support scientific undertakings of this magnitude and character. Present procedures should be revised where necessary so that agencies can provide funds in the contract, for a period of 1 to 3 years in advance, for the support of research operations connected with high energy accelerators.

(h) International collaboration: The worldwide scientific significance of research in high energy physics, the extensive, high quality of scientific activity abroad in this field, and the limited number and costliness of high energy accelerators present a unique opportunity for a high degree of international collaboration and cooperation in the planning for and design of future accelerators and in the increased use of facilities. As a first step in the direction of international collaboration looking toward the development of new high energy accelerators, representative scientific groups from other countries, including the U.S.S.R., should be

encouraged to meet with us in order to lay plans for cooperative research on new accelerator concepts. The National Academy of Sciences should be requested to advise on the best means for accomplishing this objective.

13. Specific proposals on hand: Consistent with the needs and guidelines outlined in paragraphs 11 and 12(d) above, the following comments apply to the three major proposals before the Federal Government:

(a) Stanford University: The Stanford proposal for an electron linear accelerator adequately meets the requirement discussed above (par. 12(d)(1)) of a research need for a new electron accelerator and its technical feasibility has been adequately demonstrated. It should be supported fully with the ultimate objective as described in the proposal and with an initial energy of at least 10 billion electron volts. It is desirable that this accelerator project be initiated in fiscal year 1959 in order to avoid an undue delay in high energy research. Because of its dependence on advanced microwave technology, this proposal should be of particular relevance to the interests of the Department of Defense.

(b) MURA: Although the technical feasibility and research utility of the specific accelerator recently proposed by Midwestern Universities Research Association have not been established, many of the important new accelerator concepts of recent years have come from the ideas and work of the MURA group. Continued progress in these developments is strongly dependent on the continuation and intensification of the MURA program. The group should be supported on a continuing basis with the funds and facilities necessary for its participating intensively in the development, construction, and operation of high energy accelerators.

(c) Oak Ridge National Laboratory: The research need for a high energy accelerator at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory should be further explored with the Laboratory and the southern universities concerned. The Oak Ridge group should be supported in continuing design and development activities. The technical feasibility of the accelerator proposed by Oak Ridge has not been established.

RECOMMENDATIONS

14. The SAC/GAC panel recommends that the Federal Government:

(a) Expand its support of high energy accelerator physics in a manner consistent with valid scientific needs (par. 11) and the availability of qualified research personnel.

(b) Plan for an increasing level of support for construction and operation of high energy accelerators to a level of approximately $135 million by fiscal year 1963 with the priorities and guidelines outlined in paragraph 12 (c) and (d).

(c) Note that the increased funds for high energy accelerator physics should be provided without affecting the support of other areas of basic science.

(d) Note that specific needs exist for an electron linear accelerator of at least 10 billion electron volts and a high intensity proton accelerator of at least 8 billion electron volts.

(e) Approve the initiation in fiscal year 1959 of the proposed accelerator project at Stanford University as modified in paragraph 13(a).

(f) Note that construction of the Stanford accelerator can be expected to cost approximately $100 million.

(g) Note that initial operating costs of the Stanford accelerator will be approximately $15 million per year once the accelerator comes into operation and that instrumentation and initial experimentation should be undertaken several years in advance of the completion of the accelerator.

(h) Reject the present MURA accelerator proposal but continue to provide adequate support and encouragement to the MURA development group.

(i) Reject the present Oak Ridge accelerator proposal but encourage the further exploration of the research needs of the region and the design of accelerators capable of meeting those needs.

(j) Note that the interests of the Federal Government and the scientific community are best served by the direct financing of projects in this field by the AEC, DOD and NSF with the contract authority and budget responsibility for a given project being vested in a single agency.

(k) Approve the establishment of an interagency council at the policy level to assure coordination of budget and technical planning, this council to be assisted by the scientific staff of the agencies concerned.

(l) Approve the provision of contract funds for periods between 1 and 3 years for the support of research operations connected with high energy accelerators.

(m) Encourage international collaboration and cooperation in the planning for and design of future machines and the increased use of facilities.

(n) Request the National Academy of Science to study and advise the Government on the best method for proceeding with international cooperative research on new accelerator concepts, such cooperative activity including the Soviet Union.

TABLE I

U.S. HIGH ENERGY ACCELERATORS PRESENTLY IN OPERATION

Machine	Particle	Energy (billion electron volts)	Location
Synchrocyclotron	Proton	0.240	University of Rochester.
Synchrotron	Electron	.300	University of California.
Do	do	.300	General Electric Co.
Do	do	.300	MIT.
Do	do	.300	Purdue University.
Do	do	.300	University of Illinois.
Betatron	Proton	.400	Columbia University.
Synchrocyclotron	do	.440	Carnegie Institute of Technology.
Do	do	.450	University of Chicago.
Do	do	.740	University of California.
Do	do	?	Stanford University.
Linear accelerator	Electron	1.2	Cornell University.
Synchrotron	do	1.2	California Institute of Technology.
Do	do	3.2	Brookhaven National Laboratory.
Do	Proton	6.2	University of California.
Do	do		

U.S. HIGH ENERGY ACCELERATORS PRESENTLY UNDER CONSTRUCTION

Machine	Particle	Energy (billion electron volts)	Location	Completion expected
Synchrotron	Proton	3	Princeton-Penn (New Jersey)	1960
Do	do	12.5	Argonne National Laboratory	1962
Alternating-gradient synchrotron	do	25-30	Brookhaven National Laboratory	1960
Synchrotron	Electron	6	Harvard-MIT, Cambridge	1960

Our Ambassador Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 18, 1959

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Evening Herald, Rock Hill, S.C., of May 5, 1959:

OUR AMBASSADOR PROBLEM

Many Senators are apparently quite willing to appoint a career diplomat to the Brazilian ambassadorship now.

It is something they should have done in the first place. But it took a mud-slinging open-air quarel between Clare Boothe Luce and Senator WAYNE MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon, to make them realize it.

Mrs. Luce, wife of powerful publisher Henry Luce (Life, Time, etc.) and quite an influential person herself, had won nomination to the Brazilian post. Then she got into the childish fuss with Senator MORSE and, on advice of her husband, resigned before officially filling the post.

Now the Senate is quite anxious to quietly appoint some career man to the position.

Ambassadorships have been poorly handled by the United States for some time. Generally, the diplomatic posts are treated as political plums.

This might have been all right in the past but it's a risky business today. International affairs are of the utmost importance today whereas they were rather secondary not too many years back. We must have the most qualified persons handling today's international picture.

Ambassadorships shouldn't be treated as political plums. Because a person donates a large sum to a campaign fund or offers some other political support does not qualify him or her for an ambassadorship. And being wealthy enough to entertain lavishly at your own expense isn't necessarily a qualification.

We need career personnel in our diplomatic posts. We need people who have been trained for ambassadorships.

And it shouldn't take a front-page squabble between an Ambassador and a Senator to force us to appoint a career person.

The Murray-Metcalf Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 18, 1959

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert a letter from the

California School Boards Association relative to the Murray-Metcalf bill:

CALIFORNIA SCHOOL BOARDS ASSOCIATION,
Long Beach, Calif., May 11, 1959.
Congressman J. ARTHUR YOUNGER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. YOUNGER: In accord with our recent correspondence I presented your letter regarding the Murray-Metcalf bill to the meeting of our executive board last Friday and Saturday.

The board asked me to express their appreciation of your interest in the bill and they reaffirm the position which had already been adopted by this organization in the following resolution:

"Resolved, That except for aid to federally impacted districts, the California School Boards Association is opposed to the extension beyond the present provisions of Federal aid, either for school construction or operation."

Yours truly,

LAWRENCE B. WHITE,
Executive Secretary.

New Direct Air Service From Detroit to the Orient

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 18, 1959

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, the past few weeks have witnessed a considerable manifestation of interest on the part of Detroit's three great newspapers toward the application of Pan American World Airways to service Detroit on a new air route to the Orient.

Pan American recently applied to the Civil Aeronautics Board for permission to operate from Detroit to Alaska and then on to Tokyo and beyond with jet aircraft.

This proposal by Pan American has been enthusiastically embraced by the governments of the State of Michigan and the city of Detroit as well as local civic bodies. It is to be hoped that the Civil Aeronautics Board will quickly expedite hearings in order that Pan American can provide service linking the two great industrial centers of Detroit and Tokyo.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the RECORD an editorial and two news stories recently carried in the Detroit Times, the Free Press, and the News:

[From the Detroit (Mich.) Times, Apr. 19, 1959]

FLY DETROIT TO TOKYO

One-stop flights from Detroit to Tokyo are the newest item on our jet air age agenda.

The Civil Aeronautics Board in Washington is holding hearings on a petition by Pan American World Airways to establish the route.

Flights presumably would originate in Boston, or another east coast city, stop here, then in Fairbanks, Alaska, then Tokyo.

Travel time to Tokyo would be 14 hours, cutting the present flight time by one-half.

This development should make Detroiters more proud than ever of the Detroit Metropolitan Airport, most advanced in the Nation.

Detroit, through this facility, will become increasingly important in future years as a hub of air transportation linking the Midwest with the rest of the world.

[From the Detroit (Mich.) Free Press, Apr. 16, 1959]

WILLIAMS SUPPORTS AIRLINE BID

LANSING.—Governor Williams and three other State officials Wednesday urged Civil Aeronautics Board approval of a Pan American World Airways petition to fly the Great Circle route to the Orient.

The service would provide a direct connection from Detroit to Tokyo via Fairbanks, Alaska. CAB hearings now are underway in Washington.

Besides Williams, telegrams were sent by Lt. Gov. John B. Swainson, House Speaker Don R. Pears, Republican, of Buchanan, and Senator Harold M. Ryan, of Detroit, Democratic floor leader.

Pan Am's original application is being opposed by Northwest Air Lines which flies the Great Circle route from Seattle with connecting service to Minneapolis and Chicago.

J. P. Smith, Jr., Detroit, Pan Am district manager, said that CAB approval for Pan Am would cut Detroit-to-Tokyo flying time more than in half.

"Tokyo will be only 14 hours distant, and the new State of Alaska will become a neighboring market for Michigan commerce," Smith said.

[From the Detroit (Mich.) News, Apr. 20, 1959]

DETROIT-TO-TOKYO FLIGHT IS SOUGHT

Mayor Miriani said today that Detroit is supporting a petition by Pan American World Airways to provide direct one-plane, 14-hour jet service between Detroit and Tokyo.

The mayor said that at his request members of the Detroit Aviation Commission, the Wayne County Road Commission which operates Detroit Metropolitan Airport, and the Greater Detroit Board of Commerce have appeared in Washington to support Pan Am.

The Civil Aeronautics Board, which regulates all routes flown by American airlines, is holding hearings to determine which carriers will fly on all routes over the Pacific. Pan Am proposes to fly from Detroit to Tokyo with one stop in Alaska.

Additional Research Needed in the Great Plains Region

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE BROCK
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 18, 1959

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, certain areas of the Great Plains region, which over the past decades has been ravaged by drought, dust storms, and floods, should have the benefit of carefully planned and long-range research to develop the two basic resources of soil and water.

Such action has been studied and recommended by various recognized agricultural groups, including a research committee appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture. This committee and the independent research groups in the area have recommended that this purpose can be best carried out by the establishment of a research laboratory, to be located in a strategically selected spot of the Great Plains region.

The establishment of this research center would do much to develop the natural resources and raise the economy of the areas affected, which fact has been recognized by the Legislature of the State of Nebraska. It will also insure a more adequate income for the family farmer who has been constantly fighting these adverse elements from year to year. Contributions from such research would be of material benefit to agriculture at large in other areas of the Nation and would be in the national interest in times of emergency.

Mr. Speaker, I, therefore, under the unanimous consent of my colleagues extend my remarks and place the resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Nebraska in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

LEGISLATIVE RESOLUTION 34

Resolution memorializing Congress to enact legislation relative to the establishment of a soil and water research laboratory in the Great Plains States

Whereas there is a tremendous need for additional research in the conservation and development of the soil and water resources of the Great Plains region of the United States of America; and

Whereas the conservation and development of these two basic resources will do much to stabilize the economy of this vast area, which in the past has been ravaged by drought, dust storms, and floods; and

Whereas the establishment of a major soil and water research laboratory located in the Great Plains area has been recommended by the Great Plains Agricultural Council, the National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, and a Soil and Water Research Facility Committee appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States of America; and

Whereas there are presently pending before the Congress of the United States of America several bills authorizing the establishment of a soil and water research laboratory in the Great Plains area: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the members of the Nebraska Legislature in the 69th session assembled:

1. That the Legislature of the State of Nebraska is wholeheartedly in support of the establishment of additional facilities for an expanded program of research in soil and water conservation in the Great Plains area;

2. That the President and the Vice President of the United States and the representatives in Congress of the United States be hereby urged and requested to take all necessary action to provide such assistance as may be necessary to establish a staff, equip and maintain, one major and strategically located laboratory in the Great Plains States to conduct research in soil and water conservation that is not possible or practical through existing programs;

3. That certified copies of this resolution be promptly transmitted to the President and Vice President of the United States; Secretary of the U.S. Department of Agriculture; President of the U.S. Senate; Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States; chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the U.S. Senate; chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture; chairman of the U.S. Senate Appropriations Committee; chairman of the U.S. Senate Agricultural Subcommittee on Appropriations; chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations; chairman of the House Agricultural Subcommittee on Appropriations; U.S. Senator ROMAN L. HRUSKA; U.S. Senator CARL T. CURTIS; U.S. Representative

PHIL WEAVER; U.S. Representative GLENN CUNNINGHAM; U.S. Representative DONALD F. MCGINLEY; and U.S. Representative LAWRENCE BROCK.

DWIGHT W. BURNEY,
President of the Legislature.
HUGO F. SBB,
Clerk of the Legislature.

Eleventh Anniversary of the Independence of Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 14, 1959

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, 11 years ago the independence of Israel was proclaimed. The new nation at once became a sanctuary for immigrant Jews throughout the world, a haven after centuries of wandering.

We have watched Israel with a fascination as its population leaped to 2 million, as it applied the techniques of the industrial revolution to agriculture and brought fertility to the Negev, as its democratic institutions solidified, and as its voice among nations became more and more respected. During these past formative years we are happy and proud to have helped Israel with grants, loans and other forms of assistance.

In an area of the world undergoing the tensions of nationalism and the revolution of rising aspirations, as it has been called, Israel represents economic, political, and social stability. A living example of what a free society is and what it can do, Israel, considering its strategic location, is a model for the underdeveloped but determined nations of Africa, Asia, and the Middle East.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial that appeared in the Washington Evening Star on Saturday, May 16, on the departure of Abba Eban, Israel's Ambassador to the United States for the past decade:

MEMORIAL MISSION

Abba Eban has well earned all the accolades bestowed on him during the past week at special farewell gatherings here and in New York. As Israel's Ambassador to the United States and permanent representative to the United Nations, he has spent a decade among us in the service of his country. The secret of his success in that respect has been compounded of an attractive personality, exceptional energy, a taste for hard work, brilliant historical scholarship, and an articulateness that has made his mission to America and the U.N. a truly memorable one.

Within recent times, of course, few ambassadors have had a more difficult assignment than Mr. Eban's. It has been an assignment in which he has had to call upon all his talents in promoting the best interests of the fledgling Jewish state in recurrent periods of immense challenge and crisis. Now, however, thanks largely to his fine efforts, Israel has amply demonstrated its ability to survive, and he is giving up diplomacy to go back there and run for office. Young, vigorous, and eloquent, he undoubtedly will be a formidable political campaigner, and none of his friends here in the United States will be surprised if one of these days—perhaps sooner than later—he becomes his country's Prime Minister.

In any event, now that his ambassadorial mission has come to an end and he is about to return to Israel, he can be sure that he is leaving behind him a very large measure of good will both for himself and his country.

Just a Little Fallout

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD G. WOLF
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 18, 1959

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I wish to have inserted into the RECORD a provocative editorial which appeared in the latest issue of New Republic. I hope there will be clarification of this matter by the Joint Committee in its report:

JUST A LITTLE FALLOUT

The congressional hearing on atomic fallout last week was a complete farce. The committee which held the hearing was assured by atomic energy scientists that there was no need to worry. And since this was apparently what most of the Congressmen wanted to hear, they made no attempt to call scientists who might tell them otherwise. When the statements of witnesses conflicted—as happened a few times—they tried not to notice. When questions turned out to be too sticky, they helped pull the witnesses out.

Chairman CHET HOLIFIELD, Democrat, of California, and Senator JOHN O. PASTORE, Democrat, of Rhode Island, castigated the Washington Post for delving into the mass of AEC reports that were quietly inserted into the record. The Post came across some figures which showed that bread and flour being sold in a New York City supermarket on February 10 had 4 to 18 times as much radioactive strontium 90 as considered permissible. "Irresponsible reporting," said the Congressmen. The scientists who testified in person pooh-poohed the danger. Other scientists, permitted to insert statements into the record, sounded ominous warnings but were not called upon. The committee said it didn't have time to hear everyone. The newspaper reporters and the radio and TV commentators, buried under an avalanche of reports each day that they had no time or inclination to read, reported only on the oral testimony—as must have been expected. Whenever the questions became too difficult, AEC scientists pointed out that 40,000 people are killed each year in automobile accidents. When one was asked if the New York City bread and flour were not just isolated cases, he talked about the danger of polluting ants and auto exhaust fumes. The committee let him slip by.

During the 4-day hearing an Air Force scientist said the fallout at one location he checked was producing half as much radiation as that from natural sources of radiation in the earth, air, and water. AEC scientists added that radiation from fallout was less than 5 percent of the natural background level. The committee didn't worry about the difference, for the words "natural background" made it seem safe. No mention was made of studies in New York State and Maryland which were beginning to show a correlation between cancer and the natural background radiation.

The AEC's General Advisory Committee of civilian scientists reassured the committee that all was well, pointing out that the background radiation in some parts of the world was five times that in the United States and that the people there seemed to be getting along fine. They didn't bother to add that no studies have been made in these areas on which to base such a conclusion. Or that the AEC has stated in an official publication that a level of radiation three times the background level may produce about 500,000 genetic defects per generation, 17,000 per year.

The Chairman talked blithely about scraping off a few inches of topsoil when the fallout became too high. The scientists talked about testing underground and halfway to the moon in order to eliminate the fallout problem, but a weapons expert said useless: Testing must be done in the environment in which the weapon is to be used. The committee didn't seem to hear the quiet explosion when the AEC revealed that the weapons tested during the past few years were dirty superbombs, not the clean bombs piously talked about by Lewis L. Strauss when he was Chairman of the AEC. Nor did they challenge witnesses who kept blaming the fallout on the Russians although official AEC data released during the hearings showed that the U.S. tests during the last few years were equally dirty.

No one seemed to be concerned about the fact that England had begun to test weapons, that France was about to begin, and that Sweden was debating the step. No one seemed worried about what would happen 5 or 10 years from now when Red China begins to develop nuclear weapons.

When the Joint Atomic Energy Subcommittee on Radiation holds a further hearing next month on the effects of a nuclear attack, opponents of an atomic test ban will argue, citing last week's hearings, that a little fallout from testing and a few tens of thousands of cases of genetic and somatic damage will not be too great a price to pay if it prevents a war that will kill hundreds of millions. And who will answer their arguments?

The Outlook for the Michigan Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 18, 1959

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to call the attention of the House to the following article by Dr. William Haber which appeared in the May 1959 issue of the Michigan Business Review which is published by the School of Business Administration of the University of Michigan. The following article presents an analysis of some factors that influence economic growth, employment, and unemployment in Michigan and was adapted from the author's testimony before the U.S. Senate Committee on Production and Stabilization which held hearings on area development legislation. Dr. Haber, a professor of economics in the University of Michigan, has been a member of the Federal Advisory Council on Employment since 1948. He specializes in labor economics and industrial problems. His report on Michigan employment problems and prospects will be

published by the W. E. Upjohn Institute for Community Research this summer:

THE OUTLOOK FOR THE MICHIGAN ECONOMY

(By Dr. William Haber)

(About the author: A professor of economics in this university, Dr. Haber has been a member of the Federal Advisory Council on Employment Security since 1948. He specializes in labor economics and industrial relations. His report on "Michigan's Employment Problems and Prospects" will be published by the W. E. Upjohn Institute for Community Research this summer. This paper is adapted from his testimony before the U.S. Senate Committee on Production and Stabilization which held hearings on area redevelopment legislation.)

This article deals with some of the factors which explain the present problem of unemployment and the long-run outlook for employment and business activity in Michigan.

Many areas in the United States have had persistent and substantial unemployment and underemployment for a number of years. The factors which explain the economic distress and high unemployment of such communities as those in western Pensylvania, West Virginia, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Indiana, and Wisconsin are generally known. In some areas the problem is related to the recession, from which we have not had a full recovery. Over 75 major labor market areas have rates of unemployment which exceed 6 percent of the labor force and in many of these, as in Michigan, the problem is far more serious.

In many localities, however, the causes are not primarily related to the recession. This is so in communities like our own Upper Peninsula which suffer from a depletion of natural resources which in earlier periods accounted for their growth and prosperity. Other communities, like those in western Pennsylvania, are in difficulty because of a shift in demand for a product, or a substitution of new machinery. These factors create serious maladjustments and lead to local distress which has in many areas become chronic.

SOME GENERAL OBSERVATIONS

First, a few general observations and then specific discussion of Michigan.

The first is that these local problems of economic distress or economic change are frequently manifestations of a national problem. Its incidence is obviously local, as it is now in Detroit and some other Michigan cities, or in Scranton or Altoona, Pa. Its causes are not pathological. Economic growth and change do not proceed at an even pace and are not uniformly distributed over the entire Nation. California, Florida, and Michigan, for example, have grown at a rapid rate for a long time, and will, I believe, continue to grow. Other areas have declined or grown at a slower rate. The adjustments in such areas are not automatic and, as we know, often take a long time. Until they occur, thousands of families suffer acute hardships and privation and the community's economic life is in serious distress.

The second observation is that these State and local areas of economic difficulty represent large waste of manpower and resources. Their correction calls for a joint program requiring the collaboration of the State and local community, and our experience tells us also that of the Federal Government. It calls for careful planning, often of a long-range character, for development loans, and for technical assistance in working out a program. Such a program may involve steps to improve labor mobility in order to move surplus manpower to other areas of economic growth; it calls or may call for manpower retraining and guidance to other jobs if not to other areas. Or, if it cannot stimulate the movement of workers, such a program should aim to bring in new jobs and industry through diversification and area development.

THE ROLE OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

It is axiomatic, so it seems to me, that the Federal Government's obligation under the Employment Act of 1946 requires it to assist the States and communities to achieve maximum employment. The idea is not startling and it certainly is not radical. It has the endorsement of the President, and his Council of Economic Advisers recognizes its importance. The only question is whether we should nibble at the problem or make a bold attempt to improve the situation.

My third observation is that a clear distinction should be made between measures which are temporary in character, designed to help until the community can carry on by itself and those which require long-range programs and much planning. The criteria for eligibility should in my opinion be sufficiently rigid so that the Federal Government gets involved in area redevelopment programs which call for loans and grants only when it is clear that the problem is chronic and stubborn.

The primary objective of the Federal Government, it seems to me, is to develop the policies which will insure high levels of employment for the Nation as a whole. A large number of local area redevelopment programs, unless clearly justified by the economic potential of these areas, can interfere with efficient allocation of resources and be economically wasteful. I cannot conceive of a Federal program under the proposed area redevelopment legislation being effective in as many as 70 or 80 areas. The participation of the Federal Government should be restricted to those areas which have had long periods of difficulty and for which State and local measures alone were proved inadequate.

THE MICHIGAN SITUATION

The Michigan problem represents a special case. I would not refer to Detroit or to Michigan as a distress area or one which calls for a massive Federal area redevelopment program. We have an acute and serious unemployment situation at the present time. Our problem is not entirely or perhaps not even primarily a problem of the recession. It is deeper and more stubborn. Our immediate concern is with the more than 335,000 unemployed in the State. A large majority of these out of work in Detroit have exhausted their unemployment insurance benefits and cannot again become eligible for such payments until after they return to work. This is the most immediate and serious problem facing the city and the State. Only one-third of the unemployed in Michigan at the present time are eligible for unemployment insurance and were receiving such in the last quarter of 1958. The public welfare rolls in Detroit already contain over 12,000 families, twice the number on the rolls a year ago. This number is bound to increase as more family heads exhaust their unemployment insurance rights and their benefits under the temporary unemployment compensation law.

Nor is there an immediate prospect for any substantial improvement in the unemployment situation. The probabilities are that under the most reasonable estimates of automotive production for 1959 the number of jobless in the State will average 335,000 for the year and about 275,000 in 1960. Thus even in 1960, when the situation improves somewhat, over 10 percent of the labor force will still be out of work. The immediate short range problem is therefore our most serious concern. Public welfare is hardly the most appropriate solution for men and women who have had a regular attachment to the labor force, indispensable though it is for the basic necessities of life.

It is for this reason that I urge the extension by the Congress of the Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act which is scheduled to expire at the end of March 1959. I realize that a large number of Detroit's and Michigan's unemployed have also exhausted their temporary unemployment benefits to which they were entitled. I urge, therefore, that there be exploration of a formula which would qualify jobless wage earners whose regular and substantial attachment to the labor force is clearly established and who were entitled to TUC payments, if the expiration date of that legislation is postponed. In the past 23 years the Feedral Government has collected from employers in the States over $750 million in excess of the sums returned to the States for the operation of their State employment security programs. Part of these funds can appropriately be used to meet the cost of such TUC extensions, if it should be determined that such costs should not be allocated to the States for repayment at a later time. The outlays for such extended unemployment should not be charged to employers.

THE COSTS OF UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

The problem of unemployment insurance costs is of deep concern to employers in Michigan and other States with excessively high unemployment rates. Michigan is the most industrialized State in the United States. About 50 percent of our wage earners work in the manufacturing industry. Nearly 37 percent of personal income received by people in Michigan in the form of wages and salaries comes from manufacturing. As a result we are especially allergic to national developments which adversely affect manufacturing production and employment, especially automotiev production. Michigan is hit harder in a recession than most other States. The percentage of our labor force out of work is often twice as high as the national average. This is not a recent development. Our present experience conforms to what happened in 1921, 1929–33, and 1937, in 1949, and again in 1954.

As a result, the costs of unemployment insurance in a serious recession are likely to fall most heavily on employers in States like Michigan and other high cost States and impose upon them an exceptionally large burden. This puts our employers at a distinct disadvantage in competition with employers in most other States not so industrialized and whose manufacturing industry is more diversified.

In 1958, for example, the benefits paid to Michigan wage earners from the trust fund and employers' contributions exceeded $326 million. This represented more than 6.5 percent of the taxable payroll. The unemployment insurance payments in 1959 will, of course, be smaller since most of those now out of work are not eligible for benefits. Even so, however, unemployment insurance payments will exceed $200 million and represent about 4 percent of taxable payrolls. The average unemployment insurance tax paid by Michigan employers in 1959 may be close to 2.8 percent of taxable payrolls, way above that paid by employers in States producing products in competition with Michigan.

INTERSTATE DIFFERENCES IN COST

When this legislation was adopted, the object was to eliminate interstate differences in cost of unemployment insurance. The way it has worked out these differences have been accentuated. As a result Michigan employers could be placed at a distinct disadvantage for this reason alone. The Government should explore the practicability of creating a national unemployment equalization or reinsurance fund. There is no good reason why a State like Michigan or Pennsylvania or any other State should be penalized because of a recession which is national

in origin and has a more serious impact on that State. Such a fund could easily be financed by changing the three-tenths of 1 percent unemployment insurance tax retained by the Federal Government to four-tenths of 1 percent or more, if necessary. And the equalization fund could carry the unemployment insurance costs which exceed a fixed percentage of the payroll in any State. If such a fund were in existence it would not be necessary for the unemployment insurance costs of Michigan employers to increase in 1959 and in 1960 as is definitely required if our fund is to remain solvent.

PROPOSALS TO REDUCE UNEMPLOYMENT

In addition to these observations on unemployment insurance whose enactment would provide immediate aid to the unemployed, I urge the following:

(a) That every effort be made to channel public contracts concerned with defense work and with research and development to Michigan. The managerial skills and the labor reserve are here and their full utilization is not too promising in 1959 and 1960.

(b) Many of our unemployed are in the upper age group, not old, just older. Their unemployment is often the result of technological changes in their former jobs. And an imaginative vocational training program may be of real aid in assisting them to locate work in other lines.

(c) I urge also that such people who have skills or are retrained be aided in relocating to other areas by being provided with travel funds for such purposes and vocational guidance. There is no reason why our Federal-State employment service cannot be authorized to finance such transfers when it appears that another area is likely to solve the job problem for an individual and his family.

These are all measures designed to deal with the immediate situation. I turn now to some observations about the larger problem and its long run character.

FACTORS IN THE MICHIGAN PROBLEM

I said earlier that the Michigan problem is not primarily the result of the recession. It follows that complete recovery from the recession is not likely to fully correct our job shortage and wipe out our unemployment problem.

The Detroit and Michigan problem is a complex of several factors. The first is a major shift in defense procurement with a concentration on aircraft and missiles. In 1959 it is estimated that of the $14 billion to be spent on major procurements by the Defense Department, 74 percent will be spent on aircraft and missiles. In 1953 the comparable figure was 43 percent. Michigan benefited more from defense procurement when tanks and ordnance which we produced were more important items than missiles and aircraft which have until now been less important in our industry. It has been estimated that 125,000 to 150,000 Michigan jobs may have been lost as a result of this shift.

The second factor is to be found in the decentralization of automobile assembly and production to other States. This process has been going on for a long time. It is not clear whether most of it has already occurred. I doubt whether this is so and we may see somewhat more decentralization in the years ahead. The effect on unemployment, however, is already measurable. In 1949 about 57 percent of U.S. automotive employment was located in Michigan. In 1958, 48 percent of such employment was in this State.

It should be emphasized that such decentralization is primarily motivated by market considerations, by locational factors designed to take advantage of population concentrations, to reduce transportation costs and to achieve similar economies. It is not a flight from Michigan because of taxes or wage rates or "economic climate." This sort of change is always going on. It is not unhealthy for the country although it causes difficulties in the area from which the movement is taking place. Most States have been affected by it at one time or another. In Michigan its full impact came in the postwar period, simultaneously with a shift in defense procurement.

CONSOLIDATION AND AUTOMATION

A third factor is to be found in certain consolidations among the smaller automobile companies and the retirement of one producer in the postwar period. This reference may seem like ancient history. But a check of the occupational background of many welfare department clients would reveal employment with one or another of these departed firms. The Michigan Employment Security Commission estimates that more than 75,000 job stations have disappeared as a result of these developments.

A fourth factor is related to the technological changes in which automation is one element. This is difficult to measure except in the roughest form. The impact of these changes on employment should not be underestimated. It is quite clear that the auto companies can reach prerecession levels with considerably less than prerecession employment.

Taken together these four factors combined with the recession provide an explanation of Michigan's present plight. They appear to me to be more impressive and logical than most of the talk about taxes, labor costs, and unfavorable business climate. These issues are of course always present and while some may think that they may have an important influence on the rate of future economic growth in Michigan, they do not in my judgment have an important bearing on the causes of our present problem.

MICHIGAN'S ECONOMIC OUTLOOK

Assuming high levels of employment nationally one can be decidedly optimistic about Michigan's economic outlook. Given time, an accurate interpretation of Michigan's economic advantages plus a cooperative relationship between the Michigan business community, labor, and the State government, the State's economic growth can be resumed at the rate which prevailed before 1955.

One factor which will influence this growth is the expansion of Michigan's population. Since 1950 Michigan has experienced a very rapid population growth. Its July 1, 1958, population of 7.9 million represented an increase of 1.5 million persons since 1950, a gain of almost 25 percent in 8 years time. In fact our population has grown rapidly for a long time, increasing between 15 and 30 percent in each 10-year period since 1890 except for the depression decade of the 1930's. We have grown at a more rapid rate than the Nation generally; faster than the east-north-central States with which we are usually compared. In fact, only two of the larger States—California and Florida—have grown more rapidly than Michigan during the last 8 years.

FUTURE POPULATION GROWTH

Nor is there anything to suggest that this rapid rate of population increase is about to be checked. On the contrary, even allowing for a much smaller estimate for in-migration, an important factor in Michigan's population growth in the past, it appears that by 1970 the population of this State will be at least 9.4 million persons and may be as high as 10.5 million compared with 7.9 million in 1958. Under either estimate Michigan will still be one of the fastest growing States in the United States.

On the basis of these estimates of population growth, it appears that Michigan's labor force in 1970 will be at least 1 million persons higher than in 1958.

Population growth by itself does not generate jobs. It provides, however, a sound basis for economic growth. And there is no reason to assume that Michigan's rich resources in manpower skills and in management competence, coupled with its natural resources in water and chemicals, are not likely to be develop and to provide for our growing population and expanding labor force.

There is no exodus of industry out of Michigan. The facts are to the contrary. There are more manufacturing establishments in this State now than there were in 1949 or in 1953. And even the automobile companies, while they are building elsewhere, have made substantial investments and expansion in their Detroit and other Michigan facilities in the postwar period.

Michigan's industry is overconcentrated in manufacturing and especially in automotive production.

There is a crying need for a greater degree of diversification to bring about a better balance and lesser dependence upon the economic fate of one or two major products. This must be achieved in the next 10 years and it can be, with everyone recognizing its importance and with support for a concerted program toward that end. Such a program has not been pursued with any vigor thus far, since it did not appear necessary. An opportunity to develop aircraft production and electronics after the war could easily have been exploited and this would have provided a more balanced economy. Such diversification is necessary now and critically needed if more balanced growth is to be assured. We need an industrial redevelopment program and our resources promise its success once we pursue it with a vigor which has made Michigan a great industrial State in the past.

Status of Democratic Legislative Program as of May 8, 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, except for the final category, education, the items below were listed by the majority leader of the other body in Big Spring, Tex., shortly after election day last year.

This information was compiled at my request by Albert M. Perry, legal digester, American Law Division, Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress.

The report is included hereafter under a previous consent:

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION (EXPLORATION OF OUTER SPACE)

S. 1096, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas and Mr. BRIDGES; February 17, 1959 (Aeronautical and Space Services): Authorizes $48.3 million supplemental appropriation for fiscal 1959 to expedite projects of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. (Approved April 12, 1959; Public Law 86-12.)

S. 1582 (H.R. 6512), Mr. JOHNSON of Texas and Mr. BRIDGES; April 7, 1959 (Aeronautical and Space Sciences): Authorizes $485 million for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal 1960.

H.R. 6512 (S. 1582), Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana; April 20, 1959 (Science and Astronautics): See S. 1582, supra.

CONSOLIDATION AND/OR COORDINATION OF SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH

Legislation designed to consolidate certain functions and agencies responsible for scientific research has been introduced as follows:

S. 586, Mr. KEFAUVER, January 20, 1959 (Aeronautical and Space Science): Department of Science Act of 1959: Establishes a Department of Science and Technology transferring thereto scientific activities now performed by certain other agencies, commissions, bureaus and/or administrations.

S. 676, Mr. HUMPHREY and others; January 23, 1959 (Government Operations): Department of Science and Technology Act of 1959: Establishes a Department of Science and Technology transferring thereto scientific activities now performed by certain other agencies, commissions, bureaus, and/or administrations.

DEVELOPMENT OF PEACEFUL USES OF THE ATOM

S. 683, Mr. GORE; January 27, 1959 (Atomic Energy): Atomic energy amendments of 1959: Authorizes $1 billion for the development and/or construction of power reactors of various sizes by the Atomic Energy Commission. Directs the Commission to conduct a vigorous program of international cooperation and assistance in the development of power reactors, to accelerate existing programs for the development of nuclear rocket propulsion, and to proceed with the development of a manned vehicle powered by nuclear propulsion.

H.R. 4822, Mr. TOLLEFSON; February 19, 1959 (Merchant Marine and Fisheries): Authorizes the construction of a nuclear-powered tanker for operation by the Maritime Administration.

CONSERVATION OF WATER FOR THE WEST

S. 13, Messrs. ENGLE and KUCHEL; January 9, 1959 (Public Works): Provides Federal assistance for the planning and construction of municipal and industrial water development projects on a multiple-purpose, comprehensive basis.

S. 943, Mr. ENGLE and others; February 5, 1959 (Interstate and Foreign Commerce): Authorizes $10 million for a program of weather modification directed at increasing the annual average usable supply of water in the Colorado River Basin.

S. 1591 (H.R. 8), Mr. KERR and others; April 7, 1959 (Public Works): Water Conservation Act of 1959. Sets forth national policies and procedures for the development of water resources on a multipurpose basis.

Senate Resolution 48, Messrs. MANSFIELD and MURRAY; January 27, 1959 (Interior and Insular Affairs): Establishes a select committee to make studies of water resources and future needs thereof. (Agreed to April 20, 1959—House action not required.)

H.R. 8 (S. 1591), Mr. TRIMBLE; January 5, 1959 (Public Works): See S. 1951, supra.

H.R. 289, Mr. TRIMBLE; January 7, 1959 (Interior and Insular Affairs): Establishes criteria to be used to determine the feasibility of constructing or modifying reclamation projects.

H.R. 1863, Mr. CLEMENT W. MILLER; January 9, 1959 (Public Works): Authorizes Federal assistance for municipal and industrial water development projects.

H.R. 2145, Mr. BECKWORTH; January 12, 1959 (Interior and Insular Affairs): Authorizes $200 million annually for Federal assistance to the States or local subdivisions for the planning, construction, operation, and maintenance of projects for water conservation and storage.

Certain bills dealing with specific projects or problems are under consideration by appropriate committees. Committee action has been completed in certain cases as follows:

S. 44 (H.R. 301), Messrs. KUCHEL and ENGLE; January 9, 1959 (Interior and Insular Affairs): Authorizes $290 million for the construction of the San Luis unit of the Central Valley project, California. (Reported in Senate April 8, 1959.)

S. 994 (H.R. 804), Messrs. JACKSON and MAGNUSON; February 6, 1959 (Interior and Insular Affairs): Authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Spokane Valley project, Washington and Idaho. (Passed Senate April 30, 1959.)

H.R. 301 (S. 44), Mr. SISK; January 7, 1959 (Interior and Insular Affairs): See S. 44, supra.

H.R. 804 (S. 994), Mr. HORAN; January 7, 1959 (Interior and Insular Affairs): See S. 994, supra.

H.R. 4405, Mr. ROGERS of Texas; February 11, 1959 (Interior and Insular Affairs): Provides for a study of the feasibility of developing the water resources of the Salt Fork of the Red River, Tex. (Passed by House April 8, 1959.)

FOREIGN POLICY (REVIEW)

S. 1094 (H.R. 4452), Mr. FULBRIGHT (by request); February 17, 1959 (Foreign Relations): Authorizes an increase in the U.S. subscription to the International Monetary Fund and to the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. (Passed House, amended, March 25, 1959.)

S. 1711 (H.R. 6526), Mr. HUMPHREY and others; April 16, 1959 (Foreign Relations): International Food for Peace Act of 1959: Provides for the use of surplus commodities to assist in the economic development of friendly nations.

H.R. 2159, Mr. CURTIS of Missouri; January 12, 1959 (Foreign Affairs): U.S. Trading Corporation Act: Establishes a U.S. Trading Corporation to undertake measures to meet the threat of long-range economic penetration of world markets by the Soviet bloc.

H.R. 4452 (S. 1094), Mr. SPENCE; February 12, 1959 (Banking and Currency): See S. 1094, supra.

H.R. 6526 (S. 1711), Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin; April 20, 1959 (Agriculture): See S. 1711, supra.

Draft bill to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes. (Consideration by the House Committee on Foreign Affairs began on March 16, 1959.)

House Resolution 113, Mr. MORGAN; January 15, 1959 (Rules): Authorizes an investigation of the policies of Federal agencies engaged primarily in the implementation of our foreign policy. (Passed House January 29, 1959; Senate action not required.)

House Resolution 114, Mr. MORGAN; January 15, 1959 (House Administration): Provides funds for the investigation authorized by House Resolution 113. (Passed by House February 24, 1959; Senate action not required.)

FOREIGN POLICY (LATIN AMERICA)

Senate Resolution 17, Mr. SMATHERS; January 12, 1959 (Foreign Relations): Favors the establishment of an inter-American regional development bank.

Senate Resolution 31, Mr. GREEN; January 20, 1959 (Rules and Administration): Authorizes a study of the U.S. foreign policy with special reference to Latin America and Canadian affairs. (Passed by Senate February 2, 1959—House action not required.)

House Resolution 49, Mr. O'HARA of Illinois; January 7, 1959 (Rules): Creates a select committee to make an investigation of our affairs with the Latin American countries.

FARM PROGRAM

S. 1211, Mr. HUMPHREY and others; March 2, 1959 (Agriculture and Forestry): Reactivates the program of adjusting repayment schedules of loans to farmers to the net earnings of borrowers on a year to year basis. Provides for long-term, low interest loans, and insurance of loans to farmers.

H.R. 838, Mr. MARSHALL; January 7, 1959 (Agriculture): Provides for the election of a National Agricultural Board to establish national production and marketing goals and to allot such goals to farmers. Requires referendums to be held on programs proposed by the Board and, unless disapproved by a majority of the producers, provides for such programs to become effective.

Bills concerned with specific commodities and/or farm problems which have received favorable committee action are listed below:

S. 690 provides program of research for the use of agricultural commodities for industrial purposes. (Reported in Senate April 16, 1959.)

S. 1289 extends the school milk program. (Passed by Senate April 30, 1959.)

S. 1455 authorizes cotton acreage allotments to be leased under certain conditions. (Passed by Senate April 15, 1959.)

H.R. 5247 increases the authorization for the school milk program. (Approved April 3, 1959. Public Law 86–10.)

H.R. 5432 provides price supports for feed grain based on the support price of corn. (Reported in House May 6, 1959.)

ECONOMICALLY DEPRESSED AREAS

S. 722, Mr. DOUGLAS and others; January 27, 1959 (Banking and Currency): Establishes an area Redevelopment Administration and authorizes revolving funds, not to exceed $300 million, for loans for the development of areas having excessive unemployment. Authorizes additional funds for grants, etc.

S. 1631, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas and others; April 8, 1959 (Labor and Public Welfare): Establishes a Commission to study unemployment problems. (Passed Senate April 10, 1959.)

Bills similar or identical to S. 722 have been introduced in the House.

INTEREST RATES

S. 860, Mr. PROXMIRE; February 2, 1959 (Banking and Currency): Permits member banks to count coinage and currency as reserves required to be kept on hand.

S. 1120, Messrs. ROBERTSON, FULBRIGHT, and CAPEHART; February 19, 1959 (Banking and Currency): Permits member banks to count currency and coinage as reserves. Reduces the percentage of demand deposits required to be kept on hand. (Reported in Senate April 17, 1959.)

LABOR

S. 1555, Mr. KENNEDY and others; March 25, 1959 (Labor and Public Welfare): Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959: Requires full and complete disclosure of the financial affairs of labor unions, union officials, and other parties which might give rise to conflicts of interest. Regulates trusteeships and requires democratic processes for the election of union officials. (Passed by Senate April 25, 1959.)

HOUSING

S. 57 (H.R. 2357), Mr. SPARKMAN and others; January 9, 1959 (Banking and Currency): Housing Act of 1959: Reduces downpayments required for FHA loans; increases the FHA repayment period; authorizes a reduction in FHA insurance premiums; authorizes a 3-year program of slum clearance of $500 million per year; extends the low-rent public housing program, authorizes an additional $400 million for college housing; establishes a new program of housing for the elderly; and extends the military housing program. (Reported in House February 5, 1959.)

H.R. 2357 (S. 57), Mr. RAINS; January 15, 1959 (Banking and Currency): See S. 57, supra. (House committee substituted H.R. 2357 for the Senate passed version of S. 57.)

AIRPORT PROGRAM

S. 1 (H.R. 1011), Mr. MONRONEY and others; January 9, 1959 (Interstate and Foreign Commerce): Extends Federal aid for the development and construction of airports through

fiscal 1963 and authorizes $248 million for such aid on a 50–50 matching basis and an additional $45 million as a discretionary fund for expansion of airports to handle jet planes.

H.R. 1011 (S. 1), Mr. HARRIS; January 7, 1959 (Interstate and Foreign Commerce): See S. 1, supra.

URBAN RENEWAL

S. 57 (supra): In addition to the provisions dealing with housing, etc., this bill authorizes a $1.5 billion 3-year program of slum clearance. (Reported in House February 5, 1959.)

EDUCATION

S. 2 (H.R. 22), Mr. MURRAY and others; January 9, 1959 (Labor and Public Welfare): Provides Federal assistance for the construction of classrooms and compensation of teachers. (Hearings on this and similar bills held February 1959, to be continued.)

S. 8, Messrs. MCNAMARA and HART; January 9, 1959 (Labor and Public Welfare): Provides Federal aid for the construction of schools. (Hearings held February 1959, to be continued.)

S. 57 (supra): This bill contains provisions for expanding the program of Federal aid for college housing. (Reported in House February 5, 1959.)

S. 234, Mr. LANGER; January 12, 1959 (Labor and Public Welfare): Provides loans for qualified students to continue their education beyond the high school level.

H.R. 22 (S. 2), Mr. METCALF; January 7, 1959 (Education and Labor): See S. 2, supra. (Hearings held by Subcommittee on General Education.)

Unjust Discrimination in Employment Because of Age Destroys Human Dignity and Should Be Abolished

SPEECH

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1959

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, it is my earnest hope that the day will soon come when we can sincerely and honestly repeat the words of Emerson: "We do not count a man's years until he has nothing else to count."

This quotation seems to touch directly upon a problem confronting our society today. The unpleasant truth is that we tend to count a man's years without even considering his other qualities and characteristics. Many of the more thoughtful persons in our country have spoken out sharply against this narrow, cruel, and wasteful attitude, which is throwing many of our middle-aged and older citizens into a life of stagnation and hopelessness. Yet, too many of us have continued to evaluate a man by his years, thinking not of the wisdom and experience that these years have brought him, but only of the often imagined loss of vigor and strength which are too frequently associated with the passage of youth.

It is essential, I believe, that Congress take the initiative in promoting a more rational attitude toward our aging population. That is why I am urging passage of my bill, H.R. 1180, which is identical to my bill, H.R. 11918 of the 85th Congress, and which would be a progressive step in eliminating discrimination in employment because of age.

My bill, entitled the "National Act Against Age Discrimination in Employment," would eliminate this kind of discrimination for all our country's employees to the fullest extent permitted by the Constitution. This would include employees involved in all interstate or international commerce.

Congress cannot determine employment policies for everyone. By passing this bill we shall not immediately solve the job problems of all our older workers, but we shall have made an impressive start and demonstrated our firmness of opinion on this question by taking affirmative action instead of merely urging others to adopt a policy which we are not ready to follow through on ourselves.

There is one group in this country which I know is working hard on this problem facing older workers, and I should like to pay tribute to that organization at this time. It was the Fraternal Order of Eagles of which I am a member that supplied the inspiration behind the introduction of my bill, H.R. 1180, and other similar legislative measures on the subject.

The "jobs after 40" campaign launched in 1957 by the Grand Aerie of the Fraternal Order of Eagles embraced the entire Nation under the sponsorship of local lodges commonly known as local aeries. This well-directed grassroots movement has contributed greatly to focusing national attention on the determined effort to explode the myth that older workers are unreliable and should be consigned to the scrapheap of human wreckage.

The Eagles' campaign, headed by Grand Aerie Program Chairman Judge Robert Hansen, earned nationwide acclaim, being enthusiastically received as evidenced by the fact that an estimated 1 million signatures were obtained on petitions circulated by local Eagle aeries focusing attention on the need for immediate action to the plight of those 40 years of age or over seeking employment. In addition, the "jobs after 40" campaign elicited warm praise from outstanding leaders in government, business, and labor circles.

It is pertinent to state at this point that the Fraternal Order of Eagles has always been interested in vital issues that affect the American home and family life in the Nation.

Through its widespread influence in fraternal circles the Eagles championed America's first workmen's compensation law in 1903 and the first mothers' pension law in 1911, to be followed later by its advocacy and support in seeking approval of the old-age pension law in 1923, and the Social Security Act in 1935, with its subsequent amendments designed to strengthen and improve the original law. Finally, the pages of the Eagles' magazine, the monthly publication mailed to all members, has since its inception devoted a large portion of its space to publicizing the need for developing and maintaining interest in the necessity of providing for the health and welfare of American wage earners and their families.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Altoona, Pa., Aerie No. 286, Fraternal Order of Eagles, I am proud of the many splendid projects sponsored by this great fraternal organization, and especially of the fact that the Eagles are responsible to a marked degree for the introduction of legislation such as my bill, H.R. 1180, which if enacted would crown with success the "jobs after 40" program so earnestly advocated, and the principle of which deserves at this time our enthusiastic support.

Many of us are acquainted with the story of the middle-aged worker, with children still in school or college, and with many good, productive years ahead of him, who loses his job because of company reorganization, production cutbacks, or some other reason beyond his control. He does not consider retirement, not only because he needs the income, but because he cannot yet conceive of himself as too old and decrepit to be able to contribute something to society. I venture to say that most of us here, well over age 45 ourselves, can understand this feeling.

It is frightening to realize that this man—and there are many thousands in a similar position—is now subjected to the humiliation of being told that he is "too old" to even be considered for a job. His previous training, experience, and his maturity are counted as nothing next to the number of his birthdays.

It is my belief that the right to employment without discrimination based on age is a right that belongs to each of us and should be guaranteed by law. I believe this not only because of the principle involved, but because any other policy or attitude is wasteful and impractical.

This does not mean, of course, that older workers should be given overall preference in hiring when the situation doesn't warrant it. Rather, it is the hope that employers will begin to evaluate their applicants on the basis of individual characteristics and not on the basis of restrictive age limitations. There is no question in my mind that too many of our country's employers are unwittingly hurting themselves by imposing meaningless age barriers.

Mr. Speaker, the cold, hard facts will bear me out on this. Many objective studies have been made showing that the job performance of older workers is often not only equal, but superior to that of many younger workers. Let me give you one of the major conclusions about older workers which resulted from a recent study. The experts stated categorically that their findings showed that the values of workers over 50 from the standpoint of productivity far exceed any drawbacks of physical deterioration.

On the question of productivity, for example, older workers often show up even better than persons many years younger. Studies show that variations in output of individuals within any age group are very great—greater, in fact, than differences among groups. Productivity can-

not be equalized with age alone. One expert has made this observation:

"Certainly," he says, "older men are less likely to accelerate the work pace in a short burst. But for sustained and steady work they are at least the equal of the younger men and women. Having less energy to waste, they tend to make more efficient utilization of their time by avoidance of waste motion and better use of their experience by developing and using efficient shortcuts."

I do not think anyone could argue that an inexperienced worker is better than an experienced one. An older person who is still vigorous and healthy is almost certain to acquire a mellowness of judgment and a sense of dependability that can rarely be found in younger workers.

A recent evaluation of the overall performance of older workers showed that they rated better or the same than younger persons on extremely vital considerations for management. This was overwhelmingly true on such questions as quality of workmanship, attitude toward job, loyalty to company, dependability, response to supervision, and overall performance.

These workers showed up just as well on matters of attendance and illness. This included evaluation of reports on lateness, turnover, accidents, frequency of illness, and general attendance. One of the most frequent reasons given for discrimination against the older worker is that he is a greater accident risk than his younger counterpart. Clearly, if an employer has had this in mind when establishing age limitations, he is badly underrating the mature man.

Mr. Speaker, surveys have consistently upheld the position of older workers, in showing that they almost always have accident records which are superior to other employees. The International Labor Organization, for example, found in one of its studies some years ago that there was a progressive decline in the frequency of accidents per 1,000 man-years worked, with increasing age. In fact, the accident frequency for ages 60 and over was less than half that for ages 20 to 29. The frequencies for ages 40 to 49 were less than three-fourths of those for ages 20 to 34.

It can also be said that no employer is going to suffer because an older employee is not in good physical condition. The great advances in medical science have reduced the argument that workers who have reached middle age are poor health risks. Out of a group of unemployed older workers the Department of Labor found that four out of five were in excellent physical condition, certainly fully capable of meeting regular production standards.

Both management and labor can benefit from having older people in the working force. They have knowledge and experience that younger workers simply cannot duplicate. There is little question that they exert a stabilizing influence on labor relations. They tend to be better informed and have more mature judgment, and so are more likely to act carefully and wisely on the problems which confront them.

One observer has noted: "With one hand society does everything possible to extend the life of man, while with the other it writes him off as useless because of the date of his birth certificate." I think it is regrettable that we must recognize this observation as a reality of our society. And I, for one, cannot understand why we are maintaining such a costly and absurd struggle with ourselves. Our older workers have much to contribute if we will only let them. To discriminate against them is to lose the benefit of our best developed minds and hands.

Thinking of the plight of our older workers, I am tempted to recall the words of one of the world's greatest creative thinkers. It was Michelangelo who adopted this simple, but eloquent motto: "I am still learning." It is important that we remember that these words apply not only to the schoolboy, but also to our mature men and women. The ability to learn is not something we automatically lose with the first gray hair, although many employers seem to think this is true. A person who is hired at age 45 is still perfectly capable of learning a new job, while still drawing upon his experience of years past.

Our Federal Government, as well as many other groups, is conducting an educational campaign against imposing discriminatory barriers on the sole basis of age. Such campaigns may have some slight effect. But it is perfectly clear that they are not going to solve our problem for us.

We in Congress have also occasionally raised our voices in behalf of the older worker. Perhaps our words, too, may be having some effect. We have failed, however, to take the most effective step open to us, to pass legislation which would eliminate this kind of discrimination within the limits of the Constitution. That is the objective which I am urging you to consider now. My bill, H.R. 1180, would do what I believe we would all like to do—enable the older worker to contribute to his own and the country's well-being through regular and efficient employment of his abilities.

It would be hazardous to delay passage of effective legislation on this issue much longer. The problem of the older worker is a growing one, and one which will continue to grow rapidly in the coming years, as the number of older persons in the population increases. Further delay will only mean more hardship, more people needing governmental assistance ,and more waste in a period when we obviously cannot afford it.

Then too, at a time when we are concerned, as we certainly should be, with other problems of discrimination, we might examine the evils which accompany discrimination on the basis of age. We have already demonstrated that problems of discrimination are not untouchable. We can make progress against them. The fact that we have long erected age barriers does not mean that these barriers are indestructible. We can and must make an earnest effort to crumble them.

Businessmen and politicians are frequently thought of as people who make decisions based on practical considerations. The facts which I have presented today should be sufficient to convince realistic persons of the practical advantages of the legislation which this "National Act Against Discrimination in Employment" embodies. But there is a humanitarian side which also cannot be forgotten. We owe our older citizens some consideration for what they have already contributed to our country. We shall have fulfilled our obligation to them only when we can say, in the words of Browning:

"Grow old along with me!
The best is yet to be,
The last of life, for which the first was made."

It is my ardent hope that the 86th Congress will take the step necessary to alleviate the position of this growing segment of our population. As just and reasonable men and women, we can do no less.

Act of Bravery in San Francisco

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 14, 1959

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to call attention of my colleagues in the House to an extraordinary act of heroism and bravery which occurred in the San Francisco Bay this past week. On Thursday, May 7, two young San Franciscans were enjoying our California weather and swimming at Baker's Beach, which is located at the Presidio in San Francisco, when the young man, Mr. Albert Kogler, was suddenly and viciously attacked by a shark swimming in close the the beach. Mr. Kogler's companion, Miss Shirley O'Neill, without thought to her own safety, swam out to Mr. Kogler and brought him into shore notwithstanding his shouts and screams to stay back on the beach. Young Kogler was fatally wounded by the shark and died within hours after the attack. This act of selflessness was an outstanding deed by this young lady, Mr. Speaker, and I am pleased and proud to say this girl has already been commended by official persons and bodies in San Francisco and is being recommended for a Carnegie Life Saving Medal. I direct your attention to the following newspaper articles concerned with this event:

[From the San Francisco Examiner, May 8, 1959]

STUDENT KILLED BY HUGE SHARK OFF GATE BEACH—CO-ED BRAVES ATTACK TO TOW YOUTH ASHORE

An 18-year-old San Francisco State College freshman was fatally mangled and all but devoured, apparently by a great white shark, while swimming at Baker's Beach off the Presidio with a girl companion yesterday.

Marine experts said the tragedy was unprecedented in San Francisco Bay or adjacent waters, at least in recorded history.

The victim, Albert Kogler, of 2426 26th Avenue, a former high school football and baseball star from Paradise, Butte County, died at Letterman Hospital several hours after the savage attack, despite emergency measures to save him.

HEROIC GIRL

Witnesses said the youth would never have reached shore but for heroic rescue efforts by Shirley O'Neill, of 2570 40th Avenue, also 18 and a co-ed at San Francisco State.

She and young Kogler were treading water and chatting approximately 40 yards offshore when the youth suddenly screamed in mingled pain and terror:

"It's a shark. Get out of here."

SHARK STRIKES

The girl, an attractive brunette, said she saw a large grayish "thing" thrashing about underwater as she started to swim for the beach.

She said Kogler screamed again and that she watched him struggle to free himself from the grip of what is assumed was a maneater shark.

Miss O'Neill said Kogler apparently broke away several times but that the shark, if it was a shark, struck repeatedly, its tail or a fin flailing above the surface again and again as the youth screamed in agony.

GOES BACK

By that time she had turned about, determined to help him if she could.

She reached his side and grabbed one arm, which as she recalled later, was "hanging by a thread."

The valiant young woman said the attacking fish vanished without menacing her but that the water around her was reddened by Kogler's blood.

She said she told him to lie on his back and then half dragged him through the surf.

She noted that many spectators had witnessed the desperate struggle from shore but that none offered assistance until a fisherman threw her a line as she reached shallow water.

SWIMMING SPOT

Baker's Beach lies in the Golden Gate at the foot of 25th Avenue in the Richmond District, a short distance west of the Golden Gate Bridge.

It adjoins Phelan Park, perhaps better known as China Beach, a favorite swimming and sunbathing spot for several generations of San Francisco teenagers.

Young Kogler was taken to nearby Letterman by a Coast Guard crash truck.

Attendants said he was in deep shock on arrival there.

Nurses and doctors were unable to detect his pulse a few moments later.

MEASURES FAIL

Surgeons cut into his chest cavity and massaged his heart for 1 hour and 35 minutes. Oxygen and seven pints of blood were administered but the emergency measures failed to revive him.

Capt. Sterling Mutz, an Army surgeon, said the nature of the youth's wounds indicated he was attacked by a fish of tremendous size and power.

The surgeon noted that the entire left shoulder girdle had been ripped away to the ribs and that the youth's body was torn by jagged lacerations of the back, abdomen and both arms.

Captain Mutz said the left shoulder wound appeared to have been inflicted by one clamp of the jaws.

OTHER ATTACKS

The Army surgeon said in his opinion, young Kogler was attacked by a killer shark.

Dr. Earl S. Herald, curator of aquatic biology at Steinhart Aquarium, concurred in that opinion after hearing the wounds described and surmised that the attacker was a great white shark, commonly known as a maneater. He added, however, that it may have been a killer whale.

He recalled that a 17-year-old boy was attacked and killed by a shark off Lovers Point, near Monterey, in 1952, and one at Morro Bay in 1957, but said he had heard of no such incident in the bay area until yesterday.

KILLER SHARKS

Dr. Herald noted that two shark types—the six-gill and seven-gill—are common in San Francisco Bay and northern California coastal waters and that either type is capable of attacking humans and inflicting wounds such as those that proved fatal to Kogler.

The scientist stuck to his first surmise, however, and said in his opinion the youth was killed by a great white shark, otherwise known as the maneater, although that type is rarely found hereabouts.

Kogler is the son of Mrs. Elizabeth McGrath, with whom he lived at the 26th Avenue address, and of Albert Kogler, Sr., of Ten Echo Avenue, Corte Madera, an insurance man.

Both parents were waiting in an anteroom of the hospital when their son died last night.

[From the San Francisco Examiner, May 8, 1959]

"COULDN'T LEAVE HIM"—HEROIC GIRL'S STARK TALE OF GATE TRAGEDY

(The following words are Shirley O'Neill's, just as she gave them to Examiner reporter Howard Watkins in an exclusive interview at Letterman Army Hospital.

(They are her account of how she and Albert Kogler went to Baker's Beach yesterday afternoon and of what happened after they got there.

(There is no mention of Miss O'Neill's bravery because Miss O'Neill did not refer to it.)

(By Shirley O'Neill)

Al and I were in a diving class in school together. I saw him at school today and he asked me if I wanted to go swimming with him afterwards. "Okay," I said.

We got down to Baker's Beach about a quarter of 5. I'd been there before, but we'd never been there together. In fact, this is the first time I'd ever been out with him.

FIFTY YARDS OUT

We spread out a blanket and sunned for a while. Then we went in the water.

We'd been in for about 15 minutes and were out maybe 40 or 50 yards when he said:

"We're out pretty far now, let's not go any farther, it'd be too dangerous."

We were treading water as we were talking.

We were just about to start back, and I was looking away from him, toward the Golden Gate, when I heard him scream.

WARNS GIRL

I turned around and saw this big thing flap up into the air. I didn't know if it was a fin or a tail. I knew it was some kind of fish.

There was a thrashing in the water, and I knew he was struggling with it. It must have been pretty big.

He screamed again: "It's a shark • • • get out of here."

I started swiming back. I swam a few strokes, but then I thought to myself: "I can't just leave him here."

SWIMS BACK

I was scared. I didn't know what to do, but I knew I couldn't leave him.

I turned around and took a couple of strokes back.

He just kept screaming and screaming.

I could tell the fish was chewing him up. It was a horrible scream.

All I could see was blood all over the water. He was shouting: "Help me, help me."

I grabbed for his hand. But when I pulled, I could see that his arm was just hanging on by a thread.

HEROIC ACTION

So I grabbed him around his back, but it was all bloody and I could see the insides.

He kept screaming and yelling.

So finally I told him: "The only way I can do it is if you lie still on your back, lie back and relax."

He did that. If he hadn't, I never would have been able to get him back.

He didn't scream after that. The pain must have been awful, but he wasn't complaining. He was helping me all he could.

There were people lining the shore, but no one got in the water. We got within 10 feet of the shore and a fisherman threw in a line. I managed to grab it and the people on shore pulled us in.

There doesn't seem to be anything more to say.

[From the San Francisco Examiner, May 8, 1959]

"BRAVEST ACT I EVER SAW," SOLDIER SAYS

From a rocky point high above Bakers Beach, an Army sergeant yesterday watched a boy and a girl rise above terror to heroic heights.

"It was the greatest exhibition of courage I have ever seen or am likely to see in my life," said M. Sgt. Leo P. Day, an assistant unit adviser to the 91st Division.

SEES FROM CLIFF

Sergeant Day had taken his supper to the edge of a cliff above the beach, he said.

"Screams suddenly swelled up on the air current, and I looked down to see a great red splotch in the blue-green water below."

Taking field glasses from his car, the sergeant focused on the red splotch and witnessed, as as he put it, "a drama that seemed to move in slow motion."

"I could see the boy in the foaming red water, shouting and signaling someone to 'Go back. Go away.'

"Then I saw the girl, swimming toward him with frantic strokes, completely ignoring his warning.

"Suddenly it was quiet, and she was easing him on his back and tugging him toward the shore as fast as she could go."

Sergeant Day jumped into his car and dashed down to the beach. The girl, Shirley O'Neill, 18, had already brought the boy, Albert Kogler, also 18, to the shore.

I SAW IT

The youth, mangled terribly in the shark's swift passes, was being placed in an ambulance.

The sergeant placed a hand on the girl's shoulder and said simply, "I saw it."

Shirley's reply had equal depth and simplicity:

"He told me to get out. I started to, but I couldn't. I went back and got him."

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, May 8, 1959]

SHARK KILLS SWIMMER IN SAN FRANCISCO ATTACK—STUDENT, 18, DIES OF WOUNDS AFTER COED PULLS HIM FROM WATER

A shark attacked and killed an 18-year-old San Francisco State College student while the youth was swimming off Bakers Beach yesterday afternoon.

Albert Kogler, of 768 Elizabeth Street, died at 8:05 p.m. in Letterman Army Hospital, 2½ hours after the shark's onslaught.

His right arm had been badly cut, his chest gashed and his left shoulder was nearly gone.

Army physicians said his death resulted primarily from loss of blood.

An account of the shark's bloody attack was given by Kogler's attractive 18-year-old companion, Shirley O'Neill, a fellow San

Francisco State student who lives at 2570 40th Avenue. She made a heroic attempt to save him.

She said they had decided to take advantage of the fine weather and walked northward along the western edge of the Presidio almost to where the beach runs into the rocks. Then they waded into the surf.

They were swimming about 50 yards off shore at 5:30 p.m. and had been in the water about 10 minutes when Shirley said she heard Albert scream: "Go back."

She turned to look at him and saw "a big, black shape and what looked like a tail flip over."

"It's a shark," she said Albert screamed again. "Go back. Go back."

CALL FOR HELP

Shirley then swam for shore as he cried again: "Help me. Help me."

These cries were heard by Joe Intersonine, a fireman, and John D. Dennis, a mailman, who were fishing nearby.

Once the girl reached the beach, she courageously plunged back into the surf—this time with Intersonine's fishing line around her waist.

"I wrapped the line around myself," said Shirley, "and when I reached Albert, I took him by the arm.

"I pulled and then the man pulled on the fishing line and reeled us in.

"I saw Albert struggle and he couldn't make any progress," she added, going back to the moment of the attack.

"He was a good swimmer, and so I knew he must have been hurt badly. I couldn't leave him.

"When I got back, I asked what had happened and he answered: 'It was a shark.'

"There was blood all around us and the first thing I thought was, 'God help him.' I was scared to death."

MORE HELP

The patch of blood was seen from a bluff above the beach by M. Sgt. Leo Day, of 1003 Anza Drive, Pacifica, and he ran down to the beach to aid in the rescue.

At about the same time, Police Officers Harry Paretchan and Stanley Odman arrived on the scene only to find there was no way to get an ambulance down to the beach.

The youth kept crying "air * * * air," but they could not give him artificial respiration because of his injuries, Paretchan said.

As Odman dashed off to get more help, Paretchan and the girl tried to blow air into the stricken youth's lungs by mouth.

But he said it was no help.

Paretchan then fired three shots into the air, thus alerting a Coast Guard patrol vessel, which radioed for assistance.

A half-ton Coast Guard pickup truck was run down the beach and took Kogler to Letterman, where he was placed immediately in surgery.

Pretty Shirley, with her short Italian-style haircut and blue eyes, was composed at first when she told police of the shark's slashing attack and the arduous rescue.

But on the drive back to Letterman with Sergeant Day she broke down and began to cry.

She was treated at the hospital for shock.

Bakers Beach, a popular swimming place for San Franciscans, is just north of 25th Avenue.

There were about 30 persons enjoying the sun on the long stretch of sand when the shark struck.

In 1952 a 17-year-old boy was killed by a big, white maneater shark that attacked him 50 feet off the municipal beach at Pacific Grove.

At that time he was believed to have been the first person to be killed by a shark off the State's long coastline.

COMMON HERE

An expert in the field said a shark most common to the bay is the seven-gill, a big, black variety that grows to a length of 15 feet.

The city's head lifeguard, Eddy Ukini, said he had never heard of such an incident in the bay during his 25 years of service.

The boy was the son of Albert E. Kogler, an investment broker of 10 Echo Avenue, Corte Madera, and Mrs. Harold McGrath, of 2426 26th Avenue.

They were at his bedside when he died.

His Elizabeth Street address was his Delta Phi Gamma Fraternity, where he stayed while at college.

GIRL TELLS HOW SHE BAPTIZED VICTIM—RITES IN BLOODY SAND

(By Arthur Hoppe)

At 18, Shirley O'Neill seems like any healthy teen-ager, prettier than most, with short, dark hair, freckles and blue eyes.

Wednesday afternoon she swam through the bloody waters off Bakers Beach in an attempt to rescue a friend who was being torn apart by a man-eating shark.

And after she had dragged his ripped body ashore, she knelt over him and baptized him into her church before he died.

And the first anxious question she asked her priest when she emerged from a drugged sleep yesterday afternoon was:

"Is salt water all right for a baptism?"

The priest assured her it was.

And amid all the fear and panic that swirled up yesterday at the thought of a man-eating shark in San Francisco waters, the conduct of Shirley O'Neill was nevertheless on every tongue.

AWED COMMENT

At city hall the top officials paused during the morning meeting of the Mayor's legislative committee to talk in awe for 5 minutes about Shirley's bravery.

"Incredible," they said. And "I'm not sure I could have done it." And "Imagine, a girl like that * * *"

And the same words were repeated in homes and offices and taverns and at the corner grocery.

The mayor said there should be a plaque to honor her. The president of the board of supervisors said the city should nominate her for the Carnegie Medal of Honor.

The story of her heroism in swimming to the rescue of 18-year-old Albert Kogler was revealed at the time of tragedy Thursday afternoon. The story of her devoutness came to light only yesterday.

Rural Mail Carrier Retires

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 27, 1959

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Frank Pawlowski, a citizen of Ruth, Mich., has recently retired after over 40 years of service as a rural mail carrier. On the occasion of his retirement it is fitting that we should give recognition to his long years of dedicated service to the people of his community.

Following the example set by his father, who was also a rural letter carrier, Mr. Pawlowski served as a substitute rural carrier at Ruth from 1915 to 1918. On May 23, 1921, he was appointed a regular carrier on route No. 1. Over the years he traveled one of the longest rural routes of its kind in the Nation. With perseverance typical of his fellow carriers, he covered his 66-mile route in fair weather and foul. Each winter he battled snowstorms hostile to all movement in the service of his patrons. He can take pride in a lifetime of work well done.

Along with his wife, Gertrude, he can be proud, too, of the fine family they have raised. Their son was educated in law, and is now a colonel in the Air Force. Among their four daughters, they have two nurses and a schoolteacher.

I am sure the Members of the Congress join me in wishing him long years of healthy and happy retirement.

Central Ohio Plan—Mutual Security Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL L. DEVINE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1959

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, about a month ago, I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the results of a poll conducted among my constituents in the Columbus and Franklin County area of Ohio. At that time, I indicated that a further questionnaire had been mailed to over 2,100 persons concerning primarily the proposed mutual security program.

During the 30-day period following the issuance of this questionnaire, I received 535 replies which amounts to a 25-percent return. The mutual security proposal was set forth in seven separate questions relating to each program.

In reply to the military assistance feature of $1.6 billion for material, weapons, and training to mutual security countries, 302 voted yes, 58 percent—180 voted no, 34 percent—and 43 were undecided, 8 percent. Ten percent of the group felt the amount should be reduced.

On economic assistance for defense in the amount of $835 million to Greece, Turkey, Iran, Pakistan, Thailand, Laos, Cambodia, Vietnam, Philippines, Republic of China, Korea, and Spain, 264 voted yes, 51 percent—206 voted no, 40 percent—and 50 were undecided, 9 percent. Eight percent favored reducing the amount.

On special assistance funds of $272 million for health programs, medical research and economic assistance to the Arab Nation, Tunisia, Morocco, Libya, Sudan, Jordan, West Berlin, and United Nations Emergency Fund, 243 favored the program, 47 percent—225 were against it, 43 percent—and 50 were undecided, 10 percent. Six percent wanted the amount reduced.

On technical cooperation programs in the amount of $211 million for technical assistance and training for governments, farmers, and scientists in 49 countries and 9 dependent Territories, 229 favored the program—44 percent—245 opposed—47 percent—and 46 were undecided—9 percent. Six percent of those answering wanted the amount reduced.

On the $700 million development loan fund to help new countries get started, such as Libya, Israel, Jordan, India, Pakistan, Formosa, Sudan, and Nigeria, only 162 favored this fund—31 percent—284 opposed—55 percent—and 71 were undecided—14 percent. Many people questioned whether this would be a loan in fact, and 4 percent of those answering felt the amount should be reduced.

On the special contingency fund of $200 million for emergency use by the President, 306 were in favor—59 percent—163 opposed—31 percent—and 54 were undecided—10 percent. Four percent of those answering felt the amount should be reduced.

On the program of $112 million in miscellaneous funds for U.N. children's funds, ICA costs, and so forth, the vote was not conclusive as 230 favored—44 percent—232 opposed it—45 percent—and 60 were undecided—11 percent. Six percent voted to reduce the amount.

Our questionnaire contained one inquiry unrelated to the mutual security program, involving a proposed increase of minimum wage in all business subject to Federal regulation from $1 to $1.25 per hour. The poll indicated 208, or 40 percent, of the persons favored an increase, 281, or 53 percent, were opposed and 38 persons, or 7 percent, were undecided.

Vassar Carrier Retires

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. O'HARA
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 27, 1959

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of giving recognition to Mr. Arthur B. Bates on the occasion of his retirement, I wish to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an article that appeared in the National Rural Letter Carrier for April 11, 1959:

VASSAR CARRIER RETIRES

When Arthur B. Bates, often called "Mr. R.F.D.," retired December 31, 1958, he had a world of memories of his long career.

In reminiscing Mr. Bates relates that his boyhood ambition was to be a carrier, always admiring the mailman and the horse-drawn vehicle that left the daily mail.

"My initiation in this type of service came in 1917 when I served as substitute mail clerk from the Detroit terminal on the Bad Axe and Saginaw run. This, however, did not come up to my expectations and I resigned the position in 1918. After serving a few months with Uncle Sam followed by varied jobs, an opportunity arose that formed the basis of my life work. James Carr was appointed postmaster and after his resignation as rural carrier I was named temporary carrier in October. I took the required examination on November 22, 1922, and on March 1, I received my appointment as regular carrier. I continued on route 2 until August 1932, and was then transferred to route 4, which I have continuously served for 26 years. Some of these patrons are 3d generation families.

"At that time the length of the route was 27 miles and served 80 families. The present route services 343 families and covers 50 miles.

"When I began as carrier, it was necessary to keep two horses besides the car, for motor transportation was only for the summer months. The salary was $1,890."

He was married to Relva Lennox on December 25, 1918. The couple have two children, Mrs. Lyle Jones of Big Rapids and Mrs. Lloyd Tinglan of Bay City. The family circle also includes six grandchildren.

Mr. Bates is an active member of the First Methodist Church of Vassar, served on the official board in numerous capacities, has been a member of the church choir for 35 years as well as Sunday school song leader. He is also a member of the National Rural Letter Carriers' Association.

He with Mrs. Bates plan to spend several months in Florida after which he will devote his time between his family, travel, and his two hobbies, photography and woodworking.

A testimonial dinner was given on Saturday evening, December 27, in the I.O.O.F. dining room with Post Office associates and their guests and members of Mr. Bates' immediate family attending.

The tables were decorated with a styrofoam mailbox centerpiece and placecards featuring a mailbox theme. A "This Is Your Life" scrapbook history was narrated by Shurley McIntyre. The table and scrap book committee included Mrs. Ivan Perry, Mrs. Wilbur Servis, and Mrs. Shurley McIntyre. A gift of luggage and also gold cufflinks were presented to the guest of honor as a memento of the occasion.

Taxation and Handout Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WINT SMITH
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 18, 1959

Mr. SMITH of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, it would appear from mail reaching my desk that the rank and file citizens are becoming more aware of the big spending programs as advocated by pressure groups in Washington. We also see advertisements appearing in the rural press paid for by individual citizens. I set forth one of these advertisements that recently appeared in big bold type in rural Kansas.

It said:

VOTE, VOTE

But do not vote for any politician who promises you a handout from the Federal Treasury.

No matter how nice a fellow he may be or how wide his grin, he is misleading you down the road toward socialism.

ZANIS RADIO & TV.

Another example of what many Americans are thinking. There is more and more realization that the concentration of economic power in the Federal Government by excessive taxation and the resulting big spending is a sure road to socialism for the United States. The more socialism a nation has the greater the concentration of economic power in the Federal Government. The two biggest dangers today for the future of America is big labor-bossed unions and the expansion of Federal Government.

Here is a letter from a small American businessman to his employees which points out the danger to our basic American form of Government. This letter is from the National Economic Council weekly letter:

EMPLOYER'S LETTER TO HIS EMPLOYEES

As you look at your paycheck this week, please look at the amount we actually paid you, not the final figure. Couldn't you use the difference to good advantage? The difference, which is your money, we must promptly send to the Government for them to spend as those in authority deem wise.

What they are actually saying to you is, "We, the people you have elected, have decided that we know better than you how to spend your money."

They do the same to my paycheck and I don't like it. I think it is downright stupid. I think I can spend my paycheck, and that you can spend your paycheck, better than some man in a swivel chair living off the fat of the land in Washington, D.C.

Actually, the situation is ridiculous. We, the voters, elect these officials as our representatives. They run for office to get on your, and my, payroll. In short, they are supposed to be working for us. Then they turn around and tell us we are too dumb to spend our wages wisely. They can spend the money better.

If they are right, they are sane people and we are insane. They say they must be our guards and wardens. Since when has it been good policy to allow insane people to elect their guards? If they are correct, we shouldn't be allowed to vote.

Isn't it about time for us to look around for a representative who wants to reduce our taxes, and is not hellbent on giving us all these free services that cost us so much money?

Creeping Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 18, 1959

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article on "Creeping Inflation" as published in the May 1959 issue of the Morgan Guaranty Survey:

CREEPING INFLATION

The Congressional Joint Economic Committee has recently been holding public hearings in an effort to determine whether price stability is compatible with maximum employment and an adequate rate of economic growth. Price stability in this context does not mean the absence of advances and declines in the general price level, which have always occurred and must occur in an economy of free markets, but the absence of a persistent upward trend, such as has taken place in almost all countries since World War II. In other words, the committee is trying to determine whether maximum employment and adequate economic growth are possible without chronic price inflation.

There was a time when such an inquiry would have been inconceivable. Only in very recent years has it been seriously proposed that inflation could be regarded as anything but a monetary disease resulting from abuse of power over money. The constitutional duty of Congress to coin money and regulate the value thereof was generally understood to give control over the size or metallic content of the monetary unit; maintenance of the soundness and stability

of money was taken as an implicit mandate, too obvious to require specific mention.

But now a congressional committee has been soberly considering whether deliberate participation by the Government in a regime of progressive, long-term monetary depreciation might be desirable in the public interest. This fact in itself illustrates how widely some sectors of economic thought have departed from a genuine belief in sound money. There is a present-day school of thought which holds that maximum employment and growth are impossible without a degree of gradual, or creeping, inflation. This theory apparently has so impressed the Joint Economic Committee as to become the subject of official inquiry.

WHAT CREEPING INFLATION IS

"Creeping" inflation is usually taken to mean a rise in the general price level at a rate of about 2 or 3 percent a year. This rise occurs, according to those who are prepared to accept it, primarily because powerful labor unions demand and obtain wage increases exceeding gains in productivity. The result is an increaes in labor cost per unit of output, and employers pass this increase on to consumers in the form of higher prices. True enough, the rise in prices could be prevented by the refusal of the fiscal and monetary authorities to make additional money available, but it is pointed out that this would curtail demand, cause large-scale unemployment, reduce output, and check economic growth. Hence creeping inflation, its condoners say, must be accepted as the lesser evil, the inescapable cost of substantially full employment and growth at a maximum rate.

THE COST OF CREEPING INFLATION

The cost would be high. Granted, inflation at the rate of 2 or 3 percent a year sounds relatively mild. That is the illusion of the creeping theory. The fact, of course, is that inflation in any amount is an evil, that 1 percent inflation is worse than one-half percent, that 2 percent is worse than 1 percent, and that we cannot be complacent about any degre of inflation. Further, the seemingly small annual rate is far from small when cumulated over a normal lifetime. At 2 percent a year, money would lose more than half its purchasing power during an average working life of 45 years. If the rate were 3 percent, only a little more than a quarter of the original purchasing power would be left.

With the unit of value eroding at such a rate, persons living on fixed or relatively fixed incomes would not only be deprived of the benefits of technological progress but would be forced to reduce their standard of living while the general standard rose. Pensioners, bondholders, bank depositors, beneficiaries of trust funds and life-insurance policies would be among the helpless victims—helpless because there is no real protection against inflation, especially for persons of small means who cannot afford to take risks. Money and claims to money are the only possible refuge for such people, and when money fails there is nothing left. No economic misfortune is more tragic than the plight of the old, the very young, and the disabled who feel the purchasing power of their incomes shrinking year by year, and can do nothing about it. And these dependent groups constitute a rapidly increasing proportion of the total population.

Who would gain from creeping inflation? Not the workers whose increases in money wages would be canceled out by increases in their cost of living. Not those in industries where wages would lag behind the spiral. And assuredly not those who would lose their jobs because their employers were unable to meet the rising labor costs.

The chief beneficiaries of creeping inflation would be the borrowers and the successful speculators—those who could repay loans in cheaper dollars than they had borrowed, and those effluent enough, shrewd enough, and lucky enough to take large risks and to guess right.

Creeping inflation, like all inflation, would redistribute wealth and income. It would do so blindly, without regard to equity, needs, or desirability. Generally speaking, those who would lose by it would be those least able to afford it.

DUBIOUS ASSUMPTIONS

While claiming to be based on the practical realities of today's economy, the doctrine of creeping inflation actually rests on a number of highly dubious assumptions. One of these is that inflation is a stimulant which can be administered to the economy in measured doses with predetermined effects. The idea of price inflation at the rate of so much a year, nicely modulated by a sensitive hand at the controls of monetary policy, assumes a much closer short-term relationship between the money supply and the price level than actually exists. In real life, price changes take place sporadically and unpredictably, because they result from a variety of ever-changing conditions. They reflect, for example, alternating moods of optimism and pessimism in the business world, which cause wide swings in business investment, inventory holdings, and some types of consumer demands. They reflect also the tendency of prevailing expectations (such as the expectation of inflation) to generate speculative movements that sometimes get out of hand.

The tendency for a regime of creeping inflation to give rise to speculation would be strengthened by the fact that it would be a program, not an accident. Inflation as an unwelcome byproduct of too-ambitious spending schemes is bad; inflation as an instrument of long-term policy is much worse. Historically, inflations have been due, for the most part, to fiscal deficits arising from the needs of governments for more revenue and the political difficulty of meeting these needs by taxation. Under such conditions, inflation is a reluctant yielding of ground under financial pressure. There is almost always some hope and expectation that the Government's finances can be put in order and currency depreciation stopped.

With acceptance of creeping inflation, on the other hand, monetary depreciation would be the acknowledged long-term program. The people would be put on notice that their money was to be allowed to cheapen progressively year by year for an indefinite future period. Under such conditions, how long could creeping inflation be relied upon to creep?

WOULD GROWTH BE STIMULATED?

Another very dubious assumption is that an acceptance of creeping inflation would stimulate economic growth in the long run. Admittedly, the immediate effect of an increase in the money supply may be to stimulate demand and thus make it easier for employers to take on higher labor costs and charge higher prices without suffering a loss of markets and being forced to reduce output. But such artificial stimulation puts off the moderate adjustments that are needed and natural from time to time in a free economy moved by fallible judgments and responsive to a wide variety of factors, both material and psychological. Such adjustments cannot be postponed forever. The need for them gains cumulative force through repeated deferment and eventually results in violent corrections.

Creeping inflation would tend to amplify rather than moderate the swings of the boom-and-bust cycle. In the long run, it would retard economic growth rather than accelerate it.

Every onset of the downward phase of the cycle would certainly bring political and popular pressure for increased doses of the inflationary stimulant. This pressure has appeared regularly, in one form or another, in past business recessions. The most insidious feature of inflation is that, for a time, it seems to work. Its stimulating effects are plainly visible and highly agreeable while they last. When the inevitable readjustment occurs and the painful price begins to be paid, it is natural for the unwary to assume that prosperity can be restored by the same inflationary treatment that appears to have produced it in the first place.

THE EFFECT ON SAVING

There are other reasons for doubting that creeping inflation would stimulate economic growth. Growth is limited by the size of the labor force and the average output per worker. The size of the labor force depends mainly upon the growth of population. The average output of the worker depends primarily upon the tools he uses, that is, the investment in productive equipment. Investment is made possible by saving, and the prospect of progressive currency depreciation would be more likely to discourage saving than to stimulate it.

To acquiesce in the gradual destruction of the value of money, with all the blind injustice that the process would involve, in the unwarranted hope that such a policy would stimulate economic growth over the long term, would be a strange way of administering money for the benefit of the people. A policy of accepting creeping inflation voluntarily would be a tragic error. Almost as tragic would be the error of allowing it to occur by default through failure to deal decisively with the factors that cause it.

Balanced Military Forces Necessary for Survival of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LeROY H. ANDERSON

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1959

Mr. ANDERSON of Montana. Mr. Speaker, Montana is proud that the national commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, John W. Mahan, is a native Montanan. His first loyalty, however, is to the security of America.

Balanced ground, air, and sea forces are necessary if we are to survive. A short time ago, I inserted in the RECORD some telling arguments presented by Commander Mahan for strengthening our ground forces.

Today, Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert another provocative analysis by Mr. Mahan, concerning our naval requirements. It is as follows:

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Kansas City, Mo., May 13, 1959.

Hon. LEROY H. ANDERSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN ANDERSON: As commander in chief of the veterans of Foreign Wars, I recently wrote to you regarding the cutback of American ground forces. The great majority of our U.S. Senator and U.S. Representatives who answered that letter, and there were over 300, indicated to me that they, too, were concerned with further cutbacks in our ground forces.

Today, I wuold like to bring to your attention another matter which the VFW deems to be of vital importance to our national

security. The matter I refer to pertains to the maintenance of U.S. supremacy on the seas. I have recently returned from an inspection trip of our naval units in the Mediterranean. And now, I write to you with the sincere belief that one of the most vital threats facing our Nation and the free world is the quiet but ominous growth of Soviet seapower.

Obviously, the Kremlin planners have correctly realized that the United States is dependent in war and peace upon freedom of the sealanes. Also, the Communist leaders have correctly sensed that the free world is actually an oceanic confederation bound together by the sealanes. Thus, if the sealanes are severed, the United States is isolated and the free world is fragmented. Our Nation can certainly derive no feeling of well-being from the fact that the Nazis began World War II with 57 submarines and almost won the battle of the North Atlantic, and that today, the Soviet Union has between 450 and 500 undersea craft with a large and modern surface navy.

On behalf of the 1,300,000 members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, I request that you support the following proposals designed to further our national seapower supremacy:

(a) A fully adequate naval construction program. At the present time, our combat vessels are wearing out faster than they are being replaced. We cannot survive with a second-best Navy.

(b) An appropriation in the 1960 budget for another large aircraft carrier. Such carriers give us an important margin of strategic superiority over the forces of communism. We believe the carrier to be a highly effective and economic weapon; it has unsurpassed strategic mobility, and frees the United States from the military disadvantages and political complications of fixed bases on foreign soil. It has a unique versatility in that carrier-based aviation can apply a precise degree of naval air power required, ranging from a show of the flag and the dropping of leaflets to the delivery of a thermonuclear bomb.

(c) The appropriation for and mandatory requirement of a Marine Corps of not less than 200,000. A combat-ready Marine Corps, as part of our balanced fleets, provides our Nation with an unsurpassed force-in-readiness in cold or all-out war.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars believes that the citizens of the Nation are ready to pay for these items as a required element of our defense organization and for that reason we believe that the above proposals should not be thwarted by false arguments of fiscal economy. If we lose control of the seas, we will lose our power for survival and ultimately our independence.

I know that you have many demands upon your time as a Member of the Congress; however, I would appreciate hearing from you at your convenience relative to your position with respect to these proposals by the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Sincerely,

JOHN W. MAHAN,
Commander in Chief.

Eleventh Anniversary of the Founding of Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. WALLHAUSER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 18, 1959

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, I am most happy to join in the celebration of the 11th anniversary of the founding of Israel, the gallant little nation that stands as a bastion of democracy in the Middle East.

In the 11 years of its history, Israel repeatedly has proved the wisdom of the United States of America in supporting its independence and integrity. Those who aided in the establishment of Israel can well be proud of their efforts.

Israel is founded on the same solid bedrock upon which our own United States of America was founded. It is a homeland and haven for those who love liberty; for those who want to be free.

There is no question that the existence of Israel and the dedication and determination of its people have proved a major stumbling block to the Communist penetration that has threatened the position of the free world. For this, the free world owes a deep debt of gratitude to the people of Israel.

Israel's first 11 years have not been easy ones, but the accomplishments of its leaders and its people have been many. Israel is an example of what a virile, valiant people can build in a backward area. A less brave people might have retreated or succumbed in the face of overwhelming odds that faced them, yet Israel has moved steadily forward. It will continue to move steadily forward, for the Jewish people always have been freedom loving.

For its remarkable accomplishments and its dedication, we salute Israel on its 11th anniversary. We are confident that its centuries-old destiny of peaceful leadership will be attained. We pledge Israel and its people our support and friendship.

Recovery and Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. RHODES
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 7, 1959

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post and Times Herald, dated Monday, May 18, 1959:

U.S. PROSPERITY: RECOVERY AND POLITICS
(By Roscoe Drummond)

The news of the Nation's resounding recovery should not be limited to the financial pages. It has the most far-reaching political importance—at home and overseas, now and into the elections of 1960.

1. The fiscal policies of the administration are looking better than ever. They are being justified by events. There is no better test. The refusal of the President and Secretary of the Treasury Robert Anderson to panic in the face of the recession and to attempt frantically to manipulate the economy by lower taxes and deficit spending is now showing itself demonstrably sound. The whole country can see it.

2. The President's legislative program is going to fare better in Congress. To have been "right" on the recovery means that the Democratic congressional leaders will not find it easy to refuse the President or override him on other matters. The principal need is not how to deal with the problems of the recession but how to deal with the problems of prosperity—and here it is easiest for the administration to take the initiative.

3. Just as the recession helped to strike down the Republicans in the 1958 election, so the oncoming prosperity will greatly enhance Republican prospects next year in both the congressional and presidential campaigns. The outlook is that by mid-1960 the economy will be producing at the rate of a half-trillion dollar ($500 billion) gross national product. This should enable the President to keep the budget in balance, which his critics said would be impossible, and should pay large political dividends in 1960.

4. The strength and resilience of the American economy are enhancing our position abroad as well as giving the lie to the Communist fixation that capitalism just has to curl up and die. It isn't doing any such thing. And both the raw-material-producing countries and the more industrialized nations in the free world are benefiting.

The wisdom of U.S. economic policies is winning new praise, one illustration is this remark from a recent speech by Heathcoat Amory, British Chancellor of the Exchequer:

"I am glad to have this opportunity of paying tribute to the calm and enlightened U.S. policies which did so much to prevent the spread of serious recession throughout the world. U.S. production has now fully recovered and continues to expand beyond previous peaks. In western Europe, also, the trend is now upwards; and indeed the recession in production has never amounted to more than what will appear in retrospect as a ripple on the trend."

All this does not mean there will be no deficiencies in the economy despite the high levels of prosperity. There will be. We face the prospect of considerable unemployment—perhaps 5 percent—in the midst of the Nation's highest employment. This is, in part, a technological unemployment brought about by shifting consumer tastes and new automation. It is visible in Pennsylvania and West Virginia coal towns, in New England textile communities, and some heavy-industry cities. There is also likely to be displeasure among farmers who experience declining hog prices.

Secretary of Labor James Mitchell has been rightly warning his own party not to neglect "these valleys of trouble in our prosperity." If they are not neglected, there can be no doubt that the Republicans will go into the 1960 election with the strongest possible domestic argument in their political quiver—unprecedented national prosperity.

"Johnny Shiloh"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. LEVERING
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 18, 1959

Mr. LEVERING. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure on Sunday afternoon, May 17, 1959, to take part in the dedication ceremonies for the Gen. John J. Clem elementary school in Newark, Ohio, one of the many fine cities in the 17th District of Ohio, which I am honored to represent here in Congress.

I am sure that many of my colleagues know John L. Clem more familiarly as "Johnny Shiloh," who became famous as a drummer boy during the Civil War, first at Shiloh battlefield in Tennessee. He also was known as "Johnny Chickamauga," for he was in the thick of the fighting there, and in other battles in

the Civil War. Two men who later were to be Presidents of the United States—James A. Garfield and Ulysses S. Grant—were at Shiloh when Johnny Clem rolled out the battle call on his drum.

Because I believe that my colleagues will be interested in reading a brief history of the career of "Johnny Shiloh," under leave granted me, I am inserting a brief article by Dean Jauchius, about Gen. John L. Clem as it appeared on the printed program in connection with the dedication of this new school:

"JOHNNY SHILOH"

(By Dean Jauchius, coauthor of "Johnny Shiloh")

Johnny was born August 13, 1851, the first child of Roman and Magdalene Klem, and christened John Joseph Klem. Sometime during the heated presidential campaign of 1860 Johnny decided to change his middle name to Lincoln in honor of the somber man with the anguished brow who was to have to make such agonizing decisions in the years to follow.

Twelve days after his mother's death, Fort Sumter fell and Newark's wide-aware drill team, under the command of the dashing Leonidas MacDougal, a Mexican War veteran, was redesignated as Company H, Third Ohio Volunteer Infantry, the first 3-year enlistment regiment to cross the Ohio River. Johnny, infected with an unusually virulent strain of patriotism even for a wide-eyed boy, ran away with the outfit when it left Newark the evening of May 24, 1861. His father, Roman, went to Camp Dennison, Cincinnati, to get him, but Johnny jumped train on the return trip and made his way back to his outfit. The following day, the Third Ohio Volunteers shipped out for western Virginia.

It was at Pittsburg Landing, near Shiloh Meeting House, where Johnny was to become a living legend and be given the sobriquet "Johnny Shiloh," a nickname which remained with him for a lifetime. There, on April 7, 1862, in the second day of fierce fighting, Johnny stood next to Gen Ulysses S. Grant and defied the indescribable fury of close-range cannon and musket firing, beating the long battle roll on his drum until shell fragments shattered the instrument. Then Johnny picked up a musket longer than his 30-odd inches of height and weighing more than his 40 pounds, and began to shoot back.

Some time after that sanguine battle, Johnny began spelling his last name with a C, or Clem, a switch which has caused some confusion through the years. But while he signed his letters "Jno. Clem," his War Department records, now the John L. Clem Papers, invariably carry the K spelling, or Klem.

On September 20, 1963, Johnny participated in an assault by Gen. Gordon Granger's Reserve Corps in relief of the forces of Gen. George H. Thomas, "The Rock of Chickamauga," and while in the thick of critical fighting, shot a Confederate colonel from his horse when the rebel officer called upon him to surrender. Subsequently, Maj. Gen. William S. Rosecrans ordered Johnny's name entered upon the roll of honor and promoted him to the rank of sergeant.

Johnny was discharged from service at Atlanta by order of the Secretary of War, September 19, 1864, "in order that he might complete his education with a view to becoming a commissioned officer in the U.S. Army." Prominent generals, headed by Grant and Thomas, paid his tuition at a private school, but when Thomas seemed in trouble at Nashville in December 1864, facing the desperate Rebel army of Gen. John B. Hood, Johnny ran away from school and returned to "Old Pap" Thomas. Using "ragatag" troops because Sherman had taken the flower of his army for his march to the sea, Thomas soundly whipped Hood in the final decisive battle of the west. Johnny returned to another school, ultimately received his graduation diploma from Newark High School, and was appointed a second lieutenant in the Army by President Grant.

His Army career was a distinguished one and he saw action in the Spanish-American War and in the Philippines. He sought desperately to get into action during World War I, but President Woodrow Wilson denied him that opportunity. He retired in 1919 as a major general and died May 13, 1937, at San Antonio, Tex., John Lincoln Clem is buried in heroes' ground, at Arlington National Cemetery, near the grave of an old friend who'd long preceded him, Gen. Philip H. (Little Phil) Sheridan, and near Thomas Circle, named after his beloved "Old Pap" Thomas.

The last echo of the shots fired in such tragic anger in the 1860's have long fled, and the world has turned many times since a little, blond-haired lad stood defiantly beating the long battle roll of the drum at bloody Shiloh where brother slaughtered brother in the yellow mud, but John Lincoln Clem of Newark, Ohio, remains alive in the breasts of other young Americans today as an inspiring example for the youth of all times.

The Air We Breathe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1959

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Hon. HUBERT HUMPHREY, U.S. Senator from Minnesota. This address was delivered to the Democratic Luncheon Club of San Francisco:

THE AIR WE BREATHE

(Remarks of Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democratic luncheon meeting, San Francisco, April 23)

All of us nowadays are more conscious of the air we breathe than we used to be.

In Los Angeles they have smog. In San Francisco you often enjoy—so I hear—salubrious fog. All of which makes me wonder whether it was the smog or the fog or the grog that caused our Republican friends to manhandle their colleague Joe Smith out here in 1956. At any rate you must have had mighty clear skies on election day last November when all the Republicans got manhandled.

Today it isn't fog or smog that concerns people most, it's the radioactive dust that's in the air and settles on the water we drink and the food we eat—particularly strontium-90.

This strontium-90 is one of the radioactive products of atomic reaction. It has a natural affinity for calcium and builds up in our bones—where it can cause bone cancer as well as leukemia.

People have to be pretty upset about something to sit down and write their Senators and Congressmen. And they are thoroughly upset by the latest news about strontium-90. Every one of us in Washington has stacks of mail about it. I quote just one letter:

"We have asked ourselves time and time again, how could the Atomic Energy Commission keep saying that there is no danger."

Now the Atomic Energy Commission belongs to all of us, to the people of the United States. One of its prime duties is—within the limits of security—to inform the people about matters of grave concern to themselves, and to their children's children.

Of course, that was not Admiral Strauss' idea, when he was head of the AEC. To him the AEC was a ship, he was captain, and any difference of opinion was mutiny. Also, he kept the key to the radio room in his pocket, so that no one else could let people know where the ship was going, or even where it was.

At the AEC, the Strauss song has ended, but the malady lingers on. The AEC is still doing its best to keep the American people in darkness, and radioactive darkness at that.

In December, AEC Commissioner Libby was faced with new data from the Defense Department which indicated that half the strontium-90 released in an atomic explosion falls to the earth within 2 years, instead of taking 7 years to filter down from the atmosphere, as it was hitherto believed.

The same data indicated that, instead of the strontium-90 being evenly distributed throughout the world, as previously assumed, its fallout was heavier right here in the United States than anywhere else in the world.

The evidence against the AEC's old 7-year theory was so strong that AEC couldn't even begin to defend it. Instead, Dr. Libby sought to fall back to a new line at 4 years.

On February 20 the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy received the Defense Department data. It took Senator CLINTON ANDERSON, my good friend and fellow-Democrat, a solid month of hard fighting to clear the way for putting this information before the public.

Meanwhile, Dr. Libby seems to have looked for a way to air his new 4-year theory, a way that would look almost casual, as if it were just a minor afterthought.

He was scheduled to speak at the University of Washington March 13, as one of the events in its annual lecture and concert series.

Everyone in that audience—except possibly the physics majors—must have come out pretty baffled and bewildered. It was more like a scientific monograph than a lecture. Believe it or not, there were 24—yes, 24—pages of tables and charts appended to the prepared text of the speech.

Everything was in it but the kitchen sink—and the Defense Department findings, which Dr. Libby coyly kept to himself. By so doing, he apparently sought to take the edge off their release by Senator ANDERSON 8 days later.

I'll say two things about this sorry record of evasiveness on a matter of the most urgent public concern:

First, if it took as long for strontium-90 to fall out of the stratosphere as it does for information to fall out of the AEC, we could all feel a lot safer.

Second, the AEC is still—after having been caught time and time again misleading the public—trying to play down the dangers of radioactive fallout.

Much of what we know about this subject we know in spite of—not because of—the AEC; and particularly from the hearings which Congressman CHET HOLIFIELD conducted in 1957, and which I'm pleased to say he will reopen next month.

What are the dangers of fallout?

As you know, I don't believe in States rights being used as an argument against the Federal Government doing something the States cannot or will not do. But I do believe a State has the right to protect the health of its citizens—particularly when our Federal Government defaults in its plain duty.

It's for this reason that Gov. Orville Freeman of my own State of Minnesota set up a special committee on atomic problems. At the request of that committee, the AEC tested samples of wheat from Minnesota and neighboring States.

In samples from 1956, 1957, and 1958, strontium-90 content in micro micro curies per gram of calcium ran 107, 152, and 155—and the so-called permissible level is 100.

There was one sample which tested out at 606. This sample, the report notes, was excluded from the averages. I wish it were that easy to exclude this and like samples from people's stomachs.

In communicating these facts to me, Dr. Maurice B. Visscher, of the University of Minnesota Medical School wrote:

"The really shocking thing to me is that the AEC itself has no other significant number of analyses of wheat."

The point is that we just don't know enough about the degree to which strontium-90 gets into our food and drink. Some work has been done on milk and water, and a smattering on a variety of other foods, but not on a regular and continuous basis. Apparently nothing would have been done about wheat if our Minnesota people had not insisted.

We are equally in need of more knowledge about the so-called permissible levels of radioactivity. These figures were first worked out many years ago for radium workers and X-ray technicians—that is, for adults. Now it seems, however, that the greatest danger is to children under 10.

As our knowledge has grown, these figures have been revised downward again and again. Many scientists believe that there is no such thing as a permissible level, that each increase of radioactivity increases the risk of disease and of damage to future generations.

Not only are we walking in the dark; we don't even know where the precipice is.

There is another tragic aspect to the AEC's blackout on fallout data. It leaves us tongue-tied about the shocking extent to which the Russians have been polluting the stratosphere.

We talk of dirty bombs, and, although not so much lately, of clean bombs. The ones the Soviets exploded last October can only be described as filthy. Dr. Libby estimates that this series of massive Soviet explosions increased the pollution of the stratosphere by a full 50 percent.

Had we been on our toes—and not so guilt-ridden about our own fallout showing—we would have gone straight to the United Nations, and laid these terrifying facts on the line.

The Soviets, we should have charged, are poisoning the whole world, not with their wornout dogmas but with the deadliest dose of radioactivity that has ever been inflicted upon the world. But the AEC's dirty hands prevented us from exposing Russia's dirty bombs before the United Nations.

It was just over a year ago that the Soviets first announced their suspension of nuclear tests—as usual, catching us flatfooted. Their timing of the announcement was the rankest hypocrisy. They had just completed a series of extremely dirty tests. Those were the tests which caused radioactivity in the rainfall right here in San Francisco to increase by 200 percent.

I said in the Senate at that time:

"I feel we should have exposed this information rather than guarding it as though it were a top state secret. It is these facts relating to the Soviet tests that the world should know, back into the smallest village in the faraway corners of Asia and Africa."

I was trying, as best I could, to get our Government out of the corner into which the Russians had backed us. But all I got from the AEC and its friends was a barrage of criticism.

We aren't going to get anywhere in stopping excessive fallout if we leave it up to the AEC. They're in the business of conducting tests, and also of assessing how dangerous their tests really are. No man, or Government agency, should be the judge in his own case.

For a considerable time, a number of us in the Senate have demanded that the administration put primarily responsibility for research on radioactivity where it belongs, with the Public Health Service. And I welcomed the introduction of a bill by my good friend, Senator LISTER HILL, to do just that. The Public Health Service will draw, of course, upon the expert knowledge of the AEC and of other agencies, State and Federal, public and private. It will be the responsibility of the Surgeon General, as the head of this Service, to present to Congress a comprehensive program for the control of radiation hazards. I heartily support Senator HILL's proposal; it's high time we get some honest figures on radioactivity.

But further measures are also worth considering. It might be well to require that one of the AEC Commissioners be a biological scientist—just as one is now a physical scientist. We should give to the U.N. Scientific Committee on the Effect of Atomic Radiation full information on the results of our recent studies. We should, at the next session of the World Health Organization, urge that it concern itself with the effects of radioactive fallout, as it already does with radiation from the peaceful uses of atomic energy. We should do all this and more.

For out of this great evil there may yet emerge some good. Fallout is no respecter of persons or doctrines. It settles upon the caviar the Soviets serve at their wingdings just as it does upon the food we are eating now.

Indeed, if Mr. Khrushchev succeeds in swearing off vodka—as he urges upon the Russian people constantly, and also on himself—it may simply put him in all the greater peril. On the basis of present tests, there seems to be much less strontium 90 in hard liquor than in tea or milk. The more the danger from strontium 90 becomes known on both sides of the Iron Curtain, the more pressure there will be for an end to atomic explosions.

My Democratic colleagues, Senators GORE and CHURCH, have suggested that tests be, at the very least, limited to underground caverns and outer space. This would greatly reduce radioactive fallout. Last week the administration caught up with the Gore-Church proposal.

But I hope that we can achieve the ending of all tests—with adequate safeguards for inspection and detection—not only because of the fallout danger, but because it would be a great step forward to wider measures of disarmament.

We are concerned, and rightly concerned, about present levels of radioactivity. But they are as nothing compared to the seething wilderness a third World War would make of our planet.

We must give fresh impetus to the Geneva negotiations looking toward the suspension of tests. To this end, I have introduced a resolution to put the Senate on record in support of the efforts of the United States to achieve an agreed suspension of tests, and endorsing the principle that an adequate inspection and control system must be part of any such agreement.

We are entirely willing to open our doors—to let the Russians send technicians to check on our compliance with a test ban—but we want to be able to do likewise. They say they will permit inspection, but only by the native citizens of each country, and not by an international team.

This is arrant nonsense. Still, our aim must be to continue to achieve agreement not merely to prove that failure to agree is their fault.

My friends, it is no accident that the Senators and Congressmen who have been foremost in the fight to disclose these atomic facts are Democrats. We in this party are steeped in the belief that, if you give the people the facts, they will make the right choices.

That can be—in the short run—politically dangerous. Do you recall what happened in 1956, when Adlai Stevenson called for the suspension of hydrogen bomb tests? The Secretary of State said Mr. Stevenson was "not fully conversant with the details of the problem."

Thomas E. Dewey called it "an invitation to suicide."

Vice President Nixon denounced him for "playing dangerous politics with American security."

Yes, it can be politically perilous to be too right too soon. But it can be national suicide to be right too late.

There may still be some of our fellow-citizens who doubt that there is one world. But no one can deny that we have only one stratosphere, and that we must somehow stop using it as a rubbish dump for radioactive debris.

After all, unless we all decamp to another planet, it's the only stratosphere we have.

New Frontiers—1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 18, 1959

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, the following is a speech delivered by Mr. Donald F. Carpenter, general manager, film department, E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co., delivered May 14, 1959, before the Topeka Chamber of Commerce in observance of the opening of the new Du Pont cellophane plant located near Topeka at Tecumseh, Kans. Mr. Carpenter's address is most enlightening. The speech follows:

NEW FRONTIERS—1959

Passing through Tecumseh today, Hunter Lewis pointed out a monument marking the Oregon Trail. It recalled the important and colorful role played by Kansas in the westward expansion of our country. The Oregon Trail, as well as the Santa Fe and Chisholm trails and the Pony Express route were famous paths to the challenging opportunities of the West. In spite of the substitution of the jet airliner for the prairie schooner, the paths to opportunity are still open in the United States. One is the path to industrial progress, and this is the path we are taking here in Tecumseh.

We appreciate the warmth of your greeting here tonight. We are glad that we have an important plant in Kansas. We investigated 100 possible locations, but when we learned that the Topeka area had outstanding people, good power, water, and transportation, we looked no further and here we are.

Now you are overwhelming us by your welcome. Like a Kansas steak, we have learned that the enthusiasm, friendliness, and cooperation of the community must be tasted to be fully appreciated. You have already helped us greatly by your friendly spirit and we hope we may deserve your continued support.

You have not only greeted our employees with enthusiasm but you have made their families feel the warmth of your welcome. The kids are in seventh heaven to grow up in the land of Wyatt Earp, "Doc" Holliday, Matt Dillon, and the Pawnees. Thank you for your Kansas hospitality.

As Kansas was a land of opportunity for early settlers, it is also an exciting new frontier for Du Pont and for cellophane. It is part of the industrial expansion of our great country which is so important to the prosperity of the West and of the entire United States. The industrial activity initiated here will have an impact in varying degrees throughout the entire country.

Many communities offer important inducements to attract industry. Some provide immediate advantages of a short-range character. Others provide less obvious but longer range benefits. We prefer the latter and we believe you offer them here.

As in every walk of life and every community, your greatest asset is the high caliber of your people. We have found them to be friendly, intelligent, alert, willing to learn new customs and duties, trustworthy, fearless, and capable. What more could a manufacturer ask?

If we can offer sound direction and support, it is those same people who will spell success to our new enterprise. They will bring this huge investment to life. Under their operation, it will become a vital factor in the industrial world. I fully expect that they will establish the highest levels of quality, productivity, and efficiency that will be attained anywhere in our country.

It will not be easy. Others have been striving to reach these levels in the production of cellophane for 35 years—they knew the methods, they have plants which were built at a fraction of the cost in days when a quarter would buy a haircut and a nickel would buy a cup of coffee. But there are advantages here too; there are outstanding people and what we believe is the most modern cellophane plant in the world.

It will be an interesting competition, the type of competition that has made our country great. Here a determined group of people working with modern tools will be competing against other producers of cellophane and also producers of other films such as polyethylene, vinyl chloride, polystyrene, vinylidene chloride, rubber hydrochloride polyesters and also against many types of paper, foil, and other materials.

Whether this operation will succeed or not is in the hands of the customer. He will be the judge and the jury. His decision will be final. If he says cellophane made in Kansas meets his requirements, the operations here will prosper. We expect that he will.

These same Kansas people determine the attitude of your government toward industry. In some communities industry seems to be treated in such a manner that it cannot do its best. Sometimes industry is taxed more than its fair share and restrictive regulations are imposed. All too frequently the industrial goose, while trying hard to produce golden eggs, finds itself attacked by those who prey upon it until it can no longer benefit its employees, its owners, its customers or its community.

You have demonstrated a very different attitude here. Your people are sound and substantial. They look for the long-term good rather than the illusory temporary advantage.

When we locate in a new community, we intend to become a part of that community. We expect to assume the responsibility for our share of its operating expenses. On the other hand, we do not think it proper to expect du Pont or any other business to assume the rightful burdens of others in the community, or be subjected to special penalties. We appraise the level and the trend of taxes on business in relation to all taxes. We take note of the trend of State and community debt, for this is a measure of the willingness of government to live within its income.

We are confident that our operations here will be treated fairly by your people. If our plant calls for services which increase governmental costs, we naturally expect to pay for them, and I assume the same would apply to our employees. If special regulations and restrictions are necessary, they should, of course, be applied. But we know, as do you I am sure, that just so soon as a community commences to impose unreasonable and unjust burdens upon an industry, it follows as the night the day that the industry will begin to decline, its products can no longer compete in the marketplace, its volume drops off, its employment decreases, and the enterprise which had once been an asset in a community becomes a liability.

We tried to appraise these probabilities before we came. We felt certain that we would be treated with wisdom and understanding. We are glad we are here and we hope that our operations will always be an asset in this community.

Much is being said these days about the importance of the education of our youth. We've all known it but maybe we have let someone else worry about it when we ourselves should have been personally more active in supporting our educational system. It's a national problem and one of great importance to us.

Our limited contact indicates to us that your educational system is good. The members of your community who have joined our organization bring a knowledge and adaptability which results from good schooling. We are also impressed with your universities.

In our highly specialized business we need many employees who have had advanced education, mostly technical. The proximity of excellent engineering schools gives our employees the opportunity to increase their knowledge in the scientific fields. The need for advanced education is becoming more apparent every day. This need emphasizes the importance of your excellent educational institutions. In our own operations at Tecumseh, one of every four employees will probably have a college degree.

Thus the community climate of Kansas has been instrumental in our selection of your locality for the establishment of this enterprise. Now it is important to determine what Du Pont will bring to Kansas.

The first thing we hope to share with you is confidence—confidence in the industrial growth of our country and of the dynamic nature of our free-enterprise system. We have confidence in the Tecumseh plant because it typifies the operation of the modern industrial corporation—a pooling of financial resources, technology, and a multitude of individual skills and abilities to fill human needs in a way that could not be done through individual effort alone. The cellophane business is complex and can only be performed effectively by a large organization.

Perhaps I can explain this better by telling you something about our business. The basic chemistry of cellophane is fairly simple. It is possible to reduce to a single sheet of paper the instructions that would permit an individual chemist to produce cellophane with simple laboratory equipment. But the result of the individual's effort would be a far cry from an acceptable commercial product, and the product would probably cost something over $50 a pound. The experiment would be interesting, but scarcely of practical value to the producer, the community, or the economy at large.

The story of cellophane—its development from an obscure specialty product to a familiar household institution—is a spectacular business success story. Thirty-five years ago this spring, the first cellophane in America was rolled from a casting machine at our Buffalo plant. Robert L. Richards, who is with us this evening, devoted many years of his early career to cellophane. He was there at the startup and can tell you that a 50-pound roll was a triumph in those first months of confusion.

As we were learning the ins and outs of the highly technical cellophane process, tons of product were sent to the scrap dump to be burned. There have been bonfires on the Tecumseh scrap dump, too, and for the same reason. It is better to destroy questionable product that to permit it to reach our customers. The reputation for quality must be established and preserved. Tecumseh has made a good start.

Since 1924, cellophane's growth has been phenomenal. Last year, cellophane volume was over 400 million pounds. Even though 1958 was called a recession year, still more cellophane was sold in that year than in any year in cellophane's history.

But cellophane's road to success was not an easy one. The teamwork and ingenuity of pioneers in research, production, and sales who had the courage to persevere in the face of early discouragements were prime elements in its progress. The first cellophane contributed little more than glamorous appearance to a package. It offered no moisture protection, and wrapping with it was a hand operation. Because of its cost, it was used primarily on perfumes and expensive candies. All in all, it was a very questionable business, if, in fact, it was a business at all. We know of one prominent U.S. manufacturer who heard of the early production of cellophane in France, where it was invented. He investigated it and decided against bringing it to this country. The Du Pont Co., however, saw possibilities in the product, brought it to Buffalo, N.Y., and started the long struggle there.

Then in 1927 came Du Pont's invention of moistureproof cellophane, a research accomplishment which signaled a new era in packaging. Later, in response to a need, heat-sealable film was developed. This made cellophane practical for high-speed packaging.

Other research developments followed in rapid succession so that there are now more than 100 varieties of cellophane. Although all these varieties are called cellophane, they are actually different products, each designed to meet a specific need. Cellophane's development is an excellent case history of the dynamic and continuing ability of our free enterprise system to fulfill the expanding needs of our country. When we found that fresh meat packaged in regular cellophane discolored, our research scientists and plants provided a highly specialized film which maintained the freshness and bright red color of the meat. Similarly, other special types were developed to meet the needs of bakery, candy, and other food products.

The need for special types for special purposes has continued ever since. The cellophane developed for twist-wrapping candy kisses differs from the folding type needed for caramel candies. The cellophane that is suitable for cigarettes is not satisfactory for cigars.

Every plastic film in the past decade has aspired to capture at least a part of the cellophane markets. But competition has found that cellophane is hard to beat. From the start, cellophane had rugged competition from older packaging materials, and competition from new plastic films is steadily growing stiffer. We anticipate that a billion pounds of packaging film will be consumed in 1968, and we predict that more than half of this will be cellophane.

This means that the cellophane industry will continue to expand. A vital factor in

this expansion will come from cellophane's versatility and the ability of our research scientists to continue to build new and better types of cellophane film. Several new types have been introduced in the past year, including an exceptionally durable polymer-coated type announced just a few weeks ago. Other new types are being perfected in our laboratories and plants, while still others are in the research stage.

Many of our hopes for cellophane's future are tied to the advanced technology represented in the Tecumseh plant. Improved methods and manufacturing efficiency have always been one of cellophane's biggest assets—being largely responsible for bringing the price of cellophane from $2.65 a pound in 1924 to about 60 cents a pound for the most common types today, although prices of raw materials and wage rates have increased substantially during this period. If cellophane were made today by 1924 methods with no process improvements, it would cost—not 60 cents a pound—but $5.50, and we would have very few customers, one plant and very few employees.

As you know, we have completed our plant and have commenced operations. The plant alone has cost nearly 1,000 times as much as the investment Mr. Éleuthère Irénée du Pont had for his new company back in 1802. The capacity is more than 60 times as great as the first cellophane plant in this country. It will provide a livelihood for more than 400 persons. Wages and salaries will be about $3 million a year and our payments for goods and services in Kansas will be another $2 million a year.

On this 35th anniversary of Du Pont's introduction of cellophane to the United States it is fitting that this new plant should go on stream with our four other cellophane plants. Then we had only a few customers, now we have thousands. Then we had one small plant, now we have five. Then we had 50 employees, now we have 5,000. Then cellophane was a rare curiosity, now it is a universal staple. Then we had hopes for the future, now we have realized and exceeded those hopes and with the assurance of your support we have hopes for still further progress. No one then imagined that cellophane would be used in many of its present applications. Who can now predict what new uses will appear tomorrow?

Gentlemen, during the past few years we have thought of the parable of the sower of the seed. Some seed fell upon barren ground and withered and died, but some fell upon good ground and bore fruit one hundredfold. We are confident that Tecumseh is good ground and we welcome the opportunity you have accorded us to come to your community and to become associated with your outstanding people in this enterprise. We hope the harvest may be a good one and we welcome the opportunity of sharing it with you.

Boggs Bill Gets Nod

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 18, 1959

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New Orleans States and New Orleans Item of Monday, May 11, 1959:

BOGGS BILL GETS NOD

Treasury Department approval on a bill by Representative HALE BOGGS seeking to encourage oversea investment has the effect of bestowing administration sanction on the measure and enhances its chances of passage.

No adverse criticism was offered by the Department on provisions of the legislation which would ease the tax strain on American firms investing in underdeveloped foreign lands.

Representative Boggs' justification of the tax incentives carries considerable logic. He said:

"Income on which taxes are deferred today will be reinvested and will yield greater income and greater revenue in future years.

"Promotion of private foreign investment is of such high priority in our national policy that we should not be satisfied with doing less than is necessary."

The Boggs measure, offering as it does a supplementary method of aiding this country's less fortunate allies, deserves prompt hearing and passage.

If there is hope for reducing the U.S. foreign-aid burden, it rests with encouraging the Nation's businessmen to accelerate investments abroad, which would serve the same purpose of elevating living standards in retarded nations.

Address by Louis Stein, President, Food Fair Stores, Inc., on Acceptance of the 1959 National Brotherhood Award, National Conference of Christians and Jews, Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York, May 6, 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 18, 1959

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, it was my great privilege to attend the brotherhood award dinner of the National Conference of Christians and Jews at New York's Waldorf-Astoria on May 6 in honor of Mr. Louis Stein. Mr. Stein, president of Food Fair Stores, Inc., was presented the national conference's brotherhood award for 1959, in recognition of his many outstanding services in the field of human welfare and brotherhood.

The event was one of the most impressive I have ever attended. On the program were such eminent Americans as the Honorable James P. Mitchell, Secretary of Labor; Mr. R. Newton Laughlin, president of the Continental Baking Co.; Rabbi Simon Greenburg, of the Jewish Theological Seminary; Mr. Charles G. Mortimer, president of General Foods Co.; Dr. Carroll V. Newsom, president of New York University; Mr. and Mrs. Tex McCrary; Father Vincent F. Beatty, president of Loyola College, Baltimore; and Rev. James H. Robinson, pastor, Church of the Master, in New York.

The occasion of this dinner highlighted the significance of one of the Nation's outstanding and dedicated organizations—the National Conference of Christians and Jews. The conference was established in 1928, and in the intervening years, through a scientific program of education in schools, in churches and synagogues, among community groups, through communication media and in the Nation at large, it has made bigotry become recognized as antisocial, the hallmark of the ignorant and of the internal enemy of the United States.

The conference has mobilized religious leaders of the three faiths against the enemies of religion and brotherhood. It helped to create united action against the Nazis and more recently against the Communists.

In his address of acceptance, Mr. Stein aptly confirmed the wisdom of the conference's selection for the brotherhood award. Stressing the need for greater compassion and tenderness in a scientific and materialistic world, he asked for the creation of an organized, international, cooperative project in the field of human research—a project which, he suggested, could be termed the "Humanistical Year."

Mr. Speaker, the remarks of Mr. Stein are so pertinent to today's problems and his understanding is so deep, I, under unanimous consent, am including his excellent address in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks:

Mr. Laughlin, Secretary Mitchell, Father Beatty, reverend clergy, distinguished guests, and friends, at the outset, I should like to say to Father Beatty that, while my instructors taught me many things at Fordham Law School, they haven't taught me the proper words to express to you, and to the conference, my gratitude and my humility tonight.

I shall simply say that I am profoundly honored by the award you have accorded me, and I am even more touched that you consider me worthy of receiving it. I assure you that this award shall never be a cushion to relax upon. Rather, it will serve always as a spur for greater effort in behalf of the inspiring objectives of the national conference.

And may I also say to you, Father Beatty, that while I am sincerely appreciative and even overwhelmed by your very gracious expression, I shall always bear in mind a remark made by a prominent statesman. "A eulogy," he said, "is like a fine perfume—delightful to smell but fatal to swallow."

To the welcome already extended to you, I should like to add my personal greetings. To each of you—and I mean it literally—I should personally like to say thank you; thank you for sharing this auspicious occasion with me. And thank you for your wonderful support of the National Conference of Christians and Jews.

I have long felt that business leaders must assume an even more important role than they have in public welfare and public service activities. And it is a source of gratification to me, as it must be to you, to note the increasing frequency with which businessmen are singled out for awards and commendations for outstanding service in the humanitarian field.

In my opinion, it serves to point up the changed attitudes of business leaders in the last half century or so. The business executive of today has assumed a vastly increased social, spiritual, and ethical outlook. He is aware that the men who manage our corporate affairs need not only technical competence but also the deepest religious and ethical insights. These men, through their community affiliations, are providing moral and spiritual leadership.

It is a sign of the business times to have the president of the Chamber of Commerce

of the United States maintain, and I quote him: "The only valid social goal is the improvement of the lot of man, and the better relationship of men to one another, to God, and to fundamental truth."

I am not unmindful of the fact that this award is being presented at a time when the world finds itself in the midst of perhaps the gravest crisis since the industrial revolution. The air is thick with diplomatic notes and ultimatums, with statements and counterstatements. And tensions rise and fall with the latest editions of our newspapers.

And yet, this is taking place at a time when we of the Western world are enjoying material progress far beyond anything this world has ever known. Advances in the natural and physical sciences have brought us to new peaks of material abundance, lengthened our life expectancy, made possible greater opportunities for leisure, and in other ways provided more fully for the satisfaction of human needs.

Contrast this with the fact that two-thirds of the world's population of 2.8 billion people have gained little if anything in the way of material progress resulting from scientific achievements—that their standard of living is pitifully inadequate.

And these people are be found in the teeming, underdeveloped centers of Asia, Africa, the Middle East, and Latin America, where, to add to the distress of the situation, population growth is most rapid. The people of these areas are becoming restless, and demanding of a share of the material abundance enjoyed by people elsewhere. It is in these areas that a dangerous explosion may be in the making.

As business leaders with business interests and as men of good will concerned with peace and security in the world, it behooves us to give serious thought to this situation. It suggests a different type of orientation and a greater understanding and a more lively concern with events in the underdeveloped, overpopulated areas. For in these countries smoulder the sparks of future revolts and conflict which may well engulf us.

The unprecedented development in nuclear power envisions a source of further material progress for those to whom it becomes available and a source of further unrest to the have-not peoples of the world. Nuclear power for peaceful purposes—distant though it may be—holds the promise of freedom from want, greater freedom from toil, and freedom from physical boundaries. It promises expansion in the familiar things of day-to-day living—transportation, housing, clothing, food, business, social environment.

And again the question arises: "Can mankind meet the challenge of its material progress?"

Or, to put it another way: "Will man have the wisdom to manage a world with unlimited power and unlimited ability to destroy itself?"

As regrettable as is the fact, it must be acknowledged that we are finding it difficult to do so at present. Certainly not while we sit on powder kegs and fight cold wars from the Middle East to Tibet, from Africa to Quemoy, and from Budapest to Berlin.

The years ahead—the years of nuclear power—should give us even greater concern. The use of this power is fraught with danger because of the uncertainty and unpredictability of human behavior and human governments.

To the task of eliminating this danger, to the positive task of coping successfully with our material progress, business leaders everywhere must dedicate themselves in whatever sphere of influence—large or small—they operate.

In the pursuit of these tasks, we must bring to bear all our human and spiritual resources. For of this we are sure—the hope of everlasting peace and a world that is free has its source in the mind, the heart, and the soul of man.

The fulfillment of this task, it seems to me, lies in the direction of a far greater knowledge of human behavior and human relations than we possess today. In this era of the world's development, we must turn, not alone to the physical sciences, but to the science of human relations—to those who probe the hearts and minds of man and his behavior. We must turn to the foremost authorities in humanistics.

Since I voiced that very thought in this room before the Fordham Law Alumni Association, the course of world events has more than ever strengthened my conviction that a vast effort devoted to research in human relations, administered at the highest Government levels and supplemented by private efforts, must be undertaken.

Huge sums of money and unlimited resources have been provided for search and development in the physical sciences, and the resulting achievements have been nothing short of monumental. It was my opinion that resources on a similar scale must now be provided to achieve as much in the field of human research. I went so far as to suggest, as an approach to this problem, the possibility of creating a new Manhattan project to be devoted to this work.

I should like to suggest another approach.

Last year, many nations, including Russia, participated in an extraordinary project which bore the title of the geophysical year. It seems to me that the times demand a similarly organized, international, cooperative project in the field of human research—a project that, for lack of a better word, might be termed the Humanistical Year.

In venturing this suggestion, I do not by any means underestimate the importance of the work being accomplished by Government and private agencies. Certainly the national conference, in its brotherhood program and in other programs related to human relations, is doing notable service.

But the scope of the job to be done throughout the world is far too broad and wide and deep to be accomplished by private organizations, as generous as you and other supporters of such groups may be.

There is no doubt that progress has been made, but it would be foolish to claim that progress is as satisfactory as present world conditions warrant. We must find the means to bring about more rapid progress. If to achieve this we must begin with a greater accumulation of basic knowledge in human relations, then we must recognize that the job to be done centers on research—fundamental research in human behavior and the relations of man to man.

And, lastly, the undertaking of the Humanistical Year under sponsorship of an international body would merit the highest priority and abundant budgets. It would also make available to all nations the results of projects carried out by the participating nations.

Certainly, the challenge to security and peace in the world—the challenge to achieving predictable human behavior and human governments—is global, and merits worldwide study and action.

In my opinion, if such a project were undertaken, it might well be under the auspices of the United Nations or one of its intergovernmental agencies, such as UNESCO. But, howsoever it is sponsored, it merits the force of U.S. leadership such as was demonstrated in 1953 when President Eisenhower sounded the call for peaceful uses of atomic energy, leadership which eventually led to the establishment of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

In the final analysis, I am moved by the conviction that God did not bestow upon mortal man his intelligence, his ability to research, to invent, and to develop in order to annihilate the very things he was empowered to create. But, if the human race is to have the peace that men of good will crave, we must bring men closer to each other in understanding, in spirit, and in brotherhood.

This is perhaps easier said than done; yet we must not be disheartened by the magnitude of the task. In this, we must accept the Biblical injunction that we cannot shirk a duty simply because it seems difficult to complete successfully.

We cannot and must not permit the achievements of the physical sciences to create turmoil in the world.

We cannot and must not lose the God-given belief in a better world of tomorrow.

We can and must learn together to live together.

We can and must solve the paramount problem of creating a society living in harmony with itself.

And, finally, we can and must create vital programs through which mankind will live in dignity, in brotherhood, and in peace, so that history will record our era, not as the atomic or nuclear age, but as the human age.

To this end, people and government everywhere must dedicate themselves.

It Is Already Ours

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1959

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, much has been said and written concerning the selection of a national floral emblem. In support of the many who feel that the corn tassel best represents our history and tradition, I wish to call attention to the following statement by Margo Cairns who has done more than any other individual to get recognition for the selection of the corn tassel as our national floral emblem:

IT IS ALREADY OURS

(By Margo Cairns)

It has been said: National floral emblems are rarely deliberately chosen. They spring from history and tradition. Ofttimes they represent the hopes and aspirations of a people. The birth, history, and struggle for survival and the future of nations are often symbolized by a nation's floral emblem.

How perfectly this definition of a floral emblem depicts the corn tassel. How truly the corn tassel as our national symbol springs from history and traditions. How surely the corn tassel, with its largess of golden fruit, represented the hopes and aspirations of a people—at Jamestown and at Plymouth, at the Continental Congress of 1775 in Philadelphia—and of this Nation today.

It is being urged that the rose should be adopted as our national floral emblem. Why? Has the rose played a constructive role in the building of this Nation? Was the rose waiting on the Atlantic coast to succor the first comers to this land? Was the rose with Captain John Smith that historic hour when he pleaded with Chief Powhatan for food to save his band of starving Englishmen? Was it for the rose that the Pilgrims knelt in the wilderness in profound gratitude?

No, it was for Indian corn, the grain pre-Incan peoples revered by naming it "maize,"

meaning "mother." Having mothered countless generations of original Americans through thousands of years, maize was waiting to feed, nourish, and sustain the colonists.

Corn Hill, one of the most sacred spots on this continent. Here the Pilgrims found corn in their dire need, corn for food, corn for planting. After the first agonizing winter the 50 remaining Pilgrims prepared the soil for their first gardens in the New World. It was corn they planted—not roses. The following autumn they gathered their harvest, only a few bushels of the native grain, but ample to their grateful thought. With hearts filled with joy they inaugurated our Tranksgiving Day.

Valued more highly than money, corn was used as the medium of exchange by the early colonists. When the Continental Congress shut the door on England, it also shut the door on English coinage. Again corn became the currency of the times.

With freedom and peace won, the westward movement began. Nothing like that heroic exodus had ever occurred in all history. Armies, well equipped and well fed, had conquered people and lands, but never before did families tame a virgin wilderness and add millions of square miles to a budding nation. Singly and in groups they went, on horseback, in oxcarts, in prairie schooners, floating streams in hollowed logs, taking with them two treasures—seed corn and the Bible, material and spiritual supply.

The golden seed is the genesis of our history, our traditions, our agriculture, our economy. It is a paid-up life insurance policy, a priceless gift to this Nation from the Red Man.

The corn tassel is a symbol of our native plant, the symbol of the wealth of food and gold it has poured into this Nation's economy. In honoring the corn tassel by its adoption as our national floral emblem we are honoring the courageous colonists, the Continental Congress—founders of our Nation, the hardy pioneers who broke the tough prairie sod, the conquerors of bison-covered plains, and stupendous mountains who carried the precious seed to the Pacific coast.

The corn tassel is already the symbol of our country. It always has been. The birth, history, and struggle for survival of our Nation are inexorably bound to our native plant. The corn tassel is a symbol of plenty which has aided the United States in feeding a hungry and needy world, a symbol of fellowship with all nations, a prophetic symbol of security in the populous world of tomorrow.

Let us accept the historic facts and acknowledge the corn tassel as our national floral emblem—a symbol of our Nation.

Flood Control, Water, and Soil Conservation in Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. LEVERING
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 18, 1959

Mr. LEVERING. Mr. Speaker, the Ohio General Assembly has just passed a joint resolution memorializing this Congress to take appropriate action to assure the continuance of surveys, planning, and cooperation in the construction of projects in the State of Ohio that are vital and necessary to the control of floods and the conservation of soil and water by sufficient appropriations being granted for this purpose to the various agencies involved.

My good friend and distinguished member of the Ohio Senate Danny Johnson, who introduced this resolution, informs me that it was unanimously adopted in the assembly and then passed in the senate by a vote of 27 to 3.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include this resolution and commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 36

Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to take appropriate action to assure the continuance of surveys and planning and cooperation in the construction of projects of the State of Ohio that are vital and necessary to the control of floods and the conservation of soil and water by sufficient appropriations being granted for this purpose to the Bureau of Reclamation, the U.S. Department of Agriculture, and the Corps of Engineers and other Federal agencies and departments

Whereas water and soil are the most valuable natural resources of Ohio; and

Whereas the citizens, industries, farms, and cities of Ohio have always been subject to floods, but more recently they have experienced severe hardships and great financial losses from floods; and

Whereas the nature of rivers is such that storms occurring in headwater regions of a stream in one area frequently inflict damage to points in other areas, and the benefits of stream stabilization resulting in adequate and dependable water supplies in one area become beneficial to points in other areas; and

Whereas it has become evident that we must use every means available and feasible to conserve and control all of the sources of water supply for agriculaural, municipal, indusrial, and recreation use; and

Whereas watershed development has been increasingly emphasized as vital to all programs for the flood control and conservation of water and soil by the several agencies of government, and the program is lagging because of the insufficiency of Federal funds for planning purposes; and

Whereas the Federal Government through acts of Congress has delegated to two agencies, namely, the Corps of Engineers, and the Soil Conservation Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture the primary responsibility for flood control and conservation of water and soil: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the General Assembly of the State of Ohio, That we respectfully urge, request, and petition the Congress of the United States to take such action necessary to assure (1) continuance of surveys, planning and cooperation in the construction of projects in the State of Ohio that are vital and necessary to the prevention of floods and to the conservation of water and soil, and (2) that Federal funds for this purpose be appropriated in sufficient amounts to the Corps of Engineers and the Soil Conservation Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, and also other Federal agencies and departments, and that we adopt this resolution and cause a copy thereof to be spread upon the Journal; and be it further

Resolved, That the clerk of the senate transmit authenticated copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, each Member of Congress of the United States, and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget of the United States.

Disaster in Wheat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 18, 1959

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, it is time to trade in our model T farm program. Year after year the farm bloc trots out the same tired blueprints for agriculture. The only change is in price, not in model. Each year the program costs more money.

Our taxpayers are sick of spending billions of dollars on farm subsidies. The family-sized farmer is tired of following a redtape rainbow with no pot of gold at the end.

Nearly a million and a half farms produce wheat. Of that number, just half—the big business farms—receive 90 percent of all Federal supports. This morning's Wall Street Journal underscores President Eisenhower's warning of what will happen if the Congress does not act promptly. The editorial follows:

DISASTER IN WHEAT

President Eisenhower wasn't exaggerating last week when he warned of the impending disaster in wheat unless Congress does something about it promptly.

The wheat surplus is already two and one-half times annual domestic consumption. Despite production controls, the last wheat crop was the biggest in history. In another year the taxpayers' investment in just this one crop will reach $3.5 billion.

Just as there is no doubt about the facts of the situation, so there is no mystery about the cause. The cause is high Federal price supports, which encourage farmers to grow far more than the Nation can possibly use. And, thanks to advancing technology, they can do it even when the acreage permitted by the Government is sharply restricted.

In view of the unmistakable plainness of both the cause and the effect, the administration has advocated lowering price props enough to discourage the accumulation of such menacing surpluses in the future. It has been less concerned about further curtailments of acreage, realizing that is not the key to the problem.

But this is not the congressional farm bloc's idea of averting a wheat disaster. The House Agriculture Committee has approved a bill to boost price supports and cut acreage allotments; the result, as demonstrated by experience, would be to build still more mammoth surpluses. The Senate Agriculture Committee then acted along similar, if not quite so extreme, lines.

In other words, the farm bloc is flying in the face of the established facts. It is taking exactly the wrong approach. It seems to be seeking to speed the day the President cautioned about—when the whole price support program, of which wheat is only the worst current instance, will crash of its own weight.

Given the upside-down attitude of the farm bloc, maybe that's what has to happen before the Nation's agriculture can get a fresh start. As Agriculture Secretary Benson has said, The economics of the farm dilemma is simple—it is the politics of the problem that is baffling. What farmers want and need is less Government in the farming business."

Politics, of course, will be in the farming business as long as the Government is in it. But it is, indeed, a baffling kind of politics that is calculated to bring ruin to the very people the farm politicians pretend they are helping.

FBI Director Hoover's Statement Was Less Than Fair, According to Journal-Every Evening of Wilmington, Del.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 18, 1959

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, the able Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, J. Edgar Hoover, has just completed 35 years in that position, and last week was highly honored by several Members of the U.S. Senate who praised him highly.

However, like the rest of us, Mr. Hoover, being human, is apt to make mistakes.

The Journal-Every Evening, of Wilmington, Del., is convinced that Mr. Hoover overstated the case when he told the House Appropriations Committee the other day:

We can no longer afford to let tender age make plunder into a trifling prank, reduce mayhem to a mischievous act, or pass off murder as a boyish misdemeanor.

Commenting on this testimony by the FBI Director, the esteemed Journal-Every Evening declared editorially that—

Mr. Hoover is being less than fair, and less than accurate, in implying that society, as represented by juvenile courts, is treating any youthful crime as a jolly boyish prank. Without a single exception that we know of, juvenile courts emphasize to juvenile delinquents the seriousness of their crimes. * * *

We believed that the emphasis on youth rehabilitation work, which Mr. Hoover seems to disparage, is worth while. More should be done in that direction. * * * But there is simply no excuse for him, or anyone else, to get the idea that this means treating youthful crimes as boyish pranks—in implying without warrant that this is how they are now being treated by juvenile courts.

I include the editorial from the Journal-Every Evening, of Wilmington, Del., May 12, 1959, for the information of my colleagues.

HOOVER'S OVERSTATEMENT

Do you know of anybody who has been passing off murder as a boyish misdemeanor? We don't. But FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover told the House Appropriations Committee the other day:

"We can no longer afford to let tender age make plunder into a trifling prank, reduce mayhem to a mischievous act, or pass off murder as a boyish misdemeanor."

Mr. Hoover, who has just completed 35 years in the job of making the FBI into one of the most respected of Government bureaus, was arguing that youthful offenders should get the same treatment as adult offenders. And we agree with him—up to the point where he overstates his case.

A crime committed by a juvenile is just as serious as the same crime committed by an adult. It may even be more serious. And adults are less malleable. The adult criminal, even if he is a first offender, may be harder to turn from his antisocial ways.

So it is particularly important to show juvenile criminals that they can't get away with it: We agree with Mr. Hoover's views on that. If any youth is permitted to get the idea that he can get away with serious crimes because he is young, there is something wrong with the way he is being handled.

But Mr. Hoover is being less than fair, and less than accurate, in implying that society, as represented by juvenile courts, is treating any youthful crime as a jolly boyish prank. Without a single exception that we know of, juvenile courts emphasize to juvenile delinquents the seriousness of their crimes.

They also try to reform them. After careful study of their backgrounds, juvenile courts select youths they think might benefit by a second chance with the assistance of probation officers. Many youths are rehabilitated in this way. If that were not done, Mr. Hoover and other law enforcement bodies would have many more adult criminals to deal with.

We believed that the emphasis on youth rehabilitation work, which Mr. Hoover seems to disparage, is worthwhile. More should be done in that direction. It might be a good thing for society—reducing crime and saving tax money in the long run—if more were being done to rehabilitate adult offenders as well. But there is simply no excuse for him, or anyone else, to get the idea that this means treating youthful crimes as boyish pranks—in implying without warrant that this is how they are now being treated by juvenile courts.

Unfairness on Impact Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 18, 1959

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues an editorial which appeared in today's edition of the Washington Post and Times Herald entitled "Unfairness on Impact Aid." This excellent editorial I believe clearly demonstrates the inherent unfairness in the administration's determined efforts to substantially curtail and eventually abolish Federal aid to impacted areas, legislation ccmmonly known as Public Laws 815 and 874. Each year that I have been a Member of Congress, I have had to defend this program against repeated attacks by the administration.

While it is true that the program has a tremendous effect on surrounding suburban school districts it is relied upon heavily by approximately 4,000 school districts throughout the United States. Many of these school districts are responsible for the education of the children of our key defense personnel. Many of these essential defense installations by their vary nature are located in rural communities and one such installation is located in my congressional district, the Naval Propellant Plant. The military is faced today with tremendous morale problems dealing with housing and pay matters, and now the administration once again is attempting to shirk its educational responsibilities to these dependents in a shortsighted attempt to reduce Federal expenditures.

There is a clear Federal moral responsibility involved in the continuation of this legislation until a suitable formula is found to compensate local communities for tax-free Federal land holdings.

I shall continue to vigorously resist all attempts on the part of the administration to obtain a free ride at the expense of local communities.

The editorial follows:

UNFAIRNESS ON IMPACT AID

Welfare Secretary Flemming has presented a curiously mixed bag of recommendations to Congress on the Federal-impact school aid program. One of his proposals seems to make good sense, but another appears to have been hastily conceived in an effort to cut back impact aid to school districts in the Washington area.

There is particular unfairness in his plan to reduce Federal contributions from 50 to 25 percent of per pupil local school cost in instances in which parents employed by the Federal Government reside in school districts outside the communities in which they work. As Washington area school boards know, the impact of Federal activties is often worse upon school districts near Federal installations than it is upon the district in which the Federal facilities are actually located.

The Secretary's proposal to reduce school aid from 50 to 40 percent of per pupil costs in districts in which parents employed by the Federal Government reside as well as work appears, however, to be supported by more than a mere desire to curtail Federal expenditures. In 1950, a House committee which investigated the impact program estimated that half of local school costs are paid by commercial and industrial property taxes and half by taxes on property owned by individuals. Mr. Flemming notes that the latest Bureau of the Census figures show industrial and commercial assessments ranging from only 9 to 37 percent of total assessed valuations.

The Federal program ought to make up for losses in local tax revenues resulting from the tax-exempt status of Federal installations, but it is not the proper vehicle for a general Federal aid to education program—however great the need for such a program. At the same time there is no justification for the sorts of cutbacks that would penalize suburban communities in which much of the shortage of adequate school facilities is clearly the result of the rapid expansion of the Federal Government.

Israel's Aid to Others

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 18, 1959

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, just last week that citadel of democracy in the Middle East—Israel—celebrated its 11th anniversary of statehood. Many Members of this body extolled the virtues and accomplishments of that nation. We are all aware of the gallant efforts that Israel has made in behalf of her independence and of the self-denial practiced by the Israeli people for that purpose.

It is a great wonder then how a nation so small and with so many problems can

find the time and the means to assist other nations in the world community. Some of the economic aid and technical assistance, which Israel is extending to other freedom-loving nations of the world, is set forth in a fine editorial entitled "Israel Lending a Welcome Hand," which appeared in the May 17 edition of the Washington Post and Times Herald, and which was written by the noted political columnist and commentator, Roscoe Drummond. This article, worthy of everyone's interest, reads as follows:

ISRAEL LENDING A WELCOME HAND

(By Roscoe Drummond)

Numerous Asian and African nations are today turning to a new-found ally and benefactor. This is a development of the greatest significance which is just beginning to gather momentum. It is a development which the free world can view with satisfaction.

The new Afro-Asian ally is Western in outlook, Middle Eastern in geography. It is democratic, anti-Communist and, since it is neither a large nor powerful country, it is basically a neutral source of assistance which gives its recipients no appearance of choosing up sides in the cold war.

I am referring to the young but mature state of Israel, which was reborn only 11 years ago and which is now embarking upon a wide-ranging, diverse program of economic aid and technical assistance where it is most needed.

A nation which has been greatly helped by its own friends, Israel is now helping others—to the advantage of everybody.

Israel's expanding investment assistance and technical aid ranges from Ghana to Burma. Its scope is illustrated by the fact that trainees from Afro-Asian countries and territories are now studying Israeli agricultural settlements and cooperative enterprises.

The best example of the burgeoning economic relationship between Israel and the Afro-Asian nations is what Israel and Ghana are doing together. To begin to finance an expanding two-way trade, Israel has provided Ghana with a $20 million credit over a 4-year period.

Israel is substantially financing—but taking only 40 percent of the stock—of Ghana's newly organized Black Star Shipping Line and is providing the technical training for Ghanian personnel to man its merchant marine. It is also helping Ghana develop its building industry by providing the necessary beginning capital and by training Ghanians in construction techniques.

In other fields of technical skills, Israel is providing training in agriculture, city planning, irrigation, water resources, and in consumer and producer cooperatives.

A group of Burmese farmers is now living and working on Israeli cooperative farms and it is not to be overlooked that a Burmese army contingent is learning how the Israelis defend their frontiers with citizen volunteers who simultaneously till the fields and guard the nation.

There is no spirit of pacifism is Israel and Israel is teaching none to its Asian and African friends. Israeli universities and institutes are taking exchange students from many countries, including some trainees from Thailand, India, and Japan.

Obviously, Israel is not doing all this out of sheer goodness of heart.

For Israel, it has large political as well as economic advantages. The biggest boon from this growing relationship of trust and good will is that it enables Israel to free itself from the physical and psychological isolation of Arab encirclement. Israel's expanding trade and her enlarged horizon of friends mean that she cannot be surrounded either politically or economically by a Nasser blockade.

Israel's new-found allies are also blunting Egypt's efforts to recruit Afro-Asian support in its own cold war against Israel. At the Accra conference of independent African states a year ago, Ghana almost single-handed turned back Egypt's effort to aline all Africa against Israel.

Egypt could get nothing but a harmless resolution calling for a just settlement of Arab-Israeli disputes.

Because Israel is a small, pioneer spirited new country, deficient in many physical resources and rich in nearly all human resources, it is in an ideal position to help others. It seems to me that the friends of Israel in the United States might well look for ways to nourish and enlarge what Israel is doing so well in this field.

Nuclear Super Aircraft Carrier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 27, 1959

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I shall ask the House Appropriations Committee to reinstate the Navy Department's No. 1 priority—a super aircraft carrier—in the Defense Department's budget for the coming fiscal year.

Fifteen times since World War II, the United States and its allies have been faced with threats to our mutual security on foreign soil, and fifteen times our aircraft carriers were there, prepared to cope with the crisis. Aircraft carriers are, and will be, needed to meet not only world crises, but so-called local conflicts, for a long time to come. Their mightful presence had meaningful deterrent effect in such crises as Lebanon, Quemoy, Matsu, Korea, Jordan, Iraq, Suez, and so forth.

Larger superclass carriers are needed because the latest jet aircraft require minimum 750-foot runways. The only way they can be accommodated is by the building of larger carriers. In addition, American boys are entitled to as much operational safety as is humanly possible to provide. Smaller *Essex* class carriers have a higher aircraft operational accident rate.

Leadtime on the construction of new carriers is of the essence. It takes at least 4 years from the time money is appropriated to the time a carrier becomes an operational unit in the fleet. If the decision to appropriate funds for a needed carrier is put off 1 year, then a year's precious time is lost in our defense effort.

We are pouring millions upon millions of dollars into outer space research and development. Aircraft carriers concern a defense matter which is a lot closer and of more immediate need to us today.

Because of the increased fuel requirement for jet aircraft, larger carriers with greater fuel storage space are needed. Under today's naval tactics the carrier also carries fuel for its escort vessels. Increased size of our carriers will therefore increase the operational range of carrier task forces. Construction of a nuclear carrier is to be preferred to that of a conventional carrier. While a nuclear carrier will cost approximately $100 million more to construct, its cost can be amortized by lesser costs in other ships over a period of 5 to 6 years. In addition, a nuclear plant will permit less fuel space for the carrier's own operational needs, allowing for more aircraft and personnel.

An aircraft carrier can readily be converted into a mobile propulsion pad for missiles. They have a decided advantage over stationary missile sites. They are constantly on the move and thus better able to elude the enemy's lethal missiles.

As Adm. John T. Hayward stated in a recent telecast, not only are jet bombers here to stay, but in time they will be equipped with the latest missiles. Our mobile aircraft fleet will be needed to bring them within range of the vital targets within the enemy's home borders.

I believe that we must not only plan ahead but must make firm all facets of our lines of defense. Aircraft carriers today are in the forefront of that main line of defense. A delay of a year or two means a delay of 5 or 6 years in obtaining a carrier prepared to defend us.

Combating Cancer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1959

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest threats to the health and happiness of the American people is the dread disease—cancer. Each year this scourge destroys the lives of many thousands of Americans without regard to age or station. Fortunately, the Congress has instituted an invaluable program of cancer research under the auspices of the National Institutes of Health. We should be doing more, however, to fight this deadly enemy.

The Sioux Falls, S. Dak., Argus-Leader of May 7, 1959, carries a letter from President W. W. Ludeman, of Southern State Teachers College in Springfield, S. Dak., that is a most moving appeal for more public support in the fight against cancer. I include President Ludeman's letter in the RECORD.

COMBATING CANCER

To the EDITOR OF THE ARGUS-LEADER:

During the last 3 years our family has lost two sisters to the ravages of cancer. One only needs to watch loved ones being slowly eaten away by this dread disease to realize the tragic inroads it makes on human life. And we still appear to be helpless to stem the tide. Some progress has been made but it is slow and uncertain. More funds should be made available to expedite this fight against cancer.

Larger amounts of money will find the cure because available funds in the right place do make a difference. Several billions

of dollars properly applied perfected the atom bomb in 1945. America sent a missile beyond the moon when enough money was made available.

It is my opinion that the Federal Government should step into this fight against cancer in a bigger way. We spend over $40 billion each year for national defense and it is a good feeling to know that we are secure. One billion dollars might win the battle to defeat cancer whereas it will take many years with donated funds as the main source of revenue.

W. W. LUDEMAN,
President, Southern State Teachers College.
SPRINGFIELD, S. DAK.

Mockery of Civil Service Tenure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 12, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement which I made in the Post Office and Civil Service Committee on Monday, May 11, which was holding hearings on the so-called loyalty-security bill. This followed the testimony of Mr. Loyd Wright, of Los Angeles, Chairman of the President's Commission on Security and former president of the American Bar Association:

Thursday, Mr. Wright, you used most of your time to make an eloquent statement about the danger of communism. You spent practically no time on the merits of the bill before us. Of course we Members of Congress, like other Americans, don't want Communists and other subversives in Government employ. I think you could have assumed that attitude on our part.

What you, as well as the witnesses who preceded you, did not demonstrate was the need for this legislation. Of course, it is not the bill you had in mind when you came before us 2 years ago. This bill was an emergency measure to tide us over until your more comprehensive bill was introduced. I wonder what happened to your bill. I know what happened to the Walter bill. It passed the House but died in the Senate. I have heard of no dire consequences. Perhaps you have.

Let's discuss need. We don't need this legislation to keep Communists out of Government service. We already have laws on the books to do that. I refer you to the Hatch Act and the Internal Security Act of 1950.

We don't need it to keep subversives out because we have laws against espionage and sabotage.

I can't see then that we need to correct the Cole decision. If you add almost 2 million employees on the theory that each must be investigated and watched, you not only put an imposisble burden on our FBI, but you are making a ridiculous and slanderous attack on good Americans.

You are also opening the way to abuses which would very soon make a mockery of the tenure assurances in the civil service system. Let's look at the bill and consider how it would work.

I am an agency chief. You are an employee with tenure under civil service. If I want you fired, for any reason, good or bad, founded in fact or not, I can do it. I don't have to have any particular grounds for calling you a security risk. I, your accuser, set up your so-called hearing and so-called appeal. You can't call witnesses, much less identify, or face, or cross-examine the witnesses against you.

As for the appeal to the Civil Service Commission, you are a lawyer, Mr. Wright. Members of the Commission are not. Furthermore, the only record they have is one prepared by the agency head, who is at the same time the accuser, judge, and jury.

This shocks me. I hope it shocks you. It shocks the League of Women Voters and many other Americans. We think that designating a person as a security or loyalty risk is a very serious matter. We think it should be done by due process of law. You know what that means. You know that the procedures set up in this bill are a travesty of due process.

We do have due process of law in our courts. I say let the courts dispose of persons, Government employees or not, who conspire or act against our Nation.

The Civil Service Commission 2 years ago took no position on this bill. I hope it will speak up strongly against it.

The Association of the Bar of the city of New York opposes this kind of legislation.

You were concerned about fairness and uniformity when you testified 2 years ago and recommended a Central Review Board (p. 47, 1957 hearings). Yet you are here endorsing this legislation which has no such Board.

[From Labor, Washington, D.C., May 9, 1959]
MUST WE SACRIFICE LIBERTY FOR SECURITY

"The scars of McCarthyism are still with us," said the conservative Denver Post recently in a significant editorial that deserves wider circulation.

"Today most of us consider that we have recovered fairly well from that period of pointless suspicion, fear, character assassination, and ruined careers," the Post continues. "Therefore, it is interesting to ask how many of the following practices are still going on:

"Punishment for the advocacy of ideas, unconnected with any immediate action.

"Loyalty checks in which unverified accusations are used against persons who then have no opportunity to confront their accusers.

"Investigations of universities, foundations, and churches, by congressional committees, even though there is no direct connection to proposed legislation."

All those practices are still going on, the editorial says. "The truth of the matter is that the assault on civil liberties began before McCarthy ever made any headlines, and still persists today."

The editorial then adds:

"An even more widespread evil than the malpractices listed above is the general disrepute into which controversy of any kind has fallen. Deep probing of the institutions and customs by which we live is considered at best impolite and at worst the sign of someone who is 'politically unreliable.'

"At the root of this attitude is the idea that, in the face of Communist aggression, liberty must be sacrificed for the sake of security." That idea, the editorial says, "is the most mischievous political patent medicine ever swallowed by the American people."

Labor which opposed McCarthyism when that destructive doctrine was at its height, feels like the Denver Post that the battle to preserve the liberities guaranteed by the Constitution is not yet won. The American people must be constantly on guard to protect both liberty and security.

Remember the Hospitalized Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 14, 1959

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, a most excellent reminder of the debt we owe the hospitalized war veterans appeared in the May 10 issue of the Long Beach Independent-Press-Telegram. It was written by columnist Ted Krec who has a keen ability to mold the printed word into effective darts to prick our sometimes leathery consciences. Mr. Krec's column follows:

SOMETHING FOR THE BOYS: OL' TED'S APPALLED BY SPECIAL DAYS

(By Ted Krec)

Well, friends, we finally got back on the job after a prolonged stay in the East, and it's good to see Long Beach again, believe me. I've had enough rain and chilly days to last me for a while.

But now to the business at hand. A glance at my calendar tells me that today is Mother's Day, a day set aside to pick up a bunch of flowers and/or a delicious double-dip ice cream cone and go visit your mother.

You may infer from the above that I am not a whole-hearted endorser of Mother's Day, and you'd be right. Not that I think it's a bad idea for thoughtless persons to be reminded of this occasion, but I belong to the school of thought that says if a person is worthy of honor one day a year, he is worthy of honor every day of the year. We shouldn't have to rely solely on commercial reminders for us to be good to our mothers and thoughtful of them on one Sunday a year—we should maintain this attitude all the time.

But by far the worst of all this special day jazz is the relationship we have with our service people, particularly the hospitalized veterans. This really burns me up.

My father talks about this. He was in the Navy back before World War I, and he often remarks about how, in those days of the peacetime Navy, he and his buddies were discriminated against because they were sailors. A lot of people treated them pretty lousy.

And from my own observation, I know this is true. During the days before World War II, no one had much to say about servicemen. Much good, that is.

Then came the war, and these young men were the bulwark between the folks back home and the enemy. Suddenly they were knights in shining armor and suddenly it became very desirable for our young men to don these often-slighted uniforms and go out to do their bit.

And what happened when it was all over? I can tell you—we held a lot of fancy parades and receptions in towns and cities all over the country; the boys marched in, greeted their loved ones and took off their uniforms to adopt civilian pursuits once more.

Immediately they were relegated to Never Never Land. This wasn't so bad for the guys who could get jobs and make decent lives for themselves. But how about the host of others? How about all the guys who are sitting (or lying) around veterans' hospitals all over the Nation—maimed, blind and ill? Funny, I never hear too much of a fuss being made over these fellows nowadays. You never see them much anymore either, and you won't; because most of them will never leave the hospitals.

I should amend this statement, because onec a year we hold Veterans Day (there's

another one) to honor "all our heroes." John Q. Public takes his wife and children and goes down to Ocean Boulevard to watch a parade and choke back a sob as the colors go by.

But how many times a year does John Q. reach into his pocket for a donation to help the boys in hospitals, the same boys who put up quite a scrap so that John Q. could walk down and see that parade with his family? And even more important, how many times does John Q. go out to the veterans' hospital and spend a few hours of his busy schedule taking the boys some books or other treats, and maybe just a little conversation?

It makes all these special days seem a little shallow, doesn't it? Especially when you stop to consider that these boys in the hospitals didn't give us just 1 day—they gave us the rest of their lives.

Gold and Our Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 18, 1959

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, we hear a great deal these days about this country pricing itself out of world markets and the resulting movement of domestic capital overseas, in search of lower costs of production.

Direct private foreign investments from this country have already passed the level of $25 billion, but the outflow is increasing.

Not only that, but our total dollar balance in foreign transactions, including imports, exports, tourist expenditures and foreign investments, in 1958 left us with a deficit of $3.4 billion. Of this deficit $2.3 billion was covered by an actual outflow of gold.

What we face in this country today is a shrinkage of exports, an increase in imports and a foreign industrial buildup that will assualt us both internally and externally with lower costs. These forces of low cost, arising from low foreign wages supported by a fast-growing mechanization, will beseige our economy from the surrounding lowlands and will easily outgun us with the ammunition supplied them from our arsenal.

We will experience the severest pressure to desert to these beseiging forces one by one but as we go over and join them we only aggravate the problem by adding to their strength.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that our competitive situation in relation to the rest of the world confronts us with a problem of the utmost seriousness. It is so serious that the whole subject of our trade agreements program should be reopened. We cannot afford to wait out the remaining 3 years that the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1958 still has to run.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I offer the following communication from Mr. O. R. Strackbein to the New York Times on the subject of our international competitive position. I think that the reference to our shipment of $30 billion in machinery and equipment to other countries in the past 10 years should go far to clear up what to many economists has seemed to be a mystery, namely, the ability of low-wage paying countries to convert their low-wage levels into sharp and deadly competitive weapons. The communication follows:

[From the New York Times, May 13, 1959]

GOLD AND OUR ECONOMY—PRESENT SITUATION HELD RESULT OF YEARS OF CONTRADICTORY POLICIES

In your editorial "Gold and Trade Balance" on May 9 you mention the outflow of $2.3 billion in gold from this country in 1958 and the continuation of the outflow in 1959 after a reversal in the flow had been expected.

Altogether your explanation seems to me to dismiss too lightly the significance of this gold outflow. You point to our exports or the nonperilous facts provided by the trade figures and draw comfort from the idea that there is no reason to regard this as a new and permanent state of affairs.

Then you satisfy yourself by indicating that all we have to do is to pursue an anti-inflationary policy and keep our price structure on a competitive basis internationally.

You fall thus into the same error that has long blinded those who see in imports a magic that borders on the mystic. You cannot seem to understand that our growing competitive distress in the international field is not so much a matter of our pricing ourselves out of foreign markets through higher wages, farm price supports, etc., as it is a case of other countries' rising productivity in relation to their wage levels.

MACHINERY SHIPPED

Since the Marshall plan began we have sent overseas $30 billion of machinery, including commercial exports. What has happened to this machinery? No doubt most of it is producing, much of it producing for export.

In addition, foreign productivity teams, approaching the 10,000 figure, have come to this country to study our methods of assembly line production, scheduling, labor-saving devices, etc., Was all this traffic for nothing? Evidently not. We have succeeded very well, apparently.

Were it not for heavy subsidization of agricultural exports and foreign military and aid shipments we would be running a deficit in our merchandise account no less than in our total dollar account.

The notion that we are witnessing only a temporary derangement does not seem to fit. We are looking at the surfacing of the effects of 25 years of domestic economic policy, including farm price supports, social security, obligatory collective bargaining, high wages, all contradicted by a foreign economic policy that rides in the opposite direction, i.e., a laissez-faire policy. Today even our mass production industries, previously immune to import competition, are finding exports more difficult and imports rising. Scores of companies are looking overseas for manufacturing facilities. Why? The foreign scene looks more attractive, competitively, than the domestic. The reason? Lower costs.

EFFECT OF AUTOMATION

What, then, will happen if we continue to automate, trying to keep down costs, if other countries also automate, as they are doing? Then, operating on the theory that if we can't lick 'em we will join 'em, what happens if we fail to absorb the unemployment created by our automation and slackening domestic economic expansion?

What happens to labor that is bypassed in this country in favor of expansion in other countries? Exports will fall off. What, also, of the long list of domestic suppliers to the domestic industries that are now looking overseas? Will their employment expand if the outward trek gains momentum?

Perhaps the basic dislocation is more serious than your editorial indicated.

O. R. STRACKBEIN,
Chairman, The Nationwide Committee on Import-Export Policy.

Pan Am Plan Must Be Backed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 18, 1959

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, 3 weeks ago several of my colleagues joined with me in calling attention to the fact that Friendship Airport has now taken on the honest identity as an international aviation center. Much of Friendship's new identification can be traced to the institution of service a little more than a year ago by Pan American World Airways between Friendship and San Juan, Puerto Rico.

On the occasion of that anniversary my colleagues and I pointed out that the growth of Friendship as an important international air terminal could be even further enhanced if the Civil Aeronautics Board takes prompt action in granting Pan American a certificate to operate from the east coast to the Orient by way of Alaska, with new high-powered long-range jet equipment.

I am happy to report, Mr. Speaker, that the editorial page of the Baltimore News-Post of May 12 carried a most inspirational message concerning the problem that Pan American faces in its efforts to expand the services it provides for the greater Baltimore-Washington area.

This editorial follows:

[From the Baltimore News-Post, May 12, 1959]

PAN AM PLAN MUST BE BACKED

Pan American World Airways has proposed to make Baltimore a gateway point for its transatlantic and round-the-world flights.

It is difficult to think of a development which would be of greater benefit to Baltimore, our port, our other business and industry than this.

Baltimore would become an international air hub. Other flights would come in from all over the country to connect with these.

Pan American is to be thanked for its vote of confidence in this city and its citizens. But before we get too overjoyed, we must remember this is only a proposal.

It must be approved by the Civil Aeronautics Board, one of the most atrophied agencies in the Federal Government.

For instance, the CAB has been considering for more than 3 years the matter of discrimination against Baltimore by various airlines. Such speed is unworthy of a snail—and is unthinkable in the Pan American proposal.

It behooves the new city administration, as well as the Greater Baltimore Committee, the Association of Commerce, and other civic and business groups which have fought most of Friendship Airports' battles in the past, to

support PAA's application and urge CAB action.

It is to be hoped, also, the airport board will take a firm stand on this matter. Its support on past issues has varied from none at all to lukewarm.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1959

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of May 16, 1959:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congress BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

MAY 16, 1959.

The independent offices appropriation bill passed routinely with little controversy. The bill totaled $6,458 million, which is $387 million less than last year and $125.5 million under the budget, these reductions being significant of Congress expressing the current temper of the citizens to reduce spending. Money is provided for these governmental units—the office of the President, the CAB, Civil Service Commission, the FAA, FCC, FTC, GSA, Housing and Home Finance Agency, FPC, ICC, SEC, VA, and others.

The Veterans' Administration received the largest part, $5,040 million. Some veteran statistics used in debate are interesting. Forty percent of the population are veterans or members of their families, there being 23 million veterans, and 3,800,000 veterans receiving compensation or disability pensions, totaling $3,300 million (2,400,000 service-connected disability compensations, and 1,400,000 disability pensions). There are 25,000 VA employees, and 121,000 in hospitals. There are 172 hospitals, 123,800 beds and 17 domiciliary institutions. Inpatient care cost is $778 million and outpatient care is $83 million. Plainly, the size of these VA programs and costs demonstrate the need for Congress to scrutinize carefully non-service-connected disability costs.

King Baudouin of the Belgians addressed a joint session of the House and Senate. The King's upright bearing, dignity, and youthfulness gained the close attention of all. His concise and carefully enunciated message was most thought-provoking, including this on peace: "Perhaps never before has peace been so difficult to achieve as it is today. At other times, the possibility of war endangered our homelands and our home. Today war endangers our minds and our hearts. The older imperialism sought the conquest of lands; the new seeks the mastery of intellects. The peace for which we have to labor is not to preserve our possessions, but our very personalities." About youth, he said: "Youth is the first victim of war, the first fruit of peace. It takes 20 years of peace to make a man; it takes only 20 seconds of war to destroy him. * * * In a certain sense, America is the land of youth, because it dedicates more of its energies, talents, money, and science to the birth and preservation of life than any other country in the world * * * nor shall our confidence in you misplaced, for what is written on your coins, I have read in the hearts of American people: 'In God we trust.'"

The Rules Committee impasse on the housing bill, a 6 to 6 tie, has been broken. The multibillion bill desired by the House Democrat leadership has been voted out of Rules. The compromise was the agreement that a far more conservative bill, also Democrat, could be considered as a substitute bill (bypassing the administration bill as a substitute). This may gain the support of conservative Democrats, opposed to the big-spending Democrat bill, yet who are reluctant politically to support a Republican bill, even though a fiscally responsible one. Maybe the best condemnation of public housing and Federal money spent in the housing programs is found in Ecclesiasticus, chapter 21, verse 8: "He that buildest his house with other men's money is like one that gathereth himself stones for the tomb of his burial." The further question now occurs. Will the big spending bills be held in check or will the housing bill open the floodgates of spending, which last year exceeded the budget $13 billion. The Murray-Metcalf aid to education bill has now been voted out by the Education and Labor Committee, a bill costing $11,400 millions in the first 4 years for aid to school construction, even teachers' salaries. Then there awaits us the mutual security (foreign aid) bill and other appropriation bills.

H.R.3, just approved by the Judiciary Committee for House consideration, is most encouraging. The bill endeavors to preserve States rights, from Federal encroachment and was passed in the House last year but killed in the Senate by one vote. I doubt that the House membership will pass this bill even if the Senators, including the Texans, try to undo their damage of last year.

Attending the dedication of Garland's new post office awhile back reminded me rather forcibly of the really great strides made by our Post Office Department over the last few years. Next time the postman calls, you might well compliment him, for his organization handles well over a billion letters and parcels every week—more than all the rest of the world's post offices combined—and with really remarkable efficiency. With about the same number of employees (up to 1.3 percent) they're moving 20 percent more mail than they did in 1953. Brandnew facilities opening in Garland, Irving, Grand Prairie, and Trinty Heights, Casa View and Royal Lane areas of Dallas are part of a multibillion dollar mechanization program underway, the first really comprehensive overhaul of the system since Ben Franklin's day, further increasing the speed and efficiency of this vital service.

Company Coming—And Such Company

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 6, 1959

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, I sincerely trust that recent reports with regard to a possible weakening of our position on Berlin and a visit of Khrushchev to the United States are without substantial foundation. We must be reminded on every occasion of our experiences of the past in our dealings with the Kremlin regime. Let us not be stampeded into a compromise for the sake of a conference at the summit. Of what value can conferences with the Soviets be when we consider their record of broken agreements?

Every agreement made at the summits: Teheran, Yalta, Potsdam, and Geneva—1955—has been unilaterally broken by the Kremlin, except one which was made at Yalta to enter the war against Japan. Oh, yes. This one was kept, but only after we had for all intents and purposes defeated Japan.

I believe the majority of the American people feel that unless the Soviets agree—as provided at Geneva in 1955—upon the unification of Germany under a government set up in a free and fair election and the liberation of all occupied and enslaved states, and finally the release of all U.S. servicemen who remain imprisoned by Communists regimes and satellites, no further bargains or visits are justified.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the May 18, 1959, edition of the New York Daily News, which I commend to your attention:

COMPANY COMING—AND SUCH COMPANY

According to the Associated Press' John Scalli, the Eisenhower administration appears reconciled to a possible visit by Soviet Russian Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev to the United States this year, perhaps this summer.

Khrushchev could come here to open the Soviet exposition June 28 at the New York Coliseum, on the ground that Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON is going to open a similar American exhibit in Moscow in July.

Or the Geneva Foreign Ministers' conference now in progress may produce enough results to satisfy President Eisenhower that a summit conference is in order. San Francisco, Calif., is the city oftenest mentioned as the site for such a palaver of national leaders.

We condole with San Francisco or any other U.S. city chosen to be thus polluted by the presence of N. S. Khrushchev; and here is a rough idea of what manner of man this fellow is:

He was born in April 1894 at a Ukrainian village named Kalinovka. His father was a Russian coal miner. As a youngster, Khrushchev tended sheep and pigs and mined coal.

He was a World War I draft dodger, operated obscurely in the Russian Revolution in 1917, and joined the Communist Party in 1918.

Khrushchev studied the arts of intrigue, doublecross, and murder at one of the schools set up by V. I. Lenin for the training of Communists. He learned his lessons well.

HE CHOSE J. STALIN

After Lenin's death, Khrushchev figured that Josef Stalin would win out over Leon Trotsky in the struggle for control of the Communist machine. He snuggled up to Stalin, who duly won out, and just as duly rewarded Khrushchev with increasingly important political posts.

Khrushchev's most noteworthy pre-World War II achievement was the purge in the Ukraine of a lot of anti-Stalin Reds. This occurred in 1937-38, when Stalin was liquidating his enemies and fancied enemies by tens of thousands all over Russia.

Khrushchev, a native of the Ukraine, conducted that part of the purge. On one occasion, he lured a lot of his intended victims to a lavish banquet, then called in the secret police to take them into custody.

A PROFESSIONAL DOUBLECROSSER

This foreshadowed the historic doublecross in Budapest in 1956, when Hungarian rebel leaders Imre Nagy and Pal Maleter were promised Russian protection during truce negotiations. They were arrested as soon as they arrived to negotiate, and later were murdered by Khrushchev's bully boys.

Since the death of Stalin, Khrushchev has been acting completely in character.

He heaped curses on the memory of Stalin, the man who befriended and elevated him. By one devious maneuver after another, he removed possible rivals for the mastery of the Kremlin—Lavrenti Beria, V. M. Molotov, Marshal Georgi Zhukov, and others. Khrushchev doesn't often kill such persons—yet. He lets them die slowly of frustration, heartbreak, and fear.

U.S. PUBLIC ENEMY NO. 1

Like all Communists, Khrushchev is dedicated to the Red enslavement of the human race. The United States is his biggest target and the chief object of his hate.

Throughout his expected visit to this country, Khrushchev can be counted on to exhibit all the charm he has. Thereby, he will hope to kid the American people into thinking communism means them no harm—and he will most likely succeed in fooling the same big business and big labor leaders who were suckered by Anastas Mikoyan, Khrushchev's top sidekick, on his recent U.S. tour.

We doubt that many everyday Americans will be fooled, or will show this thug, this tyrant, this killer, any cordiality. He is their mortal enemy, and we think the great majority of them are well aware of that fact.

It is to be hoped that as many Americans as can do so will show Khrushchev in every way they can think of that they do not welcome him, do not like him, and do not fear him.

Wilderness Preservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 27, 1959

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, as one of the cosponsors of the wilderness preservation bill, I have been disturbed by some of the misinformation being circulated about it.

There is the allegation that there will be a loss of taxes. This is not true because the wilderness areas already are under the control and ownership of the Federal Government.

It has been alleged that the bill will violate the multiple use principle. Actually, it will follow that principle. To the current uses of the designated areas, it would add watershed protection, recreation, education, scenic, scientific, and historical uses.

It has been said that the bill would take administration of these lands out of the hands of the departments presently having control over them and turn it over to the National Wilderness Preservation Council. Actually, there will be no change in jurisdiction. The national forest areas will continue to be administered by the Forest Service, the national parks by the Park Service, the wildlife refuges by the Fish and Wildlife Service. The Council would serve mainly as a watchdog, survey, and coordinating group.

Much of this misinformation is effectively countered in the following excellent editorial by Herb Watts in the Havre, (Mont.) Daily News:

[From the Havre Daily News]

MEASURE WOULD PROTECT OUR PARKS AND FORESTS

Even in a day when we are encouraging commercial development of Montana we must take into consideration that among the greatest attractions in this great State of ours are its parks and forests.

If measures were not instituted to preserve for everybody's enjoyment the outdoors of forests, streams, lakes, and mountains it would only be a matter of time before recreation areas would be nonexistent. Therefore a proposed wilderness system somewhat along the lines of that advocated by the Citizens Committee on Natural Resources is worthy of consideration.

There is legislation pending in Congress to develop a program to protect that which is the heritage of every Montanan.

As in measures of this type there has developed opposition from livestock, timber and other commercial interests.

According to Dr. Ira N. Gabrielson, chairman of the Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, the attacks of opponents are false and misleading because the proposed program will not damage these interests and it will affect only a very small part of the Federal lands.

Dr. Gabrielson, an eminent conservationist, states that the wilderness bill has been carefully written to avoid damage to existing interests and to "fit into" the land-use program already established. He points out that existing grazing privileges in the national forest areas are continued by a provision of the bill.

Under the wilderness bill no areas open to lumbering are affected and mining on the national forest lands involved may be permitted if needed in the national interest. A special provision of the bill safeguards State water laws and two of the units in Montana to be given protection by the wilderness bill are already in the National Park System and not available for commercial use.

Nine units are all within national forests and have for a long time been set aside by the Forest Service for special protection. Seven of these units would be subject to further studies before they become permanent units of the wilderness system. Three areas are now protected by the Fish and Wildlife Service and one on Indian lands will be included in the wilderness system if the Indians so decide.

Fifteen areas in Montana are involved and their total acreage is 4,218,843 or only 4 percent of Montana's area.

The 15 areas in Montana included in the National Wilderness Preservation System are listed below:

1. Cabinet Mountains Primitive Area (national forest).
2. Glacier National Park.
3. Montana National Bison Range.
4. Mission Range Roadless Area (Indian).
5. Mission Mountain Primitive Area (national forest).
6. Bob Marshall Wilderness Area (national forest).
7. Fort Peck Game Range.
8. Gates of the Mountains Wild Area (national forest).
9. Selway-Bitterroot Primitive Area (national forest also in Idaho).
10. Anaconda Pintlar Primitive Area (national forest).
11. Spanish Peaks Primitive Area (national forest).
12. Red Rock Lakes Migratory Waterfowl Refuge.
13. Absoraka Primitive Area (national forest).
14. Beartooth Primitive Area (national forest).
15. Yellowstone National Park (also in Idaho and Wyoming).

The units which people residing in this part of Montana seem to be the most concerned with are Glacier National Park, Bob Marshall Wilderness Area and Fort Peck Game Range.

We have heard opponents of the wilderness bill say that the proposed system would tie up a large portion of Montana and hinder commercial development but they will have to get a better argument for us because out of Montana's 147,138 square miles, only 6,592 would be preserved as wilderness under this measure. More than 95 percent of our State is not affected by the bill at all.

Before it gets too late let us consider our recreational resources. Other States in their enthusiasm for commercial development didn't take into consideration the future recreation of their people and the result was that the fellow who doesn't have a backyard patio gets his elbow room by climbing to the roof of his home and he can't see the mountains for the forest of smoke stacks and television antennas.

Armed Forces Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1959

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday, May 16, the Nation observed Armed Services Day. Military installations throughout the country and overseas celebrated with open houses and displays of Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps equipment.

The meaning of Armed Forces Day has been related appropriately and quite clearly this year in an editorial entitled "Power For Peace" and written by Brig. Gen. Perry M. Hoisington II, commander of the 57th Air Division, Strategic Air Command, for the Westover Yankee Flyer, the weekly publication at Westover Air Force Base in Chicopee Falls, Mass.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I ask that this editorial by General Hoisington be printed in the RECORD:

ARMED FORCES DAY—"POWER FOR PEACE"

(By Brig. Gen. Perry M. Hoisington II)

Americans everywhere are beginning to realize that the Power for Peace represented by our Armed Forces flows directly from the support and understanding of the people themselves.

The cost of preserving freedom comes high but, after each of our major conflicts, Americans have looked to the future, hopeful that their country's tomorrows would chronicle nothing but progress under the glow of peace.

But history has a way of repeating itself and January, 1959, found the President of the United States opening his state of Union message to the 86th Congress with a rhetorical question:

"Can Government based upon liberty and the God-given rights of man permanently endure when ceaselessly challenged by a dictatorship, hostile to our mode of life, and controlling an economic and military power of great and growing strength?"

With the lessons of history in mind, President Eisenhower answered his own question

this way: "For us the answer has always been found, and is still found, in the devotion, the vision, the courage and the fortitude of our people."

The free world in 1959 has tensions greater than any in years past. While men of good will struggle to bridge the gulf between communism and democracy, the forces opposed are moving doggedly toward the only goal that matters in their concept of government—domination of all men and subjugation of the individual to the State.

The United States now finds itself at a crossroads of history. We have arrived at a position of world leadership in an era of remarkable productivity. It is also a time when man's power of mass destruction has reached fearful proportions.

Possession of such capabilities helps create world suspicion and tension. We at Westover know that we seek only a just peace for all, with aggressive designs against no one. Yet we realize that through arrogance, miscalculation or fear of attack, catastrophic war could result. In today's world keeping peace more than ever calls for the utmost resolution, wisdom, steadiness and unremitting effort on the part of our people as well as our national leadership.

Armed Forces Day, has become an important date in the calendar of the Nation over the last 10 years. On this annual observance all our citizens come to see for themselves the military manpower and equipment which makes our Nation's Power for Peace. Here Armed Forces Day will be observed on May 16 with an open house, and aerial demonstartions. We will show how courage, energy and dedication of a few to their special military tasks in maintaining ideals and substance of freedom contribute to the assets of the free world as it faces one of the gravest challenges in history.

The success of the program and the impressions left with the civilian visitors to Westover this Armed Forces Day will be as effective as the efforts put forth by each individual who is called upon to aid in this project. Let's all put together in showing our neighbors that Westover is an intregal part of the deterrent force which maintains the security of our great Nation.

What Answer to the Challenge of International Poverty?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEWART L. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 4, 1959

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, it becomes clearer every day that this year Congress must make some basic decisions about our economic assistance programs for the underdeveloped areas of the world: at the moment, for example, there is wide discussion in Washington of various proposals that would help underwrite India's crucial third 5-year plan and assure its success.

Mr. Eugene R. Black, President of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, recently made a most encouraging and challenging report on the success of his organization in trying to cope with international poverty. Mr. Black calls this challenge the most difficult we face over the long run. I believe his thought-provoking recent address to the Economic Club of Detroit is worthy of careful scrutiny by our colleagues. This address follows:

WHAT ANSWER TO THE CHALLENGE OF INTERNATIONAL POVERTY?

Today I want to talk for a few minutes about three recent events in the affairs of the World Bank which I hope will suggest to you that there is more order in this turbulent world than appears on the surface.

The World Bank lends money mainly for very expensive things like powerplants and railroads, road systems, and port facilities. We get our money almost exclusively now from private investors in the free world who either buy our bonds or participate in our lending operations in one way or another. Most of our borrowers are governments who are new to the business of governing and are trying to govern in an orderly fashion populations which are becoming increasingly aroused against a life of poverty. This may seem an improbable set of conditions under which to do much business in these chaotic times.

Yet we are getting so large a volume of promising proposals from our borrowers that we are asking our 68 member governments to double our authorized capital. Congress, as you probably know, has been considering this request and it is one of the events I want to refer to today. At the same time we have just announced our first public sale of bonds in Germany, the largest issue we have yet tried to market outside of the United States. This event I mention because it is the result of a new order in Europe's finances which has implications far beyond the operations of the Bank. Then recently the Bank sponsored meetings with the representatives of five nations to work out ways and means of helping India over a difficult hurdle in its second 5-year plan. Here again an instance of order in the world which provides hopeful implications for the future.

Let me consider each of these events briefly, starting with our bond issue in Germany.

For a long time now our bonds have been well received in the market here and in Switzerland. We have also raised money in Canada, Holland, and the United Kingdom. But we have always felt that we could sell a lot more bonds outside the United States, particularly in Europe, when the price was right. Now market conditions in Germany—and in other European countries—offer good prospects. To us this is a very encouraging turn of events.

These good prospects are not just the result of the World Bank's achievements; more important, they are the result of the success of free world policy, and particularly American policy, over the past 10 years or so. Financially speaking, our first object in the postwar decade was to restore the competitive position of the industrial nations of Western Europe and Japan after the ravages of World War II. From every point of view financial independence is preferable to being more or less poor relations of the United States, as was the case in some degree with all of these nations 10 years ago.

Over and over again during these years it was said that this objective would be deemed achieved when two things had happened: first, when the gold and dollar reserves of the Atlantic community had been so increased and redistributed that currency convertibility could be restored; and second, when conditions in the industrial countries and their dependencies were such as to attract a sizable annual flow of private American investment to help meet their capital requirements.

Financially speaking, these things are what the Marshall plan and its successor were designed to do. We can say today that to a large extent our objective has been won and that "phenomenal" is not too strong a word to express the success of the past 10 years. Last year the stamp of success was clearly marked on the record. In 1958 alone more than $3 billion net of U.S. private capital was invested abroad, a substantial part in the industrial nations of the Free World. In the same year more European governments came to the American capital market with bond issues and found buyers there than at any time since the war. This year Japan followed suit. And in 1958 it became possible for any trader who could earn sterling or guilders or deutschemarks or almost any West European currency with his merchandise to change those currencies into dollars at will.

It would be tragic, I think, if controversy over the recession here last year and its aftereffects eclipsed the fact that we have achieved our long-sought goal of restoring the financial strength of the Atlantic community. It would be particularly tragic if, in our preoccupation with short-term movements in our own economy, we adopted policies which had the effect of undoing what we have built up so painstakingly in the international economy. I ask, for example, those of you who are concerned over the fact that last year the United States shipped abroad some $3 billion in gold out of Fort Knox to think a moment before jumping to conclusions. The United States still has about a third of the free world's gold reserves. What was lost last year was more than matched by what was gained in private investment abroad. If we traded some liquidity, which we did not need, for the acquisition of real wealth abroad, isn't it really a pretty good trade, the kind of trade, we've been trying to make for 10 years now?

I do not say that all the business of the postwar decade has been completed. For one thing there are still restrictions on dollar imports into Western Europe—and, for that matter, restrictions against European imports into the United States. But these exceptions do not dent the degree of success achieved in the postwar decade. We can say now that financial relations among the industrial nations of the non-Communist world have become something like normal, if anything is normal in this changing world.

Our bond issue in Germany, and our hope of being able to follow suit in other European countries soon, are but symbols of the restored financial strength of the free world's industrial nations. At the same time we have had considerable evidence that these same nations are now willing and able to bring a measure of their restored strength to bear on the outstanding economic problem of the this day—the problem of poverty in the countries of the free world which have yet to achieve their industrial revolution.

More and more so-called underdeveloped countries are building up the organizations and adopting the administrative practices necessary to invest money in a way that promises to lead to higher living standards. One proof of this progress came last year when the Bank's volume of lending increased 75 percent over the average of the previous 3 years. We are now lending over $700 million equivalent a year.

In the face of this substantial increase we had to look to our own sources of capital. Since we raise virtually all our money in the private markets, we naturally looked to strengthening our links with those markets. Our major link, particularly with the American market, is the guarantee which stands behind our bonds in the form of that portion—80 percent—of our authorized capital which is subscribed by our member governments but which may only be called to meet the service of our own bonded debt. Our directors recommended doubling our authorized capital—increasing it from $10 billion equivalent to about $20 billion—but leaving all of the increase uncalled, and thereby more than doubling the amount of the guarantee behind our bonds. We believe that this action will help assure our

ability to raise the funds we will need for a good many years to come.

I am pleased to say that this proposal has had a very kind reception in Congress as well as in the British Parliament and elsewhere in Europe. Here is further evidence, I think, that the free world's industrial nations are ready and willing to divert a measure of their restored financial strength to helping overcome poverty where poverty is so much the root cause of disorder in the world.

The momentum of development in some of our member countries has carried them to the point where they cannot prudently borrow further funds abroad on conventional terms of interest and repayment. This is probably the most difficult fact of economic life facing the free world's industrialized nations today for it involves each one deciding how much it is in its national interest to give further financial help in the form of what is loosely called foreign aid. I do not intend to plunge into this complicated matter today, but I will cite one instance which suggests that there is growing order here, too.

The country concerned is India, which perhaps presents the greatest challenge of all. In India undernourishment and mass unemployment are living realities for more than 350 million people. At the same time India has taken economic development into the center of its life, with all the radical changes economic development inevitably entails. No one privileged to play even a small part in India's great adventure today can help but feel that the destiny of free institutions in the 20th century will be profoundly influenced by the extent of India's success in absorbing these changes without sacrificing respect for individual liberty.

India is the World Bank's biggest borrower; we have invested in India more than half a billion dollars, almost all to help finance projects in the current second 5-year plan. It was natural, then, that when signs of a foreign exchange crisis appeared in India last summer the Bank should take the lead in convening a meeting of interested nations to see what could be done. The plan had already been cut back to the core; the Indians faced a stark choice: either more foreign exchange had to be found somewhere or still further cutbacks, some which might involve abandoning projects already started, would have to be made.

Last August and again this March the Bank sat down with representatives of Canada, the United States, Britain, Germany, and Japan to see what could be done. We hoped that by bringing several nations together at one time we could obtain a broad measure of agreement on what India's needs were, and how they should be met in the light of the measures which India herself was prepared to take to bring matters under control. As it was, both meetings were successful; the foreign exchange will be forthcoming and the momentum of India's development effort will not have to be slowed further at this time because of a foreign exchange shortage. The response encourages me to think that a community of interest exists in the free world which could support more permanent collective arrangements for meeting these emergencies.

The financial strength of the free world has been restored. Partly because of the threat of communism, partly for other reasons, there is a growing realization that the most compelling challenge in the chapter of history now being written is how to help the poorer nations in our midst find an escape from poverty, an escape, not into the jaws of communism, but one in which there is a chance that free institutions will take root and grow. And there is a growing realization that this challenge applies equally to all free nations and commands a collective use of their resources and resourcefulness.

There are, in short, encouraging signs of order in the non-Communist world; signs of a growing response to what is clearly the most difficult challenge which we face over the long run. But if we are to build on these hopeful beginnings there is one fact which must always be reflected in any policies or arrangements we may adopt to serve our ends. That fact is that a good deal more than money is needed to overcome poverty.

From the point of view of a development banker the most difficult problem by far in giving effective help to these people is the problem of promoting the right economic and financial policies. Now I could give a hundred illustration of what I mean by "the right economic and financial policies"; they would range all the way from checks on inflationary pressures to laws and regulatory practices which allow public utilities to pay their own way and set aside out of revenues something toward their expansion. But you are as familiar with the prerequisites for economic devlopment as I am. The point is that if financial assistance is to be effective, both lender and borrower must agree on such policies, however they may be adapted to the peculiar circumstances of a given country. This is true whether the assistance is made from one nation to another or through regional or international organizations. It is true whether the assistance goes in the form of loans or grants or something in between.

The admittedly fine line between what is economic and what is political often makes us very shy about talking about sound economic and financial policies with the representatives of other nations. Certainly, those who would make a political manifesto out of these ideas are guilty of crossing that line. We should leave it to the Russians to say that there is a hard and fast set of rules which a poor society must follow if it is to escape poverty today. We should leave it to the Russians to say to the leaders of these countries that they must be willing to ride roughshod over the entrenched habits and cutoms of their people and impose wholly new institutions on them with all the repressive paraphernalia of totalitarianism in the name of economic growth.

We should avoid slogans and make it crystal clear that our values tolerate great diversity in economic matters as well as political forms. But this does not mean that we have to fall into the hopeless position that virtually any policy goes when it comes to economic development. If a society is to grow richer in this day and age, there are economic and financial facts of life which must be respected whatever the social and political framework. To the extent that it is in our interest to help, we must insist on a respect for these facts of life. Otherwise, our desire to help will very probably be dissipated in frustration, if not actually turned to harm.

I am sure there would be less confusion and debate here and abroad over the American Government's efforts to promote economic growth abroad if as much emphasis was placed on the quality of help offered as on the quantity. As it is the two words "foreign aid" have become so elastic that they now embrace a host of special objectives—military, political, and commercial, as well as economic—so that it is often not at all clear just what is being attempted in a given instance. And to the extent that the United States is trying to promote economic development with foreign-aid funds, money is all too often loaned or given away without first insisting on thrashing out the difficult but inescapable conditions for making that aid effective.

By failing to emphasize quality as much as quantity, the really important idea behind foreign aid is losing its appeal not just here at home, but abroad too. When, far from reflecting the financial and economic facts of life, loans and grants are used, as they have been, to aid, abet, and perpetuate policies in other countries which make economic growth virtually impossible, then we are asking for trouble. The result, as we have seen in more than one country recently, is a deterioration of the other nation's economy and a reaction, sometimes violent, against the very programs which were supposed to help.

These are serious weaknesses. It would be a great tragedy if foreign aid became discredited here and abroad because the economic objective got lost or because we weren't ingenious enough to create with other countries a community of interest around the kind of sound economic and financial policies necessary for economic growth. It would be a tragedy because there is no more constructive idea in our whole foreign policy than the idea behind foreign aid to relieve poverty in those nations of the non-Communist world which are experiencing both a reformation and an industrial revolution in the face of such heavy odds.

My whole experience in the World Bank confirms me in my belief that when the objective is clear, a community of interest can be created around the right policies. And it doesn't require what one commentator called "a band of saints with degrees in economics." We have loaned more than $4 billion for development projects in 49 different countries and territories. All of these loans have carried conditions of one sort or another, conditions designed as much to protect our borrowers as ourselves. They have been accepted partly because our borrowers know we have no political axe to grind, but mostly because our borrowers have agreed that the conditions are necessary for the effective use of our money. Every loan has posed special problems of adapting knowledge and experience to a special environment, but all have reflected, I think, the facts of economic life which must be faced if a society is to escape poverty in these times.

And let me emphasize we would have had to do these things—to ask these conditions—even if we had been giving the money away rather than lending it. The difference between effective assistance and a giveaway is not the difference between a loan and a grant; it is the difference between an insistence on sound financial and economic policies and no such insistence.

I have tried to suggest in these few remarks that all is not chaos in our world, that there is hopeful and constructive work being done which offers something to build on by way of increasing the margin of order. Of course, no one can guarantee that if we follow the courses I have suggested, we will actually succeed in fostering both economic growth and nations in which free institutions will take root and grow. There is no certain connection between economic growth and freedom so it is impossible to argue that success is assured.

But the existence outside of the Communist empire of the world's richest nations, which are also the world's freest nations, exhibiting a great variety of political forms and economic institutions, should be fact enough to give all but the very timid among us reason to have courage in our convictions. We should, in view of the free world's great strength, scoff at those pessimists, among whom the Communists are numbered, who say that today no poor society can get rich which does not first reduce its members to the status of ants in a bureaucratic anthill.

If we want, we can bring to bear a very powerful and persuasive influence on the historic tide of change which is sweeping the globe today. Just as we gave rise to that tide through spreading our ideas and ma-

terial achievements into every corner of the world, so we can hope to turn that tide to promote political and economic progress consistent with our concepts of the dignity of man.

We can, that is, if we become as hardheaded as we are already big-hearted. We will never be loved for the quantity of our riches, but we can earn respect for the manner in which we employ them.

Poison in Your Water—No. 77

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 18, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the Grand Rapids, Mich., Herald on June 28, 1958, entitled "Knowledge of Pollution Is Revealed."

KNOWLEDGE OF POLLUTION IS REVEALED—GRAND RAPIDS OFFICIALS AWARE RAW SEWAGE BEING DUMPED INTO RIVER

(By E. W. Murphy)

Raw sewage is being dumped into the Grand River at Comstock-Riverside Park in Grand Rapids with knowledge of Grand Rapids officials, the Herald learned Friday.

This pollution of the river has been going on for years despite an outlay of $5 million by Grand Rapids taxpayers for improved treatment of city sewage to keep the river clean, City Engineer Raymond Bruggink, Jr., admitted.

A 15-inch discharge pipe serves as an outlet for the Monroe NW trunk sewer when it becomes overloaded, Bruggink said.

The resulting pollution can be seen by anyone walking along the riverbank at the park.

Bruggink spoke of an inadequate sewage collection system in the north end, making it necessary, he said, to divert overflow sewage into the river.

"It is that or have basements flooded with sewage in that part of town," Bruggink explained.

Bruggink said he does not know whether the State water resources commission is aware of this situation.

Nothing could be done to correct it without a big outlay for sewer construction, Bruggink asserted.

The water resources commission in 1952 went to court to force Grand Rapids to build a secondary sewage disposal plant costing $5 million. This plant was placed in use last year but it is still under construction.

An incinerator building, last phase of the construction, is due for completion next fall.

Bruggink said he is going to call to the attention of the city commission the need for enlarging the sewage collection system.

A report, containing the first comprehensive survey of the city sewage system since the 1920's, will be ready for City Manager Donald M. Oakes and the commission soon, Bruggink stated. He has been working on the survey a year, Bruggink said.

Bruggink did not indicate what he will say in the forthcoming report but it is expected to amplify findings of Greater Grand Rapids Civic Study Committee which last year urged spending $5 million to recondition the existing sewage collection system.

Voters in the special election last June turned down a proposal for a $3 million bond issue for an immediate start on this program.

Some of the proceeds of a city sewage tax, in force since 1953, should also be used for the construction program, the committee advised.

The committee report, prepared by Willfred B. Williams, a civil engineer, said the Monroe NW trunk sewer is inadequate and there is need for relief sewer lines north and south of Knapp NE to serve new areas east of Plainfield NE.

A number of other sewer construction projects was also recommended by this group.

Williams said Friday trunk sewers in the north end must serve North Park and the Michigan Veterans' Facility as well as the large residential area there. These sewers were never designed for their present use, Williams declared.

City Manager Oakes could not be reached Friday night for comment on the river pollution.

Mayor Stanley J. Davis likewise could not be reached. He was in Mackinaw City for the Mackinac Bridge dedication.

President and Mrs. Leonard M. Elstad, of Gallaudet College, Cited by Alpha Sigma Pi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER THORNBERRY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 6, 1959

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, President Leonard M. Elstad, of Gallaudet College, the only senior college for the deaf in the world, was recently named by the college's Alpha Sigma Pi Fraternity as its 10th annual Man of the Year. Dr. Elstad has rendered an outstanding record in his 36 years of distinguished service to the deaf.

The fraternity at the same time also named his wife, Mrs. Elstad, as Mother of the Year for the great personal interest she has taken in each student at Gallaudet.

Because I know that the Members of Congress take an unusual and keen interest in Gallaudet College, I ask consent that the description of the awards made to these two wonderful and unselfish people be placed in the RECORD.

It is as follows:

President and Mrs. Leonard M. Elstad, of Gallaudet College, have been named Man of the Year and Mother of the Year, respectively, by the college's Alpha Sigma Pi Fraternity.

The fraternity presented its 10th annual Man of the Year plaque to President Elstad this morning at the college's awards day ceremony held in Chapel Hall on the campus at Seventh Street and Florida Avenue NE. (May 13). Dr. Elstad was accorded this honor in recognition of his 36 years of distinguished service to the deaf, especially in higher education. The plaque is awarded on an international basis to a person who has made the most worthwhile contribution to the welfare of the deaf.

A devoted wife and mother, Mrs. Elstad was named Mother of the Year for her unusually friendly attitude toward and great interest in each student on the Gallaudet campus and for her fine qualities as hostess of the college. The fraternity presented her with a bouquet of red roses on Mother's Day, May 10.

Dr. Elstad is well known in the United States and abroad, as speaker, writer, educator, and administrator. Appointed to his present position in 1945, he began a vigorous campaign for a greater Gallaudet, and on May 1, 1957, the college, for the first time, achieved accreditation.

A member of a number of professional organizations relating to the deaf, he attended the International Congress on Modern Educational Treatment of Deafness, held at the University of Manchester, England, July 15–23, 1958. He served as chairman of the session on "Educational Treatment of Deafness in Different Cultural Backgrounds." He was also a member of the International Congress for the Education of the Deaf held in Groningen, the Netherlands, June 1950, and was one of only three in attendance from the United States.

Both Dr. and Mrs. Elstad are actively interested in civic, social, and religious affairs of the metropolitan area. They have two daughters: Mrs. Elizabeth Elstad Hegstrom, a lawyer in New York City; and Margaret Jean Elstad, a junior high school teacher in Freeport, Long Island, N.Y.

Support for Gettysburg

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 11, 1959

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, once more I would call attention to the support which has been consistently coming from newspapers in "the second battle of Gettsburg." I have not seen, nor have I been told of, one single public voice that has been against the acquisition of lands needed to prevent further commercialization of Gettysburg Battlefield. From Baltimore to Bellingham there has been only praise and a call for action for the idea of preserving one of our most hallowed historical shrines in its original State. As further evidence, I submit the following editorial from the Reading, Pa., Times of May 6, 1959:

THE BATTLEFIELD AT GETTYSBURG NEEDS SAVING FROM TINHORNS

We haven't been in Gettysburg for a number of years, so we must take the word for it of somebody who has. He is Representative JAMES QUIGLEY, of the 19th Pennsylvania Congressional District, of which the town of Gettysburg and the historic battlefield are a part.

We have heard from Representative QUIGLEY that all is not as well as it should be on the environs of the famous battleground, the turning point of the Civil War. He said the influx of tourists, which becomes greater every year, has caused all sorts of eyesores to grow up on the perimeter of Bloody Angle, Little Round Top, Devil's Den, and the High Water Mark. These, he assures us, consist of standing selling cheap souvenirs, salons, ice cream and hot dog stands, all brilliantly lighted with blazing neon signs. He wants something done about it and suggests that the Federal Government buy most of the areas that are thus infested and, owning the

land, oust the offenders against taste and history.

Representative QUIGLEY made his request to President Eisenhower who, as a part-time resident of Gettysburg and an Adams county gentleman farmer, must have given an attentive ear to the representative's ideas.

We hope the President acts upon the Quigley plan. For the most important battlefield on American soil to become fringed, as it has, with honky-tonk establishments, for visitors to that great shrine to go away with as many memories of hot dog and beer stands as they have of Cemetery Ridge and Seminary Ridge, of the brave men who fell there, of the place Mr. Lincoln stood to deliver his memorable address is a horrible idea.

Let the Government buy the land, a lot of it, without delay.

Congratulatory Messages to Brooklyn School on 100th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 29, 1959

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, on March 16 of this year I inserted in the RECORD the text of a congratulatory letter to the Heffley & Browne Secretarial School, of Brooklyn, which is celebrating the 100th anniversary of its existence. Many letters and messages of congratulations have since reached the school, which is the oldest of its kind in the East.

Among those who sent such messages are Mayor Robert F. Wagner, of New York City; John Cashmore, borough president of Brooklyn; Edward S. Silver, district attorney of Kings County; John J. Theobald, superintendent of schools of New York City; Rt. Rev. Henry M. Hald, superintendent of Catholic schools in the diocese of Brooklyn; Justice M. Henry Martuscello, of the supreme court of New York State; and Justice Fred G. Moritt, of the municipal court of New York. Their messages are as follows:

CITY OF NEW YORK,
OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,
New York, N.Y., March 16, 1959.

Mr. GEORGE A. KLAUM,
Principal, Heffley & Browne Secretarial School, Brooklyn, N.Y.

DEAR MR. KLAUM: New Yorkers join with me in saluting the Heffley & Browne Secretarial School on its 100th anniversary. This institute has pioneered in commercial education and rightly ranks among the outstanding business schools in the East. Among its distinguished alumni are men and women who have made great contributions to government, industry, and the professions.

As mayor, I express the appreciation of New Yorkers of the invaluable work achieved by the Heffley & Browne School whose activities are in reality adjuncts to the educational facilities in our city and which are the best in the way of educational activities in the commercial field.

May I extend the felicitations of the people of this city to the faculty, the students, and the members of this distinguished Brooklyn institute.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT F. WAGNER,
Mayor.

BROOKLYN, *N.Y., March 16, 1959.*

Mr. GEORGE A. KLAUM,
Principal, Heffley & Browne Secretarial School, Brooklyn, N.Y.

DEAR MR. KLAUM: The Heffley & Browne Secretarial School is as revered a landmark in our great Borough as is any one of the many historical monuments and structures which now serve to memoralize our forebears.

No resident of Brooklyn is without a knowledge of your institution, whether that knowledge be obtained through actual attendance, or through contact with one of your distinguished graduates.

Your pioneering in the field of commercial education has served to raise the professional standards of secretaries and business associates; and you are to be congratulated on the splendid work you have done along those lines.

Every field of our community activities has benefited from your many contributions in the educational field, and as the president of the Borough of Brooklyn, I am proud to felicitate you on attaining this milestone in your history.

Truly, you have served for a century with honor and distinction.

Cordially yours,

JOHN CASHMORE,
President of Borough of Brooklyn.

OFFICE OF THE
DISTRICT ATTORNEY OF KINGS COUNTY,
Brooklyn, N.Y., March 13, 1959.

Mr. GEORGE A. KLAUM,
Principal, Heffley & Browne Secretarial School, Brooklyn, N.Y.

DEAR MR. KLAUM: I am pleased to write you on the occasion of the centennial of the Heffley & Browne Secretarial School.

To be in business for a century with a good record is an achievement in itself. I know there must be many, many men and women in the professional and business world who feel a deep sense of gratitude for your instruction. In addition, as a Brooklynite, it is good to have your institution in this great borough.

I wish you and your colleagues every good fortune. Carry on with your good work. I won't be around at the end of your next centennial, but I am sure those who are will appreciate even more what you have done.

Very sincerely,

EDWARD S. SILVER,
District Attorney of Kings County.

BOARD OF EDUCATION
OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK,
Brooklyn, N.Y., March 30, 1959.

Mr. GEORGE A. KLAUM,
Principal, Heffley & Browne Secretarial School, Brooklyn, N.Y.

DEAR MR. KLAUM: My heartfelt congratulations on the excellent record the Heffley & Browne Secretarial School has made during the past 100 years. Your longevity alone is proof of the value of your services which, I suspect, continue to become more valuable in a society that continues to grow more and more industrialized.

It's a theory of mine that an executive is just about as good as his secretary permits him to be, and a truly good secretary will free the executive to the extent that he can make his most important decisions while fishing.

Seriously, I know how rightfully proud you must be on this significant anniversary. I know that all education has profited from your pioneering in the field of commercial education. Your more than 100,000 graduates, many of whom received their basic training in our public schools, have made a record which reflects only credit upon your institution.

May you continue to serve this large community successfully for another 100 years.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN J. THEOBALD,
Superintendent of Schools.

CATHOLIC SCHOOLS,
DIOCESE OF BROOKLYN,
Brooklyn, N.Y.

The catholic schools of the diocese of Brooklyn are happy to salute the Heffley & Browne Secretarial School on the completion of 100 years of notable achievement in the field of business education.

Many thousands have received their professional training in this, the oldest school of its kind in the State of New York, and they have filled prominent positions in the business world with distinction.

As the Heffley & Browne Secretarial School enters its second century of service, it has our best wishes for continuing success in training our youth for their role in the life of Greater New York—the world center of business.

Rt. Rev. HENRY M. HALD,
Superintendent.

SUPREME COURT OF THE
STATE OF NEW YORK,
Brooklyn, N.Y., March 11, 1959.

Mr. GEORGE A. KLAUM,
Principal, Heffley & Browne Secretarial School, Brooklyn, N.Y.

DEAR MR. KLAUM: It has come to my attention that Heffley & Browne Secretarial School is celebrating its 100th anniversary. I want to take this opportunity to congratulate the faculty, students, and alumni of your school which has serviced Brooklyn so long and so well.

Hoping you continue your good work for at least another hundred years, I am

Sincerely yours,

M. HENRY MARTUSCELLO.

MUNICIPAL COURT,
OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK,
Brooklyn, N.Y., April 2, 1959.

Mr. GEORGE A. KLAUM,
Principal, Heffley & Browne Secretarial School, Brooklyn, N.Y.

DEAR MR. KLAUM: I understand that this year marks the centennial of the Heffley & Browne Secretarial School, founded 100 years ago and is the oldest school of its kind in the East.

Ever since I could remember, the name "Heffley & Browne" has been an honored name in the great Borough of Brooklyn as an accredited secretarial school giving young men and women of our community the opportunity to emerge from the classroom into the business world.

May I extend my felicitations and best wishes for continued success to your student body, alumni and faculty.

Cordially yours,

FRED G. MORITT,
Justice.

Hellmit Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 27, 1959

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents, Mr. H. N. Morse, of 123 Pryce Street, Santa Cruz, recently sent me the following resolution with the request that it be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Though the resolution is amusing at first reading, I feel that a very important thought underlies its wordage. I commend it to my colleagues:

Whereas owing to the fact that every week in the year is designated as a special week

for promoting interest in some particular project; and

Whereas there exists a grave need for the citizens to have ample opportunity to rid themselves of anxieties and negation: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Congress be petitioned to designate a 53d week to be observed as Hellmit Week, said week to be constituted from the unused portions of other special weeks not being fully observed; and be it further

Resolved, That all citizens—and especially newsmen—Members of Congress, and all people in the service of our country be urged diligently to use said Hellmit Week to rid their minds of fears and frustrations, to permit their using the other 52 weeks of the year in constructive thought and action.

World Federation: A Must

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Miss Tracy D. Mygatt, which first appeared in Motive for October 1957, and which was reprinted by the Campaign for World Government, Inc., of which organization Miss Mygatt is New York secretary:

WORLD FEDERATION: A MUST

(By Tracy D. Mygatt)

To begin with a platitude, the desirability of a fine goal in life is something no one will gainsay. For the rudderless person is a pitiable, sometimes even a tragic, sight. How much more pitiable and tragic, then, is our torn, anarchic world of today. For still it stumbles on in the old illusions as to the dependability for peace of leagues, alliances, power blocs and arms, largely unaware of the political goal toward which Federalists believe statesmen and people should strive, democratic world federation.

"But why," promptly demands someone as concerned as I for lasting peace, "why is the United Nations not enough?"

Well, I can only beg you to bear with me as I try to persuade you that for all its countless lifesaving achievements, as notably in the field of its specialized agencies, WHO, FAO, and the rest, and in UNICEF, the United Nations is still, under its critically outdated Charter, only a league of sovereign states. Constantly, under the league system, there is the temptation in our recurrent crises, to embark on unilateral or joint military action. Only so recently as November, 1956, we saw such action on the part of Britain, France and Israel. And though shortly Britain and France yielded to the U.N. mandate, it was not before a terrified world had again glimpsed the specter of world war III.

Though the United Nations Emergency Force (UNEF) performed outstanding service in the Suez area, there was, of course, no world law behind it. And even as I write, a new crisis has developed. True, this may presently be resolved. Conceivably a reconstituted UNEF may again go to the rescue. But even if a so-called police force under the U.N. should be made permanent, as many federalists hope, it will be powerless to maintain, still less effect, lasting peace. For the Middle East (as too many other regions) is a tinderbox, beset by the very forces which ever threaten to tear the United Nations apart for good and all. And we should realize that no police force can be at once law, constable, and court.

Instead of setting sights on such a remedy, all nations, alerted at long last to the peril of annihilation, should demand universal, democratic, nonmilitary world law operative at least upon those areas in which wars explode. Granted such a mighty awareness on their part, this could be achieved by a U.N. review conference, with subsequent agreement by governments.

Late in 1955, such a conference was voted by the General Assembly and Security Council. But on June 3, 1957, the review conference was further postponed. To federalists this was nothing less than tragic. For the world cannot afford to let unbridled national sovereignty continue as foundation of the Charter. U.N. rethinking on this is desperately urgent.

For a league, however noble in purpose, is shifting sand upon which to build enduring peace. All too clearly we of today should be seeing in the ancient league pattern the hopelessness of attaining permanent peace. It is an old, futile structure.

Blood-soaked centuries warn us that voluntary compliance with league mandates has bitterly failed. To gain a warless earth, this must become a governed earth, equipped with the usual branches of government—legislative, executive, judicial. As already on lower levels of city, county, State, and Nation, we are blessed with appropriate law, so also on the top or international level, we must secure law. Our Founding Fathers' brilliant Federal system of a divided sovereignty must be extended to the world.

Now as never before, when men have split the atom, and East and West alike have added the horror of guided missiles and hydrogen bombs, our threatened world cries out for world federation as, under God, the supreme political goal for the rescue of mankind.

Indeed, had enough implementation among rank and file followed the fine utterance in the Methodist Discipline of 1951, it would not be necessary to urge world government among Methodists. They would already be in the forefront of the struggle. Now I would urge upon them the fact that the general conference at Minneapolis, in April 1955, voted that the United Nations "* * * must be given sufficient authority to enact, interpret, and enforce world law against aggression and war." Need I add a verbum sap?

Before briefly dealing with some of the main organs of the U.N. in which we advocate changes, I would stress three points of special urgency: Universality of membership, federalism of structure; and law enforcement upon the individual instead of punitive action against the member state. Happily the U.N. has recently made great progress upon the first point.

Specifically we hold that the General Assembly should be made a legislative body, its lawmaking powers strictly limited, as previously noted, to issues dealing with international relations. Also, since the "one nation, one vote" present method of representation would obviously be grossly unfair in the reconstituted Assembly, a different system of representation must be worked out at the review conference to secure just representation for all, one assuredly not forgetting urgent human claims of the upsurging peoples of Asia and Africa. Colonialism, with its glaring injustices and cruelties, must go.

Admittedly, representation is an intricate question. Various plans have been drafted, probably the best by that eminent jurist, Grenville Clark who, with Louis Sohn, has devised a scheme seemingly just to all concerned. Final decision, of course, will rest—as upon all proposals—with the review conference, and the necessary subsequent national ratifications.

Further, we must note that in the Assembly, as throughout the envisaged world government, the representatives would be, so far as possible, popularly elected, rather than as now in the U.N. appointees of the nation states. For federalists deeply cherish the concept of our Founding Fathers that sovereignty is vested in the people.

The Security Council, now incessantly blocked by veto, would become a world executive, charged with carrying out the laws of the Assembly. The International Court of Justice, always seriously restricted in its judicial competence, would become a world court with compulsory jurisdiction, and empowered to deal with individuals guilty of violating world law. Appellate and other lower courts would be formed. And the judicial decisions of all would be carried out by a genuine, civilian police force.

As for the immensely valuable work of the various councils and commissions, the specialized agencies and UNICEF, substantially they would continue as before, except for a greatly and happily enhanced field of duties, as presently indicated in my discussion of armament.

Perhaps those are correct who insist that at its inception, shortly before the atomic explosion on Hiroshima, the United Nations could not have achieved this encompassing stature, that neither the U.S. Senate nor the U.S.S.R. would have agreed to so vast a change. Yet for us who had seen the debacle of the League of Nations, it was bitterly disappointing that our petitions that the new organizations be not again a league, but a World Federal Union, were presented in vain. The men at the top failed to see the goal.

In any case—and always granting the swiftly growing problems posed by the Soviet Union and by the whole East-West deadlock—federalists deplore the lack of vision toward the objective of world federation. For if in 1945 and succeeding years, sights had been set on this goal deeply, even prayerfully, by the world's statesmen, our present situation could not have been half so desperate.

Indeed I am far from forgetting the long intransigence, infamies, and brutalities of Russia. Communism is every whit as detestable to me as to any other Christian who profoundly treasures the civil liberties Russia so flagrantly denies. Her numberless vetoes, which for years have blocked progress in the U.N. are so obnoxious that some would heartily oust her from the organization she has flouted, and refuse her entrance in the basically revised United Nations federalists envisage.

But the Soviet Union is in the world. Unless East and West are to go down in the mutual doom of nuclear war, dragging the world with them, it is imperative that we strive on, tarough far more insistent negotiation, compromise and persuasion. Disappointing as it is to those of us who yearn desperately for good concrete results, even the long-drawn-out U.N. Disarmament Conference itself is proof that such persistent, patient negotiation is possible.

Further, while such a conference is in session, may I plead guilty to some cynicism of my own toward those portions of church and laity themselves too cynical—or too absent-minded—to offer passionate prayers for its success. Indeed if prayers are answered according to our faith, it sometimes seems to me we deserve little of God. Is it "realism"—or plain sin—to doubt divine power to change Russia and the other totalitarian states?

At any rate, and as aid to such faith, we must note that first among the changes envisaged under the new order, is the universal abandonment of all national armament

above the level of domestic requirement. Thus no longer would the Soviet Union be a menace to us, nor we to her. The radioactive poisons, fast accruing in soil, water, food, and air, even from the testing of fission and fusion weapons, which now, according to mounting scientific testimony, are producing leukemia and bone cancer with prime target little children, and which menace the very genes of unborn generations, would no longer be launched against a helpless humanity. All honor to that glorious apostle of loving kindness, Albert Schweitzer, for his impassioned appeal to us all.

We should be quit of armament's intolerable financial burden, its ever-increasing inflationary danger, its deep troubling of the Christian conscience, its peril in tempting men to try again the futile and unchristian solution of war.

So at last, freed of the drain upon national treasuries for weapons of destruction, we could in earnest set about the huge-scale feeding of the hungry, healing of the sick. We could at long last rally to the needs of the now bitterly poverty-stricken two-thirds of mankind—surely our primary obligation as professed followers of Christ. Thus, and only thus, could a basically revised United Nations carry on to the full its dedicated work for humanity.

Again, as to the possibility, or even desire to win Russia, Communist China, and the other totalitarian states whether of Left or Right, please note that domestic, internal sovereignty would remain intact. And while I share the hope of many that Fascist and Communist states, as they reap the political and economic advantages of the new order, will in time modify, or even abjure, their repressive systems, it should be enough, initially, that they agree to obey the prescribed world law.

Perhaps to some this whole goal for which I plead, may appear sheer fantasy, the ultimate in rationalization. Believe me, I am as poignantly aware as any of the blackness of present skies. Yet time and again, in periods of great darkness, energy, and faith have been reborn. The mountain climber, faced with imminent death on the desolate icy peak, has rallied himself for escape through new, untapped sources of strength and courage. Shall we do less for a whole world faced with death? Shall we quail before the supreme political adventure of substituting world law for world anarchy?

Or, shall we not rather, putting sloth and cynicism from us, take to ourselves the fine saying of a Federalist friend of mine who when beset by the doubter, answers, "What should be done, can be done"?

Effects of Heptachlor or Dieldrin on Wildlife

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 27, 1959

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of my colleagues to the following report by Dr. Maurice F. Baker, leader of the Cooperative Wildlife Research Unit, Alabama Polytechnic Institute, Auburn, Ala., as presented at the 12th annual conference of the Southeastern Association of Game and Fish Commissioners, held October 19 to 22, 1958, at Louisville, Ky. The wildlife kills reported by Dr. Baker were caused by granular forms of heptachlor and dieldrin. The report follows:

OBSERVATIONS OF EFFECTS OF AN APPLICATION OF HEPTACHLOR OR DIELDRIN ON WILDLIFE [1]

(By Maurice F. Baker)

Shortly after the inception of the imported fire ant eradication program, some concern developed among wildlife officials as to the possible effect of the program upon wildlife. An outgrowth of this concern was a cooperative study wherein the U.S. Department of Agriculture Plant Pest Control Division, the Alabama Department of Agriculture and Industry, and the Alabama Polytechnic Institute would work together. The Alabama Department of Conservation, the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife (U.S.F. & W.S.) and the Wildlife Management Institute were brought into the study as partners in the Alabama Cooperative Research Unit at Alabama Polytechnic Institute. The primary purpose of the cooperative study was to determine the immediate and long-term effects upon bobwhite quail (Colinus virginianus, Linnaeus) of the fire ant eradication treatments in use in early 1958, but some observations were also made on other species.

The original plan was to treat 20,000 to 40,000 acres in one block in Wilcox County, Ala. This did not prove feasible, however, because landowners were reluctant to pay their one-third share of the cost of treatment, except on areas where the ant was a problem to them, and for other reasons. The study area finally agreed upon was located 4 miles northwest of Camden, Wilcox County, Ala. It included the lower Coastal Plain Substation of the A.P.I. Agricultural Experiment Station and two contiguous farms used as the test area, and a check area 2 mile away. A total of 4,700 acres in the area was divided as follows: 2,400 acres to be treated with heptachlor; 1,200 acres to be treated with dieldrin; 600 acres not to be treated and to be used as a check area; and 500 acres treated the year before by farmers and not a part of the experiment.

PROCEDURES

Description of study areas: About one-third of the treated area was Alabama River flood plain which was poorly drained. Approximately 90 percent of this bottomland was in good to excellent permanent pasture. The remainder was mostly in cultivation and temporary pasture. Bottomland soils were chiefly Ocklockonee Clay Loam and Leaf Clay Loam. The check area, which was river bottom, had similar soil, cover, and game conditions.

The upland part, approximately two-thirds of the treated area, was mostly in mixed pine-hardwood forest. Suitable ridge tops had been cleared and were in cultivation, pasture or in various states of old field succession. Upland soils were Guin Sandy Loam and Wickham Silt Loam, both with adequate to excellent surface drainage.

Game conditions on the areas were average for the vicinity. Bobwhite quail, cottontail rabbits, mourning doves, and wild turkeys were present in huntable numbers. Signs of predators and scavengers such as free-ranging dogs, foxes, raccoons, and opposums were common.

Application of the insecticide: Application of the poison was by air at the rate of 2 pounds of the technical material per acre. The granular formulation used resulted in a minimum amount of dust which, in effect, applied the poison to the ground—not to the vegetation. This rate of application and formulation was recommended in A.P.I. Extension Circular 516 (Revised) which also included the following precautions concerning chlordane, heptachlor, and dieldrin: "All of these insecticides are toxic to bees, birds, fish, game, and most other species of animals including man. However, these insecticides cause no serious damage when applied to relatively small areas, such as open fields and pastures. To protect yourself, follow the manufacturer's instructions."

Application of the poison began on March 17 and was completed by April 1, 1953. Rains and wind were frequent during this period, and prolonged the period of treatment considerably. In 4 out of the 5 times when applications were made no rain fell from 5 p.m. the day before application until 5 p.m. the day of application, but rain occurred within 3 days afterward in each case. Soil moisture conditions varied from waterlogged bottomland soils to well-drained upland soils.

Two planes were used—one for dieldrin and one for heptachlor. Treatment started at both ends of the contiguous areas and proceded toward their common boundary.

The original agreement between the cooperating agencies called for a blanket treatment of the 3,600 acres. Immediately prior to treatment, this agreement was modified to exclude open water of a beaver swamp.

Methods of study: It had been hoped that detailed studies could be made on several species covering a wide variety of ecological type. Limitations of funds and personnel reduced the scope of the detailed study to that of the bobwhite quail and an ecological study of a beaver swamp. The study of the immediate effects of the treatment on quail included pre- and post-treatment census on the treated and check areas, search for dead, chemical analysis of dead recovered, and day by day observation of a declining covey.

Although no detailed studies of other wildlife were planned, observations incidental to the quail work shed some light on the broad effects of the insecticidal treatment. Some treated areas of favorable habitat were searched for dead specimens of all kinds before the entire area was treated. Later, in the post-treatment quail census, additional specimens were found. It was not possible to search systematically the entire area and generally, efforts were concentrated in the better habitat types. A sample of each species was saved for chemical analysis unless decomposition had progressed too far. Others were simply tagged to avoid duplication, and left for further observation. The process of application of the poison was observed carefully. Catch pans were used to sample the rate and uniformity of fall for comparison with the planned treatment and careful attention was given to the treatment of the beaver swamp.

RESULTS

Application of the poison: A more detailed consideration is given elsewhere to the rate of application and distribution of the poison as indicated by our samples. Briefly, the samples were so variable that no conclusions could be drawn as to the overall application. The average sample was somewhat below the 2 pounds per acre rate for both insecticides.

Observation of the treatment of the beaver swamp revealed that the flow of granules ceased on each pass over the swamp, but that some poison fell in the water. Also, due to a shift in wind from one day to the next, a strip about 200 yards wide was missed—at least no poison was caught in pans placed in this strip.

Effects on quail: Thirteen coveys completely disappeared after treatment. Two surviving coveys were on the edge of the treated area and were found on the treated area only once in seven sightings. Coveys that disappeared included some ranging partly on untreated land.

Post-treatment census did not begin on any of the area until after the entire area was treated. Consequently, some of the area was not censused until 16 days after it was treated. The only evidence of the quail

Footnote at end of speech.

formerly present in these places was the remains of several dead.

In ranges poisoned near the end of the treatment, covey remnants were found and one of these was followed from day to day until all were gone and 5 of the original 10 birds were recovered dead. Analysis at Patuxent Research Refuge of these quail and others from both treated areas revealed amounts of poison in sufficient quantity to be the assumed cause of death in all but one specimen. These facts, combined with the excellent survival of quail and their presence as coveys after April 1 on the check area, indicated beyond reasonable doubt that the disappearance of quail on the treated area was due to the lethal effects of the poison. Contributing causes, if any, were insignificant.

Effects on other wildlife: Altogether, records were kept of 53 different kinds of vertebrates represented by over 187 specimens found dead on the treated areas prior to May 17, 1958 (see table I). The first 100 recovered specimens were analyzed at Patuxent and lethal amounts of poison were found in all but 6 specimens. The specimens found probably represented a fair sample of those more easily found dead. The small number of mammals found as compared to birds is probably due to their secretive habits. The two snakes represent all the reptiles found early in the investigation, but amphibians and fish represent hardly more than a minimum sample of each kind. The fish in temporary waters and small tributary streams appeared to have been completely eradicated, although some amphibians survived. No abnormal mortality was noted on the check area.

Of considerable interest is the relative nuber of different classes of vertebrates found in different broad habitat types. Table II presents such an analysis for the specimens sent to Patuxent. In general it seems that the dead were found in habitats most suitable for each kind. The high percentage of the total number of birds found dead in pastures and woods borders is related to the large amount of time spent searching in these two types. Other pertinent factors were the bright colored species, such as meadow larks and cardinals, found in these habitats and the open cover.

By listing the species found in each habitat it was found that only three species were found in more than one habitat type. This minor overlap indicated clearly that the distribution of the dead was correlated with habitat.

In summary, heptachlor or dieldrin applied by air at the rate of 2 pounds per acre, or less, appeared to result in a total kill of quail in 13 coveys that ranged all or most of the time on treated land. Two other coveys, ranging mostly off the treated land, survived. A wide range of other vertebrate animals was killed. Distribution of the observed kill was correlated with habitat and perhaps also with time spent searching in a given habitat.

TABLE I.—*Summary of dead found to May 17, 1958, on treated areas*

Mammals:	
Swamp rabbit	1
Cottontail	17
Red fox	5
House cat	1
Cotton rat	6
White-footed mouse	1
Unidentified mouse	5
Skunk	1
Subtotal	36
Birds:	
Lesser scaup	1
Broad-winged hawk	1

TABLE I.—*Summary of dead found to May 17, 1958, on treated areas*—Continued

Birds—Continued	
Red-shouldered hawk	1
Quail	21
Virginia rail	1
Wilson's snipe	3
Woodcock	1
Mourning dove	2
Barred owl	1
Red-headed woodpecker	1
Red-bellied woodpecker	1
Blue jay	1
Crow	1
Meadow lark	13
Red-winged blackbird	2
Hermit thrush	3
Brown thrasher	11
Mockingbird	2
Carolina wren	2
Kentucky warbler	1
Cardinal	13
Towhee	2
Savannah sparrow	7
Vesper sparrow	2
Junco	3
Chipping sparrow	2
Field sparrow	3
White-throated sparrow	3
Song sparrow	1
Unidentified sparrow	8
Subtotal	114

TABLE I.—*Summary of dead found to May 17, 1958, on treated areas*—Continued

Reptiles:	
Yellow-bellied water snake	1
De Kay's snake	1
Subtotal	2
Amphibians:	
Bullfrog	3
Leopard frog	6
Green frog	3
Green tree frog	1
Unidentified frog	8
Subtotal	21
Fish:	
Green sunfish	1
American eel	1
Unidentified fish	3
Bluegill	3
Green sunfish	1
Black bullhead	1
Stump knocker	1
Southeastern Creek chub	1
Sucker	1
Bowfin	1
Subtotal	14
Grand total	187

TABLE II.—*Number and percentage of animals found dead at Camden by land-use type, May 17, 1958*

Animal class	Pasture		Old field		Woods border		Cultivated field		Small waters		Swamp		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent total
Mammals	0	0	8	42.1	11	57.9	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	19
Birds	22	39.3	15	26.7	17	30.4	0	0	0	0	2	3.6	56	56
Reptiles	0	0	0	0	1	50.0	0	0	0	0	1	50.0	2	2
Amphibians	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	80.0	2	20.0	10	10
Fish	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	38.5	8	61.5	13	13
Total	22	22.0	23	23.0	29	29.0	0	0	13	13.0	13	13.0	100	100

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Blake, George H., W. G. Eden and K. L. Hays. 1958. Residual effectiveness of chlorinated hydrocarbons for control of imported fire ants. Journal of Economic Entomology. In press.

Eden, W. G. and F. S. Arant. 1950. Control of the imported fire ant in Alabama. Journal of Economic Entomology. 42(6): 976–979.

Green, H. B. and R. E. Hutchins. 1958. Economical method for control of imported fire ant in pastures and meadows. Mississippi State University Agricultural Experimental Station, information sheet 586. May 1958.

Harrington, Robert W. Jr., and William L. Bidlingmayer. 1958. Effects of dieldrin on fishes and invetebrates of a salt marsh. Journal Wildlife Management 22(1):76–82.

Rudd, R. L. and R. E. Genelly. 1956. Pesticides: their use and toxicity in relation to wildlife. California Department of Fish and Game. Game Bulletin No. 7. 209 pages.

[1] A contribution of the Alabama Cooperative Wildlife Research Unit, the Alabama Polytechnic Institute, the Alabama Department of Conservation, the Wildlife Management Institute, and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, cooperating.

It's Time We Look Into the Cost and Extravagance of the Capehart Housing Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 5, 1959

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, there is soon to be brought to the attention of this House for debate a housing bill for passage or rejection, the terms of which are in many respects extremely technical and involve the expenditure of great sums of money and the pledging of the credit of the United States of America in such proportions as to demand of all of us our closest scrutiny.

While I respect the knowledge and judgment of the great Committee on Banking and Currency which handled the bill just voted out of the Rules Committee, I am not in accord with certain of its provisions which involve expendi-

tures totally out of line with our ability to meet their cost.

We are all familiar with the fact that the administration proposal, tailored to fit the current budget, would involve an expenditure of $2,100 million over an exacted 4-year period.

The bill just voted out of the Rules Committee would substantially commit the American taxpayers to more than $5½ billion over a 3-year period.

On the other hand, there is a specific provision in this proposed legislation apt to be overlooked by all of us which I feel important enough to discuss at this time.

I direct my remarks to those phases of it which deal with an area that is in essence deceitful because it does not directly reflect itself as it honestly should upon our national debt nor the effect it will have upon the taxpayer's pocketbook.

It encourages extravagant waste and expenditures which certainly are hidden from view of the average citizen.

I refer to sections on military housing and to the general program in this vitally important area of housing. In doing so I am mindful that both the House Banking Committee and that Committee in the other body, and the Armed Services Committee have concerned themselves with this legislation and I know, in good conscience, worked their will upon it.

The program of which I complain is known as Capehart housing.

Technically, under this program the military determines what housing is required for the several establishments or bases across the Nation, and certifies the existence of a continuing need for this housing, designed under the control of the Department of Defense. The plans and specifications, when completed, are distributed to construction firms generally for bidding.

At this point, it is my belief that common sense is abandoned. Instead of treating the contract as a regular military construction contract, subterfuge is employed, whether by design or otherwise, the overwhelming effect of this scheme upon our national debt and the waste that follows the departure from usual military construction procedures.

At any rate, under the Capehart housing program the successful bidder at this stage forms a private corporation or corporations and is compelled to obtain from private sources the financing required to erect the housing certified as necessary for our national defense. The mortgage or security transaction is then entered into by the successful bidder and the ultimate lender, it being provided that the repayment of the loan shall be insured by the Commisisoner of the Federal Housing Administration, ignoring the United States of America as the real debtor in the transaction.

These mortgages are legally permitted to bear an apparent interest rate as high as 4½ percent, which under the discount practices prevailing in the mortgage market today actually in most instances becomes a real or true interest rate in excess of 5 percent. Utilizing these funds, secured by the successful bidder and loaned to the private corporation with the loan insured by the Federal Housing Administration, the construction of the project is undertaken and completed and the housing is made available for the military personnel situated at the installation.

Now let me point out at this stage that the repayment of these funds advanced for the construction of this military housing is unqualified and absolutely guaranteed by the U.S. Government; notwithstanding this and notwithstanding that there exists no way by which the ultimate repayment of these funds could be escaped by the U.S. Treasury, the obligation is never treated as a debt of the United States nor reflected in our national debt.

This I conceive to be, in essence, deceitful, yet the deceitfulness of this conduct, in my opinion, is not the greatest evil that attends a program of this character. That evil which I cannot accept without protest is this:

On an obligation unqualifiedly and absolutely the burden of the United States and its taxpayers, we find ourselves paying a fixed interest rate as great as 4½ percent which, as I have indicated, becomes as much as 5½ percent when consideration is given to the discount which must be suffered in order to sell the loan.

And I contend that these exorbitant charges need not be paid by this Government today to procure needed financing. If our credit status has become so impaired that I am wrong in this assertion, we are indeed embarked on a sea of financial ruin.

This, then, the specter of the United States paying as great as 5½ percent on a truly direct obligation, I submit, is the first evil of this process of obtaining military housing. Yet it is not, perhaps, the greatest extravagance that attends this method of procuring housing.

It has been suggested to me—and I think authoritatively—that those persons who bid for the privilege of building the housing under this program—faced with the risk of an ever-changing mortgage market and the demand that they supply their own funds for construction—are bidding at price levels so unreasonably high as to be ludicrous.

My attention has been drawn to a single project constructed under the Capehart program involving the creation of 1,000 units of military housing where the successful bidder informally stated that had the negotiations for and the award of the contract been handled as is the great bulk of our military construction through the Corps of Engineers and paid for by a direct military appropriation, his bid may well have been as much as $2,000 less per unit than was the bid accepted under the Capehart program.

Already 109,437 units of Capehart housing have been authorized. This includes 23,067 completed; 49,646 now under construction; 5,481 upon which bids have been accepted, and 8,929 currently being advertised for bids.

In addition, we find a provision for an additional 22,405 units in a bill pending in the other body that will bring the amassed figure to 131,842 units.

If this figure, and I assure you that it is accurate, is to be taken as the yardstick by which to measure the waste suggested to me as typical of all such projects, we are authorizing the continuance of a program and placing our stamp of approval on extravagant spending approaching a half billion dollars.

This is an extravagance we cannot afford. It is a waste we have no right to thrust upon the taxpayers of the United States, who through the appropriations for quarters allowance for military personnel, ultimately pay the bill.

Thus it would appear to be a financial manipulation shrouded with deceit, for certainly it conceals the true size of our national debt. The American people, and particularly those interested in the future financial stability of this Nation, are entitled to the facts in this regard.

It is suggested by many that Congress spends too much time investigating and not enough time legislating in the direction of its findings. Yet is it not true that before we approve a continuance of a program of this character, that we should be furnished with more precise, detailed, and carefully obtained evidence touching upon whether this is the only solution to the specific and positive needs for military housing.

I cannot accept as justification for this situation any statement that bidding is costing us little, because we are simply recouping the allowance granted military personnel for quarters and that we are using such allowances to pay these debts, when the sources of all of these funds, no matter how they be characterized, is the pocketbook of the taxpayer. I believe we owe those who are footing these bills, under great burden in most instances, a greater fidelity than could be found to exist in a circumstance where we blindly, by a "yes" vote, approve that which is, in my restricted ability to examine into the matter, an inconceivably wasteful program.

With this thought in mind, I urge that a comprehensive study be made of it with a view toward more conservative programing of housing required and the creation of that housing in an economically sound and honest manner.

We cannot guarantee the American people that great portions of this construction will not at some time in the future be a massive white elephant upon the hands of the taxpayers, but we can at least find a means, I am sure, by which the investment can be kept to an absolute minimum. Instead, under the FHA loan section of the bill we will be considering, there will be a provision to increase the loan limit up to $2,900 per unit and there further will be a proposal to increase the maturity limit of the loans from 25 to 30 years.

It is not at all unreasonable to assume that these increases will be reflected in greater burdens upon the Federal Government and will substantially increase the extravagance within the program itself.

If, after a study of the present program and the means by which it might be treated as a regular military construction contract, Congress in all its wisdom, decides that this system cannot

be improved to eliminate the excessive cost factors I have pointed out here, then we should at least appraise the American people of the mortgage obligation of the Federal Government in this program and let it be known that this obligation is as much a part of our national debt as any other single dollar in it.

It is only fair and proper that we do this.

Committee Is Alert Watchdog

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 18, 1959

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, my good friend and able colleague from New Orleans continues to distinguish himself in the Congress as chairman of the Armed Services Subcommittee on Special Investigations.

During these days when the entire country is so economy conscious in the operation of our Government it is heartening to note the disclosures of this subcommittee which have resulted in the savings of millions of dollars to our taxpayers.

We here in the Congress are well aware of the outstanding service Mr. HÉBERT is rendering, and I am pleased to vote that recognition is also being given him by the press at home. It gives me great pleasure to include an editorial from the New Orleans States and New Orleans Item lauding Representative HÉBERT and the work of his subcommittee:

COMMITTEE IS ALERT WATCHDOG

Additional success by Representative F. EDWARD HÉBERT's House Armed Services Subcommittee should occasion grins of satisfaction among taxpayers in general.

The panel, whose function is to serve as a watchdog over defense spending, disclosed it is investigating overpricing amounting to $4 million by Lockheed Aircraft Co. on two Air Force contracts.

According to the Congressman, the firm negotiated contracts totaling $84 million in 1954 to build 80 C–130A transport planes.

A $36.5 million estimate on the cost of parts made by subcontractors, HÉBERT said, was $2,844,000 more than the subcontractors were asking.

Neither was a subsequent reduction of $1,266,600 by the subcontractors revealed during negotiations between Lockheed and the Government, the Congressman added.

It was reported that Lockheed is currently discussing a revision of the contract.

Previous successes by Representative HÉBERT's subcommittee have constituted one of the bright spots on the Washington scene.

It was only last January that work by the probers was instrumental in obtaining an agreement by General Motors Corp. to refund another $4,908,000 on a Government jet-plane contract. That was in addition to $5 million repaid by the firm in 1956.

HÉBERT's panel had established overpayment to GM amounting to some $17 million on a $375 million contract for F–84F jet fighters in 1952.

Not only has the subcommittee been effective in throwing light on instances in which the Government came out on the short end of a deal, but it has also consistently prodded the Justice Department toward obtaining settlements in such cases.

Representative HÉBERT's subcommittee has been an alert watchdog.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Appendix

Tribute to John Anthony Burns, Delegate From Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 19, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a superb story that appeared in the May issue of the Lion magazine about Hawaii's distinguished Delegate, JOHN BURNS. I hope that each Member of the Congress will read this enlightening article about a great American.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LION FROM HAWAII
(By Larston D. Farrar)

When the Congress of the United States voted, on March 12, to admit the Territory of Hawaii as a State, and President Eisenhower signed the legislation a few days later, official Washington was practically in unanimous agreement on two things:

First, that much of the credit for Hawaiian statehood belongs to JOHN ANTHONY BURNS, the wiry, white-haired, 50-year-old Delegate from Hawaii.

Second, that Delegate BURNS will become one of the first United States Senators from the new State of Hawaii.

JOHN BURNS is a slimly built, medium-sized man with piercing blue eyes that crinkle at the corners and the strong hands and good shoulders of a detective (an occupation he followed for many years). "They say that he is the Delegate from Hawaii," Representative ROBERT W. LEVERING, of Ohio, commented recently. "They ought to call him 'JOHN BURNS for Hawaii.' That fellow has buttonholed everybody on Capitol Hill who will speak to him, and everybody speaks to JOHN BURNS."

Delegate BURNS has had another interest for many, many years—the cause of Lionism. Since March 1941, when he helped to form the Koolaupoko Lions Club in Hawaii, he has had a perfect attendance record. He served as president of the club and has been a district governor, traveling thousands of miles with the message of goodwill to Lions Clubs and other groups. He is now an international counselor.

Perhaps the interest of Lions in underprivileged children is what has drawn him to be such an apostle for Lionism. His fellow-members who have heard him speak—and others who do not know him—may be surprised to learn of his own bitter childhood and young manhood. It is possible that he never has addressed a Lions club in which any member ever held more different jobs, in getting to a place of prominence, than John A. Burns.

Before he was elected as Delegate to Congress from Hawaii as a Democrat on November 6, 1956, breaking the hold the Republicans had held on this post for 24 years, JOHN BURNS had been a messenger boy, a soda jerk, a warehouse worker for the Hawaiian Pineapple Co., a wheat harvester in Kansas, a freight crew worker, a soldier, a newspaperman, a ranch worker in California, a fruit grower, a packing house foreman, a policeman, a plain-clothes detective, liquor store operator, real estate man, civil defense administrator, and a business executive (owner of Burns & Co., Ltd.).

JOHN A. BURNS, born on March 30, 1909, at Fort Assinneboine, Mont., was taken by his parents to Hawaii in 1913. Several years after the Burns family moved to Honolulu, his father, who was in the Army, disappeared. The mother was left with the care and keeping of four children. Young JOHN, as resourceful as his Irish blood could make him, went to work as soon as he was old enough for his legs to carry him on errands.

By the time he was a sophomore in high school, he felt the urge to go to the U.S. mainland. He took a job on a freighter bound for the U.S. west coast, and then beat his way to Fort Leavenworth, Kans., where he had an uncle in the Army. That was when he worked in the wheat fields and attended high school. He joined the Army for 1 year, but wasn't interested in making a career of it, and went back to Honolulu in 1929.

Although he was 20 years old, he attended St. Louis High School in Honolulu, being graduated in 1930. As part-time work he helped train athletes at Fort Shafter. He went to work at the Star-Bulletin at night and during the day attended the University of Honolulu.

In June 1931 he married Beatrice Majors Van Vleet, and had to take a full-time job as a pineapple factory worker. Several years after their marriage, when Mrs. Burns was carrying their third child (the infant died at birth), she was stricken with polio, which, in those days, was practically a death sentence. She was paralyzed from her neck down. With the help of a Japanese masseur, Professor Okazaki, who took a personal interest in the courageous young mother, she was restored to partial health by the then controversial massage treatments. She has been in a wheelchair ever since, but she gave birth to her third child, James Seishero, the latter name the Japanese professor's own first name, 6 years later.

After placing first in a Honolulu Police Department examination in 1934, John Burns progressed through the ranks from patrolman to captain by 1941.

World War II was a time of great challenge for Hawaii itself, and for Mr. Burns. He was named lieutenant in command of the espionage bureau of the Honolulu Police Department in the days following Pearl Harbor, when, it was feared, the tens of thousands of Japanese on Hawaii might prove to be disloyal.

"I am happy to say today that not a single case of disloyalty to the U.S. cause ever was uncovered by either the Federal Bureau of Investigation or the various law-enforcement bodies on Oahu," he says today. "The Japanese-Americans were Americans in deed and in thought. It is a great tribute to American ideas that, when the chips were down, every single person stuck with us in Hawaii. I had always believed that when freedom was an issue, the people would never falter. The outbreak of the war, and subsequent impressive record in Army service of many, many thousands of Hawaiian Japanese, proved to all of us that the Japanese had learned well the lessons of democracy and were grateful for the blessings of free government."

Delegate Burns had said publicly, in the middle of November 1941, that in case of war the people of Hawaii would remain loyal. He is proud that his prophecy came true.

In September 19, 1945 he resigned from the police department and became owner and operator of a beverage store. In this period, he became active in the Democratic Party, which, at the time, was at such a low ebb in the islands that no more than two or three persons would attend any meeting of a Democratic group. There was a county committee meeting—representing 73 precincts—which he remembers well, because there were only six persons present. His brother, Edward J. Burns, at the time was vice chairman of the Republican Party in Honolulu. Edward arranged a meeting between John and the then "big wheel" of the Republicans in Hawaii.

"You'll never see the day when there will be a Democratic Party worth mentioning on these islands," the Republican leader said.

"We'll see," was all JOHN A. BURNS said, and went out to get busy.

By May 1956 he had been named second vice president of the Democratic County Committee. He ran for the nomination for the board of supervisors and failed. In 1948, he was named chairman of the Oahu County committee. In that year, he ran for Delegate for the first time. He was snowed under by the Republican, Joseph Farrington, who polled three out of every four votes cast.

In 1954 Delegate Farrington died and his widow ran. She won by 890 votes, out of 150,000 votes cast. The die was cast that BURNS would run in 1956, and he did, winning by some 15,000 votes. He was reelected in 1958 by about the same majority.

A master key member of the Lions, having brought in 12 new members during his years of service, JOHN BURNS credits the Lions for a lot of his political success.

"The Lions club gave me a new vision of public service," he says simply today. "If I had not become a Lion, and learned the meaning of service to my fellow man, I doubt that I would be in Congress today, and able to be of as great service to Hawaii as I am striving to be. Being a Lion has meant much to me in my life and in my thinking.

"I started a contact group with the Japanese because of Lions influence. I learned to make speeches because of this same influence. We were able, through speeches and contacts, to help our Japanese citizens understand the situation and do their share in the war effort."

Congressional colleagues who have been working side by side with Delegate BURNS have been particularly high in their praise of him and his work for the islands.

"His list of solid gains for Hawaii demonstrated by the number and importance of his bills passed by Congress, is most remarkable for a man who is denied a vote in Congress," Representative LEO O'BRIEN of New York, said recently. "In fact, his record would be remarkable for a voting Member of the House, supported by two Senators. JOHN BURNS has won countless votes in both Houses. He has served his people well. The Delegate, in my considered opinion, ad-

vanced the cause of statehood by at least a decade."

Senator LYNDON JOHNSON of Texas, Democratic majority leader in the Senate, had this to say about Hawaii's Delegate:

"It has been many years since any Territory, or State for that matter, has had a Representative as persuasive as JOHN A. BURNS. He has displayed vision and wisdom and a willingness to meet the other fellow more than halfway—and there are fewer qualities in this world of greater value. Nothing aided the Hawaiian cause more than the presence in Washington of an able Delegate who has earned the respect and affection of his colleagues."

House Majority Leader JOHN W. MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, asserted:

"JOHN A. BURNS' ability as well as his devotion to Hawaii and its people is outstanding. He is highly respected by his colleagues and enjoys the confidence, the respect, and the friendship of the Democratic leadership."

John A. Burns, Jr., his eldest son, an attaché in his father's office in Washington, is a graduate of Notre Dame and a noted scholar, having won several awards for his scholastic achievements. His daughter, Mary Beth Burns, a graduate of Mount Saint Scholastica College in Kansas, is now working for Hawaiian Airlines, while James Seishiro Burns, the youngest son, is a student at St. Benedict's College in Kansas. His wife, despite confinement to her wheelchair, is otherwise in radiant good health and spirits.

JOHN BURNS, a Lion from and for Hawaii, has seen his dreams come true.

Our Inheritance: An Indestructible Union of Indestructible States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 19, 1959

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an extremely fine address delivered by the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], on the occasion of the dedication of the Visitor Center and Headquarters for the Richmond National Battlefield Park at Richmond, Va., on May 16, 1959.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR INHERITANCE: AN INDESTRUCTIBLE UNION OF INDESTRUCTIBLE STATES

(Remarks of Senator SAM J. ERVIN, JR., of North Carolina, at the dedication of the visitor center and headquarters for the Richmond National Battlefield Park at Richmond, Va., May 16, 1959)

Ladies and gentlemen, we meet today on the site of the famous Chimborazo Confederate Hospital in the erstwhile capital of the Confederacy to dedicate the generous gift of the people of Richmond to the United States for use as a visitor center and headquarters for the Richmond national battlefield park.

I am grateful for the invitation to participate in this dedication because of the opportunity it offers me to commend the National Park Service, and because of the part my own State, North Carolina, played in the great conflict which Collier Cobb, one of my beloved teachers at Chapel Hill, was accustomed to call the Uncivil War.

The National Park Service merits the highest praise for its unceasing devotion to its patriotic task of preserving and making available to all the people the Nation's historic shrines. As one who has been privileged during recent months to visit the battlefields at Gettysburg, Antietam, Fredericksburg, Chancellorsville, the Wilderness, and Spotsylvania, I bear witness that the National Park Service emphasizes "with a touch impartially tender" that the unconquerable spirit of those who wore the blue and the undying valor of those who wore the gray constitute the common heritage of all Americans, regardless of whether they dwell above or below the Mason and Dixon line.

I trust you will pardon at this point an allusion rather personal in nature. I cannot come to the Old Dominion without experiencing emotions similar to those which prompted Moses to remove his sandals from his feet because he stood on holy ground. Kindred of mine fought for the Confederacy in virtually every engagement on Virginia soil from Bethel to Appomattox. One of my great-uncles was killed in action at Seven Pines. Another fell in combat on the Darbytown Road.

In the words of Britain's heroic poet, Rupert Brooke:

"These laid the world away; poured out the red
Sweet wine of youth; gave up the years to be
Of work and joy, and that unhoped serene,
That men call age; and those who would have been,
Their sons, they gave, their immortality."

Since their dust is commingled forever with Virginia's good earth, Virginia to me is hallowed ground.

These dedicatory services call to mind words quoted by Father Abraham J. Ryan, the poet laureate of the Confederacy, in the headnote to his poem entitled "A Land Without Ruins."

"A land without ruins is a land without memories—a land without memories is a land without history. Crowns of roses fade—crows of thorns endure."

The Richmond National Battlefield Park, which was established in 1944 and now contains 691 acres, is located in a land storied in memories and history. This is true because it is located in a land which has suffered ruins and worn a crown of thorns.

As the capital of the Confederacy, Richmond was the chief military prize of a fratricidal war, which lasted 4 long years and sent about 530,000 Americans to untimely graves. Of those so dying, thousands were killed or mortally wounded in battles and skirmishes fought in areas lying within or near the Richmond National Battlefield Park.

Let me enumerate a few of the major engagements occurring within these areas:

1. The Battle of Seven Pines, which was fought at Fair Oaks, 6 miles east of Richmond, on May 31 and June 1, 1862, when the retreating Confederate Army under Gen. Joseph E. Johnston turned and fought to a standstill the Union forces commanded by Gen. George B. McClellan.

2. The Seven Days' Battle, which was fought at Mechanicsville, Gaines' Mill, Savage Station, Fraziers' Farm, White Oak Swamp, and Malvern Hill in the neighborhood of Richmond from June 26 to July 2, 1862, when the Confederate forces under Gen. Robert E. Lee made a series of counterattacks upon General McClellan's army and removed its threat to Richmond.

3. The Battle of Yellow Tavern, which was fought at the Yellow Tavern, 6 miles north of Richmond on May 11, 1864, when the gallant Confederate cavalier, Gen. J. E. B. Stuart, overtook Gen. Philip H. Sheridan, and sacrificed his own life in a desperate but successful effort to save Richmond from capture by General Sheridan's forces.

4. The Battle of Cold Harbor, which was fought at Cold Harbor, 10 miles northeast of Richmond, from May 31 to June 12, 1864, when Gen. U. S. Grant continued the campaign of attrition begun by him at the Wilderness and Spotsylvania by throwing massive Union forces against the Confederates under General Lee, who held a strongly entrenched line.

5. The Petersburg Campaign, which began about June 15, 1864, when General Grant laid siege to Richmond and Petersburg, and continued until April 2, 1865, when General Lee abandoned Richmond and Petersburg and started the retreat, which ended in his surrender at Appomattox on April 9, 1865.

We are prompted to attend this ceremony by two motives. One, which is external and objective, is our desire to witness the dedication of a visitor center and headquarters marking the beginning of an expanded service by the National Park Service to those who visit the Richmond National Battlefield Park. The other, which is internal and subjective, is our wish to do reverence to those brave men of the North and those brave men of the South, who fought near Richmond for causes they believed right and whose silent tents are now spread "on Fame's eternal camping ground."

It is well for us to call to mind the valor and sacrifice of those who wore the blue and those who wore the gray. This is so because:

"If their memories part
From our land and heart
'Twould be a wrong to them,
And a shame for us."

The men of the North fought to preserve the Union, and the men of the South fought to preserve the States. As a consequence, all Americans have inherited a country whose Constitution contemplates "an indestructible Union composed of indestructible States."

If we are to do full reverence to those who wore the blue and those who wore the gray, we must do more than call to remembrance their valor and their sacrifices. We must dedicate ourselves to the preservation of the America they bequeathed to us.

This America is threatened by foes within and foes without.

The foes without are the Communist nations which strive to erase all human dignity and all human freedom from earth's surface.

A Confederate officer from North Carolina was mortally wounded during the advance on the second day at Gettysburg. After being knocked to the ground by the impact of the bullet which wounded him, he took from his pocket a pencil and a piece of paper, and wrote these words with his dying hand: "Tell my father I fell with my face to the enemy."

America will be able to defend herself against the Communists and all other external foes as long as her sons are ready to die with their faces to her enemies.

Sometimes it seems that the foes within pose a more serious threat to America than the foes without. It is certainly easier to devise a defense against external foes.

The foes within are those who seek to destroy our "indestructible Union of indestructible States" by reducing the States to meaningless zeros on the Nation's map and concentrating all governmental powers in the Federal Government. If they should succeed in their objective, their success would sound the death knell of liberty in America. This is true because "the States are the only breakwater against the ever-pounding surf which threatens to submerge the individual and destroy the only kind of society in which personality can survive."

America's protection against the foes within is to be found in the answer to this prayer:

"God give us men. A time like this demands
Strong minds, great hearts, true faith, and ready hands;
Men whom the lust of office does not kill;
Men whom the spoils of office cannot buy;
Men who possess opinions and a will;
Men who have honor—men who will not lie.
Men who can stand before a demagog
And damn his treacherous flatteries without winking;
Tall men, sun-crowned, who live above the fog
In public duty and in private thinking."

Address by Hon. Alexander Wiley, of Wisconsin, Before the Norwegian Society of Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 19, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, several years ago, when I happened to be chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, I was privileged to fly to Dublin. There I became acquainted with Prime Minister Costello. In the course of our conversation, he asked, "Where did your forebears come from?"

"Oh," I said, "they were Vikings; they came from Norway."

He said, "Senator, you are 1,200 years late."

I replied, "What do you mean?"

He said, "The Vikings settled Dublin in 750."

I said, "Put it here, brother."

Mr. President, the other evening it was my privilege to address the Norwegian Society in this city, and I related that incident. I ask unanimous consent that the address which I delivered on that occasion be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILEY HAILS NORWAY'S CONTRIBUTION TO WORLD PEACE—ENDORSES WEST'S 32-POINT PEACE PACKAGE; URGES PATIENT VIGILANCE IN DEALING WITH SOVIET OBSTRUCTIONIST TACTICS AT GENEVA CONFERENCE

(Address by Senator WILEY before the Norwegian Society of Washington, D.C., at the Broadmoor Hotel, May 16, 1959)

I am delighted to be with you tonight.

Particularly, I welcome the opportunity to participate in this celebration honoring Norway's Independence Day—the Syttende Mai.

Over the years, our own beloved United States has been enriched by the migrations of nearly 900,000 Norwegian sons and daughters to our shores.

The transfusion into the lifeblood of our country by these stanch loyal citizens brings all the virile spirit of the traditions of Norway.

In communities throughout the country, our American culture has been enhanced, our spirit of enterprise strengthened, and loyalties and devotion to duty have been enriched. Indeed, the whole fabric of our Nation has been greatly bolstered by the infusion of the spirit, ideas, determination, and fortitude of Americans of Norwegian heritage.

As does our own "Star Spangled Banner," the stirring national anthem of Norway, also, embodies the spirit, loyalty, and deep devotion imbued in her offspring by this rugged land. To illustrate, I quote the last verse of the anthem:

"Yes, we love with fond devotion
This, the land that looms
Rugged, storm-scarred
O'er the ocean
With her thousand homes.

"And as warrior sires have made her
Wealth and fame increase
At the call we too will aid her
Armed to guard, to guard her peace."

Fortunately, this strong individual dedication—borne in mind and flesh and spirit—has blessed us—as well as Norway—with outstanding leaders in political, economic, military and almost every other field of endeavor.

As we pay tribute to Norway's Independence Day, let us look to this land across the sea, to which—in these brief moments—we pay homage.

UNITED STATES-NORWAY FRIENDSHIP

Throughout history, Norway and the United States have maintained warm bonds of respect and friendship. Although both countries have a proud history of independence, the exigencies of today's world have fostered another spirit: that of interdependence, particularly among the nations of the free world.

Today, among the few nations with a common border with the Soviet Union—an ever-present threat to security—Norway has stood firmly and resolutely in the shadow of these threats to her life.

To us, who are thousands of miles away, this sometimes may not seem so significant. In reality, however, the act has required stanch courage with a willingness to sacrifice to live up to the high ideals so indelibly imprinted in the history of Norway.

Too, displaying a proud spirit, Norway has joined the North Atlantic Treaty Alliance to cooperate with other freedom-loving peoples for the preservation of the liberty of peoples and nations against the encroachment of ever-expanding communism.

The United States and the free world can indeed be proud that we have as our ally this land. Norway, too, has admirably supported the Western efforts to create and carry out an effective program for lessening the dangers to freedom posed by communism; for easing East-West tensions; for standing up to the Kremlin as it strives by threats, intimidation, blackmail, deception to extend its influence over more people and more lands.

SPIRIT OF UNITY

At the East-West conference now in progress in Geneva, we need this kind of stanch support, not only morally, but economically, militarily and strategically.

During the early meetings, unfortunately, the Soviets have displayed the irresponsible, self-serving — not peace-serving — tactics which have characterized previous conferences.

Throughout the discussions, we can expect the Soviet representatives to muddy the waters periodically.

If we are to obtain any real results, however, it may be necessary for the West to patiently tolerate these obstructionist tactics—while at the same time remaining alert to assure that these do not serve as a facade behind which the Soviets gain concessions.

For the most part, these actually serve as ruses by which the Soviets hope eventually—through overtaxing the patience of the free world—to obtain their objectives of more and more concessions from the Western nations.

We realize, of course, that not only the United States and Norway, but all the countries in the Western alliance, as well as the other nations of the world, have a stake in the outcome of the Geneva Conference.

Among other things, it may well prove how effective we are—or are not—in stopping Soviet aggression through agreement-breaking and trumped-up crises.

MAJOR ISSUES AT GENEVA

Briefly, let's look at the issues of the conference.

The principles and goals of the Western Allies include:

Resolving the Berlin crisis, while maintaining respect for the rights of access by the West to Berlin; as well as protecting the free world's interests in West Berlin;

Easing East-West tensions;

Making progress toward German reunification and an eventual peace treaty with Germany to lessen the possibility of future trouble;

Establishment of a foundation upon which to promote greater security—and lessen the possibility of an outbreak of war on the European continent.

WEST'S PEACE PACKAGE

To attain these goals, the West has proposed a 4-stage, 32-point plan aimed at establishing a series of progressive steps to bring about German reunification and promotion of security on the European continent.

The West's peace package, I believe, is a constructive, comprehensive, realistic plan which, if adopted, would lay the foundation for solving the problems relating to Germany, as well as reduce East-West tensions and promote security on the continent of Europe.

As we know, the West's 32-step plan generally aims at:

1. Uniting Berlin by free elections;

2. Establishment of a 35-member German committee made up of 25 representatives from the Federal Republic of Germany and 10 from the so-called German Democratic Republic, charged with the responsibility of working out problems between these two areas of that country, subject to certain four-power supervision;

3. Reduction of armed forces and armaments, safeguarded by an inspection and control system.

4. Establishment of procedures for ultimate free elections to allow the German people to adopt a government by self-determination;

5. Provision for writing a final peace treaty with an all-German Government; and

6. Establishment of certain security safeguards aimed at eliminating threats to security in the future on the European Continent.

The West's peace package, I believe, is a good one.

CONSTRASTING EAST-WEST POSITIONS

Now, let's review the contrasting positions of the West and the Soviet Union, upon the major issues of the conference.

As regards the peace treaty:

The West feels that a peace treaty can be signed only after the reunification of Germany. By contrast, the Soviets insist that it be signed now, with the two German states, and that reunification be left up to the two Germanys. In this, the Soviet position definitely violates the postwar agreements which it signed—but chooses now to break.

To agree to these unjustified demands would be to violate our own postwar commitments. If agreed to, it might well set the stage by which the German people—imbued with a deep nationalistic spirit—would one day seek reunification—by force, if necessary.

PROMOTING EUROPEAN SECURITY

Secondly, increasing security on the European continent.

The West feels that any security plan should be linked to progress on reunification of Germany and that such plans should contain systems of inspection and control—to prevent the Soviets from (a) again violating the agreements; and (b) carrying on subversive or other activities that would threaten the areas for which we are now seeking safeguarded security.

By contrast, the Soviets say that no link eixsts between unification of Germany and European security. In addition, they seek the establishment of a zone in central Europe where arms and troops would be limited or withdrawn entirely.

To accept such a proposal would, I believe, be extremely dangerous. Again and again, the Soviets have demonstrated they have no intention of adhering to agreements or treaties—unless it serves the cause of communism.

A so-called demilitarized zone—a power vacuum—would be an open invitation to the Soviets to embark—as they have in the case of East Germany—at first clandestinely, and then openly—on a program of clamping an iron grip by the Kremlin on the area.

PROTECTING WEST BERLIN

Third, as for protection of West Berlin, the allies recognize that to maintain the integrity and security of West Berlin there can be no weakening of our military position in Europe and West Germany—until it is assured that the interest and welfare of the people would be fully protected.

To me, this is only realism.

The Soviets' position, by contrast, aims toward exposing West Berlin for a possible Communist takeover gaining recognition of East Germany—and thus, in effect, a recognition of an extended sphere of Soviet influence in Eastern Europe.

GERMANY: PART OF WORLD PICTURE

Although the current topics of East-West meetings focus around the problems of Germany and European security, the negotiations are, in reality, only part of the larger global struggle.

The worldwide Communist conspiracy reaches greedily toward all lands and all people. Witness not only Europe, but also Tibet and Iraq.

Tomorrow, the Communist plotting may ripen in another country.

The free nations of the world must be constantly and vigilantly alert to the ever-present dangers of this global encircling network of intermingled military power, ideological operations and subversive activities, coupled with economic pressures and threats.

As we face the future, the free world can be proud that it counts among its members Norway—to whose independence day we pay homage.

The spirit which marked the unending fight of her proud people against nazism in World War II, now strengthens, by deeds of the past and dedication to the future—the free world alliance against today's threat of tyrannical communism.

CONCLUSION

Friends, I have welcomed the opportunity to join you in this celebration and tribute to Norway's Independence Day.

Thank you.

Responsibilities in Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. CANNON

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 19, 1959

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss] before the Student Bar Association of the George Washington University Law School, at the Law Day banquet, May 1, 1959. Senator Moss presented a thought-provoking challenge to the law students on their responsibilities in government. His encouragement to take the plunge into politics for the betterment of mankind through a government of law deserves the widest possible dissemination among the legal profession and to the Nation.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH OF SENATOR FRANK E. MOSS, DEMOCRAT OF UTAH, BEFORE THE STUDENT BAR ASSOCIATION OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY LAW SCHOOL, LAW DAY BANQUET, MAY 1, 1959

Mr. Toastmaster, and ladies and gentlemen, thank you for asking me to speak here tonight. It is always a pleasure for a student to return to his alma mater, and I have the further pleasant duty to talk to you on this occasion on a very challenging subject. My own student days at George Washington University Law School are still fresh in my memory, and I know how many late and lengthy discussions are centered around what you are learning here, and what you can do with it today, as well as what you will do with it later on when you become a member of one of the world's most distinguished professions.

We who are alumni and students of George Washington University, and particularly of the law school, have a right, I believe, to be proud of the fact that our school has become not only a training ground for the professions, but for political and public service. I am confident that no other school in the Nation has sent as many former students and graduates to the U.S. House of Representatives and to the U.S. Senate as has George Washington University. At the risk of treading on the toes of any Virginians who are here, I might suggest that GW could properly be called the mother of Congressmen.

In England, Law Day, the subject of our discussion tonight, is a term used to designate the day in court on which a mortgage debtor is called to account for his indebtedness. In a sense Law Day, United States of America, is somewhat analogous. On this day, solemnly dedicated by Presidential proclamation, American lawyers are called to the bar of national and world opinion to account for the opportunities for service granted them as members of an ancient and truly honorable, if not always honored, profession.

This is, therefore, the ideal occasion to speak of the law student's responsibilities in a Government under laws such as we have enjoyed for more than 180 years.

The student of law in our day must take on responsibilities possibly graver than any ever borne heretofore by members of the profession. He must hold himself twice accountable for his acts to a skeptical, distrustful and often unfriendly public. He must answer as an individual and as a member of a profession. For his character and his conduct as an individual lawyer will determine the reputation and standing of his profession.

In the beginning of a career, the absorption of the student or the young lawyer in his daily professional tasks is not easily penetrated by a sense of responsibility for things less immediate than earning a livelihood.

I would like to repeat, however, the warning sounded by one of the very eminent members of our profession, Chief Justice Arthur T. Vanderbilt:

"There is nothing more pathetic than the successful professional man who wants to serve his community but who has never schooled himself in the world of political realities. A day of public service and of real interest in the world of politics at the age of 25, is worth infinitely more to the community than a month of any old man's leisure."

Upon some of you this warning will never register. For some of you will never be more than technicians. A great many it is true will become extremely skilled technicians and be the craftsmen of the law. As a legal craftsman, you will develop a sure fast skill at drawing a note and deed of trust which squeezes the turnip dry, a skill in filing a divorce suit accompanied by injunctions and other remedies which right from the start ties the opposite spouse hand and foot, a skill in taking a release in a personal injury settlement from which there can be no escape, and at drawing and executing a will no one can break.

But some of you, I hope, will take to heart Judge Vanderbilt's admonition, and while you are still young, go out into the world of practical politics and make yourself of service to your community, your State, and your Nation. You have the training—you have the tools to do the job.

I hope you will do more than join community organizations and participate in get-out-the-vote drives. I hope you will actually go into the organization of the political party of your choice, and become an active member of it. Join at the precinct level, and work up in party councils to a position of trust and responsibility. And then when you are seasoned, and have won the confidence of your community or your area, run for public office. One way a lawyer can most fully carry out his responsibilities in a government under law is to go where the laws are made, and use his background and experience to enact those new laws made necessary by a changing world, and to improve the statutes already on the books.

There is no current compilation of the number of lawyers who are members of State legislatures throughout the country, but I am sure I am safe in saying that in most legislatures, the law is more widely represented than any other profession or calling.

In the National Congress, that is indisputably true. In this 86th Congress, 228 out

of 437 Members of the U.S. House of Representatives are members of the legal profession. Seventy are Republicans and 158 are Democrats.

In the U.S. Senate, 61 of the 98 Members serving at the present time have law backgrounds. Eighteen are Republicans and 43 are Democrats. The chairmen of 13 of the 16 standing committees of the Senate have had legal training. Both Senators from 19 States were trained in the profession which you are now aspiring to join.

Those of you who followed closely the debate on the floor of the Senate last week on the labor-reform bill, and the compromises which were effected and which prepared the way for passage of the embattled bill, know that many members of the bar were in the thick of the fight. Senator McCLELLAN is a lawyer, as are Senator ERVIN, the cosponsor of the bill, and Senator KUCHEL the leader of the group whose compromise proposal on the bill of rights finally cleared the way for passage of the bill itself. Senators MORSE, BRIDGES, JAVITS, DIRKSEN, DODD, COOPER, CASE, CLARK, and CHURCH—to name only a few—are some of the other lawyers whose names figured in debate or as the sponsor of amendments. Senator KENNEDY, the brilliant young man whose name the bill bears, and Senator GOLDWATER, who was its most vociferous critic, both somehow escaped special training in the law, so we cannot claim them in the legal fraternity. But the labor-reform bill as it was sent to the House last week has the handiwork of many lawyers in it.

The point I hope I have made is this. An attorney—or an embryo attorney has a greater responsibility than other citizens, because he is better equipped and trained to be of service to his country in the legislative field. Every citizen of this country is in politics—whether he likes it or not—because that is the way of a democracy. It is a government for and by the people. But, in my opinion, it is not enough for a law student, or for a member of the bar, simply to inform himself on the issues and vote. That is like stopping at the water's edge. I sincerely hope that many of you will take the plunge into politics, and will be of service to your community, your county, your State, and your Nation.

Some of you, and I hope there are many, will remember down through the years ahead of you that the law is a profession, an exacting profession; that a profession is a group of men pursuing a learned art as a common calling in the spirit of a public service—no less a public service because it may incidentally be a means of livelihood. Pursuit of the learned art in the spirit of public service is the primary purpose. Gaining a livelihood is incidental, whereas in a business or a trade it is the entire purpose.

Underlying the structure and fabric of our law is a Bill of Rights designed to protect the life of every citizen, his liberty and his property. At the time they framed this charter of liberties, the lawyers who in an earlier day set the first of the Revolution were mentally smarting from the personal abuses heaped upon them by King and government and the violation of personal and property rights that had been secured to freemen by the Magna Carta. Officers of the King had broken into shops and homes of friends and neighbors, searched and seized anything and everything at pleasure. Respected and honored citizens had not been free of arrest upon a hint or a sly suggestion of a petty official. Often they were imprisoned on suspicion with no opportunity to be heard and without a fair trial.

Out of their bitter memories they wrote into the Constitution basic and fundamental principles to restrain any excesses of government and check any arbitrary power that might invade the rights of personal liberty and private property.

Today the principles of freedom and fair play are being challenged and opposed around the world by totalitarian ideology that denies the existence of God and subjects the individual to arbitrary naked power of the state.

The danger of our present crisis cannot be overestimated. The very advances in science and technology that you and I and every citizen, not alone of this country, but of all the remaining free nations, rely upon to protect us may well contribute the factors to destroy freedom forever.

The advancements made in public education, the tremendous strides in mass communication—the radio, the television, the news services, the shattering of time barriers in transportation—all these have given more citizens a voice in making decisions.

The greatest threat to the rule of law in any of the nations of our free world is the danger that the people will become dissatisfied with the functioning of their system of justice and do irreparable injury to it without realizing that by so doing they are destroying the very foundation of the rule of law in their society.

It is our professional responsibility to keep the pulse of life beating strongly in the law. We cannot do this by treating our fundamental freedoms as abstract theoretical concepts of a legal system. The people of the free world must learn to believe those freedoms to be what we believe them to be, the practical dynamic concepts for living, unalienable in every human being.

In earlier days the status of law in other nations was not a vital concern to us. But we are living in an era where it is no longer possible to ignore the attitudes of other peoples. This state of society is the result of two factors. Under the impact of science and technology our world is shrinking. And old empires are dissolving into new nations, filled with aspiration not unlike our own.

The tremendous success of scientists and technicians has left a gap between our scientific discoveries and their beneficial and peaceful utilization within the framework of the institutions devised to insure freedom and rights of the individual. The bridging of this gap may well prove to be the legal framework of free societies in the making. Most certainly it will be impossible unless you understand your fellow lawyers of other nations.

If we reflect on the issues at stake in the cold war, if we analyze its deepest meaning, we come to the inevitable conclusion that among the most essential values at stake are legal ones: the relation between citizen and State, the liberty and liberties of individuals.

Now it seems to me it is with reference to this most important value—that is the relation between citizen and State—that the responsibility of the young lawyer is of greatest importance. Let me explain. The very cornerstone of this great experiment in democratic government is the theory that the average citizen himself is best qualified to govern. Thus, all citizens must be informed and acquainted with the workings of the government which they control. They must be free to consult with each other, to discuss, consider, debate and deliberate upon any ideas, and through such deliberation, to arrive at the ultimate truth. Indeed, it is this search for truth in the area of human relations that makes our form of government so noble and so satisfying.

We must not permit any man or group of men to impede or destroy the right of our citizens to grapple with any and all ideas that are presented, since we believe that through such consideration and discussion of ideas, doubt is resolved, the wheat is sifted from the chaff, the spurious and erroneous are rejected. Truth is the result.

Justice Holmes once said in a very famous dissent:

"But when men have realized that time has upset many fighting faiths, they may come to believe even more than they believe the very foundations of their own conduct that the ultimate good desired is better reached by free trade in ideas—that the best test of truth is the power of the thought to get itself accepted in the competition of the market, and that truth is the only ground upon which their wishes safely can be carried out. That, at any rate, is the theory of our Constitution."

You are all very well aware of the grave concern in this country over the threat of communism. At times this concern is irrational and hysterical. Capable men of good intentions have become so frightened by the specter of communism that they seem to forget that the cornerstone of our Government is the right to discuss ideas in the search for truth. They would build a wall around Communist thought and ideas. They would be unwilling to consider, discuss and debate its implications, whether they be good or bad, false or true. They would prohibit the rest of us from coming to grips with such ideas. In effect, they doubt the ability of our citizens to entertain such thoughts and ideas and to recognize and reject the false while gleaning what little truth there may be. In so doing, they seem to doubt the very validity of our form of government.

I submit that if we accept such a philosophy, we are rejecting the very thing which has made this country and its form of government great. If we have become afraid of ideas, afraid to face them, to discuss them, to accept the truth in them as readily as we reject the false, then we are on the road to despotism.

If we permit our Government to remove any subject from the area of thought, investigation, and discussion, we have then provided a tool by which men may be kept in ignorance, and ignorance is the tool by which our form of government may be destroyed and replaced by a despot or a dictator.

The framers of our Constitution recognized the problem and made provision for it in the first amendment. The Supreme Court on many occasions has asserted its allegiance to this doctrine and yet in these days of hysteria, responsible people, including lawyers of great skill and understanding, are criticizing the Supreme Court for its allegiance to this most basic concept of our Government. We as lawyers should be gravely concerned with this matter. We as lawyers with our background and training in the problems of government should be the first to realize the danger caused to our democracy by declaring certain thoughts and ideas off limits.

You as students of the law and leaders in your community have the responsibility for safeguarding the right most basic to our democracy—the right of our citizens to hear and to discuss; to debate and to choose; to accept or reject any and all ideas wherever their birthplace. This is the most basic right in the search for truth.

The search for truth and for what is good is man's most noble endeavor. Those men who conceived our democratic government recognized the inherent value of such an objective and believed that through free and unlimited examination and discussion of all ideas by all people, that such an objective becomes possible. It is this very philosophy which permits all of the people to participate in the search for the truth. It is through this participation of our people that we have

built a strong, healthy, and happy United States where men and women still enjoy their self respect and our great liberties.

We must not through fear, greed, hatred, or suspicion, tamper with the one great cherished and practical ideal upon which our democratic government is based.

Your ability, your background and your training have fitted you well for the responsibility of taking part in government. I urge you to lead in the democratic process—to devote your talents and energy to the betterment of mankind through a government of law. I entreat you to study well the great ideal of our government—the free expression and exchange of thought.

Your responsibility is a serious one. If you meet it with dispatch, honor and energy, men will continue to enjoy the freedoms which permit them to choose their own destiny.

Needed: Greater Maturity for Mankind

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 19, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, today I was delighted and inspired to read a thoughtful editorial, published in the Oconto County Times-Herald, propounding the philosophical question—namely, whether man, while creating a world of ever-bigger, more complex things, is himself growing proportionately, so as to be able to adequately handle these new powers.

Today, the products of man's ingenuity—through technological, scientific, and other developments—are becoming bigger, more complex, more powerful. In the face of developments of such magnitude, there is a very real need for development—not of a mass-produced, mechanical individual—but, rather, of the kind of unique individualism—mature in thought, capable of mountaintop perspective, sensitive to human values, as well as physical power, and able to handle, to regulate, and to control the implements, the machinery, and the physical forces which now are subservient to man.

As the editorial stresses, "it took centuries of turmoil, war, and revolution to establish the rights of man—the rights of the individual." However, the editorial also points out that this whole era of freedom can be lost by sins of omission—that is, failure to recognize the need for human maturity and development to properly handle the power, the weapons, the scientific, and other devices that now are the servants of men.

Because I believe that the editorial reflects a deep philosophy which we, in our rush for mechanical progress, sometimes overlook, I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Oconto County Times-Herald, May 14, 1959]

THE QUESTION

Just about everything in this country has been getting bigger.

This trend, the economists confidently tell us with hardly a dissenting voice, is not only sure to continue but to accelerate. They blueprint a future of ever-increasing incomes, ever-improving living standards, the mass enjoyment of luxuries which would have been beyond the imagination of man not long ago.

We are on the verge of explosive breakthroughs in physical sciences. The age-old mysteries of space are being fathomed, and soon will be mysteries no more. The miracles of nuclear physics are at hand. Longer, healthier, happier lives for all are promised. And we are not alone. All over the world, peoples and nations are swept along to varying degrees, in the same tide.

This is fine. Almost everyone wants more money, more of the things that money can buy, more of what we know by the word "progress."

Yet a nagging question arises—the biggest unanswered question that confronts the changing world. While just about everything is getting bigger, is the greatest resource of all getting smaller? That resource is the individual. Not just people in the mass, but individual people—each different, each unique, each a spirit as well as an appetite. Is the individual in very real danger of being dwarfed by the bigness around him, and of being reduced to a statistic?

It's easy enough to say that it can't happen here, even though we have all seen it happen in vast reaches of the earth. Easy enough, but untrue. This Nation was founded on certain concepts—the fullest freedom for all, an unflagging sense of the spiritual nature of man, a passionate regard for the worth of every individual human being. But these, like all other concepts and philosophies, will wither away to nothingness unless they are eternally prized beyond all else and faithfully protected. They must be supported in absolutely specific ways. They demand the highest degree of individual independence and responsibility. If, for instance, we give to Government the initiative and the power to regulate and dominate our lives in the name of security, the ultimate end will be the security of the penitentiary. Power once granted to government must always be balanced against a greater power in the hands of the people.

We pride ourselves on our material accomplishments. But pride can result in a deadly blindness. Other nations, whose concepts are utterly opposed to ours, are producing their own wonders. Communist Russia and Communist China are, so to speak, moving mountains. The whip and the chain, used with dedicated ruthlessness, can also get out the goods, while the soul of man dies.

It took centuries of turmoil, war, and revolution to establish the rights of man—the rights of the individual. They can be lost overnight by sins of omission no less than sins of commission. A people whose eyes and minds are fixed on material ends alone will not long remain a free people. They will become merely instruments of power.

There is no foreseeable limits to what we, through our economic, social and political organizations, can achieve. It will be the ultimate irony if, in the light of this, we surrender the individual to material bigness—whether in Government or anywhere else. We never had a more urgent need to uphold age-old principles and convictions that make for the only worthwhile kind of progress—confidence in something, faith in ideals, fairness, the determination to defend what one believes to be right.

Walt Whitman wrote, a century ago: "The whole theory of the universe is directed unerringly to one single individual—namely to you." Man in the mass must never hide the face of the individual man.

Twenty-five-year Record of Federal Housing Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 18, 1959

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I am very much interested in the financial statement recently issued by Commissioner Julian H. Zimmerman of the Federal Housing Administration—particularly in view of the fact that FHA is celebrating its 25th anniversary this year. This statement is indicative of the splendid work record the FHA has maintained from its inception in 1934.

I think it highly fitting to stop a moment to pay tribute to the FHA—an outstanding Government agency that is certainly accomplishing the objectives for which it was created.

Let me call your attention to just a few of the highlights in FHA's progress through the years:

First. FHA has made homeownership possible for millions of American families because of the favorable terms of the mortgages it insures.

Second. FHA has helped to provide homes in rental and cooperative housing projects for innumerable other Americans.

Third. FHA has enabled millions of people to repair or improve their properties.

Fourth. FHA has helped to raise housing standards and better living conditions throughout the Nation.

Fifth. FHA has carried on technical studies that have been instrumental in improving the quality of materials and methods used in construction.

Sixth. FHA has operated on a completely self-supporting basis—no tax money goes into its coffers. Fees and premiums paid by the people who use its services are the source of FHA's income.

Seventh. FHA in 1954, as one of its first acts under the Eisenhower administration, repaid the full amount originally advanced to it by the U.S. Treasury—a total of $85.9 million, including $65.5 million principal and $20.4 million interest.

Eighth. FHA has worked closely with private enterprise, indeed all its programs are designed to encourage private enterprise, never to compete with it, in providing good housing for Americans in different income levels.

The financial statement I mentioned shows FHA's dollar-and-cent rating as of December 31, 1958. Here is how the agency stood then:

	Insurance written	Insurance outstanding	Losses to funds	Percent of losses to $100 of insurance written
Property improvement loans, sec. 2	[1] $11,500,629,588	$1,307,130,939	[1] $102,457,652	89
Home mortgages	35,234,047,258	19,717,469,248	24,213,928	7
Project mortgages	6,594,089,280	5,031,627,974	36,885,362	56
Manufactured housing	5,316,041		788,147	14.83
Total	53,334,082,167	26,056,228,161	164,345,089	31

[1] Includes $778,860,621 insurance written and $14,708,557 losses relating to insurance operations prior to the June 3, 1939, amendment which authorized FHA to collect an insurance charge.

NOTE.—Since July 1, 1940, the FHA has been self-supporting and has paid all expenses out of earnings. In the early years of operation, the Treasury Department advanced funds totaling $65,497,433 to pay expenses and to establish certain of the insurance funds. In the fiscal year 1954 all of the funds advanced were repaid to the U.S. Treasury together with interest thereon in the amount of $20,385,529.

But no statement, financial or otherwise, can adequately show the full value of the Federal Housing Administration to America as a whole. I am sure that all of my colleagues here in the House of Representatives join me in extending our best wishes to the Federal Housing Administration, Commissioner Julian H. Zimmerman, and all FHA personnel as it enters its 25th year of service.

Aid by Republic of Israel to Underdeveloped Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 19, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, as the Republic of Israel commemorates its 11th anniversary, it is well to look to the future rather than the past. The distinguished columnist, Mr. Roscoe Drummond, has called attention to the significant fact that pioneer-spirited Israel is helping to finance enterprises necessary to the development of the still newer nation of Ghana. He also has stressed the fact that this aid by Israel extends as far geographically as Burma and is becoming a major factor in the advance of underdeveloped countries.

Mr. Drummond's column, as published in the May 17, 1959, issue of the Washington Post and Times Herald is so pertinent, that I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, where it will help to herald the many enlightened gains made by Israel since its founding under the encouragement of the United Nations and President Harry S. Truman back in 1948. Mr. Drummond's column is entitled "Israel Lending a Welcome Hand."

We ourselves in the United States were a new and pioneer-spirited nation less than two centuries ago, so we have every reason to be sympathetic with fledgling Israel as Israel helps struggling lands like Ghana and Burma. After all, the new United States would have had great difficulty in attaining freedom and wealth had it not been for brave and generous friends like General Lafayette and others. Israel is being such a friend to Ghana, and Israel, in turn, needs such friends in other lands.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HELP WHERE IT COUNTS—ISRAEL LENDING A WELCOME HAND

(By Roscoe Drummond)

Numerous Asian and African nations are today turning to a new-found ally and benefactor. This is a development of the greatest significance which is just beginning to gather momentum. It is a development which the free world can view with satisfaction.

The new Afro-Asian ally is western in outlook, middle eastern in geography. It is democratic, anti-Communist, and, since it is neither a large nor powerful country, it is basically a neutral source of assistance which gives its recipients no appearance of choosing up sides in the cold war.

I am referring to the young but mature State of Israel, which was reborn only 11 years ago and which is now embarking upon a wide-ranging, diverse program of economic aid and technical assistance, where it is most needed.

A nation which has been greatly helped by its own friends, Israel is now helping others, to the advantage of everybody.

Israel's expanding investment assistance and technical aid ranges from Ghana to Burma. Its scope is illustrated by the fact that trainees from Afro-Asian countries and territories are now studying Israeli agricultural settlements and cooperative enterprises.

The best example of the burgeoning economic relationship between Israel and the Afro-Asian nations is what Israel and Ghana are doing together. To begin to finance an expanding two-way trade, Israel has provided Ghana with a $20 million credit over a 4-year period.

Israel is substantially financing—but taking only 40 percent of the stock—of Ghana's newly organized Black Star Shipping Line and is providing the technical training for Ghanian personnel to man its merchant marine. It is also helping Ghana develop its building industry by providing the necessary beginning capital and by training Ghanians in construction techniques.

In other fields of technical skills, Israel is providing training in agriculture, city planning, irrigation, water resources and in consumer and producer cooperatives.

A group of Burmese farmers is now living and working on Israeli cooperative farms and it is not to be overlooked that a Burmese army contingent is learning how the Israelis defend their frontiers with citizen volunteers who simultaneously till the fields and guard the nation.

There is no spirit of pacifism in Israel and Israel is teaching none to its Asian and African friends. Israeli universities and institutes are taking exchange students from many countries, including some trainees from Thailand, India, and Japan.

Obviously, Isreal is not doing all this out of sheer goodness of heart.

For Israel, it has large political as well as economic advantages. The biggest boon from this growing relationship of trust and good will is that it enables Israel to free itself from the physical and psychological isolation of Arab encirclement. Israel's expanding trade and her enlarged horizon of friends mean that she cannot be surrounded either politically or economically by a Nasser blockade.

Israel's new found allies are also blunting Egypt's efforts to recruit Afro-Asian support in its own cold war against Israel. At the Accra conference of Independent African States a year ago, Ghana almost single handed turned back Egypt's effort to aline all Africa against Israel.

Egypt could get nothing but a harmless resolution calling for a "just" settlement of Arab-Israeli disputes.

Because Israel is a small, pioneer spirited new country, deficient in many physical resources and rich in nearly all human resources, it is in an ideal position to help others. It seems to me that the friends of Israel in the United States might well look for ways to nourish and enlarge what Israel is doing so well in this field.

The Responsibilities of Our Teachers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 19, 1959

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, earlier this year, Dr. Howard Seymour, head of the board of education in Rochester, N.Y., delivered an address in which he underscored some of the major problems facing the teaching profession today.

Inasmuch as today is being celebrated as Teacher Recognition Day in New York State, Dr. Seymour's remarks deserve special study. I ask unanimous consent to have a fine editorial from the Rochester (N.Y.) Democrat and Chronicle concerning Dr. Seymour's speech printed in the the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Rochester Democrat and Chronicle, Mar. 30, 1959]

WANTED: THINKERS, NOT CONFORMISTS

In his recent talk at State Universty Teachers College at Brockport, Dr. Howard Seymour put into focus two of the biggest deterrents in education and citizenship.

One is familiar—willingness to conform—but it can scarcely be overemphasized. Never was the need to think critically in greater demand. The superintendent of Rochester public schools reminds us that progress in any form of endeavor comes from dissatisfaction and a disinclination to conform.

A second related deterrent is the fear of failure. Students say they do not want to fail, which is understandable but it should

not deter the student from reaching his maximal ability. Living dangerously has a point, even in education. A crop of "pipe course" graduates, in such a time of challenge, would be a dreary prospect.

Dr. Seymour's message should be hammered home on a still broader front, particularly when he says we are in no danger at all of too much thinking. The danger comes the moment the peanut sized brain and fog-horn-sized voice comes to positions of power.

Education will have failed unless it moves the citizen to back his generalizations with facts; evaluates critically the statements of those who claim to be authorities; recognizes prejudice and bias; separates the important from the unimportant.

Dr. Seymour, it seems to us, is asking for practical idealists as teachers, and for understanding and help from parents; understanding that ideas from the classroom are to be welcomed, not mistrusted; understanding that all good progress has been based upon new ideas and concepts, not upon conformity and faint-heartedness.

Meeting the Soviet Challenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 19, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, today, as we face the challenge of international communism, I am always delighted to find groups which, by private initiative, are attempting to analyze the problems and make constructive recommendations for dealing with the situation.

Recently, for example, the international relations study group of the Wausau branch of the American Association of University Women undertook a review of the life and development of Russia, including its history, land, nationalities, government, the Communist Party, the economics of the Soviet Union, education, religion, literature, art, and the so-called satellite countries within the Communist orbit.

At the end of the study, the group's conclusion included five major fields in which Russia challenges the United States—namely, education, military psychology, politics, and economics.

The conclusions of the group represent, I believe, a thoughtful approach to coping with these international problems. Naturally, there are differences of opinion as to how best to meet the challenges posed by the Soviet Union to our security. Because I believe that the ideas of the study group represent a constructive contribution in this field, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the letter from Mrs. W. J. Freund, chairman of the international relations study group, of the Wausau branch, AAUW. In her letter she outlines the group's conclusions.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WAUSAU, WIS., *May 14, 1959.*

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Daily, Russia becomes more and more of a challenge to the United States. It is evident that more long-range planning, a more enlightened citizenry, and a much greater understanding of Russia is badly needed if we are going to maintain our democratic way of life.

Aware of our own ignorance on this complex subject, the International Relations Study Group of the Wausau branch of the American Association of University Women last fall undertook a study of Russia. We sought the help of Professor Petrovich of the University of Wisconsin in setting up our outline of study, securing a bibliography, etc. During the year we have learned a great deal, but I think most important, have realized how vast the subject is and that we have just scratched the surface. We are eager to continue with reading and research. Fields of Russian life we delved into were the history of Russia, land and nationalities, government and the Communist Party, economics of the Soviet Union, education, religion, literature and art, and satellite states.

At the end of this study we concluded that Russia challenges the United States in five fields, namely: educational, military, psychological, political, and economic. I shall enumerate below our conclusion in each field and several ideas (on which, with one exception, we were in unanimous agreement) on how the United States might go about meeting these challenges.

1. Educational: Intense studies of both the Russian and American systems of education have been made, but the majority opinion seems to be that we should not scrap ours in favor of the Soviet or European types. These appraisals of our system have been invaluable, and I am confident that when the American people are presented with the facts, such as in James Conant's "The American High School Today," they will take steps to strengthen our system and correct the weaknesses.

2. Military: Although it is difficult to determine who is ahead in the field of weapons, we realize we are being threatened with the Soviet's rapid advance in the field. We all agree that we must maintain the strength necessary to support our diplomatic negotiations, but feel the nuclear arms race is suicidal madness. We have to learn that our only alternative is the slow, and sometimes painful, process of negotiation.

3. Psychological: Communism does not attract people only because of its military strength or ideology. It is because these dictatorships are lifting masses of backward people into the 20th century in a single generation. We must do all we can to help hasten their progress, in our democratic way, with our aid, capital, and technical assistance.

4. Political: The long-term aim of the Communists is to seek a Communist world order, and they pursue it with missionary zeal. Would that we could instill in our people the same sense of purpose and enthusiasm in spreading the gospel of democracy. Some of our goals in this political field could be:

(a) Present positive suggestions for solving the Berlin and German crises.

(b) Offer concrete ideas to stop the arms race and work toward disarmament.

(c) Always be ready to talk at all levels. Realize Russia does have legitimate fears and try to understand her actions.

(d) Keep NATO and our alliances strong. One suggestion for strengthening NATO is to transform it from a strictly military alliance to a fountainhead of free world economic, political, and social strength.

(e) Use the United Nations to a much greater extent in solving our differences.

(f) Improve and expand our propaganda. Since propaganda is not an independent force by itself but is both a result of and extension of policy, it follows that we must first have an affirmative policy and then successfully propagandize it.

5. Economic: We believe this to be the most serious. Their economic-political penetration is formidable and succeeding. Here are a few possible ways of meeting this challenge:

(a) Enact new domestic measures to accelerate U.S. economic growth. Our rate of production should be stepped up from the static rate of 3 percent if we expect to compete with the Russians' rate of 8 to 10 percent.

(b) Increase economic aid to underdeveloped countries and help them achieve a higher standard of living. Foreign aid should be planned on a long-term basis.

(c) Improve development financing schemes. Increase funds available through the Development Loan Fund and give serious consideration to the International Development Association. It might also be wise to channel more of our aid through international agencies. Direct aid is apt to arouse suspicions, so more use could be made of the World Bank, U.N. program of technical assistance, and the special projects fund.

(d) Stimulate private investment abroad. Broaden the scope of our U.S. investment guarantee program and enact minor changes in the U.S. taxation of American foreign investment.

(e) Increase international trade.

(f) Help underdeveloped nations expand their technical skills. We could expand our technical assistance programs through the ICA and also the work of the United Nations.

We are concerned not only about these threats from the Soviet Union but also about the extreme complacency of the American people. We feel they must be warned of the danger to our American way of life, and be kept constantly and accurately informed of the realities of the world situation. We must be confident of our strengths but also aware of our weaknesses.

We believe that you, our Wisconsin Senators, are in a strategic position to assist in this warning as well, of course, as to support measures in the Senate which will further the above aims.

Yours very truly,

Mrs. W. J. FREUND,
Chairman, International Relations Study Group, Wassau Branch, AAUW.

Foreign Aid Appropriations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 19, 1959

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, in this morning's issue of the Washington Post there appears an excellent article entitled "Shock Treatment," written by Walter Lippmann. In the article Mr. Lippmann discusses primarily the proposals made on last Friday by the distinguished assistant majority leader of the Senate, the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD].

I believe the article emphasizes and points out the arguments made by the Senator from Montana, and will be very interesting to my colleagues. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHOCK TREATMENT

(By Walter Lippmann)

There is building up in this country a resistance to the foreign aid appropriations which must be taken very seriously by the friends of foreign aid. The resistance has become especially formidable in recent times. This is not only because it is unpopular to provide money for foreigners at a time when at home it is necessary to retrench on all sorts of desirable projects. The great new fact is that the supporters of foreign aid are so disenchanted with the existing program that they cannot advocate it wholeheartedly.

Senator MANSFIELD, like Senator FULBRIGHT before him, has read the signs of the tmes. He sees that if foreign aid is to remain part of our foreign policy, the program will have to be reformed.

The question is how to bring about the reform, given the fact that the mutual aid programs are involved in a vast military and civilian bureaucracy, and that this bureaucracy has acquired a vested interest which causes it to oppose serious reform. Experience shows that Congress has thus far been unable to overcome the inertia of the bureaucracy, and in its frustration it is becoming increasingly exasperated with the whole business.

It is to this state of affairs that Senator MANSFIELD addressed himself last week. He came forward with what seems to me an essentially moderate but, nevertheless, a searching and effective proposal. Its object is to compel a thoroughgoing reexamination in the administration of that part of the foreign-aid program which causes the greatest doubt and discontent. This is the part providing grants and gifts as distinguished from loans. It amounts to about 75 percent of the total appropriation. Here are subsidies to enable weak countries to maintain larger military establishments than their economic life, and their capacity to raise revenue would justify.

Senator MANSFIELD's proposal is that an amendment should be attached to the current foreign aid bill which "will require, in the case of nations receiving grants of defense support or economic assistance, that the executive branch work out in detail with the recipient nation, and submit in connection with next year's aid bill, a detailed plan for the progressive reduction of these grants" so as to terminate them within 3 years.

The amendment does not say that direct military aid is to be terminated in 3 years. What it says is that by next year there must be plans for each country for reducing the economic aid which enables it to maintain an oversized military establishment. The plan would show how the armaments can be reduced to a size which the country can digest. We can still supply arms beyond those which the country can pay for. We can still supply arms but only in the amount which the country can take without inflation and disorder.

The cutting edge of the Mansfield amendment is that it would compel the administration to reappraise, to reexamine, and to justify from the beginning and all over again, each military aid program. The amendment does not say that all military aid must terminate in 3 years. It says that the administration must provide a plan for terminating it. It is implied, and should probably be made clear, in the amendment that if no plan to terminate it in 3 years can be worked out without sacrificing the national interest, then the burden of proving that this is the case will be on the administration. It will not be able to take the line that we must go on doing what we have always done just because we have always done it.

In all probability, we shall find that in certain countries it is necessary to continue, not to reduce or to terminate, the grants or gifts. But in other countries we may expect to find that there are oversized military establishments which, far from being a defense against communism, serve only to arouse popular discontent, and that far from being defenses of liberty are the support of despots.

The Mansfield proposal, I should add, does not touch the point 4 program or the Development Loan Fund. These, we may confidently believe, are destined to play an even bigger part in the future than they have in the past. The Mansfield proposal is, however, aimed directly at reducing the emphasis on military aid and of increasing the emphasis on civilian development.

It can be argued that there are many in Congress who will vote for foreign aid only if they are persuaded that it buys guns aimed directly at Russia or China. They do not think that the development of backward countries is any interest of ours. Presumably then, this isolationist opposition will be less willing to vote for foreign aid which emphasizes civilian development.

As against them, however, there will be, so I believe, an ardor and enthusiasm for a new foreign aid program which is sadly lacking today for the old one. The American people are the heirs of generations of men and women who conquered a wilderness, and they will listen to good leaders when they explain to them how they are invited to participate in plans to conquer the wilderness of poverty and subjection in Asia and in Africa and in South America.

The Miracle of Oklahoma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT S. KERR

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 19, 1959

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article which appeared in yesterday's Washington Daily News entitled "The Miracle of Oklahoma," written by a great Oklahoman, Mr. Lyle C. Wilson.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News, May 18, 1959]

THE MIRACLE OF OKLAHOMA

(By Lyle C. Wilson)

This essay relates to the miracle of Oklahoma which is a glittering facet of the miracle of the United States.

A miracle is an event or an effect in the physical world beyond or out of the ordinary course of things, brought about by a superhuman agency as a manifestation of its power, a wonderful thing.

A wonderful thing. That is Oklahoma, a superhuman agency. That agency must be the good God. Oklahomans can and do truly say: "Someone likes us up there."

I have just returned from a brief week in Oklahoma, too few days spent mostly in the eastern part of the State, the old Indian Territory. If there is a lovelier land in the month of May, I do not know where it might be.

Massive dams have impounded in half a dozen places vast bodies of water, their shorelines running into scores and hundreds of miles. Oklahoma's acres of gorgeous redbud trees are counted by the thousands—not the trees by the thousands but the acres.

Fifty years ago when your correspondent arrived in Oklahoma as a young sprout there was not a spare cup of water in the brand-new State. Today, floodways and dams are creating a vast lakeland on Oklahoma's high prairies and thirsty Texas cities as distant as Dallas and Fort Worth may benefit.

Great industries in Oklahoma will be tapping those same waters and this rich and happy State will be richer and even happier before long. The substrata sands continue to flow with Oklahoma's national trademark, oil, black gold. Oklahoma's greatest wealth, however, is in its agriculture, its herds, and its people.

It is a fact well known that the most beautiful women in all the world are born and reared in Oklahoma. Many of them have a touch of Indian blood, usually of the proud Five Civilized Tribes. These part Indian girls and women, all princesses and queens, are very lovely, indeed, as lovely as the land in which they live.

Corn and cotton, broomcorn and wheat thrive in Oklahoma. In the counties in the valley of the Cimmaron in the north-central part of the State the wheat stands today high and green and already heavy headed—so much of it that a visitor from Washington wonders if the taxpayers can afford such a bumper crop.

Pity the poor easterner who never has cast eyes over and beyond 1,000 acres of bluestem grass. Stranger, bluestem is the prettiest ground cover in all the world and the best pasture. Eleven months a year bluestem grows and flourishes and the fat-backed black Angus cattle muzzle its richness.

An Angus steer will gain 3 pounds a day on blue-stem pasture which is as well as he would do in a feed lot munching corn. And that steer sells in Oklahoma City to the packers at premium prices. His steaks are as rich and tender as chocolate fudge.

Small wonder the cowpokes sometimes ride the range in fancy cars and publishers such as Tams Bixby of the Muskogee Phoenix stable a Cadillac and a Thunderbird to fit their mount to their daily mood.

"Oh, what a beautiful morning."

Homemade Bread and Surplus Wheat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 19, 1959

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter which I received. It deals with the surplus of wheat and homemade bread.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WOODWORTH, N. DAK.

Mr. LANGER.

SIR: The answer to the surplus of wheat is this: Get your wife, my wife, his wife, every housewife of this good old United States of

America to bake the good old-fashioned homemade bread which everyone loves to eat.

Your friend,

S. N. HIEB.

Protection and Development of National Forests Vital for Filling Wood Products, Recreation, and Watershed Needs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 19, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, conservation of our natural resources is necessarily a process as well as a product. Continual reevaluation of the nature and extent of demand, periodic scrutiny designed to solve new problems which threaten to encourage depletion or inadequate utilization, and frequent examination of interrelating programs are all matters on which a wise conservation policy depends.

Recently the U.S. Forest Service completed an important assessment of our national forests. This process has provided us with a better understanding of the type of conservation product we shall require by the year 2000.

Entitled "A Program for the National Forests," the study supplies a valuable picture of the resources of our national forests, the programs needed to insure their protection and enhance their use, and the demands which will be placed upon them by succeeding generations.

As a representative of the State of Oregon in the Senate, I have read with great interest the Forest Service's findings. I was pleased to have the opportunity, earlier this week, to attend a special hearing at which Forest Service personnel discussed in some detail the conclusions stated in the report.

My State contains 11,435,000 acres of national forest land. Because of the vast extent of these lands, much of Oregon's economic and recreational life is directly related to their management. This is why during my service in the Senate I have continually worked to secure funds adequate for the maximum development and protection of the tremendous resource which our national forests represent.

Mr. President, in the May 12 1959, issue of the Medford (Oreg.) Mail Tribune, there appears a cogent discussion, by Managing Editor Eric Allen, of the report "Program for the National Forests." I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Allen's perceptive comments be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Mail Tribune, May 12, 1959]

THE NEEDS OF THE FORESTS

One of the news services to which the Mail Tribune subscribes, Congressional Quarterly, reports that the national forests are becoming involved in the budget battle between President Eisenhower and the Democratic leaders in Congress.

At issue is a 26-page report entitled "Program for the National Forests." It was prepared by the Forest Service, endorsed by Ezra T. Benson, Secretary of Agriculture, and adopted as part of the administration's planning.

The document, an excellent one, outlines the procedures to be followed to protect and enhance the value of the 181 million acres of national forests in this country.

CQ reports that the Eisenhower administration plans to use the report as evidence that it is not, as has been alleged, ignoring the natural resources of the Nation.

But it adds, in effect, that the Democrats want to steal the administration's thunder, accusing it of not calling for effective action soon enough, and in sufficient quantity, to do the needed job.

We are pleased that the argument is over when the proposal is to be done—not if. For the national forests constiute one of the outstanding resources of the Nation; much needs to be done, and soon, to bring them to their full potentiality, and if both parties in Congress are arguing from the premise that no less than the Forest Service's proposal can be afforded, then something is going to get done.

CQ reports that the principal bone of contention is over access roads. Secretary Benson says the roads are necessary, and are called for in the program, but adds that he doesn't need any additional money for such roads now, and might request some later.

Democrats, on the other hand, say they should be built as soon as possible. Senator MIKE MANSFIELD (Democrat, Montana), the assistant majority leader, is quoted as saying, "We cannot delay putting this program into effect," adding that increased appropriations should be made right away, a position with which other Democrats agree.

In this argument, the Democrats have the best of it, for access roads are vitally important. So are other proposals in the program.

The program outlined by the Forest Service is in two phases, the first covering the next 10 to 15 years; the second contemplating development of the forests by the year 2000.

The second phase is based on the former. The Forest Service believes that progress must be made in the next 15 years to permit a tripling of the lumber yield 41 years from now, stabilization of soil for conservation or improvement of water and other resources, improvement of the grazing use of the forests, keeping recreational facilities up to the ever-growing demand, increasing disease and fire protection, improving roads and trails, stepping up research, and improvement of physical facilities needed for good forest management.

All these steps, as we see it, are urgent—some more so than others—if the forests are to fulfill their potential.

Oregon, of all the States has the most at stake.

It has the largest acreage of commercial timber of any in the Nation. Four States—Alaska, California, Idaho and Montana—have larger total national forest acreages, but much of these is not classed as "commercial."

In this immediate area, the Rouge River National Forest's 880,000-odd acres (of which about three-quarters are in commercial forest lands) constitutes a tremendously important part of the local economy.

Anything that can be done to improve and extend access roads and trails (for fire and pest control, recreational use, and timber-harvesting) will bring immense long-range benefits to this area.

Forest management in the United States is just now coming of age.

In years past, the American forests loomed so huge and so unlimited, little thought was given to their management and conservation. Within the last 50 years this started to change, with a big boost from President Theodore Roosevelt and Gifford Pinchot. Since World War II the big increase in the value of stumpage has created added impetus to the change.

These days there is pressure to save each potentially valuable tree, not only from fire but also from disease and insects. (And, by the same token, there is growing pressure to overcut the forests—a pressure which must be resisted. But that is another story.)

Today the Forest Service is seeking to bring balance to the field of forest management.

It operates under the wise philosophy that its objective is the greatest good for the greatest number in the long run. This means multiple use overall, and, where necessary or desirable, dedication of certain areas to their primary uses, whether they be to preserve watersheds, or wilderness areas, or provide recreation.

It is a complicated job, and one which demands the best that the dedicated men of the Forest Service can bring to it.

Anything which Congress can do to make their job easier will be of long-range benefit to the Nation. For in the forests lie our vast but limited sources of wood and fiber, food for our livestock, water for our rivers and our cities, and the benefits, huge but without a price tag, of an unspoiled outdoor playground for the Nation.—E.A.

How Do the Banks for Cooperatives Loans Fit Into Growth and Expansion Programs for Farmer Cooperatives?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 19, 1959

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, Mr. Fred R. Merrifield, president of the Wichita Bank for Cooperatives, Wichita, Kans., delivered an outstanding address entitled "How Do the Banks for Cooperatives Loans Fit into Growth and Expansion Programs for Farmer Cooperatives?" at the annual convention of the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, held in New Orleans last January.

This factual and very constructive address explains fully the many benefits that accrue to those who participate in the program of the Farm Credit Administration.

I ask unanimous consent that this address be made a part of these remarks and printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW DO THE BANKS FOR COOPERATIVES LOANS FIT INTO GROWTH AND EXPANSION PROGRAMS FOR FARMER COOPERATIVES?

(By Fred R. Merrifield, president, Wichita Bank for Cooperatives, Wichita, Kans.)

Possibly in presenting a discussion on the subject assigned me, I should give a little background of my experience with cooperatives and our cooperative credit agencies. I should point out that at my age and years of experience with these organizations, I am

not bragging, since of course many others have done even more than I in the achievements outlined, and as with anyone else, my various activities in working with the farmers in our Midwest area, though I hope mostly successful, have not at all times attained the goals which those with whom I worked, desired.

As has been the case with many other workers in our farm credit system and cooperatives, I served a period with the Agricultural Extension Service, starting as a county agent, then district agent and Assistant Director of Extension in Oklahoma. I also served as a national farm loan association secretary-treasurer for almost 4 years. While district agent, I was public director of Oklahoma Wheat Growers Association, the State marketing organization affiliated with the Farmers National Grain Corporation. With my fellow Extension workers, we called the meetings in Oklahoma for the organization of the production credit associations in that State, working with the county agents in selecting the incorporators of these organizations. At the time of the establishment of the Wichita Bank for Cooperatives, we were active in recommending to cooperatives of Oklahoma that they make contact with the Wichita bank for the purpose of obtaining loans.

As pointed out in the congressional committee report relative to the legislation establishing the banks for cooperatives, these banks were for the purpose of extending credit on a business basis to farmers' cooperative associations. As all of us know, the banks started to operate during the depression of the thirties and the majority of our farmers' cooperatives were in a difficult financial situation at that time. In other words, the banks not only loaned money to cooperative organizations to strengthen their immediate financial position, but were in the position of assisting in planning the rebuilding of the associations.

The real reason, of course, for the existence of the banks for cooperatives, along with the other banks of the farm credit system, is to assist individual farmers to better their position financially on their farms, this being done by the banks for cooperatives indirectly through the marketing, supply, and service cooperatives owned by these farmers. In other words, our business is to keep the farmers' off-the-farm business with their cooperatives sound in order that said cooperatives will assist these individual farmers to succeed in their own individual farm business. We believe it is the duty of the officers and business analysts of the bank for cooperatives to study, not only the operations of the most successful cooperatives, but also those who are having their trials, in order that we may assist all of our stockholder organizations in a constructive way to continue to improve their operations.

This service must be rendered in a constructive and tactful manner in order that management of our cooperatives would not consider that bank officials are trying to dictate to them the manner of running their business. In other words, we must keep before our stockholders the fact that the banks for cooperatives are merely partners of the individual farmers in the local cooperatives, or of the local cooperatives in their regionals, from the standpoint of furnishing capital and working with their boards and officers in promoting their growth and expansion plans. We believe that throughout the Nation, stockholders of the banks for cooperatives are appreciative of this service. We have tried to keep before the farmer-members of our cooperative stockholders the importance of ownership by them through investment in common stock or other permanent capital.

The Wichita Bank for Cooperatives carries on a continuous educational program, working with the State land-grant colleges and particularly with the State cooperative councils.

We in the Ninth Farm Credit District have, as have the banks for cooperatives in other districts, worked with many individual cooperatives from the standpoint of loan commitments to strengthen their organizations and assist them to better serve their communities. Following are a few examples of such local cooperatives:

The grain marketing organization at Alva, Okla., which also handles farm supplies, including petroleum products and fertilizer, has grown since the early 1930's from gross assets of $100,000 to $1,300,000.

A similar organization at Andale, Kans., has grown in a lesser period from total assets of $40,000 to $1,600,000.

Incidentally, this later organization had all loans completely paid to the Wichita Bank for Cooperatives at the time we were putting the provisions of the 1955 Farm Credit Act into effect, but despite that fact, due to their board's kindly feeling toward the bank, they invested $10,000 in cash in B stock in the bank. There are, of course, many other examples similar to those mentioned, a few larger, many smaller, that have had similar experiences. The other banks for cooperatives have, of course, had like experiences.

From the standpoint of our regional organizations, Union Equity Cooperative Exchange at Enid, Okla., was the first regional marketing organization to receive assistance from the Wichita Bank for Cooperatives. In that instance, a few of the cooperative elevators of the Panhandle of Texas had determined to set up a regional at Enid, considering that the best location for the marketing of the assembled wheat of their members. They started at that point with a small frame elevator of approximately 100,000 bushels capacity, and now, through continued loyalty of their membership and the assistance of the Wichita Bank for Coops, have the finest single grain storage plant (capacity, 60 million bushels) and office building in the Nation with the best equipped laboratory possible to establish. The old Oklahoma Wheat Growers Association, of which I had been public director, during the early days of Union Equity voluntarily liquidated and recommended to their local member cooperatives that they become members of Union Equity.

The Farmers Cooperative Commission Co., of Hutchinson, Kans., of which Jimmie Dean—a member of our central bank board—is manager, had a similar history though they served a longer period of time as a strictly commission firm, but in recent years have greatly increased their storage facilities and have been merchandising wheat on a quality basis, based on protein and baking tests.

In the case of both Union Equity and Farmers Co-op Commission, after the local farmers elevators had financed the original elevator construction, appraised valuation of properties of the organization and the repayment program was sufficient in practically every case, that new additions were financed almost 100 percent by the bank for cooperatives, and in each case have been paid off long before final maturity dates. Another rapidly expanding grain regional being served by the Wichita bank is Farmers Union Jobbing Association of Kansas City. Other banks for cooperatives serve one or more grain marketing regional cooperatives.

The Wichita Bank with the Central Bank for Cooperatives has furnished the loan finance for the Consumers Cooperative Association in Kansas City, the one regional wholesale organization in our district. As you also know, this organization had a very small beginning, and some definite problems at times, but under the leadership of its capable management and board of directors, with the rendering of real service to their local cooperative members, and with these members' loyalty and support, CCA has grown to its present volume of $129 million for 1958. With the help of the Bank for Cooperatives, CCA was the first cooperative wholesale to construct a petroleum refinery and to invest in oil wells in order that they might produce a high percent of the needed crude petroleum for their refineries. Though we give full credit to CCA management and board of directors for the success of this organization, we of the Bank for Cooperatives believe that due to the fact that we were able to lend money on a sound basis to this organization when needed through the years, and on occasion work with them very closely, that the banks for cooperatives have contributed considerably toward their success. Other wholesale supply cooperatives in other districts have had similar success.

The banks for cooperatives assisted CCA, who was joined by Central Farmers Fertilizer Co. of Chicago in the construction of the fertilizer plant at Lawrence, Kans. Certainly, this plant has been a boon to the farmers of the Middle West, not only from the standpoint of furnishing additional supplies of nitrogen fertilizer, but in reducing the price of such fertilizer in this area.

As outlined above, there is no doubt that our Wichita bank has, as have the other banks for cooperatives of the Nation, rendered a real service to date in the growth and expansion of our farmers cooperative organizations. The question now is, How will the banks serve the cooperatives in the future?

First, may I point out that we emphasize in our stockholder meetings and in other meetings where we are called upon to discuss the services of the banks for cooperatives, that we serve the local cooperatives as their own finance regional in which under the 1955 act they are investing in capital stock, and which they will soon own; that in relation to their financing operations, we are their overall regional organization serving them in a similar way as they are served by their regional marketing and wholesale cooperatives.

As we see it, with agricultural integration in the picture, in which the producing farmer is tied definitely with his marketing and supply systems, the banks can be of even greater service than they have been in the past. In the first place, we will continue on a horizontal integration basis to finance expansion of our present cooperatives from the standpoint of territory, increased services, and greater volume of business. There is certainly room in the great majority of areas for expansion of our present cooperatives. We are attempting in the ninth district to encourage folk in new communities that are not far distant from present cooperative organizations, to join in with the present cooperatives in order to obtain facilities and services for their own communities.

The other field of horizontal expansion is by mergers of presently organized cooperatives. There is a growing interest in such mergers. This type of horizontal integration is paying off. It is definitely to the advantage of the cooperatives themselves, not only from the standpoint of broadening their service, but in greater savings to the membership. The larger cooperatives, as a rule, also have a better credit rating with the banks for cooperatives.

It is in the field of vertical integration, however, that we may see the greatest expansion of the services of the banks for cooperatives in the not too distant future.

Our dairy cooperatives, including both the bargaining associations and the operational

organizations, are expanding by merging, by increasing their overall capital and physical assets in order to not only serve their farmers better, but to serve the consumers of dairy products to a better advantage. There is no question but that there must be a better working relationship and some mergers between these organizations, and that they must be prepared to handle their own surplus products and to have a certain number of pilot distribution plants serving the larger metropolitan areas. Banks for cooperatives can be of increased importance in assisting in the working out of these problems by making loans on a sound basis to assist in the aforementioned program.

From the standpoint of livestock and livestock marketing, the surface has been merely scratched by the cooperative groups serving farmers in this field. The producers marketing organizations on the central markets have rendered a real service for a considerable number of years. I, personally, assisted in calling the meetings in Oklahoma when the first producers livestock marketing organization was formed in that State. In the past few years, however, the central livestock markets have gradually diminished in volume of sales in comparison with their former importance. In my view for the cooperative livestock marketing organizations to continue to exist, they must spread the area of their activities into the country with sales yards, feed pens, testing laboratories, possibly packing plants in some areas, and other means of better serving the livestock farmers themselves. In a few areas in the Nation, some progress has been made along these lines. If the livestock marketing cooperatives do not step out in some of these lines some of our large regional supply organizations will do so in order to protect themselves. Certainly, the banks for cooperatives can assist in the broadening of the activities of the livestock raisers in the marketing of their own products.

Possibly our wheat farmers have gone further in marketing through cooperative channels than any other group, in the marketing of the grains produced on their farms. In the winter Wheat Belt, close to 70 percent of the grain produced is handled through cooperative organizations from the farm up through the regional to the mills, and recently, as you know, our regional organizations have established the Producers Export Co. for the purpose of exporting the grain through an organization owned by the farmers themselves. The banks for cooperatives, as pointed out in the individual instances mentioned before, have been very instrumental in the growth of the grain regionals, and can, and I am sure will assist in the financing of the new Producers Export Co. The regional grain cooperatives will in the near future be forced to either several jointly or through the Export Co. build port facilities for export grain. I believe that in the not too distant future these grain regionals will establish a pilot flour mill, possibly by buying out one of the established firms. There is no reason why the farmers should not, as the years go by, own a portion of their own milling business.

As I see it, grain farmers through their cooperatives should be the ones to ultimately handle their grain surplus problem, starting with the individual farmer, up through his organizations, and with Federal sponsorship, in turn prorating through some type of domestic allotment the production to be accepted from each farmer.

In the lifetime of many of our younger men there will be a complete revamping of our grain market procedure.

From the standpoint of cotton, we have throughout the South, presently, very successful cotton gins and cooperative oil mills owned by these gins. This phase of the cotton cooperative movement has become quite successful. Cooperative cotton marketing, itself, in recent years has not been quite so successful from the standpoint of the number of farms served, and we believe also from the standpoint of the service rendered, due to the lack of volume of business. It is our opinion that there must be some changes in the method of organization of our cotton cooperatives if they are to render the service they should to cotton farmers; possibly the ownership of some of the cotton marketing organizations should be centered in the local cotton cooperative groups of the gin associations or combined with other regional cooperative services, such as the oil mills and cooperative compresses.

In recent months a number of our local gins are having problems from the standpoint of volume due to competition from gins where the individual farmers are being financed by a large privately owned cotton and cottonseed marketing organization, and each farmer is definitely bound to market his cotton through gins and oil mills owned by the same cotton marketing corporation. We believe that the banks of the cooperative farm credit system can and will be able to assist the farmers in these localities with their local financing in order that they may still market through their own cooperative marketing channels.

The cotton marketing cooperatives will no doubt also join more closely for the purpose of exporting their farmer-members' cotton, and take a more active interest in the milling of their product. Banks for cooperatives will cooperate in any program to assist the cotton farmer to market his products more efficiently.

Since poultry production is a minor agricultural activity in our ninth farm credit district, and since this group has had presented to it the results of integration in the broiler and egg business, we will not take your time to discuss the place of the banks for cooperatives in financing further expansion in these lines.

One of the greatest opportunities for expansion by cooperatives is in the fruit and vegetable field, where the banks for cooperatives can be of real assistance on a sound basis.

Possibly the greatest field for increasing the service of farmers' cooperatives in the near future is in the expansion of farm supply cooperatives, both local retail and regional wholesale, and in a closer coordination of those organizations with the marketing organizations in the move toward vertical integration. In order to properly serve farmers, supply organizations must have available in the future some sort of supplementary credit to finance sales of feed and fertilizer and other supplies directly to farmers. This may be done with a closer relationship with production credit associations, or through subsidiary credit organizations affiliated with the regional wholesale supply organizations; or by the regional wholesales themselves.

In the case of affiliation with PCA's, which we normally recommend of course, funds will be furnished through the Federal Intermediate Credit Bank, while in the case of subsidiary credit corporations or regional wholesale organizations, funds may be obtained through the banks for cooperatives. In the case of integrated programs of furnishing feed for poultry or livestock, arrangements should, if possible, be made by the regional wholesale organizations with local or regional livestock, dairy products, or poultry marketing organizations for the marketing of the products so produced. Some of our large regional supply organizations are faced with serious problems in meeting competition in their feed program.

Certainly there should be a closer relationship between our cooperative marketing and wholesale supply organizations, as well as a closer cooperation between the cooperative wholesale supply associations themselves in the various territories served by them. We look forward to a greatly accelerated constructive expansion of the cooperative wholesale and retail supply business. The banks for cooperatives can well assist in the expansion in this field. Along with the increased use by farmers of their marketing and supply cooperatives, they will turn to their own short-term and long-term cooperative credit facilities through the production credit associations who rediscount with the Federal intermediate credit bank, and the national farm loan associations who make Federal land bank loans.

We believe that all cooperatives will more fully realize the fact that the interest charged by a bank for cooperatives is not the actual cost of money from these banks, but that they should take into account their receipt of stock from the bank representing net earnings of their bank which is in effect a direct reduction in the interest cost. This stock will be redeemed in cash on a revolving basis as soon as Government capital in the bank for cooperatives is repaid. When this is fully realized by all cooperative organizations it should increase the loan demand from the banks for cooperatives, both in the districts and from the central bank.

All in all, it is our belief that the field by which farmers can use their cooperative organizations for better service to themselves, is very broad indeed and that the volume of business of cooperative marketing and supply associations should triple in the next decade. The banks for cooperatives can, and will, be of real assistance in the realization of the possibilities for such growth and expansion of cooperatives to the benefit of their individual farmer member-owners. In fact, as their services are utilized, the banks for cooperatives will expand in proportion to the expansion of the farmer cooperatives which they serve.

Tribute to the Secretary of Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 19, 1959

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very excellent article prepared by Mr. Albert B. Southwick and printed in the Evening Gazette in Worcester, Mass. It is certainly an outstanding editorial summary of one of the most difficult problems facing the Congress, and it is an excellent tribute to a man who has fought hard to improve our farm economy—Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AS THE FARM PROGRAM TOTTERS TOWARD COLLAPSE

(By Albert B. Southwick)

Until recent months, most observers thought that we could live with the farm problem, bad as it is. Now some are not so sure.

A note of tension—almost panic—has crept into the political discussions of crop surpluses. At Cornell University last week, Secretary of Agriculture Benson lashed out at his critics and the current agricultural

laws, which he called "the most irrational, hodge-podge program ever patched together."

Columnist Roscoe Drummond wrote recently that if Congress doesn't soon rescue the America people from an irrational, unworkable, extravagant and deteriorating mess of a farm program * * * there will be a massive political revolt by the voting consumer.

STEADILY WORSE

Democrats and Republicans alike—at least when they are speaking off the record—agree that something has to give. Despite Benson's heroic efforts to straighten out the fantastic situation, things have gotten steadily worse for the past 5 years.

In his Cornell speech, Benson disclosed that the farm crop purchase program is costing the Government over $1 billion a year for storage, transportation, and interest alone. A billion dollars is one thousand million dollars—down the drain every year.

That is only part of the story. Uncle Sam also has $9 billion tied up in the surpluses themselves. Nobody knows whether he will get back 90 percent, 75 percent or 50 percent of that enormous sum. At best the prospects are dim. The Government has $3½ billion tied up in wheat alone. By July, 1960, the wheat carryover will be around 1½ billion bushels—enough to supply the country for almost 3 years. Wheat stocks cannot be kept forever.

What is this farm program that has led to such monstrous surpluses?

DEPRESSION-SPAWNED

Basically, it is a program spawned by the depression 25 years ago. It was nurtured on the war years of 1940–45, when the free world was straining to produce as much food and fiber as was humanly possible. It was designed for a time of depression and scarcity.

Its chief feature is the provision that the Government must support the price of cotton, corn, wheat, rice, tobacco and peanuts at a certain parity level. Without going into the complicated parity business, we can readily see that the support prices are far too high. Every year sees farmers producing more efficiently and cheaply, and every year sees the Government surplus stocks grow more swollen.

A secondary feature of the farm program is the maze of rules and regulations that permit and sometimes require the Secretary of Agriculture to support the price of many other commodities, such as dried milk, barley, oats, grain sorghum, soybeans, and butter. Benson has, in the main, administered that part of the law wisely, and has actually reduced the butter, milk and cheese surpluses in the past few years.

Benson for years has asked Congress to free him from the requirement that he support the price of the five basic crops listed two paragraphs above. Congress has persistently refused. Much as the farmers dislike Government meddling and regulations, they dread even more the thought of plummeting market prices.

However, the longer corrective measures are postponed, the worse the upheaval will be, according to most farm economists.

Benson believes that it would be possible to let the farmers down fairly easily, over a period of years, if Congress would give him permission to gradually drop support prices. But farm State politicians in Congress will not hear of it. They are politically committed to farm supports.

But the evidence is mounting that even the farmers ar getting sick of the mess. A recent poll by the Farm Journal found 55 percent of the participating farmers voting to get the Government clean out of agriculture. Another 15 percent favored emergency supports only "to prevent disaster from a huge crop or sudden loss of markets; floors set at, say 50 percent of parity (instead of 90 percent), or 75 percent of the average 3-year market price and no production controls."

ACREAGE CONTROLS

Production controls are very galling to farmers. These regulations let the Government tell the farmers just how many acres they can plant to certain crops. Since 1949, over 20 million acres have been thus withdrawn from wheat alone—yet the wheat surpluses are far bigger than ever.

This paradox springs from the phenomenal increases in production that the American farmer is achieving. In 1958, for instance, the average yield per acre for all crops was 43 percent larger than it was in 1948. This means that 57 acres of land now do the work that 100 acres did only a decade ago.

Of all the possible solutions to his dilemma, Benson is most hostile to the one being pushed by some powerful Democrats, including Senate Majority Leader LYNDON JOHNSON. This is the proposal for a production-payments plan, better known as the Brannan plan, after the former Secretary of Agriculture, who first proposed the idea.

BRANNAN PLAN

The Brannan plan would end the present price support program. In its stead it would set up a system for paying farmers directly from the Federal Treasury in order to maintain their income. That is, if a wheat farmer whose reasonable income was estimated at $10,000 per year should sell only $8,000 worth of wheat, the Federal Government would pay him $2,000.

With more than 4 million farmers in the country, this would prove colossally complicated. Benson says it would lead to direct socialization of agriculture, and would cost the taxpayers between $5 and $10 billion a year, depending on how extensively it was applied to crops.

Benson will fight the Brannan plan, and anything like it, right down to the wire. But if any reasonable approach is suggested to get the Government out from under its monstrous pile of farm surpluses, the first man to applaud will be Ezra Taft Benson, who is sick of being the fall guy.

The Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 19, 1959

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, on Monday, May 18, 1959, the Washington Post and Times Herald carried an editorial paying tribute to Commissioners McLaughlin and Karrick. The Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia has benefited greatly from the devoted service of these two men.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald, May 18, 1959]

PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD

Washington is indeed fortunate to have two men of outstanding ability and broad experience in its affairs contending for the presidency of the Board of Commissioners. Either Commissioner McLaughlin, the present president, or Commissioner Karrick, who has just been reappointed to the Board (in consequence of which it must reorganize and elect a president) could serve ably in that position. We were among those who urged Mr. Karrick to accept reappointment, and his speedy confirmation by the Senate is testimony to the high regard in which his city holds him.

Mr. Karrick's acceptance of another 3-year term on the condition that he may resign after 1 year does raise some questions, however, about the wisdom of reshuffling the city government for this relatively short period to make him president of the Board. If he leaves a year hence, presumably Mr. McLaughlin will again be in line for the presidency, causing yet another shifting of duties.

The presidency of the Board is not just ceremonial. In addition to carrying with it direct responsibility for the police and fire departments (a secondary consideration), it also entails many other important duties in the planning, housing and regional government fields. Mr. McLaughlin has provided vital leadership and displayed much useful initiative in these areas, inaugurating the Metropolitan Regional Conference, steering the interagency mass transportation study, helping to promote and organize the new District stadium as a member of the Armory Board and providing important guidance in many other official and semiofficial activities. Some of these matters are at a crucial stage in which a change of leadership could be disruptive.

Commissioner Karrick's willingness to serve connotes, we assume, a desire to serve where he would be most useful. This opportunity seems to us to lie in continuing the outstanding work he has done in the health, welfare, and other fields and in lending his considerable expertise in civic affairs and city administration to the policy sessions of the Board of Commissioners. It does not seem to us to lie in upsetting the present duties of Board members with all the consequent loss of momentum that this could mean to so many important projects—particularly since Mr. Karrick intends to serve only for another year.

There is honor enough for all who willingly and devotedly serve this city, as Commissioners McLaughlin and Karrick have done. The city will honor Mr. Karrick even more, we think, if he elects to round out his service in the present framework of the city administration.

Astoria, Oreg., Budget Analyzes Problem of Congressional Nepotism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 19, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, a most excellent and thoughtful editorial entitled "Nepotism Problems" discussing the whole question of congressional nepotism, was published in the Astorian Budget of Astoria, Oreg., on May 12, 1959. In particular, I agree with the editors of the Budget that nepotism is not wrong per se, but only when it is abused or exploited. For example, the editors of the Budget point out that the

employment of wives at the Oregon State Legislature is a widely accepted practice which meets with no challenge on the part of the public.

I also am pleased that the editors of the Budget concur in my proposal to establish uniform classification and administrative wage scales for all those employed on the staffs of members of the U.S. Senate.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Astorian Budget, May 12, 1959]

NEPOTISM PROBLEM

There has been quite a furore recently about nepotism in the official staffs of Members of Congress, primarily due to the recent disclosure that a Member of the House of Representatives had a teenage nephew on the payroll at some $11,000 a year, to do clerical work. There was a good deal of public doubt whether a youth of 19 was worth $11,000 a year to the people of the United States who pay the bill.

Nepotism isn't wrong unless it's abused. This is particularly true as regards the personal staffs of legislators. Members of the Oregon Legislature habitually employ wives or other relatives as secretaries and no one objects.

The pay scale for Oregon legislators is so woefully small that the hiring of wives to eke out their pittances is an accepted and generally approved practice.

Also, there are other advantages to a lawmaker in having a wife or someone else closely associated by blood or marriage as a member of his personal staff.

But when one begins hiring youngsters at ridiculously large pay, then the public as a right to squawk.

Oregon's Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER has just introduced legislation to set up uniform classification and published wage scales for the staffs of Senate Members. This wouldn't abolish nepotism, but would regulate it and discourage abuses. Something like this is needed for both Senate and House.

Excise Tax on Special Fuels

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 19, 1959

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution adopted by the North Dakota Association of County Engineers with reference to the 2-percent special excise tax on the sale of special fuels sold to agriculture and railroads, adopted by the North Dakota State Assembly.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION

Whereas the 36th Legislative Assembly of North Dakota passed a 2-percent special excise tax on the sale of special fuels sold to agriculture and railroads for use on farm-to-market roads eligible for Federal aid matching funds (H.B. 740); and

Whereas the construction of the Interstate Highway and the improvement of the primary highway system in the State will bring about a demand from the people of the State to improve the State and county Federal-aid secondary road systems: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the North Dakota Association of County Engineers, That we request our Senators and Representatives in Congress to take action so that more Federal-aid secondary funds can be appropriated to the State and the counties.

New Hampshire's Seacoast: A Growing Industrial Area

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS COTTON

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 19, 1959

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, New Hampshire's seacoast area has long been famed as a resort area. Its wide, sandy beaches and delightful climate have attracted vacationers from all parts of the Nation for generations. But the recreation fame of our seacoast has sometimes obscured the industrial, commercial, and maritime aspects of the area, which have been growing in recognition and importance.

An article published in the Wall Street Journal of Thursday, May 14, illustrates the expanding industrial importance of New Hampshire's seacoast area, especially Portsmouth Harbor and the Piscataqua River. The article discusses the contribution of Newington, N.H. and the Simplex Wire & Cable Co. of that city, to the new transatlantic telephone cable.

I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMPLETION OF FIRST NORTH AMERICA-EUROPE TELEPHONE CABLE NEAR AS SHIP IS RESUPPLIED

(By Paul Lancaster)

NEWINGTON, N.H.—Twenty-four hours a day, 7 days a week, seemingly endless strands of black cable coil into huge cylindrical tanks in the hold of a weather gray ship lying alongside a wharf here.

The ship is the H.M.T.S. (Her Majesty's telegraph ship) *Monarch*, a cable-laying vessel owned by the British post office and now under charter to American Telephone & Telegraph Co. The cable being loaded is destined to become part of the first transatlantic telephone cable to link North America directly to the mainland of Europe.

The new cable, scheduled for service next fall, will add upward of 36 circuits to the 42 now joining North America to France, Germany, Italy, Spain, Switzerland, the Netherlands, and Belgium. Present telephone communication with the European Continent is provided largely by radio-telephone circuits, with a few cable circuits supplied by connections with a transatlantic telephone cable laid between North America and England in 1956. Cable circuits are much more reliable than radio-telephone links on which service is frequently interrupted by magnetic storms.

Climbing overseas business following the laying of the 1956 cable—the first transatlantic voice cable—prompted the decision to go ahead with the cable to the Continent, an A.T. & T. spokesman indicated to newsmen visiting the *Monarch*. It is berthed here, just up the Piscataqua River from Portsmouth, and close by the Simplex Wire & Cable Co. plant at which some of the cable for the project is being produced.

In 1955, before the cable was installed, 101,500 calls were placed between the United States and Great Britain, the spokesman said. Last year the number rose to 261,000 "when people find it is so easy and fast to make these calls, it encourages use," he noted.

The new cable will run between Clarenville, Newfoundland, and Penmarch, France. The $40 million cable, which actually consists of two cables, one for transmission of voices in each direction, will be jointly owned by A.T. & T. and French and German Government communication agencies.

Starting in March, the *Monarch* laid cable from France to a point 200 miles off the coast of Newfoundland. Hazardous icefields forced the ship to halt operations at this point late in April. After marking the cable end with a buoy, the *Monarch*, one of the largest cable layers in the world, steamed to this port to pick up a new stock of cable at the Simplex plant.

Loading will be completed some time next week, and the ship will again head for waters off Newfoundland. It will start laying out the Newfoundland-to-France cable, pausing when it reaches the point where the earlier France-to-Newfoundland effort was abandoned to retrieve this cable and finish laying it to Newfoundland. The ship will then resume laying cable in the direction of France until it runs out of cable, when it will rendevous with another vessel which will take over and complete the laying of this west-to-east cable.

Simplex Wire which, along with English, French, and German firms, is supplying the cable needed for the 2,400-mile communications link, has its submarine cable plant right on the waterfront here. In the plant, a gleaming copper core is covered with nine assorted layers of plastic, jute, fabric tape, steel armor wire and tar-like coating. Cable for deep-sea use is 1¼ inches thick; cable for use in shallow water, where damage from anchors or fishermens' trawling lines is more likely, is considerably thicker.

The completed cable spins out from the plant in two continuous strands and is conveyed over large grooved wheels like big pulleys to the *Monarch* a couple of hundred yards away.

The *Monarch*, a 480-foot vessel, stores the cable in four round tanks, each 42 feet in diameter and 26 feet deep. The ship can carry as much as 1,840 miles of cable. Cable is fed into the water over "sheaves"—giant pulley-like devices at the stern and bow. Cable is usually laid over the stern, a British officer aboard the ship explains, but in shallow water or when fancy maneuvering must be undertaken, the bow sheave is used to prevent the cable from becoming fouled in the ship's propellers.

Though cable laying isn't quite as formidable a task as it was a hundred years ago, when the first attempts to lay transatlantic telegraph cables were frustrated by frequent breaks, it's still a tricky business.

The ship must proceed at a leisurely pace of about 7 knots an hour as it pays out cable, but it tries to avoid ever coming to a complete stop because the tremendous weight of the cable will then pull the ship back as much as 5 miles, according to a ship's officer.

It's possible to control the ship from three places—the bridge and the points at the bow and stern from which cable is lowered into the sea. This permits precise maneuvering,

which is especially important when bulges in the cable housing, delicate electronic devices called "repeaters," are fed out. The repeaters, spaced out every 44 miles to amplify signals, must not be bent, and care must be taken that the stern does not swing from side to side as they are moving through the sheave.

Answer to Criticisms of Supreme Court of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY
OF WYOMING
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 19, 1959

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, there have come to my hand some illuminating comments by Judge Walter L. Pope, chief judge of the court of appeals for the ninth circuit, on the American Bar Association pamphlet criticizing the Supreme Court.

Judge Pope was made a doctor of laws by the University of Montana. He practiced law in Lincoln, Nebr., and at Missoula, Mont.; was an assistant professor of law at the University of Nebraska, and was professor of law in the University of Montana Law School.

He was a special assistant to the Attorney General of the United States from 1937 to 1941, in connection with Northern Pacific land-grant litigation. He has served on the second court of appeals of the ninth circuit since March 1, 1949. His judicial career and his professional career both entitle him to careful attention.

The extracts I desire to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD come from a letter which he wrote on April 24, 1959, to Mr. Ross L. Malone, president of the American Bar Association. I ask unanimous consent to have these comments printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
April 24, 1959.

Mr. ROSS L. MALONE,
President, American Bar Association,
Roswell Petroleum Building,
Roswell, N. Mex.

DEAR MR. MALONE: Since I heard your talk at the San Francisco Lawyers' Club some of the delegates from California have called my attention to the American Bar Association pamphlet marked "Resolutions and Report of the Special Committee on Communist Tactics, Strategy, and Objectives." I have read this and also your article in the current journal.

I think you were certainly right when you said: "I must confess that to an outsider the distinction between resolutions adopted by the House * * * and the report of a committee which accompanies proposed resolutions to the House which reflects only the views of the committee members who sign it, is quite finely drawn and likely to result in confusion."

I had thought the bar association had an educational function—a duty to enlighten outsiders, not confuse them. But apart from that, a reading of the report strongly suggests that the confusion was a calculated one—that it was a prime purpose of those who managed this whole affair.

I cannot understand how the Board of governors permitted this situation to get so out of hand; or how they authorized the circulation of this report under the American Bar Association name; or how they allowed a long and vital report, not submitted to delegates until Monday and then in the midst of a crowded agenda, to be forced to a vote on Tuesday. A number of the California delegates tell me (they voted 2 to 1 against it), there was not time for them even to read the report, much less debate it.

I think you are mistaken when you say: "The second area of controversy with which the resolutions dealt is that of civil rights." I cannot find a single place in either the resolutions or the report where such things are dealt with. I cannot find anywhere one kind word on behalf of individual liberty or human freedom, or one word suggesting that balancing security and liberty presents a serious problem.

The bar association should have insisted on acting only on a report that was lawyerlike and temperate. This was neither. Compare it with the carefully studied report on "The Federal Loyalty Security Program" made to the Association of the Bar of the City of New York by a group of distinguished leaders of the bar which included Monte Lemann, John O'Melveny, Whitney North Seymour and six others of similar stature. Their sound and careful approach is indicated by the warning in their opening summary: "In planning personnel security attention must not be directed to security alone. There is another value which must be preserved and guarded. It is individual liberty. Liberty is a quality to which this Nation since its foundation has been devoted and which it has cherished. To ignore or even to slight liberty would be to destroy our character as a people and as a Nation."

I have no knowledge, and of course would not assume, that, as asserted in numerous quarters, the present report was written by Lou Nichols. But it certainly sounds like the work of a nonlawyer—a layman's plea for a bill of no rights. * * *

I am curious as to whether the board was ignorant of such things as those Judge Walsh related in discussing the Nelson case before the college of trial lawyers or as Arthur Krock noted of the report's recommendations based on the Flaxer case. Or, had the board even thought of the possibility that the Civil Liberties Union might be right in its suggestion that some of the recommendations ask Congress to cross over the boundary into unconstitutionality? I would think matters like these were at least worth debating.

In my view the board's disclaimer is a ineffective to avoid just criticism as the remark of the small boy who said "I did not hit you—my hand did it." I think you will find it out.

I do not recall how long I have been a member of the association. I would guess about 40 years. Often during that period the association has been superb as in 1939 and 1943 when its committee on the bill of rights argued for freedom of assembly and for freedom of worship in *Hague* v. *CIO* and *Board of Education* v. *Barnette*. Sometimes it has been a bit silly, as in 1952 when it wasted its efforts on the Bricker amendment and on repeal of the 16th amendment. Its standing was not aided when, in 1916, six of its former presidents united in a protest that Louis D. Brandeis was not a fit person to be a member of the Supreme Court. Though it seems to me it has now hit bottom I shall stay by the ship, trying to help you and the others who I know feel badly about this, to attempt to redeem the association's good name.

It seems too bad that this had to happen in your administration; that it is you who have to spend your time going about the country in an effort to explain away this report. Would not this be a good time to start a movement in support of the bill of rights. Why should there not be a committee charged with advocating the enforcement of the Bill of Rights? I could suggest the names of many men who are both (1) real lawyers of the highest standing; and (2) dedicated to the principles of constitutional liberty, who would be eager to help. Why not try?

Sincerely,

WALTER L. POPE.

Millions To Reclaim Land for Cotton We Do Not Need

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 19, 1959

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in its lead editorial on Sunday, the Milwaukee Journal expressed vigorous indignation at the action the Senate took last week in passing the San Luis Federal reclamation project bill that authorized the appropriation of $290 million to bring into production hundreds of thousands of additional fertile acres of farmland. The project will do this at the very time when we are authorizing hundreds of millions of dollars of other appropriations to take other fertile land out of production.

I ask unanimous consent that this excellent editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MILLIONS TO RECLAIM LAND FOR COTTON WE DO NOT NEED

In 1957 the Federal Government paid $2,750,000 to 143 farmers in California to take 28,900 acres out of cotton production.

Tuesday the Senate passed a bill authorizing spending of $290 million for a Federal reclamation project in Central Valley in California. It would bring 300,000 acres of land into production—paving the way for 80,000 more acres of cotton.

To Senator WILLIAMS, Republican, Delaware, Senator PROXMIRE, Democrat, Wisconsin, and others this makes no sense. Nor should it to anyone. As Williams told the Senate, the Federal Government "is spending millions of dollars to take acreage out of production." Simultaneously to spend further millions to make new land available for the very crops we already have in surplus is the height of foolishness and wastefulness.

One agency of Government works at direct odds with another agency of Government. It isn't a new thing. It's done in many phases of the agricultural program. But it is one of the things that makes that program increasingly incomprehensive, illogical and economically suicidal.

Minnesota Has "Braceros" Too

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 19, 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "Minnesota Has 'Braceros' Too," written by the Reverend Edward S. Grzeskowiak, which appeared in the Catholic Bulletin of St. Paul, Minn., on April 24, 1959, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MIGRATING FAMILIES—MINNESOTA HAS "BRACEROS" TOO

(By Father Edward S. Grzeskowiak)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The Reverend Edward S. Grzeskowiak, author of the following article, is a teacher at Nazareth Hall prepartory seminary, Arden Hills, and a member of Governor Freeman's human rights commission and chairman of its subcommittee on migratory farmworkers.)

When most people hear the word "migrate" they probably think of the seasonal migration of birds. However, families also migrate with the seasons. They are the thousands of Mexican migrant farmworkers.

But there is tragedy in their migration, because it is stark economic necessity that makes them migrate. There is further tragedy in the fact that all too often they and their problems are looked upon as hardly more than a set of impersonal and cold statistics.

These migrant families, for the most part, come from Texas, where there are not enough jobs to go around. Though of Mexican ancestry, they are citizens of the United States like the rest of us.

Last spring and summer, close to 7,900 Mexican migrants came to Minnesota. They consisted of 5,260 workers, 1,340 children between 6 and 14, and 1,330 children under 6. The number expected this year is about the same, probably a little less.

They work in a surprisingly large number of field crops in our State. By far the majority thin and weed the sugar beet fields in the Red River Valley, principally during the months of June and July.

A good number harvest the asparagus crop in southern Minnesota during the months of May and June. A small percentage work in such crops as potatoes, onions, cabbage, green beans, and soybeans.

Their contribution to our crops is often referred to as stoop labor. They do not have a special love or aptitude for this type of work. They simply are resigned to taking whatever job they can get.

Most migrant farmworkers remain in any one State for a relatively short period of time only. For this reason they often are not qualified to receive welfare aid during jobless months. Others feel compelled by a sense of independence not to seek aid.

They are excluded from coverage by unemployment compensation laws. So the urge to keep body and soul together makes them take to the roads in the spring and travel from job to job as long as they last.

Migrants in desperation have said to me, "Padre, we'll work even for 50 cents an hour, just so we get some work." Sometimes they work for less.

The Mexican migrants' need for work is matched by the growers' need for fieldworkers. The crops must be harvested when they are ready. Sometimes a delay of only 1 day could mean an economic loss to farmers.

Dependable workers must be available when they are needed. To be sure that the work is done on time, growers like to hire families. They are more stable than individuals and are less likely to walk off a job.

There is another advantage in hiring families. Usually there are several people in a family capable of doing field work. Sometimes the worker's age might be as low as 10 years. Several workers in a family makes possible a relatively high family hourly wage, even though the individual hourly wage might be very low.

It is very difficult to get facts on wages. Some growers allege that migrant families earn a lot of money. If this is true, their number is very small. I have talked to many migrants and have yet to meet a family or individual whose income could be considered high by any stretch of the imagination.

Beet workers, for example, get paid by the acre. It amounts to about $22 per acre. The work normally consist of one thinning and two weeding operations. When the fields are easy to work this pay could average to a fairly decent hourly wage, though not near as good as that enjoyed by factory workers.

When the fields are difficult to work, the hourly wage might average as low as 40 cents. It is estimated that about 60 cents of the cost of a 100-pound bag of sugar goes to pay the wages of migrant beet workers.

The average annual income of Mexican migrant families is approximately $1,000. This is not very much when one realizes that families of from 6 to 10 children are common. For some families the income is so inadequate that they do not send their children to school at all during the year because they cannot afford the necessary clothing.

Families are known to leave Minnesota with unpaid bills. When confronted with the question "Why?" they usually answer, "Well, Padre, our earnings are so small, and if we paid those bills we wouldn't have anything left. So, we just skipped." The complaint about inadequate wages is a frequent one.

It must be emphasized that wages paid migrants in Minnesota are no worse than those migrants receive in other States. Quite probably in some instances they are even better. The shocking truth is that their wages are disgracefully low throughout the entire Nation.

Migrant farmworkers are specificially excluded from coverage under minimum wage laws, both State and Federal.

Should an individual State extend this coverage to migrant farmworkers, it would well work to the economic hardship of growers within the State who would have to compete for markets with growers from other States where minimum wage laws would not apply. Effective wage improvements will have to be nationwide in scope.

Migrant farmworkers help produce consumer products that flow into interstate commerce. Unlike other workers who produce consumer goods for interstate commerce, they are excluded from coverage under the Federal minimum wage law—a stautory situation that defies both logic and justice.

The present Secretary of Labor has taken the firm stand that migrant farmworkers ought to be covered by the Federal minimum wage law. Most members of Minnesota's congressional delegation have taken the same stand. Perhaps the strongest organized opposition to this important progressive step comes from the Farm Bureau.

The problem of low wages is further aggravated by the fact that migrant farmworkers have no voice in negotiating working agreements with their employers. Working agreements, oral or written, are unilateral. They are drawn up by the growers and agreed to by the workers.

Actually the migrants are afraid to disagree for fear the would be sent home as troublemakers. They know what it means to be blackballed. There is no better argument for sound and strong unionism than the economic plight of migrant farmworkers.

Our Mexican migrant families get so little. They have a God-given right to enough. They certainly can and ought to get more.

Probably St. James had them in mind when he wrote, "Mark my words: the wages of which you have defrauded the workmen who mowed your fields cry aloud, and the cries of the reapers have reached the ears of the Lord of Hosts."

Conservation of America's Forest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 19, 1959

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, conservation of our natural resources—our water, our soil, our trees—has long been the enviable goal of mankind as it attempts to prepare the great gifts of nature for future generations.

The contributions toward conservation are continually on the increase in this Nation as more and more people come to realize that these gifts of nature are valuable heritages which must be both protected and enhanced so that the Americans of tomorrow will live in a world immeasurably better.

Recognition of the need to preserve and protect one such resource—our vast forests—has been given in an essay written by one of our South Dakota Indian high school seniors, a young man attending the Oglala Community School on the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation. He is Harry Eagle Bull.

Harry Eagle Bull's essay was printed in a recent edition of the Shannon County News, one of our fine western South Dakota weekly newspapers.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD this particularly timely essay by Harry Eagle Bull on conservation of our forests.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONSERVATION OF AMERICA'S FOREST

(The following essay was written by Harry Eagle Bull, age 19, a senior at the Oglala Community School:)

Next to the earth itself the forest is man's most useful servant. The word "forest" comes from the Latin words "foris," meaning "out of doors."

Forest lands occupy nearly one-third of the United States, or about 630 million acres. About 462 million acres of this amount are suited to the production of commercial timber. The remaining 168 million acres are classed as noncommercial. More than 17 million tons of paper and cardboard are produced from the commercial forest each year. Besides the paper, wood is used in the production of plastics, for rayon, for alcohol, and countless other products.

Much of our present forest area has been culled, cut over, or mismanaged. About 73 million acres of the commercial timber have been wastefully lumbered, until now, they produce very little for industry. Another 174 million acres have been stripped of all trees of sawmill size, but still furnish pulpwood and other products. The remaining 215 million acres still contain more than 1,000 million board feet of sawmill-size timber, but we are at present using up or destroying our forests more rapidly than they are being replenished or replaced.

The forest has many enemies, but its worst enemy is fire. Each year, millions of acres of timber worth tens of millions of dollars are destroyed by fire. About nine-tenths of these fires are man-made; they are caused by carelessly dropped matches and burning cigarettes and neglected campfires. The other one-tenth is caused by lightning.

Insects are another deadly enemy of the forest. Some insects eat leaves, others bore into the tree trunks, some kill the shoots at the top of the trees, while others attack the roots. Millions of dollars are spent each year fighting these pests. Biologists and other research scientists work the year round searching for the cause of insect infestation and for ways to cure the infestation once it has reached a serious stage.

Since it takes from 50 to 100 years for a tree to grow to lumbering size, our forests must be carefully preserved. Therefore only selected trees should be cut and other trees should be systematically planted to take their places.

The conservation of forests in America had its birth in 1873 when the rapid destruction of the forest was first realized. As a result, Congress passed a law establishing the Bureau of Forestry under the Department of Agriculture in 1891. This act empowered the President the right to set aside forest areas as national forest reserves. In 1905, under the administration of Theodore Roosevelt, this agency was reorganized as the Forest Service with greatly enlarged powers.

The Government hires and trains forest rangers to guard and protect the forest from all hazards. It is their duty to watch for fires and report them as fast as they can. Recently, both airplanes and helicopters have proven very useful in locating and combating forest fires.

Besides furnishing lumber and many other products the forests help improve our water supply and reduce erosion. In their unending search for water, the roots pierce otherwise impenetrable clays and shales, thus making the clays and shales permeable to water and increasing the ground water reservoir of that particular area. The roots of the trees hold back valuable soil which otherwise may be washed away in excessive erosion. The forest also serves as a protection against floods. The leaves and needles that the trees shed each year decompose into a carpet of humus that greatly adds to the fertility of the soil. This carpet of humus also acts as a natural blotter and soaks up the heavy rains and melting snows. The forest is the home of many wild animals as well as a grazing area for domesticated animals. Trees serve as excellent windbreaks and they also add to the beauty of parks and other recreational area.

If we are to continue to waste our forests as we have done in the past, we will soon be in serious economic trouble. Our present-day standard of civilization might never have been attained without the aid of the forests and the services that they render.

Dr. Mason W. Gross

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 19, 1959

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, May 6, 1959, marked an auspicious occasion in New Jersey, the inauguration of Dr. Mason Welch Gross as the 16th president of Rutgers University.

A well-known, widely respected public figure, Dr. Gross brings to his task a wealth of experience and a variety of talents which gives promise that he will do his part to keep the university in the forefront of the educational world.

We are proud of this selection. We look forward with anticipation to the new areas of excitement he plans for the university. We know that a bright future is ahead for Rutgers under the guidance of its great new president.

I ask unanimous consent to have four articles printed in the Appendix of the RECORD—an article from the Paterson Evening News of Thursday, May 7, 1959, entitled "Rutgers New President Scholar-Teacher"; an editorial from the Newark Evening News of May 7 entitled "Areas of Excitement"; an editorial from the Asbury Park Evening Press of May 8 entitled "An Auspicious Start"; and an editorial from the Passaic Herald-News of May 9, 1959, entitled "Studying Non-Western Cultures."

There being no objection, the articles and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RUTGERS NEW PRESIDENT SCHOLAR-TEACHER

NEW BRUNSWICK.—The State university's new president—formally inaugurated in colorful ceremonies yesterday—doesn't fit anyone's stereotype of philosopher, professor or top executive of one of the Nation's major universities. Yet he is all of these.

Dr. Mason Welch Gross isn't the tweedy pipe-smoking type, nobody ever accuses him of being absentminded, and, despite the fact that he runs an institution with an annual budget of well over $20 million he's no maneating, button-pushing, high-pressure executive either.

Rutgers new president, 16th in a line that stretches back to 1766, is first a scholar and a teacher. But teaching, which he loves and which his students say he does so well, has been squeezed from his schedule as his administrative duties have grown, first as an assistant dean, then as provost. This year he teaches but a single couse—a philosophy section for upper classmen.

Dr. Gross has all the qualifications to make a first-class teacher. He studied at Aberdeen and Cambridge, and won his doctorate at Harvard. He has the gift of precise word and the enthusiasm for his subject that keeps his lectures swift paced and lively.

But these qualifications along with a keen mind and an inexhaustible capacity for work are also part of the specifications for the head of a complex university, and New Jersey's State University with its variety of colleges, schools, research units and extension divisions certainly fills that description.

While teaching and taking on an increasing load of administrative duties through the years, Dr. Gross has handled a good many other activities. An enthusiastic amateur oarsman, he has coached several crews, both at Rutgers and Cambridge. A favorite diversion on one of the rare afternoons when his schedule permits, is to follow the Scarlet crews in the coaching launch.

One of New Jersey's widely known public figures, Rutgers' new president has served a wide variety of organizations, from the State mediation board of which he is chairman, to the Middlesex General Hospital of which he is the immediate past president.

Dr. Gross was the chairman of the joint hospital fund drive in which St. Peter's and Middlesex Hospitals raised funds for expansion of New Brunswick area hospital facilities. Honorary cochairmen in that drive were Bishop George W. Ahr and Gen. Robert W. Johnson.

Over the past few years he has spoken on education and its current and future problems in almost every community in the State—not forgetting his present hometown of Rumson, where he was an active figure in a drive for a school bond issue.

The proposed $66,800,000 bond issue to provide funds for public college facilities is now a top priority with Rutgers' new president. So much so that he wryly asks "What on earth will I talk about after November 3?"

AREAS OF EXCITEMENT

Study of non-Western culture is proposed for Rutgers University by Dr. Mason W. Gross, its newly inaugurated president, the implication certainly not being that we know all we need to know about the one we have.

This will involve not only emphasis on languages such as Chinese, Hindustani, Arabic, and Russian, but also a resurgence of interest in Greek and Latin. It will involve ever so many other things, including, as Dr. Gross pointed out in his inaugural address, money.

Out of the "new areas of * * * excitement" he plans for Rutgers, the new president hopes to witness the emergence of limitless vistas of intellectual development, more understanding of the peoples and forces that affect our destiny, and a rekindling of the spirit of search and controversy. All to the accompaniment of substantial progress toward world freedom which Dr. Gross calls the profoundest aspiration of mankind.

Dr. Gross has not outlined all of his plans for Rutgers in the years immediately ahead. He has stirred academic imaginations, however, and has invited the conclusion that whatever he has in mind is going to be ambitious and challenging.

[From the Asbury Park Evening Press, May 8, 1959]

AN AUSPICIOUS START

When Mason Welch Gross became the 16th president of Rutgers University a day or so ago he made it clear that he will do his part to see that Rutgers keeps in the forefront of the educational world. Without derogating classical educational concepts he demonstrated very forcibly that only as their application is brought abreast of modern times can a university meet today's challenge.

The nations of the eastern world are awakening. Their resources of manpower and materials are stupendous. And they are learning the tricks of western organizational methods and applying them with incredible speed. We can no longer ignore them as backward countries looking longingly to us for leadership. As President Gross said so

succinctly, the white man's burden is no longer management; it involves cooperation. It involves a realization of the Far Eastern facts of life. And one of those facts tells us that no longer are oriental people uniformly ignorant and uniformly governed by medieval war lords who still consult astrologers and soothsayers. Far from it. The oriental leaders who are emerging today are trained in modern science and modern techniques of mass communication. It is not well to underrate them.

Dr. Gross well pointed to the study of language as an easily understood example of changing educational demands. There was a time when western civilization revolved about Latin and Greek. Without these ancient languages no man could hope to be called a scholar. A great change came about in university life when modern languages were given a place of importance and German, and French, and Italian came into their own. A new phase is at hand. The East demands consideration and the greatest barrier thrown against the West is the language barrier. An educational system that has for generations been centered on western civilization must now take account of stock and devote some time to eastern ways. This Dr. Gross promises Rutgers will do.

The accession of Dr. Gross to the presidency of Rutgers has met with acclaim from every friend of that institution of learning. Perhaps the applause from Monmouth County has seemed a bit louder than elsewhere because Dr. Gross' home is here. But regardless of region. Dr. Gross' inaugural address will meet with approval. His administration has begun most auspiciously.

STUDYING NON-WESTERN CULTURES

At his inauguration as the 16th president of Rutgers, Dr. Mason W. Gross suggested that the university introduce a program of studies in non-Western cultures. The ways of life in Africa and Asia puzzle us and the reactions of Asians and Africans baffle us, Dr. Gross said. Trying to interpret what is happening on the two continents in the light of our ideas and attitudes is often hopeless. A study of foreign systems of thought, expression and ideas would add intellectual vigor to any campus. It would also, Dr. Gross feels, prepare students for fascinating careers.

A large portion of the world's population speak Chinese, Russian, Japanese, Arabic and Hindustani. Rutgers now teaches only Russian. A curriculum expansion to include others would cost money, but it would pay enormous dividends in enriching students' education and opportunities.

The basic aim of education is freedom of many kinds. One of these Dr. Gross identified as "the power of the intellect which comes about when ignorance, superstition and fear yield to clear and adequate ideas." Dr. Gross has made an excellent suggestion. It is to be hoped that the State university can find a way to implement it.

Four Americans Decorated by Portuguese Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 19, 1959

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, I should like to refer to the kind, gracious action of his Excellency, Ambassador Luis Esteves Fernandes, of Portugal, in investing with the insignia of the Military Order of Christ four U.S. leaders, namely, former Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives Joseph W. Martin, Jr., who was made a Grand Officer in the Order; former Representative James T. Patterson, of Connecticut; Mr. Charles McKnight Parr, author of "So Noble a Captain," the biography of the Portuguese circumnavigator of the globe, Ferdinand Magellan; and Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, associate editor of "World Affairs," one of my Maryland friends. The last three mentioned were made commanders in the order. The ceremonies, presided over by Ambassador Esteves Fernandes, one of the ablest diplomats in Washington, took place in the Portuguese Embassy on May 8, 1959. The Baltimore News-Post, Baltimore, Md., published a dispatch from the Hearst Headline Service on Saturday, May 9, 1959.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Baltimore News-Post of May 9, 1959]

PORTUGUESE DECORATE FATHER THORNING

WASHINGTON.—The Rev. Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, pastor of historic St. Joseph's Church, Carrollton Manor, received Portugal's highest decoration here yesterday.

Ambassador Luis Esteves Fernandes bestowed the Military Order of Christ with the rank of commander, on the specialist on inter-American affairs.

Others awarded decorations at ceremonies in the Portuguese Embassy include former House Speaker Joseph W. Martin, Jr., Republican, Massachusetts, and former Representative James T. Patterson, Republican, Connecticut.

Father Thorning was praised for his splendid achievements in the promotion of friendship between Portugal and Brazil and for his contributions to the knowledge of Luso-Brazilian culture in the United States.

Speaking of Unions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAT McNAMARA
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 19, 1959

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, in a special section in Sunday's New York Times commemorating the International Ladies Garment Workers Union appeared an article by Harry Golden, author of the best-selling book, "Only in America."

Today, when it is popular in some circles to demean the entire labor movement for the sins of a few, Mr. Golden takes a refreshing view of labor unions and their beneficial impact on America.

I ask unanimous consent that the article by Mr. Golden be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, May 17, 1959.]

SPEAKING OF UNIONS

(By Harry Golden)

When I was a boy my older sister worked in a sewing shop on Green Street in New York City. She worked 9 hours a day, 6 days a week, and earned an average weekly wage of $14. I visited her shop often on errands such as bringing her an umbrella when a heavy rainstorm blew up late in the afternoon.

I saw the hundreds of her fellowworkers performing various operations in the manufacture of ladies' petticoats and other undergarments. It was a time when the employer had not yet learned that his best customers were sitting right there in his shop.

Today the girls in the organized sewing shops spend more on lipstick alone than my sister and her coworkers of 1915 were able to spend on their entire wardrobes.

In those days when the teacher asked a boy what his father did for a living, the boy answered without humor or guile: "My father is a striker." Everybody's father was a striker, which brings me down to the present time in the South. When I see the mill workers in my State of North Carolina driving to work in automobiles from homes with refrigerators, TV, and electric washing machines; when I see their wives going to garden clubs and beauty parlors, I always say to myself, "Little do you know how much of this you owe to those pioneer strikers of 45 years ago."

And the most amazing development of all is the fact that some of the important advantages of belonging to a union trickle down to the hundreds of thousands of unorganized workers who pay no dues.

The whole business of understanding unions is complicated by a whole mess of fixed ideas that twist reality into knots.

For instance, this perilous American decade attempts to measure patriotism by the degree of hatred a man could mount against the Communists or the extent to which the Communists claimed they hated him. But that this "test" involved the complete renunciation of logic is clearly evident by the fact that trade unionism was denied the advantages of this fascinating horror. For there is no established institution in our western culture which the Communists hate more than organized labor.

The Communists do not let generals or admirals or schoolteachers or novelists or millionaires excite them, but they cannot abide trade unionists. This hatred reaches as far back as Karl Marx who did not expect that trade unions would help at all in the revolution he wanted to sweep over Europe. Lenin actively worked against and inveighed against all unions in his pamphlets. He warned that they were the supreme danger and had to be opposed every inch of the way.

The Communists have always been kinder to the proprietors. If you want a revolution, you've got to have proprietors to revolt against; and organized labor fills the vacuum between them and their target.

When Roosevelt and Churchill visited Stalin during the war, accompanied by the State Department, Harvard, Yale, and Princeton diplomats and Oxford and Eton careerists, everybody joked and sang and Stalin only grumbled when Churchill asked him about the slaughter of several million kulaks. There was a lot of humor at the party. When the Russian agricultural experts came over here, they talked to prosperous Iowa farmers and to the manufacturers of farm implements and to granary operators. Anastas Mikoyan got along with millionaires and managers. The cocktail hour was highly civilized.

But no Communists ever want to talk to a shop deputy. When Communists go back-

stage the last person they want to talk to is the Equity representative. They don't want to banter and trade jokes with George Meany or David Dubinsky. The proprietors and the managers are toys in their hands, but the union men are cobras. The unionists will not talk to the Russians about coexistent foreign trade or mutual scientific advancement. The unionists want to talk about political freedom, and the right of workers to organize, strike, vote, change jobs as they see fit, and go where they please within their country; and this the Communists have not, will not, and dare not discuss.

Of course we hear things about unions today which would indicate that many people longed for the days when the Governor could call out the militia and chase strikers off into the hills. But even the most medieval manager doesn't want that day again. He's done too well since men and women organized themselves into unions. We forget too often the terribly precarious position of the employer himself in the brutal industrial jungle before the labor unions. We forget too often that organized labor increased the profits for free enterprise in the same proportion that they raised the wages of their workers. But unions could not do what mankind itself has not yet been able to achieve, to remove from the hearts of some men a misdirected drive for power for the sake of power itself, and for the sake of greed and a perverted need for comfort.

And what is obvious from the gossip is that we do not always understand mankind, and unions we usually understand least.

Is the Post Office Department To Be Lord High Censor?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 19, 1959

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Capital Times, of Madison, is a fighting champion of freedom of speech and press. I ask unanimous consent that a hard-hitting editorial from this paper denouncing Post Office censorship of literary work be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IS THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT TO BE LORD HIGH CENSOR?

One would think from the clamor for a 5-cent stamp that the Post Office Department has its hands full with the job of delivering the mail without wasting time and money guarding the people's morals.

The Federal laws against obscenity, like other criminal laws, are supposed to be enforced by the Justice Department, but Postmaster General Summerfield has different ideas. The Post Office has impounded 24 cartons of the late D. H. Lawrence's "Lady Chatterly's Lover," a book that has become widely read because of the silly efforts to keep it from being read at all.

Although there are 30,000 copies of this edition of the book already on the stands for sale, the Post Office is now going to put the book—written more than a quarter of a century ago—on trial. The result of the publicity will be that the 30,000 will be immediately gobbled up by people who otherwise wouldn't be a bit interested.

Perhaps Congress should investigate to see if this isn't a plot to sell some copies of a book which has been forgotten since the last uproar about its sale.

It is of little importance to the Post Office how long a book has been around when its censors are looking for something to pounce on. Not long ago they swooped on Aristophane's "Lysistrata."

The censors in their enthusiasm have warned the New Yorker magazine that if it accepts book club advertising for the Lawrence book it will run the risk of not being accepted for mailing.

This comes dangerously near to threatening loss of mailing privileges for even mentioning the name of the book.

Censorship is always a dangerous business. It arbitrarily gives to the censoring authority the right to substitute his tastes, values and judgments for those of his fellow citizens. This is not in consonance with the principles of a free society.

And in an age when the mails are cluttered with trash, when you can't turn on a TV set without witnessing a display of sex, brutality, and blood-letting, it is sheer absurdity for the Post Office to be ferreting out for censorship literary contributions that will, at best, be read by only those few who can tear themselves away from TV thrillers.

Tribute by Listen Magazine to Ethical Standards of Christian Science Monitor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 19, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, in an article written by Duane Valentry, the May–June issue of Listen magazine has paid tribute to the Christian Science Monitor under its present able editor, Erwin D. Canham.

The article particularly emphasizes the influential role of the Christian Science Monitor in promoting temperance and sobriety throughout the United States. The title of the article is "Crusading Newspaper," and it stresses the high ethical standards which have long symbolized and motivated the Christian Science Monitor.

Listen magazine itself has often been a force for national good in the whole effort to further temperance and alcohol education, and it is significant that Listen now salutes the efforts of the Christian Science Monitor in the same field.

In addition to its temperance leadership, the Christian Science Monitor also is known for many thoughtful and informative articles in such realms as economics, national elections, foreign affairs and international diplomacy. The fairness and objective reporting of the Monitor are heralded often by leading members of both great political parties in the United States.

I ask unanimous consent that the article about the Christian Science Monitor, published in Listen magazine for May–June 1959, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. I also ask consent to include an eloquent statement about Monitor policy in the field of temperance, written by the distinguished editor of the Christian Science Monitor, Erwin D. Canham.

There being no objection the statement and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CRUSADING NEWSPAPER

(By Duane Valentry)

(The Christian Science Monitor has regarded alcoholism as a profound social evil, and has fought it strenuously down through the half century.

(The phrase "Commitment to Freedom," which is the title of the book I have recently written about the Monitor, epitomizes our attitude. We believe man must preserve and live his birthright of freedom by refraining from addictions which enslave and corrode. This is the personal view of Christian Scientists as well as the deep editorial conviction of the Monitor. Total freedom is our goal.)—Erwin D. Canham, editor.

What has happened in the United States and the rest of the world in the past 5 decades? What progress has been made in the age-old struggle of man toward the good in life? What part has alcohol played in the human story over this eventful period?

Answering these questions and telling the story behind the news has been, and is, the chore of the Christian Science Monitor, the international daily newspaper founded by a woman, Mary Baker Eddy, in 1908.

Leading the field of those newspapers refusing to accept liquor advertising, the Monitor has long been recognized and frequently honored as an educational medium of great influence. It is a voluble sentinel in keeping the public informed on vital issues, not the least of which has been the liquor scene.

Few indeed are the aspects of this subject the paper hasn't covered with the thoroughness for which it is famous. For example, its "Men of Distinction" editorials appearing at intervals over a decade, commented on tragic results of drinking, as brought out in the news—results which liquor ads using the same phrase failed to mention. When liquor companies dropped their "Men of Distinction" advertising, the Monitor also dropped its much-quoted and provocative takeoffs.

"Report on Liquor—What Are We Doing?"—a series of 30 articles—ran in the paper's pages in 1955 and created much favorable comment, as did "Abstinence and Alcoholism," an earlier series on this pertinent subject.

One of the most widely read newspapers in the world, the Monitor has hammered home the importance of alcohol education to counteract increased liquor advertising and social pressures to drink.

Monitor reporters have gone behind the scenes in picturing juveniles in trouble to point out how frequently such troubles began with parental use of liquor in the home. "Teen Crimes Linked to Parent Drinking" pointed out that although court records amply showed the coincidence of youth crime and home drinking, the problem needs additional study to lay the basis for stricter law enforcement.

Need for action on the part of churches to combat drinking pressures was brought out in another feature, quoting leaders of various denominations on the subject.

"Some of us have labored long and hard across the years to rehabilitate alcoholics, the victims of acute alcoholism," said Methodist Bishop John Wesley Lord. "It seems rather stupid to spend hours mopping up the water and to be unconcerned about the open and running faucet."

Dr. Myron W. Powell, of the Congregational Church, warned, "One of the worst elements in the present situation in respect to social drinking is the practical loss of a per-

son's inherent right not to drink if he does not care to do so."

Many such articles have gained even wider circulation by being reprinted by groups unconnected with the Christian Science Church, as well as in other newspapers.

On its part, the Monitor quotes from many sources in its "Mirror of World Opinion," bringing to worldwide attention local thinking on important issues, including drinking. The Voice column reprinted the Chapel Hill (N.C.) Weekly's comment on the seeming inability of many newspapers because of liquor advertising to have "the independent attitude necessary in matters of controversy about Government policy in respect to liquor that they certainly ought to have. Since the press has shown itself determined to persist in this shameful alliance with the liquor business, then Congress ought to end it by a statute outlawing the passage of liquor advertising through the mails."

The liquor seller has often been the target for editorial blasts from the Monitor: "Many courts are more than lenient with drunken drivers even when they kill innocent people. They act as if the drink were the culprit. Of course, it pays no penalty—or damages. Justice requires that this gap be closed. It can be if more responsibility is placed from one side on the drinker and from the other on those who promote his drinking."

The use of women as liquor sales promoters brought this Monitor comment:

"This annoucement should arouse a public too long apathetic toward the devastating inroads alcohol is making on American society. Women's clubs invite representatives of the National Council on Alcoholism to speak to them and describe its projects for attempting to rescue alcoholics. Will they lend themselves to this campaign to make more alcoholics to be rescued? Will they also open their doors to women representing the distillers who are pouring millions of dollars into advertising to make drinking attractive to men, young people, and now to the mother of the family?"

Wide coverage has been given by the Monitor to the question of drinking on airplanes and its relation to public safety. In a special interview Rowland Quinn, Jr., president of the Air Line Stewards and Stewardesses Association, was asked whether he felt that the serving of liquor is a motive for passengers choosing particular airlines, thus justifying airline claims of its need in order to meet competition.

"People don't fly because they can drink," he replied. "They fly because of the convenience of getting from one place to another. If liquor were banned from the airways, I don't think there would be a single passenger who would choose another mode of transportation—just so he could drink."

In his book "Commitment to Freedom," Erwin Canham, longtime Monitor editor, tells its unique story. "Christian Scientists do not smoke, nor do they drink alcoholic stimulants," he explains. "These concepts are part of their religious conviction—which is to maintain man's freedom from enslavement to any false appetite. Addiction, especially to habits which also become social evils, is contrary to the basic teachings of Christian Science."

Mary Baker Eddy, founder of Christian Science, wrote in her book "Miscellaneous Writings":

"Strong drink is unquestionably an evil, and evil cannot be used temperately; its slightest use is abuse; hence the only temperance is total abstinence." Members of the Christian Science churches therefore are abstainers.

Christian Science Monitor Youth Forums, with a worldwide membership, play an important part in the movement's alcohol education work and offer opportunity for social and cultural activities as well as congenial companionship without recourse to smoking or drinking. These well-attended groups, organized to study the purpose and international scope of the newspaper for which they are named, are a vital counteracting influence to thousands of young people, helping them better to meet almost overwhelming pressures of modern society.

To the Christian Science Monitor, this phase of alcohol education is but another weapon in its unceasing battle against liquor, a warfare it plans to continue as long as the need exists.

Public Schools for Training Indian Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 19, 1959

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, the Honorable John Hart, who for a number of years has been the outstanding Indian commissioner of State Indian Commissions, has sent me an article printed in the Minot Daily News, May 6, 1959, which states "Bureau Aim: Public Schools for Training Indian Youth."

I ask unanimous consent that this very informative article on educating Indian children be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUREAU AIM—PUBLIC SCHOOLS FOR TRAINING INDIAN YOUTH

A release just issued by the Bureau of Indian Affairs in Washington states:

"One of the basic educational aims of the Bureau of Indian Affairs is to provide for the enrollment of Indian children in public schools rather than in Federal Indian schools wherever this can be accomplished."

The release states further that under provisions of a 1953 law, a total of 43 school properties in 12 States have so far been transferred to local school districts.

Eight of the transfers are in Oklahoma, seven in Minnesota, seven in Montana, five in Kansas, four each in New Mexico and Washington, two each in Arizona and Wisconsin, one each in Idaho, North Carolina, South Dakota, and Wyoming.

In addition, the release stated, "Legislation that would facilitate the transfer of surplus Federal Indian school properties to local public school districts, has been recommended to Congress" by the Department of the Interior.

The recommendation, it is indicated, is that limitations of the 1953 law be liberalized. A limitation which has seemingly served no useful purpose, it is stated, "is one which provides no property of more than 20 acres could be transferred in a single conveyance."

In North Dakota, the Bureau of Indian Affairs is building a new Federal Indian school at Fort Totten, and has taken steps toward construction of a large, new Federal Indian school at Belcourt.

Two public school districts in the vicinity of the Turtle Mountain Reservation (where Belcourt is the center) have asked the Bureau for commitments that construction of the new Federal school will not affect Indian pupil enrollments in their public schools adversely.

One of these districts, Dunseith, is seeking Federal construction assistance from the Bureau, to enlarge its plant so that more Indian pupils can be accommodated.

The public school at St. John has pointed out that it has room to accommodate more Indian pupils, and is concerned that a new Federal school might take away some of its present pupils.

Tribute to E. L. Wall, Texas Reporter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 19, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, E. L. Wall, a correspondent for the Houston (Tex.) Chronicle in the State capitol at Austin, has seen a great deal of State and national history evolve in his more than 40 years as a newspaperman.

As a reporter, editor, and political writer he has told of many of these events himself. His career is a colorful one which embraces all types of news work. For the past 12 years he has been a respected member of the press corps at the Texas State capitol, a position he has won by his fair and impartial reporting.

Mr. President, I request unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Zarko Franks which appeared in a recent issue of the Chronicle under the heading, "Back of the By-Lines—He Saw Klan Defied, Maceo Empire Forged."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BACK OF THE BYLINES—HE SAW KLAN DEFIED, MACEO EMPIRE FORGED

(By Zarko Franks)

A freshman leigslator one day saw E. L. Wall for the first time on the capitol steps in Austin.

"Who is that man," asked the freshman of a colleague, "a career diplomat?"

Ethalmore L. (Dick) Wall, an Austin bureau correspondent for the Chronicle, would smile at this story.

The people who know him wouldn't. They'd accept it as an honest reaction of a stranger.

A confidante once said of him:

"Dick Wall is one of the few newsmen I know who'd feel at ease in tails and black tie at an ambassador's ball. He has that rare quality: built-in-poise."

THREE-PART CAREER

Wall's 40-odd-year newspaper career can be divided into three parts: reporter, editor, and political writer.

Each is a distinct skill. Few newsmen possess the raw materials—ability, imagination, judgment, and temperament—needed to make the switches successfully.

Wall, a blackland farmer's son from Ellis County, has been a Chronicle Austin bureau correspondent for 12 years.

COVERED ISLE

Prior to joining the Chronicle, he had been, in succession, city editor, editorial writer, and managing editor of the Galveston Daily News and Galveston Tribune.

Perhaps the most fascinating part of his newspaper background he owes to the island.

He was there when a fighting Catholic priest named James S. Kirwin defied the Ku Klux Klan.

He was there when two Sicilian-born brothers named Sam and Rose Maceo forged a multi-million-dollar gambling and night club empire.

SOUTHERN METHODIST UNIVERSITY EX-STUDENT

His news career, however, started in Dallas while he was attending Southern Methodist University.

"An oldtime reporter who decided to go to college would regale me with glamorous stories about the newspaper business," recalls Wall. "Most of his stories probably were lies. However, I took a job with the old Dallas Dispatch as campus correspondent."

Dallas was a four-paper town in those days. The afternoon papers were "very sensational," he says.

Every woman who killed a man was described as a "beautiful viricide." The prose was perhaps a hot purple, but the presses roared with extras and America was talking herself into going to war.

COURTROOM SHOOTING

Young Dick Wall, reporter, was in a Dallas district courtroom one day when a Negro, accused of killing his white landlord, was shot by the victim's son. The Negro lived to stand trial later and hear himself sentenced to hang.

His news career was interrupted by military service in World War I. He was discharged as a second lieutenant and returned to the Dallas Dispatch.

MOVED TO ISLE

In 1920 he asked to be transferred to the Galveston Daily News, then owned by the Belo interests. He got his wish.

It was in Galveston that he moved up the executive ladder to managing editor.

He resigned to join the Chronicle Austin bureau in 1947.

Today, at 65, Walls says:

"I've always enjoyed the writing end of news."

As for political reporting, he says:

"I've always been interested in the process of government."

POLITICAL STORIES

He's covered every State Democratic convention during the past 12 years except the one last year, "when I covered the Republicans for the first time."

His top political stories include the birth of the Dixiecrat movement in 1948 at the Southern Governors' conference in Asheville, N.C., and the National Governors' conference here in 1952, when the stage was set for Eisenhower's nomination.

He says he believes the "quality of our men in Government is a lot better than most citizens think it is."

He currently is president of the Austin Headliners Club.

He and his wife, Anne, live in Austin.

Private Colleges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 19, 1959

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, the private colleges and universities make a great contribution to our Nation. In the past a majority of college graduates were educated in private institutions, and such colleges still train a large percentage of college students.

Like other institutions in this period of social and economic change, the private colleges face serious problems in the immediate future. Since they are supported principally by private means, they are not the direct concern of government; but indirectly their welfare is important to government. They contribute a distinct quality to the cultural and moral life of the Nation. The tax-load on citizens would be much greater if all college education had to be supported from tax funds.

Macalester College, located in St. Paul, is typical of the private liberal arts colleges of Minnesota. Recently the members of the board of trustees and the faculty held a little summit conference to discuss the future of the college. The realistic way they analyzed their problems and the questions they raised will be of interest, I believe, to all Members of Congress.

I ask unanimous consent to have an article dealing with their conference printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. It was written by Wilbur Elston of the Minneapolis Tribune staff and appeared in the May 13, 1959, issue of the Tribune.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FACULTIES, FINANCES, AND GROWTH POSE PRIVATE COLLEGE PROBLEMS

(By Wilbur Elston)

What is the future of the privately supported liberal arts college?

Administrative officers, trustees, faculty members, alumni, students, and others interested are pondering this question in all parts of the Nation today. It is a question of importance to the general public as well.

Many liberal arts colleges face a crisis: They are squeezed between limited financial resources and the necessity for substantial increases in faculty salaries, as Clarence H. Faust, president of the Fund for the Advancement of Education, points out.

But they face many other problems, too. It was to acquaint themselves with the problems—and to start their search for answers—that 31 members of the Macalester College board of trustees, plus representatives of the college administration and faculty, held their own "little summit" conference last week at Stillwater.

Their first discussions centered around the educational programs, the financial structure, and the peripheral activities—such as Red Cross, community chest, and other civic campaigns—that now characterize the St. Paul college.

Then the group plunged into a discussion of the alternatives for a college such as Macalester.

Should it try to become more of a residential college—such as Amherst, Hamilton, Haverford, Williams, and Wooster—and put greater stress on a liberal arts program?

Should it seek to become a liberal arts college with professional sectors such as Colgate, Dartmouth, Denison, Lafayette, and Swarthmore?

Or should it emphasize its development as a practical liberal arts college with a strong emphasis on community service?

On one point the conference quickly agreed. It was that regardless of what kind of a college Macalester is to become in the future, it must continue its "pursuit of excellence."

Yet even this pursuit raises new questions. One way for a college to improve itself is to increase the percentages of faculty members possessing doctorates. Yet the shortage of college teachers is working against this trend on a national basis.

Throughout the Nation, 40 percent of the college teachers were Ph.D.s in 1953–54. But this dropped to 28 percent in 1954–55; to 26 percent in 1955–56, and to 23 percent in 1956–57.

Macalester rates well above the national averages, with 34 percent of its full-time faculty members having Ph.D.s, but the national figures show difficulties any college will face in improving the ratio of doctorates in its faculty.

What about size? What is happening to liberal arts college enrollment? What will happen in the future?

College enrollment in the United States rose from 214,000 in 1900 to 3,200,000 in 1958. It is estimated that it will reach six million by 1970. Some estimates run as high as 12 million students by that year.

In the past, private colleges and universities have educated a majority of the college-trained people in the United States. But now the State institutions enroll more than half of all students going to college.

It has been estimated that if present rates of growth are maintained, within two decades not more than 20 percent of all college students will be enrolled in private colleges and private large-scale universities.

In Minnesota, college enrollment went up 48 percent between the peak prewar year of 1939 and 1947—from 33,840 in 1939 to 50,000 in 1947. After a brief drop-off because of the slowing down of GI training, enrollment began bouncing back up again. It reached 51,239 at the beginning of the fall term of 1956. The increase has continued since.

Seventy percent of the college students in the State are now attending public institutions. According to the report of the Governor's committee on higher education issued in 1956, "it is likely that at least this large if not a slightly larger proportion will attend public colleges and universities in the years ahead."

The same commission reported that Minnesota liberal arts colleges enrolled 8,356 students in 1940 and 14,546 in 1956. It estimated that liberal arts college enrollment in the State would increase to 25,025 in 1970 with total college enrollment in Minnesota reaching at least 95,000 by that time.

If those estimated increases occur, the private liberal arts colleges will probably have to accept considerably more students than they now enroll. Macalester, according to the commission report, would accept 2,000 in 1970 as contrasted with its current enrollment of just over 1,500. Other more recent estimates indicate that the same college would have to accept as many as 2,500.

Yet how can private colleges with limited facilities and limited resources accept more students?

One way would be to raise tuition. Yet tuition can hardly be raised sufficiently to cover all costs. Another way would be to obtain a larger endowment and more gifts. Yet more income already is required to improve salaries of faculty members, build new facilities, and meet other current needs.

But if liberal arts colleges do not expand, they probably will be unable to meet their responsibility to provide for the educational need of their church constituencies—which is, as the 1956 Governor's commission report said—"a responsibility not unlike that which exists between the public college or university and the public at large."

But expansion costs money. It requires more faculty, more buildings, more facilities, more land. Macalester now has a campus of only 44 acres, as contrasted with 405 acres for Amherst, and even more for other residential colleges.

If a small liberal arts college expands, does it lose some of its appeal and some of its reason for being?

Students choose their colleges for many reasons, but among the reasons given for selecting one of Minnesota's liberal arts colleges are its relation to the church (Presbyterian in the case of Macalester); its small size provides opportunities for more intimate relationships between student and faculty, often in an informal atmosphere; teachers have a better opportunity to guide reading and research than at a larger school with larger classes; there is a greater respect for culture than at a large university, etc.

In general, liberal arts colleges provide competition for State institutions. They often are subject to less public and political pressure, they can offer more experimental and controversial courses, experiment with new teaching techniques, and engage in other educational activities not open to public colleges.

What are the implications for colleges which limit their enrollment?

Liberal arts colleges which limit their enrollment ought to be able to become more selective. With more and more youngsters wishing to go to college, they can raise their standards and still attract as many applicants as they do now—and probably more—depending on the level to which their standards are raised.

As their standards and excellence increase, they also can attract students from a wider geographical area and those from more diverse social backgrounds—if this is what the colleges wish to do.

If they follow this course, such colleges also can reduce their purely vocational courses, their community service programs, and their "peripheral" activities, and lay greater stress on purely liberal arts courses. They also may be able to broaden the base of their financial support if they attain greater excellence.

These questions and problems are illustrative of those faced and discussed by the Macalester "little summit" conference. Final decisions still remain to be made on the future course the college will take. But one fact remains above all:

More and more high school graduates in Minnesota and elsewhere will be going to college in the years ahead and the colleges best prepared will be those which face up to and try to find answers to the kinds of questions that the Macalester group debated in its 2-day session at Stillwater.

Dulles Library

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 19, 1959

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the attached Associated Press story, which appeared in the Newark Evening News of May 17, giving the details of a new library to be established at Princeton University in New Jersey.

I believe that the founding of the John Foster Dulles library of diplomatic history is an important event for New Jersey and for scholars everywhere. We, of the Garden State, are honored to have the papers of so important a statesman as the very great university which has already given so much to the Nation.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DULLES LIBRARY—DIPLOMAT GIVES PAPERS TO PRINCETON

PRINCETON.—The John Foster Dulles library of diplomatic history will be established at Princeton University as a tribute to the former Secretary of State.

The two-story wing to the university's Firestone Library * * * will house his personal diplomatic papers as well as microfilm copies of official State Department documents.

The State Department and Princeton University, in announcing the project yesterday, hailed it as a significant landmark in historical research. Never before has the Government cooperated in collecting and bringing together in one place such documents while the Cabinet officer involved was alive.

NINETEEN HUNDRED AND EIGHT GRADUATE

Dulles, a 1908 graduate of Princeton, is now seriously ill at Walter Reed Army Hospital suffering from cancer. He already has turned thousands of his personal papers over to Princeton to start the project, and plans to release 10 more filing cases full of them. These papers date back to his views of the 1907 Hague Peace Conference.

Robert F. Goheen, president of Princeton, said the Dulles papers are one of the most meaningful gifts the Princeton Library has ever received.

APPROVAL NEEDED

In turning them over, Dulles stipulated that scholars seeking access to them must receive either his written approval or that of his representatives. He said:

"Access to my personal papers, for the purpose of bona fide research in the fields of history, political science, international relations, or related subjects, shall be granted as widely as possible. The presumption shall be that access should be granted in any particular instance unless compelling reasons exist * * * to withhold such access."

The State Department, in making available selected documents covering Dulles' 6 years as Secretary, imposed tougher security restrictions.

Persons wanting access to them must qualify as legitimate historians. They must obtain Department clearance on all material dealing with classified data.

Military Electronic Procurement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 11, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, a private report on military electronic procurement has come to my attention. The contents and statistics in this report on the total dollar value of negotiated procurement versus advertised procurement should be of interest to our colleagues. It is time that the congressional intent that small business receive a fair share and equitable opportunity to compete be put into realistic practice by the procurement agencies. Under this type of negotiation small business cannot survive.

The following report appeared in the May 11, 1959, issue of Bishop's report:

A PRIVATE REPORT ON MILITARY ELECTRONIC PROCUREMENT

Wartime Washington was wild. Hotels, restaurants, and saloons did a land-office business serving lovers who met that very morning for the first time and who parted the following morning for the last time.

Military contracting was conducted with that same urgency. A requirement which was generated in the morning was relayed to the manufacturer by phone and contracts were concluded that very afternoon. Price was only a consideration. Delivery was the object.

American industry won World War II by producing the implements of war for those who had to wage it. There was no time for formal bidding and crash programs were placed under crash contracts. All negotiated. There simply was no other way to do it.

Proper planning now for national defense should allow the procurement of equipment under more even-tempered schedules. There is little excuse for the huge disproportion between the advertised and negotiated dollars and jobs. Missiles or minesweepers, each procurement counts as one action. From last July to February past, the Navy alone negotiated 1,132,645 jobs. They only advertised 47,727 jobs. For electronics and communications alone, the dollars awarded totalled $285.5 million negotiated versus $10.5 million advertised. And all the numbers for fiscal 1959 are not in yet.

Peacetime buying under wartime practices results in the most unfair, unequal, and dangerous situation possible. Government contracting is ostensibly in the interests of national defense but it is obviously conducted without maximum competition which is detrimental to the interests of most of the manufacturers and against the interests of all the taxpayers.

So, if it isn't going to change, why not take advantage of the ground rules which allow a single engineer to hand out a $5 million contract for radio receivers without obtaining any competition whatsoever. This is the real way to do business.

Military contracts are not being given away indiscriminately either. They have to be the target of a romantic campaign, and the engineer is the one to woo.

STANLEY L. BISHOP.

Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 19, 1959

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a bulletin issued by the American Farm Bureau, with respect to the dangers of inflation.

There being no objection, the bulletin was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INFLATION IS EATING US UP

Many people have more than they ever had before in their lives. But money doesn't go as far as it used to.

It takes more than $2 to do the job that $1 would do before World War II. These are the signs of inflation—it's a combination in which the value of our money is eroded away by a continuing rise in the general price level.

Now you can have a rise in auto prices or a pair of shoes and that won't necessarily

spell inflation. The rise may be due—among other things—to a greater demand for cars or shoes, or for the raw materials used in their production, or an upgrading in the quality of the product, or a short supply in either raw materials or finished products. In other words, a price rise in an individual commodity may be due to a number of factors.

Price is sort of like an automatic pilot in our economy. It keeps supply and demand balanced in the marketplace. Price helps to tell us how much to use and how much to produce. Price helps consumers decide how to spend their money. Price tells producers what to produce for the most profit.

It's normal to find some prices rising because of increased demand or reduced supply while at the same time other prices will be dropping because of reduced demand or increased supplies. In a stable economy, these ups and downs in individual commodity prices tend to cancel out. So the average purchasing power of the dollar stays about the same year in and year out.

But you can look for real trouble when the vast majority of individual prices move upward in the same period. This reduces the purchasing power of the dollar and we have inflation.

The dollar has lost 58 percent of the purchasing power it had in 1939. This is inflation. It's eating steadily away at your dollar every day, every week, and every month of the year. It's taking a bite out of every dollar you earn, every dollar you manage to save. It's a thief that steals while you are asleep and awake.

Then too, there are even some people who benefit during a time of rising prices and inflation. Take the speculator who is able to buy ahead of the rise. Or the debtor who is able to pay off his debts with cheap dollars. There are also some folks who are able to increase their own dollar incomes fatser than inflation is cutting the purchasing power of the dollar.

But inflation is a destroyer. Any gains that individuals or groups may get from inflation are at the expense of other individuals or groups.

Inflation eats away the value of cash, Government bonds, insurance policies, pension plans and all obligations which have a fixed dollar value.

In 1940 for example, the $750 it took to buy a $1,000 savings bond, plus another $62 would buy a low-priced car. When the bond owner cashed it for $1,000 in 1950, he found that he had to add $600 to it to buy a comparable car. Today's prices are even higher.

Of course, cars changed between 1940 and 1950, but the big change was in the value of the dollar. The dollar has continued to lose purchasing power since 1950. It is still going dowhill and threatening to pick up speed.

Inflation also is like a tax—one of the cruelest taxes you can find. The people it hits the hardest are those on fixed incomes.

Inflation taxes the thrifty. Under inflation, taxes intended to apply only to income or gains become a levy on past savings. The man who paid $750 for a bond in 1940 and cashed it for $1,000 in 1950, had to pay taxes on the difference of $250, even though the $1,000 was worth much less in 1950 than $750 in 1940.

Or take the case of the farmer who buys a new machine for $1,000. He depreciates it on his books at its cost, but when the machine wears out in a few years he may find that it takes $2,000 to buy a new one.

There was a time when farmers favored inflationary policies because they helped them to pay off farm mortgages with cheap money. This was because farm land once was the most important factor in agricultural production.

Today, farm production is more and more dependent on what economists call "purchased inputs." They include such things as tractors and equipment, fuel, repairs, tires, commercial fertilizers, antibiotics and other supplements in animal feeds, etc.

Increased dependence on "purchased inputs" puts the farmer on the spot when prices are going up on these things. Inflation increases the cost squeeze on farmers by causing farm costs to rise more rapidly than farm prices. This is epecially true at the present time when agriculture is plagued with surpluses and excess productive capacity.

Inflation also destroys because it is likely to bring on tight Government controls. Since high prices and rising wages are the symptoms of inflation that are easily seen, many people think that the disease of inflation can be cured by price and wage controls. This is about like trying to cure a fever by putting ice on the theromometer instead of treating the patient.

Inflation also destroys because it prices us out of world markets. We used to export a lot of cars abroad. Now these exports have dropped and the auto industry is having a hard time meeting the competition of imported cars from Germany, Italy, France, Sweden, and England—not only abroad, but here at home.

Inflation also is a destroyer because it creates serious imbalances which can set the stage for economic disaster. For example, our worst depressions have followed serious inflations.

Inflation results when the supply of money and credit increases faster than the supply of goods and services. It's too much money chasing too few goods. This leads to higher prices—which is another way of saying that it leads to cheaper dollars.

Who is to blame for inflation?

The Government shares the most blame when it spends more than its income and borrows the difference by selling bonds to the commercial banks.

New money is created when a commercial bank purchases a new Government bond and thereby increases the Treasury's deposits without decreasing the deposits of other depositors. This money is put into circulation when the Treasury writes checks to pay for Government spending. The new money created by Government borrowing competes with private earnings and savings to bid up the price of available goods, services, and resources.

It's easy to see why we have inflation when you take a look at Federal Government budgets for the last 25 fiscal years.

In those 25 years, including the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, our Federal Government has had 20 deficits—a nice way of saying it spent more than it took in—and only 5 surpluses.

Now during the war, there was some excuse for the Government overspending its income. But why has our Government been spending like public relations men on expense accounts for the last 13 years? Most of the recent increases in our budget have been for nondefense items. Theres' nothing like a Congressman spending somebody else's money to bring favors to his district.

The way we have been boosting the Federal debt is nothing short of fantastic, but too few seem to worry about it. "We owe it to ourselves," they say or "It's part of our expanding economy."

But to anyone who has any sort of respect for money it's shocking to know that since 1935 our Federal debt has gone from $28.7 billion to around $285 billion.

It's hard for an average man who pays his bills on time to visualize a debt like this, but let's look at the increase in our money supply that has accompanied our rising debt load. The total supply of money and credit outstanding (currency in circulation plus demand deposits) is now more than five times as large as 25 years ago. This is an increase of $111.5 billion.

And we are set to pile up some new records in debt. Our Government will spend some $13 to $14 billion over its income for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959. If you are in hock for $285 billion, what's a few billion dollars more? We owe it to ourselves, you know.

And despite a proposed balanced budget of $77 billion, for fiscal year 1960 as proposed by the President, it appears that unless we can stop our free-spending Congressmen, we will go in the hole from $1 billion to $4 billion in 1960.

A large national debt is, in itself, a powerful force for inflation. This is because Government bonds can be used as a basis for expanding the available supply of money and credit.

This happens, for example, when commercial bank reserves are increased by Federal Reserve purchases of Government bonds. For each dollar that reserves are increased the banks can add about $6 to the money supply by extending additional credit.

Sometimes it appears as though policies followed by labor and industry are important causes of inflation. This is a natural conclusion from the fact that periodic wage increases are followed by price increases and further wage increases. But it is an oversimplification. It is quite true that an inflationary situation contributes both to union demands for wage increases and employer willingness to grant such increases. But rising wages and rising prices are basically symptoms, rather than causes of inflation.

Maybe we will have to wait until the dollar is worth 25 cents or less before people generally will be willing to do anything about it. Or we may have to wait until it takes a wheelbarrow to haul enough money to town to buy a pair of shoes.

This could happen, it has in other countries.

But if we really want to do something about protecting our dollars for our children we can:

1. Balance the Federal budget and keep it balanced.

2. Make sure that all Federal policies that affect the supply of money and credit are geared to the objective of preventing the money supply from increasing more rapidly than the supply of goods and services.

The Federal budget can be balanced only if a majority of the people insist on strict economy and the elimination of all unnecessary spending.

Every Government project, program, or employee must be paid for by the taxpayers either through direct taxes or through inflation which cheapens the dollar.

Those who push increased Government spending at the expense of the Government going further in debt are really promoting inflation—regardless of their objectives.

If citizens want to be effective in getting Congress to reduce spending, they must be ready to accept some reduction in expenditures in the areas of their own special interests.

In other words, it won't do any good for you to tell your Congressman to vote for a bill that builds a dam or road in your district, but to vote against the other fellow's project because it will cause inflation.

To prevent inflation we must either cut Government spending or increase taxes. In view of the gigantic size of Government expenditures, reducing spending probably would do far more than increased taxes to stop further inflation.

The Federal Reserve System is one of our major tools for preventing inflation. It can help to stabilize the value of money by re-

lating its policies to the objective of maintaining a stable price level rather than to other considerations.

For example, the Federal Reserve can restrain the growth of the money supply by (1) refusing to support the Government bond market, (2) increasing the reserves which banks are required to maintain against their deposits, and (3) increasing the discount or interest rate that banks must pay when they borrow from the Federal Reserve.

All of these policies contribute to higher interest rates. This leads to opposition from people who believe that the Federal Reserve System should use its powers to keep interest rates low and credit freely available at all times.

Those who advocate inflationary policies—in the form of increased Federal spending, or pegged interest rates—speak of their desire to meet the needs of the people.

It is said that those who advocate a balanced budget are putting pocketbook before people. But, as Chairman Martin, of the Federal Reserve Board, has said, "If you want to pauperize people, the most effective method is to promote inflation."

Inflation is likewise the most effective method of destroying individual freedom and the private competitive enterprise system.

Sound money is the foundation of a free enterprise system. When inflation destroys the value of money, it destroys the basis for private operation of the economy and forces the substitution of Government controls.

What does this all mean to you. It means that if inflation destroys the private competitive enterprise system, you could lose your freedom and eventually your property through the process of political controls replacing economic law.

You may say that this can't happen in America. It can't happen overnight, but it could in your lifetime or in your children's span of life. Who ever thought they would see the day when they had to work a month out of every year to pay their Federal income taxes?

In 1929, considered a boom year, a married man with two children and a taxable income of $5,000 paid about $3 in Federal income tax. Today, that same man pays one-tenth of his income in taxes and the buying power of the dollar that he has left is much less than in 1929.

Inflation can be stopped, but only when it is understood that dollar depreciation hurts everyone. Inflation can be stopped and the time is now.

A Farm Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. ROSS ADAIR
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 19, 1959

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, the Indianapolis Times on May 13 had an editorial on the farm program proposed by Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART. I think it it a good, brief exposition of the matter and, therefore, include it herewith:

A FARM PROGRAM

HOMER CAPEHART, Hoosier farmer and U.S. Senator, is promoting a solution for the farm problem that at least deserves high marks for effort.

He would:

"Freeze" the surplus now in storage by prohibiting commercial sale except in case of emergency shortage. The surpluses could be used for school lunch and other charitable purposes, here and abroad.

Take out of production, for 5 years, 40 million acres now being used to grow specific surplus crops. This would cost $1 billion a year, but the farm program now is costing $5.4 billion.

Start a "real crash job" on research to discover new industrial uses for farm products.

Then let the farmer grow what he likes and sell it for what it will bring, the objective being to get the Government eventually "completely out of the farm business."

The freeze would end all but a faint hope of getting back any of the $9 billion now invested in stored surpluses, but who actually hopes to recover this money anyhow?

Certainly more emphasis should be placed on research. At present the Government is in the untenable position of spending more money to increase production, which already is surplus, than it spends to find new uses.

A fundamental weakness of Senator CAPEHART's bill is that it deals with agriculture as a whole whereas the problem differs from crop to crop. Cotton and wheat, for instance, are two separate cases, probably requiring separate treatment.

Senator CAPEHART, himself, doesn't argue he has all the answers but terms his proposal a "starting point," asking further investigation and proposals from his fellow legislators.

But his bill at least suggests that there is an alternative to the present daffy arrangement which piles up billion-dollar deficits without doing the farmer any particular good. It should get serious consideration.

Summit Mysticism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT C. BYRD
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 19, 1959

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which was published in today's issue of the Wall Street Journal, entitled "Summit Mysticism."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMMIT MYSTICISM

One of the weirdest suggestions coming from Geneva these days is that a summit conference may be called not because of any progress made at the Foreign Ministers' meeting, but on the basis of a nuclear test ban agreement if such can be reached at the talks on that subject which have also been going on in Geneva.

This seems to us to be making something close to a joke of the whole business of negotiating with the Communists. A test ban agreement may or may not be a good idea, depending on exactly what is in it. But certainly it is not an agreement that either requires or justifies a meeting at the summit. What are the heads of state supposed to discuss?

The purpose of the summit conference would be, in effect, to complete agreements prepared at the current Foreign Ministers' meeting—a meeting which was convened not to discuss the prohibition of nuclear tests but the problems of Berlin, German unification, and European security.

The West has put forth a comprehensive package plan as its solution to those problems, and if the plan is negotiable in whole or in part then it is negotiable at the Foreign Ministers' meeting now taking place. If it is not negotiable there, it is not going to be negotiable at the summit either.

Those who advocate a summit conference regardless of the outcome of the Foreign Ministers' meeting argue that the only man who has the power to commit the Soviet Union is Khrushchev. This, though, is not a very meaningful contention, for if Khrushchev really wanted to make agreements with the West, all he would have to do is get on the phone to Gromyko in Geneva.

In the minds of a good many people in the West a kind of mysticism seems to have developed about a meeting at the summit, as though this is the magic event that will make all our troubles with the Communists disappear. The plain fact is that the Soviets are most unlikely to buy anything resembling the West's package, either now in Geneva or later at a summit meeting.

In any case, when people get the idea that there just has to be a summit no matter what, they are thinking with their emotions raher than with their heads. And that is not a healthy attitude with which to try to bargain with cold and cunning agents of the Kremlin.

Nonresident Taxation Ferment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 19, 1959

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, because of the unhappy situation which exists in my State having to do with the payment of nonresident taxes, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Camden Courier Post of May 7, entitled "Nonresident Taxation Ferment."

The article mentions the progress which has been made in the interest of upstate New Jersey residents where signs point to some relief in the future. However, this is far from true in south Jersey where our residents pay a wage tax to the city of Philadelphia and no imminent relief appears to be in sight.

The article points out—and correctly so—that despite the many efforts being made on the local and State level, eventual relief will come only from the national level. Constitutional amendments and retaliatory measures are just two of the proposals advanced to deal with the problem. Neither of these, to my way of thinking, holds the answer.

But the gross unfairness of such a situation can be easily recognized; and I point out to you here as a ready example that New Jersey citizens, for instance, are paying 45 percent more in taxes than the instate residents of New York. I submit that a State or city which levies such a tax will not easily give up such a lucrative source of revenue.

The great hue-and-cry for equal justice cannot be ignored by those of us on

the national level. We here must provide the answer for our outraged citizenry.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NONRESIDENT TAXATION FERMENT

Governor Rockefeller of New York has given assurance of fairer tax treatment by that State to nonresidents working there.

"I expect to recommend some form of adjustment in my next annual message to the legislature, which will constitute an equitable solution," Rockefeller said after an hour's conference with members of the New Jersey Commission on Out-of-State Taxation of New Jersey Residents this week.

The theme of the conference was the inequity of New York's present income tax, which does not allow nonresidents working within the State the same deductions allowed residents. As a result, residents of New Jersey, Connecticut, and other States who earn their living in New York pay as much as 45 percent higher income taxes to the State. There are from 140,000 to 150,000 Jerseyites affected.

Promises have been given before by New York for fairer tax treatment but the New Jersey delegation thinks this one means more than those of the past. In a joint statement issued after the meeting with Rockefeller, members expressed themselves as "more confident that there can be removal at New York's 1960 legislative session of this source of irritation between our neighboring States." Rockefeller asked the New Jersey commission or a copy of a report it is drafting, so he can use it in preparing his recommendations for the legislature next year.

Residents of south Jersey will be glad to see our fellow citizens upstate get relief from what unquestionably is an unfair situation now existing. But whatever New York does to give them fairer treatment will in no way affect south Jerseyites working in Philadelphia and unfairly being forced to pay that city's wage tax. Relief for them is farther away.

Yet there are signs that it is coming. Next Tuesday the New Jersey commission will meet with Mayor Dilworth and "attempt to work out some kind of a compromise" on the wage tax issue. The attempt will involve a special, lower tax rate on nonresidents to compensate for the fact that they receive fewer municipal services from Philadelphia than residents.

This is an unusual approach to the problem and there is no use being too optimistic about its chances of success. Yet Dilworth and other Philadelphia city officials surely will have to agree that it is basically fair, and some good may come of it.

But the wage tax and similar conflicts may eventually be ironed out at Washington, and on a national basis. More and more signs are pointing that way.

Congress is becoming aroused over these nonresident taxes. Any number of bills and proposals for constitutional amendments have been introduced at this session to end what is becoming a national problem. Many States are involved in this overlapping and duplicating of jurisdictions, and it is no longer confined to two or three in the East.

Interstate compacts to permit States to agree among themselves on not taxing citizens twice are one frequently suggested remedy. Constitutional amendments forbidding the practice are usually ruled out by realistic observers, since more than 30 States now tax nonresidents.

The Nonresident Income Taxation Committee of the National Association of Attorneys General has just made a rather disappointing report on the subject. Headed by our own Attorney General Furman, the committee endorses the principle of nonresident taxation on the theory that workers use the services of the States in which they work.

However, the committee does say that "as a matter of abstract justice * * * individuals should not be forced to contribute to the major revenue-producing tax in two States because of their residence in one State and employment in another."

The report urges that States imposing an income tax grant the same dedeductions to nonresidents as to their own citizens. It strongly advises against retaliatory legislation, but asks States to act in good faith and in a mutual willingess to eliminate the worst features of double taxation.

States are told they should forego squeezing out all technically allowable tax gains from residents of other States. Otherwise, serious conflicts will arise which will threaten a breakdown of the Federal system, and the Federal Government will be forced to intervene and possibly to preempt the field of income taxation.

This is a very real possibility and judging by the present ferment in Congress it may be close at hand. The income tax States will be wise to recognize it.

Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 19, 1959

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Can We Escape a Ruinous Inflation," prepared by me, and published in the Reader's Digest.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAN WE ESCAPE A RUINOUS INFLATION?

(By HARRY F. BYRD, U.S. Senator from Virginia since 1933)

Everybody knows now that America is menaced in the years ahead with an inflation that could wipe out savings and impoverish millions who are living on fixed incomes. Is there any way we can keep this from happening? Let us study this question from the bottom up:

A country is suffering from inflation when a unit of currency buys less and less. Our money supply consists of two elements—the Government-engraved dollars we carry in our billfolds (our actual hand-to-hand currency), and the dollars we carry in our checking accounts—our demand bank deposits. It is in the latter that nine-tenths of the country's business is transacted.

Our total money supply increased from $36 billion at the end of 1939 to 135 billion in April 1958—a jump of 275 percent. In the same period the rate of production of industrial goods increased only 119 percent. The cost of living went up 108 percent.

In other words, though we have more than doubled our rate of producing goods in the last two decades, we have almost quadrupled the supply of money. As we have increased the supply of money faster than the supply of goods, money has become cheaper in terms of goods, and goods have become dearer in terms of money: Prices have risen.

Obviously the way to stop inflation is to stop increasing the supply of money faster than the supply of goods. We must stop manufacturing money. There are several ways in which we have been manufacturing it, but I wish to concentrate on just one, which seems to me the most important.

When the Government spends more than it collects in taxes, the difference constitutes a deficit. How does the Government pay for this deficit spending? It sells its I O U's—notes, certificates, bills, etc.—to the banks. The banks pay for them by putting a deposit credit on their books for the amount of the Government I O U's, and the Government can then draw checks against this deposit to make its own payments. In this way bank-deposit money is created. More dollars are, in effect, manufactured. This is what I meant by deficit financing.

From my experience in the Senate, dealing with annual budgets for 25 years, I long ago came to this conclusion: Federal deficit spending has been the greatest single factor in the cheapening of the value of our money.

It follows that the most important single step that we must take, if we wish to halt inflation, is to balance the Federal budget and assure our people that it will stay balanced except in extreme emergency. We will never halt inflation until we do this.

President Eisenhower made a fine start in 1953 in seeking to balance the budget. He was confronted with President Truman's Korean war budget, prepared for the fiscal year 1954, of $78.6 billion. Eisenhower reduced it to $67.8 billion. He did an even better job in fiscal year 1955, when he reduced expenditure to $64.6 billion, approaching his announced goal of a $60 billion budget.

And then the record changed. In fiscal 1956, there was an increase of $2 billion; in fiscal 1957, another $3.8 billion; in fiscal 1958, there was proposed still another increase of $3.6 billion. It will be noticed that, even before the concern caused by the launching of the first Russian satellite, this was an increase of $9.4 billion over the budget of 1955. Then, this January, a budget for fiscal 1959 was submitted which came to $76.6 billion, including roads, or $12 billion more than for 1955.

The President acknowledged in 1953 the importance of reducing planned deficits. George M. Humphrey, then Secretary of the Treasury, testified with satisfaction before the Senate Finance Committee on June 18, 1957: "Planned deficits have been eliminated." He added:

"Federal deficits necessitate increased Federal borrowing. More Federal borrowing, to the extent it comes from the banks, means the creation of additional bank credit. This tends to create more spendable dollars than there are goods to buy. * * * In ending deficits, we have eliminated this very inflationary pressure."

Unfortunately, this claim cannot now be made. On June 30 last, the deficit for the fiscal year 1958 was almost $3 billion. The prospective deficit for 1959 is estimated at $12 billion.

This a grave outlook. In the last 27 years we have had 22 deficits, with 2 more deficits in prospect. Those who favor a deficit as an alleged antirecessionary measure tell us that it will be temporary. But there is no such thing as temporary large-scale deficit financing. We know from 28 years' experience that deficit spending is not turned on and off as if controlled by a spigot. If the 1959 deficit is as large as is now clearly indicated, Federal deficits will continue as long as anyone can foresee.

Deficits pile up debt. We are now approaching a $300 billion debt. This would be the greatest the world has ever known. But this official or visible debt figure does not cover the total. In addition, the Federal Government has accumulated contingent liabilities of at least $250 billion. These are obligations that the Federal Government has

guaranteed and insured, such as $40 billion in Federal housing programs.

Liabilities of this magnitude exert enormous pressure for inflation. Such inflation is a kind of invisible tax. It is a tax, moreover, without exemptions; a tax on the incomes of the poor in the same percentage as on the incomes of the rich. It is also, in effect, a capital levy on the savings of the thrifty.

As no one needs to be told, the inflation we have already had is grave enough. As measured by the 1939 index of the cost of living, the dollar has fallen to a comparative purchasing power of only 48 cents. In the year ending last May the dollar lost more than 3 percent of its purchasing power.

Taxes already inordinately high. They already place, on business and on the people, burdens that smother incentives and reduce our potential volume of production and our potential living standards. To avoid deficits now of a magnitude which would produce a disastrous inflation, the people of this country must demand that Federal expenditures be limited to absolute essentials.

If we are sincerely looking for places to economize there is no lack of them. Let us look at a few:

1. The first thing we should eliminate (and should never have undertaken in the first place) is mere pump-priming public works. Such works are not undertaken for their own sake, but principally because of the belief that they create employment. But they never work as their proponents promise. They nearly always fail to get underway until after recovery has already started. They are always continued long after recovery has taken place. We are lucky when they are not continued indefinitely.

2. Stop launching new spending programs. This includes such projects today as Federal aid to school building, and the recent crash highway-building appropriations. And it applies to new State-aid programs generally. Sad experience shows that a new activity of the Federal Government, once started, is practically never stopped. The 18 State-aid programs of 1934 had grown to 57 State-aid programs in 1957. Where the 18 programs of 1934 cost a total of $126 million, the 57 programs of 1957 cost more than $4 billion.

3. We must also try to halt the constant expansion of established spending programs. The history of our road and housing programs, of farm subsidies, and veterans' aid, should be a sufficient warning. For example, budget experts have forecast that the farm program may cost a record $6 billion in the current fiscal year, against $4.6 billion in the budget submitted in January.

4. An outstanding example not only of the permanence but of the expansive tendency of so-called emergency programs is foreign aid. When the Marshall plan was adopted, President Truman gave solemn assurance to the American people that it was an emergency plan limited to 4 years at a cost of $15 billion. Aid has already run for 11 years. Gross expenditures have totaled more than $75 billion, including loans, grants, and use of foreign currencies. Of this, only $22.5 billion has been spent in direct military assistance, while $52.5 billion has been spent for economic aid.

I do not suggest that we can totally cut off foreign aid now. But I do suggest that we can eliminate so-called economic aid, and should develop a definite tapering-off program for much of our military aid. All this will have to be done carefully and diplomatically. But it is precisely the careless and lavish extension of military aid in the past that creates now the diplomatic problem of gradual extrication.

5. Defense spending should not be considered sacrosanct. Our security must, of course, at all times take first place. But defense spending must be constantly reviewed for efficiency to make sure that every dollar counts, and that the American people are getting the security for which they are paying. We must constantly eliminate outmoded programs and obsolete weapons to make available more funds for research and new weapons.

6. Finally, I believe there is hardly an agency of the Government that cannot reduce its administrative or so-called overhead expenditures by 5 or 10 percent and still function effectively. This is a broad and fertile field for reduction. We still have 2.4 million regular Federal employees.

In sum, the first requirement for economy is to return to a philosophy of economy. We must have the will to economize. If we had this, we would certainly revise our budgetary procedures. Three main reforms are possible here:

Many Federal agencies each year carry over huge unexpended balances in previous appropriations which continue available for expenditure in future years, usually without further consideration or action by Congress. Federal agencies started the fiscal year 1959 on July 1 with more than $70 billion in unexpended balances from prior year appropriations. This means that there can be a vast difference between annual expenditures and the appropriations for the same year. In August Congress enacted an overdue reform in this respect.

We should enact appropriations in a single bill capable of being calculated on an expenditure basis and measured against revenue.

We should amend the Constitution to permit the President to veto or reduce individual items in appropriation bills, instead of being forced to accept or reject the entire appropriation bill.

If these economies and these budgetary reforms were made, there would be real room for debt reduction and for urgently needed tax cuts. Nothing would do more to restore confidence in the stability of the dollar than to inaugurate a program of debt reduction and to show our determination to adhere to it except in periods of the gravest emergency. If we get our overall expenditures back, say, to the level of those in the fiscal year 1955, this would leave room for substantial tax reduction.

But the most important step we must take, if we wish to halt inflation, is, I repeat, to balance the Federal budget and assure our people that it will stay balanced. The menace of a disastrous inflation is real. All the pressure groups and special interests that campaign for more and more Federal spending are helping to bring it on and are thereby doing a grave disservice in the long run to their own people.

Will the leaders of these organizations ultimately realize the peril, and join in a crusade for the economies and reforms above suggested?

Text of a Presentation by Mr. and Mrs. John Regan McCrary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 19, 1959

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most impressive presentations I ever witnessed was given by Mr. and Mrs. John Regan McCrary—popularly known as Tex and Jinx—at the brotherhood award dinner of the National Conference of Christians and Jews at New York on May 6.

One associates this husband and wife team in connection with many good causes, and they are widely recognized for their fine radio, television, and other programs. But to listen to them at the brotherhood dinner, in a short, simple, and deeply perceptive performance, not only gave meaning and breadth to the theme of the conference, but gave new testimony of their combined efforts to help their brother man. Their heartfelt sincere dramatization of the objectives of the conference was a stirring spectacle.

The occasion was the presentation of the conference's brotherhood award to Mr. Louis Stein, Philadelphia businessman and nationally known humanitarian and philanthropist. The subject of their presentation was the story of how one city met the threat of organized bigotry with a reasonable and persuasive program of tolerance and compassion.

It was so appealing that I strongly feel that it should receive recognition in the important annals of the records of Congress, and for that reason, Mr. Speaker, I, under unanimous consent, offer the text of their performance at the conclusion of my remarks:

(Tex stands up first and walks to microphone alone. Jinx to come up when introduced.)

TEX. Good evening. My name is Tex McCrary, and I have been given an assignment, probably because I've been in radio and television a few years. I have been asked to do the commercial. Of course, the request was not phrased exactly like that, but I believe in being completely candid about these things.

However, luckily for you, and for me, commercials are brief. Now when you do a commercial you need a couple of props, something dramatic, to attract attention, and then a very pretty girl with a very pleasant voice to do the selling.

Item 1, to attract attention: Know what this is? It's a tear-gas shell. This particular one blinded a woman in a mob in Buenos Aires, Argentina.

Parenthetically, it's plainly marked "Made in the U. S. A." which is the sort of thing that makes no friends for America having made-in-America tear-gas shells used around the world to break up passionate mobs boiling with hatred against somebody.

However, that's a problem for the State Department. All I want to use this tear-gas shell for is to make a point:

An ounce of prevention is better than a ton of tear gas.

And that's what I want to talk about, prevention, prevention of bigotry.

Item 2: The pretty girl with the pleasant voice. May I present Jinx Falkenburg McCrary to help me bring you a message from the sponsor of this dinner, the National Conference of Christians and Jews.

(Jinx enters on applause.)

JINX. Tex, I don't think we should call this a commercial. Commercials are for selling pills and lipsticks and beer and gasoline.

TEX. And for selling insurance companies, too. And to me, the National Conference of Christians and Jews is like an insurance company, insurance of a way of life based upon communityism—not communism—but communityism.

JINX. OK, I accept the comparison. Let's tell the story.

TEX. It's a good story.

JINX. The kind of a story that does not make headlines, but should.

TEX. Yes. You know the old rule, only bad news is big news.

JINX. But this is good news and it is big news, too. You handle the headlines, Tex.

TEX. Headline: "Quad Cities Leaders Smother Bigot's Blitz."

JINX. That was the headline, the dateline, the place it happened, was called the Quad Cities, Davenport, Iowa, Moline, East Moline, and Rock Island, Ill., in the heart of America.

TEX. That was the headline and the dateline and this was the story:

On opening day of Brotherhood Week, Quad City bigots dramatically blitzed the community by plastering great screaming signs and posters on the store windows of 35 Jewish merchants in the area: "This place owned by Jews. Remember this is anti-Jew Week, February 21–28."

That was the poison theme. There were uglier variations on the same theme. But these bigots' blitz was aimed at a community that was ready for the attack. From police to press, from preachers to teachers, this community was ready.

JINX. Almost before early risers so much as saw the signs, police had ripped them down, washed them off.

But leaflets spread the poison. And so to fight it, a smoothly working, almost instinctive campaign of "ventilation" swept through the Quad Cities * * * editorials in the local papers denounced the bigots; telephone operators worked overtime dialing out a network of community calls by Protestant and Catholic business leaders; speakers on radio and TV decried the work of the bigots.

TEX. And thus in a few hours, before bigotry had a chance to blaze into passionate demonstrations, the whole community was effectively "fireproofed," "decontaminated."

Maybe America's civil defense against an H-bomb is laggard, but against a hate-bomb, the Quad Cities community leaders moved with the precision of the U.S. Marines.

How did this miracle of preparation happen? Listen:

JINX. It all began a long time ago when a wave of vicious anti-Catholic feeling swept across America behind the masks and hoods of the Ku-Klux Klan in the year that happy warrior from the sidewalks of New York ran for President. Al Smith was the target, but the very soul of America was the victim.

To inoculate this Nation against such bigotry, great Americans like Charles Evans Hughes and Newton D. Baker and Roger Straus met and formed the National Conference of Christians and Jews some 30 years ago.

TEX. It all began in a one-man office with a budget of $10,000 a year. Today, the conference is a network, I might almost describe it as a radar network that anticipates attack, in 62 regional offices and 300 local chapters operating in more than 10,000 individual and individualistic communities throughout America and Canada, with an annual budget of $2½ million.

JINX. This summer, the national conference will conduct workshop conferences for more than 1,500 teachers and community leaders, workshop conferences in human relations. These workshops will last for 2 to 6 weeks each, operated by 47 different colleges and universities.

TEX. Right now, at Michigan State University, more than 150 police officers from 43 States are attending a special session of the national conference seminar on police-community relations.

JINX. And this summer, some 300 young leaders from Los Angeles, Chicago, St. Louis, and Detroit will attend an intercultural study camp under sponsorship of the National Conference of Christians and Jews.

TEX. To counteract the tensions that boiled up in the wake of the Supreme Court's historic ruling against segregation in public schools, the national conference sponsored 2-day institutes for community leaders in 32 key southern cities.

In Louisville, Ky., a horserace called the Derby makes headlines every year. But the superintendent of public schools in Louisville, Ky., gives the NCCJ full credit for preventing headlines in a very important chapter of the human race.

JINX. Integration came to the public schools of Louisville in Kentucky without the violence of Little Rock, Ark.

TEX. Thanks to the community-conditioning national conference.

JINX. And so you see, brotherhood is more than a slogan to the conference. And Brotherhood Week lasts 365 workdays of the year.

TEX. And that's the sort of work that made it possible for the community leaders of the Quad Cities to beat the bigots during Brotherhood Week.

You know, Abraham Lincoln took less than 300 words to explain the meaning of America in his Gettysburg Address. It's taken us a little long to explain what the National Conference of Christians and Jews means to America. But let me try to put the summary into 50 words:

There are three great forces in a free society—legislation, regulation, and emulation—and the most precious of the three to democracy is emulation, the force of example for others to emulate. And that is the vital task of the NCCJ: To set the example for brotherhood.

JINX. And now we would like to present to you your chairman for the evening, a business-statesman in the American food industry, and on the very sound theory that the way to a man's heart is through his stomach. Your chairman is a man who knows the secrets of all our appetites, president of Continental Baking, R. Newton Laughlin.

Monopoly in the Milkshed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 19, 1959

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the American dairy farmer and the American consumer are becoming more and more victimized by the rapidly growing concentration of economic power in the hands of the big four dairy corporations.

In the current issue of the Progressive magazine, Sherwood Ross reports how the mergers and acquisitions by the dairy giants have enabled them to enjoy an unparalleled period of soaring profits during the very period when dairy farmer income has dropped disastrously and housewives have had to pay ever more for milk and dairy products. Mr. Ross concisely summarizes the most pertinent evidence from the current House hearings and from Federal Trade Commission complaints against the monopoly-bound giants. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MONOPOLY IN THE MILKSHED
(By Sherwood Ross)

(If, as is sometimes said, the past is prologue, this record, to those who believe that traditional American liberty even yet holds a place in its competitive structure for the individual enterpriser, forewarns of the annihilation of the small-business man in a field of competitive endeavor historically local in nature. The rise of the giant, Foremost Dairies, Inc., characterized by acquisition * * * seemingly without end, is one of the prime examples of the revision of the competitive structure of the dairy products industry in the last quarter century.)

The eloquent plea of the public counsel before the hearing examiner of the Federal Trade Commission in the still undecided case against the Foremost Dairies Corp. supplies, in capsule, the reason behind the FTC's bid to prove that Foremost, along with three other corporate giants, has come to dominate the dairy industry. This domination has been achieved by methods allegedly in violation of the Clayton Act, which prohibits corporation mergers that lessen competition, or tend to create a monopoly, and the Federal Trade Commission Act, which prohibits unfair competitive practices. The result of these FTC complaints, in addition to the probe by an aggressive House Committee on Small Business, has been to keep the Big Four of Dairyland—National Dairy Products (Sealtest), the Borden Co., Foremost, and Beatrice Foods (Meadow-gold)—almost constantly on the witness stand.

Much more is at stake than appears on the surface in this legal battle between the Government and the dairy corporations over who controls the American milkshed, and how it is controlled. The congressional investigation and the decisions of the hearing examiner will affect the welfare of our 1,500,000 dairy farmers, the future of hundreds of small, independent milk producers, thousands of small grocers, and the pocketbooks of 170 million Americans.

As a result of the acquisition of small milk producers, virtually in wholesale lots, the Big Four now control 20 percent of all fluid milk sales in the United States. Accordingly, since 1954 the FTC has cited the four for merger practices which "tend to create a monopoly" or "lessen competition." Some idea of the wealth, power, and resources at the disposal of these giant organizations may be gained from examining their corporate records:

National Dairy operates more than 400 concerns, many of which, like Kraft Foods, control subsidiaries of their own. In a pending complaint the FTC charges that National's sales have increased 39 percent, from $906 million in 1950 to $1,260 million in 1955, as a result of its 40 acquisitions.

Borden's, with hundreds of satellites producing in 48 States and numerous markets overseas, has increased its sales from $613 million in 1950 to $810 million in 1955 because of its pattern, the FTC claims, of "steady encroachment" in eliminating competitors.

Foremost, which holds the distinction of having led all U.S. corporations in total mergers for the years 1948 through 1954, increased its sales sevenfold during the 1950–54 period because of them, the FTC contends. Foremost sales rose from $52 million to $375 million in that time. The growth of its corporate assets—like those of the other dairy leaders—directly paralleled the rise of its sales. Foremost's assets soared 797 percent between 1950 and 1954.

Beatrice Foods, which operates some 300 enterprises in 29 States, increased its net sales by 58 percent—from $205 million to $325 million—in the 1950–55 period, a consequence of mergers that violate the Clayton Act, the FTC has charged.

As these huge dairy corporations, in their apparently ceaseless cycle of merger, growth, and merger, have enjoyed record sales and profits while farm prices have declined and consumer prices have advanced, it is little short of amazing that so little public outcry has been heard. Editors seem indifferent to the fact that one-third of all American families are deficient in calcium; 2 families in 10 will not purchase a quart of milk this month, and the world's wealthiest Nation languishes in 15th place on the list of world dairy-product consumers.

Some of the reasons for this poor showing are not hard to find. Florida provides a fairly typical example of why dairy products pile up. There, three of the big four—foremost, Borden's, and National—control 36 percent of milk sales in Miami, 59 percent in Jacksonville, and 60 percent in Tampa, according to figures supplied by the FTC. The housewife has to pay the milkman 28 cents a quart in Miami and Tampa, and 30 cents a quart in Jacksonville. The result has been a surplus of milk on the farms while people in the cities who need it have to go without milk. "Now what could have caused a surplus of milk in Florida?" chided the Dairy Record magazine last summer. "Could it possibly have been prices which, month after month and year after year, with only an occasional exception, are the highest in the Nation?"

But if the breadwinner's wife has been paying gold rush prices for milk, the dairy farmer has seen only the dust and not the nuggets. Representative Department of Agriculture figures for the sale of half-gallon containers (February 1958) prove this rather conclusively:

[Cents]

	Housewife pays	Middleman takes	Farmer gets
New York	49	23	26
Oklahoma City	49	27	22
Louisville	41	22	19
Chicago	41	23	18
Dayton	40	21	19

New York World-Telegram and Sun reporter Joseph Alvarez, viewing "The Milk Muddle," in September 1957, observed, "Right now, the farmer gets about 9 cents a quart. It retails for 25½ cents. Some economists maintain that the higher prices the farmer needs and the cheaper milk the housewife wants must come out of the 16½ cents in the middle." This is a point of view enthusiastically supported by dairy farmers, many of whom have been driven to desperation by sliding receipts and skyrocketing costs. A few months earlier, 9,000 mid-Atlantic region farmers resorted to milk dumping, dynamiting, and gunplay in an effort to wring 3 cents more from the middlemen. One spokesman for 3,000 insurgent dairy farmers in that area complained bitterly, "We're losing money on every drop of milk we sell. We can't meet production costs. We'd rather ruin ourselves than have somebody else do it for us." On the highways, milk schooners were flagged down, their tires slashed, headlights broken, cargoes dumped, and the supply of milk to New York City jeopardized.

National farm spokesmen mince no words in pinning the blame for low milk receipts on the middleman. William Waldorf, president of the Dairy Farmers of America, has declared, "We will be orderly but our needs are great. We are an action group. We are in revolt against the domination of the big milk trusts. They must pay more for our milk." It can hardly be maintained that "the big milk trusts" are incapable of paying more. The net profits of the big four—spurred by sales which the FTC says have been the result of mergers—have grown like this:

Net profits

[In millions of dollars]

	1952	1956	1957	1958
National	27.8	41.7	44.1	45.5
Borden's	17.7	23.6	24.0	24.6
Foremost	1.9	10.1	10.5	------
Beatrice	3.9	6.3	7.5	8.6

It should be noted that the most recent recession, which depleted the ranks of dairy farmers, put no great dent in big four profits margins. There are several reasons for this. The business magazine Barron's pointed out one of them last year in an article titled "National Dairy—It Manages to Thrive in Good and Bad Times Alike." Explaining why National's profits rose during three recessions, it observed, "Since raw materials are much more senstive to business conditions than the prices of finished goods, dairy firms such as National usually are able to widen profit margins in times of general economic slackness." Or, to take it out of Wall Street parlance, consumer prices remained high even though farm prices fell and millions of workers were laid off.

A second reason for the sizable profit margins of the big four has been the invaluable assistance tendered them by Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson. In February, 1958, in the darkest hours of the farmers' "general economic slackness," Benson cut dairy supports the full legal limit, to 75 percent. But as one Michigan dairyman told a Farm Journal reporter, "Lowering price supports won't help use up milk. The consumer will never see any of the cut. The processor will just fatten up." It took no Cassandra to make such a prediction. When the Government depressed the market price for the farmer, the dairy giants saw no reason to make any such commensurate reduction of their price at retail. The consumer—wholly unorganized, unprotected, and uninformed—made no protest.

According to the National Milk Producers Federation, the voice of some 30,000 U.S. dairy farmers, consumer prices rose 9.3 percent between April 1954, and January 1958, although the administration cut price supports 31.1 percent. The unkindest cut of all was dealt not by Benson but by President Eisenhower, the campaigner who promised 100 percent parity in 1952. He vetoed a bill sparked by midwest Democrats which would have frozen dairy supports at 1957 levels—and hundreds of dairy farmers began auctioning their herds. Hugh Moore, professor of agricultural economics at the University of Wisconsin, told the New York Times, "The veto will cost Wisconsin dairy farmers $35 million, and that reduced purchasing power will be reflected in lower income for the people who do business with them."

The plight of the dairy farmer is perhaps equalled only by the death agonies of the small milk manufacturer. Twenty years ago, he knew each farmer who trucked his milk cans to his Main Street door in the early morning hours, and he generally gave him the best price he could and still make a profit. Now—"systematically," according to the FTC—this small milk manufacturer is being bought out, sometimes forced to sell his business. The new proprietors are absentee landlords, operating the dairy in Ashtabula or Gainesville from corporate towers in New York and Chicago.

How the small dairy dealer has been driven from the field first came to the attention of Congress several years ago with a flood of protests over "price wars" and "discriminatory practices." The investigation headed by Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, chairman of the House Committee on Small Business, produced a fairly comprehensive picture of some of the methods used by the Big Four in pocketing $3.1 billion of the total $8.9 billion spent annually by U.S. housewives on all dairy products.

In Dallas, where a price war had been crushing independent distributors, a Foremost dairy chain official testified that his company was going into the red some "three or four thousand dollars" each day by selling below cost. Foremost, like the other members of the Big Four, could easily subsidize such operations. It could write off its losses in its battle against the Texas independents with the help of profits siphoned off from its Florida operations.

Another device used by the national chains to undersell the independents is to purchase milk in an area where the price paid to farmers is especially low and then to resell it in an area where the independents buy their milk at higher prices.

The Dairy Record has lashed out at the national dairy chain sales of products below cost as "loss leaders" to draw crowds in the big supermarts. Said the Record: "If permitted to exist, this canker will result in the liquidation of many of our independent dairy concerns. National dairy chains are far from being guiltless and too often are active participants, probably with the idea of weakening or eliminating competition." Of course, while a price war lasts, the housewife is content, but experience shows—and again Florida provides the classic example—that once the independents are bought or knocked out, the dairy captains will raise their prices to whatever the traffic will bear.

The Patman committee also heard evidence which indicated that the dairy chains and the supermarket chains have opened a double-barreled attack against the independent dairyman and the independent grocer. While investigating an unusual price war in Kansas City, where the price of home-delivered milk remained high, committee probers heard a cogent explanation for this phenomenon from Fred Lambert, of the Independent Processors of Missouri: "I believe the large dairies are forcing the price of home-delivered milk up in order that housewives buy all their milk needs at chainstores where the milk of the large dairies is sold. I believe that grocery chainstores do not permit small local dairies to compete with the large dairies on an equal basis. I believe there is a conspiracy between the large grocery chainstores to monopolize the distribution of milk, and that the so-called milk price wars are financed by the large dairies and the large chainstores for this purpose."

Evidently the Government agrees. A recent FTC complaint cites National Dairies for "paying promotional allowances to selected customers, principally to large chains" in violation of the Clayton Act. Practices such as those said to exist by the FTC can only hasten the mercurial disappearance of the small independent grocers, as well as the dairy independents. The number of independents has already shrunk from 2,427 in 1920 to fewer than 1,500 today; according to Alabama Senator JOHN SPARKMAN, "They are the last of the Mohicans"—the last outpost of free enterprise among small industrialists in this country.

Whether the FTC has made haste to spare our "Mohicans" from an economic massacre is the subject of some controversy. As PATMAN charged, "The great wave of corporate mergers taking place during the past 3 years, and continuing now, has elicited from the Department of Justice and the FTC not even a wholehearted pretense at enforcing the law.

Even if the FTC—which has put only nine lawyers to work on the dairy cases—should overcome the battery of legal talent the Big Four have assembled against it, there is little likelihood that, after years of delay in the merger hearings, the Big Four can now be divested of the hundreds of concerns they have bought out. To divest them of these

assets, long since woven into their corporate cloth, would be like unscrambling eggs. Thus, even if the Federal case is upheld, the value of the merger hearings—short of giving the public a breather from further corporate pressure in this field—is rather dubious. If past is prologue, as the FTC thinks, the public may expect more Federal "consent decrees," more settlements, more status quo.

Perhaps the most conspicuous administration failure has been on the part of Agriculture Secretary Benson. In addition to his ill-timed slash of price supports, in the throes of recession, he has only once used the althority granted him under the Packers and Stockyards Act to prosecute corporations involved in "unfair, unjustly discriminatory practice in commerce." (It has long been established that dairy manufacturers, in the language of this law, are construed to be "packers.")

Obviously, the great crusade has bogged down in the milkshed. It now appears that any relief for farmers, housewives, small dairy entrepreneurs, and grocer independents will have to wait for a change of administration in 1960. A vigilant Secretary of Agriculture could make the Packers and Stockyards Act a potent weapon for safeguarding the rights of small businessmen. By the same token, an administration with effective leadership could get action from the Attorney General and results from the FTC.

The ground for such an administration can be broken now. This session of Congress should enact new legislation calculated to bring economic justice to the dairy industry. High on the "must" list is the Page proposal—a suggestion which gets its name from Walter Page, manager of an organization of small dairy processors in Syracuse, N.Y., and a Patman committee witness. His proposal would compel the FTC, if it found substantial cause to issue a discriminatory price complaint after a preliminary hearing, to order the suspected offender to cease and desist from the discriminatory practice pending the final judgment of the hearing examiner.

Congress, if it hopes to reduce growing farm surpluses, should require the big milk trusts to pay farmers a fair price for their milk and keep retail consumption up by ordering retail prices down. America would not lag in 15th place on the list of dairy product consuming nations today if the housewife were not the victim of prices that remained high both in good times and bad. Toward this end, a Department of Consumers—such as the one proposed by Senator ESTES KEFAUVER in the January Progressive—might prove of inestimable value. Unless Congress acts now to restore economic justice, farmers will continue to go broke; farm surpluses will continue to pile up; the "Mohicans" will continue to vanish; the Big Four will continue to extend their domination and influence over the dairy industry; and the housewife may, one day, look back wistfully to the time when the price of milk was only 30 cents a quart.

Preservation of the Gettysburg Battlefield

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tucsday, May 19, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, a great deal has been said on the need to preserve the Gettysburg Battlefield.

Jess Gorkin, the editor of Parade magazine, has summed this up extremely well in what he terms an open letter to the U.S. Senate. The Senate should act.

Mr. President, I request unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the open letter by Jess Gorkin which was published in Parade magazine for May 17, 1959.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE U.S. SENATE—IT'S NOT TOO LATE TO SAVE GETTYSBURG

The MEMBERS OF THE U.S. SENATE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: The Battle of Gettysburg and the mmory of the men who fell here moved Abraham Lincoln in 1863 to deliver a simple eloquent address that continues to stir men's souls. In it Lincoln spoke with feeling of the brave men who had consecrated the battleground with their blood. He described it as fitting and proper that the Nation dedicate a portion of the field to their memory.

Now that shrine is in danger. Last December 14, Parade described the march of commercialism across the slopes where 160,000 Confederate and Union troop fought the Civil War's bloodiest battle. Thus began a new battle of Gettysburg, which President Eisenhower, whose farm overlooks the battlefield, and his Congressman JAMES M. QUIGLEY, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, carried to the committees of Congress. They sought $750,000 to buy land within Gettysburg National Military Park before private owners could exploit it. But the House Appropriations Committee denied them the money.

Now it is up to you in the Senate. And for each day lost, a part of our heritage is lost. Next year, or the year after, may be too late to saxe Gettysburg.

I wish I could guide you over these historic acres. I would point out a rusting auto marks the spot where Gen. George Meade, the Union commander, set up his field headquarters. You would see a free museum and souvenir shop near the scene of the first fighting. Another souvenir stand and gas station stand near the place General Barksdale was killed at the head of his Mississippians. The left flank of Confederate artillery was dug in where the Sweet Kiss shop now stands.

Or you can follow the route of Pickett's historic charge: across an auto junkyard, past a new motel on the left flank, beyond plots for a housing subdivision. Finally, you should pause at the cemetery where Lincoln spoke his memorable words. Within 100 yards of this hallowed resting place may rise an industrial plant for the land is owned by a large steel corporation.

The memory that inspired Lincoln's stirring words must be worth more to America than the $750,000 needed to stop the advance of commercialism. How will you vote, gentlemen of the Senate?

Respectfully yours,

JESS GORKIN,
Editor, Parade.

Our Depressed Areas Need Action, Not Runaround

SPEECH
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 19, 1959

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the May report of the U.S. Department of Labor shows that unemployment nationwide has dropped from 4,362,000 in March to 3,627,000 for the month of April, or a decrease of nearly three-quarters of a million. Percentagewise the unemployment in March was 5.8 percent of the Nation's labor force while the April figures represent 5.3 percent or a drop of one-half of 1 percent.

The improvement in the Nation's employment as reflected by the figures in the above paragraph should not hide the real unemployment problem that the Nation is faced with in the 74 major labor surplus areas which suffer from continuous and chronic unemployment that numbers in excess of 2 million. The Nation's unemployment problem can never be corrected until the chronic unemployment is erased in these 74 labor surplus areas, and every one of the some 2 million unemployed are provided job opportunities.

Mr. Speaker, over a period of years the Congress has helped those areas where the impact of defense activities has been felt by providing Federal funds for schools, and recreational activities. Every time there is a disaster such as a tornado or flood Congress renders assistance to stricken areas. The farmer over a period of years has felt the bite of inflation, and so forth, an he has been assisted to the tune of billions of dollars. Areas with slums have been aided with housing development programs. Therefore, all that these chronic labor surplus areas are asking for is not relief but Federal assistance in their efforts to rehabilitate their economy for the purpose of erasing the stigma of unemployment.

The area redevelopment bill which is now tied up in the House Rules Committee while not the complete answer to the problem is a step in the right direction and therefore, the House has the responsibility of considering this legislation at the earliest possible date since the Senate has already approved it. Let us not put ourselves in the position where we can be accused of giving the chronic labor surplus areas the old runaround, by listening to some who advocate such treatment while they ignore the plight of the communities in the 74 labor surplus areas with over 2 million unemployed.

Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, May 13, 1959, the Harrisburg (Pa.) Patriot carried the following editorial entitled "Our Depressed Areas Need Action Not Runaround." The editorial explains the unemployment problem in Pennsylvania and I call it to the attention of the membership of the House:

OUR DEPRESSED AREAS NEED ACTION, NOT RUNAROUND

Is Pennsylvania being set up for another runaround in Congress?

That's the way it is beginning to look. In both Senate and House, Republican leadership is pointing at the dramatic drop in unemployment as testimony that the bigger spending proposals of the Democrats aren't needed. And Democrats, especially the Dixie die-hards, are nodding agreement. Towering over all of them, President Eisenhower continues to wave the threat of vetoes.

Let's sort out this big spending versus balanced budget controversy:

The President is right on balancing the budget. This demands tax increases. The

President has proposed two—higher postal rates and a 1½-cent-a-gallon gasoline tax hike. There's a question whether this would be enough additional money to balance the President's budget but even these revenue-raisers are getting the cold shoulder from most Congressmen, including the Republicans. Balanced budget oratory now by congressional leaders has a phony ring. They're just talking.

Pennsylvania's biggest stake in the budget is not a lot more money for airports, or housing, or community facilities, or dams.

Pennsylvania's biggest stake and greatest need is Federal aid for the depressed areas. There continues to be more of these areas of chronic unemployment in our Commonwealth than in any other State in the Union.

Because of this, the dramatic jobs gain and jobless drop nationally has not been equally spectacular in Pennsylvania. Where 6 in every 100 workers still are idle nationally, 9 in every 100 are still out of work in our State. In the hardest hit of our coal areas, 20 of every 100 workers still can't find jobs.

Even if Secretary of Labor Mitchell doesn't have to eat his hat in October, with national unemployment falling below 3 million then, there will still be massive jobless totals in Pennsylvania's chronically depressed areas and our State's unemployment overall still will run 1½ times higher than the national average.

If Secretary Mitchell's forecast is right, there'll still be 5 percent unemployment nationally. But here in Pennsylvania, the jobless total will be 7½ to 8 percent.

There still are, as the Secretary just has emphasized again, far too many long-term unemployed in the depressed areas. For all the good jobs-jobless news of mid-April, this continues to be a cause for deep concern.

What is going to happen to the Federal aid program for depressed areas?

A stripped-down version of the Senate-passed bill now is stymied in the House Rules Committee where Dixie Democratic Neanderthals hold forth. Is this bill going to be held back again until the final days of the session and killed off in the closing rush?

The Democrats have a clear-cut majority in both the House and on the Rules Committee. But will they act in behalf of the depressed areas?

Let Benson Try

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. ROSS ADAIR
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 19, 1959

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, the South Bend Tribune, South Bend, Ind., recently had an editorial suggesting that Secretary of Agriculture Benson be given an opportunity to try his plans to improve our agricultural situation. The article is persuasive and, under leave to extend my remarks, I include it herewith:

LET BENSON TRY

Looking at the huge agricultural surplus problem in the United States and its tremendous cost to the taxpayers, it would seem that Congress would wake up to the facts and give Secreary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson a chance to try his methods.

In principle, Benson advocates a free farm economy where the farmer can grow what he wants with little help from the Government. He is willing, however, to start with something less than that.

A variety of programs have been tried. All have been failures from the practical point of view. Agriculture problems have not been solved despite all the billions that have been spent.

The surpluses and the cost of subsidization have reached stupefying proportions. Surpluses owned or under Government control are worth $9 billion. It is costing $1 billion a year to keep them.

This cannot continue indefinitely. Therefore, Congress would be wise to let Secretary Benson have his way. Even if he isn't 100 percent successful, his plan should bring improvement.

Benson realizes that his free-enterprise ideas for the farmer are not politically possible. So what he is trying to persuade Congress to do is to let him lower the price props. This, he insists, will save the Federal Government $1 billion a year at the start while leading farmers to the marketplace instead of Government storage bins.

Price supports have encouraged over-production at the very time that agriculture has taken giant steps forward in productivity. And the biggest and most efficient farmers are the chief beneficiary of the programs that have been in vogue.

It has been said with a great deal of truth that no sensible person wants to see all Federal assistance to agriculture ended—at least not overnight.

But it is becoming increasingly clear that something akin to drastic reform is necessary to stop unworkable and extravagant programs that don't even remotely suggest that we are making headway in solving the basic problem of surpluses.

Homer Davidson, president of the American Meat Institute, made a significant statement recently with respect to the U.S. farm problem.

Suggesting that there is a sensible, nonpolitical way in which the farmer can help reduce surpluses, he said:

"An expanding animal agriculture is the best way to attack the so-called basic commodity overproduction." Continuing, he said: "The perishable nature of meat makes it a commodity which defies controlled production. The free market price is probably the only practical instrument that can be used successfully to balance production and consumption and be fair to both producer and consumer."

Benson clings to the idea of a free economy for agriculture, too, but thus far the politicians haven't seen anything in that philosophy calculated to win them votes. But the horrible mess isn't yielding to the subsidy treatment. Benson should be given a chance to try his ideas. It could be that he would be so successful an end to subsidies might heave into sight.

Fighter for Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 18, 1959

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times, dated May 19, 1959:

FIGHTER FOR DEFENSE: THOMAS SOVEREIGN GATES, JR.

WASHINGTON, May 18.—To an aide who walked into his office in the Pentagon this morning, Thomas Sovereign Gates, Jr., made this comment: "I have decided to accept an invitation to be Deputy Secretary of Defense. It plays hob with my personal plans, but I guess it is my duty." The comment tells much about the character of the man who is moving up from Secretary of the Navy to step into the No. 2 position in the Defense Department and who may very well become the next Secretary of Defense.

Mr. Gates' sense of duty led him to remain in the Pentagon to replace the late Donald A. Quarles.

ABRUPT SHIFT OF PLANS

The new call to duty resulted in an abrupt shift of personal plans for the Philadelphia Main Liner. Much of his mature life has been spent in public service—first as a decorated naval intelligence officer in World War II and then for the last 6 years as Under Secretary and then Secretary of the Navy.

Until today, he had been planning to retire from public life next month and return to private business in Philadelphia. As he told friends, he felt he had done his stint of service to the Nation.

In remaining in the Pentagon, the 53-year-old official realizes that he is stepping into a far more demanding job than ever confronted him during the last 6 years. Instead of the advocate, he now becomes the arbitrator in the intense interservice competition for roles and dollars.

His own appraisal of the magnitude of the job was spelled out in two recent speeches that he had thought were more in the form of farewell addresses to public service.

DIVIDED SERVICE OPINIONS

In one speech, he noted that the Joint Chiefs of Staff continue to struggle with divided opinions and the Secretary of Defense continues to struggle handicapped by traditionally divided service opinions. In another speech, he pointed to the strain of official life in the Pentagon and observed that the great tensions of this public service have resulted in some sad events just recently—a reference to the sudden death of Mr. Quarles.

In the last 6 years—a period in which the Navy has undergone an atomic-missile age revolution—Mr. Gates has gained a reputation as a man who can deal with such controversies and pressures in an incisive, yet kindly manner. He also has proved to be an individual who cannot be steered around at will by the admirals, as was often the case with some other Secretaries of the Navy.

Recently, for instance, the admirals came up with a proposal for doing away with many of the specialist branches in the Navy, thus giving the preference to the traditional line officers.

In his determined manner, Mr. Gates balked at the proposal. He told the admirals to go out and get the views of the specialists. The admirals went out and came back with their original proposal.

Mr. Gates finally overrode the admirals with the observation that there was a greater need than ever for specialists in the Navy.

Mr. Gates has proven to be a fighting advocate for the Navy at a time when most of the money and interest seemed to be directed toward airpower. He has not always been successful in these fights, as indicated by his aside one day after leaving a losing briefing before the Secretary of Defense.

"We seem to get a Good Conduct Medal for our presentation but we don't get the additional funds."

FUNDS FOR LIMITED WARS

Much of his time in the Navy has been spent in advocating and arguing for more funds for limited wars and less stress on weapons of massive nuclear destruction. He also has attempted to stir the admirals away from a fixation with the carriers to a

dependence on missile-launching submarines as the capital ships of the future.

In his new job, Mr. Gates will sit in a decisive position in determining the running debate over limited war, all-out warfare and on whether the missile-launching submarines should be placed on a joint command.

The betting of his colleagues is that in his new role as arbitrator he will not display a partial Navy viewpoint. As one admiral said, "I am just a little fearful that he will drop too much of his Navy background."

Mr. Gates was born in Germantown, Pa., the son of the president of the University of Pennsylvania. In line with family tradition, he attended Chestnut Hill Academy and the University of Pennsylvania. He then joined the investment banking firm of Drexel & Co.

Upon his graduation from the university in 1928, he married Millicent Anne Brengle. They have three daughters. A son, Thomas S., 3d, was killed in a fire in a Canadian ski lodge in 1956.

Tribute to James V. Allred: A Dedicated Public Servant, a Wise Jurist, a Valued Friend

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 19, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, U.S. District Judge James V. Allred of Corpus Christi, Tex., is lovingly respected by all who know him both in Texas and throughout the Nation—and with good reason.

This man's honesty, integrity, commonsense, kindness, and dedication have marked him as one of the finest and most outstanding men of his generation.

A biography of Judge Allred would tell how he was appointed, then elected district attorney of a three-county north Texas district and fearlessly fought the Ku Klux Klan's terrorists; how he was then elected attorney general of the State and later served two terms as Governor. He was then appointed a U.S. district judge, but resigned that post in 1942 to run for the U.S. Senate. He was defeated and returned to private law practice. Later, however, he was appointed a Federal district judge for the southern district of Texas and he holds that position with honor and distinction today.

A biography would also show how his leadership brought social security, old-age pensions, and unemployment assistance to Texas. Under his administration, a volunteer parole system for State prisoners was established, the fee system for county officials was abolished, a department of public safety was established and drivers license law passed. Under his guidance the interstate oil compact was formed which brought order to the choatic oil industry, a sales tax was defeated, enforcement of liquor and gambling laws was tightened, millions of dollars were added to our appropriation for school aid.

These things would be listed in an official biography and they are wonderful accomplishments. However, the people who know and love Jimmie Allred see more than that.

These people see Jimmie Allred as the public servant so determined to keep himself free to pursue the course which he felt best for his State and Nation that he refused many offers of financial assistance and came out of office with debts it took him years to pay. They see James V. Allred through the eyes of those whose careers he has boosted and of the people who have apeared before him in his courtroom: Such as the man who was an alcoholic with his promising career tumbling down about him when he appeared before Judge Allred, and who is now a sober, hard-working Corpus Christi businessman thanks to the judge, his staff, and cooperative citizens—or the young college student in what might have become the first of many brushes with the law had not the man on the bench taken a personal interest in him, and many others.

The people who love James V. Allred know he took law cases as an attorney which gave no promise of a fee and that as a jurist he looks out for the rights of the people who appear before him. They know he has quietly but actively supported with both time and money a number of worthwhile charities.

I know firsthand of James V. Allred's wisdom, courage, and generosity. We are proud to call him our friend. I had the privilege of serving under James V. Allred as assistant attorney general of Texas while he was attorney general, as served, by appointment of Governor Allred, successively as a director of the Lower Colorado River Authority of Texas, district judge, and presiding judge of the third administrative judicial district.

Mr. President, I request unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Jim Mousner from the Houston Post for Sunday, May 17, 1959, under the heading, "Titled Texan—Judge Allred Has No Regrets Over Political Career."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TITLED TEXAN—JUDGE ALLRED HAS NO REGRETS OVER POLITICAL CAREER

(By Jim Mousner)

CORPUS CHRISTI.—The boy listened with rapt attention as the prosecutor and the defense attorney argued the case. He had been scared when an officer came to his school and took him out of class to serve as a witness at the trial. But now, as he watched the two attorneys, the fear was crowded out by a fierce ambition.

From that day in justice court at his home town of Bowie in Montague County, Jimmy Allred, then 15, knew he wanted to be a lawyer. The seed of a career was germinated—a dual career that led from a shoeshine stand to the Governor's mansion and a Federal court bench.

Federal District Judge James V. Allred recalled the trial the other day as he sat in his office on the second floor of the Federal building in Corpus Christi. Leaning back in the comfortable leather chair, his feet propped on the edge of his desk, the judge let his memory range back over the 45 intervening years.

An older boy, one of Allred's associates, had been charged with disturbing services at a little church near Bowie.

"I listened to the prosecutor and was convinced that the defendant was guilty. Then I heard the defense attorney and was just as sure that he wasn't. I remember being impressed by the lawyers' poise, their self-assurance. The prosecuting attorney was a young fellow. I suppose every boy has an idol. He was mine."

Alfred dreamed early his dream of becoming a prosecuting attorney. Some years were to elapse before he succumbed to the allure of politics, but while still a young man he was to see his dreams fulfilled.

THE PROSECUTOR, THE POLITICIAN

It's been 10 years since Allred accepted his second appointment as a Federal judge, but even though the veneer of reserve that one acquires in a position of grave responsibility it is easy to spot Jimmy Allred the prosecutor, Jimmy Allred the politician.

The infectious energy, the disarming grin, the voice with the bite of a whip-lash—all the facets of a personality that made James Allred one of the most dynamic figures of Texas politics—are still evident. The intensity of the voice as he rehashes a past political battle, the hand that suddenly balls into a fist, forefinger out-thrust, as he drives home a point.

Back in the west Texas town of Bowie where Allred was born on March 29, 1899, his chances of becoming a lawyer didn't seem too bright.

He was the sixth of nine children of Mr. and Mrs. Renne Allred. The elder Allred was a rural mail carrier. The size of the family and the father's modest income made it necessary for the six boys to go to work at a rather early age. Young Jimmy peddled newspapers and shined shoes as his contribution to the household.

He attended school at Bowie, played tackle on the Bowie High football team and graduated with honors in the class of 1917. Though he had scholarships from Texas A and M College and two or three other schools, he decided to attend Rice Institute.

"It was my first time away from home. I worked at a service station out on Preston and rode the trolley from school to work and back, an hour each way. I stayed 2 months, got overworked and homesick, and quit," he said.

WORE HIS OLD UNIFORM 2 MONTHS

After two more jobs, one with a Fort Worth peanut broker and another with the U.S. Immigration Service in El Paso, he joined the Navy near the end of World War I. The promise of a $125-a-month job after his discharge failed to materialize and he took a job as a stenographer in a Wichita Falls law office, where he wore his Navy uniform for 2 months before earning enough money to buy a suit of clothes.

He divided his time between his stenographic chores and combing the law books in the office. In 1920 he enrolled at Cumberland University in Lebanon, Tenn., and earned his LL.B. in a year. Returning to Texas, he went to Austin (his first trip to the State capital) and took the bar examination.

"On July 13, 1921, I received a wire telling me I had passed. I felt like I could have jumped a five-wire fence," he smiled.

When his first 40 days of private law practice netted him only $30, he took the prudent step of associating himself with an established Wichita Falls law firm. A short time later Gov. Pat Neff appointed one of the firm's partners district attorney of the three-

county district of Wichita, Archer and Young Counties, and Allred was named his assistant.

Within 6 months the elder lawyer tired of the job and persuaded the Governor to name young Allred in his place.

ONLY 24 UPON HIS APPOINTMENT

"I'm sure Governor Neff didn't know how old—or how young—I was," Allred grinned. He was only 24.

Allred's early ambition to become a prosecuting attorney had finally been realized and he poured all his zeal and energy into the job. The procecution of two men in connection with a series of floggings brought him into conflict with the Ku Klux Klan, which was experiencing a revival in the 1920's. The defendants were acquitted but the floggings ceased.

He was opposed by the Klan in his race for his first elective term but was returned to office by an overwhelming majority.

Judge Allred still looks back on his years as district attorney as the most enjoyable of his career. The old spectre of too little money again rose to haunt him, however, and he returned to private practice in the Wichita Falls law firm. One of his brothers, Ben Allred, was appointed in his place. (Five of the six Allred brothers studied law and passed their bar examinations.)

But the young ex-district attorney had tasted the fruits of political victory and it only took a minimum of encouragement to send him into the race for attorney general a few months after his resignation as district attorney.

"You've heard of a candidate being drafted to run—so many people asking him that he couldn't refuse. Well, I was drafted by three people," the judge laughed.

One of the three was a newspaper reporter who broke the news of Allred's candidacy in a front page story one Sunday morning. Lawyer Allred received a few letters from people around Wichita Falls "which I interpreted as a mandate to run."

ONLY WEST TEXAN CANDIDATE

There were six candidates in the race, including the incumbent, Attorney General Claude Pollard. Allred was the only one from west Texas.

"I had very little money to finance a campaign," he said. "I just started out meeting people and making speeches—on the streets, from the rear end of trucks. I did most of my campaigning in small towns. Always had trouble with the cities."

Much to his surprise, he found himself in a runoff with Pollard. But the 27-year-old political novice was dealing with a seasoned pro who leveled the charge that he was the former Gov. Jim Ferguson's candidate. Should he refute the charge or keep quiet? He followed the advice of friends who urged him to deny any affiliation with the impeached Ferguson.

Ferguson fired back a few days before the second primary, and this, Allred figures, turned almost certain victory into defeat, although it was only by 4,000 votes.

Smarting from his first political setback, Allred went back to private law practice and applied himself to the courting of a pretty Southern Methodist University coed, Miss Jo Betsy Miller. They were married on June 20, 1927.

Three years later, Allred was back in the Texas political arena, this time pitted against Attorney General R. L. Bobbitt, who had been appointed by Gov. Dan Moody to fill Pollard's unexpired term.

In what Allred calls "the most exciting race of my career" he defeated Bobbitt by 130,000 votes. His campaign was partially financed by $500 he borrowed against his life insurance policy. He still has the receipt for its repayment made 10 years later.

Reassured by his sweeping victory in the 1932 election, Attorney General Allred announced his candidacy for Governor in 1934. At 34, he was the youngest of seven candidates in the race. The first primary threw him into a runoff with Tom F. Hunter, a Wichita Falls oilman whom he defeated by 40,000 votes in the second primary.

When Gov. James V. Allred took the oath of office on January 15, 1935, he found himself the chief executive of a State floundering in the depths of a national depression. Thousands were jobless, hungry, desperate.

Governor Allred's administration moved to alleviate the crushing despondency of the depression through a broad rehabilitation program carried out in cooperation with the Federal Government. Legislation was passed providing for social security, old age pensions, and unemployment assistance.

These were a few of the major accomplishments of the Allred administration. Others included:

1. The establishment of the Department of Public Safety by combining the Texas Rangers and the Highway Patrol.

2. Abolition of the fee system for county officials.

3. Establishment of the volunteer parole system for State prisoners.

4. The passage of a driver's license law.

"One of the things I am proudest of is the interstate oil compact, which saved the oil industry from Federal control," said Allred. "The conservatives won't admit it, but I and Ernest Thompson (Col. Ernest O. Thompson, chairman of the Texas Railroad Commission), backed by half a dozen independents, were responsible for getting the compact adopted."

Allred forces also defeated a general State sales tax, waged a successful war against gambling, tightened State control of the liquor traffic, and obtained a $10 million appropriation for rural school aid.

The Governor ran for reelection in 1936 and received 553,219 of the 1,053,117 votes cast, more than his 4 opponents combined, in the largest vote recorded in the State up to that time.

Allred took time out from his gubernatorial duties to place the name of John Nance Garner before the Democratic National Convention in Philadelphia for renomination as Vice President. He then campaigned for the Roosevelt-Garner ticket in Oklahoma and New Mexico.

Could Allred have been elected to a third term as Governor?

"I doubt it," said the judge. "I think the people were ready for a change."

Allred announced his decision not to seek a third term on March 19, 1938, in the first broadcast ever made from the Governor's mansion.

In July of the same year President Franklin D. Roosevelt appointed the former Governor a Federal judge of the southern district of Texas.

The Allreds moved to Houston, where he took the oath of office on March 4, 1939.

But Judge Allred couldn't resist the allure of politics. In 1942 he resigned to run against O'Daniel for the U.S. Senate. He lost by 18,000 votes.

Looking back on the race and O'Daniel's previous political successes, Allred comments that "Pappy's strength wasn't in his hillbilly band but in religion. Those little sermons did the trick."

Senator O'Daniel blocked Allred's appointment as judge to the fifth circuit court of appeals in 1943 but, after 6 active years in Democratic politics concluding with a campaign for Senator LYNDON JOHNSON in 1948, he was again appointed Federal district judge by President Harry S. Truman. He took his place on the bench in 1949.

Judge Allred says he's through with politics. Does he miss it?

"Sure I miss it," the judge replies. "Anyone who was in it as long as I was would miss it. But I've had to slow down. I blacked out over at Silsbee during the 1942 race and I've had to take it easy since."

The Allreds make their home in Corpus Christi, a central location for a giant area covered by the southern district. He holds court here, and in Victoria, Brownsville, and Laredo. He handles approximately 400 cases a year, most of them immigration cases accompanied by pleas of guilty.

The Allreds have three children, James V. Allred, Jr., David Allred, and Sam Houston Allred.

Allred declines to comment on the contemporary political scene in Texas, but as for his own political philosophy, he says:

"I thought I was a moderate, but the history books have made me a liberal. But that's all right."

Allred says he probably has to work harder on his cases than the other judges in the district because of his lack of background on the bench and his limited legal education.

He says one of his guiding tenets is to try to see the many sides of a case and take them into account in rendering a judgment.

"We have all made mistakes," he says.

Allred admits his political career made him apprehensive about serving as a Federal judge.

"But now," he says, "I believe it's the best background I could have had. I don't think anyone should serve as a judge or prosecutor unless he's been knocked around some."

The Egg Business in the Northeast

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 1959

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following letter from a constituent of mine, Mr. Arthur E. Prosser, gives the other side of the controversy on the egg business in the Northeast.

Mr. Prosser also writes me as follows:

I thought that you might be interested in hearing the other side of the egg support discussion. I believe this represents the thinking of most of the old established poultry farmers in your district. We are not happy but we know from experience that Government help (?) is not the answer. The ones making the most noise should not be in the business to start with. Unless Uncle Sam takes them under his wing and keeps them there, they would go broke in a good year. With Uncle Sam's help they make competition that will break us.

I think that he has come up with an interesting answer, namely that Government supports only increase the number of the inefficient, penalize, and finally force liquidation on the efficient and hard-working poultryman, and finally take away the farmer's freedom:

[From the Poultryman, May 8, 1959]

OFFERS SUGGESTIONS IN PRESENT DILEMMA

CHESTER, N.Y.

EDITOR, THE POULTRYMAN: The following letter was written to Prof. J. H. Bruckner, head of the poultry department at Cornell University. Since I could not attend a meeting held last week at the university, I wrote my ideas for consideration by the group. I think your readers will be interested in the following comments. They are the other side of the argument for supports:

"Our letterhead carries the statement 'Egg Producers Since 1925.' During these 34 years, in addition to accumulating a pouch and some gray hairs, I have made some observations by watching and listening to people brighter than I.

"It was very kind of you to invite me to attend the meeting of representatives from various segments of the poultry industry, but as I have 'shot off my mouth' at similar meetings during the past 34 years I am declining with thanks. However I should appreciate it if the secretary of the meeting would read the results of my study of the poultryman's problems.

"On January 1, 1959, we incorporated our farm business with Cornell's help. My two sons, who attended Cornell and served a hitch in the Army, have taken over the operation of our farm. They are operating the farm with the help of two good couples who have been in our employ more than 10 years. The help has to be paid even though there may be nothing left for my sons.

"We are not happy about present conditions but I have seen bad conditions before and expect to again. I don't like it but I am convinced that some of the solutions being offered are not the correct ones: hence this letter."

PUBLIC NOT INTERESTED

"1. I heard Dr. Cliff Carpenter say many years ago 'Always remember, the public is not interested in the cost of production'. So, crying through the press that we are producing eggs and selling them below cost proves nothing except that we are a little dumb.

"2. Support price, attractive as it looks, is another stinker. If Uncle Sam guarantees you a price (which by the way would help western eggs more than nearbys) he will also tell you how many hens you may keep. This would call for a police state to check on the number of hens in a flock. This would be practically impossible. I told a fellow poultryman who is for controls that what he means is: he is for controls for everybody except himself. He chiseled in the black market during World War II so I conclude that he would sneak in a few extra thousands hens over his quota.

"What possibly could be done with all the eggs that would be produced if poultrymen, good and bad, were guaranteed a profit? We had a similar experience a few years back with butter. That cost the American taxpayer plenty, just as the support price on grain is now doing—but the real honey in supports is the one on tobacco. (We have to subsidize a crop which some medical authorities assert causes lung cancer; then are asked to contribute to the Cancer Fund to try to cure it."

NO MIDDLE ROAD

"We are going to have to make up our minds soon if all business is going to stand on its own feet or else have the Government take over all business and give us what it thinks we should live on. There is no middle road between capitalism and communism.

"3. Government buying of eggs now on open market. Our capable Secretary Ezra Benson is being condemned for not doing this, which has been done before with no help to anyone. Here's what happened in our own case: We were selling eggs to a local State institution. The Government got into the act a few times to bolster the market. They supplied western eggs to this institution free—that is, at taxpayers' expense—with the result that we lost a customer and our eggs were dumped on the New York market to further depress it.

"I have just itemized three proposals which I am sure will not work. Now I'll try to throw in something that I believe will.

"1. Clean up unfair competition. In a recent check on grade A eggs in stores only 5 dozen out of 36 dozen tested were actually grade A. We should demand adequate inspection from the State (one place where government is needed). Next, and most important, we should be sure our eggs are grade A. Just because an egg is nearby doesn't mean it's good.

NEED BETTER MARKETING

"I have seen better eggs in the New York market that were produced in Minnesota than some produced within 100 miles from the city. You all know how to produce grade A eggs. In regard to the term 'nearby': Just what is its significance now in this age of superhighways, refrigerated trucks with sleeper cabs? Wisconsin is no farther away than Ithaca was when I started selling eggs in New York.

"2. If you have a one-man plant, are willing to work 7 days every week and retail all your eggs you can get by. The next step is at least 10,000 hens. (Some say 10,000 per man). This means a large investment but how else can you hire a man capable of getting union wages elsewhere?

"3. This is tied up closely with 2—get most of these 10,000 and larger flocks tied up with a large co-op. A small one does not have the bargaining power with the supermarkets with which you have to do business.

"4. Build a fire under G.L.F. and make them do a better marketing job. There is no use starting another organization. Eastern State Farmers' Exchange has just taken over most of the small co-ops in New England. This is the solution, I believe. We buy all our feed from G.L.F. but they are behind in marketing. We should not have to truck 300 cases to New York market and thus depress it further. I am offering this as a challenge to G.L.F. They are in a position to do something so 'let's get on the ball.' We can help them move eggs by supporting the Poultry and Egg National Board. My suggestion would be about 3 cents per ton on feed. We should spend more on advertising. All that Poultry and Egg National Board lacks is the money.

"5. Integration may be the answer for those who would rather work for wages (and who wouldn't now)? The only integrated deal, I believe, is the one Neppco described in the February News where you are paid 6 to 9 cents per dozen for producing the eggs for the feed companies. I certainly would stay away from some contracts I have seen where you have to buy a certain brand of feed and they market your eggs.

"As an oldtimer I should like to close with this parting shot: Don't panic if you operate this year at a loss. It isn't the first time it has happened nor will it be the last. Just make sure that you are a good enough poultryman to make money in a good year. A lot of the people in the business can't even do that—why keep them in buiness at the taxpayer's expense? Operating as you did just 5 years ago will break you. That's why I am glad to have youth take over Orange Poultry Farm, Inc.

"ARTHUR E. PROSSER, Sr.,
"Orange Poultry Farm."

A Call to Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 6, 1959

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an editorial which appeared in the Laconia Evening Citizen, Laconia, N.H., of May 16, 1959, with reference to the recent appointment of Chester W. Jenks, of Manchester, N.H., which is in my district. Mr. Jenks is an outstanding citizen and will contribute greatly to the White House Conference on the World Refugee Problem. He is the son of the late Congressman Arthur B. Jenks who represented the First District of New Hampshire for several years:

A CALL TO WASHINGTON

Chester W. Jenks of Manchester has accepted an invitation from President Eisenhower to participate in a White House conference May 21-22 on the world refugee problem.

The President has made an excellent selection in Mr. Jenks, who is widely traveled, and has a sympathetic understanding of the plight of the homeless in many lands. A further advantage is his close friendship with Secretary of State Herter, who was his classmate at Harvard. When Mr. Jenks and Rev. Mark Strickland visited Russia last year, Secretary Herter attended personally to their passport requirements.

In Defense of an Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD J. IRWIN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 19, 1959

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, there has been much hullabaloo in recent weeks in the press regarding the controversial installation of $100,000 worth of rubber tile in the new Senate Office Building.

All of this unwarranted and certainly unfavorable publicity has been extremely unfair to the rubber tile industry of this country and particularly to the Danbury, Conn., Rubber Co., one of the largest manufacturers of rubber tile in the Nation.

In behalf of this constituent company, I would like to introduce into the RECORD the following letter sent me by Mr. John E. Ryan, president of the Danbury Rubber Co., in defense of his industry:

THE DANBURY RUBBER CO., INC.
Danbury, Conn., May 13, 1959.

Hon. DONALD IRWIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Referring to the controversial installation of $100,000 of rubber tile in the New Senate Office Building in Washington, D.C. by one of our competitors, we believe that you should be interested to know that our company in Danbury, Conn. is one of the largest rubber tile manufacturers in the country.

We specialize in the manufacturing of rubber tile for flooring and our 150 employees depend on rubber tile for a living.

We want to assure you that rubber tile is a fine product which is used extensively in offices, churches and all kinds of institutions besides being used extensively in homes. Many people buy it for self-installation.

The slippery condition that is being referred to in the press is due to the type of wax used and the rubber tile is not at fault. We ourselves recommend very little waxing

and mostly buffing. The noise condition, which is much less than in other types of resilient floors, can be reduced further by using acoustical ceilings and inexpensive drapes alongside the windows.

All publicity made around that floor is detrimental to our product and may hurt our company. We would appreciate any help you can give us in giving the public the truth about rubber tile.

We also hope that this letter will help save some taxpayers' money.

A copy of this letter is being sent to our Employees' Union AFL–CIO local 402.

Very respectfully yours,

THE DANBURY RUBBER CO., INC.
JOHN E. RYAN, *President.*

Garrison Diversion Unit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. QUENTIN BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 1959

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article appearing in the May 14, 1959, issue of the McLean County Independent, Garrison, N. Dak., which points out the great power of the Federal Budget Bureau:

WATER RESOURCES USE

The great concern that every North Dakotan should feel toward the Garrison diversion project and water resources in general in the State was reemphasized at a meeting held here last Friday evening attended by a small group of interested people.

The rapidly declining water level table and the greatly increased need for new sources of supply behooves every citizen—not just farmers and ranchers—to become more water conscious to help develop and retain sources of supply in our area.

Garrison diversion project is a part of the long-range Pick-Sloan plan for the Missouri Basin conceived in 1941. Alert men that dealt with Federal authorities at the beginning of plans for Garrison Dam released and saw to it that diversion and irrigation plans were a part of the plan accepted by Federal personnel as compensation to North Dakota for loss of a great many tax-revenue acres to be flooded by Garrison and Oahe Reservoirs.

Nearly 600,000 acres are stricken from the tax revenue roster by the waters of these reservoirs in the State. If the basin project is not completed as originally conceived and agreed upon the State will have suffered a great loss of revenue that can never be regained. To compensate for this loss the diversion project must be built.

A moral obligation rests upon the Federal Government to the people of North Dakota to fulfill original commitments and build Garrison diversion and irrigation project. We see no need of reauthorization by the Federal Budget Bureau nor Congress for Garrison diversion but point out that this is a part of the original basin plan and the dam and reservoir without the diversion is not the complete unit originally agreed to.

The Federal Bureau of the Budget has had the Garrison diversion report under study for a long time now. This Bureau was originally set up as an auditing and advisory group to the executive branch of the Government. Now it appears—and its long delay in releasing the Garrison diversion report to Congress seems to prove it—it has become almost a legislative body in nature with power to make decisions that belong only to the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of the Federal Government.

But getting back to the homefront—the North Dakota Water Users Association of which the newly organized McLean County branch is a part, is on the right track in combining and consolidating water interests in the State to help present a united front for this vital and valuable resource in the State.

The truth of the matter is that priority to water rights is established by prior use. If downstream interests can establish use of Missouri River water before upstream interests can; when the test comes as to who may get the water the prior user gets the nod and Johnny-come-latelys may get what is left over.

It appears to us that McLean County is not yet fully awake to the great resource we have in Garrison Reservoir and how our State interests are clamoring for and receiving greater benefits from Garrison Dam presently than we on the homefront are. Congratulations to the men that by their presence at the meeting Friday night showed their awareness and interest in one of North Dakota's greatest resources.

Citizen's Scholarship Foundation of Greater Fall River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 19, 1959

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, Massachusetts has long been known as one of the great intellectual centers of the United States. One of the first moves made by our Pilgrim forefathers when they landed on this shore was to provide for the education of their younger generation. Today Massachusetts citizens still have that feeling. Our many great universities and colleges attest their interest.

In particular, however, the citizens of one city in Massachusetts are carrying their interest in education even further. The city of Fall River, recognizing that private education is a necessary adjunct to public education, and that the youth of today is faced with an even greater problem in achieving knowledge than the youth of any previous age, has instituted the Citizen's Scholarship Foundation of Greater Fall River. Beginning last year, they collected funds from the ordinary citizen to provide for the awarding of scholarships to qualified but needy local high school graduates. Truly this is a real advance in the interest of education. The United States can be proud that its citizens feel so strongly about the future generation's ability to meet the challenge of our expanding knowledge.

I congratulate the Scholarship City, Fall River.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that several letters bearing on this subject be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITIZEN'S SCHOLARSHIP FOUNDATION,
OF GREATER FALL RIVER,
Fall River, Mass.

The recent announcement by the Citizens' Scholarship Foundation of Greater Fall River of the awarding of 24 scholarships to qualified but needy local high school graduates was a milestone. Never before has an organization composed of thousands of ordinary citizens attained such a goal.

Because this type of a grass-roots movement is unique to Fall River, considerable favorable national publicity has come to our city. We all benefit from such favorable comment eventually and we are proud to have had a part in it's inception.

Yours for a better community through education.

John M. Arruda, Mayor of Fall River; Albert H. Brosnihan, Chairman Merchants Division, Fall River Chamber of Commerce; Raymond J. Conners, M.D., Past President of Bristol County South Medical Society; Roland K. Desmarais, Attorney at Law; George W. Graham, President, Fall River Trust Co.; William S. Lynch, Superintendent of Schools; Daniel J. McCarthy, Business Agent, ILGWU; C. J. McCauley, President of Firestone and Latex Products; Thomas A. Rodgers, President of Globe Manufacturing Co.; Myer N. Sobiloff.

THOMASVILLE, GA.

DR. IRVING A. FRADKIN,
Chairman, Citizens Scholarship Fund of Greater Fall River, Fall River, Mass.:

It is good to learn of the scholarship project begun by the Citizens of Greater Fall River. This is a splendid example of the kind of increased local concern for education needed in communities throughout the Nation. In order to achieve the fruitful goals of democracy, everyone must help our talented young people develop their abilities to the full.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

MRS. FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
New York, N.Y.; January 28, 1958.

DEAR MR. MCCARTHY: I was interested to get your letter and to learn of the effort being made in your community to make your people more aware of the opportunities and advantages of a college education. I congratulate you and am happy to send a dollar toward this effort.

I would just like to add, however, that I hope all able young people will someday get their education at the taxpayer's expense.

Very sincerely yours,

ELEANOR ROOSEVELT.

APRIL 18, 1958.

Your letter of April 7 to Mr. Root has been turned over to me. I was very glad to see it and extremely interested in the material you had to present.

As you surmised, the story on your committee that we ran was rewritten from a New York Times dispatch. The story appeared in the Times just as we were going to press and I felt that it was interesting enough to try to get in immediately. Had we had more time we probably would have written to you for greater information.

I can understand your feeling against having this committee written up as a one-man plan, but even after reading the column that you enclosed, I gather that this is primarily your baby. This is certainly nothing to be ashamed of.

Unfortunately, at this moment, I don't think we could do anything more with your story. Having run the little item sort of kills it for us for at least a couple of months. It still, however, looms as a possible story

for us, say in the fall. At that time we could carry it on the basis of the number of high school graduates you were able to help go to college and the success of the first year's drive. I am going to mark my calendar for some time in September to get in touch with you again, and I wish you would do the same. Perhaps at that time we can get together on a longer story on your plan, one that would blueprint for other cities ways in which they could set up such a committee. In the meantime, I would be very happy to be kept informed about all of your activities.

I too feel that this is a wonderful idea and something that could be done in any community. We have carried many stories recently of citizen action to help their schools and the children of their schools, but none have done anything quite like this.

Thank you for writing to us. I hope to hear from you again in the near future.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL ABRAMSON,
Managing Editor.

OFFICE OF THE MINORITY LEADER,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., April 19, 1958.

GREATER FALL RIVER SCHOLARSHIP FOUNDATION,
Fall River, Mass.

DEAR DR. FRADKIN: I was delighted to learn that the house-to-house canvas in Somerset for the Greater Fall River Scholarship Foundation has been such a huge success. This has given great impetus to the scholarship fund drive and augurs well for a successful climax for a project of immense importance to the youth of the Greater Fall River area.

The spirit of the scholarship fund is that no talented youth in our area should be denied higher education because of the lack of financial means. The importance of higher education, in this age of intense international competition, is common knowledge. For this reason, the scholarship drive merits enthusiastic and generous support.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr.

NEWSWEEK,
New York, N.Y., April 16, 1958.

CITIZEN'S SCHOLARSHIP FUND OF GREATER FALL RIVER,
Post Office Box 103,
Fall River, Mass.:

Thank you for your letter of April 8 including the material on the Fall River plan and its latest achievements. It certainly is an inspiring project.

I am sending it on to our education editor, and he will be in touch with you if it is decided to do an article.

Thank you for thinking of us.

Sincerely yours,

MALCOLM MUIR, Jr.

THE READER'S DIGEST,
Pleasantville, N.Y., April 24, 1958.

CITIZEN'S SCHOLARSHIP FUND OF GREATER FALL RIVER,
Fall River, Mass.:

You're certainly to be commended on the "Fall River Plan" and several of us here have read your material on the subject with keen interest.

We're all agreed that this is a fine and worthy project. We do think, however, that a Digest article now would be premature; that a story with greater impact and appeal could be developed after the plan has been in operation for a couple of years and there is some record of accomplishment on the part of the scholarship winners. We would welcome a progress report in another year or two.

Meantime, our best wishes for the continuing success of your "grass roots" campaign.

Sincerly yours,

KENNETH W. PAYNE.

DIOCESE OF FALL RIVER,
Fall River, Mass., February 6, 1958.

Mr. DANIEL J. MCCARTHY,
Corresponding Secretary, Citizen's Scholarship Fund of Greater Fall River, Fall River, Mass.

MY DEAR MR. MCCARTHY: Here enclosed find my contribution, small enough, for the establishment of a scholarship fund in Greater Fall River.

Since your demands are so modest, I feel quite confident that the community as a whole will respond generously and trust that many of our deserving young men and women will benefit by the scholarships through the medium of this fund.

Believe me, with every good wish.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES L. CONNALLY,
Bishop of Fall River.

DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
Washington, D.C., March 20, 1958.

Your letter of February 14 to President Eisenhower has been referred to this Office for reply.

It is certainly a real pleasure to learn of the spirit which the citizens of Fall River have entered into their drive for a fund for scholarships to help superior, needy youngsters to go on to college. In addition to contributing to a worthy cause the people of Fall River have set a fine example of democracy in action.

We are delighted that another city is already following your leadership and join with you in the hope that other communities will undertake similar action.

Sincerely yours,

J. HAROLD GOLDTHORPE,
Assistant Director
Student Assistance Project.

CITIZEN'S SCHOLARSHIP FOUNDATION
OF GREATER FALL RIVER,
Fall River, Mass.

DEAR SENATOR SALTONSTALL: In our form of democracy, one principle, the principle of self-help has done more to insure the success of our way of life than any other. Because we feel that education of our children is the basic necessity in the formula for keeping our country great, we of the Fall River plan are making every effort to keep alive the principle of self-help.

The Citizen's Scholarship Foundation of Greater Fall River is such an organization founded to raise moneys for the advanced education of gifted but needy high school graduates. This project has the unqualified support of President Eisenhower, Mrs. Roosevelt, and many other dignitaries.

Last year we awarded 24 scholarships—this year we expect to double that amount, ranging from $100 to $500. This money is obtained from the broad base of over $10,000—mainly from the $1 memberships.

We have found that a grassroots movement becomes more than merely giving out scholarships. It becomes a uniting factor in a community; it stimulates parents' interest in higher education; it gives students the incentive to do better work, finish high school, and consider college. It is a fine example of brotherhood in action.

The enclosed brochure is available to any interested party writing to Citizen's Scholarship Foundation, P.O. Box 103, Fall River, Mass.

Yours for a better America through education,

Dr. IRVING A. FRADKIN.

MARCH 17, 1959.

DEAR DR. FRADKIN: I was thrilled with the Fall River plan. Its cross-sectionnlism is exactly what this country needs, in education as in all other aspects of our communal life.

My personal problem concerning becoming president of this great grassroots movement is that I simply have so little time to devote to the duties which must arise from the association. I'm with you all the way and would be glad to lend my name to the idea with the understanding that I just can't get out to your town to help. If my name can help you've got it.

Sincerely yours,

SAM LEVENSON.

B. M. C. DURFEE HIGH SCHOOL,
Fall River, Mass., April 6, 1959.

Dr. IRVING A. FRADKIN,
President, Citizen's Scholarship Foundation of Greater Fall River, Fall River, Mass.

DEAR DR. FRADKIN: Although you are aware I am sure of my intense personal interest in the efforts of the Citizen's Scholarship Foundation of Greater Falls River since its inception, I feel compelled to put in writing some of my reactions to this splendid project.

In these days when the need for scholarship help is truly great and continuing, the foundation is doing a superior job in stimulating students of high school years to do better work, in encouraging them to feel that they have a real opportunity to go to college, and in urging their parents to regard a college education as truly desirable for them. All of these will result in direct benefit to our country.

The New York Times, issue of April 5, 1959, carried a front page story decrying the fact that little scholarship help reaches pupils of families in the lower income bracket. It is primarily this feature in the work of the Citizen's Scholarship Foundation of Greater Fall River which makes it unique and which calls, I believe, for universal support.

As principal of B. M. C. Durfee High School, I am particularly proud that our students, working with other young people, have participated actively in the work of the foundation, arranging their own programs and being so successful therein that they are able now to present a scholarship of their own. By their unselfish attitude these students are setting an example not only for others of their age group but for adults as well.

It is my sincere hope that the efforts of the Citizen's Scholarship Foundation of Greater Fall River will continue strong and that it may serve as a model for other communities.

Very sincerely yours,

AMBROSE F. KEELEY,
Principal.

FALL RIVER PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
ADMINISTRATION OFFICES,
Fall River, Mass., April 3, 1959.

Dr. IRVING A. FRADKIN,
Fall River, Mass.

DEAR DR. FRADKIN: May I express once again my enthusiasm for the Community Scholarship Fund and the work it is doing. There is no doubt in my mind that the good effects transcend and go away beyond the actual donation of scholarship moneys to the recipients.

I am convinced that the publicity attendant upon the raising and donating of these moneys prompts parents to think in terms of college education for their children where formerly there was no hope. Particularly, a parent who would like to see his child have the opportunity to attend college and cannot quite make it financially is given an added boost. At the same time a student who can get some financial aid and needs a little bit more is able to convince his parents that a college educatino is within reach. Here you are giving added incentive to the able student and at the same time stimulating him to a realization of his potentialities. I have no doubt that the number of students who

will elect a college curriculum in high school will increase and that students in general will avail themselves of additional opportunities.

A greater number of pupils going on to higher education should result in a more enlightened citizenry and a more progressive community.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM S. LYNCH,
Superintendent of Schools.

Great Oaks and Little Alcorns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 18, 1959

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the Buffalo, N.Y., News columnist, Hubert Holloway, recently paid tribute to former Democratic National Committee chairman and Postmaster General James A. Farley in his "Notes and Quotes" column.

Said columnist Holloway:

One of Buffalo's best friends in New York City is James A. Farley. He always speaks of Buffalo in flattering terms and sends greetings to Buffalonians by way of his visitors. The Haverstraw boy who made good in politics takes the end of his senatorial ambitions in the spirit of some little-known words of Daniel Webster:

"The result has caused me no personal feeling whatever, nor any change in my conduct or purpose. What I have been, I am, in principle and in character; and what I am, I hope to continue to be. Circumstances or opponents may triumph over my temper and self-respect."

On April 9, 1959, the Salem, Ala., Times-Journal also paid tribute to Jim Farley in an editorial. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the editorial in the Appendix:

GREAT OAKS AND LITTLE ALCORNS

Naturally the resignation of Meade Alcorn as Republican national chairman caught a little space in the prints. But the fact is that these days national chairmen don't seem to strike much fire.

Back in the heyday of Jim Farley, the late Franklin D. Roosevelt's party manager, the job seemed to have a lot of glamour. Farley ran the Democratic operation as if he were a kind of cross between Cecil B. DeMille of Hollywood and the president of General Motors.

The postwar crop of national chairmen hasn't been of the same order at all. Mostly they've made the whole thing appear about as exciting as if they were bossing a nationwide network of department store billing clerks.

Now and then they try to put a little life in the job by tossing off a strongly partisan statement, but generally the reaction to these is that, whichever party is involved they range from the foolish to the preposterous.

Party organization politics may be a good deal more ethical than it used to be. It's also a lot less fun.

Importance of the Mutual Security Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 6, 1959

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the remarks of Gen. William H. Draper, Jr., before the New Hampshire Weekly Newspaper Publishers' Association meeting held at the University of New Hampshire, Durham, N.H., on May 15, 1959. General Draper, Chairman of the President's Committee To Study the U.S. Military Assistance Program, is displaying outstanding leadership. This speech is an excellent presentation of the importance of the mutual security program. I am deeply impressed by General Draper's logic, clarity of expression, his conception of the future, and his vision of the part the United States must play in world affairs. He is making an outstanding contribution to the development of effective foreign policy in this crucial and trying period:

REMARKS OF WILLIAM H. DRAPER, JR., CHAIRMAN, THE PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE TO STUDY THE U.S. MILITARY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM, BEFORE THE NEW HAMPSHIRE WEEKLY NEWSPAPER PUBLISHER'S ASSOCIATION, UNIVERSITY OF NEW HAMPSHIRE, DURHAM, N.H., MAY 15, 1959

Ladies and gentlemen, 2 weeks ago Dr. Henry M. Wriston made an informal talk to a small group not unlike yours—a quiet gathering of New York newspaper and magazine and news service editors and writers.

Dr. Wriston is president of the American Assembly. You know him better as the former president of Brown University.

He was talking in his gentle way and in his beautiful words.

He spoke of the cold war.

He told of changes not only dramatic but profoundly important.

He pictured with clarity the increases in Communist pressures and aggression against the free world.

Then he turned his attention to the phrase "cold war" itself.

"Cold war" was a brilliant and illuminating aphorism when it was conceived and uttered, but it has been worn smooth in the commerce of our conversation, Dr. Wriston said.

He found that the old phrase "cold war" conceals the broadened scope of the struggle, the new instruments which have been brought into play and the fresh intensity epitomized in the single phrase of Mr. Khrushchev, "We will bury you."

Right here and then Dr. Wriston conceived and uttered a new aphorism, just as brilliant and just as illuminating. He said simply: "We are in a second 100 years' war."

I am with you tonight to talk about the second 100 years' war.

Those of you who are of my generation saw it start, as early as 1918.

The question of how many of us of any living generation will see it end, how many of us uneasy under the poised horror weapons even will know when it ends and which side is the victor.

This uneasiness is in all Americans. Those of us who are honest with ourselves admit it, as the best of actors admit to stage fright and the bravest of soldiers admit to battle fright. It is human of all of us to have this emotion.

President Eisenhower in an address in late April explained why in nine words. He said: "We live in a climate of tension and challenge."

The President put the tension into these few words: "We confront world communism in a protracted struggle in which we are menaced by political, economic, and military resources."

And the challenge into these: "As long as the Communists pursue their basic goal along broad and diverse fronts, we have no choice but to meet the challenge wherever or however it may be presented."

All of us face many menaces in private life. Illness, accident, old age.

All of us buy insurance.

Mutually we face this menace in national life.

We can't buy insurance. No company is big enough to underwrite the risk.

So we are furnishing our own, insuring ourselves.

And our insurance policy is a broad one, and comprehensive. We call it mutual security.

We want insurance against the political form of this national menace.

That insurance is in our foreign policy, directed by the President, carried out by the State Department, supported without partisanship by the Congress.

We want insurance against the military form of this national menace.

That insurance is in our military assistance program.

We want insurance against the economic form of this national menace.

That insurance is in our economic assistance program.

And it is the military assistance and economic assistance that concern me.

They are the major parts of our mutual assistance program.

I speak tonight as the chairman of the nonpartisan committee appointed by President Eisenhower to study the military and economic assistance programs.

Thus I speak in the light of the committee's unanimous findings and conclusions sent to the White House a few weeks ago.

We believe that the plain issue is whether our country intends to seek survival in isolation—a state of siege in fortress America—or whether we intend to combine our military and economic resources with those of other nations and together build a common defense against the common threat.

Khrushchev in Leipzig the month before last repeated Lenin's prediction that communism would rule the world.

Then he said: "War is not longer inevitable. This is so not because the imperialists have become better, but because they have become weaker. The forces of peace are stronger than ever before."

By "forces of peace," Khrushchev means the forces of communism. Unfortunately, his statement is correct: that they are stronger than ever before.

Russia's conventional forces of 175 active divisions and more than 20,000 combat planes are being strengthened impressively with nuclear weapons and with ballistic missiles.

The manpower of Communist China has been joined with that of the Russians to face the free world with the greatest military threat in history.

Russia's industrial production forges ahead at a pace faster than our own.

Red China's industrial surge is defined in Chinese claims of greatly increased agricultural production and a steel production that surpasses Great Britain's.

The Kremlin has put this increased production to work in the second 100 years' war.

It has stepped up the distribution of arms to nations it has or wants.

It has stepped up the dispatch of technicians to nations it would corrupt or envelop.

It has shipped out in the past several years economic and military assistance—money and machinery, goods, raw materials, and weapons, all stamped "U.S.S.R." or even "Red China."

But this is more than a shipment. It is the Kremlin's imitation of our own economic and military assistance programs, a move to meet us and to beat us on our own terms.

It is more than that. It is a new weapon for the Kremlin. It is an economic and military offensive of a new kind. And Russia's foreign aid alone was greater by $1 billion last year than it was the year before.

It is with this background that we must view the approaching crisis in Berlin in the context of the growing political, economic, and military menace to the free world.

It is in this same context of open threats of war and open threats of nuclear destruction over Berlin that we must consider the necessity and the scope of our mutual security program.

Last November the President appointed our committee to consider the necessity for the proper scope of this program.

The committee has 10 members, 3 of them retired professional military men: Admiral Radford, former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; General Gruenther, former Commander of NATO; and General McNarney, former commander of the European theater.

It includes seven civilians, two of them former budget directors: Joseph Dodge, a Republican who under General MacArthur balanced postwar Japan's budget and started Japan on the road to recovery; and James Webb, a Democrat who served also as Undersecretary of State.

The others are: John McCloy, Assistant Secretary of War during World War II and later U.S. High Commissioner of Germany; George McGhee, former Assistant Secretary of State and Ambassador to Turkey under President Truman; Dillion Anderson, former Special Assistant of the President for National Security, and Marx Leva, former Assistant Secretary of Defense.

The President asked our Committee to evaluate the military assistance program on an independent, objective and nonpartisan basis.

He asked us to study the relative emphasis which should be given to the military and economic programs, particularly in the less-developed nations.

And he asked us to recommend to him the most suitable means whereby the free world's defenses may be insured.

We discussed all of these problems with responsible and informed officials in Washington, including the Joint Chiefs of Staff and Members of the Congress. I might say that my good friend Congressman MERROW, who is largely responsible for my being here tonight, was one of the influential Congressmen with whom we talked.

We studied the national security policies of our Government and the secret reports and policy papers of the Department of State and the Department of Defense.

We then formed into subcommittees.

Then with small staffs and senior retired four star military officers—all serving without pay—we visited all of the areas and most of the nations where important military and economic assistance has been strengthening our allies and friends.

We consulted our unified commanders in Europe and the Pacific.

We consulted our ambassadors and the economic and military officers overseas.

And we consulted officials and private citizens of the nations concerned.

Several university groups and others expert on mutual assistance made special studies for the Committee's use.

After all this, we delivered interim findings and recommendations to the President in March.

Those findings and recommendations were unanimous. I can summarize them for you this way:

The Communist military, economic, and political threat is greater than ever.

Deliveries of weapons and military equipment to our friends and allies have been averaging $2.4 billion annually but in recent years have been maintained at this necessary rate only by drawing heavily upon the unexpended appropriations built up during the Korean war until at one time they were more than $8 billion.

The pipeline represented by these unexpended appropriations has been emptied to the point where it will be down from over $8 billion to $2½ billion next month.

This is barely enough for necessary contract and production lead time.

No longer can it be counted upon to supplement substantially the current lower appropriations for military assistance.

This means that unless we start now appropriating funds each year about equal to the value of annual deliveries required, within a year or 2 the weapons we furnish our friends and allies will be reduced by about one-third.

Our committee found that the requested level of economic assistance for the coming fiscal year (fiscal year 1960) is the minimum required, and that increased economic development assistance probably will be needed in the years ahead.

The committee found that to be so because of the precarious economies in many of the less-developed and newly independent countries and because of the need for economic strength in those countries for our own security.

The free world's defense perimeter is manned jointly by allied and U.S. forces.

Here are the frontiers of freedom:

They extend through the NATO area in central Europe, through the Middle East, and around the rim of Asia to the northern Pacific.

The weapons for the allied forces defending this perimeter have been furnished very largely by our military assistance program.

The economic support needed by many of the countries concerned has been supplied through the economic assistance program.

This whole wide area is important to our security. Our allies and our friends cannot defend it without our help. Together we do have the strength.

Within these frontiers are the homelands of the free world where together we can maintain mutual bases, room for mutual maneuver, mutual defense in depth, and mutual use of unrestricted oceans.

If strong and well-armed forces hold these frontiers, then in the event of local aggression our friends and allies and we ourselves gain time for reinforcement. We gain time for political action.

These forces-in-being give the free world advantages should war come.

They represent a major deterrent to aggression and an opportunity through negotiation to avoid war itself.

The capacity of these forward allied forces to meet limited attack is strengthened greatly by our weapons in their hands. Providing those weapons is a much more acceptable alternative than surrender or resort to atomic warfare. This was demonstrated at Quemoy.

I was impressed by Ambassador Tran Van Chung, of Vietnam, in a recent speech which I quoted before. Consider this:

"We have lulled ourselves into half-consciousness and half-action by calling it the cold war, but during these last 14 years this cold war has almost always been hot for some people or other of the free world.

"It was hot for the Chinese mainland for 4 years, from 1945 to 1949 during the Chinese civil war.

"It was hot for the Vietnamese and the French for 8 years, during the Indochinese War.

"It was hot for Korea, for the United Nations, and the United States itself for 3 years, during the Korean war.

"It was hot for Hungary in 1956.

"It was hot for Quemoy, Matsu, and Nationalist China only yesterday.

"It is hot for Tibet now.

"It may be hot for all of us tomorrow."

He added: "Most of the time, all the Communists had to do was to divide and conquer, and the cold war has been cold only when the Reds were digesting their victims."

All of us realize that the military and economic assistance programs have been subject to criticisms.

We on the Committee found that some of these criticisms were justified.

We propose in further reports to propose corrective measures and organizational improvements.

Our Committee concluded, however, that the mutual security program is and will continue to be an effective and essential tool to carry out our national security interests and to promote free world defense.

To abandon mutual security for errors in execution or for any other reason would be to abandon the free world and to lose the second 100 years' war.

Our Committee commented: "In our fascination with our own mistakes, and the constant use of foreign aid as a whipping boy, gradually we may be choking this vital feature of our national security to death."

Any fair-minded appraisal of the mutual security program cannot fail to conclude that the results have contributed immeasurably to our strength and security and that of the free world.

Had it not been for the Marshall plan, there is little doubt that the dramatic recovery of Western Europe would have been impossible.

Had it not been for the NATO alliance, there is little doubt that some of the free countries of Europe long since would have been dragged behind the Iron Curtain, as Czechoslovakia was.

Think about that for a moment, of even more of Western Europe blotted off the map of the free world.

I went to the Far East on the work of our Committee. I was in Taiwan shortly after the free China forces repulsed the Red Chinese attempts to engulf Quemoy and Matsu. This victory by our free Chinese allies would have been impossible without our military and economic assistance.

We furnished the artillery and the ammunition that the Chinese gunners used. We furnished the F-86's and we trained the free Chinese pilots who knocked 31 Communist MIG-17's out of the air with a loss of only 2 or 3 of their own planes.

I saw the motion pictures of dogfights taken from the hot gun positions of the F-86's. They were inspiring. They illustrated graphically how our military assistance is the difference between victory and defeat for our allies—and thus for ourselves.

The victory itself illustrated how our military assistance helps to keep local conflicts from spreading, possibly to catastrophic world war.

Remember that this Communist thrust against the free world was thrown back by those directly attacked.

Remember that it was thrown back without involving America's own forces in battle, an involvement that would have brought the dangerous threat of war between ourselves and Red China, perhaps even war with Russia.

A sidelight is interesting here. The free Chinese under their own standard of living and their own pay scale fielded 20 soldiers for what it would have cost us to have sent a single American boy.

Now who in America supports and approves and indorses mutual security?

President Eisenhower just 10 days ago appealed again to the Congress to vote the full program he has asked for fiscal 1960 as a "tool in our battle for lessening of tension. * * *"

Former President Truman on the same day told a congressional committee that it would be "playing with dynamite" to cut the President's request.

Mr. Truman was emphatic that the amounts requested by the President for both military and economic assistance were of "absolute, vital importance."

He said, that rather than skimp on assistance to our allies, Congressmen should vote a reduction in their own salaries.

You remember that the Truman doctrine saved Greece and Turkey from communism. Thus it was Mr. Truman who initiated the concept of mutual security.

The Congress consistently has approved the principle of mutual security and has voted the necessary funds, whether Congress was controlled by Democrats or Republicans.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff have given it unwavering support.

The National Security Council sits in the White House and repeatedly has endorsed mutual security as vital to the United States.

Spokesmen for some 70 national private organizations have testified regularly before congressional committees in support of some or all of our military and economic assistance. They represent labor and business and industry and agriculture.

Two weeks ago the Chamber of Commerce of the United States at its annual meeting reindorsed mutual security as a part of its own policy.

The American people themselves favor it.

A Gallup poll about a year ago showed 33 percent opposed and 51 percent for it.

An interesting thing to you gentlemen is that the poll revealed that the more the people knew of mutual security the more they were in favor of it. For instance, the better-informed were 56 percent in favor. And the well-informed were 63 percent in favor. Even so, these who were listed as well-informed would not have the understanding of mutual security that your members have.

Mutual security is not a sectional program. It is not a partisan program. It is a program on which all Americans can unite in the interest of our own security and the security of the free world.

Our Committee is convinced that mutual security is necessary. Our Committee is convinced that America can afford it. What America cannot afford are the costs and the risks involved in abandoning mutual security or cutting it to ineffectualness.

Here on the slopes of New England you have had a basic mutual security for many years.

When most of us were boys mutual security against fire was invoked by a farmer banging an iron bar on a wagon wheel's iron rim hanging from an apple tree.

Today there's mutual security in the volunteer fire departments. The man who fights his own fire alone will have no place to live in except the embers of his home.

So, too, would the free world people who fight the fire of Communist aggression alone be left to live—if they live at all—in the embers of their nations.

Our Committee is convinced that mutual security should be recognized by the American people and the Congress alike as a long-range program that must continue so long as the Communist threat in a "climate of tension and challenge" endangers our survival.

Mutual security is our insurance against the Communist political menace.

Mutual security is our insurance against the Communist economic menace.

Mutual security is our insurance against the Communist military menace.

Mutual security is a long-range project, just as an insurance policy is.

You do not buy your insurance in a year. You plan ahead for 20 years, or for your whole lifetime.

Mutual security needs that planning, that looking ahead.

We cannot win the second 100 years' war a year at a time.

Thank you.

River Barges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANCHER NELSEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 19, 1959

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, Minnesota is very much interested in all forms of transportation, and river barges are no exception. Some time ago the St. Cloud Times carried an editorial which I believe is of enough consequence to warrant attention, and therefore I ask consent to place in the RECORD this editorial:

[From the St. Cloud (Minn.) Times, April 4, 1959]

RIVER BARGES

While their share of the public transportation market is but 8 percent, river carriers occupy a strategic place in the scheme of freight movement in this country. One of the oldest methods of goods transportation, river traffic has come a long way since the romantic time chronicled by Mark Twain.

These days, giant motor vessels developing as much as 8,500 horsepower course the rivers with 30,000 tons of freight in tow. Nor does the pilot need to squint for landsights. During pea-soup fogs, radar keeps barges safely in the channel.

All is not well on the rivers, however. Though barge lines have used technical developments to improve service and though traffic volume and revenue are up, there are problems of competition.

River men fear a clash with the railroads over the traffic which parallels the inland waterways. Railroads, under their interpretation of the transportation act of 1958, are filing notice of rate reductions in an attempt to capture some of this traffic. Barge line owners respond that this traffic would have to be carried by the railroads at a loss; they properly note that other inland shippers would, in effect, be forced to subsidize this rate-cutting.

Experience has demonstrated that freight can be moved over water more cheaply than over land. This is an economic fact of life. Any tampering with rates that might force barge lines out of business would be detrimental to the entire economy. Barge lines have a legitimate place in our transportation system.

Bright New Slums

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 20, 1959

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, in Congress, in our idealistic concept of the Federal Government eliminating slums with Federal money, we lose our way in solving the problem, much like the saying, "We don't see the forest for the trees." Perhaps the recent editorial of Tuesday, April 15, 1959, from the Wall Street Journal expresses the dangers of blindly going on spending more Federal money as though Federal money will solve this problem, when, as a matter of fact, it may, and frequently does, create more problems than it solves.

BRIGHT NEW SLUMS

One of the cures being proposed for the recession is more spending on public housing. "There is every justification for low-rent public housing to represent 10 percent of annual housing unit production on a continuing program basis," says the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials.

That would mean upward of 2½ times the 35,000 federally aided units now planned this year. It would seem, however, that even the most dedicated advocate of Federal pump priming would eschew the creation of new slums as a recession panacea.

Unfortunately, that is what many public housing developments have become. Several staff reporters of this newspaper have been reporting on these new slums. Launched in 1937 as a make-work project, federally aided public housing became the darling of many a social planner who saw in it a way for problem and low-income families to lift themselves to some level the social planners thought desirable.

It mattered not that what was an old tenement to a planner might be home to a family; that in the old neighborhood there existed at least some community feeling. Level the slum, anyway, decreed the theorists; move the family into the shiny new low-income project, where it often felt completely rootless and cut off from its old friends and community.

In their new surroundings some poor but hard-working families began to go downgrade. And what of families transplanted from old slums to new projects with the label problem pinned on them? "Problem families merely create their old environment at the new site," our Mr. Vicker quotes one midwestern housing man as saying.

And as the shiny new property deteriorates, the families with the most ambition and self-respect move elsewhere, speeding the deterioration in the housing project. Problems that are widespread at all levels of society become bizarre in these surroundings which have become as blighted as the old slums they replaced.

There are juvenile gangs in the new slums as virulent as in the old. There is rampant illegitimatism, alcoholism, vandalism, and filth.

For, as Mr. Vicker's housing man notes, "It isn't buildings that make slums. It's people. Move those people from a slum to a new housing project, and they'll create a new slum."

That is the crux of the matter. The whole idea that slum clearance would automatically improve all human beings rests on an erroneous concept of man's nature, the notion of perfectibility through external trappings. It is a welfare-state notion—not, be it noted, a religious one. Christianity and other religions teach that moral and spiritual progress is an inward matter.

The welfare-state concept, in contrast, assumes that whatever man's faults may be they are the result of society; just fix up society and man will cease all the activities that are adjudged troublesome, immoral or illegal. Thus this idea not only defies all human experience but also removes from the individual all responsibility for his actions.

This is not to say that local communities do not recognize their obligations to help those who would otherwise be helpless. What we are saying is that the state cannot possibly make man perfect, as, the welfare state's advocates believe.

It has been growing more and more evident that after 20 years and hundreds of millions of federally invested dollars for public housing there is a social mess at least as bad as when the program was launched.

So before plumping for more and more public housing units the planners would be well advised to take a realistic look at what has been the result so far. They can't possibly help the slum dweller or anyone else by creating more of their bright new slums.

The Economics and Morals of Our Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL L. DEVINE
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 18, 1959

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, early this year L. R. Boulware, vice president of the General Electric Co., made an address at the Ohio Pastors Convention in Columbus, Ohio. I have been requested to insert excerpts of this address in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM THE ECONOMICS AND MORALS OF OUR FREEDOM

(By L. R. Boulware, vice president, General Electric Co.)

As you direct your interest this afternoon to the relationship of your ministry to the economic culture in which we live, I am assuming your real interest is in trying to find still more ways to help those within the area of your influence to do ever better their individual parts in causing our economy to yield an ever higher return while operating in the balanced best interests of all concerned.

Nothing in my long and reasonably varied experience has caused me to be other than enthusiastic about the good things we businessmen do, and admittedly just as disgusted about both the bad things we do and the good things we neglect to do or have not yet learned to do. I personally am more convinced every day that history is going to deal very harshly with me and most of my contemporaries—and with great justice—for our neglecting for so long our obvious responsibilities over and beyond the things we have been doing. We have gone along for half a century still fancying we were doing our full duty at our work when there was compelling evidence all around us that we were neglecting these additional kinds of work that we needed to do; we were blindly following our predecessors in doing what I impolitely call the "metal cutting and paper shuffling" part of our job as though it were our whole job; we didn't even sense that the content of the managerial job of each of us was changing and expanding in new directions in a way that imposed urgent new requirements on us.

This is not to overlook the very obvious fact that the objectives, diligence, manners, and results of business in the public interest have all shown great progress. But in a country as wonderful as this, our obligations are every bit as great as our opportunities. And my complaint about myself and my fellow participants in business is that our opportunities to serve the common good are so vast that what we are achieving is just not an acceptable percentage of what we should be finding ways to accomplish.

I personally think the mission of business is to please people * * * to help them have more of what they want or of what they will want when they know enough of the facts.

Business is not buildings, or machinery, or inventory, or money. Business is people. Business is people dealing only with each other * * * with the willingness of each, on a something-for-something basis, to give an equal value in return for what he wants. Business thus concerns itself with things only through people * * * and then only as the result of people indicating they need or want those particular things. A business is simply a gathering of people who have volunteered to do things for each other.

Thus, I believe the human considerations must be kept up front in every thought, act, and relationship in business even where it might appear, at first glance, that only material considerations are involved.

I think one of the top marvels of all the world's history is the way we interdependent citizens have come together in business voluntarily, have so largely done for each other what each wants done in return for what he gives, and have in the process maintained our education and morals at a level that has permitted almost everybody to go around doing practically as he pleases without intruding unduly on the free choice and other rights, dignity, usefulness, economic progress, and spiritual well-being of his individual fellow citizen.

Yet the majority of the public is not satisfied with the performance of business. You are not. I am not. And I am sure managers in general are not.

Part of our failure is certainly due to our not satisfactorily explaining to enough people how what we are doing is good for the many and not just for some few. Part must be due to our not yet having fully exhausted the possibilities of gearing our intentions, practices, manners, and results as intimately as we should and can to the other fellow's viewpoint.

But our most damaging failure has been in not doing the very considerable part, which I thing was required of us, in helping people adjust their expectations to what was reasonably possible or feasible at the moment. Most college people have a preposterously false expectation not only about what government can "give" the individual citizen by some magic that results in little or not expense to him but also about what business can deliver on that same something-for-nothing basis. This results in too many people assuming that there is "more in the wood" than there currently is, that somebody is getting enormously more than his share, that management could deliver vastly more benefits if it only tried or even cared.

People typically fill one or more of five roles in business—and as both contributors and corresponding claimants in each role—as investors, i.e., riskers, of prior savings; as customers; as suppliers, distributors, or other participating businessmen; as employees; as citizens.

The only reason for a business—as well as the requirement for its survival—is its ability to act as a highly creative clearinghouse where people can voluntarily come together and, aided by the superior ideas and facilities made available there, can do more for each other than if working separately as individuals utilizing only their own inner resources.

Owners are the citizens who have saved rather than spent some money. In response to an incentive they have risked savings in the investment that makes the very existence of the business possible in the first place. They are the contributor-claimants who make service to customers possible, make jobs possible, make sales (and jobs) by other businesses to that business possible, and make location in and services to a given community and the Nation by that business possible.

Direct investors in business are not some few—but the great majority—of citizens.

There are further millions of cases where savers are at least indirect investors through their funds being risked in business securities.

There are relatively few rich people among these owners—fewer all the time—in comparison with the rapidly growing number of owners in lesser circumstances. Farmers, professional people, widows, business proprietors, and others who make up our work force of almost 70 million—including hourly workers—have some or most of their savings invested in business and working for them there.

I personally think owners are the most misunderstood of all citizens. There has been a tendency to think of them as bad people way off somewhere else, whereas they are the same good folks we find all around us.

We certainly find our General Electric share owners to be natural and normal folks in every best honorable and human sense of the word. In return for the use and risk of their savings, owners typically want, in essence, exactly the same things people want in the other four roles and, do function also as customers, suppliers, distributors, employees, and other affected citizens. The things owners typically want, as pay for what they contribute, are:

1. The basic material rewards in dividends and in the protection and enhancement of the value of the savings they have risked on the facilities and plans of the business.

2. The extra human satisfactions in full information, in opportunity for significant participation and recognition in matters of common interest, and in a gratifying two-way association in an enterprise whose economic and social objectives and results they are proud to be approving and supporting. They want to be fully useful. They don't want to be thought bad people—because they are trying to be good people who do good, not just for themselves but for the many.

3. The political satisfactions from the assurance that the good dividends, the attractive growth in the value of their risked savings, and the outside reputation of the business for accomplishments in human betterment have all been the result of competence and diligence applied equally to the interests of all concerned and have in no instance come from any such thing as robbing Peter to pay Paul.

Customers are citizens in the role of giving or withholding work—of giving or not giving us our daily jobs to do. While owners make jobs potentially possible, only customers actually supply and maintain our jobs.

Customers are free to buy those products or services that are offered at values they find attractive and in circumstances they approve. In return for such buying as contributor-claimants, they in turn seek:

1. The basic material values desired in performance and competitive price.

2. The extra human satisfactions in such factors as form, taste, aroma, color, convenience, distinction and other emotional or esthetic satisfactions.

3. The political assurance that the attractive material and human values for them as customers are not at the expense of equally fair and attractive arrangements with employees, suppliers, distribution folks, and people as citizens of the near or larger community.

Again, the customer gives business its daily work to do, and provides that work only where he feels he is offered an attractive value in return. He has many alternatives to buying from any given company or industry.

There are two ways in which other businesses are, or feel they are, affected by what the participants in a given business do.

The first is in the direct arrangements with other businesses such as suppliers, distributors, or dealers. In General Electric, for instance, we buy from 45,000 suppliers of materials, components and services. They get around 47 cents of each dollar we receive from customers for our finished product. Thus we are somewhat in the position of selling—and taking the responsibility for—the products of these 45,000 other smaller or more specialized businesses. In return for what they do for us, they want:

1. The basic material rewards in a profitable opportunity and the steadiest feasible use of their facilities.

2. The extra human satisfactions in full information, in respect for dignity and human values, in significant two-way participation and resulting deserved recognition, and in that interested, two-way, cooperative association which can yield mutual rewards in business competency and in a kindredness of human spirit as well, and

3. The political assurance that the rewarding profit opportunity and equally rewarding personal association are the product of able and faithful work in the balanced best interests of all concerned and not the result of any robbing Peter to pay Paul in either the material or nonmaterial sense.

The second kind of relationship of a given business with other businesses is the direct or indirect competition for customers, employees, suppliers, distributors, dealers, share owners, lenders and even for dignity and recognition.

The essence of our American enterprise system is the freedom and incentive of the individual to save, risk and compete. Our progress is based on the freedom and incentive to excel—to do better than we thought was our best and then be properly rewarded from the standpoint of what is in the balanced best interests of all concerned.

In recent years, there has been a growing tendency to try to lessen competition between individuals, businesses, industries and communities—to the end of protecting or subsidizing the inefficient, of giving "security" against the progress in values forced by competition. I submit that, however well-intentioned, these measures put us on dangerous ground, and we as citizens need to scrutinize these trends and proposals in a whole fresh determination to be sure we know what is and what is not in the immediate and future best interests of the many.

Employees are the citizens who do the work peculiar to a given business. Employees then are citizens who do needed work within a given business. That work must be done better than competitors can get it done either within or outside their plants, or there will be no jobs in the given business.

A manager is the particular employee whose job it is to take the responsibility for the adoption and execution of what he judges—on the basis of the best information available—will best please the claimants as an equitable return for their contributions.

Wise and conscientious employees thus contribute their full skill, care and effort to the common end of pleasing people with the aims, procedures and accomplishments of the business.

We find our General Electric employees want their contributions rewarded on a two-way, something-for-something basis. In return for their skill, care and effort, they make the same characteristic claims for:

1. The basic material rewards in the right pay, benefits, physical working conditions and other financial or material aspects of their jobs.

2. The extra human satisfactions in such things as important work, respect for dignity, full information as to what's going on and what's ahead, participation and recognition, and gratifying two-way, man-to-man association with his supervisor and fellow employees in the significant common effort; and

3. The "political" assurance that the good jobs with good pay and other attractions and rewards are the result of diligent efficiency and not of any short-changing of customers, suppliers, distribution folks, owners or citizens.

A business is constantly faced with the necessity and desire to exhaust the possibilities of providing good jobs and satisfying associations—while equitably meeting its other obligations—out of the money that comes from pleasing customers with products and services.

A business has contributor-claimants in the role of citizens even though all or some of them may at the same or another time be also customers, owners, employees, suppliers, distributors, dealers, etc.

The usefulness of a business affects people as citizens in such things, for instance, as the value of their homes, the amount of taxes that must be collected, and even how much people feel like contributing to churches and charities. At General Electric, we try to do our part through putting forth our best efforts to be a good employer, a good buyer of goods and services, a good tax collection agency with no favors asked, a good source of products and services for customers, a good source of business opportunities for distributors and dealers, a contributor to and worker in charities and other worthwhile causes, a law-abiding and otherwise good corporate citizen—with plenty of good individual citizens—and a forthright public and private witness as to where we think, for what's it's worth, the common interest lies.

Citizens—as such and beyond their other roles—have a great effect in turn on the ability of a business to be useful.

Meanwhile, the pay we give citizens for what their Government does for us is currently about 8 cents out of each dollar we take in from customers. There is probably another 8 cents of taxes in the prices paid our suppliers for the components included in our products. The tax of inflation is still another ingredient in our prices.

In the face of what I have represented as the opportunity, desirability, and obligation of pleasing people in three separate respects in each of their five kinds of relationships in business, what is the resulting present situation and future problem of business with all these people—that is, with people individually and with the public overall?

1. I think business has long done its best job in the material area. But even here the job is not good enough on two counts. First, the wonderful accomplishments should, can, must, and, I think, will be improved. Second, these accomplishments for the common good have so far failed to produce the satisfactions they should have, due to a communication failure that we all need to work at overcoming.

2. As to the extra human satisfactions, I believe business has obviously been doing well for a long time in consumer products and services. Rapid strides have been made in recent years in the employee relations area, and these are continuing to accelerate. But there has not been enough progress or effort toward extra human satisfactions for investors, for other participating businessmen and for people as citizens through supplying them the facts as the common problems, as to where the common interest lies, and as to how each may help others as a duty to them and himself.

3. It is in what I call the political satisfaction or assurance area that I believe the failure of business to satisfy people has been most marked—as well as most damaging to the usefulness of business. Too many people in their various contributor-claimant roles are—on the basis of mountainous misinformation about business and what's in the wood—damaging their own interests by withholding rather that giving cooperation in what is a common effort toward common goals.

This overall failure results in business falling short of the material accomplishments and the other desired satisfactions it could be producing to enrich our lives.

Whose job, whose duty, whose privileged mission is it to do something to correct this needless waste? I think it's everybody's—because everybody is affected for good or bad when busines is or is not as useful to people as it should be in all their relationships in business. I think it's everybody's duty also because everybody has an opportunity to do something, and I sincerely believe the obligation of any one of us is just as great as his opportunity to do good.

I think the first contribution to a proper sense of proportion about business can be made by keeping constantly before ourselves just how much there is "in the wood" and how it goes to satisfy the competing claims of the contributors.

I think the next facts we want to keep before ourselves is where values and jobs come from, what will make them stay and improve, what will kill them or force them to go away.

Then I think there are some more findings from practical experience we need keep before us such as—

That we lead a something-for-something life on this earth, and all efforts to turn it into a something-for-nothing existence have ended in disaster.

That Government has no magic resources and can furnish people only what it has first taken away from people; that free government is damaged and endangered when localities or individuals try to have their representatives bring home from government more than those localities or individuals paid to government.

That a business can furnish people only what people have first furnished the busiess; that business represents and is the many and not the few; that it has no magic resources or anything to give away; that business cannot, voluntarily or under force, reward any one or more groups of its contributor-claimants with more or less than

is coming to them, and still long survive to supply the values, jobs, and satisfactions.

That so-called taxes on business are almost entirely taxes on consumers, because they are costs like materials and wages, and because they either reduce progress and jobs or raise prices and the cost of living.

That a Government deficit is still a tax, will show up as the tax inflation included in consumer prices, and should be recognized as not part of the price business is charging for the goods but as the price of Government activities which the politicians didn't dare collect from people directly and visibly.

We also come face to face with the fact that, in our business relationships as elsewhere, the protection and enhancement of our freedom and well-being presents us with problems in morals just as much as with problems in economics. We cannot be free citizens, making free choices in buying and selling goods and services, and we cannot otherwise go around as free people doing so largely as we please unless we not only know what is the right thing to do economically but are also willing to do that right thing voluntarily without having any policeman standing over us or even anybody looking.

We ought not to want something for nothing—even if it were possible to get it. Also—as a matter of morals beyond obvious expediency—we citizens must resist the insidious appeal of robbing a few theoretically bad Peters to pay a vast number of theoretically good Pauls.

There is a great need for us to become wise and sophisticated to the point where we are proof not only against the false ideas and intended misrepresentations of the wily demagog but also against the equally false and even more damaging fallacies put forward by our well-meaning but misguided fellow citizens.

But over and beyond this, we citizens have to discipline ourselves to make the necessary investment in the moral intentions and conduct required.

To sum up, I believe the first job to be done is for us managers to progress faster in the proper application of mind, muscle and morals in deserving—and then achieving—the understanding, approval, and resulting cooperative support of the business process by all who participate and are affected.

But we managers have proved we are not all knowing and all powerful, and we fully recognize that fact. We need help—both in our own guidance and in the guidance we offer others.

So our other job is to seek continuously the help of all other citizens in the guidance of ourselves and our fellow contributor-claimants in our joint pursuit of the common interest.

It would be an unconscionable understatement for me to say that you, of all people, are in a merely preferred position to help us managers and all others understand—as well as to help stimulate us all to do voluntarily—what is in the balanced best interests of all concerned in the pursuit of what we want here and hereafter.

Why I Love This Country, America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SILVIO O. CONTE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 19, 1959

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, we Americans talk much of how proud we are of our country, and how very much it means us to be citizens of this great land.

But I feel that few of us really appreicate how fortunate we have been in America. Perhaps freedom is only appreciated in the fullest extent by those who have been deprived of it.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a letter written by a recently naturalized citizen who really knows what freedom means. His letter, sent to the editor of the Holyoke, Mass., Transcript-Telegram, was placed at the head of the editorial column by that newspaper. To me, this letter embodies the finest in the American spirit. I sincerely commend it to the attention of all my colleagues in the Congress:

WHY I LOVE THIS COUNTRY, AMERICA

Here I was living in Poland for 20 years, living very well, too, for even though Poland was not a wealthy country, it was a happy land. Then the year 1939 rolled around and all hell broke loose. The Germans and the Russians once more divided my poor country. At first we thought our circumstances weren't much different but after 6 months the oppressors began showing us their true colors and their might.

They began by deporting landlords of large estates and forests but soon they were even taking office workers. They were all deported to Siberia, but Russian propaganda told us they were not being punished but rather they were going to Russia to make a better living for themselves. Before the year was over we were all living under the oppressors thumb. Soon we were living like the proverbial rabbit, always packed and ready to flee at a moment's notice.

Then it hit my family; my two sisters and three brothers and their families were sent to Siberia. Siberia, the very word struck terror in our hearts, but even in our wildest dreams we couldn't imagine how really bad it was. Every letter I received from my family contained pleas for food.

In the year of 1941, war broke out between Russia and Germany and then we were under German rule. The Germans were too busy with the Russians so our circumstances improved for a few weeks, but soon the Ukrainians formed a partisan party. They (the partisans) made a deal with the Germans—they would join the German army if they were given their freedom.

Soon the newly formed German Ukrainian Partisan Army began plundering our part of Poland. They announced they would have a resurrection in Poland. They were true to their word. In the dead of winter they burned and plundered nine villages. We never slept in our own beds that winter of 1943. Every night after dark we slept in the nearby woods, in bags filled with straw.

Can you imagine what it is to sleep in the dead of winter with your wife and three small children in the woods? Then one day the Ukrainian partisans attacked our little village. My wife and I were preparing for our nightly visit to the forest when all of a sudden we heard a terrific uproar. They were burning our village, murdering our women and children in the most horrible fashion. The Ukrainian partisan women were torturing our women and the men our children and our men.

According to the partisans it was too easy for the Poles to die by machinegun fire. They tortured everyone they caught. My wife, my children, and I were fortunate in that we escaped to the forest and, although it was bright from the fires burning in our village, a band of partisans passing by near us did not see us. There is an old Polish saying which says that even a spider's web makes an excellent curtain; so it was with us that night.

After a week, the German Army came and they kept sending us from village to village until the Russians started pushing back the German Army. Then they sent us to Germany to a concentration camp and it was there that my first little boy died from starvation. This was no great calamity to the Germans. They claimed they brought us to Germany to work and if we couldn't work then we deserved to die and they would bury us.

Finally came the day when our liberators, the American Army, came. When I saw my first American I felt as if I saw the good Lord Himself. I was then 33 years old and it was the year 1951 and we made an application to come to this wonderful country, America. I and what was left of my family finally arrived in New York where we stayed 10 days. Now we have been living in this country for 8 years. My wife, my son, and I are American citizens and proud as we can be. We are living, working, eating, breathing free air. How can I ever repay everyone who helped me and mine in even the smallest way whatsoever to come to this wonderful country, and to live in freedom. Long live America. Long live the United States. God bless you all."

ANTONI TELICKI.

Minimum Wage Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 4, 1959

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, an excellent statement in support of the pending legislation to increase the minimum wage to $1.25 an hour and extend Federal Labor Standards Act coverage was made by Mrs. Marion C. Reed, the president of the Consumers' League of New Jersey, before the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare on May 14. It is a pleasure to bring it to the attention of my distinguished colleagues in the House:

STATEMENT FOR CONSUMER'S LEAGUE OF NEW JERSEY FOR THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE, MAY 14, 1959

My name is Mrs. Marion C. Reed, 918 Boulevard, Westfield, N.J. This statement is made for the Consumers' League of New Jersey, an affiliate of the National Consumers' League for Fair Labor Standards. I am president of the Consumers' League of New Jersey.

The Consumers' League of New Jersey appreciates the opportunity to go on record as favoring S. 1046 and H.R. 4488 to extend Federal Labor Standards Act coverage and to increase the minimum wage to $1.25 an hour. We also strongly support S. 1085 and H.R. 4948 which would provide Federal Labor Standards Act protection for agricultural workers on corporate farms.

Twenty million workers are not given the protection of Federal Labor Standards Act that has been promised to them as rapidly as practicable. The promise can be kept to 7½ million of these workers if S. 1046 and H.R. 4488 are enacted.

The stated intent of Congress is to provide a fair wage floor for all workers within its jurisdiction as rapidly as practicable. The first effort to do this was about 20 years ago when the Federal Labor Standards Act was

enacted to protect a segment of these workers. Since then the Congress has continued to revise upward the wage rate of the original Act.

The principle of minimum wage legislation, both Federal and State, is a practical and proven means of assuring at least the minimum standard of living necessary for the maintenance of health and decency for family living. This objective cannot be achieved satisfactorily until the protection is extended to all workers. There should be no favored classes of occupations in the United States. We believe all the workers who can be covered by an act of Congress should have this equal protection. It is the American philosophy to provide equal protection to all.

The vast majority of excluded workers are not members of unions and are not protected by either State or Federal legislation. Large numbers of these employees earn less than $1 an hour, less than $2,000 a year. The plight of these workers is becoming even more desperate as the gap between their pay and the average weekly wage widens. Their income is not enough for even a meager standard of living, so they must look to public relief funds or depend upon relatives or friends for help. They deserve a fair wage.

In New Jersey a minimum-cost-of-living budget for a woman living alone would require $1.41 an hour according to statistics released from the Women's Bureau, U.S. Department of Labor, February 8, 1955. The cost of living for a male worker is not available but would require well above $1.25.

We are also in favor of the companion bills by Senator McNAMARA and Representative ROOSEVELT extending coverage to agricultural workers. This would provide, for the first time, some protection to agricultural workers. The migratory farm workers have been excluded from most protective legislation. Many of the problems concerning migrant labor could be solved by placing a floor under their wages. These workers are an essential part of our economy and should not be neglected.

New Jersey is both an industrial and agricultural State. Our economy is directly affected by the wages paid in other States. Employers opposed to inclusion in Federal Labor Standards Act coverage have declared that the conditions under which they operate are determined on the State level therefore they should be controlled under State minimum wage legislation. They then oppose State coverage because their interests would be served best by being under the Federal act. This reminds one of the old shell game.

It has often been stated that many workers, particularly in the retail trade and service industries, properly receive their protection from State minimum wage laws. There are no minimum wage laws in 19 States. Twenty-one of the States having minimum wage laws do not cover men. Thus all intrastate workers (men, women, and minors) are covered in only eight States. Only 3½ million of the 20 million not covered by Federal Labor Standards Act are subject to current State minimum wage laws and orders. We believe that both State and Federal coverage is necessary, but it is obvious that the combined present coverage of Federal Labor Standards Act and that State minimum wage laws do not protect all workers. If the proposed legislation is passed regulating important areas on the Federal level, it would facilitate the coverage of workers on the State level. The average citizen believes himself covered by the Federal Labor Standards Act and that State minimum wage laws do not protect all workers. If the proposed legislation is passed regulating important areas on the Federal level, it would facilitate the coverage of workers on the State level. The average citizen believes himself covered by the Federal Labor Standards Act until unfortunate circumstances show him otherwise.

The proposal of some opponents of the bill to exempt some industries from maximum hour regulation would be detrimental to the minimum wage orders of New Jersey. It has been established by an opinion of the Supreme Court of the State of New Jersey that overtime is an essential part of establishing a minimum fair wage rate.

This opinion confirms our own findings based on long experience that overtime provisions are essential to accomplish the purpose of any minimum wage law. We believe that any extended coverage under this act should contain both wage and premium overtime provision of 1½ times the regular hourly rate after 40 hours a week.

Extension of coverage in the retail trade is proposed. Nearly 7 million workers (6,928,000) are in this category. About 3 percent are protected, leaving 97 percent to be included. The retail trade industry has developed from the single isolated store to an industry that is largely dominated by corporations operating multistate chain stores. "From 50 to 70 percent of our retail volume in all categories except autos, gas and oil, lumber and building materials is done by no more than 400 retail organizations" (Fortune, Nov. 1952, p. 131). This has placed tremendous power in the hands of those corporations in determining the rate of wages to be paid and the number of hours to be worked. The intimate interrelationship between the development and the structure of retailing and basic patterns of the economy is generally recognized. Since the amount of goods that is moved from the shelves of the employer is determined by the amount of disposable income of all workers, the retail industry should be the last one to advocate less than a living wage. Sales people in the retail trade need a minimum wage comparable to that set for those employed in manufacturing in order to compete for the goods produced in this country's expanding economy. Retail employees are put in an unfavorable position by one of the industries whose very life depends upon workers in all industries receiving a fair wage.

Now I would like to confine my remarks to how the passage of these bills will affect New Jersey. There are an estimated 180,000 workers in New Jersey that are not receiving the $1.25 per hour. This rate would increase the total wage and salary payrolls by less than one-half of 1 percent. The purchasing power of the State's low income families would be increased by an estimated $49 million a year. These people can scarcely exist on less than the proposed $1.25 rate. The proposed minimum would help to relieve the burden now placed on relatives, charitable organizations, and tax-supported relief agencies. Higher wages lead to self-support and decrease public relief expenditures.

RETAIL STORE EMPLOYEES

We do not have the figures as to the number of chains operating in New Jersey and the size of their labor force, but the percentages are similar to the national picture estimated by the U.S. Department of Labor. Department store chains account for 3 percent of department store employment; limited price variety stores (commonly known as dime stores) employ 71 percent of the workers in their class; and food store chains employ 35 percent of the total food store workers. Time and again representatives of retail stores that operate across State lines have opposed Federal coverage and have contended that if they are to be subject to coverage it should be on the State level. (Hearings before the Senate Subcommittee on Labor, U.S. Senate, pt. 2, pp. 835, 836 and 909.) And yet, they strongly opposed State wage orders in New Jersey.

When the New Jersey wage order for $1 an hour was promulgated, a suit was brought to invalidate the wage order. It is interesting to note that out of the approximately 11,000 retail firms in New Jersey, only 132 were petitioners in the suit (*J. Abbott & Son* v. *Holderman*). Among these petitioners were 23 chains incorporated outside the State with their main business offices in other States; at least 7 more were firms which operated more than one store. The wage order was upheld by the court.

HOTEL WORKERS

The Consumers' League of New Jersey is particularly interested in hotel coverage on the Federal level. It is estimated that 11 percent of hotel workers in the United States are employed by interstate firms. At least 7 large hotel syndicates operate in the State of New Jersey.

Hotel workers are a low-paid group, even in those States having wage orders for the workers. A 1955 survey in 17 cities by the Bureau of Labor Statistics revealed that the average pay for women dishwashers was 35 cents and hour, New Orleans, and 82 cents an hour in Philadelphia. Elevator operators in Birmingham, Ala. received as little as 31 cents an hour.

In New Jersey, the 1954 Wage Survey showed that 86.1 percent of the full-time women hotel workers and 66 percent of the men received less than $1 an hour. In fact, 26 percent of the women worked full time for less than 50 cents an hour. New Jersey has the doubtful distinction of being the only State with minimum wage laws to specifically exempt hotel employment. This exemption was put into our law at the final moments of its passage in 1933. Bills to remove this exemption have been introduced at every session since that date, but have failed to pass due to the entrenched opposition.

We believe that if the employees of the hotel chains were covered by FLSA a precedent would be established which would make it much easier to amend our State Minimum Wage Act to include employment in hotels.

CANNERY WORKERS

The section of Federal Labor Standards Act concerning cannery exemptions affects large processing interests in this State. At present they are wholly or largely exempt for more than half the year from the requirements of paying time and one-half for overtime. For 14 weeks they are entirely exempt, no matter how long the hours may be, and they can be cruelly long in the busy season in canneries. Then for a second 14 weeks, food processors are required to pay time and one-half, for overtime only for hours worked beyond 12 a day or 56 hours a week. To strike out the cannery exemptions from the standard overtime provisions would be a major improvement. Workers in food processing should get the same minimum rates including time and one-half for overtime as required by law in other industries. The usual argument is that the hours must be long in the busy season because the food processed is perishable. But human health is likewise perishable.

AGRICULTURE

The farmers in New Jersey, last summer expressed a preference for Federal minimum wage coverage for agricultural workers. The newspapers reported a conference between the farmers and Governor Meyner to discuss a minimum wage for agricultural workers which he had advocated. The farmers expressed the need for Federal protection because of the interstate competition for prices of farm products. They said they did not want a State minimum wage. So at present there is no minimum wage, no overtime pay

for working as many as 50 or 60 hours a week. Poverty and suffering have not disappeared from America.

Many migrant families depend upon the income from their children to eke out a meager existence. The family is seldom financially able to met any emergency. If they arrive a few days before the crop is ready to harvest, many have no money for food. A uniform Federal minimum wage and hour regulation would reduce some of these hardships.

The United States enjoys great wealth. We are proud of the high standard of living of our citizens. We do not like to face the fact that not all of our workers have the same minimum wage protection. However, only a little over half of those who could be covered by Federal Labor Standards Act are covered. Over 20 years ago protection was promised as rapidly as practicable.

Studies have been made to determine the effect of the $1 minimum wage on the low-paying industries. There were no more business failures than normal in spite of predictions to the contrary. A small amount of unemployment resulted because of the increased wage rate. This was small in comparison to the number who benefited. The most common result was the replacing of obsolete machinery, realinement of work and other methods to increase efficiency and productivity.

The increase of the minimum rate to $1.25 now would be absorbed as easily as was the earlier $1 rate. This would not contribute to inflation because most of the money would be spent for necessities, such as food which is a surplus item.

In conclusion we urge the extension of coverage to as many workers as possible. No society can permit any group within it to be deprived of the opportunity of a decent living standard on a share in the abundance that society provides, without gravely impairing its strength and cohesiveness.

Thank you for the opportunity of submitting this statement.

Department of Agriculture Appropriations

SPEECH
OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1959

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 7175) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Chairman, in our discussion of the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration appropriation bill for 1960, I join with several of my distinguished colleagues who ask that the costs of this program be considered in their proper perspective and that we be fair in the assessing these benefits which accrue directly to the farmer and his family.

Farmers are not to be blamed for the high cost of surpluses and outmoded agricultural programs. Farmers are harassed by a cost-price squeeze resulting from the sharp costs which occurred in the 1939–52 period and which has hardened the economy.

The big majority of the farmers are not asking for tax handouts from the Government. They want more freedom less Government interference, and more commonsense in farm programs. Our farmers and ranchers are not wallowing in Government handouts. Only about 56 percent of the agriculture appropriations can be called direct aids to farmers. The other 44 percent benefits many people.

Programs that make up the 44 percent have multiple benefits and should not be charged exclusively to the farmer. In this category are such programs as long-range programs for the improvement of agricultural resources—including research, meat inspection, disease and pest control, education, market development and services, protection of soil and water resources, and forest and land management.

Our investment in REA and FHA loans is subject to repayment and should not be considered as part of the Agriculture program cost.

In addition, there are those phases of the program which are related to foreign aid and which create good will abroad. In 1958 alone we donated $272,500,000 worth of food to needy persons overseas.

Then, there are our food distribution programs: surplus foods donated through Department of Agriculture auspices which have benefited more than 14 million schoolchildren through the school lunch program and other foods which have been distributed to about 1.4 million persons in charitable institutions. In March of this year alone, surplus foods were distributed to 5,741,298 needy persons in the United States.

It is unfair to blame farmers for the price of food at retail. The farmer's share of the food dollar today is 40 cents, a descent from a peak of 53 cents in 1945.

The other 60 percent of the food dollar goes to pay for increased labor and transportation costs; it goes to the food packer and processor and to pay for those attractive, sanitary food packages which look so good in the supermarket and store so well in the deep freezer, the refrigerator, and the cupboards.

Now, let us look at the conservation reserve program—the long term and only remaining part of the soil bank. This program has considerable merit as a tool for getting at overproduction and overcapacity—the roots of our present farm problem.

Maintaining fertility falls properly to the farmer himself. Conserving the physical integrity of the soil resource falls to the Nation as well as to the farmer and landowner in order to save the people's heritage and safeguard the national welfare. If the soil is destroyed, then our liberty of choice and action is gone, condemning this and future generations to needless privations and dangers. The farmer must be responsible for crop rotation and fertilization in order for his farm to get at least normal yield per acre.

Land, after all, is not an economical commodity. It is an integral part of the Nation, even as its people are, and requires protection by the individual owner and by the Nation as well. This is a natural resource which benefits all the people.

The conservation reserve plans for future generations as a reservoir for potential food production. It will be a reserve for more food and better food. For present generations, the improvement of water resources, increase in recreational and wildlife resources and improvement of forest resources for utilization within 15 years as pulp and paper products, bring immediate benefits.

The soil bank payments average $13.50 per acre with a limitation of $5,000 to each farm. These payments do not compensate the farmer for what he would have received for normal farming operations. Rather, he receives an annual payment in lieu of the rent he might otherwise receive from another farmer for the use of his land. Furthermore, the farmer has to do something to earn this payment. He must put the land into grass or trees or other permanent cover, and take care of it.

This program will conserve and build our vital land, water, and forest resources, and alleviate the problems of surplus production during peacetime periods of normal consumption requirements. Within a few years we can dispose of our surplus stocks and save storage and interest costs. Acreage allotments, marketing quotas, and support prices will not be necessary. American farmers will be able to get decent prices in the market place.

This type of program will, through Government action, seek to compensate for the disadvantages now applicable to farmers caused by tariffs, labor, and social legislation which increase their costs.

Our farmers and ranchers have been victimized during the past 10 years through the failure of the Congress to make needed changes in old, outmoded legislation, some of which was needed to meet the wartime emergency.

Many of our farm families and the taxpayers will continue to reap the sad economic consequences of obsolete rigid programs unless recommended changes governing our price support laws are made without delay.

Congress must move in the direction of greater freedom for our farmers and less Government in agriculture.

U.S. Department of Agriculture budget expenditures of fiscal year 1959 (midyear review estimates)

	Millions
Programs having multiple benefits and not directly chargeable to the farmer:	
Programs relating to foreign aid, including Public Law 480 (International Relations) and International Wheat Agreement	$1,383
Food distribution programs, including commodity purchases under the program for removal of surplus agricultural commodities, school lunch and milk	391
Investment in REA and FHA loans, which are subject to repayment	603
Long-range programs for the improvement of agricultural resources, including research, meat inspection, disease and pest control, education, market development and services, protection of soil and water resources, and forest and public land management	645
Total (44 percent)	3,022

U.S. Department of Agriculture budget expenditures of fiscal year 1959 (midyear review estimates)—Continued

	Millions
Programs predominantly for benefit of the farmer:	
Agricultural conservation program	$257
Soil bank programs	880
CCC price support, supply, and related programs, including National Wool Act and acreage allotments and marketing quotas	2,638
Sugar Act program	75
Total (56 percent)	3,850
Grand total	6,872

Crop Surplus Is Costing United States Billions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 6, 1959

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the scope and waste of our Federal agriculture subsidy program has become a disgrace to our Nation and a tremendous burden upon the pocketbooks of our taxpayers. Recently, the Detroit Free Press printed a series of articles on this subject which I believe is worthy of the attention of all the people of the United States. These articles—the first of which follows—give a good picture of the waste and the folly of our present farm programs:

CROP SURPLUS IS COSTING UNITED STATES BILLIONS

(By Ray Cave)

America's farm price support program is developing into a national crisis, and unless there is drastic congressional action things will get worse before they get better.

By June the Government will have paid for $9 billion worth of surplus farm commodities—primarily wheat, corn, and cotton.

Nine billion dollars is enough to run the city of New York government for more than 4 years under the present budget.

The Federal Government will own more wheat than the Nation consumes and exports in a year. There is enough wheat available in the country to supply domestic needs for nearly 4 years.

The Government will own more corn and cotton than the Nation uses and exports in half a year.

By June it will cost $1,750,000 every day just to store these surpluses. It will cost more than $500,000 a day to move the commodities, and a million dollars a day in interest on the money involved.

Alarmed by the cost of the price support program, President Eisenhower said early this year:

"The price support and production control program has not worked.

"The existing price support program channels most of the dollars to those who store the surpluses and to relatively few producers of a few crops."

Speaking of the billion-dollar storage and interest cost, Agriculture Secretary Ezra Taft Benson recently said:

"This is fantastic and indefensible."

The spending of fortunes to keep farm prices high has led to situations where:

1. The Government is letting private storage companies do a job which it can do for half as much money.

2. Government storage fees insure such profits in cheap storage facilities that warehouse operators have offered to pay farmers not to sell their crops but to let the Government take them over. That way, the Government pays for the crop and foots the storage bill.

3. One storage company could make a $3 million net profit on the Government business it handled in 1 year.

4. A fleet of old freighters had to be used by the Government to store surplus wheat.

Typical of the farm surplus dilemma which besets the country is the story of Bondurant, Iowa.

The 328 people who live in that tiny farming community near where the South Skunk River tumbles past Des Moines wouldn't know a million dollars in gold if they saw it—and they can see it by looking out their windows.

It's stored in 230 squat steel bins, built in successive years as the Government bought millions upon millions of bushels of the surplus commodity they contain, hard, yellow corn.

It isn't unusual to have a million dollars in your backyard in Iowa these days. You can see the same thing at Pocahantas, or Swea City, or Clare, or Dickens, or Lake Park, or Winterset.

Stand on any Iowa hill and chances are you would see some of the 70,000 structures containing part of the 391 million bushels of Government-owned corn stored in the State today.

It cost the Government $606 million to buy the corn in Iowa, at an average cost of $1.55 a bushel. But nobody wants to buy the corn from the Government.

Of the 215 million bushels stored in Government bins in 1958, only 13,800,000 could be sold.

These sales were largely possible only because the corn was starting to deteriorate. The law allows the sale of a commodity which might spoil to the highest bidder above the going market price.

Some of the corn in Government bins is 8 years old, but each year huge new surpluses are added.

The reason is simple.

Under the farm support law, the Department of Agriculture must acquire all corn which a farmer doesn't choose to sell on the open market.

Congress has seen to it that Uncle Sam's price often is higher than the market price. As a result, much of the grain is bought by the Government.

The Government is able to sell or give away only a fraction of what it buys. The rest it must store. The storage problem alone is a fiscal chamber of horrors.

According to the Grain Storage Division of the Department of Agriculture in Iowa, the Government can store corn in its own bins for 4 cents a bushel a year.

If deterioration losses and depreciation are considered, the cost to the Government to handle its own storage becomes 6 cents a bushel a year.

But the Government is paying 16½ cents a bushel a year to private concerns which store corn, plus 4 cents a bushel for loading and handling.

In spite of this apparent tremendous difference in cost, the national farm policy demands that private storage facilities be used whenever they are available.

In Iowa in the last year, Agriculture Department statistics show, the Government:

Paid $8 million to store grain in its own bins;

Paid an estimated $30 million to store less grain in private facilities.

The records indicate that the Government could have saved a minimum of $15 million by setting up its own storage facilities for all of the grain it owns in Iowa.

But even Government-owned storage is expensive. It takes 505 Federal employees to look after the Government's storage of farm surpluses in Iowa.

Harold Brightwell, in charge of Government grain storage in Iowa, says each bin must be checked twice a month for spoilage.

Moisture is the deadly enemy. Fans are now being used to ventilate the large bins.

Last year, Brightwell says, about 4 million bushels of the 215 million bushels of corn stored in Government bins was deteriorating and had to be sold.

Another 11,569 bushels was damaged beyond any value. This, in terms of the corn stored by the Government in Iowa, is an insignificant amount to lose, says Brightwell.

One form of storage is that operated by farmers on their own land. The farmers keep the corn, after getting their money for the crop from the Government, and store it themselves.

For keeping a watchful eye on their crop they receive the full storage rate of 16½ cents a bushel a year. There were 63 million bushels of this "reseal" corn on Iowa farms last year.

For going into the storage business (often using Government loans to build the facilities—and at considerable urging by the Government) Iowa farmers grossed $10 million last year.

Though the storage industry avoids efforts to pin it down on the exact cost of building and operating bin-type storage for corn, it is generally conceded that such storage often can be constructed for 30 to 40 cents a bushel.

Does this mean the 16½-cent storage rate paid by the Government is making a "surplus profit" deal out of the storage industry in Iowa?

"Emphatically not," says Fred Maywald, official of the Iowa Farmers Grain Dealers Association, which has 300 storage firm members.

"The Government keeps encouraging us to build storage facilities," he says. (Washington is indeed making exery effort to encourage private storage construction.)

"If the Government wants the warehouse trade to continue expanding its facilities to handle surplus crops, it will have to keep the 16½-cent storage rate," Maywald says. "Everybody in Iowa would be glad if we didn't have to build another bushel of storage space.

"We're afraid if we build as fast as the Government wants us to and the farm program changes we'll have empty warehouses across the State."

Yet, if the farm surplus situation is a scandal from one point of view, it is no gravy train for the farmer from the other.

A man who knows both is Joseph F. Carber, a Clinton County farmer and head of the Agriculture Stabilization Committee in Iowa.

"The farmer is living well, that's true," says this ruddy-faced operator of 220 acres.

"I never thought I would make as much as I am, and I never thought it would cost me so much to make it. Like everybody else, our standard of living is up, but don't think the average farmer is getting rich.

"My net income last year was $4,000 (compared with an average of $4,667 for the State). Considering the time I put in on that farm, that doesn't make my hourly wage very high." (It also is noteworthy that this is the income on a farm worth an estimated $100,000, including equipment).

But if farmer Carber seems unconcerned about the surplus crisis, Government representative Carber is a much more worried man.

Overseeing the millions of dollars which the Government pays Iowa farmers for their crops, he has arrived at this easily summarized point of view:

"We must have some form of production control to stop this excess of supply over demand.

"As long as farmers grow more corn than there's a market for, we'll never get rid of it.

The 328 citizens of Bondurant are right after all. That isn't a million dollars in gold in their backyard. It couldn't be. Nobody wants it.

Secretary of State Herter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER NORBLAD
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 11, 1959

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial by Mr. Robert Ingalls in the Corvallis, Oreg., Gazette Times:

SECRETARY OF STATE HERTER

Like his predecessor, Christian A. Herter trained for the highest post in the Foreign Service of the Nation, the Secretary of State. Though they approached the apex through different paths, John Foster Dulles as a brilliant international lawyer, Herter as a Congressman and Governor of Massachusetts, each consistently maintained his preoccupation with foreign affairs throughout his career.

Herter was born in Paris of American parents and began his education in France. He began his foreign service as an attaché of the American Embassy in Berlin, at a trying time as it was just before the United States entered the first World War. During the following peace negotiations, he was on the Secretariat. He was an aid of Herbert Hoover's in the relief work which brought Hoover into prominence and eventually led to his election as President. In the House of Representatives, Herter was credited with helping to put through the Marshall plan for the recovery of Europe.

President Eisenhower has followed military practice and advanced the next in command to the top post in the Foreign Service. He held back the appointment to let nothing take away from the gratitude he wished to express to the retiring Secretary Dulles and to get a doctor's report of Herter's physical condition. Herter's appointment means for the most part the Dulles policies will continue to dominate the foreign relations of the United States. Before his illness there was criticism of Dulles by many Democrats, and the phrase "brinkmanship" was coined to describe his firm attitude and willingness to use force against the Communists if necessary. Since his illness however, the criticisms have disappeared and while, to some extent, this is in respect to the man and sympathy for his illness, the great majority of writers and politicians have conceded the great things he accomplished and the manner in which they were done. This leaves much of the former censure to the limbo of politics and members of both parties are equally guilty of the same injustice at various times and under various circumstances.

This is unfortunate because foreign policy is much too serious a matter for petty politics and needs bipartisan cooperation and effort.

Stop, Look, and Listen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 19, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, there is no more dedicated American than Hon. Thomas E. Murray, former member of the Atomic Energy Commission and at present consultant to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

His ability, his wisdom, and his experience in the field of atomic and nuclear and thermonuclear energy is broadly recognized and appreciated.

He recently made a report to the Chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, "The Present United States Ban on Nuclear Testing," which report has been made public.

The importance of the report and the views of Dr. Murray is evidenced by an editorial on same, "Stop, Look, and Listen," appearing in the Washington Star of May 18, 1959, which editorial I herewith include in my remarks:

STOP, LOOK, AND LISTEN

It is not necessarily a good sign that Premier Khrushchev now has indicated that he may be receptive to the recently modified Anglo-American plan for policing a total ban on military nuclear tests. Actually, in the opinion of more than a few experts—including Thomas E. Murray, the distinguished former member of the Atomic Energy Commission—that plan is highly risky, and Soviet acceptance of it would be a bad thing for the free world.

Mr. Murray, for example, feels so deeply about this that he has written a special memorandum on the subject for the joint congressional atomic committee. In effect, the memorandum, which is full of challenging questions and sobering admonitions, adds up to a stop-look-and-listen warning against what he regards as our country's too-trustful and easy-going attitude toward a ban.

Thus Mr. Murray's most essential points may be outlined as follows: (1) Politically, morally and militarily, the administration has made a potentially grave mistake in declaring a moratorium on all types of tests and in recently indicating that it may be willing to agree to a ban without insisting at the same time on the strictest kind of inspection system—a system embracing, among other things, the great land mass of Red China. (2) The United States had better wake up to the fact that the men of the Kremlin have long been trying to maneuver it into a trap—a trap in which we might find ourselves incapable of developing and maintaining nuclear defenses (including the antimissile) vital to survival. And (3) Mr. Eisenhower should revert to the policy, as set forth in his letter to Premier Khrushchev on April 13, of advocating an end to easily detectable atmosphere atomic-hydrogen detonations (the ones that cause health-endangering fallout), but of continuing with noncontaminating detonations underground and in outer space until there is real disarmament or genuinely trustworthy and vetoless policing methods.

As matters stand, according to Mr. Murray, our country faces the peril of drifting into the worst kind of agreement regarding a ban on such detonations. Actually, in his opinion, "No military man in possession of the facts would have recommended the test moratorium, or consented to it except under heavy pressure. The military judgment today must still be the judgment made by the President in December 1957, that a total shutdown on all tests, small as well as large, underground as well as overground, is imprudent, dangerous to the national security, an unwarranted sacrifice of defensive strength." And it is for that reason, above all, that he has warned as sharply as he has against what he regards as a too-soft official approach to the problem.

Mr. Murray's warning seems to us to be sound. In any case, now that the talks on the proposed ban are temporarily suspended, our Government would be well advised to undertake a sweeping review of the whole problem, and of American policy in regard to it. Certainly, as far as national security is concerned, the United States ought to make haste slowly before it ties itself to serious and probably hazardous commitments in the matter.

Poison in Your Water—No. 78

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 18, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the Ann Arbor (Mich.) News of October 3, 1957, entitled "Thirty-Eight Percent of Ann Arbor Hills' Sewage Systems Said Failing."

[From the Ann Arbor (Mich.) News, Oct. 3, 1957]

THIRTY-EIGHT PERCENT OF ANN ARBOR HILLS' SEWAGE SYSTEMS SAID FAILING—ENGELKE CALLS SITUATION HEALTH MENACE

A report on a thorough inspection of sewage disposal systems in Ann Arbor Hills subdivision, adjacent to Ann Arbor, shows 38 percent of the systems are failing or have recently failed, the county health department said today.

Dr. Otto K. Engelke, county health department director, terms the situation "a public health menace that requires immediate community action to prevent the outbreak of disaster in that area."

"The conditions existing now cannot and will not be tolerated indefinitely," Dr. Engelke declared.

He said that officers of the Ann Arbor Hills Association and the city of Ann Arbor are negotiating for a satisfactory solution to the problem.

SEEKS COMMUNITY ACTION

But Dr. Engelke said "the health department feels that the most satisfactory method of resolving this problem is through community action, and it is for this reason that the department is withholding action against individuals during these negotiations."

Health department sanitarians found in their survey that 29 percent of the sewage disposal systems were failing at the time of their inspections and another 9 percent had recent difficulties.

"There was sewage in open roadside ditches, and swampy places were filled with sewage," the inspectors reported.

Children were playing in the swamps, and one of the bogs was near a well supplying the

subdivision's drinking water, a sanitarian said.

"Before failure was ascribed to any of the sewage disposal systems, the sanitarians had to find evidence of wet sewage on the surface of the ground," the report states.

EVIDENCE PRESENT

Evidence of this was present on 34 premises—29.4 percent of the cases—in the 116-home subdivision, it adds.

Premises with dried sewage as evidence of recent repairs to the sewage disposal systems were termed recent failures. The report found 11 homes in this condition.

Septic tanks are "a reasonably acceptable method of individual sewage disposal if three conditions are met," according to Joseph W. Price, director of the sanitation division of the health department.

"There should be suitable soil composition, sufficient land area for the tile field, and rural setting," Price said. The rural setting is necessary because the best of conditions sometimes cannot prevent septic tank system failure.

"The type of soil found in Ann Arbor Hills is not ideal for individual home sewage disposal, and sewage disposal on an individual home basis is never satisfactory in a built-up community with houses relatively close together. The only solution for such a problem is a community sewerage system," he said.

Let the Dairymen Decide

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 6, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the dairy farmers of this country have never had a chance to vote on the type of dairy program they prefer. Under the provisions of the dairy marketing bill which Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY and I have introduced in Congress, the dairymen would be given that opportunity via a nationwide referendum on the program outlined in that bill.

Ed Christianson, president of the Minnesota Farmers Union, comments on this and other features of the Humphrey-Johnson bill in his column in the current Minnesota Farmers Union Herald. Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include Mr. Christianson's column in the RECORD:

A DAIRYMEN'S DAIRY PROGRAM

Dairy farmers have never had an opportunity to vote in a referendum on the type of support program they would prefer.

We believe that they would overwhelmingly accept a program which included moderate quotas if it gave them the assurance of something better than the present disastrous price levels. The price of all milk, wholesale, in March in Minnesota dropped to 59 percent of parity, which is a situation which cannot be accepted with complacency by anyone who is sincerely concerned about the well-being of dairy producers and our locally owned dairy institutions.

Farmers will get a chance to vote on a 90 percent of parity support program, including marketing quotas and compliance deposits, if the Humphrey-Johnson dairy bill introduced in the Congress last week becomes law. A national referendum would be held for producers to choose between the new program and the old one.

An important feature of the Humphrey-Johnson bill is that the quota program would be made effective through incentives rather than penalties.

If dairy prices were weak, the dairy board could establish marketing bases and quotas.

The individual producer would have to stay within his marketing quota if he wished to be eligible both to receive a refund of his compliance deposit and to receive a deficiency payment to bring his return to 90 percent of parity. The compliance deposit of 25 to 30 cents per hundredweight would be deducted from the farmer's price of the milk and refunded at the end of the marketing year if he had not exceeded his quota.

Senator HUMPHREY made a very important point in his floor speech upon introducing the bill. He showed that a dairy support plan, such as contemplated in his bill, would greatly increase returns to the producer, yet it would cost the taxpayers much less than the present Benson programs.

International Association of Firefighters Position on Extension of Social Security for Firefighters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 4, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following statement of the International Association of Firefighters on the extension of social security for firefighters:

THE IAFF POSITION ON EXTENSION OF SOCIAL SECURITY FOR FIREFIGHTERS

Our organization over the years has found that retirement plans were concurrently established with the adoption of paid fire departments in our communities. Historically, we find the provisions of retirement benefits by State and local governments in the United States are unique. Here is found the largest group of employees probably in the history of the world whose retirement has been provided for without the financial assistance of the Central Government. This movement was well established before the United States passed the Social Security Act.

We, as firemen, enjoy a very privileged position in our communities where retirement systems exist. It is universally known that, through the generosity of our States and city fathers, early retirement opportunities are provided for many of our firefighters, substantial disability benefits as well as provisions for adequate ordinary disability retirement allowances, benefit payments to our widows and orphans do not fall into the category of being subsistence allowances and most areas provide for an adequate income as the result of the loss of the breadwinner. Under the provisions of many of the retirement organizations that are presently in existence, firefighters also enjoy the benefit of special consideration being given for the hazardous nature of the firefighter job in his community by providing for additional creditable service in computing his actual retirement allowance.

It is the contention of our international organization that, by extending the old age survivor's insurance program to cover the firefighters, a substantial cost in the operation of local and State government is being unnecessarily foisted on the already heavy taxpaying public. It has been brought to our attention that a survey conducted in 1957 by the General Court of Massachusetts showed that:

"Under supplementation, the Commonwealth with an annual payroll of $120 million for State employees would be obliged to pay about $2 million annually[1] (2¼ percent on the first $4,200 of all salaries). By 1975 the State's share of cost would rise to nearly $5 million per year; all this in addition to the annual budget for State retirement purposes which already calls for payment of about $4¼ million annually.

"The other public employees in Massachusetts municipal, regional, and county government would have proportionate costs amounting to some $7 to $10 million immediately and from $15 to $25 million in 1975, all in addition to the cost of maintaining their normal retirement system."

The report further shows that, under integrated and/or coordinated methods of extending the OASI coverage for public employees, substantial costs are reflected immediately upon the adoption of such a program. And we, as firefighters, question whether or not the taxpaying public in the State of Massachusetts, or any other State, could or would assume such a burden.

We, as firefighters, know that, as public employees, we must look to the taxpayer for funds. There is no doubt that in difficult times the taxpayer may question the necessity of dual coverage for expense, and it is our position, as an international organization, that, where possible, we avoid dual coverage as well as avoid the hazards of attempting to ride two horses at the same time.

Since the Federal Social Security Act is primarily and basically designed as a social measure attempting to meet the basic needs of the entire working population and in contrast to State and local government retirement plans which are designed to meet the needs of superannuated employees where benefits are based upon contributions and are, therefore, geared to the amount of salaries and length of service, and since we, as firefighters, desire more than mere subsistence which is provided for under the OASI, we look to the future of our retirement systems when a strong foundation has been built through the means of savings, thrift, and the generosity of our local and State government officials.

In the event the existing retirement programs in our communities covering the firefighters indicate a deficiency in the benefits in the survivor's awards for employees who at an early age expire under conditions that cannot be attributed to the fire service, it is our feeling that the local retirement plans can effectively be amended providing for the coverage at less cost to the local taxpayer than by the extension of a Federal social security program.

As the result of the 1956–58 amendments to the Social Security Act, the prohibition in the Federal law with respect to the firefighters in positions under retirement systems was lifted in the States of Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Maryland, New York, North Carolina, Oregon, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Washington, and the Territory of Hawaii. Under the Federal law, section 218(d)(6) gives the States in certain cases the option of dividing a single retirement system into smaller units. Here, each unit is deemed to be a retirement system. Most important to our membership, a separate referendum is held with respect to each unit or "deemed retirement system." We find in the 11 States mentioned that the States of Florida, Georgia, New York, Tennessee, and the Territory of Hawaii may, under the Federal law, divide a "deemed re-

[1] As of the first week of January 1959, the social security deduction was raised to 2½ percent which increases the above mentioned figures.

tirement system" as they wish on the basis of the desires of the members.

It is our contention that, if under any circumstances there is an indication of the need for extending the old age insurance program, in such instances Congres legislate and provide the option of dividing a single retirement system into smaller units of the public employees and the State and political subdivisions of the State.

In closing, we also wish to stress the fact that under retirement system policy, it would be subject to continual changes and OASI provisions and that, as the retirement systems continue to be adjusted, the advantages in municipal administration will tend to disappear. And, in our opinion, the quality of public service would be lowered as a result.

A Chance in Life—Boys Towns of Italy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 6, 1959

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege on Saturday evening, May 16, to attend an unusual and inspiring event—the benefit dinner-dance of the Union County Committee for the Boys' Towns of Italy on the occasion of the 15th anniversary year of this magnificent work.

Like many of our colleagues, I had long been familiar in a general way with the purposes of Boys' Towns of Italy—to give life and happiness and hope to children who had nothing—and I had known something about its founder and head Msgr. John Patrick Carroll-Abbig, the Irish priest who, with the encouragement of the late Pope Pius XII, devoted his life to the homeless children of postwar Italy.

It was a revelation, however, to meet this kind and scholarly monsignor who, because he truly loves his children, has attracted the respect and admiration and support of thousands of people throughout the world. And it was deeply satisfying to me to witness the generosity and the devotion to this humanitarian work of so many hundreds of my friends and constituents in Union County, who have proved through the years to be one of the most active and loyal groups of supporters anywhere.

I wish it were possible, Mr. Speaker, to include in the RECORD the words and pictures I found in the committee's program, which describe in impressive fashion the wonderful work being done—as a result of their help—through the Boys' Towns of Italy.

I wish it were possible, too, to recognize here the many people who have worked with Mr. Arthur Venneri, chairman of the Union County committee and general chairman of last week's annual benefit, and with Mr. Louis Dughi, campaign manager for the 1959 campaign, and to list by name all those who have contributed so much in time and effort and love and money to this most worthy of causes.

And, finally, I wish it were possible to do full justice to the contributions made to that evening by the toastmaster, Dr. A. M. Falcone, and by Her Excellency Princess Gabriella Pacelli among the honored guests.

Instead, Mr. Speaker, for the edification of our colleagues and as a testimonial to the greatness of spirit of he who founded Boys' Towns of Italy and of those who support them, I take special pride in including as a part of my remarks the text of the speech last Saturday evening by the Rt. Rev. Msgr. John Patrick Carroll-Abbing.

I would only remind our colleagues at this time—when world peace is uppermost in all our minds—that true peace is the fruit of love and justice and unselfish sacrifice. This is Monsignor Carroll-Abbing's work, and this is God's work.

The speech follows:

Dear friends of Boys' Towns of Italy, we are gathered together in this 15th anniversary year of Boys' Towns of Italy and while we rejoice over the accomplishments of the past 15 years our thoughts go back instinctively to the Christmas eve 1944, when the idea of Boys' Towns of Italy was born.

It was late evening and as I made my way through the dark streets of war-damaged Naples, I was stepping off the sidewalks to avoid walking on the bodies of the children sleeping there, huddled together for warmth. They were some of the 125,000 children left homeless and fatherless by the war who wandered the land from destroyed city to destroyed city seeking for food and shelter, miserable, emaciated, embittered, and homeless children. I had seen these children before, in the caves where I myself lived in the battle areas when I endeavored to help the helpless civilian population caught between the battle that waged on the one side and the German blockade on the other. I had seen the brothers of these children die in the heroic fight for the liberation of Naples, in the defense of the besieged city of Rome. I had seen them in the concentration camps; I had seen them sitting on the ruins of their homes trying to realize that all the things that were dear to them had been taken away, leaving them alone and unloved in the world.

You look into the eyes of a child and you stand in awe and reverence before the innocence that shines forth mirroring the brightness of their souls; you see the mysteries of childhood's joys and little sorrows, but eyes that reflect the security of the love that surrounds and protects them.

But I looked into the eyes of the children of the war and I saw only bewilderment and hurt, bitterness and suspicion and the fear of being hurt again. A friend of mine, a colonel in the U.S. Army, summed up his own thoughts that Christmas eve when he said: "To think that they might be my kids lying out on a sidewalk if things had happened differently."

It was this thought, this identification of the said little war waifs with their own dear ones at home that probably gave to so many GI's overseas the inspiration to try and help these little ones. My first help came from them and it is a great happiness to me to know that so many of these men who helped me in those arduous and tragic days are still a moving spirit in the Boys' Towns of Italy committees that exist in so many cities of the United States.

It was with the permission of Pope Pius XII that I was released from my duties in the Vatican and was able to dedicate myself to the children of the streets. The first center, the Shoeshine Hotel for the shoeshine boys, was in a cellar near the railroad terminal in Rome. It was a miserable dwelling but for me and the boys it was home, and what laughter and fun we had in the evining before the boys went to bed in their iron doubledecker bunks.

I started the first Boys' Town in 1945 in the one available room of a bombed-out villa. Today that first Boys' Town has more than 30 beautiful buildings, cottages, schools, and workshops.

And today there are 9 Boys' Towns, a Girls' Town and 30 day-care centers for younger children, providing total care for approximately 2,400 youngsters and day care for 5,000 others.

The Boys' Towns are staffed with well-trained teachers, instructors, social workers, and counselors, picked for their special suitability for work with dependent children.

The very important feature, however, of the Boys' Towns is the way in which the youngsters are encouraged to become the most important agents of their own training by allowing them to assume direct responsibilities in every sector of their daily life.

The mayor is elected by secret ballot by his fellow citizens. He and his four commissioners (for finance, public works, sanitation, and education) preside over the popular assembly, the meeting of the citizens that takes place daily. They are responsible to the citizens for the honest and competent carrying out of their duties. For instance, the commissioner of sanitation is responsible for the state of cleanliness of the whole town. He receives an allocation of funds under the town budget and offers for competitive bidding all the contracts for cleaning the buildings, the streets, gardens, etc. The citizens who bid for these jobs and who are paid for them must carry out their cleaning jobs well, otherwise the commissioner of sanitation diminishes their daily pay for their task.

The judge is also elected by the citizens by secret ballot. He administers the legal code and can impose fines, etc. within the framework of the law. Citizens can appeal from him to the court. The court judges more serious offenses. The accused can appeal against the decision of the court to the court of appeal and as a last resort to the popular assembly.

A basic economic law, introduced by the citizens of the first Boys' Town in Italy and reaffirmed in the others, was: Chi non lavora non mangia. "He who does not work, does not eat." The boys are paid in regular Boys' Towns currency for their work at school and in the workshops. They cash their pay-checks at the town bank. They pay the boy waiters in the restaurant for their meals. They pay for their shoes, their lodging, their purchases in the town stores (which are run by boy storekeepers). They buy their cokes and candy in the soda fountain run by a boy citizen.

The confidence shown in them, the trust granted to them, the warmth of the family life that surrounds them, and the daily training in democracy by democratic living, have shown their good results in the thousands of fine young men who are now good citizens in the world outside. Many have come to the United States as specialized craftsmen. Some are already U.S. citizens; one, at least, is now in the U.S. Army; some have married here and have their own homes. All this in 15 years.

The United States has thousands of friends in Italy today, young men who look to America with the warm familiarity of friendship. They do so because men and women over here of every national origin

and background interpreted to them by their kindness and their generosity the spirit of brotherly love, giving them the knowledge that there were people in the world who care for them.

Our daily struggle to expand and maintain the Boys' Towns continues. In the Boys' Towns themselves we do everything possible by our own industry to maintain ourselves. Thousands and thousands of people over there help us, giving us their services, their labor, their gifts in money and kind to maintain the children. And in the United States thousands of other people take a little of their time and of their substance to enable us to erect the new buildings we need so badly to extend our work. It is a daily struggle; the struggle that every working father and mother has to support the family, and our family is a big one, made up of healthy and vigorous boys and girls. At one time I used to dream of a great donation which would solve a great part of our problems. This dream has never come true and today I am glad because the efforts of so many thousands of people like you in Union County have made them members of the great family of our Italian Boys' Towns, enriching us by their friendship and enriching them by the blessings that God surely bestows on a great nation whose sons and daughters have given so much love and so much care to children so many thousand miles away.

As you go home and look up at the stars remember the words of the poet: "Ogni lagrima di bambino che si asciuga è una stella che si accende in cielo" (Every tear that is wiped from the eye of a child is a star that is lit up in the sky). May God grant to us in our lifetime the grace and the happinesss to light up many stars in the sky by wiping the tears from the eyes of many children. God bless you.

Clarence Cannon Day in Missouri Legislature

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 18, 1959

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday, May 13, was Clarence Cannon Day in the Missouri Legislature, honoring the outstanding American who is the dean of our Missouri delegation in the Congress, who is our beloved friend and adviser and leader, and who holds one of the most important roles in national life as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of this House.

It had been my intention last Wednesday, while ceremonies in Mr. CANNON'S honor were being conducted in Jefferson City, to call the event to the attention of the House, but unfortunately for my purpose the House did not meet that day. I have delayed until now on this for the very good purpose of obtaining and including as part of my remarks a truly outstanding and scholarly speech on the role of the representatives of the people in a democracy made before the Missouri Legislature by our remarkable colleague, one of the world's greatest authorities on parliamentary law.

Showing through this excellent talk, in addition to the erudition and scholarship, is the warmth of personality we who know CLARENCE CANNON and who love him associate with this fine and decent and kind human being.

Mr. Speaker, every Member of this House will take pride, I am sure, in the description Mr. CANNON gave to the Missouri Legislature of the role of legislative bodies under our form of government, and will read his speech with delight.

I am sure that my colleagues here will also take pride, Mr. Speaker, in the introductory remarks made about Mr. CANNON in the Missouri House of Representatives by Speaker Richard H. Ichord on Clarence Cannon Day.

For that reason, I include as part of my remarks, under unanimous consent, the introductory remarks of Speaker Ichord and the address by the Honorable CLARENCE CANNON on Clarence Cannon Day, in the Missouri General-Assembly, Wednesday, May 13, as follows:

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS OF SPEAKER RICHARD H. ICHORD ON CLARENCE CANNON DAY

Mr. CANNON, Governor Blair, Mr. President, members of the senate, ladies and gentlemen of the house, distinguished guests, this joint session of the Missouri General Assembly is our official way of saying on behalf of all the people of Missouri to the dean of the Missouri congressional delegation: Thanks for your dedicated representation of us in the Congress of the United States. Thanks for your many and varied important contributions to the art of self-government.

To our guests who have traveled here from all parts of the State for this occasion we extend a hearty welcome and we cordially invite you to attend the reception in the house lounge immediately following this joint session.

Before presenting our honored guest, may I review briefly a list of his many accomplishments, the cause of this day.

He has been Parliamentarian of the House of Representatives during both Democratic and Republican administrations.

He has served longer in the Congress of the United States than any other man in the history of our State, having broken the record established by Senator Thomas Hart Benton.

He has been chairman of the Committee on Appropriations in the House of Representatives longer than any other man in the history of our Nation.

He has been parliamentarian of all Democratic National Conventions since the year 1920.

He is the author of the "Precedents of the House of Representatives," now the accepted authority, not only in the Congress of the United States, but in State legislatures and other legislative bodies in other countries, notably the Philippine Commonwealth.

He is the author of "Cannon's Procedure in the House of Representatives," also used in the State legislatures and other legislative bodies. In this respect, his unseen hand has been present in every piece of legislation considered by the assembly, for his written word has decided the fate of many legislative measures.

He is the author of "Convention Parliamentary Manual," the only codification of procedure in national political conventions.

He is the author of numerous periodical articles, of the Treatises of Parliamentary Law in the "Encyclopedia Brittanica" and "Encyclopedia Americana."

He has been the authority on parliamentary law for Brittanica since 1927 and Americana since 1931.

He is a Regent of the Smithsonian Institution where he has interested himself in basic scientific research, making large contributions to the scientific advancement of our Nation.

His career has included many and varied endeavors: Professor of history, farmer, businessman, and an active attorney at law.

He is one of the few many-sided men in history who have been able to attain political as well as scholarly renown. Many scholars have been able to achieve a minor success in politics and many in politics have been able to achieve a minor degree of success as scholars, but rare indeed is the man who reaches both pinnacles. This is such a man.

For these achievements, for these contributions to his State, his Nation, and the world he have designated this day as Clarence Cannon Day. May I present to you, the Honorable CLARENCE CANNON, Congressman of the Ninth Congressional District of Missouri.

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE CLARENCE CANNON

Mr. Speaker, when Charles the first, of England, stalked angrily into the House of Commons and demanded of the speaker of the house the recission of a resolution to which he objected, the speaker falling on his knees before the King said, "Your Majesty I have no eyes to see, no ears to hear or tongue to speak save as I am directed by this honorable body."

By the same rule that honorable body—which some years later beheaded His Majesty, the King—could be addressed only through its speaker. That rule has come down to us through the centuries.

So, on this formal occasion—during a session of the house—with the speaker in the chair—I am not permitted to address friends who may be present, or his Excellency, the greatest Governor of the greatest State of the Union, or even the house itself, save through its speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot tell you how much Ida and I appreciate your kindness—and the indulgence of the house—for this great and undeserved and unmerited courtesy in permitting me to attend so unusual a session. I accept it as an indication of the attitude of the house toward the Missouri delegation in Congress, in both houses and on both sides of the aisle. The only difference in the service we have rendered is that I have lived just a little longer. And as must always be the experience of those admitted to the floor, I stand with the greatest humility before this body of exceptional and distinguished men—not only because they constitute the most carefully selected and carefully screened body of men within the confines of the State—the most eminent men of their respective communities—not only because they represent officially—important constituencies and the wealth and power of the State—but because here in this chamber assembled they are the visible symbol of the greatest achievement of the American people, our form of Government, a form of Government hitherto untried in human history, a form of Government which has made possible in two short centuries the preeminence of the American people in every field of human endeavor, and the development of a civilization which has been the wonder and admiration of the world.

This assembly is the heart and soul of that system of government. It represents democracy in action. Destroy or nullify its functions and you have left but the shell of free government. Any influence which tends to reduce the confidence or the regard in which it is held by the people militates to that extent against the effectiveness of the Government, if not the preservation of the Government itself.

Mr. Speaker, wherever dictators and usurpers have climbed to autocratic power in any country, their first care has been to strike at the representatives of the people

in the legislative branch of the government. Oliver Cromwell, in proroguing the English Parliament, pointed his sword at the mace lying upon the table of the House of Commons and cried, "Take away this bauble." And when it was carried out there went with it representative government in all England.

Again, Napoleon, stalking into the French Chamber of Deputies at the head of his grenadiers, cried "Follow me. I am destiny. I am the divinity of the day." As his bayonets drove out the representatives of the people, some of them climbing through windows to escape, they drove out civil and religious liberty.

From that day until the end of the Napoleonic dynasty, France, and all Europe controlled by France, was without representative government.

Again, more recently, Hitler, seizing the reins of government in Germany, as the first step toward world domination, burned down the Reichstag Building, so that Germany's House of Representatives, unable to meet, was scattered in confusion, and before it could reassemble, a large number had been proscribed or were in concentration camps, and free government in Germany had been destroyed, and free government was in peril throughout the world.

Here in America, whenever any man or group of men have sought to establish autocratic control, whether political, economic, or industrial, they have struck, either directly or by innuendo, at the influence of the representatives of the American people. Of course, the American people have long ago advanced beyond the stage of armed interference with the legislative branch of the Government by military authorities. That would be impossible in America today. Our state of civilization does not countenance the political prison or the concentration camp. But there are other ways of undermining the standing and influence of the assembly in the regard and confidence of the people, which, whether with or without sinister motives, can be just as effective when carried to their ultimate conclusion.

Both Congress and the State legislatures have been subject to criticism—as they should be—ever since the establishment of the Republic. One of the most priceless prerogatives of every American citizen is the right to criticize his elected public servants, and that right has been widely and fully exercised from the admission of the State into the Union down to the 70th General Assembly now in session. At times that criticism has been more virulent and more undeserved than at others. And that is as it should be. Better that we be unjustly accused on many occasions than that we escape merited stricture on any single occasion.

The right to criticize—freedom of speech—has come down to us simultaneously with, and as a corollary of, parliamentary procedure. Freedom of speech is inevitably accompanied by parliamentary control of the right to speak.

Parliamentary practice had its inception when the tribe—beneath the oaks of England or in the Black Forests of Germany—finally agreed to sit down in a circle and speak one at a time. And that is the primary requisite in parliamentary procedure today.

We trace the beginning of the struggle for individual rights—the rights of the people—the protection of the citizen against the tyranny of the state from earliest times.

The spirit of democracy knows no geographical bounds. At the time the yeomen of the British Isles were maintaining their rights against autocracy the Gauls and Franks in Germany were fighting the same battle. After the Battle of Soissons there were vast quantities of booty—the wealth of the dying Roman Empire. Among the spoils was a beautiful vase which King Clovis asked be allotted to him. But a private soldier from the ranks insolently swung his battle axe and shattered it into a thousand fragments. So strong was the sense of equality and equity among the Germanic people that the King dared not show resentment. But a few weeks later when in the course of his inspection of the troops he discovered a spot and a broken thong on the soldier's shield, he cut him down with his battle axe and looking down at him said, "Thus didst thou to the vase of Soissons."

From these many divergent sources has come our love for democracy and the parliamentary law necessary to preserve it.

When Jefferson was called on as Vice President to preside over the Senate he—in his usual methodical manner—prepared a digest of the rules and practice of the English House of Commons. With his opportunities during his service as Washington's Ambassador to France to contrast the traditional deficiencies of the singularly ineffective rules of the succeeding French Assemblies his Jefferson's Manual probably embodied the most efficient system of parliamentary practice up to that time. And it remains today the basic law of the National House of Representatives.

A well established system of procedure is essential to expedition and efficiency in legislation. And familiarity with the procedure of the House is indispensible to a successful legislative campaign. How often have we seen a minority put its program through against a decisive majority through superior knowledge and application of parliamentary tactics.

But parliamentary law cannot be learned from a textbook. It requires practice and observation. For that reason those constitutencies which retain their representative from year to year exercise the largest influence in the assembly.

It has always been so. President Taft, during his service as Chief Justice recalled that Edmund Burke himself related that it was by slow degrees and constant application that Charles James Fox became the greatest parliamentary debater in the world. Speaker Champ Clark, who knew whereof he spoke, said that a man has to learn to be a representative and the best rule is for a constituency to select a man of fair capacity, industrious, honest, sober and courageous, and keep him as long as he discharges his duties faithfully and well. It is to the interest of the State of Missouri that the constituencies represented here today observe that wise admonition—concurred in by two great Americans who left their impress indelibly on our national institutions. The lengthening service of your distinguished colleague Senator Kinney, and his invaluable contributions through the years to his district, his city, his State and to the Nation constitute a convincing example of the cogency of that long-tested rule.

As representatives you are faced today with the most momentous issues of any Missouri House since the civil war. For the problems of the Nation are the problems of the respective States. The Nation today is confronted with unprecedented complications in defense, inflation, labor standards, economic monopoly and predatory exploitation of the consumer, which mark the struggle today between democracy and totalitarianism in modern business. And in our State especially just at this time the price of agricultural products and farm income are among the critical domestic problems of the day. (I am gratified to see present in the chamber this afternoon a great farm leader, Mr. Heinkel, whom the Missouri delegation in Congress is always glad to follow in matters of agricultural policy.)

In its widest implications the field of legislative responsibility of the Missouri General Assembly is no longer provincial; it is nationwide.

Missouri is one of the great States of the Union. It has a great history and a greater destiny. A great and wise Governor. Progress and prosperity are just ahead. And in the future this house and its speaker and the senate and its lieutenant governor have ahead of them an ever widening field of service and accomplishment and achievement.

Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration Appropriation Bill, 1960

SPEECH
OF
CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 18, 1959

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 7175) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, unless I am completely mistaken, the validity of justice of this amendment is admitted both by the chairman of the committee and the ranking minority member.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. WHITTEN. May I say I have not so agreed and did not agree. But I say that if there is merit to the gentleman's argument then the proper place to present it is before the legislative Committee on Agriculture and not on the floor after the contracts have been entered into.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Perhaps, unintentionally, I misstated myself. What I meant, and what I think the RECORD will show, if the gentleman does not revise his remarks, was that the chairman of the committee admitted there was merit in the amendment. I realize that the opposition to an amendment which has merit is to object that the present—that is, when it is offered from the floor—is neither the time nor the proper place to consider or adopt it—just postpone it—the amendment is all right, but let let us not take it up now. That is the usual argument here when it appears that the committee had failed to see the need in committee.

This morning a letter came to me, which may be of interest to those who in the last session and since have continuously criticized and berated Secretary of Agriculture Benson. That letter was read to you just a few minutes ago. You might give it consideration in considering the pending amendment. In those days, we were told time and time again, not only by present Members of the House but by some who are not now here that, if we did not get rid of Secretary Benson, the country would go to the dogs; that Secretary Benson's agricultural program was worse than the

program and the administration of the program which was adopted in 1938 by our Democrat friends.

And permit me to add that time and experience have demonstrated that that program, while it may have gained votes for its originators and sponsors, has as yet neither cured nor contributed to the cure of any of the ills affecting the agriculture industry, although we can all admit that it has been beneficial to a few large corporations which have been farming and collecting subsidies. It has not reduced our surpluses.

It has been my privilege to know something about farming for at least 60 years and, while the farmers suffered hardships, so did others, including an almost fixed percentage of businessmen.

A few years ago, a friend who was township clerk as well as chairman of the Republican township committee in one of the townships of my home county of Allegan, wrote me that, in his township, because of Secretary Benson's administration of the Democrat farm program, that is, the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, and the amendments thereto, the farms in that particular township were being abandoned.

At my suggestion, personal surveys were made by disinterested people familiar with the situation in that township. One was by a member of the State senate and another by a disinterested individual, both acquainted not only with the farms but with the people who lived on the farms in that particular township.

Do you know what that survey pointed out? Sure, that many of my constituents and others living in the district of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], were abandoning farming. But there was a joker in the situation. The farmers were not farming. Do you know what they were doing? They went to Holland City and to factories in our own towns in the Fourth Congressional District of Michigan and worked in the factories. They lived at home on the farms but they were letting the kids and the women of their households run the farms with the tractors and other farm machinery which made it possible to have two instead of one family income. That is the way they were moving out. They were enjoying two sources of income. Permit me to say to my colleagues on both sides of me that that explains why there are more Democrat votes than usual up there in the last election. Some people think it is fine to have Uncle Sam give them a cash benefit if others pay the larger part of it. They draw their wages in the factory. They want higher wages while working in the factory, then let the wife and kids run the farm. They have no objection to a gift of cash if it is paid in larger part by the other fellow. They are fine folks, they are the people who pay the taxes, but I do not know of any reason why we should let the farmer turn his soil into conservation payments and then take a job which another man needs and who has no source of income except his labor. But if you want it that way, you can have it.

In my judgment, it is neither right nor fair to permit a landowner to put his farm in the soil conservation program, draw down a subsidy for taking his land out of production, and be given a special benefit or subsidy which must be paid from the taxes collected from all of us. That procedure is a deliberate taking of the money paid to Uncle Sam by everyone, regardless of their wishes, and used for the benefit of those belonging to a special group.

It is especially reprehensible when the benefit payments go in large chunks to corporations or wealthy individuals who own large farms. Yet many brazenly assert that the program is for the aiding of the small farmer. That is nonsense and most of us know it. As many an editorial has pointed out, it is vote buying through the expenditure of tax dollars.

Indonesians Live With Hopes, Fears

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. J. CARLTON LOSER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 1959

Mr. LOSER. Mr. Speaker, I have already placed in the RECORD several articles written by Mr. Coleman A. Harwell, editor of the Nashville Tennessean, during his world tour.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am today including the first of three articles on Indonesia. I believe you will find it of interest. It follows:

INDONESIANS LIVE WITH HOPES, FEARS

(By Coleman A. Harwell)

JAKARTA, INDONESIA.—Mochta Lubis, one of the victims of Indonesia's strange struggle for independence, sent out a message of hope last week from the imprisonment of his home.

The tragic situation of Lubis typifies the confusion and contradictions of Indonesia today. His message bespeaks both the hopes and the frustrations you discover on every hand.

This was his message:

"Despite the present situation, I am fully confident in the cause of true democracy for Indonesia."

Lubis is not a military hero. Many of his fellow countrymen dispute that he is indeed a hero at all. Some of them say of this editor who has been held prisoner in his own home for 2 years, without trial, that he was too brash. With this Lubis agrees.

"My continued detention," he said, "is my own fault because I refuse to compromise the principles of the freedom of the press."

His message was delivered in the worn voice of his tiny wife, Holly, whose eyes filled with tears as she spoke.

TOLD OF CONCERN

She had been told that newspapermen all over the free world, from New York to Jerusalem to Ceylon, were concerned with her husband's fate and welfare. She had been asked how things were with her and him and their three little children.

"It is not so bad," she said, "we hope * * *"

She turned her head away as tears welled up. But only for a moment; then she turned back and smiled and said, "I'm sorry."

That was her only display of emotion in our talk, the only evidence of the strain of keeping life on an even keel in a home that is a prison.

She and the children come and go freely. It is especially important that the little ones not to be upset by the abnormal situation; that she and her husband not let their anxiety show to them. And that is difficult in the face of the uncertainty, the lack of hope, not knowing if anything will happen today or tomorrow or the day after.

That is why Lubis' predicament is typical of Indonesia—the uncertainty, the not knowing, the evasion of concrete decisions.

NO COMPROMISE

Lubis was one of the millions who exulted when the heavy yoke of Dutch rule was thrown off in 1950. He welcomed freedom not with just a shout, but with a clattering typewriter that proclaimed his joy and also his unwillingness to compromise on any issue of freedom.

His critics say he went too far. Even some newsmen who proclaim their personal friendship say he was too vitriolic in his criticism of President Sukarno—he should have known Sukarno would get even with him; that's the Indonesian way. In any event, Lubis went right on with his attacks.

When a high official—Abdulgani—accompanying Sukarno to America in 1956, was alleged to have profited on a dollar exchange in San Francisco, Lubis printed the story in his newspaper, Indonesian Ria. Lubis was arrested soon afterward, placed under house arrest. His newspaper, hounded by the government, finally gave up.

There is a question as to whether Lubis' immediate situation was helped or injured earlier this year when he was voted the $5,000 Magsaysay award by Philippine newspapers for the greatest contribution to press freedom in South Asia. Certainly it has not helped in feeding the Lubis household, for the money is still in Manila.

HOPE DASHED

Earlier this year, a professor who had won the Sukarno Government's disfavor, was permitted to go to Manila to collect a similar award. This spurred hope in the Lubis household for a time. But nothing happened.

So Lubis paints colorful scenes of the beautiful tropic land he loves so much, reads everything he can get hold of, talks with Holly, helps his children with their studies—and waits.

But, in contrast with past years, criticism of the Government on any important issue cannot be found. And the vigorous investigative reporting, once prevalent, is now nonexistent.

Pressures on the press—a sort of cat-and-mouse technique typical of public life in Indonesia—had started before last year's rebellion in Sumatra. Since then, the country has been under martial law and the press is under control of the military commander in each area.

ARMY CRACKS WHIP

Control is exerted in a most tantalizing, mercurial fashion. Instead of a press law or advance censorship, the army cracks down afterward in any way it sees fit, whether or not the matter is military.

The latest instance would have been funny if it had not been so serious. It illustrates how things are done in Indonesia.

A Dutch captain, Henricus Schmidt, captured in the revolution and sentenced to life for war crimes, was given a reduced sentence to 5 years, set free because he had already been in prison 5 years, and permitted to leave the country.

The attorney general announced the fact, which was published by all papers. Widespread protests resulted, so the attorney general was removed from office. That official wrote a letter to the conservative, government-critic paper, Pedoman, saying he felt he should not have been discharged because he merely executed the order issued by the supreme court.

Pedoman published the letter on page 1 and also ran an editorial saying the minister of justice, who issued the supreme court order to the attorney general, should be asked to explain his action.

NEWSPAPERS CLOSED

Next day, the army closed Pedoman. Some other papers reported the fact. They were closed. Apparently the army felt uncomfortable, so it closed other papers.

All of this was in character. When Schmidt's release had been protested, a scapegoat had to be found. When someone spoke for the scapegoat, he was put in the same class. Then more and more.

Then something else happened. The Indonesian press association announced that if all papers were not allowed to reopen by the next Monday, none of them would print any future announcements by the army. A very brave threat—maybe.

Guess what happened? The papers reopened Sunday.

But not because of the threat. They were permitted to reopen because President Sukarno was making a major speech on Tuesday. And how would it go over without a press?

Of course, the press association knew this when it made its threat. That, too, was in the Indonesian manner.

Tragedy, comedy, democracy—what? It is all very serious, very important business. Is Mochtor Lubis' confidence in the future of democracy justified?

Incentives, Not Subsidies, Meet Human Needs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1959

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, Nation's Business for May produces a most interesting editorial, "Incentives, Not Subsidies, Meet Human Needs." I ask unanimous consent to insert it in the Appendix of the RECORD:

The day's most costly question is:

"Don't you believe in meeting human needs?"

Only the wicked can answer no.

This permits those with schemes for spending Government money to smear with a nasty stick anyone who dares to challenge their proposals.

So long as an ounce of emotion outweighs a pound of logic the Government can thus be embarked on all sorts of adventures calculated to meet human needs that the people or their State governments have been unable or unwilling to meet.

Presumably the needs are genuine and urgent. Presumably the plans for meeting them are well-intentioned.

The misfortune of our country—and of other benevolent countries before us—is that economic forces are not swayed by good intentions. The evidence of this is on clear view in dozens of places:

Thirty years ago the Government undertook to meet the human needs of farmers. Today the farmers' needs are only slightly less but the Government's problem is monumental.

Twenty years ago Government attempted to legislate a balance of power between workingmen and employers. Today we have a labor despotism that dares threaten Government officials who fail to carry out its orders.

More recently, in an effort to build up stockpiles while meeting the needs of a war economy, Government artificially stimulated production of strategic metals at home and abroad. Today, with the stockpiles overflowing, we are using, among other things, quotas, tariffs, and subsidies in an effort to stabilize the metals industry.

Government dabbling in other economic fields has been equally disillusioning. The benefits are either less than expected or overbalanced by the resulting complications.

Human needs are not met by complications. They are met by an economic system strong enough and versatile enough to support jobs. Jobs, in turn, produce the goods by which needs are satisfied.

Fortunately, our economy as originally set up had a great deal of built-in equilibrium. It has always managed to straighten itself after every push to the left. It has been able to do this because it offered rewards and opportunity to those who were willing to work. Each new Government effort to meet human needs reduces those rewards and opportunities a little.

Oppressive taxes and controls impede private effort. So Government must shoulder additional responsibility, reducing further the field for individual action.

Subsidies to a group or community require, in fairness, subsidies for those with whom they compete. Eventually the subsidies become a right to which the beneficiaries are encouraged to believe themselves entitled.

When the Rural Electrification Administration was creatd 24 years ago, it was authorized to lend money at 2 percent interest to speed electrification of farms. Now, with farms 95 percent electrified, the President has suggested that the interest rate be raised to equal Government's borrowing cost.

With equal logic, we can continue unemployment benefits to those who were recently unemployed, sickness benefits to the recently ill, depressed-area aid to communities recently depressed, educational benefits to the recently illiterate.

We can, and in truth are, building an increasing group that depends on Government rather than ambition for advancement. In Michigan and Pennsylvania unemployment remains high, though in those and nearby States jobs are available for skilled people. Employment agencies observe: Unemployment benefits are very attractive.

Apparently they are less attractive in West Virginia. A Congressman of that State urges aid for depressed areas so that "100,000 unfortunate West Virginia boys can come home." The 100,000 left their native State to find employment. What he wants to stop is the spirit that kept this country from remaining a narrow band of States along the eastern seaboard.

Even where that spirit still exists today, Government intervention is working to erode it. A young man who recently started his own business reports sadly, "I was determined to get along without Government help—but all my competitors were getting it. Now I'm getting it, too—every bit I can."

It is time to consider if this is the sort of society we want. Shall we force individuals to accept Government help, or shall we encourage them to be self-reliant and ambitious?

How Congress acts on the subsidy measures urged in this session can go a long way toward setting our course.

We can depend on the individual to meet his own human needs by offering incentives, giving him room to grow and prosper.

Or we can so conduct ourselves that Khrushchev's statement "your grandchildren will live under socialism" becomes a prediction, rather than a threat.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer, plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Raymond F. Noyes is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate passed bills on life insurance tax and on Navajo Indian irrigation project.

House debated Housing bill.

Senate committee by vote of 9 to 8 ordered reported the nomination of Secretary of Commerce Strauss.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages 7514–7540

Bills Introduced: 35 bills and 4 resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 1969–2003; S.J. Res. 98; S. Con. Res. 36; and S. Res. 121–122. **Pages 7518–7519**

Bills Reported: Reports were made as follows:

S. 1968, to strengthen the wheat marketing quota and price support program—reported March 18 during Senate adjournment under prior authorization (S. Rept. 295);

H.R. 5674, fiscal 1960 authorizations for military construction, with an amendment (S. Rept. 296);

S. 1901, to amend the Agricultural Act so as to stabilize and protect the level of support for tobacco (S. Rept. 297); and

S. 218, 707, and 1291, private bills (S. Repts. 298–300).

Pages 7513, 7518

President's Message—Atomic Energy: President transmitted copy of an amendment to agreement between the Governments of the U.S. and of the United Kingdom for cooperation in the uses of atomic energy for mutual defense purposes, signed at Washington on May 7, 1959—referred to Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

President also transmitted copy of an agreement between the Governments of the U.S. and of the Republic of France for cooperation in the uses of atomic energy for mutual defense purposes, executed on May 7, 1959—referred to Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Page 7590

Taxation—Life Insurance: Senate passed with amendments (motion to reconsider tabled), H.R. 4245, proposed Life Insurance Company Income Tax Act of 1959, after adopting amendments as follows:

All committee amendments en bloc, bill as so amended thereafter considered as original text for purpose of further amendment; Byrd amendment of a technical nature affecting dates of filing tax returns; Curtis amendment of a corrective nature respecting certain reinsurance transactions in 1958; Byrd amendment of a technical nature to strike out language on "1958 reserve for dividends to policyholders"; and Williams (Delaware) amendment relating to two stock companies mutualized prior to 1958.

Senate insisted on its amendments, asked for conference, and appointed as conferees Senators Byrd, Kerr, Frear, Williams (Delaware), and Carlson.

Pages 7514, 7540–7555, 7567–7578

Printing: Consideration of Senate's unfinished business, H. Con. Res. 95, authorizing reprinting of H. Doc. 451, of 84th Congress, entitled "How Our Laws Are Made," was resumed, but temporarily put aside again for consideration of other matters. **Pages 7514, 7578**

World Bank: Senate disagreed to House amendment to S. 1094, to amend the Bretton Woods Agreements Act so as to authorize increased U.S. subscriptions to the International Montetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, requested conference with House, and appointed as conferees Senators Fulbright, Green, Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Wiley, Hickenlooper, and Langer.

Page 7589

International Health: Senate considered but temporarily put aside for another matter S.J. Res. 41, International Health and Medical Research Act of 1959.

Pages 7579–7581, 7590–7598

Navajo Indian Irrigation Project: S. 72, auhorizing construction of the Navajo Indian irrigation project and the initial stage of the San Juan-Chama project as participating projects of the Colorado River storage project, was passed with an amendment by Senator Hayden to preserve obligation of the "States of the upper division" in the Colorado River compact to prevent depletion of flow of river at Lee Ferry below an aggregate of 75 million feet for period of 10 consecutive years.

Pages 7603–7607

Appendix

Needed: An Investment Attitude

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 20, 1959

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, we in the West know the true worth of the investment made to develop our natural resources, the return which this investment has brought, and the need for a continuation of this attitude and program now.

That is why the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] struck such a responsive chord when he addressed the Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner in Tacoma, Wash., May 2, 1959.

So that my colleagues may know Senator SYMINGTON's appraisal of problems besetting us today, I ask unanimous consent to have his Tacoma address set forth in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF SENATOR STUART SYMINGTON, DEMOCRAT OF MISSOURI, JEFFERSON-JACKSON DINNER, TACOMA, WASH., MAY 2, 1959

Thank you very much for asking me to be with you here in Tacoma.

It is a privilege to visit your busy and beautiful State, and to meet with so many people who have a hand in developing the rich resources of the Pacific Northwest.

Here in the State of Washington you not only have a rich store of wealth in your mountains, fields, rivers and valleys, but are very fortunate in your geographical position.

The location of the Seattle-Tacoma area on the great circle route between two hemispheres makes it a great gateway for the jet age.

With the forward-looking leadership characteristic of this area, there is no limit to what can be achieved in this wonderful country.

By your choice of Governor and Senators, you have insured yourselves the kind of leadership we need, not only in Washington and the Northwest, but in all America.

I want to pay tribute to your outstanding Governor, Albert Rosellini.

In these days of tightened sources of State income it is not easy to build the kind of record Al Rosellini has made; and this is especially true when you inherit a deficit from the previous administration.

But your Governor has had the vision to write a progressive program, the good sense to face the financial realities, and the courage to put the State on a pay-as-you-go basis.

When the Governor of New York put over his tax program, the newspapers started running him for President. They should look as well to the State of Washington.

May I also pay tribute to your senior Senator, WARREN MAGNUSON. He is the able and experienced chairman of a great committee, and one of the most respected elder statesmen of the Senate.

All of us benefit from his experience, wisdom, and advice.

You always know where MAGGY stands. Invariably it is on the side of progress; i.e., the side of the people.

As for your junior Senator, "SCOOP" JACKSON, I don't have to tell you what I think about him.

SCOOP and I have long been partners in the effort to keep this country strong so it can remain free.

There is no more reliable friend and ally; and I predict that SCOOP will have a great future as a leader of America.

It is a long way from the State of Washington to the city of Washington. But I can report, as a somewhat prejudiced observer, that the Republican Party in the Nation's Capitol is just as bad off there as it is here.

Before the last election, an official at the White House wrote a book, "A Republican Looks at His Party."

Now he is writing a sequel, "A Republican Looks for His Party."

As they look at the calendar, the Republicans become more and more worried.

Next year, they see, is a presidential election year. If they are going to win again, they know they are going to have to pull a very large rabbit out of the hat.

Let me tell you a story I understand actually happened. As you know, the Republicans have now appointed a nationwide committee to try to formulate the true principles of their party.

This committee held a meeting recently; and one member, a sort of newcomer to Republican politics, said he thought what the party needed, more than anything else, was to stop acting like the party of privilege, and start representing the interests of all the people.

But older and more experienced Republican heads intervened.

One of them said in all seriousness, "You are wrong. We are the party of privilege. This has been our role throughout our history, and we should not change."

There is nothing like honest confession—and this confession of philosophy helps explain the Republican policies of today.

A party of privilege is bound to tradition.

It looks backward.

It is opposed to growth and investment.

It perpetuates waste.

It approaches the most pressing problems of the country with timidity, washing them gently with solutions which are 10 years old.

This preoccupation with tradition results in strange inconsistencies in national policy.

As example, the administration is obsessed by the threat of inflation, even though, according to the consumer price index, the last 12 months witnessed no inflation whatsoever.

Yet efforts to eliminate unemployment are ignored, even though that current problem is so pressing.

In your own State it now constitutes 8 percent of the labor force. In some States as high as 15 percent.

The administration justifies its reductions in the budget by asserting it wants to save our children from the burden of interest payments on the national debt.

But what do these reductions actually cut?

They cut funds for better schools, which in the long run would give our greatest resource—these very children—an opportunity to add thousands of dollars to their incomes.

They cut funds for medical research, which would add many useful years to the lives of all citizens.

Because the Republicans have been so preoccupied with tradition and are afraid of modernization, they have failed in their pledge to keep waste out of Government.

From the 99 chauffeur-driven Cadillacs, to the jungle of committees in the Pentagon, to the six different air forces the taxpayer now supports, to the great and growing mess in the Department of Agriculture, there is now mountainous waste in our Government.

We pay for that waste in taxes.

We pay for it doubly, since all these billions of wasted money could be used for what we really need.

My friends, this preoccupation with looking backward, which lends so much to this duplication and waste, is nevertheless not the most serious flaw of this Republican administration.

The people are on to much of this, as the last election showed.

By far the most serious Republican policy—and it is slowly coming to light—is the way this administration has concealed from the people the steady deterioration of our position in the world.

This latter policy is very serious, because it goes to the heart of our democratic system—the people's right to know the facts, and thereupon to act upon them.

If they are lulled into complacency, how can they make the effort necessary to keep us both prosperous and free.

The people want the truth—and because of these misrepresentations, come next year, will turn these Republicans out.

In 1960, at local, State, and National levels, the people will give the Democratic Party the greatest victory in its history.

May I talk briefly tonight about two areas in which we have been misled: national security and economic growth.

First, as to our defenses:

The administration has been telling us that we had defenses we do not have.

As illustration: For a long time the administration withheld the facts about Russian development of intercontinental ballistic missiles.

The American people were led to believe we were in fine shape, maybe even ahead, in both the development and the production schedule of this weapon.

But last January the Secretary of Defense finally admitted that the Russians will soon have a 3-to-1 lead over us in this field.

What happened when we learned the truth about ICBM's?

The people were immediately informed that our weakness there was compensated by strength in other sectors. One of those listed was our intermediate range ballistic missiles, which, we were told, were operational on foreign bases.

But now we learn that none of these IRBM's are operational—and are told the Russians have many hundreds of medium range ballistic missiles that are operational.

And what was the other major part of our defense balance that justified our voluntarily handing over ICBM superiority to the Communists?

It is the Strategic Air Command, which the administration says comprises over 90 percent of our retaliatory capacity.

Under questioning, however, the administration admits that three-fourths of the present Strategic Air Force is obsolescent: and that its 3-year plan for replacement of these old bombers will replace only a very small percent of those now in operation.

In his television address to the Nation a month ago, the Presiednt showed a chart of 17 missiles he said were "now in use by our Armed Forces."

Only one of these missiles could travel farther than from San Francisco to Los Angeles. That one was not operational then, and isn't now.

This entire process reminds me of the used car salesman who wants his customer to look only at the new paint job, because if he examines the car more closely, he will discover it has no clutch, no brakes, and no motor.

Now, about our economy.

The challenge we face from the Sino-Soviet Empire is fully as much economic as it is military.

The Communists are out to outproduce us, dry up our markets, and show the world that they can offer material welfare equal to, and superior to, that of the United States.

They are still behind us in some areas—but they are gaining fast.

Since 1950, the Russians have gone from 34 percent of American steel production to 71 percent; from 46 percent of our coal production to 113 percent; and from 27 percent of our aluminum production to 39 percent.

But does this administration warn the American people of this Russian progress, or take the steps to meet it?

It does not.

In the last Democratic administration, our economy grew at the rate of about 5 percent per year.

In this administration, economic growth has been slowed to a little over 1 percent a year.

Is this the way to provide for a population which will reach 235 million by 1975?

Is this the way to provide for the growth of the West?

Or is it the way to stunt the growth of the West?

If we had been able to keep up the Democratic growth rate between 1953 and 1958, it would have meant: $2,800 more income for each family; $31 billion more for our farmers; 10 million more man-years of employment; and $39 billion more private investment.

Every segment of our economy, every section of our Nation, would have been more prosperous than it is today.

At least as much as most, you in the Pacific Northwest have tasted the bitter fruits of Republican economic contraction.

You have seen the resources wasted by the policy of no new starts on the Columbia River.

You have felt the credit pinch of tight money.

You have felt the drain of unemployment.

You have seen glowing opportunities for the development of this region snuffed out by the indifference of this administration.

What you need is more investment capital to develop the riches that lie at your feet.

This requires a willingness on the part of our Government to make long-term investments instead of continuing to be obsessed with budget balancing on a year-to-year basis.

It requires an administration which is not afraid of growth.

I believe there must be more willingness on the part of Government to conceive and carry out broad economic plans, instead of responding haphazardly and uneconomically to such crises as power shortages and floods.

As we all know, the difference between civilized man and the savage is planning. The difference between men and animals is that men look ahead.

Long-range planning of resource development therefore, on a multistate basis, would enable the West to know where it was going, and how fast.

So, my fellow Democrats, our work between now and the next election would seem cut out for us.

We must set the record straight.

We must tell the people the truth about the world situation—and also about the lost opportunities caused by the policies of these Republicans.

We must convince them, by our record in Congress and in the country, that the Democrats will improve that record.

If we do so we will win; and the Nation will be stronger for the effort we have made and will make in the years to come.

Vacationers Enjoy Wisconsin State Parks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 20, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, with vacation season just ahead, folks in Wisconsin, and throughout the country, will be seeking scenic, historic, restful, or other places of interest to enjoy their time off from daily routines.

In Wisconsin we have a wide variety of opportunities for visitors or travelers to really enjoy their vacation. These include: good food, friendly hospitality, scenic and historic sites throughout the State, almost a million acres of land set aside for fishing and hunting lands, campsites, and a wide variety of other opportunities for indoor or outdoor vacationing.

Particularly, our State parks offer the visitor a chance to enjoy spots of unique beauty, as well as of scenic, scientific, and historic interest.

Annually, these parks attract more than 5 million visitors—including our home folks, friends from sister States, and visitors from Canada.

For those who are seeking a wide variety of chances to "get away from it all," Wisconsin indeed offers a wonderful opportunity.

A recent edition of the Wisconsin Agriculturist carried an excellent article entitled "Vacationers Enjoy Our State Parks." I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wisconsin Agriculturist, May 16, 1959]

VACATIONERS ENJOY OUR STATE PARKS—SURVEY SHOWS THAT THOUSANDS VISIT STATE'S MANY PARKS AND CAMPSITES

Wisconsin's State parks are the showcases of the State. The 31 areas in the system include some of the unique beauty spots as well as places of outstanding scenic, scientific, and historic interest.

Each year these parks attract more than 5 million visitations from within and outside the State. For more than 50 years both the enjoyment of these parks and the resulting economic benefits to the people of the State have been increasing. But what of the future?

The Wisconsin Conservation Department made a comprehensive study of State park visitors during 1958 in cooperation with the State highway commission, Federal Bureau of Public Roads and the University of Wisconsin. Between June 20 and Labor Day 17,152 drivers of cars were interviewed as they left the several State parks and State forest recreation areas. This number was 2 percent of the vehicles recorded at the State parks during the summer season.

Visitors to our State parks came from 47 States and from Canada. Wisconsin citizens supplied almost two-thirds of these visitors while Illinois, containing the closest major population center in the country, accounted for over half of all out-of-State visitors. Our Illinois neighbors frequented every park in the State with Big Foot Beach, Devil's Lake and Peninsula the most popular areas for them.

COME FROM MIDWEST

Over 23 percent of the nonresident visitors were from Minnesota. The parks along the western edge of the State, particularly Interstate, Pattison, and Merrick, received the majority of Minnesota's use.

Iowa, Michigan, and other neighboring and Midwestern States were also substantial users.

The northern 29 counties, covering about half the area of the State, produced only 20 percent of the use by Wisconsin citizens, while the more heavily populated southern half provided 80 percent of the park useage.

Visitors come to the State parks for a variety of purposes. Since the basic concept of Wisconsin's State park system is to preserve the areas of outstanding statewide scenic and historical significance, it is apparent why one-third of the visitors came primarily for sightseeing.

They came to see the rugged beauty of Devil's Lake nestled in the Baraboo Bluffs; the highest point in Wisconsin at Rib Mountain; bluffs high above the Mississippi at Wyalusing and Perrot and the State's highest waterfall at Pattison.

MANY ARE CAMPERS

Picknicking, another favorite summer activity, was the reported purpose for 19 percent; while camping, the fastest growing recreation in the State parks, was the recreational purpose of exactly one-sixth of the visitors.

About 13 percent of the visitors mentioned swimming as their primary recreational purpose. Other recreational purposes including boating, fishing and hiking were specified by a few visitors.

Visitors spend quite a sum of money within a short distance (20 miles) of the State parks. The average expenditure per car was $16.38. This figure includes the average expenditure of $3.75 per car for lodging, $8.30 for food and drink, $2.51 for car expenses, $1.82 for other purposes such as boat rental, souvenirs, or golf fees. Considering the number of cars entering the parks each season, these figures give an estimate of the economic effect that visitors have on the region surrounding a State park.

Improvements are badly needed in all Wisconsin State parks, yet 55 percent of the visitors gave no opinion when asked what they thought is most in need of improvement.

Those who did respond, including many campers, suggested these park problems: Not enough campsites, too few picnic tables and fireplaces; inadequate toilets; poor or insufficient roads and parking areas; poor maintenance; and too crowded conditions.

University of Connecticut and Georgetown University Scientific Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 20, 1959

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, in connection with this week's discussion of appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, I should like to call attention to a healthy development in the field of education. This is the move on the part of our academic world to concentrate the spotlight of research on some of the difficult problems that are unfolding in the space sciences.

Two noted universities, one a State university and the other privately endowed, have recently announced studies which underline the reinforced interest in science. One is intended to bring latest information on technology together; the other is to examine the more theroetical aspects of space law.

The University of Connecticut has concluded plans for its second annual institute on missile technology. It is sponsored by the Chief of Research and Development, U.S. Army. The course will run from July 26 through August 7, and will cover all important principles connected with the application of missile technology. It is designed for those seeking fundamental, practical working knowledge in areas related to the development, production, and operation of missiles and components. The course is comprehensive, to provide full coverage of new developments, and is coordinated to facilitate technical understanding and improvement. A staff of military and civilian experts has been gathered from universities and industries engaged in missile research and development. The fields of study will include such current problems as guidance and ballistics, propulsion theory and design, reliability and astral problems.

Here in Washington, Georgetown University has announced a program at its law school to study both nuclear energy law and space law. An institute has been established to conduct intensive, continuing research into national and international legal problems arising out of the peaceful and military uses of nuclear energy and the exploration of outer space. Acknowledging the interrelation of political, economic, and technological factors, the university is calling on faculties of various universities and departments to combine in an interdisciplinary approach to legal problems of the nuclear-space age. The institute will be under the direction of the law faculty and will have the cooperation of an advisory committee of industrialists, scientists, and lawyers actively engaged in such matters.

Thus America's universities, and particularly these forward-looking institutions I have cited, are marshaling their resources to help study the tremendous potential of the space age. The country needs and welcomes the thoughtful, academic consideration and the broadening of the instruction base that these institutes offer.

Padre Island: A National Seashore Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 20, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, for a long time, the 117 miles of beach on Padre Island in Texas has been recognized as one of the last undeveloped seashores in this country.

James Rowe, of the Corpus Christi Caller-Times, has summarized the present situation of the movement to establish a national park on Padre Island in an article for his newspaper.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD Mr. Rowe's article, published in the Corpus Christi Caller-Times for Sunday, May 17, 1959, under the heading, "Padre Island: A National Seashore Plan—The U.S. Park Service Wants To Preserve This Beautiful Expanse of Wasteland for Future Generations, but Bringing It About Will Take Effort From Many People, Here and Elsewhere."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PADRE ISLAND: A NATIONAL SEASHORE PLAN—THE U.S. PARK SERVICE WANTS TO PRESERVE THIS BEAUTIFUL EXPANSE OF WASTELAND FOR FUTURE GENERATIONS, BUT BRINGING IT ABOUT WILL TAKE EFFORT FROM MANY PEOPLE, HERE AND ELSEWHERE

(By James Rowe)

Padre Island has been recognized for more than 20 years as one of the last undeveloped seashores in the United States. Potentially it is one of this Nation's outstanding seashore recreational areas, an unspoiled stretch of beach 117 miles long.

Efforts to establish a national park on Padre Island have been made in the past, but in recent months the first evidence has appeared of a genuine marshaling of public opinion to preserve at least part of the island as a public beach and recreational area. The regular session of the 56th legislature ended without approval of a resolution that would have given consent to the Federal Government to establish a park on the island. Pending in the Senate of the United States is a resolution asking designation of Padre Island as a national park, if State consent is given.

Recently the Advisory Board on National Parks recommended to the National Park Service that Padre Island be designated as a shoreline area. The Park Service is studying this recommendation. As a preliminary step in this direction the U.S. Department of the Interior last week asked Congress to appropriate $15 million to buy up three shoreline areas. One of the areas under consideration is Padre Island, almost all of it privately owned.

SIMILAR TO A NATIONAL PARK

What is a shoreline area, sometimes known as a national seashore? The National Park Service defines it as similar to a national park, but more descriptive of its special qualities and appropriate uses of a seashore. "It is an area capable of sustaining in part, at least, some special public uses, such as the hunting of waterfowl, which would be inappropriate in a national park."

Why is Padre Island being considered as a seashore area? An on-the-spot survey of the island was made 3 months ago by a representative of the National Park Service. The unique appeal of the island is expressed in the following portion of his report on the survey:

"The island is a typical example of a barrier beach, unusual because of its great size which enhances its primitive character. The wide, clean beach, composed of fine sand and broken shell, extends in an unbroken sweep from horizon to horizon. The slope of the shore is uniformly gentle, providing ideal conditions for swimming, surf fishing and other beach recreation.

"A distinctive feature of Padre Island is the windswept, irregular dunes. Lacking extensive vegetation, much of the sand is shaped and reshaped by the wind. When stable, the dunes bordering the beach are often imposing up to 40 feet high. Elsewhere, unstable dunes are smaller, often in the shape of small rippling mounds, or else nonexistent, resulting in flats stretching from sea to sound (Laguna Madre). The general atmosphere of the island is one of undisturbed isolation and seemingly endless expanses of flat, sparsely vegetated beachland.

"Padre Island presents one of the last remaining opportunities for this Nation to preserve such a length of beach in its natural state. In future years America's growing population will have few chances to experience and gain inspiration from a vast sweep of ocean shore unaltered by man. * * * To preserve America's longest island beach will provide not only an outstanding area for biological and geological study, but also a place where future generations of Americans can experience a wild spaciousness that is their heritage."

THE AREA HASN'T BEEN DETERMINED

How much area would the Padre Island National Seashore encompass? No agreement on this subject has been reached. The maximum area recommended is 88 miles long, beginning roughly 15 miles from the north and south tips of the island. The area also would include that portion of Laguna Madre westward to the east line of the Intracoastal Canal.

What would be done to develop the island? The Park Service recommends that the central section of the seashore area be roadless "to preserve the island's primitive character." In other sections a road system behind the barrier dunes would provide access to the beach. Other developments would include camping and picnic areas and information centers at the north and south entrances.

How can the property needed be acquired? There are no hard and fast rules. It can be accomplished by State, Federal, or private purchase or by any combination of these. Even provision can be made for development of the oil and gas potential of the area. This was followed in the establishment of the Everglades National Park in Florida, with up to 10 years given for exploratory drilling. In this connection, Leo J. Diederich, acting chief for the division of recreation resource planning for the Park Service wrote, "Some reasonable alternative (to obtaining fee title outright) looking toward the maximum protection of natural values during the oil exploration and extraction period no doubt will be seriously considered in evaluating further the Padre Island proposal and any enabling legislation which would be required to authorize its establishment as a unit of the national park system."

At this point the National Park Service has not committed itself on Padre Island, other than to note its obvious claims to development as a public recreation area.

THE STEPS TO BE TAKEN

What must be done to ensure development of the Padre Island National Seashore?

First of all, the State legislature must give the Federal Government permission to establish a seashore area on Padre Island. Without this permission the Federal Government will make no further plans for Padre Island. The permission can be given by a simple resolution, such as was proposed during the regular session. With sufficient backing of legislators and the people it might even be possible to persuade Gov. Price Daniel to submit it for consideration during the special session beginning tomorrow, after the vital questions of taxation and spending have been dealt with..

The next important step would be to gain congressional approval of a bill designating Padre Island as a national seashore. Thereafter the National Park Service would make further surveys of the island, define the exact area needed and make recommendations to Congress..

The final step would be land acquisition through gift or purchase. At that stage, agreements on development of oil and gas prospects would be made and time limits set on that exploration.

It is apparent that there can be no overnight establishment of Padre Island as a park or seashore area. Great patience and resolution will be required. But public opinion in Texas seems to be uniting gradually in support of the plan. Many resolutions from garden clubs, Audubon clubs and civic organizations supporting the Padre Island proposal have gone to State legislators and to Congressmen. The theme of this rising tide of public support comes from a recent survey by the National Park Service of Atlantic and gulf coasts: "The seashore is a priceless resource for which there is no substitute. Once subdivided and developed, it is lost forever."

In its overall survey of the Atlantic and gulf coasts, the Park Service had this to say of the Padre Island proposal: "It should be given the highest priority. Padre Island presents an opportunity for beach recreation of a type unmatched by any other area along the Atlantic or gulf coasts. Its great size, remote character, endless sweep of broad beach, grass-topped dunes, and windswept sand formations have great appeal. Its natural resources, historical and biological values should be preserved."

Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH, author of a bill to make Padre Island a national park, said to the Senate: "Mr. President, this great windswept waste, with sea, sand, and scrub timber was the last refuge of the Karankawa Indians, who were cannibals, and who therefore were detested by the Spanish settlers of Mexico and the Anglo-American colonists from the north, as well as the other tribes of Indians. * * * This summer pirates' hangout—this place of treasure—is now one of the finest fishing spots in the world, and will soon fall into private development and be lost forever as a great winter tourist resort for the American people unless prompt action is taken."

It is a curious fact that much of the enthusiasm for creating a national park or seashore area on Padre Island has come from other areas of Texas rather than the coastal bend. We who live here have long taken Padre Island and its companion, Mustang Island, for granted. Residents of the Texas coast are apparently not nearly as fearful as their inland brethren that this vast span of relatively unspoiled beach may yield inevitably to the real estate developer as was the history in Florida. The enthusiasm of coastal residents must be kindled, too, if the dream of a national park on Padre Island is to be realized.

SUBSTANTIAL TOURIST BENEFITS

Beyond the preservation of a wilderness area on the Texas coast, residents of the coastal bend could expect substantial tourist benefits from a national park on Padre Island. The flow of visitors to this area would be increased substantially, if experience in other sections of the country hold true. A tourist study of the Great Smoky Mountains National Park, for instance, indicated that visitors spent approximately $28 million in and near that park in 1956.

Already the section of coast between Tivoli and Brownsville has almost unmatched attractions for nature lovers. There is the Aransas National Wildlife Refuge near Austwell, the last wintering ground for the whooping crane. There is the unusual Laguna Atascosa Wildlife Refuge in Cameron County which harbors one of the greatest concentrations of bird life in the United States during the season of migration. There is the Rob and Bessie Welder Wildlife Refuge near Sinton with its bountiful bird and animal life. A national seashore area on Padre Island would complete a unique concentration of tourist attractions within a 200-mile section of the Texas coast with Corpus Christi as its approximate center.

The danger is great, however, that the flurry of interest over Padre Island will be taken by too many people as a definite promise that the island will become a national recreational area. Only constant, unremitting effort by individuals and groups can bring that proposal to a successful conclusion.

Recently the National Park Service completed its first comprehensive survey of the Atlantic and Gulf beaches in 20 years. Recalling the complacency and inaction which followed the earlier survey the Park Service reported: "For the most part it represented the ghosts of departed opportunities."

Twenty years from now Padre Island will represent the ghost of a departed opportunity if the people and their legislatures do not act now to preserve it as an unspoiled wilderness area for the enjoyment of the living and of future generations.

Tribute by Pendleton East Oregonian to Harry S. Truman on Occasion of His 75th Birthday Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 20, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, a public man can only be considered in perspective. Nobody has said this more frequently than Harry S. Truman himself. Yet, the 75th birthday of this eminent American has afforded many opportunities to assess his career. I have read few editorials more sympathetic or perspicacious in this respect than that which was published in the Pendleton (Oreg.) East Oregonian, of May 8, 1959, entitled "Truman's Diamond Jubilee." In particular, I should like to invite attention to that phase of the editorial which emphasizes the courage and decisiveness of the decision which President Truman took in relation to Korea. That decision may well have been a turning point in safeguarding the free world from aggression.

Mr. J. W. Forrester, the editor of the Pendleton East Oregonian, is a liberal and enlightened citizen who owes partisan affiliation to no particular political party. That is why his editorial tribute to ex-President Harry S. Truman carries special significance. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial entitled, "Truman's Diamond Jubilee," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRUMAN'S DIAMOND JUBILEE

It is thoroughly in character that the diamond jubilee dinner for Harry S. Truman in New York should be a fund-raising affair for the Democratic Party, with a closed-circuit television hookup carrying the program to similar gatherings in key cities throughout the Nation. Whatever stature history bestows upon the former President, among his contemporaries he quite earnestly wants to be known as a politician.

"I don't want to be a statesman," Truman has said on several occasions—most recently on April 20, when his Lamar, Mo., birthplace was being dedicated as a public shrine—"because that's a dead politician, and I am a politician and expect to be one for the rest of my life."

Perhaps no former President has been so closely identified with his party as Harry Truman has been with the Democratic Party. Here is evidenced a certain irony, for the Truman administration was more bipartisan than many, as witnessed, for example, by the high diplomatic assignments given to John Foster Dulles.

Politically, one of Truman's most characteristic traits has been his hell-giving. As he headed west on a special train for a whistlestop campaign in 1948, the President vowed, "I'm going to give 'em hell."

The phrase stuck with him. Even when campaigning for Adlai E. Stevenson in 1952 and 1956 he used the same technique, flailing power and real estate lobbies, Wall Street, and "gluttons of privilege"—favorite targets all. Like a good party soldier, he traveled extensively in both Stevenson campaigns, despite differences with the candidate in 1952 and outright opposition to him prior to the 1956 convention. In 1952 he made 211 speeches, covering 18,000 miles in at least 27 States.

"Give 'em hell, Harricum," was the way his fellow Democrats greeted Truman as he got up to speak before the 1956 convention. The Harricum came from the Latin usage of Oxford University in citing the Missourian for an honorary degree. But despite the affection felt for him, and his very real political power in the party, he was unable to put across his personal candidate, Gov. Averell Harriman of New York.

It's Harry Truman, because what the young man wanted is to be Harry, and the plainness again seems highly characteristic. The former President disclosed, April 30, that his parents originally had name him Harrison S. Truman. "The "S" was to stand for either Shipp or Solomon; the parents couldn't make up their minds and decided to let Harrison make his own choice when he grew older. When the time came, the youth chucked the Harrison for the less awesome Harry.

For all his pepper and plainness, Harry Truman can be eloquent when eloquence is called for. Not long after taking the oath

as President on April 12, 1945, he said: "Last night the whole weight of the moon and stars and all the planets fell on me. Please pray for me."

In a historic message to Congress of July 19, 1950, asking that the country be put in a semiwar footing for the hostilities in Korea, the President declared: "The free world has made it clear, through the United Nations, that lawless aggression will be met with force. That is the significance of Korea, and it is a significance whose importance cannot be overestimated."

It would be presumptuous to declare what history will say in its summation of Harry Truman. We can, however, venture an opinion. It is that Mr. Truman will be rated a far stronger President than he is today.

Address by Representative Collier at Bataan Memorial Dedication

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
Hon. EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 20, 1959

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the dedication speech by Representative HAROLD R. COLLIER on May 17, 1959, at the dedication of the Bataan Memorial.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Fellow Americans, there is so little one can say or so little that need be said that could possible reach the deep feelings which prevail on this occasion.

Certainly it would take volumes of words to even approach the emotions, human suffering, deeds of heroism, and love of country which are fully embraced in the history of Company B of the 192d Tank Battalion.

It is, in a sense, a small measure of fulfillment that in solemn gratitude and pride of community and country we dedicate this plaque in honor of a heroic group of soldiers who wrote an indelible chapter in the epic of the Pacific theater in World War II.

We have all learned much of the Maywood Tank Company which was the last of the American forces to cross the bridge from Bataan on the fiery night of January 7, 1942, before it was blown to bits by enemy shells.

The 192d Tank Battalion entered combat early in December of 1941 to engage in the struggle for Clark Field and it continued its fighting for more than a month, moving on to Luzon before its withdrawal into the Bataan Peninsula.

Against great odds it contributed in large measure to the prolonged defense of the peninsula, under the command of Col. Theodore F. Wickford, of Maywood.

It was a member of this company that brought down the first enemy plane to the credit of the armored forces in World War II.

It was here on this site exactly 30 years ago that the 33d Division Tank Company was activated and it was this division that was redesignated as the famous fighting Company B of the 192d Tank Battalion in 1940 when most of the nations of the world were already engaged in conflict.

In November of that year, Company B was ordered to active duty at Fort Knox, Ky., less than 2 months before the sneak attack upon Pearl Harbor which drew the United States into conflict.

The suffering of those who survived the horrible death march of Bataan has been described in the bitter accounts of the early struggle in the Philippines as was the further suffering which came in the Japanese prison camps.

The vicious fighting, the death march, and the maltreatment in the prison camps took their toll and left but few survivors of the original company.

I can't help but recall on this solemn and proposeful occasion, words which Abraham Lincoln uttered at Philadelphia 95 years ago, because no one has ever been able to say in so few words the very thoughts in which we find the true meaning of this ceremony.

It was there he said, "We accepted this war and did not begin it.

"We accepted it for an object and when that object is accomplished, the war will end, and I hope to God that it will never end until that object is accomplished."

So it was with these war heroes of the Maywood Company, when they answered their call to make whatever sacrifice was necessary to remove from mankind the tyrants of that time.

And more significant, in the immortal address at Gettysburg, did Lincoln say those words which could be said in no better phrase or sentiments to fit this very occasion today:

"But in a larger sense," he solemnly declared, "we cannot dedicate, we cannot consecrate, we cannot hallow this ground.

"The brave men, living and dead, who struggled here, have consecrated it far above our poor power to add or detract.

"It is for us, the living, rather, to be dedicated here to the unfinished work they have so nobly carried on."

"It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us, that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to the cause for which they gave their last full measure of devotion, that we here highly resolve that the dead shall not have died in vain."

And then, we ask, who shall not have died in vain.

In our lifetime it means the hero dead of the great conflicts since the turn of the century.

They died to keep freedom alive.

They gave their all that we might continue to enjoy life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

We can make their deaths in vain by ignobly surrending to those things which do not represent the way of life that has been our God-given heritage.

The hero dead of the last great world conflict and those who were spared from the supreme sacrifice were American patriots, strong of body, strong of mind and spirit, and strong in their belief in God.

They did not hesitate to fight for the right as God gave them to see the right.

For if we but stop to appreciate the true values of our heritage we must, by the same token, concede that there can be no guarantee of life or liberty or the pursuit of happiness unless we know what it means to defend it with the same full measure as the men who fought on Bataan.

For those who died that we might be here today with the same traditions, ideals, and freedoms as the day they left these United States for the Pacific battlefields, the job is done.

And well done, it was.

But our work and responsibility to do in our own way what must be done in preserving all of these things remains as a challenge.

For even as we are gathered here today, there are millions of human beings behind the Iron Curtain of communism enslaved as the tyrants of our time would spread its godlessness and suppression of democracy around the world.

May the eternal light which will burn here on this spot after the light of each day has passed, for time immemorial be a reminder to each of us that the light of freedom may flicker and die if we, as Americans, falter in our responsibility to God and country in the years before us.

For those few who gave so much for so many, we must never forget.

Our Judicial System—Democracy's Brightest Light

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN O. PASTORE
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 20, 1959

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in Appendix of the RECORD the text of a timely address, "Our Judicial System—Democracy's Brightest Light," delivered by Mr. Albert Brick, a Washington attorney, at the annual Law Review banquet on May 9, 1959, at his alma mater, the University of Florida.

I say "timely" advisedly, as this talk is a defense of the U.S. Supreme Court, and a most informative defense of our country's judicial system.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR JUDICIAL SYSTEM—DEMOCRACY'S BRIGHTEST LIGHT

I am pleased and honored to be your guest on the occasion of the annual Law Review banquet, especially because the Gertrude Brick Memorial Award will be made to the freshman who has distinguished himself in the Law Review course during this past semester. If my mother were alive she too would rejoice in this happy occasion because it was through her encouragement that I acquired the determination and desire to become a member of the legal profession.

Standing before you as I am—and you are a captive audience—reminds me of the saying, "Beware of the speaker whose mind is measured by inches, whose words are measured by yards, for he will be dealt with by the foot." Unfortunately, there are today too many of our fine citizens who would like to deal with our judicial system with their feet, so to speak, to kick out literally the system of judicial law and order as we understand it in our country. It is to these people that I would like to address myself so that they can fully understand the calamity and chaos that would befall our fine and democratic form of government if they could but succeed in their efforts.

An American citizen traveling in a foreign land is sometimes asked by a native to define our form of government and, as is natural, he finds himself explaining it in wide and generous platitudes.

This is understandable because this great land of ours for the last hundred years or more has been blessed with prosperity, progress, freedom and happiness. Yet if he is meticulous he will understand that there are several fundamentals inherent in our form of government which set it apart from all others.

We have a Constitution which, while not perfect, has its built-in checks and balances that provide us with the necessary ground rules to prevent a dictator from taking over and stifling our guaranteed and inalienable rights and freedoms. These checks and balances come about by virtue of the separation of powers delegated to the three branches of government—the executive—the legislative—and the judicial. If you attempt to stifle or weaken any one branch you, of necessity, weaken all.

But, in my opinion, the most important and indeed the brightest light of our democracy is our judicial system which, in the last analysis, has the power to review the actions of the other two branches of government. It is therefore incumbent upon our judiciary to be fearless, independent and free of pressures. The fact that you or I may disagree with a decision or the reasoning set forth in an opinion of the Supreme Court of the United States does not mean that the system is faulty.

The truth of the matter is that time and again since the birth of our Nation our courts have stood the test and have proven their worth. From the tumultuous period under Chief Justice Marshall, the Supreme Court has survived though its critics have been many.

It survived the Dred Scott decision and the Civil War and during the early years of the Franklin D. Roosevelt administration the Court remained intact and without change even though that most popular President sought to change the Court and its system—and even he failed in the attempt.

Now in recent years the Supreme Court has again come into focus becaus of an ever increasing amount of criticism—fanned to heat by its decision in the case of *Brown* v. *Board of Education of Topeka* (349 U.S. 294), which declared segregation in public education to be unconstitutional. Even the American Bar Association has criticized the action of the Court in an almost unprecedented move which caused the Chief Justice to resign as a member from that body.

I saw the Chief Justice at several of the bar association functions in London, England, in August of 1957 and on one occasion while conversing with him I told him that I disagreed with most of his decisions although I admired his sincerity and his courage.

Recently some of our Members of the Senate and House of Representatives are attempting to pass legislation which would curb the jurisdictional powers of the Court. It is my firm conviction that this attempt to change the judicial system as we have known it since the inception of our Nation shall fail.

However, all this activity and criticism can and will take its toll on the integrity and independence of our judiciary unless the right thinking members of the bar and the body politic come to the defense of the Court and to the defense of a system which has helped our Nation to prosper and reach a position of prestige in the family of nations.

The continuance of the present judicial system with a courageous, fearless, independent judiciary will depend on our good judgment. The constitutional guarantee of trial by jury is, in my opinion, the very bulwark of our democratic process even though many of the enlightened nations, including England, which was the mother of the jury system, have drastically curtailed trial by jury. We all realize that a jury trial is expensive and costly and that it has some drawbacks. But, to me, it is an essential part of the checks and balances and provides an opportunity for a litigant to be judged by his peers.

In the final analysis there must be a repository of final decision and our Constitution provides that this power reside in the Supreme Court of the United States.

Nevertheless, our fine Constitution is not completely perfect for it had to cover a great deal of ground in an understandable and succint document. Among the amendments to the Constitution is the 10th amendment, which states as follows:

"The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

Now his amendment has probably stirred up more debate and discussion than any single portion of our Constitution. On the present issue there are sincere persons who believe that the Supreme Court has encroached upon this amendment by taking away from the States the right to determine whether its public schools are to remain segregated or not. The opponents shout that these persons are only attempting to preserve the status quo. The din is loud and the attempt to curb the power of the Supreme Court Justices is proceeding with speed.

Again I state that whether you agree with the result of the Supreme Court decision in *Brown* v. *Board of Education of Topeka* or not, you must admire the courage and fearless manner in which the Justices, in effect, overruled the case of *Plessy* v. *Ferguson* (163 U.S. 537), which was decided in 1896, which upheld the doctrine of separate but equal facilities. There was not one dissent—the decision of the Court was unanimous. This was a remarkable performance, to say the least, whether you agreed with the Court or not, particularly since this present Court has as many, if not more, dissenting opinions written than have been written by the Supreme Court at any other time in its history.

Recently this Court, in the case of *Bartkus* v. *People of State of Illinois* (79 S. Ct. 676) in dealing with the question of double jeopardy, held that the Federal Government could prosecute for a criminal act even though the defendant had been acquitted by a State court jury for the same crime. This decision is one with which I completely disagree, and I give you a further example of our system of checks and balances when the Attorney General of the United States, a member of the executive branch, promptly announced that he would advise going slowly and not to prosecute unless there were compelling reasons. Hard decisions always make hard law with which we, as citizens, have the right to disagree but not to disobey.

Yet while we disagree we should not destroy or allow the destruction of our judicial system, nor allow conditions to become so intolerable for our Justices so as to destroy courage and independence on their part. It is, however, proper and right to insist that only men of great ability, learning and integrity to appointed to our judiciary so as to insure the proper administration of justice.

Frankly, I have searched through the Supreme Court decisions to determine whether the questions involved in the case of *Plessy* v. *Ferguson* ever came before the Court while those great liberals, whom I always admired and whom I saw in action in my early days in law school in Washing, namely, Justices Holmes, Brandeis, and Cardozo, sat, but posterity was not given the benefit of their deliberations since the questions were never presented to them while they were sitting as members of the Supreme Court.

Now the eternal argument concerning the Supreme Court has mostly centered about its right to overturn stare decisis. The case of *Plessy* v. *Ferguson* has been the law of the land for 59 years and the legislative branch of Government had recognized and even upheld this law before and after this decision by voting money year after year for the segregated school system of the District of Columbia, for which territory it has always legislated.

The question I should like to pose to you is, "Shall the Supreme Court be bound by its prior decisions?" This is not an easy problem but one which requires some examination since certainty of law is a very desirable factor. However, many changes have taken place since our Nation won its independence and our great document, the Constitution, was written. For instance, it must be remembered that in 1800 our population was 6.1 percent urban and 93.9 percent rural, while in 1950 the Bureau of Census revealed that 64 percent of our population was urban and 36 percent rural. The increase in population, the modern inventions, and the vast movement of our citizens to cities were facts that the framers of the Constitution could have hardly visualized, but there were among them many farsighted individuals who foresaw greatness and tremendous progress for our great new Nation. One of the finest minds aiding the framers of the Constitution was a beloved southerner from Virginia who was later a President of the United States. This man, Thomas Jefferson, was also the founder of the Democratic Party, and author of our Declaration of Independence.

It is interesting to understand what his mental processes were when he was aiding in the framing of our Constitution, for he is credited with having said:

"I am not an advocate for frequent changes in laws and constitutions. But laws and institutions must go hand in hand with the progress of the human mind. As that becomes more developed, more enlightened, as new discoveries are made, new truths discovered, and manners and opinions change with the change of circumstances, institutions must advance also to keep pace with the times. We might as well require a man to wear still the coat which fitted him when a boy as civilized society to remain ever under the regimen of their barbarous ancestors."

Does this sound like the words of a man who would insist that the Justices of the Supreme Court be chained to stare decisis? I think not, and I feel strongly that if we are to win the hearts and the minds of men in this cold war with the cunning, ungodly Communists, we must display moral fiber to the world by preserving and defending a courageous, fearless, independent judiciary even though we may from time to time disagree with its decisions. The attempt to curb the powers of the Court should be strenuously opposed and blocked as it is an attempt to brainwash, intimidate, and destroy our present judicial system, which I predict will shine as a bright star when the present storm subsides.

In conclusion, I would again quote Thomas Jefferson, who said: "I have sworn upon the altar of God eternal hostility against every form of tyranny over the mind of man."

Threatened Splitup of Du Pont Co. Interests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ALLEN FREAR, JR.
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 20, 1959

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Why a Splitup?" published in the Delaware Coast Press, of Rehoboth,

Del., of recent date, dealing with a threat to the Du Pont interests.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY A SPLITUP?

Almost synonymous with the growth of our country has been the stature of the Du Pont Co. Throughout the years it has grown and prospered with the rest of the country, and it, together with the members of the Du Pont family, have been honored citizens of the country and the State as well.

Their contribution to our country is well known, and their farsighted policies have added much to our way of modern living, besides having been the motivating force in reorganizing our schools after the First World War when they contributed without stint.

We look with pleasure on the latest effort of the court in appointing someone sympathetic to the voice of sound reasoning. It would seem that trying to disrupt such an effective instrument of interpreting the American way of life isn't really as popular as it might have been thought to be. We feel the interests of the E. I. du Pont Co. stockholders are being sold short when the Supreme Court orders a splitup of the company.

Coming at a time when the free world is fighting for its very existence, this hardly seems to us to be the time to try to destroy its finest fruit—success in its field.

By thus disrupting the Du Pont team that made America respected as a disciple of free enterprise we would be playing into the hands of those who destroy our way of life. We hope that when viewed in retrospect, reason based on fairness will prevail.

Down on the Eastern Shore, where a man can think for himself and be respected for his thoughts regardless of what his politics are, we have yet to find anyone who would do this to such a fine old American institution as the Du Pont combine.

It is hard to justify a splitup move which would weaken our economic machine. Surely they have not been accused of browbeating labor. The truth be that it would be hard to recall to mind any such difficulty to our knowledge.

If being big is such a sin, then the same line of thinking would call for us to become federated States, rather than a union. Heaven forbid.

A Woman President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN
OF VERMONT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 20, 1959

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the Honorable James A. Farley has been considered one of the most astute politicians in this country. He seems to be losing his grip and inviting a lot of trouble for himself. He is reported to have said we will never have a woman for President.

The inevitable happened. The women accepted his challenge and replied to Mr. Farley.

One of the most effective replies was made by the wife of the junior Senator from Oregon, Maurine Neuberger. I ask unanimous consent that the letter of Mrs. Neuberger, which contained a flattering reference to our colleague Senator MARGARET SMITH and which was written to the editor of This Week magazine of May 17, 1959, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEE HERE, MR. FARLEY

DEAR EDITOR: So James A. Farley thinks the White House is beyond the reach of 87,858,000 American females.

I profoundly disagree, despite my respect for Mr. Farley's political skill and wisdom. I fear it is characteristic of the average male to be so smug and self-confident that he really believes only a member of his own sex can be trusted to run our country. Have men always performed with such consistent success that nobody of the opposite sex should ever be given a chance?

Jim Farley listed three major reasons why he contends there never will be a "Madam President" within lifetimes of any of us:

1. Know-how: He claimed no woman could amass the varied experience necessary for the presidency.

What about MARGARET CHASE SMITH, of Maine? She has been a telephone operator, circulation manager of a newspaper, executive of a woolen mill, lieutenant colonel in the Woman's Air Force Reserve, secretary to a Congressman, Member of the House, and is now U.S. Senator. Put Mrs. SMITH's experience up against that of any male mentioned for the White House in 1960, and her fitness will compare most favorably.

And what of American women like Eleanor Roosevelt, Mrs. Oswald Lord and Eugenie Anderson? How many male politicians could match their experience overseas in diplomacy or with the U.N.?

2. Nerves: Women are too emotional to cope with the vast burdens of the White House, Mr. Farley contends.

Emotional instability and neurotic tendencies are said by psychologists to lurk at the root of most crime. Although women comprise over half of our population, only 11 percent of the people arrested for major crimes in 1957 were women, according to statistics of the FBI.

Physical well-being and health are other contributing factors to emotional steadiness. American males live an average of 67 years but females live for 73 years. "Weaker sex," as applied to women, is another legend with its roots in masculine self-esteem.

3. Prestige: Mr. Farley emphasized that a woman President could not command respect in world negotiations.

Now, isn't such a remark exactly like a man? Surely members of her own sex, all over the globe, would rejoice that a woman finally had reached the diplomatic summit. Negotiations with a woman in a dominant role could acquire a dignity and universal acceptance never before achieved.

Indeed, even Mr. Khrushchev might think twice before betraying his promises and pledges to a woman.

MAURINE NEUBERGER.

Trees for Tomorrow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 20, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, today I should like to call attention to the program "Trees for Today"—a reforestation project that will contribute much in Wisconsin to providing forest resources for future generations, as well as a source of wood products to stimulate the economy.

The "Trees for Tomorrow" program is the story of 8,100,000 trees, 33,000 people, and 216,000 acres of privately owned forest lands. The project is sponsored by the Wisconsin paper and power industries. The objectives include a program of tree planting, forest management, sound conservation practices, and educating more people for wise, farsighted utilization of our forest resources.

Today, Wisconsin ranks first among the 42 paper-producing States in sales dollars, tonnage produced, investment, and taxes paid; and second in number of employees. About 47 percent—of 16 million acres—of the total land area of Wisconsin is classed as commercial forest land. Two out of every three acres of such forest land are privately owned. This year the people of Wisconsin are expected to plant 40 million additional trees.

Recently, I received the 15th annual report of "Trees for Tomorrow, Inc." The report contained a thought-provoking article on the value of forest and forest products to America, entitled "A Promise for the Future," by President Folke Becker.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A PROMISE FOR THE FUTURE

The economic stability, the social structure, and the security of this Nation are founded on America's productive capacity.

Translated into more personal language this statement simply means permanent jobs at maximum wages, leisure, travel, and an opportunity to enjoy America's outdoors. It means adequate schools with well paid teachers and widespread opportunities for our children to attend college. It also means our ability to produce nuclear weapons, we trust, not for war but to maintain the peace.

Until recent years we held an unchallenged position throughout the world. Today, although not of our own choosing, we are locked in a combined ideological and economic war with Russia, her satellites, and perhaps, in the not too distant future, with China. Economic wars are won with resources.

The industrial fiber of America and our productive capacity are based not on a single industry but on a network of key industries. Some of these industries such as steel are dependent upon nonrenewable natural resources.

The paper and power industries use resources that can be renewed—cellulose from wood, and water from lakes and streams. However, we are so accustomed to the daily use of water and wood that they are taken almost for granted. Paper's importance is overwhelming. We use more than 35 million tons of paper each year for facilitating our free economy, for freedom of the press, for thousands of uses, day by day, in the highest standard of living ever known. Per capita consumption has reached 412 pounds, compared with four pounds in China where paper was invented. No other commodity, except food, would have such a profound effect if it disappeared.

These are a few of the obvious reasons why the paper and power industries in Wisconsin, in addition to their own forestry programs, are building for the future through the long range program of Trees for Tomorrow.

When Trees for Tomorrow was founded in 1944, we visualized a time when there would be a vast new forest for Wisconsin. That forest is beginning to take shape.

This 15th anniversary booklet documents a wide range of resource building activities through which thousands of people, who cherish America, are helping to assure the future prosperity and security of our country.

We trust our friends throughout Wisconsin with whom we have worked so closely during the past 15 years will not consider these pages a report of a job completed but a promise for the future.

New Book by Gladys Workman of Scottsburg, Oreg., Is Highlight of State's Centennial Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 20, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, my native State of Oregon this year is commemorating 100 years of statehood. In connection with this eventful anniversary, many epic events are taking place.

I think hundreds of residents of the historic Umpqua River Valley must have participated at Scottsburg, Oreg., recently in heralding the publication of "Only When I Laugh," a new book rich in Oregon lore and facts by Gladys Workman of that community. Officials of the Oregon State Centennial Commission scheduled Scottsburg's formal participation in the centennial to coincide with the publication of Mrs. Workman's book by the Prentice-Hall Co.

Mrs. Workman is a remarkable person. She and her husband, Norman, originally migrated to Oregon's lowland valleys for his health, leaving behind a thriving business in Los Angeles. In the Umpqua region Mr. Workman helped to establish daffodils and daffodil bulbs as an important source of earning power, for the lush local climate is appropriate to the growing of these lovely flowers which once were immortalized in an undying poem by William Wordsworth.

Gladys herself developed new and improved techniques in ceramics, and she began to tour Oregon and the Pacific Northwest, helping handicapped people to live more fruitful and enjoyable lives after they had learned to excel in ceramics, too. All of this led to an appearance for Mrs. Workman on the famous Ralph Edwards' "This is Your Life" television program, and other recognition also followed.

Furthermore, Gladys Workman became a close and intimate friend with Mrs. Annie Applegate Kruse of neighboring Yoncalla, known as the home of the eagles, where the pioneering ancestors of Mrs. Kruse blazed the famous Applegate trail long ago. The book by Mrs. Workman duly chronicles the life at Yoncalla of Annie Kruse and others who trace their ancestry back to those gallant frontiersmen, who led the first trains of Conestoga wagons into southern Oregon.

We cannot know where we are going unless we are aware of where we have been. The new book by Gladys Workman of Scottsburg, Oreg., adds to the understanding of Oregon's people today and of their pioneer past.

Mr. President, a very colorful and vivid letter has come to me from Mr. Jack Lawson of Scottsburg, Oreg., in tribute to Gladys Workman and the historic community in which she lives. Mr. Lawson's letter helps to highlight Mrs. Workman's new book, which is so pertinent to the history and traditions of southern Oregon. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this letter from Jack Lawson be printed with my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SCOTTSBURG, OREG.,
May 17, 1959.

Hon. RICHARD NEUBERGER,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR NEUBERGER: It was not by design, especially, but more a happy coincidence this centennial year of the State of Oregon that the book by Gladys Workman, "Only When I Laugh," published by Prentice-Hall, should be released to the American public.

More eloquently than anything else it blends the old days of the pioneers with modern life in a remote spot of Oregon, the village of Scottsburg on the beautiful, fir-lined Umpqua River. Even in Oregon today, relatively few people have heard of Scottsburg. It has no mayor, no fire department, no police department, no hospital—not even a local doctor. But it has Emma Hedden, granddaughter of Cyrus Hedden, Oregon pioneer who established a general merchandise store and the second post office in the Territory of Oregon 111 years ago, before Oregon officially became a State. Today the Hedden store of Scottsburg is the oldest general merchandise store in the State owned by one family.

In her literary gem, Mrs. Workman essentially views the people of Scottsburg and the Umpqua Valley through her own experiences, but succeeds in entwining something of the Umpqua's gallant history, when Scottsburg was the major seaport of Oregon between the Columbia River and San Francisco and the major center of pack trains to the mining regions. There were as many as 500 pack trains in Scottsburg at one time, with a population of more than 2,000 frontiers men and women. Scottsburg as a major seaport was destroyed by a disastrous flood in the early 1860's, which carried hundreds of lives, animals, and buildings out to sea.

Mrs. Workman, her husband and nephew, Norman, didn't arrive on the Umpqua until 1946, but they have been making modern history ever since. In the tradition of "The Egg and I" and other stories of modern pioneers, Mrs. Workman tells of her hilarious experiences, and some most dramatic, and even tragic. She introduces descendants of the early pioneers and the newcomers, as well, in most delightful anecdotes in an absorbing account and with genuine feeling of the vast, raw country of virgin timber that surrounds the Umpqua. The readers meets many Oregon characters he will want to know better in future books. He lives the tragedy of forest fire, flood, river accidents—and the heroic party line. He will meet Ruthie and Dorothy, who find humor and philosophy in the most serious situations.

He will learn how Norman Workman stumbled or bumbled into the daffodil growing business in a small and insecure way and nurtured it into a thriving and prosperous business affecting the economy of the entire Umpqua River Valley.

He will learn how Gladys Workman was forced into the ceramic business, to create an entire new industry in Oregon.

But most important, "Only When I Laugh" is an introduction to a new rich vein of Oregonia which will lead to a wider understanding and appreciation of Oregon and will add appreciatively to its future as an outstanding State of the Union.

As you might imagine, Gladys is most excited today, and most occupied with so many happenings and visitors she sometimes wishes she had never got talked into writing the darned book.

But the people of the Umpqua love it; the people of Oregon—and the entire United States, will, too.

Sincerely,

JACK LAWSON.

Alleged Waste in Expenditures on New Senate Office Building

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 20, 1959

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the Milwaukee Journal entitled "Waste, Waste, Waste," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

In a remarkably happy analogy the Milwaukee Journal points out that spending $150,000 for office carpeting to cover the beautiful tiling the new Senate Office Building now enjoys is like buying a statute of Venus and dressing it in a Mother Hubbard.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

WASTE, WASTE, WASTE

The ways of architecture are wonderous. And so are the ways of Senators. And when you mix Sentaors and architects up together in a single enterprise, the result can be more wondrous.

Take the matter of the new Senate Office Building. That's the place where the subway planned from the Capitol ended up unaccountably across the street. The place where the elevators find it difficult to rise. The place where for a time the public address systems in hearing rooms were haunted by pixies.

The new building has beautiful tile rubber floors—$100,000 worth of them. Now tile rubber floors are complete unto themselves. But the Seantors don't like them. So they have voted to spend $150,000 for office carpeting with which to cover them. This is like buying a statue of Venus and dressing it in a Mother Hubbard.

The carpeting poses a new problem. The building has 207 rooms with an average of three doors each. And they are thick, beau-

tifully made doors. But they were hung to go over tile floors snugly. With carpeting on top of the tile, the doors can't swing. So half an inch will have to be sawed off the bottom of each of more than 600 doors. And these are no ordinary doors, mind you, but walnut doors 2¼ inches thick.

Senators DOUGLAS, Democrat of Illinois, and PROXMIRE, Democrat of Wisconsin, suggest nonslip floor wax for the tile floors instead of expensive carpeting. But the Seante will hear none of it. It's going to be carpeting. If the House Un-American Activities Committee looked, it ought to find a great variety of reds in the Upper Chamber. At least there should be a lot of blushing faces.

Pay Rates for Employees at Airport Mail Facilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 20, 1959

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill to provide that employees at airport mail facilities who handle high priority airmail should receive the rate of pay which is justified by the complexity of their duties.

Buffalo is proud of its beautiful airport. As a Member of Congress from Buffalo, and as a member of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I am interested in air traffic at the Buffalo Airport, and also in the quality of postal service that airport is capable of rendering.

The airport mail facility at Buffalo is staffed by a group of devoutly loyal employees of the postal transportation service. Were they to receive double their present rate of pay, their devotion to duty could hardly be increased.

Nevertheless, since having come to Congress, I have learned of the way in which the Postal Classification Act of 1955 was intended to provide equal pay for equal work. By the standards of complexity of duties, by the tension of making sure that mail moves without interruption between the closely connecting air flights, and by the standards of more elaborate as well as more frequently changing scheme requirements, postal employees assigned to airport mail facilities such as that at Buffalo should be granted level-5 pay.

Most distribution clerks in the postal service are assigned to level 4, with a starting salary of $4,035 annually. The starting salary my bill proposes for airport mail facility clerks is $4,275 annually, or just $140 additional per year. This is just 55 cents per working day, or 7 cents per hour.

The Post Office Department has already authorized as high a rate of pay for some people who handle airmail in installations other than airport mail facilities. Under a job description titled "Mail Dispatch•Expediter," which the Post Office Department has numbered 2–198, the Department has authorized one level-5 position when distribution is performed in accordance with authorized airmail schemes.

At airport mail facilities, not only is mail distributed in accordance with such schemes, but it also meets the more demanding test of close-coupled contact with airline personnel to insure that connections are accomplished and that the highest priority class of mail suffers no delay.

Because of considerations such as these, I hope that my bill may be given early attention, and that the existing injustices may be corrected.

House Majority Leader John W. McCormack Speaks in Praise of Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 4, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, Congressman MCCORMACK has a soft spot in his heart for the underdog, whether it be one of his constituents in need, a public issue that requires a strong pleader, or a small nation that is determined to survive and prosper.

The experience of his Irish ancestors and the hardships they endured for their faith and their independence, helped to mold the character and the leadership qualities of JOHN MCCORMACK. No one has to ask him to speak up for any minority group. The fact that they need, and are deserving of support, is all that matters. He will battle for them—all the way.

Since he came to Congress almost 40 years ago, he has been a loyal and admired friend of the Jewish people. Time and again in those days he stood on the floor of this House to advocate the establishment of a national homeland for the Jewish people in Palestine.

After a long and arduous struggle, that dream has become a reality.

Who therefore has a better right to be the main speaker at exercises honoring the 11th anniversary of the State of Israel?

His address on this occasion was sincere, straightforward, and eloquent.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I insert in the RECORD the following editorial comment, titled "Champion of Liberty and Freedom," from the May 17, 1959, issue of the Lynn Telegram-News, published in Lynn, Mass.:

CHAMPION OF LIBERTY AND FREEDOM

House Congressional Majority Leader JOHN W. MCCORMACK delivered an inspiring address in Washington on the 11th anniversary of the State of Israel.

Congressman MCCORMACK, who enjoys universal respect for his unswerving honesty and loyalty, said: "The West needs Israel. There is in the whole Middle East no other real ally of the United States than Israel."

Serving in Congress since 1920, a period of nearly 40 years, the distinguished Congressman from Massachusetts, is well qualified to make the aforementioned statement.

He has followed the status of the State of Israel in the past 11 years and has repeatedly noted in his able manner the progress of this small democratic country and its splendid fight for peace.

The House leader commented in his address "that it was a credit both to the intelligence of the Israeli people and Israel's advanced state of development that Russia has seen fit to exclude Israel from its economic aid programs aimed at winning influence in the Mideast."

Congressman MCCORMACK has always fought for all freedom-loving people. He has been waging a continuous battle for the small nations who are seeking a way to unshackle themselves from the chains of their oppressors.

Liberty-loving free people have always had a champion in Congressman MCCORMACK.

Congressman MCCORMACK is a man of high principle, distinguished for his courage, ability, prudence and intelligence.

The minority groups of the world will always gain heart and courage from Congressman MCCORMACK, a true champion of freedom and liberty.

Economic Growth; Employment and Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 20, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to call attention to an editorial from the New York Times of May 18 by Edward H. Collins, entitled "Congressional Study—Views on Report's Implications That May Come Back To Haunt Authors":

CONGRESSIONAL STUDY—VIEWS ON REPORT'S IMPLICATIONS THAT MAY COME BACK TO HAUNT AUTHORS

(By Edward H. Collins)

The report of the Joint Congressional Committee on the Economic Report was submitted on March 9 by Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, of Illinois, chairman of the committee, on behalf of the majority members of that body. It was part of a 70-page document that included, as well, a minority report and the supplementary or additional views of several members of the committee.

As early as the second paragraph the report began to move rapidly toward what many observers were already convinced would be its central conclusion. That, in the words of the report, was a policy that would place "principal emphasis on prompt and full recovery from the 1957–58 recession" and would give "first priority to the attainment of maximum employment and production."

Before setting down its own choice of objectives, however, the report laid the foundation for it with a preface that was plainly designed as a tranquilizer for those thousands of Americans who, contemplating the spectacular flight of investment into stock market equities, the continuing drain on the country's gold stocks, and the historic dimensions of the 1959 peacetime budget, made no secret of the fact that they were decidedly cool toward the idea of administering further artificial stimulants to the economy.

TWENTY-FOUR-HOUR POLICY

The theme of this almost ritualistic preface was in its way, reminiscent of an observation attributed to the then Secretary of the Treasury, Henry Morgenthau, in the early thirties, when the dollar was in process of gradual devaluation. American international financial policy, Mr. Morgenthau was quoted as saying, was "on a 24-hour basis."

In its second paragraph the report of the joint committee pointed out that changing economic circumstances call for shifts of emphasis to be given the various economic objectives recognized in the Employment Act of 1946, as well as the objective of anticipating the danger of inflation.

A few paragraphs later it came back to this point a second time, dealing with it a little more emphatically.

"Economic prospects," it declared, "are subject to abrupt changes. Those responsible for public economic policies must remain alert, therefore, to the possibility of a resurgence of inflationary pressures, and must be prepared to deal promptly with any such developments." Thus, even before setting forth its own choice of policy emphasis, the authors of the report had made it abundantly clear that any proposals it might make would be subject not only to modification, but complete reversal, in case of any substantial change in the state of the economy.

That this gratuitous emphasis on the reversibility of economic policy was a shrewd political move at the time the report was being prepared is hardly open ot question. For the key figure underlying the policy adopted in that report was the January figure on unemployment, which stood at 4,724,000, or 6 percent of the civilian labor force. The prefactory observations of the innocent piece of byplay must have seemed by its authors at the time the bluest of blue-chip investments. One may perhaps be excused for wondering, however, whether today, 3 months later, the authors of this ingenious stratagem may not be asking themselves whether they might not have paid too high a price for it.

For in the weeks that have elapsed since then there have been some changes made, some of them of great importance. The most important single one of these is the fact that the unemployment figure of 4,724,000 has forfeited most of the significance that made it the center of the committee's policy proposals for 1959. The corresponding figure for April was 3,627,000. The recession peak of unemployment, touched in June, 1958, was 5,437,000.

By no means all of this, of course, was attributable to the recession. If we take the 2,900,000 total, which was the average for the three boom years, 1955–57, as a reasonable measure of full employment, then the recession-induced unemployment figure, even at its crest, was only 2,530,000. The April figures show that this has now been reduced by 1,810,000 or about 71 percent, which would put it at 727,000.

But this is by no means the entire story. In most of the discussion of the lag in employment in recent months, little attention has been paid to the element of seasonal influences, perhaps on the theory that the latter were either highly technical or unimportant, or both. Nothing could be less true. The fact is that, if one examines the weights attached to the figures on unemployment expectancy, one will find that, taking 100 for the average month, they range from as high as 117 in January to as low as 77.8 in October, an extreme swing of almost 40 percent.

What does this mean in terms of present reemployment prospects? It means this. We have put behind us in the first 4 months of the year a period in which unemployment figured to average 8.5 percent above the year's average and we are moving into a period of 8 months between now and the year-end when the indicated seasonal rate is 5.4 percent below average.

But even that is an unrealistically conservative figure, since it includes the month of June, which shows a sharp jump each year, but for a reason not pertinent to the present discussion. Both employment and unemployment are influenced in that month by the addition to the labor market of many thousands of young people seeking temporary summer jobs. If we omit June from our calculations we find that the situation for the remainder of the year points to a rate of unemployment 8 percent below the average for the year and 16.5 percent below the level normally indicated for the 4 months we have just put behind us.

Against this background it would be strange, indeed, if that sound investment of a few short months ago—the decision by the joint committee to emphasize with such fanfare the basic importance of reversibility in directing the Nation's economic policies—hadn't begun increasingly to assume the appearance of a promissory note tossed off in a moment of reckless abandon and that might be presented for payment almost any day.

Need for Increased Enforcement Personnel in the Internal Revenue Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH S. CLARK
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 20, 1959

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, excerpts from a letter I have received from the National Association of Internal Revenue Employees, which numbers 22,000 present and past employees of the Internal Revenue Service, the text of a resolution passed by the association, and a letter by Mr. Jerry Kluttz which appeared in the October 1958 issue of the association's bulletin, all dealing with the urgent need for increased funds to provide for a substantial increase in the number of enforcement personnel in the Service.

There being no objection, the letters and other matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REVENUE LETTER

(By Jerry Kluttz)

IRS hopes to escape the economy ax that's being swung on Federal agencies.

"We've already been through the economy mill," a high official commented, "and it's inconceivable to me that we'll be forced to take still another cut. We're down to muscle and bone now," he added, "the fat we had has disappeared."

The facts, he continued, show that IRS has taken a 10 percent cut in its staff since 1953, and that more than 5,000 jobs have been abolished since that time.

He also said that a Treasury order last year forced IRS to further reduce its staff, and that IRS's failure to get its full budget approved by the Congress will force it to abolish several hundred Revenue agent jobs as they are vacated.

It's no secret that several high-rank Treasury and IRS officials are convinced that IRS could collect millions more in Federal taxes if it had more agents and other types of employees to work on enforcement of the tax laws. The additional revenue would offset the cost of the employees as much as 20 to 1.

Despite the excellent case IRS has for an exemption from the economy order, many officials here say the pressure will be on IRS to save every possible dollar. If that happens, employee benefits such as higher grades, salaries, and promotions may have to be delayed.

The President has called on all Federal agencies to follow a policy of "Spartan economy" in their operations. He has ordered minimum cuts of 2 percent in their staffs to help offset the cost of the recent 10 percent pay raises. Most of the cuts, he feels, can be accomplished by abolishing jobs as they are vacated.

But the President's directive has a couple of loopholes through which agencies can win exemptions if they can show the cuts and economies would damage their vital programs.

IRS hopes to take advantage of them to escape most of the cuts but realists here believe that the agency will win only a partial exemption from the President's order and that it will be forced to show some economies.

RESOLUTION 5—REQUEST FOR REALISTIC APPROPRIATIONS

Whereas economy in the operations of the Government is a meritorious objective; an objective which should be the primary concern of each and every Federal employee, and in furtherance of such economy it may appear that a decrease in expenditures will effect savings resulting in a more economical operation; and

Whereas the Internal Revenue Service is scheduled to get $325.5 million for its operations for the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1958, which sum is the amount requested for the Internal Revenue Service by the Treasury Department, and such sum is identical in amount with that of the Internal Revenue Service budget for the present fiscal year and does not reflect any increase required by higher operating costs; and

Whereas it is contemplated that the major portion of the savings required to be accomplished to stay within the budgetary limitations will be met through an effective reduction in the number of employees, either through attrition or some other manner, or through limited capital expenditures for business machines, or both; and

Whereas testimony adduced at House Appropriations Committee hearings has consistently stressed that the Internal Revenue Service can obtain additional revenue ranging from $5 to $20 for each additional $1 that is spent, providing that such sums are available to hire additional employees; and

Whereas savings effected through a reduction in the amounts expended for additional employees or business equipment is a false type of economy which does not result in real savings, but merely defers the impact of the reduced revenue potential and is, in fact, a retrenchment; and

Whereas reports on the House Appropriations Committee hearings disclose that a greater appropriation for Internal Revenue Service activities would probably have been granted, if requested, as the explanation was made that the Internal Revenue Service was being given every cent that the Treasury Department had requested for it: Be, it, therefore

Resolved, That the Commissioner of Internal Revenue be urged to request appropriations which are realistic and which recognize that the explanation of budgetary limitations as a reason for inability to provide essential equipment, travel funds, personnel, or promotions is difficult to comprehend

when such budgetary ceilings are self-imposed; and be it further

Resolved, That it is the wish of this convention in view of the fact that the Commissioner of Internal Revenue does not finally determine or establish the amount of the appropriation to be allocated to administration of the Internal Revenue Service, his designated representative accompany the NAIRE committee for the purpose of appealing to the Secretary of the Treasury for more adequate funds to properly support the chief revenue producing agency of the United States.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF
INTERNAL REVENUE EMPLOYEES,
Washington, D.C., May 12, 1959.

The Honorable JOSEPH S. CLARK,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CLARK: This is in answer to your letter of April 28 in which you asked for the views of the association about the need for additional Internal Revenue Service personnel in connection with the reduction in the budget for the Internal Revenue Service.

I am having delivered to your office a supply of 30 copies of our association's publication, named The Bulletin, October 1958 issue, wherein is contained on page 6 Resolution No. 5, Request for Realistic Appropriations. This resolution was applicable to the budget for the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1958, and it was resolved that the Commissioner of Internal Revenue be urged to request appropriations which are realistic. It was further resolved that an appeal be made to the Secretary of the Treasury for adequate funds to properly support the chief revenue-producing agency of the United States. As an employee group, we are thankful for the leadership of Commissioner Dana Latham, who has given every indication of his desire to provide an adequate budget for the continuation of the Blue Ribbon Service program. We are as proud of him as we are of the Service and as an employee organization will endeavor to support his program in every possible manner.

It is noted in the release from your office dated April 10 that you have statistical figures issued Commissioner Latham as to the ratio of tax collection to costs of collecting revenue. The experience of our membership tends to bear out the figures as given you by Commissioner Latham. To give you an idea of the attitude of our members on this subject, I can only give you their general quotations, which are as follows:

"We are losing revenue because we are unable to make proper type audits and we are unable to audit a sufficient number of the returns where experience dictates additional enforcement is needed due to insufficient numbers of examiners. We have certain 'must' work which must be performed regardless of the number of available examiners. This includes such things as claims for refund and offers in compromise of liabilities which receive priority in our work assignments. We must audit all types and classes of returns to secure coverage. This coverage is needed to insure voluntary compliance in all tax areas. Due to the spreading thin of our agents in the priority work and to cover all types and classes, we are unable to audit a sufficient number of returns where experience shows that revenue potential is high.

"I believe that not enough has been said about voluntary compliance. In all news releases concerning our campaign for additional funds it has been emphasized that additional enforcement personnel would secure X additional dollars of deficiencies per dollar expended. All of us who are in the know are sure that lack of proper enforcement is an open invitation to otherwise voluntary compliance taxpayers to hedge on the tax liabilities reported on the returns filed. Without doubt additional enforcement would result in greater voluntary compliance.

"In my opinion our revenue officers have done an outstanding job in holding uncollected tax warrants to a minimum. However, as you doubtless know, there are millions of dollars of uncollected taxes in which there is no doubt as to the liability. There is a limit to the number of delinquent accounts which can be properly handled by any one revenue officer. There is no doubt that additional revenue agents and special agents would create further delinquent accounts and additional revenue officers must be hired to keep uncollected warrants to a minimum.

"There is no doubt in my mind but what office audit personnel could be doubled without reducing the average yearly productivity of approximately $60,000 each. Also, Internal Revenue agent personnel could be increased materially before reaching diminishing returns. The same would apply to revenue officers as considerable additional time should be devoted to canvassing. Enforcement of tax laws should be equitable and the application should reach as near 100 percent as possible.

"Our tax system is based on voluntary compliance. Voluntary compliance may be based on several things, including patriotism; however, there is no doubt that the main force behind voluntary compliance is the fear of getting caught. Every day awareness of enforcement is the best possible tool. This has been proven by highway patrols in enforcement of speed laws by radar signs, presence of highway patrolmen, etc."

Those of us who have been in enforcement work in the Internal Revenue Service have no doubts in our minds that the statutory laws pertaining to Federal income tax and the enforcement thereof by the Internal Revenue Service is one of the strongest bulwarks against the spread of crime in this country. It is only through increased enforcement that the effects of the criminal element can be diminished. In view of the concerted drive by all Federal agencies in this respect, it appears that this would be the most opportune time to increase the activities of the Internal Revenue Service by adequate budget measures, and I sincerely hope that you can impress upon your colleagues the desirability of providing the necessary means with which to effect this program through the Internal Revenue Service.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE BURSACH,
Secretary-Treasurer.

Education Necessary To Make Soldiers Effective

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 20, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, studies of the Armed Forces have shown that soldiers who are poorly educated are quite often ineffective.

I feel this is but another indication of the need for continuing aid to all phases of education in order to help the citizens of tomorrow prepare for and realize a better world.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Sherman (Tex.) Democrat for Thursday, May 14, 1959, under the heading "Ineffective Soldiers." That concise editorial in a paper noted for leadership in Texas, illustrates that a better educational effort is needed in this country for military defense as well as for production and peaceful prosperity.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Sherman Democrat, May 14, 1959]

INEFFECTIVE SOLDIERS

There were 2,500,000 men rejected or prematurely discharged by the Army in World War II. An 8-year study initiated by President Eisenhower when he was president of Columbia University reports among major findings that emotional disturbance was more frequent among the poorly educated.

Far more broke down because of Army life than because of the stress of combat. When faced with the challenge, most performed well. Those that couldn't were the poorly educated, those with handicaps in their backgrounds, or who were overwhelmed by the military situation. The least educated were four times less effective than high school and college graduates. Especially in the new Army, education will be the backbone of the Nation's defense.

Plight of Egg Producers in Oregon and the Pacific Northwest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 20, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, many of us who represent farm areas are concerned over the desperate plight of egg producers. Their prices are often far too low to meet the cost of production.

The Oregon Daily Journal of Portland, in its issue of May 12, 1959, published an excellent editorial summarizing the problem of egg raisers under the title of "Plight of the Egg Producer."

I especially agree with the portion of the editorial which suggests some banding together of egg growers to control production, so that prices will not drop otu of sight due to vast supplies which cannot be profitably sold. This is similar to the self-help legislation which I have been helping to cosponsor at the request of our Oregon turkey growers, who also have faced a somewhat comparable situation.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have printed in the Appendix of the Record the editorial from the Journal of May 12 on the abysmal economic conditions now being suffered by many egg producers in Oregon and elsewhere in the Nation. This editorial should help to dispel the notion that all farmer are prosperous and all farmers get Government bounties. Producers of the so-called basics may receive Federal price-support checks but egg producers do not.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PLIGHT OF THE EGG PRODUCER

Cheap eggs may be a joy to the consumer, but they are giving egg producers their toughest sledding since depression days. Eggs in Oregon and generally throughout the Nation are selling at the lowest level since the 1930's. Combine this with the fact that poultry feeds, due to Government price supports, are relatively in the stratosphere, and it is easy to understand the desperate straits of many poultrymen.

Eggs just now are in a seasonal flush of production, and when this is over prices may recover some, but low prices in the egg industry are more than a seasonal problem. Basically, it's a matter of year-around overproduction, due in part to a change from the old-fashioned chicken house, as a part of a diversified farming operation, to egg factories with streamlined methods and a kind of automation.

This is more true of some other States than Oregon, which still has quite a number of producers who combine egg production with general farming. In California, for instance, eggs are mass produced in "factories" with as many as 200,000 chickens. This trend is found also in Texas and in other States of the Southwest and South. Just the other day plans were announced for the world's biggest "henhouse" near Johnstown, Pa., where 1 million layers are to be kept under one 15.4-acre roof, with a minimum production expected of 14,000 cases of eggs weekly.

Factory-type operations are coming to Oregon, too, though on a lesser scale. A Journal story has described one in the Portland area where one man manages 14,000 hens through automatic watering, feeding, and lighting.

It's the old story of larger, more efficient operations putting the little fellow out of business, but at present prices, even the most efficient operators, who have large investments, are hard hit. And Harry Rohe, general manager of the Oregon Egg Producers Association, tells us that the man who relies on a diversified farming operation may weather the storm better than the specialist.

It's an easy thing to tell about the plight of the poultry producer. It's a harder thing to say what should be done about it. Some poultrymen have gone to Washington to seek Government action, including egg buying.

Rohe says producers in this area are less inclined to pin faith on this expedient, although it should be pointed out that the U.S. Department of Agriculture is buying some eggs, both for the school lunch program and to help supply needy persons and welfare institutions.

He believes the long-range answer is in a nationwide organization of producers which will act voluntarily to keep production from getting out of hand. A small surplus, even 5 percent, will have a disastrous effect on the egg market. If the producers themselves seek cooperatively to keep surpluses under control they will have a better chance of a fair price for their product, says Rohe.

As a temporary expedient, Oregon producers favor a Government purchase program for light-type laying hens to take thousands of birds out of production and thus reduce the egg surplus.

Like so many other phases of the farm problem, this one defies easy solution. Past experience indicates Government intervention does not provide a really satisfactory answer. The poultryman's problems would be less, in fact, without Government support of the feeds they must use. Efforts by the egg producers to find their own answers through stronger and more widespread organization appear the most commendable and to have the best chance to be effective.

Nasser, Dangerous Gambler

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 4, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a very interesting editorial which appeared in the Daily Evening Item of Lynn, Mass., on May 15, 1959, written by Joseph Lajed Israeli, newsman but now temporarily on the staff of that outstanding newspaper.

President Eisenhower expressed himself this week with utmost caution about the U.S. attitude toward the United Arab Republic. This caution seems to be more than justified.

The Middle East is one of the hottest spots in the cold war and, with all its oil, the Suez Canal, the airfields in Dahran and its strategic position on the map, the stake is great.

The key to any development in the Middle East lies in Nasser's hand and this is the key to an understanding of Nasser:

The President of the United Arab Republic is neither a Communist nor an anti-Communist. In fact he has no political ideology at all. But he has a dream: he is dreaming of a great Arab Empire. And the Caesar of the Arab Empire—this is most important—is going to be Gamal Abdel Nasser himself.

If you know this, you understand the gist of Nasser's policy. Nasser wants to destroy Israel for two reasons: First, the Jewish State doesn't fit into the frame of a future Arab Empire. Secondly, Egypt and Syria, the two countries which make up the United Arab Republic, are divided by Transjordan which could be easily conquered by Nasser, if he were not afraid of the Israeli Army which could—and probably would—interfere.

Nasser has had one rival in the leadership of the Arabs, Nuri-a-Said, Prime Minister of Iraq. He was a western statesman. So Nasser became pro-Communist, bought Russian arms and brought the Red influence to the Middle East.

The revolutionaries of Baghdad killed Nuri-a-Said and Kassem became Prime Minister of Iraq. Nasser hailed him as the liberator of the suppressed masses. Kassem became very popular among the Arabs. Too popular. A new rival in Arab leadership. Who is then supporting Kassem? The Iraqi Communists. Nasser became immediately anti-Communist.

Tomorrow, if the Martians will help anybody who might become a rival to Nasser in his frenzy to become the Caesar of the Arab Empire, Nasser would turn for help to the inhabitants of Venus.

Abdel Nasser is a gambler—a dangerous one. He is playing up, in turn, the West against the East, trying unscrupulously to fulfill his maniacal visions.

The Russian Tactics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT C. BYRD
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 20, 1959

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a column entitled "The Russian Tactics," written by Joseph Alsop, and published in today's issue of the Washington Post and Times Herald.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE RUSSIAN TACTICS

(By Joseph Alsop)

GENEVA.—With the Soviet and Western plans at last on the table, the Geneva conference has entered what may be called the minuet stage. The strange conventions of such rallies require the participants to perform a sort of formal dance, miming negotiation, before they really come to grips and seek results.

This seems a good moment, therefore, to take a sharp look at the peculiar Russian tactics which have produced this meeting and are being used here. Soviet diplomatic methods badly need to be better understood, precisely because they are so foreign to Western methods.

Never forget that one of the main Russian techniques of negotiation is to create an artificial state of tension, in order to be able to seem to give way later on, when they are really only diminishing the tension they themselves have created.

The first rule, laid down long ago by one of the wisest observers of the Soviet Union, has been faithfully followed in the present case. The status of Berlin had remained unchanged since 1949, when Khrushchev last November suddenly announced that this situation, already endured for close to a decade, was absolutely unendurable and intolerable. As the Khrushchev announcement was larded with the most naked military menaces, a state of extreme tension immediately resulted.

Remembering these menaces, a great many Westerners, including even some skilled Western diplomats, are inclined to regard the smiles that Andrei Gromyko is now painfully distributing as solid and substantial concessions. The smiles will not secure the maximum Soviet objective, Western abandonment of free Berlin. But even though Berlin's freedom is not to be sacrificed, the Soviets will get certain changes in Germany which will importantly benefit their East German puppets. And they will also get a summit meeting.

It is a very nice trick indeed, to get so much for so little, by the simple device of bellowing menaces and then putting on a false grin. It will also be a nice trick of the Soviets to smooth the road to the summit by making the concessions needed for an accord in principle on control of nuclear tests. They have always been more eager for such an accord than any of the Western nations. Yet if they move toward an accord, most Westerners will happily conclude that the Kremlin is at last in the mood for serious negotiations.

Great patience, the habit of bazaar bargaining, and totalitarian control of their

countries, are all required by national leaders desiring to use these methods of getting something for nothing. The czars of the past used these methods just as much as the present masters of the Kremlin. But another Soviet method that has been used in the Berlin crisis is decidedly more modern.

Even 2 years ago, when Nikita Khrushchev accurately warned this reporter that "even our glum Comrade Gromyko could be taught to smile on occasion," he also said something else of much greater import. He forecast that the other Western allies would cease to be comfortable about the American bases on their territories, when they began to realize that those bases made them natural targets for Soviet H-bombs.

That realization has been industriously promoted by Khrushchev, ever since the Berlin crisis began. The naked military menaces of the earlier period have now been succeeded by thoughtful little lectures crammed with useful facts and figures. On the eve of this conference, West German Socialist editors visiting Moscow were told by Khrushchev, for instance, that only eigh H-bombs would utterly destroy West Germany. There was a reprise of the same theme in Khrushchev's Kiev speech, and more reprises are to be expected later on.

It should be clearly understood, moreover, that this Soviet H-bomb rattling is already having some of the desired effects on the Western Alliance. The British, for instance, are already frankly uncomfortable because they regard the British Isles as natural targets. This discomfort has enormously influenced British policy from the beginning of the Berlin crisis. No one can predict how far such influences may carry later on, if the American Government continues to neglect the world balance of military power.

There, in truth, is the central fact of the Berlin crisis. This fact is already too easy to ignore. It will no doubt be blandly forgotten if we turn the Berlin corner without being frightened out of our wits. But it is still a fact that there would have been no Berlin crisis, if the Eisenhower administration had made the needed efforts to maintain the Western nuclear lead. And it is also a fact that worse crises have to be expected later on, if the military balance is allowed to deteriorate further.

The plain truth is that their form of society gives the Soviets certain important negotiating advantages, such as the freedom to use military menaces almost at will. If the Western Nations must also come to the negotiating table without real confidence in their own strength, then the Western cause will be doomed in the end.

Slogan and Slowdown

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 20, 1959

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, in mid-April the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] addressed a Jefferson-Jackson Day banquet in the tricity area of Pasco, Kennewick, and Richland, Wash.

Favorable reaction is still reaching my office from the searching and penetrating analysis given regional, national, and international issues in his address.

I request unanimous consent that Senator HUMPHREY's address of April 20 be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ENERGY FOR ABUNDANCE—REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, DEMOCRATIC DINNER MEETING, TRICITY AREA, WASHINGTON, APRIL 20

Here in this tricity area you not only stand at the confluence of two great rivers, the Snake and the Columbia, but also at the crossroads of two great historical achievements in man's quest for energy.

Here you receive the benefits of electric energy created by falling water from the multipurpose Grand Coulee Dam on the great Columbia River.

And here you are helping to bring about the most phenomenal of the long line of achievements in the power field—the development of electricity created by atomic power.

One of our greatest needs in America today is energy and more energy—energy to fulfill the infinite needs of man and his environment—energy for abundance.

Why do we need so much power?

We need an ever-increasing supply of power just to maintain our present standard of living. We need it to keep pace with a rapid increase in population—a population which will reach some 260 millions by 1930.

We need an ever-increasing supply of power to support our Defense Establishment.

We need power to remove poverty here at home and increase economic opportunity for all.

We need power to extend a helpful hand to less fortunate neighbors abroad.

We need power to serve as a living example of what free men can do with science and industry.

Whether ultimately we take the road of fission via hydrogen or fusion via nuclear fuels; whether we get our usable electricity by utilizing heat and turbines for electricity; or whether we achieve direct conversion of heat into electricity without the expense and waste inherent in the use of steam, we still must achieve an abundance of energy which should, in time, make all men free from the grueling toil of our ancestors, the malnutrition and famine of our contemporaries.

Power is our first line of defense in the cold war.

When I look at the amazing growth in Soviet generating capacity, my biggest concern is that we keep ahead in the kilowatt race—far ahead.

Between 1945—the last year of World War II—and 1958 the total generating capacity in the United States more than doubled. Our total output of electricity almost tripled. This is good, but not good enough.

The generating capacity of the U.S.S.R. jumped from 10.7 million kilowatts in 1945 to 48.3 million in 1957—more than a fourfold increase. Output there rose from 43.3 billion kilowatt-hours to 210 billion—almost fivefold. According to Allen Dulles of the CIA, their output by 1965 will rise to 460 billion kilowatt-hours—more than double in about 8 years—more than 10 times as much as 20 years earlier. In the cold war and the threatened competition in the economic field it is slight comfort to be assured that in 1965 our capacity will still be more than twice that of Russia—when we have quadrupled our capacity while they have multiplied theirs by 10.

I do not take the doctrinaire position that all the electrical energy we need should be public power, or private power. The problem is not that our sources of energy be in private or public hands, but that there be enough of it at economical rates.

I do not want to be misunderstood. In the drive for abundant supplies of low-cost energy there is—there must be—a place for Federal development, for the Federal yardstick in both hydro and atomic power. There is a place for State and local public power systems where the people want them. There is and should be a big place for private enterprise, regulated as a monopoly and stimulated by public competition.

I am not the imaginary "whole hog" strawman at which Mr. Eisenhower shoots somewhat more than imaginary darts in the form of scare words. But I have no doubts whatsoever as to the benefits which would be lost should private monopoly in the power industry be freed from competition by public and cooperative electric systems.

I have no reservations whatsoever about the continued desirability of construction of public generation and transmission facilities and the marketing of Federal power under the preference clause. I say to my friends in the private utility industry: In an economy of abundance, particularly here in the Northwest with your tremendous power potential, if Federal development went forward as rapidly as it should, there would be an abundance of low-cost power for all—from the smallest little cooperative to the largest private power company.

In this country, since 1953, we have been living under the influence of an administration hypnotized by its own sloganmakers. You are all familiar with the expensive slogans of recent years: "Get the Government out of the power business." "Unleash private enterprise to develop the Nation's rivers at no expense to the taxpayers." "Partnership." "Abolish the Federal monopoly on atomic energy and let American private enterprise do the job." "Reduce expenditures." "Reduce taxes." "Enlarge loopholes for the great corporations through accelerated depreciation." "Balance the budget at whatever cost."

Here in the Northwest you have seen the fruits of this policy of slogan and slowdown.

In spite of everything we could do, the Idaho Power Co. has acquired the great Hells Canyon site at an immense cost to the Northwest in terms of flood control, low-cost power, phosphate development, industrial growth, and all of the benefits which would have flowed from that great project.

You have witnessed years of inaction in the authorization of vitally needed projects.

You have witnessed the appointment to the International Boundary Commission of men like Doug McKay—men who speak the same language as the interests that have jeopardized the longstanding international cooperation between the United States and Canada on the full development of the Columbia.

You have been acutely aware of the way in which Federal budget recommendations for power and river development have dropped almost from sight.

The Pacific Northwest has 40 percent of the potential hydropower in the United States and only about a quarter of this has been developed. There is nothing more essential to the well-being of this Nation—yes, and to its security—than that we get on with the task of pushing this development to completion.

You, we, the entire Nation have already lost the equivalent of one Bonneville Dam at Hells Canyon. This is a luxury we can ill afford—even though the Congress was able to force the administration and the Idaho Power Co. to disgorge the $365 million subsidy which the administration had

granted to that company after it had pledged it would develope the middle Snake without a cent of the taxpayers' money.

It is time that we got about the business of harnessing the hydropower of the Northwest, increasing the irrigated lands to meet the needs of our growing population, controlling the destructive floods which threaten our lands, industry, commerce, and people.

If the psychology and slogans of the Eisenhower administration had been official policy in the old days, the Lewis and Clark Expedition would have been grounded in St. Louis for lack of funds; the Oregon Trail would have been closed to balance the budget; and the settling of the Northwest would have been postponed indefinitely as a threat to a stable dollar.

In 1954 the administration launched an all-out drive to give away the richest discovery in the history of man. That was the atomic energy program for which the Congress up to that time had voted something like $13 billion.

In Congress, because of the great leadership of your own Senators WARREN MAGNUSON and HENRY JACKSON, we were able to water down the giveaway. We were able to assert a preference right for nonprofit systems; we were able to write in an amendment permitting the Atomic Energy Commission to force the cross-licensing of patents.

But under our form of government, with its division of powers, the Congress—even when the Democrats have a majority—cannot govern the country. And the results of the great battle over the atomic energy program have not been heartening.

Year after year the Democrats in Congress have fought to get the money and executive support necessary to carry out a crash program on atomic energy. We have been met with a numbers game on what was being accomplished, or planned, or daydreamed, or hoped for, ad infinitum. So that today we are lagging behind England and the Soviet Union in the development of atomic energy.

Last year under the leadership of your Senator JACKSON and Senator MORSE of Oregon, we authorized a dual purpose reactor for Hanford, to produce both plutonium and electricity—700,000 kilowatts of electricity—two Bonnevilles. But the pressures against this reactor never cease. All we have so far is an installation under construction which can be made dual purpose, but the fight for the power part of the installation is still ahead of us.

There is still another battle we must somehow win. Senator JACKSON and those of us who support him have insisted that power from the Hanford reactor be fed into the Bonneville power grid where it can be utilized to its maximum to supply all of the people with low-cost power. But the Republican administration cannot see this proposal. Their vision stops at private utility stock market quotations.

The Republican administration is blind to the benefits of a giant power grid, which can tie together the generating facilities of an entire region.

The productive power of a modern industrial society is closely related to the cost per kilowatt-hour of electricity. And the economical production and transmission of electricity is inextricably tied to a "giant power" grid, envisioned a generation ago by Gov. Gifford Pinchot. In the Northwest the Bonneville power grid has given you the closest thing in the Nation, with the possible exception of the TVA area, to giant power. But we must build a power grid for the whole Nation which will enable us to tie giant atomic reactors to hydro and steam facilities so that the entire Nation may have the benefits of an abundance of low-cost power, supplied by public and private sources alike.

Taken as a whole, our power system is too much like our highway system 40 years ago. Some of you can remember the days when our highway system was largely a county and city affair. Even the paved roads—and there weren't many of them—looked like something kids in the first grade had drawn for fun. They were a few feet wide; they climbed any hill a team and wagon could climb; they zig-zagged around each farm or other obstruction, real or political. Adequate for a team and wagon, they were a challenge to even the model T and a positive threat to the occasional foolhardy spirit who wanted to push a White Steamer down them at 20 miles per hour.

We just could not have gotten very far into the 20th century with that kind of a highway system. So we did something about it.

But today the Nation's power grid is planned about as scientifically and with just about as much regard for the Nation's requirements as the counties planned highways 40 years ago. Part of the trouble—then and now—was inability of the local units to finance anything better. Part of the trouble—then and now—was an inability to conceive of anything that couldn't be seen from the window of a courthouse.

Our technicians can build a real power grid, and we can afford that kind of a power grid. We ought to have it. And we ought to have it soon.

Five hundred thousand kilovolt transmission lines which are only in the talking stage here are already in operation in Russia. The Russians are planning million-kilovolt lines with direct current transmission over which they can transport power 1,000 miles with only limited loss of energy. These lines will enable them to link giant hydro to giant thermal generators with the latter (if coal fired) built near coal mines. The economies of "hauling coal by wire" will be of great significance in achieving low-cost power.

In this great land peopled by "strangers from a thousand shores," we have moved mankind far in three centuries, blessed by immense natural resources and the greatest individual freedom of any industrial people in the history of the world.

Have we grown weary? Or old? Or afraid?

Are we prepared to lay down our burdens and give up our hopes and fall prey to our fears and distrust of each other?

I say no, and I believe the overwhelming majority of our people say "no." Let us go forward, contending as we may over our honest differences and over our various vested interests, but let us have an end to fears and the slogans of stagnation and sterility.

The highest wisdom, it has been said, is to dare. I believe this and I believe you do, too.

Nuclear Test Ban Pitfalls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 20, 1959

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I take this means to call attention to my remarks in this RECORD following the day's legislative business under title "Nuclear Test Ban Pitfalls." They summarize an important memorandum on that subject by Hon. Thomas E. Murray, former Atomic Energy Commissioner, and present consultant to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and are followed by the complete text of Mr. Murray's memorandum. I also call attention to the following related materials to be found in the RECORD:

"The Case Against the Nuclear Test Ban," an editorial from Air Force magazine, Wednesday, April 29, 1959, at pages A3631–A3632.

"Communist Diplomatic Perfidy," my compilation of Soviet treaty violations and reasons therefor, Thursday, May 14, 1959, at pages 7373–7376.

Fight Rice With Rice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. A. THOMPSON
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 20, 1959

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, because of my great interest in the rice industry and rice as a food for Americans, I would like to refer the membership of the House to the factual story of some of the benefits that can be derived from rice—other than that of helping the rice farming industry—and the phenomenal results as stated by my good friend and columnist of note, Bill Keefe, in the Times-Picayune of April 14, 1959:

FIGHT RICE WITH RICE

Louisiana State University's football squad, with its sights set on a second straight national intercollegiate championship, will rely on a Cannon and Dietzel fuel for initial power this fall. The Cannon, in this case, is all-American Halfback Billy Cannon; the Dietzel fuel is a feeding theory introduced to Coach Paul Dietzel's training table by Trainer Marty Broussard.

When commissioned by Dietzel to find a high-energy food to fit into the Fighting Tigers' diets, Broussard's search confined him to his home State, and to a familiar figure at LSU football games—Dr. J. Norman Efferson, dean of the university's college of agriculture. After a series of huddles with Dr. Efferson, Broussard unveiled his energy-packed formula at the training table: rice in its various forms. The fact that the Tigers meet the Rice Owls in the first game of the season, which will be nationally televised, puts an emphasis on rice.

The steps Broussard took to set the Tigers' training table with energizing food were analytical, but simple. Dr. Efferson had proved that a pound of rice contains 1,644 calories of energy. The dean's research figures also showed that a single calorie of energy will move 1 pound about 3,000 feet. Broussard transferred these statistics into football terms. He reasoned that a calorie of energy would move the average football player, weighing 200 pounds, some 15 feet. (That's 200 into 3,000.)

A pound of rice, according to Broussard's theory, would provide enough energy to move a typical player 24,600 feet, or 8,229 yards. This is more than ample for the average football game, in fact, for nearly the entire season.

"I can't say that we went undefeated last year because we ate rice," says Broussard, who is president of the Southeastern Conference Trainers Association. "But studies here have convinced me that rice is a quickly assimilated energy food, high in carbohydrates, vitamins, and minerals. It's that easily digestible energy factor that interests

me," Broussard points out, "because now we can send a boy out on the field with something in his stomach that won't slow him down."

Dr. Efferson, a research pioneer in the rice industry, said, "If we didn't think that rice had high energy and was a quickly digested food, we wouldn't recommend it to our athletic department."

Coach Dietzel, who earned coach of the year honors last season, enthusiastically endorses Broussard's formula. "They've convinced me that rice is an important energy food. That's why you'll find it on our training table."

Oklahoma Salutes Two Great Texans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED EDMONDSON
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 20, 1959

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure to place in the RECORD a resolution recently adopted by the State Senate of Oklahoma, commending our distinguished and beloved speaker, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, and his distinguished fellow-Texan who is the able majority leader of the Senate, the Honorable LYNDON JOHNSON.

Both Speaker RAYBURN and Senator JOHNSON have through the years won a firm and enduring place in the hearts of all Oklahomans.

Their friendly assistance in matters of keen interest to Oklahoma has been a great help to all of us in the Oklahoma congressional delegation. They have been good neighbors in the finest sense of the term, and their friendship is treasured by every Oklahoman in this body.

Beyond this, however, both of these great Texans have won the admiration and respect of their colleagues by their continuing demonstration of statesmanship of the highest order in their roles as congressional leaders. America is a stronger and a finer place in which to live because of the solid rocks which Speaker RAYBURN and Senator JOHNSON have added to its foundations, during their distinguished terms of service in the Congress.

I am pleased to note the recognition of these two great Americans in the State Senate of Oklahoma, and am further pleased to call this resolution to the attention of the House:

ENROLLED SENATE RESOLUTION 44

Resolution commending the Honorable LYNDON BAINES JOHNSON, majority floor leader, U.S. Senate, and the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, Speaker, House of Representatives of the United States; directing that this resolution be spread upon the pages of the permanent, Journal of the Senate of the 27th Legislature of the State Oklahoma; and directing that duly authenticated copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Honorable LYNDON BAINES JOHNSON, to the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, and to each honorable Member of the Oklahoma delegation in the Congress of the United States.

Whereas the Honorable LYNDON BAINES JOHNSON, majority floor leader, U.S. Senate, and the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, Speaker, House of Representatives of the United States, personify the finest qualities of American statesmanship and political leadership; and

Whereas these statesmen have, over a period of many decades, ably served their State and Nation in positions of high responsibility; and

Whereas during these many years of public life and constructive accomplishments for the people of this Nation these gentlemen have compiled a record of public service unparalled in the annals of modern U.S. history; and

Whereas these statesmen from our neighboring State of Texas combine the rugged and exemplary qualities of the pioneering spirit of America with the 20th century concept of constructive progress in the art and science of government; and

Whereas, the knowledge gained from many years of political life and service to their fellow men is an invaluable asset to the Government and people of the United States and a high goal worthy of attainment by those who serve everywhere in high public office; and

Whereas the outstanding record of statesmanship and public service written in the Nation's Capitol and in the State of Texas by our esteemed and highly respected neighbors to the south will live forever in the hearts and minds of those who adhere to the principles of integrity, service, and progress in government; and

Whereas these gentlemen have endeared themselves, not only to the great Democratic Party, of which they are outstanding leaders, but also to all the people of this Nation; and

Whereas, it is the consensus of this body that these statesmen are ever vigorous and progressive in their devotion, sacrifices and services in the public interest and in their foresight for the future role of this country; and

Whereas, the Honorable LYNDON BAINES JOHNSON and the Honorable SAM RAYBURN have set a high and enviable standard in the political life of this Nation which stands as a worthy goal for those aspiring to positions of governmental leadership: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the 27th Legislature of the State of Oklahoma, That this body hereby officially commends the Honorable LYNDON BAINES JOHNSON and the Honorable SAM RAYBURN for their exemplary record of public service and conscientious devotion to the public interest, extending over a period of many decades, and for their progressive planning and foresight in guiding the future destinies of this great country.

That this resolution be spread upon the permanent journals of the Senate of the 27th Legislature of the State of Oklahoma as an indelible record of the appreciation and esteem of this body for the Honorable LYNDON BAINES JOHNSON and the Honorable SAM RAYBURN: Be it further

Resolved, That duly authenticated copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Honorable LYNDON BAINES JOHNSON, to the Honorable SAM RAYBURN and to each honorable Member of the Oklahoma delegation in the Congress of the United States of America.

Adopted by the senate the 12th day of May 1959.

———, *Acting President of the Senate.*

CERTIFICATION

I, Leo Winters, secretary of the senate of the State of Oklahoma, do hereby certify that the above and foregoing is a true and correct copy of Enrolled Senate Resolution No. 44 as the same was adopted by the Senate of the 27th Legislature of the State of Oklahoma, the original hereof being on file in the office of the secretary of state of the State of Oklahoma.

Witness my hand and the seal of my office at the State capitol this 12th day of May 1959.

LEO WINTER,
Secretary of the Senate.

The Other Side of the Transportation Coin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 20, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, one of the best-qualified persons in the United States to discuss our transportation system, overall or otherwise is Hon. Anthony F. Arpaia, a member of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

On May 14, 1959, at the 28th annual banquet of the Rhode Island Truck Owners Association, held at Providence, R.I., Commissioner Arpaia made a frank, objective, and challenging address, which I include in my remarks:

THE OTHER SIDE OF THE TRANSPORTATION COIN

I could, I suppose, discharge my function here by a talk which would be pleasing and comforting to your ears. It would start by praising the important contributions which you, as regulated carriers, have made to the development and stability of our country; the great job you are doing in meeting the needs of commerce, etc.; how our standard of living, productive capacity, and trade depend on the effectiveness of public transportation.

In fact, it is easy to make grandiloquent comments concerning the importance of public transportation. It is virtually impossible to overestimate the value of transportation as a whole to production and distribution, the overall development of our economy, and the specialization which it permits, whether of natural resources or human skills.

But, as a famous British writer once said, "There's no weapon that slays its victims so surely as praise." And sometimes, when one reflects upon the haphazard complex of our transport media as it is composed today, there is just cause to wonder whether the orthodox concept of public transportation is still valid. The fate of public carriage has certainly been the subject of a lot of worry, study, and talk by experts and nonexports, but its future is still shrouded in confusion and conflict rather than in progress and stability.

Under the circumstances, then, I guess it is better to pause and reflect, to refrain from indulging in pious platitudes, and to stop feeding ourselves a diet of easily digestible pap. It may be smarter to get a little cynical and hypercritical—to analyze this welter of transport operations and try to find out where we stand and where we're going before it is too late.

WHAT HAS HAPPENED TO PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION?

For many years, when railroads were virtually the only source of carriage, they had a clear track. There was no basic standard or measure of the efficiency or true cost of their service. Reasonableness of rates was measured, not by meaningful standards of performance and economy, but by what the traffic would bear. To the extent cost was considered, it included fancy financing resulting in overcapitalization, high fixed

charges, duplication, and anything else attributable to railroad operations. Shippers, in general, had no alternative but to accept service as it was and pay the price asked. The Commission was on hand to protect shippers against unreasonably high and discriminatory rates, etc., but the base on which those rates was fixed was never in question.

When motor carrier service came into being, these operators, not having any conceptual basis for pricing, generally adopted the railroad rate structure for their own. This worked out very nicely for them (and the railroads, too) because it afforded them the opportunity to compete at the railroads' higher rates on high valued and attractive traffic without immediately breaking down the general level of prevailing rates for railroads. The shipper got no real relief from inefficiency and lack of economy.

Then came private carriage. For the first time in modern history of transportation, many shippers had a practical alternative of taking public transportation or leaving it. A shipper's cost of providing his own service could be realistically compared with the rates charged by public carriers. He could also size up offered standards of service with those he himself could produce and control.

The extent to which public carriers are unable to meet the present standards of cost and service of private carriage is the real root of the present plight of public transportation. The question follows: Why aren't they able to do so? Before I try to answer this question, let's analyze.

WHAT TRAFFIC IS LEFT FOR PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION

There are still some commodities which are not readily susceptible to private or exempt transportation, and there are also some shippers, usually small shippers, who are not in a position to use private transportation. Also, there are some occasions when even those who use private transportation for a substantial portion of their traffic must resort to public transportation. Then, of course, volume shippers through the power to bargain are able to get commodity rates established which match what they want to pay. There are some commodities attractive to carriers because they move in large quantity. These illustrate the type of traffic left for public carriers and for which they make their pitch by slashing rates.

The present outlook

The total traffic of regulated carriers is still substantial, yet the percentage of the Nation's transportation service performed by them is constantly falling. Whether its erosion will continue and duplicate the history of passenger traffic depends on whether public transport is able to meet this revolution in the pricing and movement of goods with a successful counter revolution. To the extent that public carriers continue to do business at the same old stand in the same old way, they obviously cannot do so and prosper. Meanwhile, motor common carriers are hamstrung by hodge-podge of certificate restrictions both as to commodity and territory which limit their efficiency; railroads seem moribund under a staggering load of fixed charges, waste, duplication, passenger deficits, and local taxes; and coastal water carriers complain that they are being driven out of business.

The handicaps of public transport

In my opinion, some of the handicaps of public transportation are of the carriers own making and some are due to regulatory law and procedures.

The private and exempt carriers have many advantages. They have no terminal costs, no obligation to carry less truckloads and no restrictions on routes or territory. They can take the most direct, convenient and economical route and serve any point at will.

The certificated motor carrier, on the other hand, must comply with many restrictions which limit economy, flexibility and maximum utilization of equipment. These limitations apply to commodities or to routes and points, or both. Few motor carriers, indeed, have broad general commodity authority to all points they serve and ideal territorial limits.

Railroads were built, in part, by promoters, and not by hard-headed businessmen. In such cases they did not meet transportation demands in existence or reasonably foreseeable. Some of them have never been able entirely to overcome the handicap of lack of economic justification. With the development of the truck, such handicaps have become magnified. Where short hauls, numerous interchanges, duplicate administrative and solicitation expense, multiple terminals, high fixed debt and reduced volume are involved, railroads are not geared to meet the competition of one who carries his own goods.

Then there is the handicap of complacent, unprogressive management. In spite of other handicaps, real or imagined, there is too much lack of initiative in regulated transport. Whatever else either the law or the Commission can be blamed for, they do not select management and cannot control management policy and direction, which is sometimes blundering, incompetent or worse. The fact that, under the same law and regulation and under the same economic conditions, some carriers succeed and others fail demonstrates this. Failures have become successes with changes in management and vice versa.

Of course, the overall factor of general economic conditions affects public transport differently than ordinary business. We are bound to have recessions or economic squalls. Most businesses can easily survive such setbacks. Carriers, on the other hand, have a fixed plant, and operate on a low margin of profit. They sell service and nothing more. They cannot build inventories in anticipation of a pickup later or live on inventory. When volume drops, revenue drops, period.

What are carriers doing to overcome their handicaps?

Even now, most carriers don't seem to recognize their real deficiencies. They seem to be under two illusions: (1) that there is a fixed amount of transportation to be performed, and (2) that if the price is rigged sufficiently high, everything will be "jake." Unfortunately, as I pointed out before, the transportation plant is no longer completely in the hands of certificated carriers. It is in the control of shippers—they can add to it at will.

Or, as an alternative, carriers resort to the other extreme and slash rates regardless of profit on the wishful theory that somewhere, somehow, other traffic can be made to carry the load. With lack of vision they reduce rates to their out-of-pocket costs, not appreciating that their costs are of less than academic interest to shippers who can use private carriage. What they have to meet is the shipper's cost of performing the service. Since their present technique of reducing rates has not been effective, they should use more effort to cut out some of the layers of waste at the bottom of the cost pile. This alternative has not been pursued.

There has been no real endeavor to bring down costs where it counts by a fundamental change in the techniques of getting the goods from origin to destination quicker, cheaper, and better than any shipper can do it for himself. Carriers certainly cannot do it by trying to improve their own lot by putting as many roadblocks as possible in the path of a competitor. Nor, can it be done by rigid adherence to the present wasteful methods of operation. Two courses seem inescapable: to eliminate waste and unnecessary costs within each form and to provide services in combination, not only to produce additional savings, but to improve service.

To what extent has regulation been a handicap?

Now that I have said my piece, at least in part, about the lack of realistic understanding and action by the public transport industry, it is also fair to ask: Does regulation contribute to the difficulties which surround public transportation?

That a service as vital to our welfare as transportation requires some measure of control goes without saying, but we should be open minded about its scope and extent in the light of the revolution which has taken place. We should also make sure that regulation does not become a narcotic or a bromide which lulls not only the public, but the carriers themselves, into a false sense of security and protection. In this day and age of risk for the free world and its institutions, there is no room for smugness. In the light of the ever-increasing growth of unregulated transportation, we cannot persist under the illusion that public transportation will be able to fill its expected role merely because the Government has a hand in it.

Is any part of regulation anachronistic?

Now, the pat answer to that is: "The Interstate Commerce Act has been amended many times. It was amended only last year. It's as fresh as this morning's paper." True, since 1887, there have been many amendments to the act. Before 1920, changes were urged by shippers; since that time they have been generally urged by carriers.

In spite of amendments to the act, no substantial and fundamental alteration has been made in the basic approach of transportation regulation. This, in spite of tremendously significant developments in our economy, technology, in methods of production, distribution, and shipper and public habits and needs since the 1930's.

Practically every revision of the act and the adoption of a transportation policy has been to broaden the coverage of regulation rather than to narrow it. Peculiarly, this has been out of a desire by regulated carriers to help themselves by imposing stricter controls on everybody else. The justification was, of course, that this would strengthen public transportation and in this sense serve as a public purpose.

I personally think that transportation regulation covers too broad a field and that the approach should be changed. There are certain carrier activities which could be removed from regulation without damage to the public. There are others which instead of requiring prior approval each step of the way could be made subject to complaint or investigation when and if the public interest warrants. In other words, the sphere of regulation should be reduced and the emphasis should be shifted to where it serves a worthwhile purpose.

As an aside, I deem it necessary to make some observations regarding an apparent indifference on the part of the public respecting the present scope of transportation regulation. Last year extensive hearings were held by the Senate Subcommittee on Surface Transportation. The air was charged with emergency and the sole objective at the time was to save the railroads. In this atmosphere, in addition to many carrier witnesses, there was also some public testimony. Three things impressed me:

(a) Almost without exception all witnesses who represented shippers were in favor of less regulation. The National Industrial Traffic League, the United States Chamber of Commerce, eastern food processors and dis-

tributors, peanut producers, poultry packers, farmers and farm groups, private carriers, etc., were all in favor of either broadened exemptions or loose regulation. It is noteworthy, however, that individual small businesses did not otherwise appear or have their day in court.

(b) The editorial comment in magazines and newspapers was predominantly in favor of relaxed regulation. Even assuming that these editorials were inspired or planted, as is sometimes claimed, there was no pronounced public rejection of them by shippers either by way of letters to the editors or, as far as I know, letters to the Congress.

(c) The Secretary of Agriculture and other witnesses testified that unregulated transportation was more efficient and cheaper than regulated transportation. A recent study by the Department of Agriculture reasserts this view.

While hasty conclusions should not be drawn from the type of record and the limited scope of the hearings before the subcommittee, the indifferent reaction of the public to regulation as it now stands should cause some eyebrow raising.

1. Does it indicate that regulation has lost its original significance?

2. Is there some coverage of regulation which is being forced upon the public unnecessarily?

3. Does regulation provide a refuge or shelter for inefficient and incompetent carriers?

4. Does regulation encourage rather than prevent economic waste and inefficiency in transportation as a whole?

5. Or, to put it in a more general way, assuming that transportation had never been regulated; would there be any demand for regulation under present conditions; and, if so, to what extent? This last question is provocative. It is important to pose it if only to shock carriers and shippers into a realization of what may be the present temper of the general public.

There are major considerations which shippers and the public should carefully weigh should the issue of emasculation of regulation be placed squarely before them. I shall mention only a few:

1. History which shows that carriers can weaken themselves through cutthroat practices and rate cutting. When railroads were competing only with each other they did exactly this.

2. The fact that 48 States might exercise jurisdiction in areas in which there would be no Federal regulation would create an impossible burden on interstate commerce.

3. The fact that shippers located in outlying points, particularly less-truckload shippers, would be prejudiced because carriers would naturally prefer to give the service first to those who are more easily accessible and furnish full truckloads. Such shippers might be compelled to pay a premium for service since there would be no common carrier obligation to serve all points and all shippers equally.

4. Needed connecting lines could be ruined by discriminatory practices of railroads seeking to preserve their own long hauls without regard to the most direct and economical routes.

But there are, it seems to me, some areas in which regulation could be relaxed. Many times while pondering the growing volume of matters where the only parties are carriers vying with one another to obtain some petty advantage or interpose some obstruction or impediment in the path of competitors, I ask myself: What real purpose does all this serve except to benefit one carrier at the expense of another? There is a hopeless volume of proceedings, many of dubious importance to transportation as a whole, which comes before the Commission. We have tried to keep up with the incoming flow but we seem to be swimming against the tide.

However insignificant the impact may be on transportation, each matter receives the same due process and formal consideration. Important and far-reaching proceedings are in the meantime awaiting their turn. This treatment is unavoidable because of the volume and variety of work the Commission must administer under the many sections of the Interstate Commerce Act and the procedural requirements of the Administrative Procedure Act.

There are today some activities of carriers which are of no perceptible impact on the public but which are nevertheless covered by regulatory law. Their elimination would result in savings in time, expense and energy to everybody by reducing many present, fruitless requirements which the Commission must follow. The area of coverage should be confined to conditions which are current. The sheer volume of proceedings serves to deprive the public of decisions within a reasonable time on vital matters of broad scope. And delay is just as galling to Commissioners, I can assure you, as it is to the parties.

The present provisions of section 5 relating to pooling, common control, acquisitions, consolidations, etc., offer a good illustration of what I mean. It is plain hardship to subject motor carriers, whose total investment amounts to as little as $50,000, $60,000, $70,000 or $100,000, to prolonged and expensive proceedings which involve the time of our investigative staff, our examiners, as well as our processing staff, merely because common control of two carriers must receive prior approval. Yet the carriers involved are relatively small and the impact on the soundness of transportation is virtually nonexistent.

I have seen dockets in these types of cases over a foot high and 4 years old where there has been a hearing, rehearing, petitions, reconsideration, reopening, and every other device in the book used by competitors to delay a decision on the application. Should the Commission spend so much of its time trying to determine whether common control of two such carriers should be approved, when their total gross annual volume may be less than a few million dollars? The same applies to issuances of securities, mergers, consolidations, and pooling.

Do carriers abuse regulatory procedures?

The time has come for carriers to reappraise their attitude toward the purpose and function of regulation. It is not to protect them against each other at the expense of the public and national welfare. Carriers seem to expect that the task of regulation is complete when it adjusts private disputes between them regardless of what their actions do, or fail to do, to help serve the public aims of regulation.

Let me illustrate. Under setcion 204(b), the Commission is empowered to establish just and reasonable classifications of groups of carriers as the special nature of the services performed by such carriers shall require. In October of 1952, the Commission made a valiant effort to correct the repetition of the uncertainties and ambiguities which arose from the inept descriptions contained in certain grandfather certificates which had been processed without any basic standards or guides.

The investigation known as Ex Parte No. MC–45, Descriptions in Motor Carrier Certificates, was instituted in October 1949, and over 100 lawyers representing interested parties participated. Its purpose was praiseworthy—namely, to achieve logical and broader groupings of commodities in certificates.

Because of the selfish and petty attitude of protestants who relentlessly oppose every grant and seek to impose as many restrictions, exclusions, and limitations as possible on every applicant for operating authority, we are right back where we were before, if not worse. I submit that their objective is not to promote efficiency in transportation in the public interest. It is to make a competitor as inefficient as possible.

The Commission is caught in a vise. How can this sorry scheme of operating authorities (as Mr. Blanning, former Director of the Bureau of Motor Carriers characterized it) be corrected and the staggering volume of proceedings which result as a consequence be diminished?

If motor carriers would only realize that their efforts to freeze a pattern of uneconomic operations on their competitors, without regard to the interest of the public, may aggravate the situation to the point that shippers may press Congress to take action to correct this uneconomic pattern. They should be told that Congress can, with one fell swoop if it desires, wipe out every commodity limitation and every route and point restriction in every certificate; or, it can, in fact, abolish regulation altogether. It could, if it so desired, provide that any certificated carrier which transports one or more of a certain class of commodities can transport them all to any and all points, intermediate, off route, etc., in the territory which it is authorized to serve. And this can happen.

Shippers' reaction to the lack of constructive attitude of carriers

Regardless of how the carriers feel about it, shippers are getting sick and tired of trying to find out which carrier can transport what particular commodity to which points. Recently, a shipper, who has turned to private carriage, told me that the immediate occasion for doing so was that his shipping dock could accommodate only four trucks at one time and that he had no room to enlarge it and no desire to make the investment to do so. He said, "There is a virtual circus at my plant every day. Some mornings as many as 20 trucks line up in the street and in the yard trying to make deliveries. One carries one thing, another, something else. No wonder the rates are high and service is poor. The motors are running and the drivers are waiting while we are waiting for deliveries. Why, in heaven's name, can't one or two carriers be authorized to transport all the commodities which I need?" If motor carriers insist on being shortsighted and petty, the day will come when the public will get so disgusted at this economic waste that there will be demand for the repeal of motor carrier regulation.

The proper role of regulation

Regulation, in my opinion, should be a ballast to keep the transportation scheme from foundering in the heavy sea of destructive forces, but it is not intended to be used as a weapon to obstruct or kill off competitors. Nor can regulation be used as an instrument to deny the public of the manifold advantages of an efficient, low-cost service.

Decisions of management, unless harmful to the public, should be beyond the reach of Government interference. This is what makes carrier enterprise private instead of regimented, and it is the way to make private enterprise enterprising. This can't be done by holding public carriers on a short chain without real justification.

The Subcommittee on Surface Transportation in its report on S. 3778 hit the nail on the head when it stated:

The subcommittee, from its observation of the Commission, is not satisfied that the Commission is devoting its efforts to the most fruitful areas of regulation. The Commission should earnestly examine the Interstate Commerce Act, and related acts, and come forward with legislative recommendations which will reduce its sphere of action to matters which fundamentally af-

fect transportation. There are some activities now required of the Commission which are of no great consequence but which take time and effort. This attention could be devoted to matters of greater significance. These matters of importance are now delayed because of preoccupation with relatively minor problems.

The Commission should be in the best position to recommend how the sphere of regulation can be reduced. If it doesn't do so, then somebody else will.

Two separate governmental investigations of transportation have been recently authorized: one by the Senate (Res. 29) and another by the Secretary of Commerce. The investigations when undertaken should not be conducted in an atmosphere of crisis and emergency. They should reflect the true public and shipper interest. But if the representations in such inquiries are predominantly those of special interests and pressure groups—the situation may become even more chaotic and deterioration will go on apace.

The carriers in the meantime can do much to improve themselves by collectively developing means of improving service and reducing costs. There is no future safety either for the carriers or the public in vindictive partisanship, selfish interest and cynical disdain for the public interest.

Further, regulated carriers should not expect the Government to rescue them from the consequences of inefficiency and lack of initiative. In order to meet their real competition, private carriage, they must drastically overhaul their methods of operation. Singly, experience shows it cannot be done. Similarly, to the limited extent it has been tried, experience shows that through joint operations between all forms of transportation it can be done. Yet, only a few are trying and they are blocked at every turn by the diehards.

These diehards just don't believe there is oxygen in the air because they can't see it. If they continue in this attitude, they are not only deluding themselves, they are performing a distinct disservice to our treasured heritage of free enterprise and are laying the foundation for the demise of public transportation as a private business.

Foreign Ministers' Meeting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 20, 1959

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert the following statement from the Gaffney Ledger, Gaffney, S.C. of May 16, 1959.

FOREIGN MINISTERS' MEETING

The Foreign Ministers' meeting in Paris is a test for the democracies. The ministers must remain unified, and must see to it that a foundation of solidarity is established for the prospective summit meeting.

There has been general agreement among the Western democracies on the question of rights in Berlin. However, there has been some wavering on the part of Great Britain, at least, on the question of what alternatives would be employed if the Soviet Union sticks to its threat about the supply of Berlin.

We repeat what we said about the situation several weeks ago. There is absolutely no reason for President Eisenhower to attend a summit meeting concerned largely with the Berlin crisis. That crisis is an artificial crisis, created by the Russian for a purpose.

We suspect that one of the purposes behind the creation of the Berlin crisis was to divert attention from Iraq and Iran, where the main Soviet move today is being made. We are standing behind our rights in Berlin, and to meet on the crisis, in the spirit of "compromise," is merely to admit that we will compromise away some of our rights.

We must be on the offensive in any summit meetings. We must demand that the Russians give freedom to Hungary, stay out of Iraq and Iran, and make concessions looking toward German unity. If the Russians will not give ground on any of these issues, then they will have adopted an obstinate position.

Area Redevelopment Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 20, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the House Banking and Currency Committee has reported a necessary and important bill, S. 722, House Report No. 360. In this connection, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following report on the problem of distressed areas in the State of New York. This report was published by the Area Employment Expansion Committee of New York City:

AREA REDEVELOPMENT FACT SHEET NO. 61, NEW YORK STATE

The Empire State is among those which would benefit from the proposed area redevelopment legislation. While the total number of areas immediately affected constitutes a somewhat smaller proportion of the total of the State than is prevalent in other States where there are more chronically distressed areas, yet the problems are none the less serious in this State.

In January 1959, there were 1 major labor market, Utica-Rome, and 11 smaller areas which would become eligible immediately for benefits under the area redevelopment bill (table I). Their total civilian labor force was over one-half million people, which probably represented some 6 percent of the State's working population (table II). The average rate of unemployment in these areas was 11.9 percent. It would take 29,865 new jobs to eliminate the unemployment in excess of 6 percent in these areas.

In addition, there were 6 major labor markets, 4 smaller labor markets and 3 very small labor markets in which there was a substantial labor surplus. Continued high unemployment in these areas would graduate them into the chronically distressed state. It is probable that some of these areas will reach this condition.

There are 23 counties for which no labor market data are currently available.

DISTRESSED AREAS

A. Major labor market

Utica-Rome: This large labor market in central New York State, including both Oneida and Herkimer Counties, suffered seriously from the postwar contraction of the textile industry. It has struggled desperately to replace some of the textile jobs with new durable goods plants, but these have also been hard hit by unemployment. While these plants have opened up new jobs for the younger people, they have not provided job opportunities for the older population. As a result the rate of unemployment in the labor market in January 1959 was 11.8 percent.

The unemployment rate reached a high of 11.3 percent in January 1955, but had declined in the subsequent years reaching a low in the fall of 1956 (table III). In 1958 this labor market again suffered reverses so that the average unemployment rate for 1958 was 10.4 percent. The community needs considerable assistance to revamp its basic economic structure.

B. Smaller labor markets

Eleven smaller labor markets have had a high rate of unemployment for long enough periods to become eligible for benefits under the area redevelopment bill.

The following are the periods during which these smaller labor market areas have been certified as having had substantial labor surpluses:

Smaller Labor Market and Periods of Substantial Labor Surplus

Amsterdam: June 1954 through September 1956; March 1958 to date.

Auburn: January 1955 through July 1955; April 1958 to date.

Batavia: March 1958 to date.

Elmira: April 1958 to date.

Glens Falls-Hudson Falls: June 1958 to date.

Gloversville: November 1952 through September 1955; April 1958 to date.

Kingston: September 1958 to date.

Newburgh-Middletown-Beacon, July 1958 to date.

Oneida: June 1958 to date.

Plattsburgh: March 1959 to date.

Watertown: April 1958 to date.

Amsterdam: This textile community has suffered repeated setbacks from the closing of large textile mills. The shift of mills from this area to other States and the contraction of operations are the basic causes for its difficulties. The community has made desperate efforts to attract new plants. It has sponsored local industrial advances though individual improvements have been made.

The labor market includes Montgomery County. It has had annual average rates of unemployment of 9.4 percent in 1955; 9.8 percent in 1956; 8.9 percent in 1957, and 14.1 percent in 1958. In January 1959, the unemployment rate was 13.5 percent.

Auburn: Including as this labor market does Cayuga Caunty, it has been a center of industrial activity except that it has suffered from plant closings and the contraction of some of its basic industries. Among the most significant closings was that the International Harvester Co. Recently an electrical machinery company moved out of the area. Difficulties are being faced by other textile plants in the area. The annual average rate of unemployment in 1955 was 9.1 percent; in 1956, 7.1 percent; in 1957, 8.4 percent, and in 1958, 14.3 percent. Relief from continued high unemployment is not in sight.

Batavia: This labor market includes Genesee County. Its annual average rate of unemployment in 1957 was 8.8 percent, and in 1958 9.4 percent. While it was only recently certified as having substantial labor surpluses, it faces serious problems. Layoffs have occurred in its machinery and primary metal industries and many of its local residents must depend upon jobs in nearby areas for continued employment since the area does not itself support the population.

Elmira: This labor market includes Chemung County. Unemployment began to assume serious proportions in December 1957 and has continued at high levels through

1958 and in 1959. In February 1959 the rate was 11.1 percent. The community has suffered from widespread layoffs in machinery and the electrical equipment plants.

Glens Falls-Hudson Falls: This labor market includes both the counties of Warren and Washington. Unemployment was most marked in 1958 with reductions in the electrical equipment, paper, and textile industries. In 1958 the average rate of unemployment was 9.7 percent.

Gloversville: This is one of the truly chronically distressed labor markets. It encompasses Fulton County. It suffers from the decline of the dress, glove, and the woolen knit glove industry. These have been adversely affected by imports. This area has been suffering from continuing high unemployment for a number of years. In 1955 the average rate of unemployment was 13 percent; in 1956, 9.3 percent; in 1957, 14.1 percent, and in 1958, 19.5 percent. In 1959, the rate was 17.9 percent in February. This is an area needing immediate and continuing attention.

Kingston: This labor market of Ulster County has suffered from the closing of a large machinery manufacturing plant, as well as losses in the aircraft, paper, and chemical industries. Only the seasonal pickups in the summer resort trade help offset these setbacks. The average rate of unemployment in 1958 was 8.1 percent, and in January 1959, 10.4 percent.

Newburgh-Middletown-Beacon: This labor market includes Orange and Putnam Counties as well as the city of Beacon and the town of Fishkill in Dutchess County. There have been widespread layoffs in the apparel, textiles, leather goods, metals and machinery industries. Many residents working in outside areas have also been adversely affected. The average rate of unemployment in 1958, was 9.7 percent. Much hope has been placed in the economic effects of the New York Thruway but these have not yet lived up to expectations.

Oneida: The Madison County labor market has also recently been added to the list of the distressed areas. There have been heavy cutbacks in the silverware industry. This is a community which needs long-term improvements. Residents have been working in outside areas and commuting and the cutbacks in these outside areas have adversely affected local people. The unemployment rate has been particularly high in 1958, with an annual average rate of 13.1 percent. Long-term redevelopment is essential.

Plattsburgh: This labor market includes Clinton County and has suffered from the long-term drop in construction and losses in mining industries. The average rate of unemployment in 1958 was 12.9 percent and unemployment continued at a high rate of 15 percent in February 1959.

Watertown: The Watertown labor market includes Jefferson County. The difficulties of this community are attributable to the decline in employment in the machinery and paper industries. The high unemployment rates were first noticeable in March 1957, and continued through all of 1958. The average rate of unemployment for 1958 was 11.6 percent.

AREAS OF SUBSTANTIAL LABOR SURPLUS

In addition to the preceding distressed areas there are a number of labor markets with substantial labor surpluses. This condition has not been of sufficient duration to qualify them for the benefits of the act (table IV). These areas will become eligible as of the following dates:

Labor market area and earliest date of future eligibility

Corning-Hornell: June 1959.
Olean-Salamanca: June 1959.
Albany-Schenectady-Troy: July 1959.
Buffalo: July 1959.
New York: July 1959.
Syracuse: July 1959.
Jamestown-Dunkirk: July 1959.
Orleans: September 1959.
Binghamton: October 1959.
Catskill: December 1959.
Waterford-Mechanicsville-Stillwater: January 1960.
Wellsville: January 1960.
Rochester: July 1960.

TABLE I.—*New York State—Areas of "substantial labor surplus," April 1959, by status of current eligibility and earliest date of future eligibility under the Kilburn, House Banking Committee recommendation, and Senate-adopted S. 722 bills*

Labor market area	Status of current eligibility			Earliest date of future eligibility		
	Kilburn	House Banking Committee recommendation	Senate-adopted S. 722	Kilburn	House Banking Committee recommendation	Senate-adopted S. 722
Major:						
Albany-Schenectady-Troy				1963	July 1959	1962
Binghamton				1963	October 1959	1962
Buffalo				1962	July 1959	1961
New York				1962	do	1962
Rochester				1963	July 1960	1962
Syracuse				1963	July 1959	1962
Utica-Rome		X		1962		1961
Smaller:						
Amsterdam	X	X	X			
Auburn		X	X	1960		
Batavia		X		1962		1961
Corning-Hornell				1962	June 1959	1961
Elmira		X		1962		1961
Glens Falls-Hudson Falls		X		1963		1962
Gloversville	X	X	X			
Jamestown-Dunkirk				1962	July 1959	1961
Kingston		X		1963		1962
Newburg-Middletown-Beacon		X		1962		1961
Olean-Salamanca				1963	June 1959	1962
Oneida		X		1961		1960
Plattsburgh		X		1961		1960
Watertown		X	X	1960		
Wellsville				1963	January 1960	1962
Very small:						
Catskill				1963	December 1959	1962
Orleans				1963	September 1959	1962
Waterford-Mechanicsville-Stillwater				1963	January 1960	1962

TABLE II.—*New York State—Labor force and unemployment in labor markets, January 1959*

Labor market area	Civilian labor force (total)	Unemployment total	Unemployment as percent of the labor force	Number in excess of 6 percent	Labor market area	Civilian labor force (total)	Unemployment total	Unemployment as percent of the labor force	Number in excess of 6 percent
A. State, total	(1)	(1)			B. Distressed areas—Con.				
B. Distressed areas [2]	505,250	60,180	11.9	29,865	Smaller—Con.				
					Newburgh-Middletown-Beacon [6]	78,400	7,630	9.7	2,926
Major: Utica-Rome	137,400	16,200	11.8	7,956	Oneida [7]	17,850	2,150	12.0	1,079
Smaller	367,850	43,980	12.0	21,909	Plattsburgh [4]	20,050	2,800	14.0	1,507
					Watertown [4]	35,150	4,800	13.7	2,091
Amsterdam	23,000	3,100	13.5	1,720					
Auburn [3]	28,900	4,200	15.0	2,520	C. Substantial labor surplus areas	6,790,750	582,250	8.6	174,805
Batavia [4]	21,200	2,200	10.4	928					
Elmira [4]	40,600	4,300	10.6	1,864	Major	6,612,950	564,200	8.5	167,423
Glens Falls-Hudson Falls [5]	37,700	3,400	9.0	1,138					
Gloversville [4]	23,450	5,000	21.3	3,593	Albany-Schenectady-Troy	245,100	21,800	8.9	7,094
Kingston	42,450	4,400	10.4	1,853					

Footnotes at end of table.

TABLE II.—*New York State—Labor force and unemployment in labor markets, January 1959*—Continued

Labor market area	Civilian labor force (total)	Unemployment total	Unemployment as percent of the labor force	Number in excess of 6 percent
C Substantial Labor Surplus Area—Con.				
Major—Con.				
Binghamton	94,400	7,300	7.7	1,636
Buffalo	526,500	64,500	12.3	32,910
New York	5,321,100	441,200	8.3	121,934
Rochester	249,600	15,200	6.1	224
Syracuse	176,250	14,200	8.1	3,625
Smaller	148,450	14,600	9.8	5,693
Corning-Hornell [6]	39,000	4,100	10.4	1,760
Jamestown-Dunkirk [3]	62,900	6,100	9.7	2,326
Olean-Salamanca [4]	31,150	2,950	9.5	1,081
Wellsville [7]	15,400	1,450	9.5	526
C, Substantial Labor Surplus Area—Con.				
Very small	29,350	3,450	11.8	1,689
Catskill [8]	9,900	700	7.1	106
Orleans [8]	14,000	2,000	14.3	1,160
Waterford-Mechanicsville-Stillwater [9]	5,450	750	13.8	423
D. Other nonsubstantial labor surplus areas [10]	(1)	(1)		

[1] Information not available.
[3] Eligible for assistance under the House Banking Committee recommendation, i.e., unemployment of 6 percent in at least 18 of the previous 24 months, 9 percent during at least 15 of the previous 18 months, 12 percent during the previous 12 months or 15 percent during the previous 6-month period.
[4] September 1958.
[6] January 1959.
[7] November 1958.
[8] December 1958.
[9] October 1958.
[10] June 1958
[11] March 1959.

[10] Information not available for the following 11 small and 12 very small labor areas:

Small areas:
Chenango
Delaware
Dutchess
Hudson
Oneonta
Ontario
Oswego-Fulton
St. Lawrence
Saratoga
Tompkins
Wayne

Very small:
Cortland
Essex
Franklin
Hamilton
Lewis
Livingston
Schoharie
Schuyler
Seneca
Tioga
Wyoming
Yates

Source: Division of Employment, Department of Labor, State of New York. Bureau of Employment Security, U.S. Department of Labor.

TABLE III.—*New York State—Unemployment as percent of labor force in distressed areas, 1955–59* [1]

Labor market area	Year	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	Apr.	May	June	July	Aug.	Sept.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	Annual average
Major: Utica-Rome	1955	11.3	10.1	9.5	8.3	6.9	7.2	8.0	6.6	5.8	5.4	5.5	6.3	7.6
	1956	8.0	7.2	6.9	6.2	4.9	5.1	5.2	4.1	3.8	3.5	3.8	5.1	5.3
	1957	6.8	6.3	6.1	5.1	4.1	4.5	5.0	5.2	4.0	4.5	6.5	7.8	5.5
	1958	10.6	11.4	12.0	11.7	11.1	11.6	11.6	9.3	8.2	8.4	9.0	10.3	10.4
	1959	11.8												
Smaller:														
Amsterdam	1955	11.4	9.6	10.3	8.8	9.0	8.8	12.0	8.4	6.8	6.9	9.4	10.9	9.4
	1956	12.0	10.3	15.9	15.1	13.6	11.5	14.1	4.2	4.7	4.8	5.0	6.5	9.8
	1957	8.2	7.2	6.8	7.5	8.2	10.1	19.0	5.3	5.8	6.2	9.8	12.2	8.9
	1958	15.3	16.1	15.1	13.8	13.6	15.5	18.0	13.2	11.5	11.7	12.2	13.0	14.1
	1959	13.5												
Auburn	1955	13.6	13.0	11.4	10.3	10.0	6.8	10.1	5.0	4.2	6.3	11.5	6.6	9.1
	1956	7.3	8.6	8.6	9.3	7.9	7.1	9.8	4.9	5.3	5.3	6.3	5.2	7.1
	1957	7.5	8.2	8.3	9.3	11.7	7.4	8.9	6.8	6.6	7.7	8.8	9.8	9.4
	1958	11.5	12.8	14.4	15.3	15.4	15.4	14.9	14.0	15.0	15.0	14.3	13.8	14.3
	1959													
Batavia	1955													
	1956													
	1957		7.6										10.0	8.8
	1958		11.4							7.4				9.4
	1959													
Elmira	1955	8.3	8.2	7.4	5.8	5.0	4.7	4.9	3.7	2.9	2.5	2.9	3.1	5.0
	1956	4.4	5.6	5.6	4.3	3.1	3.4	3.7	4.5	2.5	1.9	2.2	2.4	3.6
	1957	4.1	4.4	3.9	3.0	2.3	2.7	2.8	4.5	2.8	2.6	7.1	11.6	4.3
	1958	12.5	14.1	14.6	15.2	13.4	12.9	11.3	11.6	9.3	7.7	8.3	8.4	11.6
	1959	10.6	11.1											
Glens Falls-Hudson Falls	1955													
	1956													
	1957					5.5						5.9		5.7
	1958					10.3						9.0		9.7
	1959													
Gloversville	1955	22.4	20.6	17.3	17.6	16.6	10.3	13.9	6.7	5.8	5.5	8.2	10.8	13.0
	1956	16.4	12.2	11.4	12.0	10.6	7.8	7.9	3.9	4.3	4.9	8.5	11.6	9.3
	1957	19.7	15.7	14.6	13.3	13.8	11.7	21.0	7.5	7.8	9.3	15.0	19.4	14.1
	1958	24.3	24.8	23.8	25.6	23.0	18.8	17.6	11.4	11.7	12.3	17.9	23.9	19.5
	1959	21.3	17.9											
Kingston	1955													
	1956													
	1957							4.5						
	1958	9.7				6.6		7.7					8.2	8.1
	1959	10.4												
Newburg-Middletown-Beacon	1955													
	1956													
	1957						6.6						7.2	6.9
	1958						9.6						9.7	9.7
	1959													
Oneida	1955													
	1956													
	1957						3.0	5.4	3.0	3.1	4.5	6.9	9.0	5.0
	1958	12.8	13.7	14.7	14.0	12.3	14.7		10.2		12.0			13.1
	1959													
Plattsburgh	1955													
	1956													
	1957													
	1958		13.9										11.8	12.9
	1959	14.0	15.0											

Footnote at end of table.

TABLE III.—*New York State—Unemployment as percent of labor force in distressed areas, 1955–59* [1]—Continued

Labor market area	Year	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	Apr.	May	June	July	Aug.	Sept.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	Annual average
Smaller—Continued														
Watertown	1955													
	1956													
	1957			10.3						2.9				6.6
	1958	12.8	14.4	15.2				9.9	8.6	8.5				11.6
	1959	13.7	14.2	11.6										

[1] Eligible for assistance under the House Banking Committee recommendation, i.e., unemployment of 6 percent in at least 18 of the previous 24 months, 9 percent during at least 15 of the previous 18 months, 12 percent during the previous 12 months or 15 percent during the previous 6-month period.

Source: Division of Employment, Department of Labor, State of New York. Bureau of Employment Security, U.S. Department of Labor. Annual averages calculated from these data.

TABLE IV.—*New York State—Unemployment as percent of labor force in areas of substantial labor surplus, 1955–59*

Labor market area	Year	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	Apr.	May	June	July	Aug.	Sept.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	Annual average
Major:														
Albany-Schenectady-Troy	1955	8.3	7.9	7.5	6.7	5.6	5.0	5.3	4.3	3.7	3.3	3.4	3.9	5.4
	1956	5.7	4.5	4.3	4.1	3.1	3.0	3.3	2.9	2.5	2.4	2.8	3.0	3.5
	1957	4.3	4.6	4.5	4.0	3.4	3.4	3.7	3.4	3.2	3.3	4.0	4.5	3.9
	1958	6.7	7.2	7.4	7.5	7.1	7.3	7.5	6.9	6.3	6.4	6.7	7.1	7.0
	1959	8.9												
Binghamton	1955	6.1	6.5	5.8	4.7	4.2	4.5	4.8	4.5	3.8	3.5	4.0	3.5	4.7
	1956	4.6	4.9	4.6	3.8	2.9	3.0	2.9	2.3	2.4	2.3	2.7	2.7	3.3
	1957	3.6	3.7	3.5	2.8	2.1	2.5	2.3	2.0	1.9	2.3	2.7	3.4	2.7
	1958	4.9	6.1	5.9	6.2	5.5	6.6	7.2	8.3	6.5	6.8	6.5	7.0	6.5
	1959	7.7												
Buffalo	1955	6.6	6.6	5.9	5.0	4.2	3.6	3.7	3.4	3.2	3.2	3.0	3.3	4.3
	1956	4.4	5.0	4.9	4.3	3.7	3.6	4.3	3.7	4.0	2.7	2.9	3.2	3.9
	1957	4.2	4.5	4.6	4.6	4.4	4.5	4.9	4.5	4.7	4.5	4.5	5.6	4.6
	1958	8.2	9.9	11.7	12.6	12.6	12.4	13.1	12.8	11.4	11.1	10.9	11.1	11.5
	1959	12.3												
New York	1955	6.9	6.3	5.9	6.1	6.0	6.1	6.1	4.9	4.4	4.5	4.1	4.2	5.5
	1956	5.5	5.2	5.2	5.6	5.6	5.7	5.5	4.2	4.1	4.0	4.4	4.2	4.9
	1957	5.9	5.5	5.1	4.9	5.3	5.5	5.8	4.5	4.3	4.7	5.2	5.6	5.2
	1958	7.4	7.4	7.6	7.8	7.8	8.0	7.8	6.8	6.7	6.2	6.6	7.1	7.3
	1959	8.3												
Rochester	1955	3.8	3.7	3.6	3.3	2.9	2.6	2.7	2.6	2.2	2.2	2.2	2.4	2.9
	1956	2.8	2.9	2.9	2.9	2.8	2.7	2.6	2.4	2.2	2.2	2.1	2.4	2.6
	1957	2.8	2.8	2.9	2.9	2.7	2.6	2.7	2.5	2.4	2.4	2.7	3.1	2.7
	1958	4.5	5.6	6.0	6.4	6.5	6.7	6.8	6.7	5.9	5.2	5.1	5.2	5.9
	1959	6.1												
Syracuse	1955	6.6	6.8	6.3	5.4	4.1	4.0	5.0	3.7	2.8	2.4	2.5	3.3	4.4
	1956	4.2	4.5	4.5	3.8	3.2	3.0	3.8	2.7	2.1	1.8	1.9	2.3	3.2
	1957	3.1	4.0	4.2	3.7	3.4	3.3	4.1	3.8	4.1	3.7	4.0	4.8	3.9
	1958	7.2	8.1	8.2	8.5	8.4	8.4	9.3	7.7	7.2	6.5	6.8	7.2	7.8
	1959	8.1												
Smaller:														
Corning-Hornell	1955													
	1956													
	1957						3.0							
	1958						10.0		11.7				10.4	10.7
	1959													
Jamestown-Dunkirk	1955													
	1956													
	1957									2.4				
	1958							13.8		9.7				11.8
	1959													
Olean-Salamanca	1955													
	1956													
	1957								3.0					
	1958			8.4					7.6					8.9
	1959	9.5	9.5											
Wellsville	1955													
	1956													
	1957											4.5		
	1958										9.5			
Very small:														
Catskill	1955													
	1956													
	1957													
	1958									7.1				
	1959													
Orleans	1955													
	1956													
	1957													
	1958						14.3							
	1959													
Waterford-Mechanicsville-Stillwater	1955													
	1956													
	1957													
	1958										11.9			
	1959			13.8										

Source: Division of Employment, Department of Labor, State of New York. Bureau of Employment Security, U.S. Department of Labor. Annual averages calculated from these data.

The Fine Art of Nepotism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 20, 1959

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Evening Herald, Rock Hill, S.C., of May 16, 1959.

THE FINE ART OF NEPOTISM

Nepotism is the practice of bestowing special favors upon one's relatives, by reason of relationship rather than merit.

The word nepotism has become one of rather general use in the past few months because of some dubious practices in Washington. It seems several of our national legislators are in the habit of employing sons, daughters, wives, nephews, nieces, uncles, aunts, etc., at salaries which these people obviously don't merit.

But our U.S. nepotists are apparently a bunch of pikers and amateurs at the practice of nepotism.

The king of them all would be Generalissimo Rafael L. Trujillo of the Dominican Republic.

Today, he celebrates his 29th year of iron-fisted rule over the Dominican Republic.

Trujillo has done a remarkably expert job of keeping the country, so to speak, in the family. Brother Hector is president of the

Republic. Rafael, Jr. (who attracted U.S. attention through his courtship of Actress Zsa Zsa Gabor) is a general and chairman of the joints chiefs of staff. A nephew, Jose, is Secretary of Defense. Another nephew, Luis, is Secretary of War and Aviation. A second son, Rhadames, was a major at 13. It could be that Rhadames is a trifle backward since Rafael, Jr., was a general at 9.

Even the in-laws get into the act. Former Son-in-Law Porfirio Rubirosa (who also had a fling with Zsa Zsa) has served as a diplomat, between marriages and flirtations.

Trujillo's situation may seem humorous to Americans. But a sobering fact is that our country is pouring millions of dollars into Trujillo's Dominican Republic. Our tax money is helping Trujillo tighten his already viselike grip on the Dominican Republic people.

Thanks From the Lapins

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 20, 1959

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, today ends a glorious 3-month stay in the United States of 30 Polish women, victims of Nazi atrocities in the form of inhuman forced medical experimentations upon them at a time when most of them were young teenagers. Tomorrow these ladies return to Poland.

This entire project was privately financed and directed by the Ravensbrueck Lapin committee, headed by Norman Cousins, editor of the Saturday Review, with the full cooperation of the State Department and the Pan American Airways which has furnished transportation for these ladies to this country and for their return to Poland.

The ladies were given medical care and attention in the United States and were received into the homes of private American families. It was purely a humanitarian project and it has also contributed greatly to the reputation of our Nation for its humanity and desire to promote peace and justice throughout the world.

Yesterday, a number of Members of both Houses of Congress met with the ladies and the Ravensbrueck committee to do honors to the committee and to bade farewell to the ladies. I am sure that everyone who had the privilege of personal contact with these victims of Nazi atrocities must have been tremendously impressed with the courage, spirit and sense of gratitude so obvious in everything they said or did. It would be difficult indeed to guess from their expression the full deepness of their suffering an dtragedy. And there was no feeling of bitterness, merely deep disappointment that to this day the German Government has failed to act to recompense them even in part for the terrible injustice inflicted upon them. To me and, I am sure, to all of us, they were an inspiration for greater efforts on behalf of justice and peace for all the world.

As an expression of the feelings of these ladies, I present a statement from one of them. May God grant that the fine action of the Ravensbrueck committee may inspire us to further and even more effective acts proving to the world that the people of the United States are the most humanitarian and peace-loving Nation in the world.

I REGAINED MY FAITH IN PEOPLE

(Stefania Lotocka thanks everyone in the name of the lapins)

Like a fairy tale 3 months have passed since the moment of landing in New York. Already the full-hearted guardianship of Norman Cousins and his bewitching daughter, accompanying us during our trip all the way from Warsaw, gave us a taste of what was awaiting us on American soil. After landing in New York, we were again in the care of wonderful people such as Caroline Ferriday, Mrs. Benneson, E. Anderson, and Dr. Hitzig. For 4 days during our stay they devoted all their valuable time to us. In New York I learned that four of us were invited to Detroit.

In complete consecration lovely, smiling Judy Reynolds arrived for us. With Judy we also became friends communicating with her in a mixture of languages—English, French, and Polish.

The 23d of December we flew to Detroit. The welcome at the airport I will never forget. I was touched, sick, and very tired. At a certain moment I met the eyes of Dr. Dorsey and under the influence of his expression, a feeling of security came over me unknown since my return from Camp Ravensbrueck. That evening I met several ladies from the committee, again people with overflowing hearts: Mrs. Harvey Barcus, Mrs. L. Gussow, Mrs. E. Gaska, and several others who took us under their protective wings. The holidays passed with mixed emotional moods. Immediately after the holidays each one was placed under the solicitous care of doctors and each one according to her needs started her cure. I learned that all the doctors donated their medical care gratis, devoting very much of their valuable time. Dr. Dorsey, chairman of the committee, surrounded us with truly fatherly concern. All the doctors like Dr. Krystal, Dr. T. A. Petty, Dr. C. A. Domzalski, Dr. W. Kozlowski, Dr. E. Tanay, Dr. T. Zurkowski, and Dr. Sadowski to bring relief to our pains and ailments.

Dr. S. J. Roman, after a thorough examination, donated to each of us glasses. Dr. A. F. Pozdol, Dr. Drabkowski, Dr. J. L. Toton, Dr. Jerome Krause, Dr. A. C. Sawicki, and Dr. S. Laczynski—dentists who on our razed teeth built themselves magnificent monuments. All of society and the entire Polonia gave proof of their concern in our fate.

Thanks to the devotion of Prof. E. Ortega with the Berlitz method we are able to communicate in the English tongue.

From the persons with whom we are living and from those we contact, we are continually receiving so many proofs of their sincere friendliness that to the end of my life I am supplied with food for the soul. I regained faith in people.

I know and understand that more than once we were the cause of much trouble to you, dear friends. Each one of us taken individually is a problem. I am also certain that if you think of our difficult experiences, from the bottom of your big hearts you will forgive all.

From my childhood I remember that every fable had its end. Now I know, this fable does not have an end. But to be able to understand and evaluate this one must go through hell and fulfill life. So this miraculous, never-ending fable I will take with me to Poland.

STEFANIA LOTOCKA.

The Conservation Reserve Authorized by the Soil Bank Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 20, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the conservation reserve authorized by the Soil Bank Act is a Federal program, which was supported by members of both parties. The program has been in operation for 3 years and during that time, it has established a remarkable record of accomplishment.

The conservation record is particularly impressive. During the time the program has been in operation, a total of 23 million acres has been placed in the reserve. In 1957, a total of 6 million acres was placed under contract. In 1958, a total of 4 million acres was placed under contract. In 1959, a total of 13 million acres was placed under contract and an additional 7 million acres was offered by the Nation's farmers but could not be placed in the reserve because the Department of Agriculture did not have a sufficient authorization to enter into contracts on this land.

On the first 10 million acres placed in the reserve during 1957 and 1958, establishment of protective cover has largely been completed. On this land, nearly 9 million acres are now covered with flourishing stands of grass which protects the soil from wind and water erosion, conserves the plant nutrients for further generations of Americans, and also contributes to the wildlife populations on this and adjacent lands. A truly remarkable accomplishment in this regard is the fact that in excess of 3 million acres of this grass has been established in the southern Great Plains, usually known as the dust bowl, where wind erosion has been a problem for over 30 years.

Another million acres have been planted to trees—a major contribution to forestry, wise land use, and conservation of soil and water on these lands.

On the 13 million acres placed in the reserve in 1959, final figures are not as yet available. On the basis of a sample projected to the entire acreage, it is estimated that on this land, 3 million acres are already established with a satisfactory cover, 8,500,000 acres are to be planted to grass, 700,000 acres are to be planted to trees, 150,000 acres are to be developed as wildlife cover, and the balance to be established in temporary cover, water conservation measures, etc.

The impact of the program on conservation has equaled or exceeded the highest expectations of the various conservation groups who supported the original legislation.

Among the many favorable aspects of the conservation reserve, one of the most noteworthy is the wildlife phase. It is particularly noteworthy because the benefits of the program to wildlife extends to such a widespread segment of the general public. Both urban and rural peo-

ple enjoy hunting and fishing. In fact, one of every five Americans over 12 years of age fished and/or hunted during recent years. This army of sportsmen supported the original legislation and has been enthusiastic over the increase in wildlife which has already taken place.

Sportsmen in such States as Ohio, Georgia, South Dakota, Oklahoma, Washington, and Michigan have reported greatly improved hunting on lands in and near conservation reserve acres. Game and fish department figures show almost a 100 percent increase in pheasant population during the past 2 years in North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Minnesota, and Iowa. Wildlife population increases have been reported in every State where substantial acreages have been placed in the conservation reserve.

Conservationists recognize and approve the wildlife improvements resulting from the program and credit the increase to the 10 million acres placed in the reserve through 1958. Similar benefits are anticipated from the 13 million acres added in 1959. They also expect comparable benefits if the program were carried forward to the ultimate goal of 60 million acres originally contemplated for placing in the conservation reserve.

These conservation interests and sportsmen are unable to understand why a program, so successful and of such widespread benefit, should now be crippled by two actions of the Appropriations Committee.

The limitation on the 1960 authorization to $325 million dollars will almost halt placing additional land in the program. The 2.3 million acres that can be added within this limit will hold the program to 25 million acres—far from the 60 million acre goal.

Even worse is the action of the committee in setting a $3,000 maximum contract limitation. This will in effect make it almost impossible to add any land to the reserve next year.

The conservation reserve program has demonstrated its ability to encourage farmers voluntarily to reduce production. It has made possible a substantial land use adjustment, which contributes to soil, water, forest and wildlife conservation. It deserves continued bipartisan support.

Resolution of Council No. 731, Knights of Columbus, Waukegan, Ill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARGUERITE STITT CHURCH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 20, 1959

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am happy to offer a resolution of Waukegan, Ill., Council No. 731, Knights of Columbus, concerning the joint resolution declaring Good Friday a legal holiday:

RESOLUTION OF WAUKEGAN, ILL., COUNCIL NO. 731, KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS, APPROVING JOINT RESOLUTION OF CONGRESS DECLARING GOOD FRIDAY A LEGAL HOLIDAY

Whereas there is now pending in the U.S. Congress House Joint Resolution 338, a joint resolution declaring Good Friday in each year to be a legal holiday, introduced in the House of Representatives, April 14, 1959; and

Whereas the pendency of this resolution before Congress has been brought to the attention of Waukegan, Ill., Council No. 731, Knights of Columbus: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by Waukegan, Ill., Council No. 731, Knights of Columbus, That:

SECTION 1. The joint resolution declaring Good Friday in each year to be a legal holiday being House Joint Resolution 338, 86th Congress, 1st session, introduced in the House of Representatives, April 14, 1959, be and the same is hereby approved by Waukegan, Ill., Council No. 731, Knights of Columbus.

SEC. 2. The passage of this joint resolution by both Houses of Congress is respectfully requested by Waukegan, Ill., Council No. 731, Knights of Columbus.

SEC. 3. A certified copy of this resolution be sent by the recording secretary of this council to Senator DOUGLAS, Senator DIRKSEN, Representative CHURCH, and Representative CELLER, in Washington, D.C.

Not a Remedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEO E. ALLEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 20, 1959

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Rockford (Ill.) Morning Star of May 19, 1959, entitled "Not a Remedy":

NOT A REMEDY

Congressional Democratic leaders would relieve the headache the vast Federal highway program is giving Congress by transferring funds from the General Treasury to the highway trust fund. Such a switch would deepen any Federal deficit, but the Democratic spenders have not shown much concern over deficits. They don't want to curtail the program and neither do they want to raise taxes to keep it going full scale.

When Congress in 1956 authorized the 41,000-mile National System of Interstate Highways, it created a special trust fund outside the regular Federal budget to finance the construction program, with revenue from highway-user taxes, such as those on gasoline and tires, going into the fund. Due partly to increased construction costs and partly to an increase in authorized mileage, the cost of the program is now estimated to be nearly $12 billion more than the revenues from the earmarked funds.

An amendment introduced by Senator BYRD, of Virginia, and made a part of the 1956 law provided that the Federal Government could not spend any more money than it had in the trust fund. As an antirecession measure, Congress this year suspended the Byrd amendment for fiscal 1959 and 1960, but not for later years. The amendment would apply in fiscal 1961.

The Federal Bureau of Public Roads contends it cannot, under the Byrd amendment, make any allocations to the States for fiscal 1961 this summer because the highway trust fund is so short of money. The fiscal 1961 Federal money ordinarily would be apportioned this July because there is a gap of a year between the time the Federal money is promised and the States are ready to spend it. The Democratic spenders would meet this problem by dipping into the General Treasury.

President Eisenhower, who recognizes that the straightforward way to carry out spending programs is to provide new taxes, has proposed an increase of 1½ cents a gallon in the present 3-cent Federal tax on gasoline and diesel fuels. The increase would raise an extra $723 million the first year and $900 million in each following year for the highway trust fund. At present rates, the highway trust fund would put out an estimated $241 million more during the next fiscal year than it took in.

The public was assured when the plan was adopted in 1956 that the program would operate on a pay-as-you-go basis through the highway trust fund. It should be kept on that basis. If the gasoline tax is not to be raised, the program should be cut back to where building would be limited to available funds provided under the existing law.

The "Payoff" Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 20, 1959

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the May 16, 1959, edition of the AFL–CIO News:

THE "PAYOFF" PRESS

It's a lot easier to mount an editorial crusade against crooks and racketeers or to pen righteous editorials about "labor racketeers" than to call the police.

That's the dominant lesson that emerges from the shameful testimony given the McClellan committee on payoffs by several New York newspapers to easily identifiable hoodlums disguising their extortion racket in trade union trappings.

The highly respected New York Times, the sometimes raucous New York Daily Mirror, and the American Weekly, a widely distributed Sunday supplement, all admitted paying off racketeers to insure delivery of sections of their papers during a Teamsters strike.

Somewhat chastened by public exposure, they solemnly promised the McClellan committee that they wouldn't do it again. And amazingly, Senator MCCLELLAN didn't bother to raise the vital point that a newspaper dedicated to public service and clean labor-management relations didn't call in the district attorney or courageously refuse to pay tribute.

Instead the Arkansas Senator called for placing all transportation unions under the antitrust laws, an ill-conceived, drastic, and wholly unrealistic step that would penalize millions of members of clean unions without ever getting to the root of the problem.

The New York newspaper case exposes the double standard that governs too many American business operations—clamor for restrictive and punitive labor legislation, but pay off any hoodlum that comes along posing as a labor official.

Corruption and extortion in labor-management relations will be eliminated when employers refuse to do business with crooks.

Tied in with the AFL–CIO's campaign against the racketeers, this will wipe out the

practices that are sowing the seeds of destruction of decency and honesty in labor-management relations.

Maritime Day, 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK J. BECKER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 6, 1959

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, on Friday of this week, May 22, we will observe Maritime Day. It seems fitting that in saluting the occasion we pause to consider what this means.

The security and well-being of every citizen depends on a strong merchant marine—traditionally operated as a private enterprise with the aid and cooperation of the Federal Government.

Both in peace and war, a strong merchant marine is essential to the strength of our country. A strong merchant fleet is necessary for the prosperity and stability of America's peacetime commerce and it becomes America's fourth arm of defense in times of national emergency.

During war years, American merchant ships were equipped with antiaircraft and heavier guns and merchant crews shared the gun stations with U.S. Navy gun crews.

In M-day or mobilization day plans, if the need should ever arise, the Navy would be responsible for the utilization and routing of merchant vessels. These ships would become naval auxiliaries for the transport of troops, munitions, fuel, and supplies.

In the security plan of the Nation, the ships of the American merchant marine are of prime importance and trained and efficient personnel for these ships is a natural concern of the Government.

It has been said that a ship is only as good as the men that sail her; therefore, if America is to have good ships, she must have good men aboard these ships.

Congress recognized this some years ago and the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 was signed into law. This called for Federal training of merchant officers and the act has often been referred to as the Magna Charta of the merchant marine. Standards were raised and, consequently, the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point was dedicated in 1942.

THE CAMPUS OF THE SEVEN SEAS

The U.S. Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point is located on the north shore of Long Island, near the confluence of Long Island Sound and the East River, in sight of the towering skyline of Manhattan.

Built and equipped at a cost of $8 million, Kings Point occupies approximately a 65-acre site on Long Island Sound, a campus of the seven seas.

I have watched Kings Point grow from its very first day, when I attended the opening ceremonies as Nassau County commander of the American Legion, later during my 8 years in the Assembly of New York State as chairman of the military law committee and during my years in Congress; several times, I have served on the congressional Board of Visitors to Kings Point and on each occasion of a visit to the Academy I have been impressed by this "Annapolis of the Merchant Marine," its officers, and the cadets.

Every citizen should visit Kings Point and see this fine institution. Pause in the library and see the records made by cadets during World War 2 and read the tales of heroism.

The Academy's fine gymnasium, O'Hara Hall, is named after Ed O'Hara, a cadet from California. During a battle with a German raider, O'Hara, seeing the Navy gunners downed by enemy fire, took over the gun and dispatched the enemy to the bottom of the sea, but O'Hara was mortally wounded in the courageous action.

President Eisenhower on February 20, 1956, signed the bill that gave Kings Point permanent status thereby placing it alongside West Point, Annapolis, the Coast Guard, and Air Force Academies as one of Uncle Sam's five Federal Academies for officer training.

It was a happy day for all hands, my fellow colleagues STEVE DEROUNIAN, STUYV WAINWRIGHT, and I had worked long and hard to insure the final passage of the bill for permanency. John Scherger, chief clerk of the supreme court in Mineola and a very good friend, was president of the Association of Parents and Friends of Kings Point. The association had aided considerably in the battle for recognition.

TOP ADMIRAL, TOP STAFF

The Academy, under the capable direction of Rear Adm. Gordon McLintock, has advanced far in the field of higher education. The faculty is often called on for aid and cooperation in highly technical matters. Presently, several Academy officers are asigned to the building of the *Savannah*, America's first atom-powered ship. Truly a remarkable testimonial to the knoweldge and competence of the Academy staff.

SPARKLING SPORTS STAFF

Kings Point has also advanced in the world of college sports. Under Comdr. James W. Liebertz the Academy presents an intercollegiate sports program unequalled by any school its size.

Commander Liebertz was aide to Capt. Gene Tunney, who was in charge of the Navy's physical fitness program during World War II. The Kings Point athletic director is one of the Nations' most popular men in college athletics and his coaching staff includes two former great athletes from schools here in the Nation's Capitol—Clem Stralka, of Georgetown, and later a great line star with the Washington Redskins, and Tim Stapleton, a three-letter man at George Washington. Harry Wright, All-American from Notre Dame, took over last year as head football coach and the football fortunes started to rise to new heights. St. Comdr. Tom Carmody supervises the physical training program that has every cadet participating in physical development.

I might add that in addition to the educational and physical development of the cadet, there are the Academy chaplains, representing the three faiths, to aid the Kings Pointers' spiritual development.

The cadets spend 3 11-month years in residence at the Academy, plus a year of study and work aboard American vessels at sea. Upon successful completion of the course, which almost equals 5 years of regular college study, the degree of bachelor of science is awarded. Kings Pointers also complete courses qualifying them for U.S. Naval Reserve commissions.

The U.S. Merchant Marine Academy in these short, yet action-packed years of existence has served the country well. We hope that Kings Point will continue to provide the young men who will be America's merchant marine officers and ambassadors of good will for many more peaceful maritime days.

Imports of Canadian Bread in the Detroit Market

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR A. KNOX
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 20, 1959

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Speaker, a recent Associated Press news item datelined Lansing, Mich., described a serious problem that has developed in the city of Detroit because of the free importation of Canadian bread. This dispatch quotes two State senators, Harold M. Ryan and Raymond C. Dzendzel, who have urged the Michigan Legislature to appeal to Congress to "rectify the inequity of free bread imports" from Windsor, Canada.

The two senators pointed out that while bread imported from Canada is duty free the Canadian Government levies a tariff on traffic in the other direction. Senator Ryan cited the fact that Canadian bakers work for 85 cents an hour less than the current scale in Detroit and that flour costs $1.25 less per hundredweight in Canada. These basic inequities have naturally created unfair competition for the Detroit bakers. The flood of imported bread has reached the staggering figure of 400,000 loaves every month and it has forced Detroit's bakeries to slash prices drastically in a futile attempt to remain competitive.

While this problem would be serious enough in any American city, it is particularly ominous in Detroit. As you all know, the State of Michigan is one of the leading centers of unemployment in this country with Detroit itself contributing vast numbers to the rolls of the relief-eligible. The unfair competition experienced by the baking industry in Detroit comes on top of an already bad situation in the automobile industry where, despite a favorable rate of auto sales so

far this year, many skilled workers are without jobs.

It was not too long ago that one of our most highly esteemed colleagues, the late Honorable Daniel A. Reed, spoke out against the severe domestic problems that were being created by unregulated auto imports. On February 2, 1959, referring to a speech made by Mr. Ernest R. Breech of the Ford Motor Co., Mr. Reed said:

The next time the free-trade advocates from Detroit express concern over unemployment in that area, they might well give some thought to the fact that the difference between the jobs displaced by imported autos and the jobs created by auto exports showed a net deficit of 28,900 jobs. That conservative estimate is no insubstantial number of unemployed American citizens, the vast majority of them in Michigan.

Our late colleague went on to compute the monetary loss to America caused by this unemployment to be in excess of $200 million for the 12-month period preceding his remarks. Just think of that—$200 million in wages lost because of imported automobiles—and then tell me that our so-called free trade is actually free.

The same lack of reciprocity that is crippling the baking industry in Detroit has been injurying our auto industry for years. In 1957, 2 years ago, the United States imported 95,510 automobiles from the United Kingdom and 100,083 automobiles from West Germany. And how many cars do you suppose we sold in those two countries in the same year? Britain allowed only 265 America autos to be imported and a scant 576 cars of our manufacture managed to hurdle the trade barriers of West Germany. And this is the phenomenon that some of us refer to as reciprocal trade.

Returning to the cross-border competition in the importation of bread by hometown of Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., felt the seriousness of situation when Our Own Bakery was forced to cease operation and put 60 men out of work. This bakery was confronted with competing with Canadian bread imported from Sault Ste. Marie, Canada.

The 11th Congressional District of Michigan has also suffered because of the importation of hardwood plywood. For many years certain areas of my district have been dependent upon the plywood industry for the employment of its citizens. Up until the year 1951 the domestic industry was not too greatly effected by the imports of plywood; as the imports in 1951 consisted of 67 million square feet, and the domestic consumption at that time was 827 million square feet. But when we look at the statistics of imports we find that 4 years later in 1955 the imports had grown to 628 million square feet. The domestic consumption had increased about 100 percent to 1.5 billion square feet. The ratio of the imports was 10 times greater in the year 1955 over the year 1951. The foreign producers gain has been at the expense of the domestic industry with a consequent loss of jobs for our citizens. The towns of Escanaba, Gladstone, Newberry, and Munising, Mich., have drastically felt the impact of such imports, with some plants forced to close their doors, not temporarily, but permanently.

And remember that the problems presented by foreign imports faces all of us; it is not only the bakers, the unemployed woodworkers, the unemployed automobile workers, or the Treasury Department that must bear the expense of our free trade foreign policy. This policy steals money from the pockets of every single U.S. citizen, from every business concern, and from every American industry.

Something must be down before this wasteful, irresponsible doctrine has stolen our country right out from under us.

U.S. Price Fixing (Fair Trade) Bill Contrary to Public Interest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 20, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial appearing in the Waterloo (Iowa) Courier on March 26, 1959, entitled "U.S. Price-Fixing (Fair Trade) Bill Contrary to Public Interest."

That editorial sets out the inherent vices of H.R. 1253, the fair trade measure now pending before the House of Representatives.

Such legislation is not in the public interest and should not be enacted:

U.S. PRICE-FIXING (FAIR TRADE) BILL CONTRARY TO PUBLIC INTEREST

The laws and merchandising practices which parade under the title of "fair trade" are actually mere price-fixing methods designed to stifle competition.

True cutthroat competition is not necessarily in the interest of consumers. If a big, well-capitalized company sells consistently below cost until local competitors are driven out of business, it may later charge excessive prices if it obtains a monopolistic situation. But most such practices are subject to prosecution under the antitrust laws.

The so-called fair trade laws require all merchants to sell products at a price fixed by the manufacturer. Iowa has such a statute, although attempts by national manufacturers to follow price-fixing practices have broken down rapidly in recent years. Iowa has an even worse situation in regard to cigarettes, requiring a fixed mark-up by State law.

What is the net effect of fair trade price fixing where the effort is successful? Robert A. Bicks, first assistant in the Justice Department Antitrust Division, told a congressional committee this week that compliance with such laws increased retail prices by 17 percent, according to a department survey. He reported that nationwide price fixing would cost consumers billions of dollars a year.

However, 16 State courts have now invalidated their fair trade laws; and advocates of price fixing are seeking enactment of a Federal law which would require every retailer to sell the product of a manufacturer at the price set by the manufacturer. As Bicks noted, this would be the least desirable time to adopt a law which could only create higher prices, inflation, and more economic uncertainty.

This is not to deny that there are problems involving competition between reputable, established merchants, and fly-by-night operators. The consumer, if interested only in price when purchasing appliances and other merchandise, will ultimately be cheated if he ignores the availability of servicing and the value of the merchant's good name.

But the solution to such problems does not lie in the elimination of price competition by law. Moreover, the clamor by certain merchant groups for price-fixing practices is bad public relations. The consumers tend to become disillusioned with business advocacy of the free enterprise system when he sees these groups advocating a system which is neither free nor enterprising.

The Labor-Management Performance Act of 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 20, 1959

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

THE LABOR-MANAGEMENT PERFORMANCE ACT OF 1959

Congressman CARROLL D. KEARNS, ranking Republican on the House Labor Committee, introduced a new labor reform measure in the House today. "Weeks of hearings in the House, together with the public reaction against the Kennedy bill as passed by the Senate, demonstrate the need for a new approach to labor reform," said Congressman KEARNS at a press conference this morning. "I think we've been on the wrong track thus far. We need a new look.

"The heart of the labor reform problem is the breakdown in performance under existing laws. Whether the failure is in the law or its enforcement is an open question. The result is that the fundamental rights of the working men and women of this country definitely are not being protected.

"The breakdown is most serious when it fails to provide lack of protection against internal union abuses and to oust the criminal elements from the union movement. Union members can sometimes obtain relief from internal union problems through use of the courts but it is a long and expensive process. Few rank and file union members can afford the time or the money. In the criminal area the congressional hearings have clearly exposed an appalling failure of enforcement.

"Nevertheless, the Senate act relies on court enforcement of its watered down bill of rights and on criminal penalties for most of the rest of its provisions. Such legislation is no more than a repetition of the same old theme song: 'Let the house of labor take care of itself.'

"My new bill offers a fresh approach. It is based on the recognition that, if the corrupt element is to be eliminated from the labor movement, the major part of the responsibility rests on the membership of any union to do its own housecleaning. Personally, I think they will do it if they are given the necessary tools and real protection while the

job is being done. This bill does exactly that.

"The bill contains a simple by comprehensive bill of rights which will go a long way toward insuring that control of the union will be in the hands of the members rather than the officials. Independently audited financial reports are required but the bill recognizes that regardless of where the reports are filed, only union members will be sufficiently well-informed to question them. Thus it provides that the reports must be given to union members only. By far the great majority of union leaders and employers honest Americans; therefore, no reports are required of labor officials or employers. Such reports are aimed only at wrongdoers and it is ridiculous to think a criminal is going to write us a report of his crime.

"Enforcement procedure is of paramount importance. The bill contains a simple, well-tested method—the unfair labor practice procedure of the National Labor Relations Board. All the member need do is file a charge of violation of the bill of rights or the reporting provisions, and the NLRB takes over the investigation and prosecution of his case. He is protected from retaliation while the case is processed. The confidence which rank and file workmen have in the Board is amply demonstrated by the fact that last quarter they filed 62 percent of the Board's unfair labor practice cases. The bill also includes important changes in Board structure to speed up its case handling."

Congressman KEARNS stated further, "Any labor reform measure must include restrictions on organizational picketing and secondary boycotts. Emotions run high on these issues, but both unions and employers are inclined to forget the impact of such activities on the working men and women who suffer as a result. Their right to be free of such coercion must be preserved if the freedom of association guaranteed by the Wagner Act is to mean anything.

"My new bill prevents picketing after a union loses an NLRB election and, at the same time, markedly speeds up NLRB procedure for holding such elections. It also stops picketing where the labor organization involved cannot establish that 30 percent of the employes want the union to represent them.

"In the secondary boycott area, there are presently restrictions on inducement of secondary employees. They are retained and a ban on threats, restraint and coercion of any person added. Hot cargo contracts are also outlawed.

"Believe me, the time has come to assure a greater voice to the union member in calling strikes. It is obvious that union officials must compete with each other to get the maximum wage increase for their members. Too often the members lose money as a result, either from lost wages or inflation caused by the increase. Consequently, the bill provides for a secret ballot strike vote to be taken within 7 days prior to commencement of any strike.

"There are many other provisions in the bill, which it is impossible to explain in detail in this release. However, they likewise definitely provide practical methods of protecting the rights of individual workmen.

"The Performance Act of 1959 is the least restrictive on the activities of legitimate unions of any bill presently before the House. It provides far fewer opportunities for harrassment of honest unions. At the same time, in my opinion, it provides the union member with the only practical, realistic method of enforcing his rights that can be found in any of the bills introduced.

"As a Member of Congress for 13 years, serving on the distinguished House Labor Committee, I believe that this bill offers the greatest opportunity for harmonious labor-management relations, and protection to the public, of any approach yet conceived."

Indonesia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. CARLTON LOSER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 19, 1959

Mr. LOSER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Coleman A. Harwell, editor of the Nashville Tennessean, and Mr. Kenneth Olson, dean emeritus of Northwestern University, have just returned from a 30,000-mile round-the-world trip. These distinguished gentlemen held journalism seminars, under the State Department's exchange program, in Greece, Israel, Afghanistan, Ceylon, and Indonesia.

It has been my privilege to place in the RECORD the articles written by Mr. Harwell for his paper during this world tour. Today, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including the last two articles on Indonesia. They follow:

THE U.S. TAXPAYER HAD A HEART ATTACK

(By Coleman A. Harwell)

JAKARTA, INDONESIA.—The lady was outraged by the treatment given her cruise ship in the harbor here.

Officers stalked all over the ship, she said. She said they demanded cigarettes, liquor, and food, they were insolent and arrogant.

One American man aboard shouted, "These are the people getting my tax dollars."

He became so outraged, she went on, that he actually had a heart attack. And she didn't blame him.

One significant detail needs to be added to this account. The cruise ship was Dutch.

It was as if a party of Germans had gone to Paris for a holiday just after the World War II occupation there. They would not have been warmly received.

It would have helped the outraged American taxpayer and it might have helped his country, too, if he had tried to see the situation here, not from the view of a luxury cruise member, but from that of the citizen of the country visited. We thought of him a number of times during our stay here.

SOME THINGS OBVIOUS

He might not have found it easy to see things as Indonesians see them. We found some well-trained, diligent Americans here who are finding it difficult to get the viewpoint.

The boundless enthusiasm of the people over their independence is apparent. That they do not know precisely how to use it and that their zeal carries them off in many directions is also apparent, and understandable.

The country is full of contrasts and contradictions. But some things are obvious to everyone interested.

When the Dutch were thrown out (finally in 1949), they left one of the worst rates of literacy in the world, estimated as low as 3 percent. They left no trained nationals (you don't use the word "native" anywhere today) to man public services or businesses.

They left few hospitals, few doctors, few schools, few teachers, little industry. They left poverty. They left hatred.

Indonesia won its independence technically in 1945 after defeat of the Japanese, who had taken over from the Dutch in 1942. There followed a period of great confusion after which the British came to represent the Allies and accept Japanese surrender. The Indonesians, with Sukarno as the hero-leader, proclaimed their independence and sought to take over. The Dutch, listed among the Allies, claimed control. There were sporadic clashes all over the country.

TREATY DRAWN

In time, a commission drew up a treaty, granting independence to Indonesia, leaving only a portion of West New Guinea in Dutch hands, and that subject to negotiation within a year.

Thus Sukarno and his followers had won their 20-year fight—almost. Now remained the problem of making victory real.

Sukarno was suspect by the West on the ground that he had collaborated with the Japanese. His reply was that he had seen this, not as service to the Japanese, but as a means of achieving independence from the Dutch.

In time he nodded in the direction of Russia and the West at the same time. He proclaimed a policy of neutrality. He made speeches. He did little.

But some of the things he did do made some of his fellow countrymen very unhappy.

They raised an issue similar in some respects to one that has disturbed the U.S. States rights.

DEMANDED MORE

The vast and rich, though thinly populated islands of Sumatra, Celebes, Borneo and the lesser Sundras charged that smaller, poorer, more densely populated Java was draining the national treasury. They demanded a greater share of returns from their rubber, oil, pepper, coffee, copra and tobacco. Their demands got nowhere.

So leaders in these areas began a system of sabotaging the central government. They shipped their products outside, collected, built up a revolutionary fund.

At this point, seeing serious consequences ahead, Sokarno decided to rely on his strongest rallying point, hatred of the Dutch. Citing the fact that the Dutch had not carried out the agreement to negotiate on West New Guinea, he proclaimed seizure of all their properties in Indonesia, valued at nearly $2 billion.

Thus again, Sukarno was the hero.

ANOTHER CHALLENGE

But another challenge lay in the future. By spring of 1958, the rebel leaders proclaimed they were ready to strike again.

They said they had strong forces, especially in big Sumatra, and would resist the central government "to the last."

What happened to the alleged "strong forces" is a mystery like many another in Indonesia. A lot of people, including many Americans, were fooled—in fact, many Indonesians still believe the rebellion had American encouragement. They cite the air attacks on government forces which could have come only from Formosa and other areas of our allies. They cited the capture of American Allan L. Pope, who was shot down in an antiquated plane he flew for the rebels for $10,000 per month.

Incidentally, Pope is still a captive in Indonesia. Our officials see him whenever they wish, say he has recovered from his injuries except for a limp, and is well-cared for. They keep agreement with the Indonesian Government.

Regardless of why the rebellion failed, the important points are these:

1. When forces of the central government which was apparently tottering were gathered together by vigorous, young Gen. Abdul Haris Nasution, and went after the rebels in Sumatra, they found no major resistance. The rebellion withdrew to small pockets in the wilds, where it still exists today, how strongly, is anybody's guess. Strong enough, it is obvious, either to justify the Sukarno government continuing its martial rule or to provide an excuse for doing so.

2. Sukarno, like him or not, has ridden out another crisis. He could now continue his

palship with Red China's Chou En-lai and court Russian aid while visiting the United States, and making comments that sound anti-Communist.

3. It became apparent that two other men were of major importance, General Nasution, whose power is great in the military rule and who is more clearly tagged an anti-Red, and Prime Minister Djuanda, a nonparty engineer, widely respected.

These are the facts faced by America in this vast land of 85 million people, which stretches east to west as wide as the United States, covering a major action of the protective island rim that encircles Red territory, and contains a great amount of the world's natural wealth.

FACTS TO FACE

These are facts on which the United States based its decision early this year to ship a quantity of small arms to Indonesia. The shipment, announced by Ambassador Howard Jones, has been guessed as worth $20 million. There followed more recently U.S. announcement of the sales of some outdated warplanes to Indonesia.

Americans favoring the moves feel we must show the Sukarno-Nasution-Djuanda government that we'll give it support in a crisis. Otherwise, they believe, Indonesia will inevitably turn toward Red China and Russia.

How, they say, can we gain Indonesia's friendship if we sit by and let the Communist nations supply its military needs? How, they say, can we expect the Indonesians to rely on us and the West when we continue to let our European ally, Holland, cling to a portion of this country? Don't we know how the Dutch are hated here? Are we going to follow their lead or are we going to act in the manner of Abraham Lincoln and Franklin D. Roosevelt and the other Americans often quoted by the Indonesians themselves as leaders of liberty.

And what sense does it make for us to build roads and help Indonesia eradicate illiteracy if we aren't willing to show confidence in their government?

Thus, out of much confusion, our American policy seems to be emerging in Indonesia.

INDONESIA HUNGERS FOR EDUCATION

(By Coleman A. Harwell)

JAKARTA, INDONESIA.—In 1950, the year the Republic of Indonesia was established, two of its citizens served on public university faculties.

Out of 70 million people that is a low percentage.

This indicates the state of education at that time for all the people of Indonesia.

It has been estimated that the rate of literacy here under Dutch rule was among the worst in the world, perhaps as low as 3 percent.

When the United States considered aid to Indonesia, one of the things agreed upon by International Cooperation Administration (ICA) officials was that education should have a top priority.

Today it is ICA's best estimate that one-half of the children of the whole country go to school. All of these are expected to go through the third grade and become literate. There are 200 Indonesians serving on public university faculties, a great increase over 1950, and 25,000 university students.

You've heard people described as being hungry for education. There seems to be little doubt that this is true of the Indonesians, certainly of those in accessible areas.

Towns and villages have made their own brick and built 9,000 schools for themselves in the past 2 years. Every school in Indonesia, it is said, holds at least two sessions per day.

PEABODY GRADUATE

Of special interest to Nashville and its neighbors is the fact that the educational assistance program here is directed by Dr. Will P. Saunders, a graduate of Peabody College. Dr. Saunders came from Abbeville, Ala., was graduated from State Teachers College, Troy, taught in Alabama and was a school supervisor in North Carolina. To this solid experience, he added M.A. and Ph. D. degrees at Peabody, the latter in 1953, soon after which he came here.

A hearty, dedicated type, Dr. Saunders doesn't skip the bad when discussing the job here.

He cites, for instance, our early mistake in teaching unneeded technical skills—the operation of lathes, for instance, in a country that uses none. ICA is now making a study, with Ford Foundation aid, to determine what skills are useful.

He cites these things:

More than 2,000 Indonesians have studied in America since 1950; others will follow next year.

The University of California contracted in 1953 with the University of Indonesia to develop a medical school. He says with pride that this project is now "phased out." That means completed. He says the medical school is an "excellent one."

The University of Kentucky contracted to develop an engineering school at the University of Bandung. Under Dr. Cliff Keizer progress is being made. The school has 19 professors.

Kentucky is also helping develop an agricultural and veterinary school at Bogor; UCLA is developing an engineering school at Jogjakarta; John Hopkins is aiding an international relations school.

The Ford Foundation is cooperating with ICA and sponsors these projects: A badly needed economics school aided by University of California; another aided by Wisconsin; teacher training schools aided by State University of New York and United Brethren at Protestant University in Sumatra.

Eminent educators working with Dr. Saunders include: Dr. Raymond B. Allen, president, UCLA; Dr. Philip Thayer, dean, Johns Hopkins; Dr. Henry Dyer, vice president, education testing service, Princeton; Dr. Abdul Sassani, U.S. Office of Education; Dr. Mike Krenitzski, Texas A. & M.

The chief adviser on higher education is Dr. Helen Dwight Reid, former college dean and U.S. education official.

Cost of the program: $3 million per year from ICA; $1 million from the Ford Foundation.

The value: Who can estimate the impact of broad literacy and a substantial rate of scholarship in technical fields among 80 million people in one of the world's richest countries?

Suppose this has the impact of American educators? Suppose, on the other hand, that it does not? Suppose, instead, the $5 million accepted recently from Russia for a technical school at Amban, were left unchallenged?

ANOTHER TENNESSEAN

Overseeing the whole ICA program here, including education, is another man with Tennessee ties. James Baird, of Baird, Miss., a former planter, a Temple University law graduate, with wide administrative experience, looks forward to his biennial home leave this summer and a visit to Monteagle. He and Mrs. Baird hope their children will join them there.

Right now, Baird is engrossed in these things:

Plans for a 250-mile road into rich, remote areas of Sumatra, for which ICA will furnish the technical guidance and supervision;

Installation of 50 or 60 diesel generators which will use some of the vast oil resources here to furnish electricity to small cities in remote areas;

Continuation of the malaria-control project jointly with World Health Organization of the U.N., which it is hoped can stamp out the disease in 10 years;

Negotiation of a new surplus commodities contract under which Indonesia procures cotton, rice, tobacco, powdered milk and textiles from America;

Plans for construction of 30 merchant marine ships, possibly by Japanese shipyards, financed largely by Japanese reparations, and concurrent training of officers by the Merchant Marine Academy at Sands Point, R. I.;

A projected training program from film industry leaders, technicians, etc., in Hollywood, to compete with the influence of Red China.

Baird's aim is to help Indonesians develop their own resources, both human and natural. He believes they have an abundance of both. In them he sees the hope of a nation politically and economically independent.

How We Stand From Tia Juana to Tierra Del Fuego

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN V. CARTER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 20, 1959

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks. I would like to include in the RECORD a newspaper editorial by William S. White, which appeared in the Washington Evening Star on May 18. This editorial concerns itself with the serious situation that confronts America in dealing with her neighbors to the south. Some of my colleagues may find it surprising that a Congressman from Iowa should be concerned about anything other than the price of corn. However, in watching the change in the character of the world map, the change in the world's political alinements and, I think, looking at the future realistically, it suddenly becomes painfully obvious that the time may not be too far away when we will be thrown in total reliance on the Western Hemisphere as our bastian of defense. Would not it indeed be a sad note in history if we were to preempt the possibility of our hemispheric solidarity through failure to properly deal and communicate with our friends to the south.

Mr. Speaker, there are many more millions of people living south of the Rio Grande than live to the north of it, and the indications are that population growth south of the Rio Grande will be at a much greater rate in the future than the north of the Rio Grande. From some reason, I find that many people are still surprised by this particular statistic. It is true, Mr. Speaker, that machines and production are important; but if any of us have previously doubted the fact, I think we are convinced now that people still are and probably always will be the most important thing on the face of this earth.

I am not in complete agreement with Mr. White's proposal for collective military actions that are included in the following editorial. However, I do think it might be a worthwhile stopgap measure to be considered by the American Government. The only true way to arrive at a thorough understanding and a fully cooperative community of nations with Latin America is for us to share unselfishly our wealth and our experience with the people that inhabit that area. Let me emphasize that this must not and cannot be done with any kind of indulgent or protective attitude. It must be done in a spirit of deepest sincerity, as a cooperative venture between proud nations with great faith in the future of our lands and our people. If there are those among us who constantly apply the "what's in it for me" criteron to any program for the advancement of mankind, then I would simply point to the enlightened self-interest aspect inherent in a program to reverse the present trend in Latin America. Mr. White's editorial follows:

EROSION IN LATIN AMERICA—COLLECTIVE MILITARY ACTION SEEN AS SALVATION OF U.S. INFLUENCE

(By William S. White)

Our principal ally, Britain, is negotiating in the Foreign Ministers Conference at Geneva under the cruel pressure of steadily increasing dangers to vital British interests in the Middle East.

It is not merely the Berlin crisis which Britain must face, along with the rest of the West. Beyond the Mediterranean, Iraq—which both the United States and the British have so long sought to keep in the pro-West camp—has now seemingly gone all the way into international communism. Moscow has turned the Middle Eastern screw at a brutally apt moment.

Responsible informants in Washington therefore assume, as they must, that British policy at Geneva over Germany is bound to be softened by British concern as to what the Russians might further do in the Middle East.

A chief Western negotiator at Geneva is thus being distracted and weakened by unavoidable fears as to what might happen a long way from Berlin. The long story of declining British power in what used to be a great sphere of British influence, the valley of the Nile is developing a sad new chapter.

Not at this present Big Four Conference will America be similarly bedeviled and enfeebled by perils elsewhere to American interests. But there is a rising possibility that one day, in some other Big Four meeting over Europe, we, too, will have to fight with one hand while the other hand gropes for solutions of other problems far away.

For U.S. influence in the vast 21-nation area of Pan America is crumbling away, all but unnoticed in our preoccupation with the Old World. This vast pan-American expanse, as the Middle East expanse used to be to the British, is our traditional sphere of influence. And it is the source of much of our real economic strength, though few realize it and most of these few forget it.

Neither the Eisenhower administration nor Congress is paying great heed to this slow erosion in the Western Hemisphere. But a few quiet men are pressing constantly for facing up to the realities in Latin America before it is too late for us, as it is already too late for the British in the Middle East.

One of these men is Senator GEORGE SMATHERS, of Florida, whose awareness of Latin America is sharpened by his political location. SMATHERS for years has been telling the administration and Congress that things are not good for us south of the border. He knows, because he goes down periodically to make fresh checks and because he has thoroughly reliable private sources of intelligence.

Communism is an increasing force. Anti-Americanism (U.S. style) is growing, in part because of our own faults. But most of all, economic problems aside, the danger in Latin America comes from the absence of real military power properly restrained.

SMATHERS has highly reliable information, for example, that the recent invasion of Panama from Cuba would have succeeded had it involved as many as 250, repeat 250, well armed men. This may seem a comic opera thing; but it is far from that.

A revolutionary overturn in Panama would intolerably threaten us if, as almost certainly would be the case, it endangered the Panama Canal. In such an event we should be compelled to intervene with troops—and then the cry of Yankee imperialism would resound from the Rio Grande to the bottom tip of South America.

What is the answer? It is to supply what is now absent—a real and collective military power in Latin America which the Latin Americans themselves would respect, and not suspect. SMATHERS and others, therefore, are working for the establishment of an all-American international police force, made up of volunteers from all the 21 pan-American nations.

Such a force might one day avoid in the New World the chaos now gripping the ancient Middle East. And it might avert the clear possibility of an ultimate loss of practical U.S. influence right here in the Western Hemisphere.

Memorial to Late Bruce Blackman, Wilkes-Barre Newspaperman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 20, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Times-Leader Evening News of May 11, 1959:

BRUCE BLACKMAN MEMORIAL

It was a warming gesture to have the new Forty Fort High School unit of the National Honor Society designated the Bruce G. Blackman Chapter in tribute to the memory of the late sports editor of the Times-Leader Evening News, a member of the board of education in the West Side district almost a quarter century.

Bruce Blackman was generously endowed with the ideals of service, leadership, and character on which membership in the society is based. He himself easily would have qualified for election. Those of us who were his associates in the fourth estate during the past 40 years knew him as a man of integrity and devotion to duty. He was as dedicated to education and to youth as he was to journalism, which is saying a great deal.

The five charter members of the Bruce G. Blackman Chapter of the National Honor Society and others who will be added to the rolls in the years to come now will be doubly honored by their inclusion in this select company bearing his name. In perpetuating his memory in this fashion, the organization will provide its members with a daily source of inspiration and an example they well might emulate through life.

Very few individuals are heroes to those who know them best, as familiarity detracts from the aura of greatness. Bruce Blackman is one of the exceptions to the rule, and with good reason.

Protection for U.S. Silk Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 20, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader of May 11, 1959:

THREAT TO LOCAL ECONOMY—PROTECTION FOR U.S. SILK INDUSTRY

This community has a big stake in the hearing before the U.S. Tariff Commission in Washington on May 19 when the appeal of the American Silk Council for relief from trade concessions on silk fabric imports will be heard.

At the present time, the entire industry concentrated in the East, with this area one of the principal centers, has been reeling under the effects of ruinous foreign competition, chiefly from Japan.

With workers in the American industry receiving approximately $1.90 an hour and Japanese workers receiving only 11 cents an hour, it is impossible for American plants to compete for markets in this country.

In the past 4 years, Japan has taken 60 percent of the American market in this field. In 1955, Japan sent some 14 million square yards of silk fabric imports to the United States and U.S. mills produced 51 million square yards. During the past year, the situation practically has been reversed with Japan sending here 55 million yards and domestic plants turning out 31 million yards.

While no figures are available on employment, it is not difficult to arrive at conclusions that are anything but reassuring. Plants have been closed and operations have been curtailed. Whereas the industry once employed 12,000 in this region, now there are between 5,000 and 6,000 on the payrolls. And this number unquestionably will be reduced if the situation is not corrected.

What the American Silk Council seek is protection either in the form of higher tariff or quota limitations, so it will be able to compete. That seems like a reasonable request in the light of developments.

The Eisenhower administration has been friendly to Japan which is having economic difficulties of its own, to be sure. Washington's concern is the threat of communism in that Far East land which is the anchor of our defense line. With a teeming population, the Japanese Empire must trade or collapse. Its plight has been worsened by the elimination of Red China and other countries on the mainland which once constituted Japan's chief market. Washington is trying to build up trade between the United States and Japan as an offset, thus making it possible for Japan to survive.

While Washington's policy can be understood in this regard, the disastrous effects on the American textile industry cannot be ignored. It is a stiff price to pay for lending a helping hand to an ally. The Government

in Washington admittedly is on the horns of a dilemma.

The American Silk Council, realizing the international complications involved, is not asking the administration to cut off Japanese imports entirely, but to impose reasonable curbs that will insure the preservation of the U.S. industry.

The American industry now buys raw materials from Japan for processing here and has indicated a willingness to increase these imports to maintain the dollar position in Japan. It is the fabric yardage that is upsetting the cart in this country.

Ironically, the American silk industry is not allowed to buy yarns from Red China, but Red China sends raw material to Italy where it is processed and then shipped to the United States without restriction, adding to the headaches of the U.S. plant owners and their employees.

Another handicap for the American industry is that when foreign fabric is found defective or inferior, purchasers have no recourse, whereas if a batch from U.S. mills is not satisfactory it is returned promptly.

Furthermore, American machinery is being sent to Japan, improving facilities over there at the expense of the U.S. industry and workers.

As a distressed area, with thousands still idle, this community can ill afford to have this threat to its existence continue. In fact, with a little cooperation from Washington, thousands of idle workers, experts in this field, might be reemployed locally, thus relieving pressure on households and relief agencies.

Under the law, the decision is in the hands of the President, acting on the recommendation of the Tariff Commission. Congress cannot step into the picture until later and then it requires a two-thirds vote to overrule the executive branch of the Government.

While there is no desire to upset the delicate international balances under circumstances like these, a realistic approach is in order. American workers and communities should not be penalized unfairly.

On Labor Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ERNEST WHARTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 11, 1959

Mr. WHARTON. Mr. Speaker, I have just received an interesting and timely letter from one of my constituents concerning a forthright statement on pending labor legislation. In my opinion, this represents a plain and factual reaction of the man on the street, and I shall favor any recorded vote which will tend to answer his inquiry.

GHENT, N.Y.

DEAR SIR: I understand that the Senate has passed the Kennedy labor bill, but that the House will knock it down.

It is pitiful how some of our Congressmen sell the American people into bondage to racketeers and thugs. I sometimes wonder how many of these men are in debt to the unions.

After World War I Russia had a democracy for 1 day then the Bolsheviks took over.

What chance does the small man have if the Government backs up hoodlums and racketeers.

Yours truly,

C. R. HINDLE.

World Trade Battle and American Jobs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. DENT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 20, 1959

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, shortly after my election to Congress in January 1958, I made a study of the reciprocal trades, foreign aid, and mutual assistance to our friendly allies in relationship to American employment.

I have maintained all along the way that the present Reciprocal Trades Act is detrimental to the American economy.

I believed then, and I believe now, that Congress should do something drastic to change this destructive force that has caused the bulk of the present industrial unemployment. It has just now become apparent to some of the slowly awakening public press that this is true.

The following article appearing in the Pittsburgh Press is indicative of this awakening and presages an internal disturbance in this country in the near future that will have the most serious effect upon the entire gamut of our national livelihood—political, commercial, labor relations and, above all, the economy of our Nation from a revenue.

As we shift from producer to consumer, do we shift our tax base from production to sales?

Someone, soon, had better start looking inward instead of outward for the answers to our problems.

The article follows:

WORLD TRADE BATTLE—JOBS AT STAKE AS AMERICA'S EXPORTS DIP—FIERCE COMPETITION FACED IN WESTERN EUROPE, JAPAN

(By Charles Lucey)

WASHINGTON, May 18.—The United States today is bucking into the toughest battle for world markets it has faced since the days of the clipper ships.

It is a battle involving jobs and payrolls on the docks of New York and San Francisco, in the steel mills of Pittsburgh and Cleveland and Birmingham, the machine shops of Cincinnati and Indianapolis—in a word, all the United States of America.

Probably close to 4 million workers hold jobs based on this country's foreign trade. Any serious shift there could have strong bearing on good times or bad in America.

Already storm signals are rising for the United States in this fierce new competition developing in overseas trade.

American exports dipped by billions last year as imports climbed higher. That trend is continuing in these first months of 1959.

First-quarter exports were $3.8 billion, roughly $230 million less than in 1958's first quarter. Imports were about 3.6 billion, or 450 millioh more than a year ago.

Our export surplus for this period a year ago was nearly a billion. This time, only 271 million.

NOT CRITICIZED YET

Now there's a drain-away of U.S. gold reserves to foreign countries. Commonly this goes hand-in-hand with export-import troubles. Nobody regards this as critical yet. But the trend is worrisome because, long-range, it could involve the stability of the American dollar.

High producing costs here at home are losing business for numerous lines of U.S. industry. It's not general or across-the-board, but there is wide agreement that the danger grows.

Always, heretofore, American technology has been the offset to lower costs overseas. But the gap narrows now between our technology and that of industrial Western Europe and restless, resurgent Japan. They're good, too.

CHALLENGE TO UNITED STATES

Today for the first time in the modern industrial era, the United States faces the challenge of competition from a producing area of something near equal strength—the new, economically united Western Europe.

A formidable six-country area of 165 million people welded together in what is called the European common market—this is the prospect. It may hold great new trade possibilities for the United States but there are hazards, too.

Readying to meet new worldwide challenges, big American corporate business is surging overseas to build new plants or tie up with foreign concerns.

TARIFF PREFERENCES

This holds especially for Western Europe, where those inside the six-country area gain tariff preferences unobtainable if they operate from the United States or elsewhere.

In many cases, this means U.S. concerns will be bidding for new markets they were not reaching before. But when it also means their new foreign manufacture displaces old business in exports from these shores, it will cost America jobs.

Then, looming over and beyond all of this is the rising power of the Soviet bloc economic offensive. Already the Communists match the West, thrust for thrust, in some vital world areas.

This ominous threat is sure to grow as Russia, Red China and the Soviet European satellites expand their industrial might.

These are the main facets of the new economic challenge the United States faces around the world.

This challenge, insofar as it relates to friendly allied nations, is in large part United States created.

It was plainly to this ocuntry's interest after the war to build its western associates economically strong. They could not be politically significant allies otherwise. Today they have some of the most modern plants and equipment in the world—in some cases whole industries shining new from head to toe.

That part is good—but it means the United States, in a world shifted from a seller's to a buyer's market, has to root-hog-or-die in competing in overseas markets.

Many trade experts hold it is not new at all land no more than a return to former normal patterns. New or not, it confronts this country with real competition for the first time since the gunds died on World War II.

U.S. trade prospered in postwar years because we were sending billions overseas in loans and grants and these returned, in a kind of indirect subsidy, to pay for American goods shipped abroad. That's long since on the wane.

Certain international lending institutions are finding now that, when loans are made to underdeveloped countries, these countries often seek to spend this money not in the United States but in oversea countries where they believe they can get better prices.

Probably not all of the decline of U.S. exports in 1958 as compared with 1957 constituted a fair comparison because the Suez crisis of 1956 had shoved oversea trade, especially in oil, unusually high.

But it is a continuing trend right to this day, and so increasingly the deterioration of

our competitive position becomes a major disturbance.

Not only does the United States face the danger of pricing itself out of foreign markets—in many cases, the experts hold, it has designed itself out of them.

Autos, for the best example. The world has shown it is not impressed with Detroit's chrome and plush. It doesn't want America's big, dazzling, 16-cubic-feet electric refrigerators; it wants simple small ones.

Neither is the new, more intense competition for the United States limited to world markets—the figures emphasize the rising tide of our own imports and greater ability of foreign manufacturers to get their goods placed on American shelves.

From the high-tariff protectionists, because of this, comes a new cry for higher duties on everything from abroad. Yet there must be give-and-take in world trade and many businessmen denounce protectionism as defeatism—an economic isolationism that is no more possible in 1959 than political isolationism.

For these, they see the answer not in timidity but in boldness. They see the rising challenge, but believe the United States can meet it by a new technological breakthrough and by checking inflation at home to hold down costs. It is a tough test, perhaps the toughest in modern times.

In closing, let me state once again, that cheaper production in America, which some say will be the answer to foreign competition, will create the gravest situation yet found by our State Department.

If we take back our own domestic markets and make inroads into our former foreign markets, the economic crisis in the countries we have helped to industrialize will tear down every argument advanced by the State Department for helping these countries in the first place.

That is, Mr. Speaker, the real danger of continuing the present blind, and sometimes stupid, setup which believes we can raise the standards of others in a competitive world without lowering our own.

Loyalty Day Essay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK KOWALSKI
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 20, 1959

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, recently I had the great honor of participating in the Connecticut Loyalty Day Parade held at Stratford, Conn., under the sponsorship of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. It was a memorable occasion.

In connection with the parade and the Loyalty Day observance, the Bridgeport Lodge of the Loyal Order of Moose held an essay contest.

The winning essay was submitted by Joan E. Cholko, 12 years old, a student in the seventh grade at David Wooster Junior High School. She lives at 427 Bruce Avenue, Stratford.

Her essay is worth the study of all of us. I call it to the attention of the House:

WHY WE HAVE A LOYALTY DAY PARADE IN AMERICA

We have a Loyalty Day parade in America to demonstrate, outwardly, to the other nations of the world, the loyalty or devoted allegiance which we have for our beloved United States of America, a Nation of peace and great freedoms.

The parade also demonstrates the military strength of our Nation, which is always ready to defend the principles of democracy. These principles have to be defended if there is to be peace throughout the world.

JOAN E. CHOLKO.

Statement of Don Romulo O'Farrill Before the Public Works Committee of the House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. FALLON
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 20, 1959

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, at my invitation the Honorable Romulo O'Farrill, president of the Congresos Pan-Americanos De Carreteras, and other Pan-American highway experts, attended today's highway hearing of the Public Works Committee to meet and become acquainted with the members of the committee.

The Inter-American Highway has been of keen personal interest to me since I introduced legislation in April 1955, authorizing funds for the completion of its construction. I believe this joint venture in completing this great highway will result in the increased interchange of cultures and commerce. It cannot fail to benefit our own country as well and will surely create better bonds of mutual understanding among the American nations.

I have the privilege of inserting in the RECORD Mr. Romulo's statement made before our committee today.

Listed below are the names of the Pan-American highway experts who attended the meeting with Mr. Romulo:

ADDRESS TO THE U.S. CONGRESS, HOUSE PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE, BY DON ROMULO O'FARRILL, PRESIDENT OF THE PERMANENT EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE PAN AMERICAN HIGHWAY CONGRESSES AND PRESIDENT OF THE MEXICAN HIGHWAY ASSOCIATION, MAY 20, 1959

Honorable members and friends of the Committee of Public Works, House of Representatives, it is an honor for the Permanent Executive Committee of the Pan American Highway Congressess, on this occasion of its fourth annual meeting, to call upon this distinguished committee which has played such a large part in the evolution of the Pan American Highway System from a theory to actual fact.

You and we have spent many active years in support of this vital hemispheric link. As men and machines have forged ahead to connect our several countries and in fact our continents through a major international highway system, so have all of our peoples become more closely allied through the economic and cultural exchange which are automatic byproducts of such a network.

Our critics have sometimes become impatient with our work and have complained that progress has been slow. To this we would say that only Don Quixote himself could turn windmills into giants and, by contrast, our problems have run the gamut of climate, terrain, and continuing construction in the face of rapidly increasing costs. As you so well know because of you intimate connection with the highway, our problems have been very real ones but, as you also know, they have not been found insurmountable.

I cannot let this moment pass without a special word of praise for the magnificent support given our cause over the past many years by the Bureau of Public Roads. The contribution of this Bureau is not susceptible to normal standards of measurement for its guidance and help, ever sympathetic to the particular needs and requirements of the individual nations and both the Inter-American and Pan American Systems as a whole, have loomed large in the minds and hearts of all of us. Under the guidance of the Federal Highway Administrator, Bertram D. Tallamy, our working relationships and close cooperation have reached a level of unparalleled productivity. All of us today pay an especial tribute to this friend of the Latin Americans.

The Pan American Highway from Laredo on the United States-Mexican border down to Rio alone links the capitals of 17 continental countries and covers 18,769 miles. Of this distance 7,700 miles are paved; 8,541 are in good condition for all year travel; 1,690 miles require improvement to insure passable all year traffic; and only 836 miles remain to be constructed.

Out of this 836 miles to be built some 435 miles are in the section of the Darien of Panama and the contiguous zone in Colombia. Fortunately, all members of the Organization of American States have proclaimed the financial problem of a route through the Darien to be one of an Inter-American nature and one which requires joint Inter-American action for its solution. This thesis was established by the Pan American Highway Congresses and reaffirmed at the meeting of the Representatives of the Presidents.

We in Latin America estimate that 70 percent of the total production of our nations is transported over highways and especially those highways which are identified with the Pan American Highway System. According to the compilation of the International Road Federation, there are 3,511,000 motor vehicles in Latin America. Of these almost 2 million are private cars and 1½ million are buses and trucks. In the 20 Latin American Republics, total production has been increasing between 2 and 10 percent per year. Thus, an average of a 5 percent per year production increase in the countries of the Latin American community make that community one of the most rapidly developing economic areas of the world. Yet the full impact of the economic and social benefits of this prodigious system cannot be fully realized until North and Central America are linked by land passage with the South American system.

The committee which I represent today is deeply appreciative of the important contribution of the United States to the building of our Inter-American Highway system. The U.S. contribution covering two-thirds of the cost of the Inter-American Highway construction in the five Central American countries and Panama to the Canal Zone has been more than a giant step to insure realization of the highway. Not only has this action provided a strategic defense for that vital zone of the continent but has also helped to increase and facilitate the movement of ideas, produce, and travelers. The salutary and far-reaching effects of in-

creased Inter-American travel alone are known to all of us.

Many steps lie ahead which require our additional thought and financial assistance. The matter of financing the Darien gap in Panama and Colombia is one of the most important problems before the Executive Committee of the Pan American Highway Congresses as we meet now in Washington. We undertake our deliberations in the firm belief that the House of Representatives Public Works Committee shares our conviction that a formula must be found which will permit the financing of the last important land link between the Americas; also that the committee shares with us our conviction that a Pan American Highway system fully operative, and adequately maintained, is one of the finest gifts that men of our generation can give to the world.

We of Latin America are proud to number the members of this committee and its staff among our personal friends and among the foremost friends of our individual countries. The names of the Honorable GEORGE FALLON, the late Harry McGregor, and other present and past committee members have an especial significance. They have gone far to give new meaning to the phrase "Inter-American friendship" and for all of this we are fully appreciative.

PERMANENT EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE PAN AMERICAN HIGHWAY CONGRESSES, FOURTH PERIOD OF SESSIONS, MAY 18–22, 1959, PAN AMERICAN UNION, WASHINGTON, D.C.

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

Argentina.

Brazil: Delegate, Sr. Alberto Amarante, President, National Highway Council; alternate, Sr. Marcilio Motta, National Highway Department.

Colombia: Delegate, the Honorable Virgilio Barco Vargas, Minister of Public Works; alternate, Mr. Alfredo D. Bateman, National Highway Director.

Chile.

United States: Delegate, Bertram Tallamy, Federal Highway Administrator; alternate, Gerald W. Russell, Officer in charge, Transportation and Communications, Inter-American Regional Economic Affairs, Department of State. Advisers, Paul F. Royster, Frank Turner, Robert F. Ide.

Mexico: Delegate, Mr. Romulo O'Farrill, President, Mexican Highway Association; alternate, Mr. Jose J. March, Director General, Mexican Highway Association.

Panama: Delegate, The Honorable Roberto Lopez Fabrega, Minister of Public Works; alternates, Sr. Tomas Guardia Jr., Executive Technical Director Darien Sub-Committee; Sr. Tomas Guardia Sr., Chief Inter-American Highway.

Peru: Delegate, the Honorable Eduardo Dibos Dammert, Minister of Development and Public Works; alternates, Carlos Donayre, Minister-Counselor, Peruvian Embassy; Carlos Gibson, Commercial Counselor, Peruvian Embassy; Raul Paraud, Subdirector of Highways.

Venezuela: Delegate, Eng. Alonso Perez Luciani; alternate, Eng. Francisco Aspurua.

Organization of American States: Francisco J. Hernandez, Permanent Secretary to the Pan American Highway Congresses; Hugo J. Seifart, Technical Adviser to the Permanent Secretariat.

Special Observers: International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, Mr. C. Lacayo-Faillos; International Road Federation, Robert O. Swain, Executive Director; Wm. C. La Baugh, Director of Engineering; Inter-American Statistical Institute, Efraim Murcia Camacho; United Nations, Louis Delanney; United Nations Economic Commission for Latin America, Daniel Bitrán.

Bucking the Tide

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF
OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 20, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker pursuant to permission granted I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article from the Washington Post and Times Herald of May 20 entitled "Bucking the Tide":

BUCKING THE TIDE

Since 1953, 17 States have thrown out their so-called fair trade laws as unconstitutional, and many major manufacturers of once fair-traded items have in consequence abandoned this retail price-fixing scheme altogether. Consumers throughout the country have benefited from the broadening of competition which has resulted. But the small independent druggist and other not-so-small retailers for whom "fair trade" has been a handy commercial crutch have viewed the trend with great alarm.

So alarmed have they become, in fact, that these businessmen who only seven years ago were in Washington demanding the McGuire Act to sanctify their state fair trade laws—waving high the banner of "States' rights"—have done a complete about fact. They now appeal for a Federal "fair trade" act to take over from the crumbling State laws the job of enforcing minimum retail price agreements. And, amazingly enough, they have persuaded a lopsided majority of the House Commerce Committee—headed by that stalwart States' Righter, Representative OREN HARRIS—to report favorably on their bill.

That such legislation would be against the interests of the American consumer is clear enough. Estimates of the probable cost of a Federal price-fixing law like that which the House committee favors run from $1 billion to $10 billion a year. What is perhaps less clear, but without much doubt equally true, is that a Federal fair trade law would not benefit the retailer in the long run, either. Assuredly it would invite extension of the minimum wage laws to millions of employees not now covered, for if the Federal Government has any business in the retail pricing field, clearly it ought no longer to be foreclosed from the retail wage and hour field. The amendment by which the House committee hopes to head off such action would probably not stand a legal test—and in any case it is certain to open a general "States' rights" debate over "fair trade."

Beyond this consideration, however, merchants who want "fair trade" price-fixing ought to consider whether they really want to live in a rigid market of that kind and whether the consumer reaction to the abolition of much retail competition would not be likely to harm business subsantially. If the retailer is to be placed at the mercy of his brand-name manufacturers, would he not lose the opportunity for pricing and sales initiatives so essential to business promotion and growth? Would he not be in effect become a mere subsidiary of the manufacturers, unable to adapt his merchandising program to local conditions and opportunities?

There can be no doubt that the consumer wants the full benefit of the free enterprise system in retailing. We suspect that the thoughtful retailer knows that his true interests lie in the same direction.

Expert Analysis of Pending Wheat Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE BROCK
OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 20, 1959

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, the problem of writing a new wheat legislative program has been occupying the attention of the House and Senate Committees on Agriculture for some time.

It is a very controversial issue and the respective committees have heard testimony from every conceivable source. Much of it is conflicting and is designed to benefit one specific group as opposed by another.

I have given much thought to it, as have the other legislators from the Farm Belt States. We are not completely in agreement as to the best possible solution of the problem. We all wish to protect the income and advance the best interest of the farmer who raises wheat. We also look forward to reducing the enormous wheat surpluses that have been accumulated in our storage bins.

To find some reasonable and fair solution to the wheat problem, I have asked one of the outstanding agricultural experts in the United States to give me the benefit of his views on the problem. He is Carl F. Wilkins, who has served on congressional committees as an agricultural economist and is recognized for his studies and work in this field.

Mr. Speaker, may I, therefore, under the unanimous consent of my colleagues extend my remarks and place Mr. Carl F. Wilkins' analysis and reply in the RECORD. I know that they will render a valuable contribution to all thinking on this controversial issue:

EXPERT ANALYSIS OF PENDING WHEAT LEGISLATION

You asked me to analyze the difference between the Senate bill in regard to wheat and the proposal before the House.

First of all I would like to point out that the economic record clearly proves that we cannot have a solvent economy without an average of parity for our farm production and the production of other raw materials.

In addition I would like to point out that parity of income must have an additional factor units of production to multiply by the price.

The Senate bill as I understand it provides a 65 percent of parity price for those who do not cut back their production and a support price of 80 percent of parity for those who cut back 20 percent of their production.

First of all I wish to point out that both proposals evade the basic need of an average of 100 percent of parity for farm products to create the reciprocal market in rural America for the goods which we must produce to meet our payrolls and capital costs.

The wheatgrower with 65 percent of parity and full production will have an income based on 100 percent production and 65 percent of the needed price or 65 percent of parity income.

The group who produce 80 percent at an 80 percent price support will have an income based on 80 percent production and 80 per-

cent price or 64 percent of parity income. The 65 percent of parity price support will establish the market price and the wheat with an 80 percent price support will land in the hands of the Government. The bill undermines the capital investment on wheat now in storage thus automatically forcing a loss.

On the other hand the bill before the House provides for a 90 percent price support with a reduction of 30 percent in production. Under this proposal the grower will be paid 90 percent for 70 percent of normal production and will receive 63 percent of parity income.

Both bills will therefore have about the same result and end up in establishing an income of 65 percent from wheat production. I cannot understand how Congress, after voting for legislation which provides parity for labor and permits adjustment of wages to increases in the cost of living on one hand, can defend legislation which still further reduces the income of rural America through lower farm prices.

In one respect the House bill is very important. It returns to the 90 percent price support. In my opinion, without a minimum of a 90 percent price support for farm production, it is impossible to ever reach the goal of parity or price balance between the income of rural areas and industrial areas.

For example in 1957 the per capita income of 34 States with a population of 79 million was approximately $720 less than the per capita income in 14 States with a population of 91 million. The 34 States depend upon their primary income from farm production and other raw materials while the 14 States depend primarily for their income upon manufactures, payrolls and finance.

Passage of either bill will help to force down the income of the 34 States while on the other hand increases in hourly wages and debt expansion will increase the income of the 14 States.

The record of your own State, Nebraska, proves that the present program for agriculture has deprived your State of $460 million of income per year over the past 7 years. The program set forth in wheat legislation will force a further loss upon your State and other rural areas.

In all fairness if wheat growers are to cut back their production they should at least be paid 100 percent of parity for the wheat they do produce. If 65 percent of parity is sound legislation for agriculture, an industry with 14 percent of all capital investment in the United States, then all other groups should be cut 35 percent below present income levels.

No group has ever been exploited to the extent that our farm operators have been exploited during the past 8 years.

In 1946–50, with a national income averaging $211 billion, the farm operators were paid $14.2 billion. In 1957–58, with a national income of $362 billion per year, the farm operators were paid $12 billion, or $2 billion less per year.

This underpayment to agriculture and in turn to rural America is undermining our economic structure, setting the stage for economic collapse. The two bills if passed will add to the dislocation. I cannot understand how Congress and the American people can justify the attitude toward agriculture. A level of 65 percent of parity or economic equality for rural America is completely contrary to the principles of our system and against the laws of mathematics which govern our income and exchange of goods and services.

Poison in Your Water—No. 79

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 20, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of March 5, 1958, entitled "City Polluting River, United States Says; Must Correct Garbage Plant":

CITY POLLUTING RIVER, UNITED STATES SAYS; MUST CORRECT GARBAGE PLANT—ST. LOUIS OFFICIALS STUDYING HOW TO FINANCE IMPROVED WAYS OF DISPOSAL—LEGAL ACTION POSSIBLE

What steps to take to meet a new financial problem handed the city yesterday were under study today. Participants in a conference called by the U.S. Public Health Service, which has legal authority to compel compliance with its orders, directed the city to study speedily ways to improve its methods of garbage disposal. The aim is to reduce pollution of the Mississippi River.

The Public Health Service and other agencies represented at the conference at Soldiers' Memorial—the Missouri Division of Health, the Illinois Sanitary Water Board, and the Bi-State Development Agency—found that the city of St. Louis was a principal contributor to pollution of the Mississippi because of its practice of putting untreated garbage into the river. The city grinds the garbage it collects but does not treat it.

SURVEY REQUIRED BY JULY 1

As a result of this finding the conferees instructed the city to have an enginering report prepared on methods for improving garbage disposal. The survey must be completed by July 1.

The city was instructed to submit the report to the State health division. Should it be found that no method other than the present one is feasible, the city was directed to present strong reasons to justify continuing the present practice.

Facilities for converting garbage into fertilizer or treating it in some other manner would cost more than $1 million, Frank Kriz, president of the board of public service, said.

Murray Stein, chairman of the conference and chief of interstate enforcement for the Public Health Service's water supply and water pollution control program, expressed surprise when he learned that the city put ground, but untreated, garbage into the river. He described the practice as "very unsatisfactory."

OTHER METHODS RULED OUT

Kriz said that before garbage grinding facilities were expanded in 1955, the city considered other methods of handling the 150 tons of garbage collected daily from householders. All were either impractical or too costly, he said.

He said the idea of building a plant to convert the garbage to fertilizer was rejected because there was no assurance there would be a market for the product after a fertilizer plant was built.

"No other city is marketing fertilizer at a profit or at anything close to justifying the cost of a fertilizer plant," he remarked.

A facility for cooking the garbage, then selling it to hog feeders, was also rejected because of a lack of any assurance of a market for the feed, he said. There is no suitable space in the city for a sanitary landfill, Kriz pointed out.

DEFENDS GRINDING

He defended the grinding method, saying that the garbage is ground so thoroughly that no chunks are flushed into the river. Representatives of Illinois and Missouri conservation agencies, as well as officials of the Public Health Service, reported at yesterday's conference that large pieces of garbage have been floating down the river as far as 150 miles south of here.

There was no direct evidence that the refuse came from the city's grinding plant, but conferees found no other municipality in the area that puts untreated garbage into the Mississippi.

Kriz said that when the grinding plant was expanded, it was the city's plan to connect the facility to a sewage treatment plant to be built by the Metropolitan St. Louis Sewer District.

Health officials expressed dissatisfaction with this plan, however, pointing out that the sewer district's schedule of projects to abate stream pollution here does not call for the construction of sewage treatment facilities before 1963 and as late as 1967.

LEGAL ACTION POSSIBLE

A Public Health Service official said that if the city fails to have the engineering report made, a public hearing would be called by the U.S. Surgeon General. Should he find that the conferees' order was proper, he then can order the report. Failure to comply with this order would result in legal action, the official said.

Kriz told a reporter he would confer tomorrow with Mayor Raymond R. Tucker, to determine whether to proceed with hiring an engineering firm and to see if funds for the job are available.

The conferees accepted the sewer district's 9-year timetable of projects to abate stream pollution.

Antitrust Laws Needed for Labor Unions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 12, 1959

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, the following article was published by the National Small Businessmen's Association in their Small Business Bulletin of May 1959. This is a penetrating analysis of one of the major problems confronting the American people today and a great public service. With local autonomy gone and bargaining demands now formulated at the national level, labor monopoly power in the hands of professional managers wields a force with almost unlimited power over the national economy.

Current newspaper headlines illustrate the threat to use that force and the need for bringing labor unions under the jurisdiction of our antitrust laws. I urge my colleagues to study this article and other aspects of the problem and to join with me in support of labor antimonopoly legislation:

Labor Monopoly Threatens Our Free Economy System

(By John Kilcullen, special counsel to the National Small Businessmen's Association)

The problem of monopoly, which Congress sought to dispose of by enacting the Sherman Act 70 years ago, has reappeared in a form quite as threatening as that in which it appeared during the late stages of the 19th century.

Then it was the monopoly of the large corporations and the industrial trusts. Now it is labor monopoly. The effect is the same—monopoly prices. And the victim is the same—the consumer.

LABOR EVEN MORE THREATENING

In many respects, labor monopoly is far more threatening than the business combinations of the last century. It is more extensive and more powerful. And, because labor is the most important element in costs, its effect upon consumer prices is greater.

Where industrial monopolies regulated the prices of only a few commodities, labor monopoly has its impact upon the price of all commodities. Where the business monopolies were limited to certain industries or areas, labor monopoly wields a unified nationwide force with almost unlimited power over all industries.

Most important of all, labor monopoly is gradually undermining the value of money, a process which, unless curbed, can eventually destroy not only economic welfare but national security as well.

Unfortunately, the labor monopoly subject and what can or should be done about it has been clouded by emotional and irrelevant arguments. As a result, clear understanding of the subject has been lacking. Spokesmen for organized labor insist that the term "monopoly" can be used only in relation to business and commercial functions—that it has no valid applicability to unions or any of their activities.

LABOR CLAIMS IMMUNITY

By reason of this, they argue, it is unrealistic to consider any union activities or practices within the context of the antitrust laws. Let us proceed to examine whether this is true or not.

Monopoly power may be defined as the ability to set prices and outputs of particular commodities and services at levels which are significantly different from those that would be established by the interaction of the forces of supply and demand in a free market.

MONOPOLIST SEEKS SHELTER

In normal circumstances, monopoly power cannot be exercised unless the monopolist is in some way insulated or sheltered from competitive pressures and the checks and balances provided by natural economic forces.

In the case of business firms which manufacture or sell a product, such insulation is difficult to achieve. If they attempt to set or maintain the price of a particular commodity at an artificially high level the consumer will seek, and probably find, a suitable substitute.

Thus would-be monopolists find themselves in control of a product which has no market. To avoid this they must attempt to prevent the entry of rival products or rival businesses into the competitive market. But here they are stymied by the antitrust laws. Any efforts in this direction are prohibited and subject to severe penalties.

Labor unions, on the other hand, are effectively insulated from competitive pressures because those who require a supply of labor cannot find, except in rare instances, a suitable substitute. They have no alternative than to pay the price demanded by the union which supplies or controls the necessary labor.

Further, by virtue of their immunity from the antitrust laws, unions can protect their control over labor supply and labor prices by preventing the introduction of new and cheaper methods or products whose prices are forced up by increased union labor costs.

TEAMSTERS THREATEN TROUBLE

A case in point is the action taken by the Teamsters Union to prevent piggyback transportation of truck trailers by rail. This method was developed in cooperation between trucklines and railroads to provide lower freight costs where longhaul shipments are involved.

The Teamsters viewed this cheaper method of transportation as a threat to their control of labor supply in the motor freight industry. Accordingly, they notified trucking firms that any firm making use of piggyback arrangements would face labor trouble with the Teamsters.

When a few trucking firms ignored this threat, the union directed its members to refrain from loading the trailers onto the railroad flatcars and engaged in picketing to prevent others from loading the trailers. Efforts to obtain legal relief from this high-handed interference with interstate commerce were rendered futile when the Supreme Court held that the Teamsters' boycott could not be enjoined.

If any business firm or firms in the transportation industry were to attempt to impose any such restraints upon the piggyback arrangements they would unquestionably be prosecuted under the antitrust laws.

OTHER EXAMPLES CITED

Many examples of similar union practices can be found in the building construction industry. There, unions have been successful in pushing wages of the bricklayers, plumbers, plasterers, and other crafts to a higher point than almost any other group of industrial workers.

To protect these high wage levels the unions have used various devices to keep competitive products and methods of construction off the market. The Carpenters Union has, for example, outlawed the use of various types of prefabricated door and window sash, wall sections, and modular units. These would greatly increase efficiency and cut costs in building construction.

The Plumbers Union has barred the use of plastic pipe, a new and improved product, which would more than cut in half the amount of plumbing labor involved in home construction and reduce costs of construction appreciably.

In some areas the unions closely regulate the entry of firms into a certain line of business, decide what projects a particular firm may be permitted to bid on, and set a minimum amount for any given bid.

In the printing industry the unions have prevented the use of automatic equipment which would permit cheaper and more efficient printing of books, magazines, and newspapers.

All of these restrictions have, of course, the objective of preventing competition with the unions' established control over the available labor supply. Needless to say, the cost to the consumer is enormous.

Organized labor's apologists willingly admit that unions utilize these various devices to prevent or neutralize competitive factors. But they argue that: (1) Workers are justified in taking these collective measures to obtain the highest possible wages and preserve their opportunities for employment; and (2) labor is not a commodity. Consequently the control of labor supply is not to be equated with the control of the supply or price of a commercial product or service.

The first part of this argument begs the question as to whether any segment of society is justified in taking self-help measures at the expense of all other segments. The producers of a commodity could, by the same token, argue that they have a right to make an adequate profit from their efforts. And, where necessary, they should be permitted to protect their product from price-cutting competition.

In a practical sense the businessman's argument is just as logical and morally justified as that of the union. But in each case, the result is the same—curtailment of competition and higher prices to the public.

IS LABOR A COMMODITY?

The argument that the labor of a human being is not a commodity or article of commerce originally found expression in section 6 of the Clayton Act amendments to the Sherman Act adopted by Congress in 1914. The implication was that any attempt to apply the antitrust laws to unions would amount to putting union members in the same category as so many sacks of flour or pairs of shoes or loaves of bread. To even suggest such a notion, the reasoning goes, demonstrates a disregard of human values.

Actually this argument is more emotional than real. Admittedly, human labor should not be regarded as a commodity or article of commerce. But there is no rational relationship between this premise and the proposition that unions, as organizations, should or should not be subject to the antitrust laws. It is ridiculous to suggest that putting antitrust restraints upon the union would place its members in the category of commodities to be bought and sold in the marketplace.

In actual fact, it would be more accurate to say that just the opposite result would occur—that many of the present practices whereby unions exploit the workers and sell their services to those who can be induced or forced to buy them would be outlawed.

It is a right of workers, individually and collectively, to proffer or withhold their labor as they see fit. But in the vast majority of situations where union economic power is employed to bring about restraints of trade or to force unrealistic or uneconomic costs on production of commodities, the choice of the individual worker to proffer or withhold his labor is not involved. In most such situations the individual union members have little, if any, voice in determining the price to be charged for their labor, or in the determination as to whether their employer is to be permitted or restrained from handling a particular type of product or doing business with another employer.

UNIONS SELL LABOR

These decisions are, for the most part, the decisions of those who manage the union affairs. Consequently, these decisions and the actions which flow from them must be treated as actions of the union as an entity apart from the human beings whose labor is being proffered or withheld.

In this context it becomes apparent that the labor of human beings has become a commodity or article of commerce, because the union itself is engaged in the business of trading and selling this commodity. And when the union engages in monopoly practices and restraints of trade it is not necessarily acting for, or in the interests of, those whose labor is being bought and sold.

The idea of a labor union as an association spontaneously formed by individual employees to equalize their bargaining power and protect themselves from exploitation by a powerful employer is as obsolete as the horsecar.

LOCAL AUTONOMY LOST

This concept was true in years past when unions were local in character. That is, they were composed of workers in a particular area, or plant, or trade who had common interests and objectives.

In that setting the workers had a direct and immediate interest in their union, and the union had many of the aspects of a

genuine fraternal self-help organization. The local union formulated its own collective bargaining demands, carried on the bargaining and, when agreement could not be reached, made the decision on whether or not to engage in a strike.

Although the local union was affiliated with a national or international union, this affiliation was a loose one. On policy matters the local union was autonomous and independent.

During the prodigious union growth of the past 25 or 30 years, local union autonomy has long since been thrown overboard. The center of gravity shifted to the headquarters of the national or international union.

There, the major decisions are made and carried out by a group of professional managers. They have taken over the functions of formulating bargaining demands—even conducting negotiations for the local unions.

In many industries the national union negotiates a pattern contract with a major company. The terms of this contract then become the obligatory terms for all local unions and employers throughout the industry. Decisions to strike are likewise made by the national managers with local members having no choice but to comply.

This transfer of the decision making functions from the local members to the national officers has caused, quite naturally, a marked drop in interest of rank and file members in union affairs.

For the most part the union member no longer feels a close identification with the union. Studies of union loyalty attitudes have shown a high percentage of members having little, if any, interest in the union other than its periodic efforts to get higher wages, and a generally prevalent feeling of skepticism and lack of trust toward the union officers and their motives. This lack of rank and file interest is demonstrated most strikingly by low attendance at union meetings.

COMPULSORY MEMBERSHIP VITAL

In the face of this sharp decline in interest among rank and file members, gradual disintegration of many unions would have been inevitable if the union professionals had not had the foresight to demand and obtain compulsory membership provisions in their collective bargaining contracts with industry.

Under these so-called union security clauses the workers are obligated to become, and remain, dues-paying union members as a condition of retaining their jobs. Union managers argue, and have been able to convince the public, that such clauses are necessary to eliminate freeriding by workers who share the benefit of union collective bargaining activities without paying the cost. But their actual purpose has been to prevent large-scale defections by workers who no longer have any sympathy for, or interest in, the union. This also explains why the professional unionists have thrown almost their total power and resources into the fight against the right-to-work laws.

In the process of change from local union autonomy to the centralized power of the national unions, other changes have taken place in regard to union objectives.

The bread-and-butter union objectives of Samuel Gompers have quite clearly been displaced by a broad program of changes in the social and economic system.

The new union managers, almost to a man, maintain no strong sympathy for the competitive enterprise system. They strongly prefer a planned economy. Abundant evidence of this is available from the legislative proposals supported by the AFL–CIO. These include demands for heavier taxes on sources of investment capital, heavy Government spending in the fields of public power and public housing, Federal aid to education, rigid Federal farm subsidies and controls, Federal regulation of natural gas prices and many other programs which would expand the areas of governmental regulation and planning. The ultimate goal is complete Government control over industrial programs, production, and prices.

The accomplishment of that ultimate goal has been slowed down to some extent because the American people are still too strongly committed to the competitive enterprise system. The most effective means of overcoming this public resistance and to hasten progress toward the planned economy is to break down the competitive enterprise system and destroy public confidence in it. The most effective tools for accomplishing this are the anticompetitive practices and uneconomic wage costs imposed upon industry by labor unions.

SOLUTION OFFERED

It is futile and unreasonable to expect that labor unions will ever voluntarily, in the public interest, forego their demands for higher and higher wages. Nor when these demands are thwarted by competing forces, will they forego the temptation to strike down the competition. Only when legal restraints are imposed and enforced by the Government will there be any adequate protection of the public interest.

Effective legislation in this field would have to do three things:

1. Prevent centralized control of collective bargaining policies by national or internation unions, and return these functions to the local union level.

2. Prohibit strikes and other forms of coercive action carried out as part of a prearranged plan or combination between two or more unions to impose concerted wage demands and other contract conditions upon industries affecting interstate commerce and trade.

3. Prohibit union imposed restrictions upon the use of products and improved methods of work performance, limitations on production, price fixing, and similar arrangements arrived at through agreement—either voluntary or coerced—with individual employers or groups of employers.

Simultaneously, it should be made clear that where an individual union engages in any action in the form of strikes, picketing, or boycotts as a means of obtaining or enforcing a demand for wages or other conditions of employment—and such action is not a part of any concerted plan, combination, or arrangement with any other union—it would not come within the scope of any antitrust or antimonopoly restrictions even where it may result in an interruption of interstate trade or commerce.

Under such legislation the ability of local unions to use their traditional economic weapons in support of legitimate union objectives would be fully preserved and protected. But the big power combinations of unions would be broken up, just as the big corporation trusts of the 1890's were broken up by the Sherman Act.

It should be apparent to those who have a grasp of the economic force now building up within our country and throughout the world, that enactment of such legislation is our only hope of staving off ruinous inflation and the drabness of the welfare state economy that inevitably lies in store for the next generation.

International Institute of Gary, Ind.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 20, 1959

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the International Institute of Gary, Ind., is celebrating its 40th anniversary this week. During that period of time, thousands of immigrants have come from across the ocean to the Calumet region of Indiana and this organization has contributed greatly toward making it easier for these new citizens to launch their career as Americans in a proper manner. Its community service and good work during this period of time is immeasurable. Under the direction of Miss Elizabeth N. Wilson during the last 14 years, the work of this organization has greatly expanded until today its service reaches to thousands of citizens in homes of the Calumet area.

The following editorial by H. B. Snyder, editor of the Gary Post-Tribune, pays a deserving tribute to the International Institute of Gary, Ind.:

THE INSTITUTE'S BIRTHDAY

Gary seems to have had more than its share of anniversaries since the city's own golden jubilee 2 years ago, but they do give us a chance to look back with satisfaction and pride. This week the International Institute celebrates the 40th anniversary of its founding and there are reasons for the whole city to share in the celebration.

We are a city of varied backgrounds amalgamated into one people. An important part of that amalgamation has been handled by the International Institute since it came into being as a department of the YWCA back in 1919. Its work has been varied and one can see in that variety an important part of the history of the Nation and of Gary.

Born in the era of mass immigration that followed World War I, the Institute's primary function in its first years—one that continues today—was the integration of the first highly restrictive immigration through group activities, solution of legal problems and classes in English. Passage of the first highly restrictive immigration act in 1921 brought new problems, including the reuniting of families separated by the quota act.

The 1930's brought changes. With the depression many families sought repatriation to their homelands. Among those who stayed, many needed relief of one kind or another and this brought new emphasis on naturalization. These years also brought two changes in the Institute's own character. In 1934 it was severed from the YWCA and became a separate agency. In 1937 it became a charter member of the Community Chest.

The World War II years brought a different set of problems. There was an increasing pressure for naturalization on the part of various industries engaged in warwork. Both the military and industry pressed security investigations of aliens, though in cool retrospect the record of American patriotism of immigrants can be matched by few, if any, groups.

Postwar years have developed yet another set of pressures on the Institute. Again there was the business of reuniting separated families. Dependents of many veterans who won citizenship through wartime service were clamoring for entry. And from Europe came the rush of displaced persons, first fleeing from the released Nazi oppression and later from new oppression of Soviet communism. The oppressed, whether escaping from the remnants of the Hitler terror or after such later events as the abortive Hungarian revolution, all brought problems of adjustment with them as they came to new homes in Gary.

What the future holds is uncertain. Many will go on seeking a way out from behind Europe's Iron Curtain. There is a concerted move under way now in the United Nations seeking some help for refugees both from Red China and from the

troubled Middle East. Whatever happens in the field of immigration is almost certain to affect Gary. The city is fortunate to have the International Institute and Miss Elizabeth Wilson, its director since 1945, on hand to help solve the complex legal and personal problems any newcomers will bring with them.

Community Action Program in Meriden, Conn.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK KOWALSKI
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 20, 1959

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, the city of Meriden, Conn., which I am happy to call my home, has recently inaugurated a community action program, designed to secure additional contracts for industry in the Meriden area.

This program, which I regard as most important, has been set up through the cooperation of the Department of the Navy and the Department of Defense. It has as its goals the creation of 2,500 new jobs and an increase of $25 million in annual sales volume. These are not easy goals to achieve, but the spirit and aggressiveness of the Meriden Industry Action Committee convince me that they will be reached.

I cannot speak too highly of the cooperation shown in this endeavor by the Navy Department. Since the day that I requested the establishment of this program in Meriden, the Navy has given every possible assistance. I gladly pay public tribute to Vice Adm. E. W. Clexton, Chief of the Office of Naval Materiel; Rear Adm. R. L. Swart, Vice Chief; and Mr. Kenneth Borgen, Industrial Assistance Coordinator.

Mr. Borgen spent several days in Meriden arranging for the start of this program. Later he spent an entire week there, guiding and advising the local committee in drawing up and initiating its program. He has worked tirelessly and most effectively for the program and I cannot speak too highly of his tremendous contribution to this community effort.

The Navy is willing to assist any local community in establishing a program such as Meriden's, though unfortunately this is not too well-known. I am hopeful that other Connecticut cities and towns will institute similar programs, and I call the attention of my colleagues from other States to the Navy's great interest in helping local communities to help themselves.

The Industry Action Committee of Meriden has made a preliminary report which I feel is highly significant.

Portions of the report follow:

COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAM TO STIMULATE ECONOMIC GROWTH AND EMPLOYMENT

This community action program is designed to increase the level of economic activity and employment in Meriden, Connecticut, by a $25 million increase in annual sales and the creation of 2,500 new jobs. This is for the initial purpose of relieving the unemployment situation in Meriden with a longer range purpose of increasing sales and jobs yearly, to provide for population growth and to stimulate an expanding economy. A survey of 24 plants in Meriden on April 28, 1959 disclosed that they had a potential employment of 2,427 new jobs if they had the business.

The basic principle underlying this program is that of concerted, cooperative community, State, and Federal action focused on a common economic problem utilizing the basic framework of standard business practice and our free democratic enterprise system. The advantage of a community action program is that it marshals the human and business resources available and focuses community effort on a common objective. Required is an effective community organization and procedural mechanisms to carry out the program.

For business firms and Government activities outside of the area, the program provides a central point of community information and enables ready location of unique and highly qualified suppliers, as well as industrial site locations.

This program was developed by the cooperation of Meriden businessmen, congressional officials, and a representative of the Navy Department in discussion sessions at Meriden, Conn., over the period of April 27–May 1, 1959. It is requested that all recipients of this publication lend their assistance in achieving our objectives.

Committee members: Mr. Theodore Frost, chairman and president of Connecticut Telephone & Electric Corp. of Meriden; Mr. Sanford Shorr, vice chairman and manager of Chamber of Commerce of Meriden; Mr. W. J. Wilcox, secretary of the Manufacturers' Association of Meriden and Wallingford; Mr. W. L. Lyons, president, the Lyons Tool & Die Co., Meriden; Mr. Albert Hulme, public relations director, Cuno Engineering Corp., Meriden; Mr. Frank Tracy, plant manager, International Silver Co., Meriden; Mr. Morton Greenblatt, vice president, Elmore Silver Co., Meriden; Mr. Albert Rene, public relations director, the Miller Co., Meriden; Mr. Daniel Rich, general manager, Rich Plastics, Meriden; Mr. Fred Dossin, factory manager, the Charles Parker Co., Meriden.

Committee advisers: Mr. Kenneth P. Borgen, Industrial Assistance Coordinator, Office of Naval Material, Executive Office of the Secretary of the Navy, Washington, D.C.; Comdr. A. J. Yuzakewich, Inspector of Naval Material, Bridgeport; staff, Mr. Jack Goldman and Mr. John Gibson; Mr. David S. Miller, commissioner of police, Meriden.

The Industry Action Committee of Meriden, Conn., will pursue the following actions to stimulate the flow of business into the area.

1. Directory of firms: Prepare and distribute a supplement of the "Directory of Business Firms of the Northeastern United States in Substantial Labor Surplus Areas Who Seek Defense Department and Other Government Prime Contracts and Subcontracts," of June 16, 1958. This directory will go to all Government procuring activities and their prime contractors for use in selecting sources of supply. The inspector of naval material, Bridgeport, will provide a letter of transmittal and supply a distribution list.

2. Directory of local Federal purchasing activities: Arrange for the preparation and distribution of a purchasing directory of all Federal activities who made local purchases along the lines of a publication of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce entitled "ANAFMA, Sales Manager's Guide to Southwestern Bases," issued March 1959 (undated). The directory to cover those local Federal purchasing activities of the northeastern part of the United States and to include such information as a listing of major items of purchase by dollar volume, procedures for dealing with the activity, and the name and location of the purchasing officer.

3. Market analysis: Arrange for a study of the Federal procurement market for the fiscal years 1959–60 including such departments and agencies as the Department of Defense, Atomic Energy Commission, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, General Services Administration, Department of the Interior, and the Department of Agriculture. Tabulate major procurement items by dollar volume and procurement agency. Match these procurement requirements with the supply capability of Meriden firms and ascertain the potential Federal business capable of being performed in Meriden. Make this information available to Meriden firms. The U.S. Bureau of the Budget is a source of such information. Arrange for plant tours of Meriden firms by selected agencies.

(a) Make a similar study and distribution of the procurement market offered at the State level in the Northeastern States by State purchasing activities.

(b) Make a similar study and distribution of subcontract opportunities available from selected Government prime contractors in both defense and commercial business of these firms. Arrange for selected prime contractor representatives to tour Meriden plants.

(c) Analyze overseas markets with the Boston office of the U.S. Department of Commerce in a similar manner.

4. Community monograph: Arrange for the updating of the 1956 Meriden monograph of the Connecticut Development Commission with a suitable cover and transmit to selected addresses such as some of those receiving the supplement to the "Directory of Firms."

5. Plant facility lists: Establish a standard format for practical, usable individual plant brochures and encourage each appropriate businessman to develop and use this sales tool.

6. Business promotion: Arrange with salesmen of Meriden firms to publicize the capability of other suppliers in Meriden while making their regular calls. The "Directory of Firms" supplement and plant facility lists can be used for this sales effort. Any promising business leads thus developed should be relayed to the appropriate firm.

7. Intracity subcontracting: Explore the precise nature of the subcontract and supply complex of Meriden in terms of products and their dollar volume which is performed for Meriden firms by outside sources. Discuss the findings of this survey with appropriate firms and encourage maximum interchange of work in the Meriden area where it is economically feasible.

(a) Determine in the course of the study whether new businesses might be established in Meriden to supply goods or services not presently available. If this proves to be the case, encourage the expansion of existing suppliers in these product lines or the establishment of a new business.

(b) Insure that all Meriden firms are fully informed on the production or supply capability of each other through plant tours or other devices.

8. Intercity subcontracting: Arrange with appropriate organizations and individual large firms in adjacent cities such as Hartford, Bridgeport, and Boston to maximize the interchange of subcontract and supply work with Meriden businessmen. Use techniques similar to those of intracity subcontracting.

(a) Expand this economic integration as appropriate to other cities where the greatest opportunities lie.

(b) Enlist the help of field agencies and the Federal Government in locating sources of subcontract work such as the Inspector of Naval Material in Bridgeport.

9. Government procurement information: Arrange for an appropriate Meriden office to maintain a central, current file on publications on Government procurements. The file should contain such items as "Selling to Navy Prime Contractors," "How to Sell to Agencies Within the Department of Defense," "General Procurement, Information on Guided Missile Programs, Rockets and Target Drones," "The U.S. Missile and Aircraft Market" (Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce), "Daily Synopsis of U.S. Government Proposed Procurement, Sale and Contract Awards," and "Inventions Wanted by the Armed Forces." These are only a few of the many helpful publications available.

(a) Enlist the help of local Federal field offices in keeping Meriden businessmen fully informed on Government business practices and business opportunities.

(b) Sponsor educational seminars periodically on such subjects as research and development, inspection procedures, contracting procedures, quality control and other subjects. Such seminars should include representative prime contractors.

(c) Encourage and exhibit of business opportunities for the New England States in 1960 similar to the Hartford exhibit of procured items of July 1958. The exhibit of business opportunities is a display of hardware; soft goods and supply, service or research and development capability needed by private industry, State and local governments, the Federal Government and its prime contractors. The exhibits are manned by qualified purchasing agents or procurement personnel. The Department of Defense assists sponsoring groups to stage such an event on a regional basis with four held per year.

(d) Advise businessmen on how to sell to Government agencies via information sheets such as "Selling to the Navy" in appendix II.

10. IBM directory service: Encourage the establishment of an IBM system at the State level to list the supply capability of businessmen for use by both Government and private industry in locating sources of supply. Such a system is used in the State of Oklahoma and is outlined in appendix III.

11. Commercial product trend analysis: Investigate the commercial opportunities available to Meriden firms in terms of growth potential by analyzing the industrial trend series of the U.S. Department of Commerce. Match these trends with Meriden capability and advise businessmen of new opportunities.

12. Legislation: Analyze State and Federal proposed legislation affecting economic development and support those bills with greatest promise of assistance.

13. Production pool: Explore with community businessmen the desirability of pooling their resources to undertake larger contracts. Twelve firms already contacted are very much in favor of the idea.

14. Business development: Encourage the establishment of new small business enterprises from within the community as their need becomes known. Assist promising young men and women to become established.

15. Committee effort: The committee will continue in operation for a period of a year. It will act as a steering committee and render positive leadership in carrying out this program. In this connection, it will integrate its efforts with existing organizations such as the manufacturers' association, chamber of commerce, and the urban redevelopment committee. In necessary cases, the committee will itself take necessary action on the program where other reources are not appropriate or immediately effective. The committee will develop a publicity and promotion campaign. It will keep appropriate people informed on progress and results of their work.

Adlai E. Stevenson Speaks—Urges Passage of Housing Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BRADEMAS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 20, 1959

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, today Members of the House of Representatives continue debate on an issue of deep concern to millions of Americans—housing.

I am sure that as my colleagues consider voting on the housing bill they will find interesting and helpful an eloquent address by the Honorable Adlai E. Stevenson delivered on May 5 in Newark, N.J., to the American Council To Improve Our Neighborhoods.

I should like to draw particular attention to the following statement in Governor Stevenson's speech in which he indicates his support of S. 57:

In my judgment, the housing bill which the Senate has already passed and the similar bill the House is now considering represent a constructive enlistment of the private and the public forces which are essential to getting on with this job.

Governor Stevenson's address follows:

ADDRESS BY ADLAI E. STEVENSON AT AMERICAN COUNCIL TO IMPROVE OUR NEIGHBORHOODS DINNER, TUESDAY, MAY 5, 1959, NEWARK, N.J.

My remarks proceed from an impressive title—"The American City: A Cause for Statesmanship." I despair, frankly, that any words of mine can satisfy the promise of this title (which is not mine), or that my grasp can equal its reach.

As for the American city, I am not expert in its problems. I confess to not even living in it, but rather as far from it as the logistics of commuting permit. I know this makes me, in the literature of the subject, a "fugitive from civic responsibility," form of parasitical growth taking income and culture from the city, and in return only adding to the morning and evening traffic jams.

As for statesmanship, again I pretend no expertise. If certain political adventures of mine—in my youth—may have seemed to involve pretenses of statesmanship, I recognize that issue as having been publicly settled.

Yet surely the first charge upon statesmanship as it applies today to the American city is clear enough. It is the charge upon statesmen responsible for all of the cities of the world. It is that these cities be permitted to survive—that they not become, in a chain of blinding flashes, only smoking, gaping holes in the ground. The point does not bear laboring. Neither may it be forgotten—lest it become the ultimate irony that man's foregathering in the city was to simplify his self-destruction.

The real city planners, the architects of our tomorrows, are not we who meet tonight here in Newark, but those who are even now gathering in Geneva. May they feel the strength of our hopes, the power of our prayers.

But survival isn't the only problem we have in common with the rest of the world. Urban renewal and a shortage of housing are universal. I was told everywhere from central Asia to Leningrad that housing is the No. 1 problem of the Soviet Union. And I have seen the great boom towns in the exploding population areas from Damascus to Manila, and the new central cities that have arisen from the ashes of London, Warsaw, Berlin. Everywhere on earth the city planners and officials are struggling with the same problems of the decay and death of old centers and the birth and growth of new ones.

In distant places, I have, like you, often thought that in spite of our standard of living, in spite of amenities that exceed the grasp, even the imagination, of most people, we in America have still fallen far short of even arresting the spread of blight and decay in our cities. Like you, I have often wondered how we can hope to solve the problems of maintaining our alliances, of meeting the Communist economic offensive, of extending a helping hand to the peoples now searching for national identity and independence, of standing firm against aggression anywhere, if we can't mobilize our domestic resources to meet the needs of day-to-day work and living.

We are not concerned just with the new low-income and minority ghettos in some cities, nor just real-estate values in the downtown central business districts, nor the bedeviled commuter, nor the costly, growing traffic congestion, nor the general offensiveness of the urban sprawl. The deficiencies in our schools and communal services, like parks, playgrounds, hospitals, and the ugly outcroppings of juvenile violence, are all pleading for attention and are all part of the broader task on which we are embarked—the revitalization and reinvigoration of the city as a way of life.

It is not even a renaissance we seek; rather it is the construction of an entirely new mode of living—poles apart from the Victorian city of old. What we are concerned with is the exciting, exhilarating adventure of constructing economic, financial, social, and political tools to build—not a city—but a metropolis.

But, to return to "statesmanship" in this context, I would define it simply as the marking and the doing of the central thing that needs to be done—finding the right key—and turning it.

If there is a key to the answers to the problems which today beset our cities, I am sure I haven't got it. I don't think there is one key. But I think of Pope's line about a key to a drawer wherein lie other keys.

Because, I suppose, a good many of the years of my life have been devoted to the problems of government, the drawer I look to is the one marked "government"—government with a small "g."

This term does not mean, for me, the agencies of public government as distinguished from those of what we call business or private enterprise. I wish the Nation could realize, as you in action do, how closely the functions of a corporation are related to governmental functions when—for example—a great insurance company takes over the clearing of a slum and its replacement with the facilities for decent, 20th century living.

The problems of the American city will be met when, and not until, we recognize that they are already and inexorably committed to the joint trusteeship of private enterprise and public responsibility; that they demand a shoulder-to-shoulder, two-fisted attack; that their solution depends entirely upon an alliance of private and public agencies—with each respecting its own limitations and the capacities of the other, and with each acting in support of the other.

It is equally essential to recognize that the public agencies involved operate at three levels—Federal, State, and local—and that there is a similar problem of distributing responsibilities among these three, with each being equiped to do its appointed part.

America has the resources, the wealth, the raw materials, the intelligence, the technical know-how, the pressing need, and the driving desire to solve all the problems which have

so far prevented the remaking of the cities. Statesmanship's question here is not what to do but who is to do it—and how to make an alliance among the agencies involved, as you have evidently done with such spectacular success here in Newark.

There is no point in emphasizing at an action conference the stake private enterprise—including every businessman in every city in America—has in the preservation and the strengthening of the urban structure. You, more than any other group, have pointed out that what is good for the American city is good for every businessman who operates there.

Part of these returns are direct—in profit on the building projects themselves. But more and more the business community is coming to realize that urban renewal also means more customers coming in the doors, that an equity investment in a slum clearance development project represents philanthropy—at a profit. We are beginning to recognize that not only charity, but investment as well, can best begin at home, in homes.

I suspect that in the long run the clearing of slums will come less as the result of public concern about the people there being poor people than as a product of the business community's concern about their being poor customers. This isn't cynical. It simply recognizes the fact that it is hard to sustain public concern—except when a school burns down or a rat bites a child—in a problem which neighbors can solve by moving away from it. But businesses can't easily do that.

So business, especially big business, has a great opportunity here to make a contribution—and to make a profit.

But there are some parts of this job that just cannot be done at a profit, and therefore will not be done privately. The necessary distribution of responsibilities for city saving will not come about as long as influential groups insist that any governmental financial aid, except to guarantee mortgages, is socialist sin—which you are either against in all of its manifestations or for, all the way.

I came across, the other day, a speech I made at a Housing Day Conference in Chicago 10 years ago. This line jumped out at me: "The public housing debate is over." That was shortly after, of course, the enactment under the sponsorship of Senators Taft, Wagner, and Ellender, of the Housing Act of 1949—providing for the building of 135,000 public housing units a year for 6 years, or 810,000 in all.

But now, 10 years later, only half of those 810,000 units have been built, and some of those who denounced Senator Taft as an old Republican have brought in a housing bill providing for no public housing at all.

Nobody likes public housing. It is a mark of failure, and the Nation will welcome and accept the views of those critics of public housing who will develop alternatives which are constructive and realistic. But mere insistence that private enterprise can do the job without public housing is no answer—unless this insistence that private enterprise can do the job without public housing is no answer—unless this insistence is backed up with action. We are entitled to say here, with a new meaning, "either put up—or shut up."

There is reason for larger satisfaction about the increasing supply of middle-income housing. I saw a few days ago in New Haven the heartening spectacle of a beautiful new city rising from the ashes of ugliness and neglect. We have in Chicago now, as you have in a number of your cities, substantial developments which confirm the willingness and ability of private capital and enterprise to carry the job of reconstruction forward if public funds are available for the preliminary clearing of the old slum areas.

I am most encouraged, incidentally, by the reports of success in leasing these new accommodations on open-occupancy basis, for any realistic appraisal of the housing problem must take account of the serious danger that subsidized housing will become racially segregated housing and will thereby aggravate a problem as serious as the housing problem itself.

Last week a friend of mine who has done a great deal in the effort to rebuild Chicago showed me how the private equity investment of $4,725,000 per year for 10 years will produce the capital required to completely rebuild an entire square mile of slums with fine, modern living accommodations which can be rented to low middle-income families at a fair profit. Surely this means that our goals are within our reach. I was sobered when he added that this proposition assumes a public subsidy to acquire this land and to write it down to use value, and that these costs will run to $8 million per year. But this is the kind of cooperative venture, the kind of public-private alliance, which alone can do this job. It appeared, for a while, that there was solid recognition of the degree of aid that would have to come from Federal sources to support local urban renewal, in both its private and its public aspects. Of late, there has been considerable doubt cast on both the extent of such aid and its character or continuance. The plain fact is that those who oppose Federal aid for urban renewal are actually against urban renewal. For they know full well that many of the possibilities of local revenue have been preempted by Federal and State taxing bodies, that the largest urban centers are operating under archaic revenue authority with little hope of relief from State legislatures dominated by nonurban lawmakers. The vast sums urban renewal requires are just not available, presently, or in any foreseeable time, exclusively from private funds or from the local resources of the overwhelming majority of urban centers.

In my judgment, the housing bill which the Senate has already passed, and the similar bill the House is now considering, represent a constructive enlistment of the private and the public forces which are essential to getting on with this job. These bills recognize the continued need for some public housing, particularly now when the relocation problem has become even more acute as a result of the expansion of the highway and other construction programs.

These bills reflect the lessons of administrative experience which we have had to learn the hard way. It is clear now that the administrators of the Federal program destroy the effectiveness of local authorities and discourage willing private investors when they keep changing the rules of the game, throwing out projects which were carefully devised to conform to the old rules but which don't meet the new ones. Too many of us here are familiar with the crippling effect in our own cities of arbitrary notices from Washington that all projects are to be scaled down by an arbitrary percentage. Too often the scaled down project just doesn't make sense. Half a building is not better than none, and it is often the falsest economy to pick at a slum instead of rending a bulldozer all the way through it.

It is noteworthy, too, that these pending bills reflect the significance of the conservation principle that a dollar put into preventing urban decay is $10 saved in subsequent rebuilding.

Such legislation deserves support solely in terms of the human values that are involved. The juvenile delinquency a slum breeds infects a whole city. The tax bill for it—for police regulation, for fire protection, for relief payments—goes to every taxpayer.

You and I vote at each election with complacent confidence that democratic capitalism means security and the supplying of life's purposes. But our votes count no more than the votes from slum victims which are not based on that faith.

I reread not long ago the story of the 21 American soldiers who chose not to return from the Korean Communist prison camp but to stay with those who had captured their minds as well as their bodies. Fifteen of those "21 Who Stayed" came from slums—some in the cities, some in the country. I could only think of Bret Harte's poetic dictum that nobody will carry a musket for a boarding house.

But, we are being told, we can't afford these things.

I would, if it were necessary, say to this that there are emergencies in which you call the doctor without asking the cost, and that cancer in our cities is such a case. When somebody starts talking about the evil of passing a burden of public debt on to the next generation it makes me want to ask if it is better to pass on a burden of slums, of ignorance, of national weakness. There is a time in war to say "Damn the torpedoes, full speed ahead," and there is a time in peace for equal daring.

But to support a program of full scale renewal and rebuilding of the cities is not to be soft-hearted (which seems to me no sin in a democracy); it is also to be hard-headed. I am not a budget buster. But I do believe in America's greatness, and that this greatness can be traced to bold leaders and bold enterprises and the basic notion that money invested properly and adequately will multiply wealth. What is true in our past economic history is true of our future. There are millions to be invested in the rebuilding of our cities. The Federal and local government funds appropriately invested will generate manifold greater private investment and resulting new levels of economic activity. And every dollar of public funds that goes into slum clearance and urban renewal will be returned to the public coffers in increased revenues.

I hope we are ready to stop, in the face of these great needs which are also great opportunities, the demagogic, political debate which assumes that Government and private enterprise are inherently antagonistic. I hope we are now ready to accept, instead, the demanding necessity for a confident alliance of public and private enterprise in meeting the problems of the city.

I concede that we will have to spend more and proceed at a much more rapid rate if we are to more than nibble at the problem that confronts us.

Yet money is not enough. Indeed the wrong amount of money at the wrong time and in the wrong place may hinder rather than help our efforts to construct the city of the future. We Americans have a penchant for believing that sufficient inputs of energy and dollars can solve any problem. We rush in where angels fear to tread and frequently we profit, but sometimes we learn why the angels, in their greater wisdom, have not joined us and preferred to stay aloft. Urban reconstruction is a case in point.

Despite the laudable efforts we had been making to deal with various aspects of the problem in the generation since the New Deal began, does the sum of these parts add up to a meaningful whole? Instead of developing a comprehensive program, are we in danger of creating a patchwork, a conglomeration of temporary and short-sighted solutions to pieces of a problem which cannot be handled piecemeal? Even in that haven of generalities—a preamble to a Federal law—we look in vain for a comprehensive statement of what we are after.

What do we want our downtown centers to become? What, in the long run, are the

proper uses of the land in the "gray belt"? What kind of transportation system will best meet our needs? How do we want to use the remaining open spaces around our cities—for parks, for wildlife reservations, for industries, or for the next wave of developments?

We shall have to look to ACTION and to groups like this for responsible, sustained help in finding the answers. But it will have to be left to the citizens of each urban community, acting through their own governments, to settle their own issues. And here we run into another problem of government—the problem of too much government. At the local level the jumble of bureaus, municipalities, counties, commissions, authorities, corporations, and officialdom generally has neither a sense of union nor a sense of direction. In most instances even the skeleton of a limp confederation is lacking.

At the very root of this problem is also the fact that although we have become a dominantly urban and suburban society, our political thinking and structure is still predominately country-minded.

One hundred million Americans live today in 168 metropolitan areas. This is over 60 percent of our total population. Yet, while we maintain a huge Department of Agriculture in Washington, no one there speaks for the cities as such. And in most legislatures the vote of a small town or rural citizen is worth substantially more than his city cousin's.

I know, from my years as Governor of a divided State, how difficult this problem is. There are two sides to it. And yet there is bound to be a change. Local governments must be given the fiscal authority which the discharge of their responsibilities demands. There must be enlargement, in one way or another, of the revenue sources available to them. Gotham won't secede from New York, nor Chicago from Illinois, but this is a serious problem and it is going to take ingenuity—and a willingness to seek out entirely new ways—to meet it.

These urban problems have today become metropolitan problems, problems that cross all lines between city and suburbs and between incorporated and unincorporated areas, problems that have no city limits.

The plain fact is that the resources on which our urban life depend—land, water, and breathable air—are getting scarcer. The decisions about their use, like the decisions about transportation, are hard decisions. Any assumption that the city planners or high-level commissions will devise the answers seems to me to go only half way. For the answers, however wise, won't mean anything unless they are adopted—through the political decisionmaking process—by those affected by these decisions.

I know the difficulties which will be in the way of developing new machinery of decision. The sovereignties and vested interests of established local units and officialdom will be as hard to break down as they are at the national and international levels. The various suburbs which surround our major cities are already developing special ethnic and economic personalities, and this will make it harder and harder for the citizens of one area to be persuaded to submit their interests to a common vote which includes the citizens of another.

But I know, too, of the bold, effective way this problem has been met by Toronto. We are all watching eagerly the imaginative inquiry being conducted at Detroit. Other cities have taken the first essential steps toward metropolitan planning and are now looking to the possibilities of one form or another of limited metropolitan government.

If building new instruments seems to some of you hopeless, then I must say that I think the other choice is to accept for our cities the fate of eternal worrying at the edges of our urban concerns, of everlasting plucking at everbroadening scabs of blight and decay, and more authority will remain at the higher State and Federal levels.

A balkanized metropolis can probably cope, in daily desperation, with the problems of urban survival. It can make our day-to-day difficulties tolerable. But it can never conceive the great plans, set the great policies, make the great decisions, which are essential if the cities are to be built and rebuilt according to the blueprints of our hopes.

I have tried to suggest that the problems of the American city demand the exercise of what is perhaps the most difficult art of democratic government: the effective mobilization of all of the forces which make up the free body politic and the free body economic—not just to make the right decisions, but also to carry them out.

I find great significance in the fact that it is a citizens' group such as ACTION that sponsors this meeting. For whatever may be the answers to the city's problems they must be worked out by the common consent of those affected by them.

There are people in the world today who say that tough public problems are best solved behind closed doors, by dictators, or central committees. But in our land we dare not even reach for a goal of human improvement in disregard of human needs, human values, human judgments. The central tenet of statesmanship in a democracy is that unless the people understand it and participate in it, no long-term program can endure.

So, as we put ourselves to the rebuilding of our cities, to the problems of their growth, we will look for leadership, a high quality of skill, in the managing of this task. But we will not buy the shibboleth that autocratic action is essential to achieve the desired result. We will not leave the subject to an anointed few.

The municipality of tomorrow must be renewed in the image of people's hopes and ambitions for a better life. The values to be recreated must have a sound political and economic pedestal, but they must flow from human needs.

Thus will we build and rebuild our cities, and in so doing renew and rekindle our faith in ourselves and in the limitless creativeness of free men.

Education Is Everybody's Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 20, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by Frank W. Abrams, former chairman of the board, Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, and chairman of the executive committee of Council for Financial Aid to Education, Inc.:

EDUCATION IS EVERYBODY'S BUSINESS

The Founding Fathers of our country talked much about equality. However, it seems to me that the essence of the American dream is not so much equality of people as it is the equality of opportunity. Men are not equal. They are not all alike. They are not of the same stature, the same physical strength, the same talents of mind or spirit. Nevertheless, they are all children of God, they possess inalienable rights, and so far as possible they should have the same chance of progress. And we are coming to see that it is education that provides this chance. If we are to achieve the American dream of equality of opportunity it will be by providing equal facility for a first-rate education.

Again, if we are interested in the physical well-being of our people, or the development of informed and responsible citizens, or the social, cultural, and scientific advance of the Nation, the answer will be found in the quality and character of American education. The schools and colleges supply the scientists and managers of American industry. They produce both the leaders of Government and the informed citizens, and they determine the level of culture and intelligence.

And still again, our entry into both the atomic and space ages within two decades has signalled a reappraisal of what we mean by national strength. In the past we have measured the strength of nations almost entirely by size of population, gross national product, natural resources, the size of military esablishments, and the control of colonial empires. Now with a jolt we realize that perhaps the best measure of a nation's strength is the quality of her intellectual resources. And in this higher education plays the decisive role.

The challenge to all of us today as we consider the future of education in this country is a challenge to character. It will not be met solely by our ability as a people—nor by our resources as a nation—nor through our generosity, but as the result of our devotion to ideals and principles. And the test of this devotion is the price we are willing to pay in the form of sacrifices.

As I have asked myself what seems to be the most important thing for Americans to be saying to each other at this time, I have come to this conclusion. The test we now face is a test of character, and the proof of our devotion to freedom, to education, and to everything else we hold dear, is our willingness to sacrifice for them.

There are some other things of which I think we should remind ourselves. I am going to put first the fact that—America will always be "unfinished business."

I grant you that there is no place in the world where so many people have so much.

Our standard of living as a Nation is unbelievably high. Half the time when our representatives abroad are talking to people in underdeveloped areas of the world—and even in some developed areas—they have to understate our condition in order to be believed.

We live in a country where the "rich"—measured by the standards of hundreds of millions of people in other parts of the world—are more numerous than the poor.

We also live in a country where life expectancy has gone up 40-odd percent since the turn of the century—thanks to medical education.

We live in a country where the individual has achieved an amazing freedom from tyranny—the tyranny of Government, the church, or economic groups.

In this country today we have unparalleled cultural satisfactions—easy and inexpensive access to the finest music, the greatest art, the best theater. All roads lead to America and to the vast waiting audiences of the American people.

We have every reason for pride in our achievements.

But is anybody prepared to say we have come to the end of our road? Has America achieved the ideals of its founders—or all we now see that it is possible to achieve?

Of course not.

If we can agree that America is not finished business, then I think we must say to ourselves—"A better America will be a product of better education."

The progress of the United States has been the progress of education in this country from the beginning.

As we have raised the general level of education—expanding the number of people who could go to school—increasing the number who could go beyond literacy into higher and higher education—we have raised the ability of millions of individuals to discover and develop their potentialities, to lead richer lives, and to handle their own affair successfully. On the material side education has increased our capacity as individuals to produce, and thus to earn. Through education men have increased their ability to cooperate with one another in great undertakings and to use the discoveries of the free, inquiring mind for the development of hundreds of thousands of goods and services which make life richer and safer. We have accomplished more because we have learned more. And this has given us a strong base on which to build as a nation.

The contribution of education is perfectly obvious in the economic field. No American businessman today can be unaware of the importance of the American system of education to his operations. The American system of production harnessed to serve not a privileged few but 175 million people could not exist today if 97½ percent of our adult population had not achieved literacy, if more than 75 percent had not completed a grade school education, if nearly 40 percent had not completed the work of a secondary school, and if 6 percent had not already been graduated from a college, a university, or a graduate school.

Mr. Alfred P. Sloan, Jr., undoubtedly one of th greatest organizers we in this country have ever known, would be the first to tell you that the General Motors Corp. could not be organized in a nation which did not make available to it so vast a number of educated men and women as the United States. It could not find the necessary leadership at every level or the necessary workers, and certainly it could not find enough customers. And I am sure that Mr. Irving S. Olds of United States Steel would agree with this for his company.

When I got my first job as a young graduate engineer, working in an oil refinery—and a very primitive refinery it was by our present standards—college men were so rare that they had to tread cautiously and remember that they were an underprivileged minority. As recently as 40 years ago the foremen and skilled workers in such plants had a substantial contempt for us college boys, and they also were very glad indeed to see that we did not miss our chance of graduating from the college of hard knocks.

As a businessman I cannot visualize the corporate enterprise of tomorrow—with its vastly increased use of technology—without assuming a substantial growth of our educational system not only in breadth but in depth.

I would like to put forward a third proposition. It is this—in the end the best educated nation will achieve world leadership.

I think we are justifiably concerned at the gains which a hard-driving Soviet Russia has been making in the field of education. And I think what troubles us most is the evidence that the Russian people seem more than willing to pay the price of sacrifice. I think we have a right to be disturbed at our own easy-going educational ways, because much more is involved here than leadership in the production of scientists in any race to achieve military supremacy. Even if we or the Russians could achieve that—and I don't think either of us can—we would still need to face the fact that a better world can never be brought into existence by force. A better world must first be constructed in men's minds.

In the end it must be achieved by a vast increase in the availability of education to the peoples of the world. And by that I mean the kind of liberating education which we know in this country and which has made so great a contribution to our own security and well-being. Again and again public opinion studies in this country have shown that as you increase the level of education, you increase the ability of people to understand and to give temperate and tolerant answers to critical questions.

Under these circumstances nothing is more important than that our own educational system achieve greatness—which means not only that it will remain free and independent but that it offer young Americans the hard challenges of intellectual leadership. We cannot bring out the best in the generations which will meet the issues of the future by soft and second-rate challenges now.

I have one final proposition—only as each of us individually contributes to the support of education will we get the kind of educational system we need.

I want to say something at this point about the teaching profession of this country.

Back in September 1947, I made a speech before the Advertising Council in New York on "The Stake of Business in American Education." I was asked to help in the work of getting public attention on the problems of education, and I finally gave in to the pressures of good friends and the obvious importance of the cause.

I certainly didn't know very much about my subject, but it began to look to me as if business was a kind of absentee stockholder in education and ought to pay some attention to its investment. That was about what I said at the luncheon.

Afterward I went back to my office satisfied that I had done my good deed for the day. The three or four hundred people at the luncheon had applauded in all the right places, and I received the normal letters one might expect after an effort of this sort.

What I was not prepared for was what came after the educational press had reported my comments. Postcards, letters, telephone calls, telegrams began pouring in from educators who took my speech much more seriously than I did. And then I discovered—or rediscovered—some of the great army of teachers and administrators in this country who are deeply devoted to education. They weren't asking anything for themselves. It was education that mattered to them—and the young people who were being educated. They wanted to do a job—and they thought what I had said was helpful to their cause.

Since then I have become increasingly aware of how much these fine people in teaching have been sacrificing for the rest of us. There isn't a college graduate in this country whose education was not paid for in part by somebody else—through college endowments and otherwise. We all got a free ride of one sort or another. But we don't often think that our teachers were also making a financial contribution to the education of each and every one of us through their compensation rate.

When I finished my chore for the Advertising Council, I thought I was through with that assignment. I never made a greater miscalculation than that one. As I became better informed on the problems of education, I saw—and the company from which I graduated a few years ago also saw—that there was a job to be done by business and industry for American education.

We have a magnificent public educational system. There are no better schools or colleges or universities than many of those which are tax supported.

We have no finer teachers than those who are in such tax supported institutions.

They deserve our help and affectionate regard. But only as we participate individually do we truly commit ourselves—and a better America will not be created for us by any government under any party. We will produce it ourselves by our own efforts. And I think we will all be better served if we make maximum good use of our right to pay a substantial part of the bill through voluntary giving rather than depending entirely on the compulsion of taxes.

Can we do it? Let's look at some factors which indicate the capacity of support from private sources.

What we need at the moment—in terms of money—is an increasing investment of something like $500 million a year in our public and private institutions of higher education.

This is a respectable sum, but it is only about one-ninth of 1 percent of our gross national product even in the recent year of recession. Let me put this sum in perspective in some other ways.

There are more than 800,000 business enterprises, large and small, which filed tax returns with the Bureau of Internal Revenue last year. If these companies averaged only $600 per year to higher education, it would mean about $500 million.

It is estimated that corporations in the United States spend $5 to $6 billion annually in research and development work. Actually, of course, this type of activity is a particular beneficiary of our educational system since it requires highly educated technical personnel. If corporations were to invest in colleges and universities a sum equal to 10 percent of their research and development budgets, they would get more than a half billion dollars.

The last reported annual net income before taxes of American business and industry amounted to over $47 billion. Just over 1 percent of this amount contributed to the support of higher education would provide the $500 million needed. Since a corporate taxpayer may spend up to 5 percent of its net income for philanthropic purposes under the Internal Revenue Act of 1936, such a contribution would be only a little more than one-fifth of the allowable percentage.

The expenditure for advertising by American companies totals approximately $10 billion per year, and there is no corporate expenditure which owes a greater debt to the existence of a vast educated market than advertising. Far be it from me to suggest that any part of this great sum should be diverted per se to education. But I do think some of our advertising could be designed to stimulate private support of education.

Of course, by far the largest expenditure of virtually every business and industrial enterprise is to its annual outlay for payroll. This figure is roughly $250 billion today. Since education determines, more than any other influence, the capacity of these more than 65 million employed people to produce, it would not seem unreasonable for an enterprise to contribute an amount equal to two-tenths of 1 percent of its payroll to improving and expanding its source of personnel supply in this country.

Please bear in mind that no single yardstick of ability to pay that has been enumerated above is suggested as the source of funds. These are purely measures of private ability to support a national need that is of basic importance to the future of business itself.

The final and chief beneficiary of the educational system is the individual. His life is greatly enriched by education—but it is evident that he also has a direct financial gain.

We have already seen a very wide acceptance of the duty of the college graduate to support his college or university. Very few of the nine million college graduates in this

country today paid the full cost of their education.

The extent to which this obligation is being recognized today is indicated by the fact that American colleges and universities are receiving approximately $130 million a year from their graduates—a very respectable sum. Nevertheless, on the basis of nine million graduates, this is an average of only a little more than a dollar a month. It would not be too difficult for these nine million beneficiaries of education to contribute several times this total, and become a substantial partner of business in the educational enterprise.

If you believe that America is still unfinished business and that a better America will be a product of education—and if you agree that we must develop the world's best educational system so that American ideas of freedom, justice, and equality will influence the shape of the world in which our children and grandchildren will live—I think you must share the feeling many of us have that we are involved in the most important job that the American people have to do as they seek world leadership for peace in the years ahead.

Let us dedicate ourselves to this purpose. And let us learn to make whatever sacrifices are necessary to accomplish this end, for education is everybody's business.

Law: Many Things to Many People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE BROCK
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 20, 1959

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, the date of May 1 is observed by those in the legal profession and our courts as Law Day. To those so engaged the meaning and concept of the law is clear and they are generally very zealous in their observance of the ethics of their profession and the tenets of the bar associations. However, to those unschooled in the law, it ofttimes has an entirely different meaning—at times an awesome regard for something beyond their ordinary comprehension, never recognizing the protective cloak it throws over their daily lives.

Morris D. Cook, an eminent member of the bar for some 30 years, and president of the Dodge County (Nebr.) Bar Association, recently wrote an enlightening description of the intent, purpose, and protective accomplishments of the law, as we know it and respect it. The Fremont Guide and Tribune, a leading journal in the State of Nebraska, thought so much of Mr. Cook's masterful treatment of the subject that it was carried as the lead editorial in their April 30 issue.

In order that all will have the benefit of this very unusual dissertation, may I request at this time the necessary permission to extend and place in the daily RECORD the editorial published by the Fremont Guide and Tribune:

LAW: MANY THINGS TO MANY PEOPLE
(By Morris D. Cook, president, Dodge County Bar Association)

President Eisenhower by proclamation has designated May 1 as Law Day and the American Bar Association has urged its observance.

The word "law" means many different things to many people. To some it is the policeman on the corner or the patrolman on the highway. To others it is the judge on the bench and the lawyers in the courtroom. Many think of it as the dramatic battle of wits between the district attorney and the lawyer for the defense on television, or the hair raising exploits of the private detective.

The Capitol Building, the courthouse, the prison, and the voting booth, all appear in the kaleidoscope of impressions we receive of the law.

All these, and many more, are the outward expressions of the law, but, in a broader sense, they are not the real law.

A great many of us probably have never been in a courtroom. Yet, in many respects, next to our place of worship and our homes, it is probably one of the almost sacred places.

It is what happens in the courtroom that determines how we enjoy the sanctity of our homes, the safety of our loved ones, and our means of livelihood. The courtroom literally affects our lives from the cradle to the grave and beyond, for even after death, our estate is managed and distributed in the courtroom.

In a sense, the courtroom is the depository of everything we own, our freedom and our lives. It is here that they are protected or taken away.

It is axiomatic that we rarely fully appreciate the things we have until we lose them. The safeguards of our Constitution, such as the rights to trial by jury, freedom of speech and religion, representation by counsel, presumption of innocence, public trial, and many others, are only words until we need them. Then they become like old friends in time of trouble.

Not all our laws are good; neither are all judges or law enforcement officers for they are only human beings subject to all human frailties. However, most of our laws are good, particularly those dealing with fundamental rights. For instance, our rules of evidence are designed to ascertain the facts and, contrary to popular opinion, they do just that.

Space does not permit a discussion of these rules but they are the results of many, many years of experience and thinking by the founders of our present system of legal procedure.

For example, the prohibition against hearsay evidence prevents our trials from becoming mere gossip forums with all the unreliability attached to gossip.

Our Constitution and other basic laws guarding our fundamental rights are not merely printed words but are like living, breathing things. They have withstood the impact of wars, national calamities, and all the vicissitudes of mankind. In times of public stress when passions run high, they protect the minority from the excesses of the majority. Although the majority may rule, it is not always right. One only need to remember that at one time the majority thought the world was flat.

It may be trite to say that the very foundation of our Nation is founded on law. Nevertheless, it is well to keep this thought in mind during these troubled times in our world affairs for all our military might cannot save our way of life if we lose these fundamental laws.

It would take volumes to even hit the high spots to describe what a wonderful system of laws we have in these United States. So far, with all its imperfections, it is the best that has ever been devised by the heart and mind of man.

Therefore, it seems quite proper that at least once a year we pause a moment in our busy lives and, in a manner of speaking, "count our blessings."

MORRIS D. COOK,
President, Dodge County Bar Association.

DAV Services in West Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLEY O. STAGGERS
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 20, 1959

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, an exceptional record of vital rehabilitation services freely extended to thousands of West Virginia citizens has recently been brought to my attention. Again, these splendid humanitarian services are not sufficiently appreciated by those who have benefited thereby, directly and indirectly.

Among the several congressional chartered veteran organizations, which have State departments and local chapters in West Virginia, is the Disabled American Veterans. The DAV is the only such organization composed exclusively of those Americans who have been either wounded, gassed, injured or disabled by reason of active service in the Armed Forces of the United States, or of some country allied with it, during time of war.

DAV SETUP

Formed in 1920, under the leadership of Judge Robert S. Marx, DAV legislative activities have very substantially benefited every compensated disabled veteran. Its present national commander is another judge, David B. Williams, of Concord, Mass. Its national adjutant is John E. Feighner, of Cincinnati, Ohio. Its national legislative director is Elmer M. Freudenberger; its national director of claims, Cicero F. Hogan; and its national director of employment relations, John W. Burris—all located at its national service headquarters, 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Inasmuch as less than 10 percent of our country's war veterans are receiving monthly disability compensation payments for service-connected disabilities—some 2 million—the DAV can never aspire to become th elargest of the several veteran organizations. Nevertheless, since shortly after its formation in 1920, the DAV National Headquarters, located in Cincinnati, Ohio, has maintained the largest staff of any veterans' organization, of full-time trained national service officers, 138 of them, who are located in the 63 regional and 3 district offices of the U.S. Veterans' Administration, and in its central Office in Washington, D.C.

They there have ready access to the official claim records of those claimants who have given them their powers of attorney. All of them being war-handicapped veterans themselves, these service officers are sympathetic and alert as to the problems of other less well-informed claimants.

SERVICE FACILITIES IN WEST VIRGINIA

The DAV maintains a full-time national service officer in West Virginia, Mr. Henry E. Smith, located in the VA regional office, 832 Fifth Avenue, in Huntington. The department commander is Mr. James R. Greer, Box 535,

Rupert, and the department adjutant is Mr. Clifford E. Mason, of the same address.

There are four VA hospitals in West Virginia, in each of which the DAV has a voluntary services representative, as follows: Mr. James B. Taylor, Jr., at Beckley, with 200 beds for general medical patients; Mr. Edward C. Wereley, at Clarksburg, with 184 beds for general medical patients; Mrs. Esther M. Darling, at Huntington, with 180 beds, general medical; and Mr. Earl T. Rosensteel, at Martinsburg, with 1,400 beds at the VA center.

During the last fiscal year, the VA paid out $63,813,000 for its veteran program in West Virginia, including $17,738,910 disability compensation to its 20,083 service disabled veterans. These Federal expenditures in West Virginia furnish substantial purchasing power in all communities. Only about 8 percent, 1,558, are members of the 35 DAV chapters in West Virginia.

SERVICE ACCOMPLISHMENT BY DAV

This 8 percent is strange, in view of the very outstanding record of personalized service activities and accomplishments of the DAV national service officer in behalf of West Virginia veterans and dependents during the last 10 fiscal years, as revealed by the following statistics:

Claimants contacted (estimate)	42,816
Claims folders reviewed	35,680
Appearances before rating boards	13,276
Compensation increases obtained	1,815
Service connections obtained	786
Nonservice pensions	740
Death benefits obtained	59
Total monetary benefits obtained	$1,000,470.39

These figures do not include the accomplishments of other national service officers on duty in the Central Office of the Veterans' Administration, handling appeals and reviews, or in its three district offices, handling death and insurance cases. Over the last 10 years, they reported 83,611 claims handled in such district offices, resulting in monetary benefits of $20,850,335.32, and in the central office, they handled 58,282 reviews and appeals, resulting in monetary benefits of $5,337,389.05. Proportionate additional benefits were thereby obtained for West Virginia veterans their dependents and their survivors.

SERVICES BEYOND STATISTICS

These figures fail properly to paint the picture of the extent and value of the individual advice, counsel and assistance extended to all of the claimants who have contacted DAV national service officers in person, by telephone, and by letter.

Pertinent advice was furnished to all disabled veterans—only about 10 percent of whom were DAV members—their dependents, and others, in response to their varied claims for service connection, disability compensation, medical treatment, hospitalization, prosthetic appliances, vocational training, insurance, death compensation or pension, VA guaranty loans for homes, farms and businesses, and so forth. Helpful advice was also given as to counseling and placement into suitable useful employment—to utilize their remaining abilities—civil service examinations, appointments, retentions, retirement benefits, and multifarious other problems.

Every claim presents different problems. Too few Americans fully realize that governmental benefits are not automatically awarded to disabled veterans—not given on a silver platter. Frequently, because of lack of official records, death or disappearance of former buddies and associates, lapse of memory with the passage of time, lack of information and experience, proof of the legal service connection of a disability becomes extremely difficult—too many times impossible.

A VA claims and rating board can obviously not grant favorable action merely based on the opinions, impressions, or conclusions of persons who submit notarized affidavits. Specific detailed, pertinent facts are essential.

The VA, which acts as judge and jury, cannot properly prosecute claims against itself. As the defendant, in effect, the U.S. Veterans' Administration must award the benefits provided under the laws administered by it, only under certain conditions.

A DAV national service officer can and does advise a claimant precisely why his claim may previously have been denied and then specifies what additional evidence is essential. The claimant must necessarily bear the burden of obtaining such fact-giving affidavit evidence. The experienced national service officer will, of course, advise him as to its possible improvement, before presenting same to the adjudication agency, in the light of all of the circumstances and facts, and of the pertinent laws, precedents, regulations and schedule of disability ratings. No DAV national service officer, I feel certain, ever uses his skill, except in behalf of worthy claimants, with justifiable claims.

The VA has denied more claims than it has allowed, because most claims are not properly prepared. It is very significant, as pointed out by the DAV acting national director of claims, Chester A. Cash, that a much higher percentage of those claims, which have been prepared and presented with the aid of a DAV national service officer, are eventually favorably acted upon, than is the case as to those claimants who have not given their powers of attorney to any such special advocate.

LOSSES BY REVIEWS

Another fact not generally known is that, under the overall review of claims inaugurated by the VA some 4 years ago, the disability compensation payments of about 37,200 veterans have been discontinued, and reduced as to about 27,300 others at an aggregate loss to them of more than $28 million per year. About 1 percent of such discontinuances and reductions have probably occurred as to disabled veterans in West Virginia with a consequent loss of about $280,000 per year.

Most of these unfortunate claimants were not represented by the DAV or by any other veteran organization. Judging by the past, such unfavorable adjudications will occur as to an additional equal number or more during the next 3 years, before such review is completed. I urge every disabled veteran in West Virginia to give his power of attorney to the national service officer of the DAV, or of some other veteran organization, or of the American Red Cross, just as a protective measure.

The average claimant who receives helpful advice probably does not realize the background of training and experience of a competent expert national service officer.

COSTS OF DAV SERVICES

Measured by the DAV's overall costs of about $12,197,600 during a 10-year period, one would find that it has expended about $3.50 for each claim folder reviewed, or about $8.80 for each rating board appearance, or, again, about $22.70 for each favorable award obtained, or about $123 for each service connection obtained, or about $54 for each compensation increase obtained, and has obtained about $14.10 of direct monetary benefits for claimants for each dollar expended by the DAV for its national service officer setup. Moreover, such benefits will generally continue for many years.

METHODS OF PROVIDING SERVICES

Evidently, most claimants are not aware of the fact that the DAV receives no Government subsidy whatsoever. The DAV is enabled to maintain its nationwide staff of expert national service officers primarily because of income from membership dues collected by its local chapters and from the net income on its Idento-Tag (miniature automobile license tags—project, owned by the DAV and operated by its employees, most of whom are disabled veterans, their wives, or their widows, or other handicapped Americans—a rehabilitation project in thus furnishing them with useful employment. Incidentally, without checking as to whether they had previously sent in a donation, more than 1 million owners of sets of lost keys have received them back from the DAV's Idento-Tag department, 2,992 of whom, during the last 8 years, were West Virginia residents.

Every eligible veteran, by becoming a DAV member, and by explaining these factors to fellow citizens, can help the DAV to procure such much-needed public support as will enable it to maintain its invaluable nationwide service setup on a more adequate basis. So much more could be accomplished for distressed disabled veterans, if the DAV could be enabled, financially, to maintain an expert service officer in every one of the 173 VA hospitals.

MEMORIAL HONOR ROLL

During the last 10 years, the DAV has also relied on appropriations from its separately incorporated trustee, the DAV Service Foundation, aggregating $3,300,000, exclusively for salaries to its national service officers. Its reserves having been thus nearly exhausted, the DAV Service Foundation is therefore very much in need of the generous support of

all service claimants, DAV members and other social minded Americans—by direct donations, by designations in insurance policies, by bequests in wills, by assignments of stocks and bonds and by establishing special types of trust funds.

A special type of memorial trust fund originated about 3 years ago with concerned disabled veteran members of the DAV chapter in Butte, Mont., which established the first perpetual rehabilitation fund of $1,000 with the DAV Service Foundation. Recently it added another $100 thereto. Since then, every DAV unit in that State has established such a special memorial trust fund, ranging from $100 to $1,100, equivalent to about $4 per DAV member.

As a DAV life member, I am pleased to enroll as one of the benefactors on the memorial honor roll of the DAV Service Foundation, with the realization that only the interest earnings therefrom will be available for appropriation to the DAV for its use in continuing to maintain its national service officer setup in my State of West Virginia.

Each claimant who has received any such rehabilitation service can help to make it possible for the DAV to continue such excellent rehabilitation services in West Virginia by sending in donations to the DAV Service Foundation, 631 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington 4, D.C. Every such serviced claimant who is eligible can and should also become a DAV member, preferably a life member, for which the total fee is $100—$50 to those born before January 1, 1902, or World War I veterans—payable in installments within 2 full fiscal year periods.

Every American can help to make our Government more representative by being a supporting member of at least one organization which reflects his interests and viewpoints—labor unions, trade associations and various religious, fraternal and civic associations. All of America's veterans ought to be members of one or more of the patriotic, service-giving veterans' organizations: The United Spanish War Veterans, the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Amvets, Military Order of the Purple Heart, and the Disabled American Veterans. All of America's disabled defenders, who are receiving disability compensation, have greatly benefited by their own official voice, the DAV. I am proud to be a member of the DAV, as well as a member of the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and Amvets.

The Danger of Nasserism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 20, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by the distinguished Senator from New Jersey, the Honorable HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, as it appeared in the April 1959 issue of B'nai Zion Voice:

THE DANGER OF NASSERISM

(By Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS)

The grave situation in the Middle East constitutes a most serious challenge to the free world today.

As I read the latest dispatches from the Middle East, I am especially mindful of many early warnings against Nasserism and its true character. Instead of facing the unpleasant facts, we helped to build up the Egyptian military adventurer. We fed his imperialistic ambitions in the naive belief that he would, in gratitude, identify himself with the West.

It should have been apparent to anyone who could read Nasser's own words as set down in his book, "The Philosophy of the Revolution," the "Mein Kampf" of pan-Arabism—that Nasser was motivated by violent hatred of the West and by dreams of empire at the very outset of his political career. But our State Department preferred to view the matter otherwise, and we all but begged to be blackmailed.

The inevitable results were the weakening of our prestige and influence throughout the whole area, the perpetuation of the Arab-Israel conflict as Nasser's best instrument for promoting the tensions on which his dictatorship feeds, and the entry of Soviet power on the Middle East scene through Nasser.

Nasser's forces are working overtime to convince the American people that Nasserism and Arab Nationalism are synonymous and that we have no choice but to swallow our dislike of Nasser and come to terms with him. This devious argument, which some misrepresent as hard-headed realism, would be more persuasive if one did not know the history of the power struggle within the Arab world and the essential weakness of strong men like Nasser, whose sole strength has been his ability to play off East against West. He has no indigenous strength. Even with the military aid and political support of the Kremlin, he was ignominiously defeated by little Israel, and he is being increasingly resisted and challenged by Arab countries like Lebanon, Jordan, and Iraq.

Add to this the opposition of Turkey and Iran, the growing resentment against Nasserist aims in Libya and Sudan, and the forthright action of President Bourgiba of Tunisia in breaking off relations with Nasser. The picture is not one of an invincible man of destiny marching from conquest to conquest, but of a political mirage going the way of all such fantasies of the desert.

The task before the West is clear. Our previous policy of massive appeasement of Nasser must be permanently replaced by a policy of massive containment.

Let no one intimidate us into believing that by pursuing such a policy we will be standing in opposition to Arab nationalism. America has provided the greatest impetus to Arab nationalism. It was at our initiative and under our leadership that the old imperialism were withdrawn from the Middle East. We fostered the political independence of all the Arab States and have lavished assistance of all kinds on these countries.

We are today prepared to continue our help to the under-developed Arab countries and ill-used Arab peoples. But we should not be prepared to equate Nasserism, with the ligitimate national aspirations of the Arab peoples, which we support.

I have already urged that we set ourselves the goal of establishing a stable economy in the Middle East, on a regional basis. That is the first thing we must do if we are to get peace.

In urging that a program of economic assistance in the Middle East should be pursued, however, I wish to make it clear that I do not believe that such assistance, if applied through the United Nations, should be given to nations which fail to observe the United Nations Charter, which explicitly prohibits economic boycott and belligerency of the kind now being waged by the Arab States against Israel.

At the same time, I believe that countries like Israel, which are clearly and unmistakably linked with the United States, in the worldwide struggle for democracy and against Communism, should receive expanded aid directly from the United States on the basis of bilateral agreements.

Where Israel is concerned, even those who had blindly opposed its establishment must now admit that it stands as the major bastion of Western strength in the Middle East.

The moral and material support we have rendered to Israel—and such support has been largely bipartisan in character—must be viewed not only as a matter of aiding justice, but also as an extraordinarily vital expression of enlightened self-interest.

For if—Heaven forbid—Israel should ever fall, the Middle East would be finally opened up to the domination first of Nasserism, and next to the domination of Communist imperialism centered in Moscow. Then the hopes of the free world in that part of the world would vanish—and with them our hopes for Africa, and large parts of Asia, and perhaps even of Europe.

Neither the people of Israel themselves, with their magnificent though small defenses, nor the public opinion of the whole Western world, would ever permit this.

In the light of the bonds by which history and fate have linked the destines of the peoples of Israel and the United States, is it not time to give full and unqualified public expression to this relationship?

Our Government has shown friendship and support for Israel in many ways—but it has not yet publicly proclaimed our determination to maintain Israel's political independence and territorial integrity, come what may. It makes absolutely no sense to argue that a declaration by our Government to this effect would tend to stir up resentment and latent hostility against America within the Arab world. Our past reserve on this subject has certainly not served to check the barrage of anti-American propaganda emanating from Cairo.

Indeed, the inhibition we have imposed upon ourselves in order to appease Arab extremists has had the very opposite effect; it has encouraged them to believe that we are not unequivocally committed to Israel's defense and that by hammering away at America for being friendly to Israel, they may induce us to withdraw our support from Israel altogether. I believe, therefore, that a categoric warning that an attack against Israel would be dealt with as a threat to the security of the free world is the best way of tranquilizing the astmosphere surrounding the Arab-Israel conflict.

This policy, forcefully stated and resolutely pursued and implemented by American leadership in the United Nations, would be the prelude to peace and mutual cooperation among the peoples of the area for the benefit of future generations and for the good of mankind.

George Washington Day Dinner, American Good Government Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. CARROLL REECE
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 20, 1959

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, each year the American Good Gov-

ernment Society calls to memory the enduring contributions of George Washington to good government in this country by holding a public George Washington Day dinner here in the Nation's Capital. On these occasions the society's annual George Washington Awards are presented to two people for their outstanding contributions to good government in our own times.

Among the previous recipients of the George Washington Awards are the late Robert A. Taft, Harry Flood Byrd, Herbert Hoover, Allan Shivers, Howard W. Smith, Robert E. Wood, the late Walter F. George, George M. Humphrey, Karl E. Mundt, William M. Colmer, Richard B. Russell, and William F. Knowland. This year the recipients of the George Washington Awards of the American Good Government Society were JOHN L. MCCLELLAN and Lewis L. Strauss.

The awards were presented at the 1959 George Washington Day dinner attended by more than 700 ladies and gentlemen on Thursday, April 30, the 170th anniversary of the inauguration of the first President of the United States.

On behalf of the trustees of the American Good Government Society, U.S. Senator HARRY FLOOD BYRD, of Virginia, made the presentation to Secretary Strauss and Representative CHARLES A. HALLECK, the minority leader of the House of Representatives, made the presentation to Senator MCCLELLAN.

I offer for the RECORD Representative HALLECK's remarks on making the presentation to Senator MCCLELLAN, the citation from the George Washington Award and Senator MCCLELLAN's response:

Mr. Chairman, all of you folks, I am happy and proud to be a part of this wonderful evening. I would like to say first of all that I note with approval that the purpose of the Good Government Society is to promote the education of the American public in the principles of the Constitution and of free competitive enterprise. Now certainly this is a worthy objective, and I would like to observe, in passing, that good government is government according to these principles.

Tonight it is my singular privilege to present the Society's George Washington Award to a man who has made a unique contribution to the preservation of these principles, the Honorable Senator, JOHN L. MCCLELLAN of Arkansas. If you will pardon a personal note, I have not only worked with him as a colleague in the Congress but I've been hunting and fishing a few times with JOHN, and I mean it when I say that he's a great guy any place you find him. [Applause.]

I think you will all agree that the primary purpose of government under our Constitution is the protection of personal liberty. The Constitution has given Congress the legislative power to provide this protection against both our enemies—those from without and those within our own society who would encroach upon our liberty.

The power to investigate is an essential component of the legislative process if the Congress is to perform its function intelligently and effectively. It is a power, however, which must be used with the utmost fairness and restraint.

As chairman of a select committee, Senator MCCLELLAN has labored long and well to bring to the attention of Congress and the American public the abuses that are today threatening the personal liberty of many hard-working Americans. JOHN MCCLELLAN has won the gratitude and respect of all right-thinking Americans for the fearless and fair manner in which he has carried on his investigations. [Applause.]

In these days when Congress is fair game for everybody, no Member of Congress has done more to enhance public esteem of Congress as a champion of the human rights guaranteed by the Constitution than has Senator MCCLELLAN. [Applause.] And no man has done more to improve the understanding of the investigative functions of the Congress of the United States.

JOHN MCCLELLAN has shown a deep devotion to the Constitution and the free-enterprise system, and so all of us who love him and respect him and admire him, applaud him for the great job he has done.

JOHN, [applause] this says: "Resolution and Tribute and Honor."

"JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, lawyer, statesman, and patriot, has devoted a quarter-century to the service of the people of Arkansas and of the United States—as prosecuting attorney, as Representative in Congress, and, the last 17 years, in the U.S. Senate. At 17, having passed the examinations, he was admitted to the Arkansas Bar by special act of legislature.

"Among his notable achievements have been the adoption by Congress of many recommendations of the Hoover Commissions—on both of which he served with distinction; the enactment of community property income tax law; and the exposure of corruption and tyranny in labor unions, which deny the constitutional rights of union members. For 20 years he has been an advocate of flood prevention, and the development of the Nation's water resources.

"Courage and integrity, wisdom and suasive power have indelibly marked Senator MCCLELLAN's work for efficient government and for liberty—the sum total of human rights. He is Arkansas' most illustrious son.

"For the board of trustees, American Good Government Society, Burks Summers, president, and J. Harvie Williams, secretary, April 30, 1959."

JOHN, good for you. [Applause.]

SENATOR M'CLELLAN'S RESPONSE

Thank you, CHARLIE. I only regret that you couldn't have started that speech in the Senate, where I could have yielded all the time you want. You have been very generous with your flattery, and I, like all human beings and particularly Irishmen, like it when it is favorable. I wish you might have continued.

Mr. Toastmaster, President Summers, Admiral Strauss, distinguished guests, my colleagues, members of the society, my friends, ladies, and gentlemen, it is not merely difficult—it is just about impossible—for me to express the extent and depth of my appreciation for the high honor which you have so graciously conferred upon me here this evening. To say that I am happily surprised is a gross understatement.

Indeed, I can hardly reconcile this happening with reality, for it had never even remotely occurred to me that I had ever done anything to be worthy of the George Washington Award of your splendid organization or to be deserving of the enviable recognition which you have accorded me tonight. To be so honored by your distinguished society overwhelms me, and I take great pride in it and have a greater appreciation for it when I contemplate what this society stands for, the kind of government that it supports and approves, as has been so ably referred to here and been so ably described in the wonderful address we have just heard by my distinguished colleague, Senator GOLDWATER. [Applause.] This is indeed a marvelous tribute, and it is one that I shall always cherish and treasure.

I accept this notable award with profound gratitude and humility, but I cannot—and I do not—accept it in my own right and for myself alone. But I accept it for and on behalf of my family—for Mrs. McClellan, my loving wife and devoted companion, and for my precious and wonderful children. [Applause.] For, if I have ever done anything to deserve this, if my labors and my feeble efforts have in any way, even in the smallest measure, contributed to good government, the national security, and the public welfare, I readily and proudly acknowledge that the larger share of the credit is due them. Their faith and their abiding trust have constantly inspired and sustained me. Without their confidence and encouragement many, many times I might well have faltered and failed.

Then, too, I should like to accept this award in the name of my native State, the great State of Arkansas, and her people, whom I have the honor to represent in the U.S. Senate. [Applause.] Except for their suffrage, their support, and the trust that they have reposed in me, I could never have had the high privilege of serving or the opportunity to serve in the National Congress; and to them I am eternally indebted and thankful.

And may I say to you fellows, Governor, and all of our friends in Arkansas, I am happy indeed that you have come here tonight. You indeed honor me greatly. [Applause.]

When I meditate upon the affairs of state and reflect upon what constitutes good government, there comes to my mind a story that illustrates to me a great truth and one that maybe we should all relearn, observe, and remember. It is said that on one occasion a minister of a tiny country church asked a celebrated actor, who happened to be present in his audience, to render for the congregation the 23d psalm. The great actor readily agreed. He rose and in a most eloquent manner dramatized the beautiful passages of the 23d psalm. His efforts were an overwhelming example of forensic oratory. But when he sat down, the minister turned to a humble parishioner, a man of simple words, and asked him if he too would recite the same psalm. The poor parishioner stood up, fully conscious of his plain clothes, his face weather-beaten, and his lack of training in the art of public speaking. But he began reciting, "The Lord is my shepherd * * *" and, as he continued, the congregation listened with consecrated attention. When he ended, there were tears in the eyes of the church members. They had been stirred and moved to a state of reverence and devout worship.

After the services, the minister asked the great actor why it was that the parishoners were more impressed by the words of the simple workingman than they had been by his. The great actor hesitated a moment, and then he said, "Well, I knew the psalm, he knew the psalm, but he also knows the author."

So we hold that governments are instituted among men to secure and maintain certain basic and unalienable human rights. Among those fundamentals that we foster, cherish, and seek to preserve are equality, liberty, and justice for all, under the authority of law that is derived from the consent of the governed, and not by dictatorial powers arrogated by men unto themselves. [Applause.]

If we are to have good government, these words, "equality, liberty, and justice," must have their meaning and be a part of our being. They must live in our hearts as well as in our minds. In short, we must "know the author," for I believe the indestructible principles embodied in these words, "equality, liberty, and justice," have upon them the divine seal, and that "good government" as our highest political aims has the approbation of His divine will.

I have heard my friend speak here this evening. His remarks and his address reminded us of the conditions that prevail in the world today and conditions that unhappily prevail here in our own country. They point out to us the gravity of dangers that may threaten us and the crises that may be impending. Since this is the 170th anniversary of the occupancy of the Presidency of the United States, I think it might be well for us, therefore, to reconsecrate and rededicate ourselves and our lives, our fortunes and our sacred honor, to the preservation of the land that we love. That is what I shall try to do. Thank you. [Applause.]

What Is an American?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 20, 1959

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, Freedoms Foundation this week presented awards for two editorials that discuss what it means to be an American.

The first editorial I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD was published in the Tatler, newspaper of Central High School, Paterson, N.J. The second appeared in the Statesman, journal of the New Jersey Department American Legion's Boys State, and was written by Morris Shimshak, 400 East 38th Street, Paterson:

[From the Tatler]

WHAT IS AN AMERICAN?

An American is granted the promise of a bright future. He has the right to belong to the organizations of his own choice, and the right to contribute his share toward democratic government in using his voting privilege. He has time for leisure and relaxation from his work. An American doesn't toil from dawn to dusk. He has the right to educate his children in the finest public schools in the world. An American is aware of unlimited opportunities that are within his reach. Today's American is a well-informed person. He is free to do whatever he chooses. His home is his castle, and he is proud to provide his family with luxuries as well as necessities.

Each and every American has the right to worship as he chooses and where he chooses. An American probably has some of his savings invested in Government bonds, believing in the strength of his Government. He lives in complete freedom from fear, knowing that the defenses of America protect his home and his family. He stretches out his hand to help the oppressed.

[From the Statesman]

DEMOCRACY DEPENDS ON ME

This slogan was suggested and developed by the National Boys' State Committees of 1947 and 1950. It was more fully expounded and interpreted as "The security of my rights, privileges, and responsibilities as an American citizen depends on me."

The slogan embodies the principles and objectives of all Boys' States throughout the Nation to "develop civic leadership, develop an interest in the study of our Government, arouse a desire to maintain our form of government, and to provide a laboratory for a functional study of citizenship."

The additional point that we at New Jersey Boys' State are attempting to make, especially through our Statesman paper, is the one that this slogan be adopted, not for a week, a month, or a year, but for a lifetime. No truer ideal must be a reality to make our American way of life a fait accompli. The democratic ideals of our forefathers will only be reached when a greater number of Americans—the wealthy, the educated, the gifted, as well as the poor, the illiterate, and the weak—learn to share the burdens and responsibilities of government. The American government—local, county, State, and Federal—will never be better than the sum total of the contributions of each of us as individuals.

You, the men of Boys' State, are and will be the men of the Nation. Upon your shoulders will be placed the heavy responsibilities of tomorrow. May you have the strength and the courage, the willingness to serve without counting the cost, the spirit of giving without expecting a return that will insure the future of this great land.

Leadership requires an unselfish spirit of service and concern for the rights and privileges of others. It requires patience. It requires tolerance. It requires long hours of study. It will require working, not by the clock or calendar but by getting a job done. It means courage to set the pace rather than following; to work while others shirk; to accept failure with grace and understanding. It means you need the qualities of industry, thrift, and self-reliance. You need to know your responsibilities and be willing to accept them.

"In the past your school and we at Boys' State have certified to your leadership. All we ask now is that when you begin to have doubts about your ability to improve our order of government and the conditions of the world you find the answer in the slogan, "Democracy Depends on Me."

The Oil Centennial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 30, 1959

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Warren, Pa., Times-Mirror of Wednesday, May 13, 1959:

THE OIL CENTENNIAL

If a man is sometimes a cussed animal, he can, also, at times, be an appreciative one. Part proof of this is borne out by his predilection to commemorate any event of special significance to him, with birthdays and anniversaries high up at the top of the list.

This is a good year for people who appreciate commemoration; 1859 was a vintage year for important occurrences, Oregon statehood, the Colorado gold rush, and the birth of the oil industry are examples, so that makes 1959 a big year for centennial celebrations. One of the most significant of these celebrations is scheduled for August 27 at Titusville. There, just 100 years ago, "Colonel" Edwin L. Drake completed drilling the world's first successful commercial oil well and the oil industry was born.

Drake could have no idea of the tremendous scope of scientific and economic advances his accomplishments would make available to the world in the century to come. For oil, used centuries ago by the Seneca Indians as a medicinal ointment, suddenly opened new worlds of comfort and convenience to man. Starting in 1859 as kerosene—an illuminant superior to the whale oil and coal oil in use at the time, oil eventually made possible the development of the internal combustion engine—and with that the birth of the automotive—and later the air—age. In the 20th century, uses for oil have expanded rapidly and oil has spawned new industries right and left. Today oil is found in thousands of products ranging from asphalt highways to fine fabrics; from heavy duty lubricating oil to plastic kitchen utensils; from household heat to satellite fuel.

We can no more guess what wonders will come from this miraculous natural resource in the next 100 years than Colonel Drake could predict the last 100 years. But we can be sure they will be great and that the lot of mankind on August 27, 2059, should be easier, more convenient and comfortable than ever before dreamed of.

As we said before, man does have the spark within him that enables him to appreciate significant occasions. And it's fitting that commemorative ceremonies have been scheduled at Titusville this year. Oil put Titusville on the maps of history. But Titusville, and its determined Colonel Drake, put mankind on the road to unparalleled achievement.

Michigan's Tourist Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN LESINSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 20, 1959

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, this week we Michiganites are celebrating Michigan Week, a time during which we review our State's rich history, progress, and potential for the future. May 19 is set aside especially to emphasize the natural friendliness of Michigan people and the part hospitality plays in the State's great tourist industry. We invite all to read the following article by Culver Bailey, staff writer for the Michigan Education Journal, describing the beauties of our State and hope it will induce you to spend your next vacation in Michigan:

MICHIGAN'S TOURIST INDUSTRY

(By Culver Bailey)

During all four seasons Michigan offers tourists unparalleled opportunities for fun and relaxation.

Tourism is firmly rooted as an industry in Michigan, an industry providing employment and income for a large segment of the State's population. In spring, summer, autumn, or winter there are tourist attractions in this State to attract literally millions of Americans.

Ranking with manufacturing and agriculture as one of the State's top three revenue producers, the tourist industry comprises a statewide combination of relatively small enterprises devoted to servicing the wants and needs of the Michigan vacationer. The State's tourist industry is big business in dollar volume yet small business in nature.

Benefits of tourism are not restricted exclusively to those directly involved in operating vacation facilities. Tourist dollars fil-

ter into every business channel of our highly complex economy—retail, wholesale, professional and governmental.

Michigan's annual vacation travel revenue exceeds $650 million by conservative estimate. At least $39 million of this total reaches the Michigan State treasury in the form of sales tax collections, gas, liquor, and cigarette taxes, and hunting and fishing license fees.

Some 9,750,000 tourists vacation in Michigan annually. Approximately one-half of this total are Michigan residents. A survey of the Nation's travel market conducted by the Curtis Publishing Co. revealed that Michigan ranks as fourth most popular vacation State in the Nation with a 5.7 percent share of the domestic travel business. Ahead of Michigan are New York (10.9 percent), California (8.4 percent), and Florida (7 percent).

Beckoning tourists to Michigan is a montage of natural beauty — lakes, stream, beaches, forests, mountainous hills, and picturesque scenery.

MICHIGAN AT ITS FRESHEST

This month Michigan is at its freshest, for it is springtime. More than 17 million acres of forests are decked in their spring garb. Crisp, green leaves usurp winter's greyness, cherry blossoms burst forth, and delicate flowers add brilliant hues to nature's design.

Tourist interests in spring are marked by festivals and special events which herald the new season. The maple syrup festival at Vermontville (April 18); the blossom festival at the twin cities, St. Joseph and Benton Harbor (May 3–9); the tulip festival at Holland (May 14–16); the blessing of the blossoms at Traverse City this month, are but a few.

The out-of-doors vacationer looks forward to spring fishing season. With the exception of black bass (bass season opens June 20), all of the State's game fish become legal to catch on April 25. The popular bluegills, sunfish, walleyes, perch, and northern pike currently are being sought in Michigan's lakes.

Summertime in Michigan means the height of tourism. With the longest shoreline in the nation (3,121 miles) and 11,037 inland lakes, Michigan truly merits its "water wonderland" label. Water for every summer whim is in plentiful supply—water for swimming, boating, fishing, water skiing, or scenery. Four of the five Great Lakes touch Michigan's shores. Shoreline scenery lures many tourists—sand dunes along Lake Michigan or Lake Superior's Pictured Rocks, for example.

"Michigan's islands — more than 500 of them—are especially attractive in the summer," wrote Robert J. Furlong, executive secretary of the Michigan Tourist Council, for the magazine inside Michigan. "Some are large, some small, but each with an individual charm. One of these is famous Isle Royale in Lake Superior, the country's only island national park. Another is unique and historical Mackinac Island. Still another is Beaver Island, made famous in the middle of the last century as a Morman stronghold."

MANY SUMMER ATTRACTIONS

Additional manmade and natural attractions on the docket for Michigan sightseers include the Lake Huron shore scenic drive, the Straits of Mackinac Bridge, the Soo locks, the Porcupine Mountains, and the Hartwick Pines. There are many others, including the new Enrico Fermi atomic plant near Monroe; the sparkling sandy beaches at Holland, Grand Haven, Muskegon, and Saugatuck on the west coast; the St. Clair Metropolitan Beach at Mount Clemens, largest in the Midwest—a crescent of white sand 300 feet wide and a mile long; Thunder Bay, near Alpena; and Huron Beach at Hammond Bay, north of Rogers City.

Summer is the best time to visit Michigan's historical sites. Indians, French, British, Spanish, and colonials all played important roles in developing this part of the Nation. Old landmarks still stand in testimony of their contributions.

Diversity of attractions is a major reason for this State's high ranking as a tourist State. For example, after visiting Detroit's Greenfield Village and automobile plants, the tourist can travel north to deep sea fish at Munising, or mountain climb in the upper peninsula's copper country. Fishing for trout in one of upper Michigan's many cool, swift-running streams is a happy respite for tourists.

"A summer vacation snag in previous years has been accommodation shortages," said Robert McIntosh, of Michigan State University's tourist-resort service. "The Mackinaw City-Sault Ste. Marie accommodation shortage after 4 p.m. is an example. However, this summer the situation will be lessened considerably."

Awaiting vacationers throughout the State this summer will be 2,500 motels, 3,500 resorts (cottage-type), and 100 resort hotels. McIntosh said the heaviest concentration of motel and hotel accommodations will be found in the Roscommon and Chippewa Counties.

Highlighting Michigan's fall tourist season are color tours and hunting. During autumn the forests are aglow with huge splashes of brilliant colors. Deep reds, bronzes, yellows, oranges, and greens turn Michigan's landscape into an artist's palette.

Vacationists in Michigan at this time of year will find well-marked color tours to guide them through the forest areas. These tours begin on or about September 15 in the Upper Peninsula, and during the first week in October in the northern counties of the Lower Peninsula.

Almost every kind of game from rabbits to moose awaits the Michigan hunter in scores of public parks and hunting areas during the autumn season. October 1 will herald the opening of the hunting season in the Upper Peninsula and the northern Lower Peninsula for upland birds, ducks, geese, and for the increasingly popular archery season for deer. Pheasant season in the Lower Ueninsula is set for October 20–November 10 this year. Putting the final touches on autumn tourism, hunters with firearms will stalk Michigan's deer starting November 15.

WINTER TEMPO PICKS UP

Winter, once the neglected stepchild in the State's tourist industry, is fast filling an important niche in Michigan's year-around tourist activities. The Michigan Tourist Council estimates that one-half million sportsmen participated in the State's winter sports this year. Some 150,000 skiers, an increase of 20 percent over last year's total, spent $14 million here this winter.

Michigan is well suited for winter sports, for much of the State has greater snowfall than any point between the Rocky Mountains and New England. This unique aspect of its climate is largely due to the influence of the surrounding Great Lakes.

Michigan's winter vacationland is invaded by thousands of skiers, skaters, tobogganers, ice fishermen, and rabbit and bobcat hunters. Representing an investment of more than $9 million, some 69 winter sports areas now dot the State.

Weekends find such resort areas as Gaylord and Cadillac packed with out-of-door enthusiasts. Ski areas adding snow-making machines this year included Dryden, 18 miles north of Rochester; Mount Christie, north of Oxford; and Holiday Hills, east of Traverse City. Snow-making equipment is used when there is an unseasonably small amount of snowfall.

Spring, summer, fall, winter—each season has something to offer in Michigan's all-year vacationland. Answer this vast State's invitation, for some diversion will be discovered to your liking.

And while you are in Michigan, I hope you will visit the 16th District, the home of the Ford Motor Co.'s Rotunda, its exhibit building, which is currently honoring our 49th State, Alaska, with one of its largest displays.

ALASKA EXHIBIT BIGGEST EVER AT FORD ROTUNDA

The 49th State, Alaska, is featured in the largest single display ever presented in the Rotunda, Ford Motor Co.'s exhibits building in Dearborn which opened Sunday.

The Alaska scene occupies the center court of the Rotunda and is the major exhibit of the 1959 summer show, "New Adventures on the American Road." Other displays, geared to the interest of travelers, will be added within the next few weeks prior to the height of the summer tourist season.

In what is believed to be the biggest representation of Alaska ever exhibited in the United States, the backdrop for the Rotunda scene is 125 feet wide. On it, a mountain rises to a height of 50 feet. In the foreground, a waterfall, 20 feet high, utilizes 45,000 gallons of water per hour.

Animated figures in the setting are a Kodiak bear, nine feet high; a fisherman; trout which jump in the waterfall; a walrus, and a seal that cavorts in the water.

Living trees and wildflowers, indigenous to Alaska, an 18-foot totem pole and Ford station wagons carrying outdoor living equipment round out the scene. The National Geographic Society assisted the Rotunda staff in selecting authentic trees and flowers for the exhibit.

The scene was constructed by the Silvestri Art Manufacturing Co. in Chicago. Four trailers, 40 feet long, and another open at the top to accommodate 20-foot-high trees were needed to bring the scene to Dearborn. Silvestri officials describe the mount backdrop as one of the largest ever painted in their shops.

The Rotunda is one of the Nation's top six tourist attractions. Every year nearly 2 million persons from throughout the United States, its possessions and more than 80 foreign countries visit the Ford Motor Co. showplace. Tours of the nearby Rouge plant originate at the Rotunda.

Current Rotunda visiting hours are 8:30 a.m. to 9 p.m., Monday through Friday, and 1 p.m. to 9 p.m., on Sundays. Starting June 1 the Rotunda also will be open 1 p.m. to 9 p.m. on Saturdays and holidays.

Is Public Money Nobody's Money?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 20, 1959

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the old fallacy of getting something for nothing from the Federal Government is a problem which returns to haunt us many times during the congressional session.

"Is Public Money Nobody's Money?" is the title of an editorial from the Perryton (Tex.) Ochiltree County Herald, and comments graphically on Federal Government spending:

IS PUBLIC MONEY NOBODY'S MONEY?

There seems to have arisen in the past two decades the attitude on the part of bureau-

crats and Congressmen that the public money is nobody's money, merely to be spent with a free hand.

All of us who have a bite taken out of our income to support this sort of spending are bitter about it, but it is frustrating not to be able to do anything about it.

In the news this week were a few instances of what is being done with your money.

In Michigan, a doctor was paid $41,000 for 2¼ months' work taxing X-rays for the Army induction station. When challenged, he admitted that the same work could have been performed for $5,000 were it being done with private money. Government money is different.

The Air Force Academy at Colorado Springs is another case in point. Already the Air Force has maneuvered around and spent twice as many million dollars on the Academy as Congress ever authorized, and is still spending. Where they are getting the tax money appears to be a mystery, except that other Air Force appropriations are being manipulated to provide the cash. It all comes out of your pocket.

The Senate is building a subway to connect the Senate Office Building with the Senate Chambers. This has cost several million dollars, making it beyond a doubt the most expensive subway on the face of the globe, and it was discovered that the money ran out before the subway got to its destination. All they have so far is a tunnel, which will be extended with your money, of course.

Somehow, some way, we are going to have to insist on money conservation. How to do it is anybody's guess.

The Modern Crusade of the Innocents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 20, 1959

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, in the near future, Congress by its action in either accepting or rejecting legislation to provide Federal grants to the States for education may well establish a policy which will be far-reaching. In fact, historians of the future will probably refer back to this session of Congress and our decision on Federal aid to education as having an important influence on generations to come in America and what is in store for this Nation.

Recently, two Members of the other body with conflicting views, discussed the subject, "Is Federal Aid to Education Necessary?" on the "American Forum of the Air." I have a transcript of this debate.

The Senator who was opposed to the Murray-Metcalf bill said it would lead to the Federal Government controlling the schools and in turn it would lead to the Federal Government prescribing the curriculum of our schools.

This Senator said: "When it does that, you've a dictatorship. That is the way Hitler and Mussolini arose in their countries."

The other Senator did not agree. Then he added, and these are his actual words:

"But even if it were true, I would suggest the possibility that it would be the lesser of the evils of not giving our children a decent education."

Mr. Speaker, I found this statement shocking, but even more disturbing to me is the way certain educators themselves ignore history. For example, all my friends in education agree with me and oppose Federal strings and control. Yet they are blind to history and will not not see that it is impossible to remove control from the financing of schools. Japan is a good example of this power of the purse and central thought controy. There before the war, organizations like chambers of commerce and of course all municipal functions of government were dependent for funds to exist from the central government, and why educators, of all people, would naively believe it would be different in America is beyond me.

The latest evidence of a misguided educator came to me in the form of letters forwarded by a teacher.

Hereafter is one of these letters which is typical of them all. After it, is my reply and the accompanying comment to the teacher. I think all three letters form a composite picture which recalls the Children's Crusade in Old World Europe. I wonder if unwittingly this 20th century Pied Piper could not be leading her innocent boy and girl students into oblivion and modern slavery. For myself, I do not consider such a risk the lesser of two evils and in all conscience I shall continue to actively oppose Federal control of our educational system.

These are the letters to which I refer:

The Honorable THOMAS M. PELLY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PELLY: Lately I have heard so many good things about you because you are such an outstanding man. So I am telling you from the bottom of my heart to please vote for schools, because we need your help for the Murray-Metcalf bill.

Now would you like to hear something about myself. I have two hobbies, horses and dogs. I have a dog called Susie.

My father works at Peter Thomas Co. My mother doesn't work.

———— ————.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., May 18, 1959.

DEAR THIRD GRADE STUDENTS: Your letters have reached me. When I was your age and in the third grade I went to Summit School. The same building still stands. It is at Union Street and Summit Avenue. Since I am a grandfather, you can tell it is getting to be an old building indeed.

Seattle, just like other places in the United States, needs new school buildings particularly I think to replace portables which get quite stuffy in winter.

The necessary money to construct such new schools and get good teachers of course must come from the citizens who live in Seattle, regardless of whether the city, the county, the State of Washington, or the Federal Government taxes these people to pay for them.

The Constitution of the United States does not call for the National Government to finance education and building of such schools. The Constitution of the State of Washington, on the other hand, accepts responsibility and guarantees an education to you and each other child in Seattle.

The reason our forefathers left education to the individual States was for fear of a dictatorship and a President of a king such as George III of England gaining control of our schools and telling each teacher what to teach. Thus Federal control could come about if special requirements were attached to accepting Federal money.

Before Pearl Harbor the people of Japan were under "thought control" made possible by financing of Japanese schools by the central Government of Japan.

I have urged the Congress of the United States to recognize the needs of our schools and pass a law so as to have the Secretary of the Treasury send back a part of the income tax paid by each State to that State to be used for schools in the way each State decides it wants to use the money.

Your teacher told you and each member of your class to write me to vote for a different kind of a law. She has told you to tell me to support the Murray-Metcalf bill which would provide Federal grants to the States for use not only in constructing new schools but also for paying her and other teachers higher salaries.

I am sure she deserves better pay and I am sure your parents and the school board members elected to manage the Seattle schools want to increase it. As a matter of fact, if all property was valued and taxed properly and fairly in our State the problem would be simplified.

Many well-intentioned people are now urging Federal Aid to Education as a solution. But other equally well-intentioned people believe if the Federal Government once starts in granting money for teachers' salaries, its role will be expanded and new Government-selected books and other school needs will be added to these Federally-financed items. That will in time pave the way, some of us believe, to central control and the way opened for regimentation of all school children into one pattern of thought. History could repeat itself. We could have a Hitler in America under such a system.

I want you to know that your school and the education of every child in America is very important to me.

As the Representative in Congress of the northern part of Seattle and King County, which has had and will continue to have a huge increase in school population, I intend to do all I can to meet this problem without endangering principles that are basic to our way of life, such as the freedom from any form of "thought control," the right to think and make our own decisions free from any influence, kindly or otherwise.

I have two granddaughters attending McGilvra Grammar School. One is in kindergarten and one in the first grade. In a couple of years they will be in the third grade just like you are and I hope they too will be able to express themselves as eloquently as you have in your letters to me. It goes without saying that I want only the best in life for them, just as I do for you, and I know this can be accomplished without jeopardizing our intellectual freedom.

Thank you for writing to me as you have.

Sincerely,

THOMAS M. PELLY,
Representative in Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., May 18, 1959.

DEAR MISS: I am enclosing a single reply to the various letters from your third grade students which you forwarded to me. I am sorry that I cannot talk to your class personally. Instead I hope you will act as my representative in reading the enclosed letter to them.

Children should take an early interest in civics and matters of concern to our country. However, in this instance I believe

that perhaps unwittingly you have acted unwisely in using your third grade students in what amounts to spreading propaganda for legislation in which you have a personal interest and the real implication of which obviously is over their heads. My reaction to their letters would be the same regardless of whether your students were urging support of or opposition to the Murray-Metcalf bill. I am sure you realize that many of the parents of the children attending our public schools are strongly opposed to Federal aid to education. Furthermore, while I do not impugn your motives, to me it is not proper to use children in this way.

Th National Education Association, the Washington State Education Association and on down through the various State and local groups, interested in and dedicated to the improvement and advancement of our educational system, perform an essential service in providing information. I value their help and although I am not always in agreement with the position taken by these various organizations and their representatives, I nevertheless appreciate their objectives and respect their point of view.

That I oppose Federal strings to school dollars is a matter of record. However, I am also conscious of the critical financial need facing our school system. It was in this connection that I initiated H.R. 4079, which would return a percentage of the Federal income tax to the various States to be used in any way those States themselves deem advisable, in the field of education and with no Federal controls of any nature.

Any other type of bill, it is my belief, could result in the Government censoring text books, so to speak, and occupying a seat on each school board in America.

I hope you will accept my letter in the spirit in which it is intended. The right to petition is in the Constitution, but this does not include the right of a teacher-guardian to use children in spreading propaganda.

Kind personal regards.

Sincerely,

THOMAS M. PELLY,
Representative in Congress.

Con Edison; Serving a Growing New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 20, 1959

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Charles E. Eble, president of Consolidated Edison Co. of New York, Inc., before the New York Chamber of Commerce on May 7, 1959:

CON EDISON: SERVING A GROWING NEW YORK

(An addressby Charles E. Eble, president Consolidated Edison Co. of New York, Inc., before the New York Chamber of Commerce, May 7, 1959)

I am delighted with this opportunity to talk about Con Edison to the New York Chamber of Commerce. The chamber and Con Edison have much in common. Both have grown up with the busiest city in the world; both have made major contributions to its growth and development; both are vitally concerned with its future and dedicated to its constant improvement. A number of our executives count it their privilge to serve as members of this chamber and to participate in its activities.

We need not look far to find specific examples of these mutual interests. The city's subways are a case in point. This chamber originated the idea of the city's first subway and the plan for its initial operation. This plan called basically for the city to provide the tunnels and stations, and for private enterprise to provide the equipment, and power supply, and to operate the system. A board composed of chamber members carried this idea through to completion in 1904. The initial pattern of operation was generally followed until 1940 when the city took over the entire subway operation, including the subway powerplants. These plants provide power to operate two of the city's three subway systems. The power to operate the third, the IND, has been supplied by Con Edison since the IND was built in the middle 1930's.

Con Edison has long held that city ownership and operation of the subway powerplants are not in the best interest of the city's taxpayers. Between 1945 and 1956, we made a number of proposals regarding power supply for the subway system but they were not accepted. Finally, in late 1956, on the urging of the city planning commission, the city administration asked if Con Edison would submit a proposal to purchase the subway powerplants. Shortly after, negotiations were begun which led to Con Edison's present offer. In April of 1958, the Preusse committee, appointed by the mayor to study the desirability of selling the plants, strongly recommended their sale. Public hearings were held in February of this year, and in March the board of estimate approved the sale. Con Edison committed itself to buy the plants when we signed a contract with the city and the Transit Authority on April 30. The public auction required to effect the sale is scheduled for May 19.

At the February hearings, the New York chamber vigorously endorsed the sale of these powerplants to Con Edison. I am sure support such as this contributed directly to the city's decision to sell the plants—a decision we are confident will be of lasting benefit to New York.

When Ike Grainger asked me to come here today, he suggested that I talk about Con Edison. Now, I imagine many of you associate Con Edison with its holes in the street, which by latest report totaled 322. Of course, you are not alone in that respect. A number of well-known entertainment personalities have had fun with our street work, but we don't think things are quite as bad as Jack Paar indicated a few weeks ago when he was shown a picture of Grand Canyon. He took one look and said. "Well, this time Con Edison has gone too far."

THE UTILITY INDUSTRY

Con Edison is one of the larger companies in one of the Nation's major industries. Although the utility industry had its beginnings over 135 years ago, it continues to experience dynamic growth. Today it is one of the most significant sustaining forces in our economy. During the recent recession, as in earlier ones, the continuing investments by electric and gas utilities played an important role in carrying the economy through the period of adjustment. Last year, when total expenditures by the Nation's industries for plant and equipment declined to $30.5 billion, down 17 percent from 1957, electric and gas companies spent a record $5.6 billion, or almost one-fifth of the total. Con Edison's construction expenditures in 1958 reached a record $189 million, a significant part of the overall utility industry investment.

And there is no indication that utility industry growth is slackening. Recent forecasts indicate that electric sales in the United States will double in 9 years, quadruple in 18. Gas sales nationwide are expected to increase between 5 and 6 percent annually over the next several years. It is apparent that future utility expansion to meet growing demands will have a continuing favorable impact on the Nation's economy.

CON EDISON: THE COMPANY

New York City is perhaps best known for its skyline and other glamorous aspects, but as you are aware, it is outstandingly the Nation's leading city in finance, commerce, and industry. The business and industrial complex that has grown up, in and around New York, coupled with the millions of people who live and work here, make it the most concentrated market for energy in the world. Con Edison's job is supplying this market for energy with electricity, gas, and steam.

There are a number of ways of looking at Con Edison. As a business enterprise, its operation is made possible by the investments of 180,000 stockholders—people from all walks of life, from all parts of the United States, and from several other parts of the world. Individuals own more than half the stock, and about 35 percent of all stock is owned by people with 100 shares or less. No stockholder of record owns as much as 1.5 percent of the total common stock.

These investments have made possible the development of the extensive facilities required to supply the energy needs of the areas Con Edison serves. We provide electricity to nearly 9 million people in a 600-square mile area that includes essentially all of New York's five boroughs as well as most of Westchester County. Gas is supplied in a 400-square mile area that includes Manhattan, the Bronx, part of Queens, and most of Westchester. Steam service is provided to most of the buildings in midtown and downtown Manhattan.

Our electric facilities at present include nine powerplants with more than 4 million kilowatts of capacity. To generate last year's electrical requirements, these plants used an amount of coal, gas, and oil equivalent in heat content to 8 million tons of coal. To insure our fuel supply against possible interruption, a stockpile of 1.5 million tons of coal—enough to fill 25,000 rail cars—is maintained as well as substantial amounts of oil. Many of our generating units are equipped to burn coal, oil, or gas. This provides flexibility in meeting any possible disruptions in fuel shipments and also gives us the added economic benefit of being able to use the lowest cost fuel at any given time.

Until a few years ago we manufactured all the gas we sold but today, natural gas makes up almost our entire supply. The company still maintains three gas manufacturing plants which are used to supplement natural gas during periods of high demand.

To provide steam service, Con Edison has six steam generating stations, as well as several other steam sources which can be drawn on as the situation requires.

Since energy must be delivered the instant it is needed, there is the additional requirement for extensive distribution facilities to connect our energy sources directly with every customer. Con Edison has 43,000 miles of underground electric mains, 26,000 miles of overhead lines, and 4,000 miles of gas mains. Distribution facilities alone account for more than one-half our present investment.

To operate these facilities and to carry out its business activities, Con Edison has 25,000 employees and 15,000 of them have been with the company 25 years or longer. This high proportion of experienced and loyal people who take pride in the company's reputation is important in maintaining our high standards of service.

CON EDISON AND NEW YORK

A utility is unlike many other businesses in that its growth and development—yes; even its success—hinge in large measure on the local communities it serves. By the very nature of its business, a utility company cannot move to another location or seek another market.

For well over a century, the relationship between Con Edison and New York has been mutually beneficial. The company has had the good fortune to grow up with one of the major cities in the world and many of its important suburbs. On the other hand, we believe these communities have directly benefited from having the continuing high standard of energy service which Con Edison has provided.

But the impact of Con Edison's operations on the economic life of the communities it serves extends beyond that of meeting their ever-growing energy needs. Con Edison is one of New York's largest employers, with an annual payroll of $156 million. Its continuing construction program—$200 million this year—is a major source of business for contractors and suppliers and provides employment for a substantial number of people. Con Edison's maintenance and operating activities also play important economic roles. Last year, we spent $49 million for supplies and outside services other than fuel. Fuel, incidentally, is the biggest item we buy; last year our fuel bill was nearly $92 million.

Con Edison is also one of the area's major taxpayers. Our local taxes last year amounted to $77 million, of which $71½ million went to New York City. We are the city's largest real estate taxpayer, with our real estate taxes last year amounting to 6½ percent of all such taxes received by the city. The benefit the city derives from these taxes becomes even more apparent when it is recognized that Con Edison's investment in distribution facilities—something over a billion dollars—is taxed at the same rate as ordinary real estate; that is, the rate includes provisions for education, welfare, fire protection, police protection, and the like. Yet, the facilities themselves are for the most part underground and require little or no expenditures by the city for such services.

CUSTOMER GOOD WILL

To operate successfully, a utility company must earn and hold the good will and confidence of its customers. Without these, it is doubtful that a company could maintain a financial position that would enable it to attract the new capital necessary for progress; without these, a company could not reasonably expect in the long run to retain its franchises to supply energy.

We at Con Edison consider the good will and confidence of our customers as the company's greatest asset, and we know that to retain these, it is of primary importance for us to do our job in the best possible manner. Our continuing objective is to provide our customers with the form of energy they want, when, where, and in the amounts they want it, at the lowest possible cost consistent with continuing good service.

CONTINUING PROGRESS

In New York, the task of supplying energy is perhaps more difficult, more expensive, and on a larger scale than in most other parts of the country. The nature of the area places exacting requirements on its energy supply; severe dislocations in the life of the city would occur if this supply were interrupted for even a relatively short time. To meet these exacting requirements, Con Edison has developed energy supply systems that are unsurpassed in reliability anywhere in the world.

Our history is filled with examples of technical advancement and industry firsts. We know that using the most advanced equipment and techniques serves to improve the quality of our service and helps to keep the cost of energy down.

Last September, we placed the world's largest turbogenerator in operation at our Astoria plant in Queens. This 335,000-kilowatt unit is the most efficient on our system. Two similar ones are under construction and still another is on order. Savings that will be realized through use of these modern turbogenerators will help offset the rising costs we are experiencing in practically every aspect of our business.

Since 1950 we have switched over from manufactured to natural gas. Natural gas is a better and more economical fuel and the changeover has resulted in continuing benefits for our gas customers. To make this change involved a tremendous conversion job which included some modification of every gas appliance used by our customers. This job took 5 years to complete and cost $36.5 million.

We have introduced electronic accounting machines which have greatly improved the efficiency and reduced the cost of our accounting processes. We have developed new techniques and equipment that enable us to accomplish our street work faster and more economically. We are right now constructing one of the Nation's first large-scale nuclear powerplants. These are but a few examples of Con Edison's continuing quest to provide its customers with the best possible energy service.

However, we feel our responsibilities to our customers extend beyond this. As one of New York's major enterprises, Con Edison has an important role to fulfill as a good neighbor and a good citizen.

Being the city's largest user of fuel, we have long realized the importance of controlling the emission from our power plant stacks. Since the early 1900's, Con Edison has pioneered in the development of smoke control equipment. We have spent over $63 million since 1937 alone to minimize this problem. The air pollution control equipment for each of our newest generating units cost $5 million and is designed to remove 99 percent of the solids from the smoke.

The nature of our business requires frequent—and in many cases daily—contacts with city, State, and Federal Government agencies on a wide variety of matters ranging from health, safety, and inspections to taxes, building permits, and city planning, all of which affect the public interest. We also cooperate closely with various city departments in fire, storm, or other emergencies which affect the city's energy supply or the general welfare, and our operating people are an integral part of the municipal civil defense organization.

DIG WE MUST

As another example of our community-mindedness I'd like to tell you something of our street work program. I am sure you have all seen our signs—"Dig we must for a growing New York." In simplest terms, they tell the reason for our street digging. Cables and pipes laid to serve 5-floor walkups cannot carry the energy needed to supply a 40-story building being built on the site today. And there is no way of predicting precisely where new major loads will spring up. Coupled with New York's rebuilding is the constant demand by existing customers for more energy. As this demand increases, the time comes when existing cables and mains cannot carry the load. I assure you if there were a practical way of meeting the city's growing energy needs without digging, we'd have adopted it long ago.

Faced with the necessity for carrying out underground work in the city's streets, we have continually sought to develop means of doing the job more quickly, more economically, and with the least possible inconvenience to the public. Let me give an example of a recent innovation.

Our construction engineers have designed and developed horizontal earth boring equipment to meet situations where it is necessary to install facilities under busy parkways, railroad tracks, or congested street intersections. This equipment makes it possible to install conduits in any size from 2 inches to 36 inches in diameter without disturbing the street surface except for small pits at the ends of the traverse. In connection with the installation of a 30-inch gas main across Manhattan, we are making extensive use of this equipment. We plan to bore under Fifth Avenue as well as under other sections along the route of the main. The alternative, of course, would be to dig up the street along the entire route. Equipment such as this, as well as other new new techniques we have developed and perfected, serves to reduce the inconveniences accompanying our street work.

ATOMIC POWER

At times our advance planning involves us in reducing major scientific advances to practical engineering concepts that are economically feasible. In this regard, the development of a safe, practical, and economic means of generating electricity with nuclear fuels is perhaps the most intriguing challenge that ever confronted the electric utility industry. In simplest terms, nuclear fuels, such as uranium, are sources of heat. The heat can be used to change water into steam, and the steam, in turn, can be used to drive turbogenerators. The electricity generated, of course, would be no different from that which we have today.

Nuclear fuels have a major advantage over fossil fuels because of their high unit energy content. One pound of uranium, for exaple, has the same energy content as 25 rail cars of coal. The potential savings in transportation costs are apparent. Nuclear fuels also contribute importantly to our total supply of energy sources.

But nuclear fuels have their drawbacks, too. They are radioactive and require special handling; they must undergo extensive processing and, in most cases, fabrication before they can be used; the machines in which they are burned—reactors—are unbelieveably complex. Because of radioactivity, extensive shielding and safety precautions must be incorporated into plant design. At present, we know how to use only a small portion of the potential energy in nuclear fuels. All of this—and more—adds up to the fact that while we know how to generate electricity with nuclear fuels, we do not as yet know how to make it as cheaply as will fossil fuels.

We expect, however, that with further development, nuclear fuels will become economic in many parts of the country. Even so, there should be a word of caution here. Nuclear energy does not promise the millenium insofar as the cost of electricity is concerned. The potential savings through use of nuclear energy is in fuel costs. Out of each dollar of Con Edison electric revenue, only 18 cents goes for fuel. Obviously, nuclear fuel will always cost something, and indications are that nuclear plant capital costs will be more than such costs for conventional plants. Percentagewise, the potential savings is small.

Following passage of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, Con Edison was the first utility company in the country to announce plans for the development and construction of a nuclear powerplant. We are presently constructing a 275,000-kilowatt nuclear plant at Indian Point, some 35 miles north of New York on the Hudson River, with completion scheduled for early 1961. The project is being financed entirely by Con Edison. No Gov-

ernment financial assistance has been received or requested.

Pioneering in this field is both complex and expensive. Initially, we planned to build a 236,000-kilowatt plant which was estimated then to cost $55 million. The plant we are building has a capacity of a 275,000-kilowatt plant and is estimated to cost $100 million.

As you can see, this is a major increase in cost. Part of the increase was due to additional capacity, part to major design modifications necessitated by results of early research, part to the need for carrying out additional research, part to increases in construction costs that have occurred over the past 4 years and part due to the fact that our early estimates had to be based on meager technical data.

Indian Point will not produce economic power. We have never expected it would. The capital costs of this plant will be something over $360 per kilowatt. Our newest conventional plant costs on the order of $200 per kilowatt. Our best estimate is that Indian Point will produce power at an overall cost of 14 mills per per kilowatt-hour, assuming full load 75 percent of the time. A new conventional generating unit at the same site would produce power at a cost of about 8¾ mills. Our principal objectives in constructing Indian Point are to gain knowledge and experience that will enable us to build economic nuclear units in the future. This knowledge and experience can be gained in no other way. We are confident also that our efforts will contribute to nuclear technology and benefit the entire industry and the customers it serves.

LOOKING AHEAD

When we look at the future of the market Con Edison serves, we see a dynamic and growing area. New York is building and rebuilding at a rapid rate. The city continues to grow upward—buildings are torn down to be replaced by new ones, in most instances many times taller than their predecessors. Last year 14 major office buildings with a net rentable area of 5.7 million square feet were completed. More than twice that number of buildings with three times the floor space were under construction at the end of the year. Another seven were in the planning stage.

Last November, David Rockefeller addressed this chamber on the extensive plans to develop lower Manhattan. This undertaking alone will provide major impetus to New York's growth. Another important and optimistic note in the city's long-term outlook is the continuing growth of its nonmanufacturing industries. These facts are all positive indications of New York's vitality. They also mean that New York will need a lot more energy in the future.

To provide for the city's growing energy needs, Con Edison is now engaged in the largest expansion program in its history. Indicative of the magnitude of our present growth, it took 106 years from the founding of our first predecessor company until we acquired $1 billion in utility plant. Twenty-eight years elapsed before the second billion was acquired. Our present program calls for the expenditure of $1 billion over the next 5 years.

To carry out this billion-dollar program will require extensive financing. It is estimated the company will need to finance, through the sale of securities, some $625 million in addition to the nearly $60 million obtained earlier this year through the sale of convertible debentures. The balance of the billion dollars will come principally from provisions for depreciation and retained earnings.

It is apparent that our company must maintain a healthy financial position if it is to attract this necessary capital. The importance of the public service commission's taking a realistic approach to our financial requirements cannot be overemphasized. The company must be permitted to earn a continuing adequate return on its investment if it is to attract the capital necessary for the expansion and improvements that make continuing good service possible.

To sum up, Con Edison looks to the future of New York with confidence. We know that New York's daily activities and future growth depend on energy—and energy is our business. We are building the energy facilities now that will enable the city's future growth to take place. Our job is to insure that New York will always have enough energy—and ahead of time.

How Much Federal Aid Then?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 20, 1959

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the voice of Texas at the grassroots is not always heard in this Congress as we debate more Federal aid for this or that program.

The following editorial from the Ochiltree County Herald—Perryton, Tex.—entitled "How Much Federal Aid Then?" has caught my attention and should be of interest to my colleagues. After all the pioneer spirit of this great country, including the independent thinking of Texans is in the heart of every American, though unfortunately lying dormant and unexpressed too much of the time:

HOW MUCH FEDERAL AID THEN?

Spencer Whippo, member of one of Ochiltree County's pioneer families, has spoken to civic clubs in recent weeks, telling of the early days of this county and surrounding area when there were but a handful of families on the plains.

Lack of running water handicapped the settlement of the plains area—and it was a major undertaking to dig for water. Without water, there was no survival.

The late E. L. Whippo dug a well some 177 feet, by hand, before finding water. The Brillhart family established a home after digging a deep well, by hand.

Life was hard in Ochiltree County in those days, in the late 1800's. The residents were in a depressed area. No one guaranteed them high prices for their products. Their only roads and schools were those they built themselves.

For social security they did their own savings, or starved.

All they had was character. All they did was work. All they wanted was self-respect.

The sum of these three traits became America.

How different it is today. Character among a new generation is being formed by a national climate that demands security above all, that demands more money for less work, that pampers criminals instead of punishing them, that gives away national resources that should be used at home, that wants the Government to take care of people instead of people taking care of themselves.

Long years of early American self respect and hard work built America, but the traits you see today can destroy it in half the time. This may sound corny, but it's true.

News Campaign Gets Top Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 20, 1959

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, we all remember the grim and somewhat unnerving period of recession last year. While unemployment mounted and production declined, Harry B. Haines, publisher of the Paterson Evening News, delivered a counterblow.

"Believe in America," he told his readers, for the recesssion was a "psychosomatic slump, more mental than physical." For his campaign, Mr. Haines was awarded last week a George Washington Gold Honor Medal from the Freedoms Foundation.

I am inserting in the RECORD a portion of the story in the Paterson Evening News, Paterson, N.J., May 13, 1959, describing the award ceremony:

NEWS CAMPAIGN GETS TOP AWARD

"A nation is never static. It must always be moving up or down, and when it is going down it takes a strong individual to halt the gathering momentum and send it back on the upward track," W. C. (Tom) Sawyer, vice president of Freedoms Foundation, said yesterday in the crowded city hall council chambers where leaders of business, industry, and government, and private citizens from all walks of life, assembled to witness the presentation of the foundation's top Americana award to Harry B. Haines, publisher of the Paterson Evening News.

Over the past 10 years the foundation's program and philosophy have won public acceptance, he said. He noted that in 1958 more than 40,000 nominations for awards were submitted and given serious consideration by the awards jury for the 800 awards to be presented.

Turning to Mr. Haines, who was to receive his third Freedoms Foundation award, Mr. Sawyer called him a leader of men.

"When the Nation was wallowing in the morass of fear and gloom of an economic recession, his newspaper lighted one little candle. From its gleam other candles across the Nation caught the spark and soon the darkness was dispelled and the clear outlines of a strong, courageous America broke through," he said.

He described the Evening News' "believe in America" campaign as the catalyst that unified the people's hopes and faltering courage into a solid determined force that reversed the plunging economy by the sheer force of their own will.

Representative GORDON CANFIELD, who worked with Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield to have the "believe in America" message carried around the world via a special U.S. postal cancellation, said he, too, had been "excited by the ringing message."

Canfield recalled "the banners, the buttons, the proud confidence of the people" inspired by "believe in America," a clarion call with which Mr. Haines bombarded his readers.

"If this campaign was not constructive citizenship, then I do not know the meaning of the term," he stated.

Dr. Michael Gioia, superintendent of schools, as an able master of ceremonies, said he felt his role a fitting one, since the administration he heads has the responsibility for training and disseminating knowledge to more than 23,000 young people of this city.

Bringing the felicitations of the Greater Paterson Chamber of Commerce, John Anderson, president, said that leadership was the outstanding feature of Mr. Haines' personality.

Forward Paterson saluted Mr. Haines through its president, Jack Stern, who said that "Believe in America" expressed on a larger scale the goal this movement strives to achieve.

He expressed Forward Paterson's gratitude to Mr. Haines for his cooperation and leadership and to Mayor Edward J. O'Byrne who so often went out on a limb to help the city overcome its own downward trend.

Lt. Col. Robert W. Wilson, commanding officer of Combat Command C, New Jersey National Guard, commended Mr. Haines not only for the recognition given his newspaper for the "Believe in America" campaign, but for his support of the National Guard program with all the force of his editorial columns.

Visibly moved by the demonstration in his honor, Mr. Haines expressed deep appreciation for the honor bestowed on him and the Evening News by Freedoms Foundation for the third time. He received an award in 1953 and again in 1957.

"It is not so much the medal but what it signifies," he said. "It is an award that belongs to the people of Paterson, of America, more than to me. It was they who proved they 'believe in America.' "

Our Farm Surplus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 20, 1959

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, there are plenty of people making money from our Nation's extravagant farm programs, but these people have little to do with actual farming.

A recent series of articles in the Detroit Free Press points out the waste and the speculation which is taking place with the hard-earned money of our taxpayers, waste which must be stopped.

Following are the two articles by Mr. Ray Cave:

BIG MONEY IN STORAGE OF WHEAT

(By Ray Cave)

The storage of America's $4 billion grain surplus is so lucrative in some types of storage facilities that a warehouse firm recently offered a Midwest farmer a 5-cent-a-bushel payoff not to sell his wheat on the open market but to let the Government take it over.

The storage operator assumed the Government would allow the wheat to sit in his storage facility for months or years while he collected the full storage rate.

There is no indication of whether or not this nickel-not-to-sell practice is widespread.

If it is widespread, it is costing the U.S. taxpayer millions of dollars to store surplus crops which America's farmers had been willing to sell on the open market.

The Government official who learned of this nickel-not-to-sell offer said another private grain-storage operator had told him of making a similar offer.

"There's no law against it," this storage man had pointed out to the Government agent.

He's right. There isn't.

In another Wheat Belt State a private storage concern was reported to have offered to pay a 5-cent-a-bushel trucking fee to get Government grain moved into its storing facilities.

Once there, the company apparently figured, it would still make a profit when the Government paid its usual storage fee of slightly more than 16 cents a bushel, plus handling costs.

These handling costs amount to about 7 cents additional a bushel if the wheat is delivered by truck, or 2 cents if delivered by rail.

As farm surpluses have grown Government storage expenses have soared. It costs the Government more than six times as much to store the farm surplus now as it did 8 years ago.

In 1952 it cost $73 million. This year it will cost $476 million.

Total storage costs for the 7 years are $2,300 million.

The hope for a quick profit is certainly one factor in the national stampede into the farm-surplus storage business.

Last year alone 600 million bushels of new grain-storage space was constructed, bringing the national total to 3,500 million bushels of space available. This is a national increase of 20 percent in 1 year.

By the end of this year an additional 367 million bushels of space is expected to have been constructed.

Under the uniform grain-storage agreement, the Government pays between 16 and 17 cents a bushel to store wheat and corn, whether the surplus commodity is being kept in a multi-million-dollar grain elevator, a steel quonset hut, a converted cotton warehouse or an old oil tank.

Responding to this flat rate, private storage construction is booming across the Nation. For example:

In Iowa there were 208 million bushels of private storage in 1958, compared to an estimated 275 million bushels in 1959, an increase of 32 percent.

In Kansas there were 1,000 million bushels in 1957, 282 million new bushels constructed in 1958, and an estimated 150 million more bushels being put up in 1959. Thus in 2 years grain-storage facilities in Kansas were expanded more than 40 percent.

The amount of money Uncle Sam is pouring into the pockets of private storage concerns is even beginning to worry long-time members of the storage industry.

Alarmed at the type of storage facilities being constructed to hold Government surplus grain by latecomers to the storage business. Price Feuquay, owner of an Oklahoma grain elevator company and chairman of the National Grain Trade Council, predicts:

"They're going to smell the stink of rotting wheat all the way to Washington if the Government doesn't strengthen its storage requirements.

"The losses will be enormous, and the taxpayer will have to foot the bill because some of those new companies won't have enough money behind them to pay for the rotten grain.

"The rate the Government is willing to pay to store grain in cheap facilities is encouraging the construction of such facilities," says Feuquay.

"Secretary Benson is soon going to find that he can't curtail the price-support program, not because of pressure from farmers, but because of pressure from the greatly expanded storage interests."

The pressure, he says, will come from newcomers who have rushed into an apparently profitable business in recent years.

How profitable can storage Government grain surpluses be?

One giant Oklahoma wheat-storage firm made a net profit of $3 million on the Government grain it handled last year.

The Government makes the storer 100 percent responsible for the condition of the grain.

Not only has the storage industry greatly expanded (there are now 12,000 storage firms with contracts to handle surplus commodities) but the Government has urged the farmer to build his own on-the-farm storage.

The Government will lend the farmer 80 percent of the cost of the building and 75 percent of the cost of equipment needed.

If the farm storage is inspected and approved, the Government will then pay the farmer to store its surplus grain at exactly the same rate it pays the private storage industry. Such grain may be kept on the farm several years.

Asked pointblank about the profits which wheat-storage people might be making in his State, in view of recent expansion there, Lewis F. Wolfe, State administrative officer for the Oklahoma office of the Commodity Stabilization Service, said:

"It must be a paying business or they wouldn't be in it."

FIRM GETS MILLIONS FOR IDLE WHEAT

(By Ray Cave)

ENID, OKLA.—A cooperative storage company in this northwest Oklahoma town made a net profit of $3 million last year by storing Government surplus grain.

The company which operates four huge grain elevators, also made a net profit of $1.8 million on grain stored at private expense, giving it a total net profit for the year of nearly $5 million.

With room for 50.3 million bushels of grain in its elevators, the Union Equity Cooperative Exchange can hold more wheat than would be consumed in 18 years in Baltimore.

At that, this giant co-op is holding only a tiny fraction of the Nation's wheat supply.

There are now 2.3 billion bushels of wheat in this country.

Since the United States uses only a billion bushels a year, for both domestic and export markets, 1.3 billion bushels are being stored with no market in sight.

All but 100 million bushels are owned by the Government, which acquired it under the price-support program.

It is in the storing of these vast surpluses that firms like Union Equity prosper.

Union Equity is the largest wheat storage facility on one location in the country.

Yet it needs only 125 full-time employees. The operation is so mechanized that only 16 men are needed to work elevator Y, with its 16.3-million-bushel capacity.

Its newest pair of elevators, built in the early fifties at a cost of roughly 40 cents a bushel, hold 31.6 million bushels.

Controlled through stock held by 92 small grain elevator co-ops, Union Equity returned a 7.8-cent-a-bushel dividend to stockholders for each bushel of wheat that stockholders had sent to Union Equity.

Dividends are paid to the small co-ops, which then give the profits to their individual farmers.

The Government received no dividend for the $74 million worth of grain it stored with Union Equity.

It is a nonmember user.

If the profits of Union Equity are giant-sized, so was the vision of the late Edward N. Puckett, who expanded the business when Government surplus first began growing in the late forties.

A storage designer as well as a businessman, he wanted to try a revolutionary concept of grain-elevator construction. Shaping the bins like honeycombs instead of circles, he cut construction and operating costs.

He designed an ever-moving belt system to shift grain from bin to bin, thus getting air to the grain to prevent spoilage.

He installed heat indicators to catch the first hint of spoilage.

He ordered automatic unloading equipment which can empty a boxcar in 4 minutes. In 6 more minutes the carload of wheat is weighed and placed in any one of the 624 bins in elevator Z—a 900-foot-long, 180-foot-wide monster.

Union Equity is located on three major rail lines, and its wheat can be shipped to the gulf for export, or to Kansas City for domestic use, at about an equal freight rate.

The freight rate advantage makes Enid a major grain storage center.

Union Equity, largest of the four Enid companies, sometimes buys and sells a million dollars worth of wheat a day.

Visitors are welcome at Union Equity.

In the company's new $500 million office building, the Midwestern informality equals the efficiency.

Gerald Frazier, assistant general manager, estimates about 40 percent of Union Equity's operation this year will involve Government wheat, with a net profit from the storage of Government wheat estimated at $2 million.

Some Government wheat has been held by Union Equitys since 1951. But most has been kept between 2 and 3 years—at the standard 16-cent-a-bushel storage rate.

Contrasting again-t the shimmering white of Union Equity's giant elevators are the green bits of property between railroad tracks, parking lots and smaller company buildings.

The farmer who owns this land has nourished it well, and rarely considers the irony of his position. With 50 million bushels of wheat within his sight, he is busy growing more wheat.

Here's How 85,000 Rural Folks Feel About the REA Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 6, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Wisconsin Electric Co-op, our statewide association of rural electric and telephone cooperatives, recently adopted a series of resolutions on various REA and cooperative proposals to be considered by Congress. As these resolutions express the thinking of the 85,000 rural electric and telephone co-op members in my State, I would like to include the resolutions in the RECORD under leave to extend my remarks:

WISCONSIN ELECTRIC CO-OP RESOLUTIONS

PEACETIME APPLICATION OF NUCLEAR ENERGY

Whereas the most rapid development of nuclear energy in a manner which will assure widespread availability at lowest possible cost is vital to sustaining our national position in a troubled world; and

Whereas nuclear energy promises applications particularly suited to the needs of rural electric systems; and

Wheras a public policy which would prevent the monopolization of nuclear development by any segment of the power industry, but instead would establish competitive incentive to accelerate development is vital to the Nation's welfare; and

Whereas it is our opinion that Federal sponsorship of large-scale units employing a variety of reactor types should stimulate development of nuclear energy for generating electric power: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we go on record in support of the legislation proposed by U.S. Senator GORE which would authorize construction of large-scale units by the Federal Government which, in our opinion, would result in most expeditious development of promising new source of harnessed energy.

FEDERAL CAPITAL BUDGETING

Whereas the present Federal budget makes no distinction between appropriations to finance current operating or noncapital type expenditures from appropriations made for such programs as REA where expenditures are fully repayable with interest; and

Whereas this failure to distinguish between the two types of appropriations creates public confusion regarding the fully liquidating type appropriation and a failure to understand that such programs are carried on without any ultimate expense to the taxpayer and actually are wealth creating and result in great social and economic benefits to the Nation; and

Whereas legislation has been introduced by U.S. Senator WAYNE MORSE amending the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921 to provide for a budget distinguishing between capital investments and noncapital expenditures: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we go on record endorsing such legislation and urging its enactment in the current session of the Congress.

GENERATION AND TRANSMISSION LOANS

Whereas the availability of an adequate supply of wholesale power is one of the fundamental requirements to good rural retail service and most rural cooperative power systems are dependent upon the willingness of a single supplier to make power available to them in adequate supply at reasonable cost; and

Whereas down through the years the right of electric cooperatives to borrow funds under the REA program for generation purposes has not only proven an excellent bargaining tool, but in most instances, particularly in Wisconsin, has been utilized to the great advantage of electric cooperatives; and

Whereas those cooperatives dependent upon their own generation and transmission systems must be assured an adequate source of capital funds to plan the orderly expansion of facilities to keep pace with load demands; and

Whereas the Administrator of REA, David Hamil, has recently publicly stated REA policy to continue this very effective program and to meet all legitimate G. & T. capital requirements of borrowers: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the REA generating and transmission loan program be continued on a basis that will meet all legitimate loan requirements and that Administrator Hamil be commended for his policy on such loans; be it further

Resolved, That we commend the excellent manner in which generation and transmission borrowers in the WEC service area have utilized these programs for the benefit of our rural member-owners and state our conviction that the tremendous growth of load demands to serve the future needs of rural people will require vast expansion of our generating capacity and will require a continuing REA policy of making available sufficent funds to meet these demands to assure the future vitality of the rural electric program.

COOPERATIVE TAXATION

Whereas the Secretary of the Treasury has recently proposed new standards which would impose punitive tax liabilities on cooperatives; and

Whereas our cooperatives are paying their full share of taxes, with the electric cooperatives of Wisconsin contributing more than a half million dollars in taxes to support Government during the past year; and

Whereas under present tax laws, electric cooperative tax payments in Wisconsin are expected to triple by 1970: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we express our unalterable opposition to the imposition of additional taxes against cooperatives or the establishment of tax standards which would impose a hardship on members in protecting their equity in their cooperatives.

THE RURAL TELEPHONE PROGRAM

Whereas since the REA Act was amended in 1949 to initiate a program to finance the expansion of modern telephone service in our rural areas; and

Whereas while the program has achieved commendable progress in assisting in the development of modern telephone service in the more densely occupied rural areas, but has made less creditable progress in more sparsely populated areas where the assistance of this kind of financing program is more seriously required; and

Whereas the administration of the telephone program has been carried on under a policy which does not recognize the importance of aggressive assistance to groups of rural people who might formulate a potentially feasible telephone cooperative—a method of approach which proved so successful in the electric program; and

Whereas the cooperative phase of the telephone program is more seriously lagging each year until in 1958 the proportion of loan funds to new commercial-type borrowers exceeded funds to new cooperative-type borrowers by 14 to 1; and

Whereas the electric cooperatives feel an abiding obligation to each other and to the Federal Government for the full repayment with interest of all loans under this program and are confident that only under a cooperative-type program can we continue our confidence that the telephone loan program will be able to maintain the type of repayment record of electric cooperatives: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we respectfully petition the Congress and the Administrator of REA that it become the expressed policy of REA to promote the cooperative telephone program on a preferential basis and that sufficient staff be assigned to effectively assist potential members of such associations in the organization and development of modern service; and, be it further

Resolved, That the Department of Agriculture consider the assignment of this organizational effort to the farmer cooperative services if it cannot properly be assigned within REA; and be it further

Resolved, That appropriations necessary to finance extension of modern telephone service through cooperative-type borrowers be earmarked separately from appropriations to commercial-type borrowers and that independent records of the progress of cooperative type borrowers be maintained; and be it further

Resolved, That WEC continue its policy of lending all possible assistance to cooperative-type borrowers and potential cooperative-type borrowers.

REA FINANCING PROGRAM

Whereas the President of the United States has publicly stated that he will recommend legislation increasing the rate of interest charged electric and telephone cooperative borrowers under the REA program, and that he will further recommend legislation delimiting the availability of loan funds to meet necessary capital requirements of borrowers to force them into the private money market; and

Whereas all exacting studies of borrowing costs indicate that the REA loan program is being carried on over the duration of loan terms at no cost to the taxpayers; and

Whereas the present interest rate was established in 1944 at what was admittedly a favorable rate for the purpose of encouraging the rural people of America to bring service to areas of low density on an area coverage basis to alleviate the deplorable neglect by the existing industry which claimed these areas could not possibly yield sufficient revenue to meet the basic cost of service; and

Whereas a study conducted last year indicates that any increase in the cost of borrowing funds for Wisconsin borrowers would result in higher retail rates, a slow-down in application of electric power for productive purposes, delay, if not retard, the acquisition of necessary equity for bargain power in a private money market, and make it unfeasible to continue our common effort to bring electric service to every rural home in Wisconsin: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we urge the Congress to oppose any and all proposals which would thusly stifle our present healthy development, cause service to deteriorate, and increase retail power rates on an already seriously depressed rural economy; and, be it further

Resolved, That upon completion of a survey by the National Rural Electric Cooperative association of capital loan funds needed during the 1960 fiscal year by electric and telephone borrowers that WEC notify members of the Wisconsin congressional delegation of the amount of these funds and, in our name, respectfully request that the Wisconsin delegation support adequate appropriations to meet these requirements.

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OPINION

Whereas in July 1958 the Comptroller General of the United States issued a ruling, admittedly at the request of a commercial power company, which, if upheld would cast a cloud upon the intent of the Congress in passing the REA Act of 1936 and open to question the legality under which Congress has legislated and the executive department has administered the program down through the years; and

Whereas Senator AIKEN, of Vermont, has introduced Senate Resolution 21 reaffirming the intent of the Congress with respect to the REA Administrator's loan-making authority; and

Whereas this ruling by the Comptroller General is so completely contrary to both the legislative and administrative history of the REA Act that Members of Congress, including Representative LESTER JOHNSON of the Ninth District of Wisconsin, have introduced legislation authorizing a thorough investigation of this and other actions of the Comptroller General; and

Whereas we the delegates at the 23d annual meeting of WEC would greatly deplore the use of a responsible and high office in the Government of the United States for the purpose of public harassment for irresponsible and veiled objectives: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we condemn in the strongest possible manner this particular ruling of the Comptroller General, and that we commend Senator AIKEN, Representative JOHNSON, and other Members of the Congress who seek to correct the record and investigate an untoward purposes behind this action; and be it further

Resolved, That we go on record urging approval of the Aiken resolution and that the investigation of the Comptroller General be authorized to proceed without delay.

FOSTERING YARDSTICK IN THE POWER INDUSTRY

Whereas the nonprofit segment of the power industry provides the public with its only effective yardstick as to the performance of the dominant profit-motivated segment; and

Whereas during the past century it has frequently been found, as in the REA program, that power distribution conducted solely as a service to consumers has been successful in bringing an adequate supply of harnessed energy to segments of the public after commercial companies have failed to do so; and

Whereas the opportunity of the public to turn to nonprofit service where existing commercial service has not proven adequate provides the public with an alternative which can be used for bargaining purposes to correct poor service; and

Whereas we feel it a matter of sound public policy that the Congress initiate public development of such natural resources as our great river systems under public programs that will assure full development as an alternative to partial and inadequate single purpose development for the primary benefit of a limited few; and

Whereas we feel that development of the Nation's resources should, wherever feasible, be accomplished on a multipurpose basis with power capacity resulting therefrom assessed realistically for its actual portion of the cost and distributed in a manner which will result in greatest public benefit as ascertained by the Congress; and

Whereas power produced as a portion of multipurpose development of publicly owned natural resources should be, as a matter of historic policy, distributed with preference accorded to those power suppliers who will make it available without exacting a profit as a middleman between the public and the product of its own tax-financed development: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the delegates at the 23d annual meeting of Wisconsin Electric Cooperative, go on record urging the Congress to carry on a continuing survey of our natural resources for the purpose of perpetuating them and initiating their development and utilization for the greatest public benefit and that a continuing national investment program be carried on earmarked for the maximum development of such resources; and be it further

Resolved, That the Congress implement all such enabling legislation with provisions which will accord preference to means of distribution which will get the benefits of such development into the hands of the public at lowest possible cost consistent with returning to the Federal Treasury the investment costs over the life of the projects.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

We, the delegates at this 23d annual meeting of Wisconsin Electric Cooperative, hereby resolve that we support H.R. 3460, H.R. 3461, and H.R. 3462, recommended by the TVA Board of Directors to finance future normal growth of TVA power facilities by bonds backed solely by TVA's revenues.

CONSUMER INTEREST REPRESENTATION

Whereas in our highly organized and complex society, the trend is toward increasingly greater organization of individuals into groups with a common aim of achieving greater bargaining power; and

Whereas in most instances the objective of such organization is to achieve a greater share of return in the common marketplace at the expense of the consumer; and

Whereas today the only broad segment of our society which is not organized as such in its own interest on a broad basis is the consumer; and

Whereas attempts at Government regulation in the interest of the consumer through such regulatory agencies as the Federal Power Commission, the Interstate Commerce Commission, and the Federal Communications Commission is weakened by the organized pressures applied by special interest group; and

Whereas the REA program is one of the very unique and highly successful Government-sponsored programs designed to strengthen the hand of consumers; and

Whereas U.S. Senator ESTES KEFAUVER has introduced legislation in the Congress which would create a consumer department of Government aimed at more effective representation of consumer interests in our national economy: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we the delegates at this 23d annual meeting of Wisconsin Electric Cooperative hereby endorse this legislation and urge its enactment.

The California Visit of Senator Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLAN HAGEN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 20, 1959

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, the Honorable JOHN F. KENNEDY, recently visited the State of California. In the course of such visit he graciously met with our distinguished Democratic Governor, Pat Brown, and praised his record of accomplishment as a liberal.

The Senator received excellent press coverage during the visit. I invite to your attention the story of an interview by Reporter C. K. McClatchy of the Sacramento Bee in the issue of May 2, 1959. The story reads as follows:

KENNEDY WILL LEAVE BROWN OPEN FIELD IN CALIFORNIA PRIMARY

(By C. K. McClatchy)

SACRAMENTO.—U.S. Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY declared if he becomes an avowed candidate for the presidency he will not enter the California primary because he expects Gov. Edmund G. Brown will go to the convention as the State's favorite son.

The Massachusetts Democrat, on a half-day whirlwind visit to the capital, said he will decide whether he will seek his party's nomination sometime before the March 8 filing date for the New Hampshire primary.

Governor Brown said it is his present intention to file as a favorite son candidate. He added that once he files he will stay in the primary race even though other candidates enter the competition.

PRAISES RECORD

KENNEDY praised the record of Brown during a joint press conference held in the Governor's office.

"Governor Brown's record here," Kennedy said, "is well known across the country. His fight for better labor standards, a FEPC and a balanced budget has strengthened the party nationally and proved it to be liberal."

KENNEDY also commented that Brown, too, has been strengthened politically by his record on his recent trip to Washington where he favorably impressed Democratic leaders.

The Senator brought laughter to the crowded press conference after he described both Vice President RICHARD NIXON and Gov. Nelson Rockefeller as formidable opponents, but declined to make a comparison.

"You may not believe this," KENNEDY said, "but I have given much more thought to the Democratic nomination than the Republican choice."

ENDORSES PRIMARIES

KENNEDY put in a strong endorsement for presidential primaries and said he disagreed with former President Harry S. Truman's comment they are only "eyewash."

"Presidential primaries," KENNEDY said, "broaden the participation of party members in the selection of candidates. I am opposed to the selection by conventions, such as we have in Massachusetts."

KENNEDY said he regrets Mrs. Clare Boothe Luce will not go to Brazil as the American Ambassador. He said he had supported her in the Senate and praised her work as Ambassador to Italy.

Following the press conference the Senator spoke before the State assembly where he said the Nation stands at the edge of a new era which will require leadership the equal of Lincoln's.

KENNEDY was honored at a luncheon sponsored by Democratic legislative leaders in the Senator Hotel and departed for Los Angeles.

SEES NO LABOR FIGHT

LOS ANGELES.—Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY says he does not expect strong labor opposition if he becomes a candidate for the Democratic presidential nomination in 1960.

He made the statement last night in a question and answer session at the Los Angeles Press Club.

The Massachusetts Democrat was asked if he feels labor would vigorously oppose him because of his labor reform bill.

"I don't think labor is going to exercise a veto over any of the possible candidates mentioned," KENNEDY said. "Nor would such a veto stick. I don't think any work I did is going to hurt me."

KENNEDY stuck to his previous statements that it is too early to say whether he definitely will be a candidate for the presidential nomination.

States Should Be Reimbursed for Building Modern Highways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 20, 1959

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert the text of a statement I submitted to the House Committee on Public Works in connection with its current hearings on legislation to reimburse States for expenditures incurred in the construction of roads which were subsequently incorporated into the Interstate Highway System. Among these measures is also my bill H.R. 6409, which I introduced on April 15, 1959. The text of my statement is as follows:

STATEMENT BY HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO, OF NEW YORK, TO THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS, MAY 19, 1959 ON H.R. 6303 AND H.R. 6409

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I appreciate this opportunity to present my views in support of the bill, H.R. 6303, introduced by the distinguished chairman of this committee, my own bill H.R. 6409 which is similar in content, and related bills. The purpose of all these bills is to equitably reimburse the States for toll and free roads which were incorporated into Interstate and Defense Highways of the Nation.

Several years ago Congress had authorized the construction of an interstate system of roads and highways of 41,000 miles extending into all parts of the country, in order to meet present-day highway needs as well as defense needs. This should have been undertaken several years earlier because of the growing needs. Some of our States had the vision and foresight to realize the immensity of our traffic and highway problems and they could not wait until Congress made up its mind. They were confronted with the problems and the only logical solution was to begin construction of roads.

This they did, and they built them well. The upshot was that in numerous instances these roads were later incorporated into the Interstate System and in these past few years they have been carrying a heavy traffic load. Let us not overlook the fact that those States which were the largest contributors to the Interstate System have the heavies traffic demands and largest use.

Statistics show that a total of 10,954 miles built and financed by States have thus been incorporated into the Interstate System, and the cost of construction of these roads is given as more than $6 billion. The bills under consideration would reimburse the States for this expenditure, but less the States' share of the cost and less Federal payments already made. Thus, the total net reimbursable amount for all States would come to $4,295,600,000, which is roughly about 70 percent of the entire outlay. These reimbursements, however, are not to be made at once, but over a 15-year period, beginning with the fiscal year 1962.

As for my own State of New York, it had been allocated a total of 1,227 miles of roads under the 1956 Federal Aid Highway Act. New York, however, was one of those States that had the foresight to start building modern highways several years before the 1956 measure was enacted. New York took the initiative in the construction of such highways as the New York State Thruway and other roads, but it did so in the expectation that some sort of reimbursement would be made at some future date. In this way, New York was a pioneering State, it had spent about a billion dollars on the thruway alone.

Of the 1,227 miles allocated to New York, 658.2 miles of roads are financed through Federal aid and 568.8 miles were financed by New York State at a cost of $1,036,000,000. If the Federal Government had contributed 90 percent of the cost, as it has done for all interstate highway construction under the 1956 act, New York would have been entitled to receive $932,600,000 from the Government. Actually, New York received only $133,500,000, which means that it has a legitimate claim for the reimbursement of $799 million.

It is for this very reason that I introduced my bill. I feel that New York is justly entitled to this refund. In fact, 3 years ago when we debated the 1956 Federal Aid Highway Act on this floor, I stated that at time New York was already entitled to a reimbursement of $650 million and that it should not be penalized because it had the initiative to go ahead with its road program and could not wait until the Federal Government determined its course of action.

Mr. Chairman, the New York State delegation in Congress has nearly always shown consistency in support of legislation which is not only beneficial to our State, but to the Nation as a whole. We have never acted in a provincial manner despite the fact that the people of New York contribute nearly one-fifth of the tax collections of the Government. I, therefore, urge you to approve this bill and to reimburse each State to the share to which it is entitled.

Benson Unyielding, Says Farm Controls Must Go

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 20, 1959

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, with the agricultural appropriation bill before us for consideration, the following article from the Waco Times-Herald of April 8, 1959, I submit for my colleagues' consideration. I am among those who believes there is throughout this country a strong grassroots support of Mr. Benson's flexible policies as opposed to the higher rigid support programs which has gotten us in the present agricultural difficulty. In fact, I believe people of this Nation if given the chance at this time to a referendum would throw out the entire agricultural subsidy program, going far beyond Mr. Benson's moderate approach in solving this troublesome problem:

GAINING SUPPORTERS—BENSON UNYIELDING, SAYS FARM CONTROLS MUST GO

(By Clark Bolt)

You may want to cuss him; you may think he's the biggest enemy the farmer has; you may not ever agree with him. But this fact still remains: Ezra Taft Benson has done more to change the thinking and direction of farm programs than any other man in the Nation during the past 6 years.

And he's gaining more supporters to his side daily.

As Secretary of Agriculture, Benson has the hottest position in Washington—hotter even than the position of the Secretary of State, the office of any President's Cabinet which usually catches all of the opposition's barbs, quips, and verbal diarrhea. During the past 6 years, Benson has been the main target of any and all opposition. He's probably the most controversial Secretary of Agriculture the Nation has ever had.

And though his opponents are many, and though they continue to deride his program, Benson has not backed down one iota from his original stand 6 years ago. That simply is that Government control of agriculture must go if agriculture is to come out of its problems.

Benson made that statement shortly after he took office as Secretary of Agriculture. He repeated it to us at press conferences back in 1953, at the Future Farmers of America convention in Kansas City; he said it again at the national soil conservation district supervisors convention in New Orleans in 1954; he repeated it in 1956 at the national watershed congress in Lincoln, Nebr.; he reemphasized it in San Angelo in 1957, while on a drought inspection tour of west Texas; and he said it again even more forcefully Tuesday in Dallas at the annual meeting of the Texas Cotton Ginners Association.

He has changed his position on some statements during the past six years to be sure. But basically, he has not and does not intend to change his thinking on how agriculture's ills can be cured.

Practically every type of program, remedy, plan, and gimmick has been tried to cure agriculture's ills during the past 40 years through some type of Government action. All have failed. Rigid suport prices have gone by the wayside; flexible support prices

have not kept the farm surpluses from piling up. Soil bank, AAA, two-price plans, compensatory payments, are all a part of recent programs and of now proposed plans to somehow cure agriculture. Here is what Benson says can cure the farm dilemma:

"In the interest of the whole Nation, we need less Government in farming. Quit trying to fix prices unrealistically from which flow the twin evils of production for Government warehouses and Government control of farmers. Emphasize markets, increased efficiency, and competitive selling. Eliminate Government stranglehold on agriculture."

For spreading that philosophy in the past Benson has been laughed at, scorned at, rejected by members of his own party; farmers have thrown eggs at him, he has been declared a political liability and one politician claims Benson is doing all this because he wants to become President of the United States.

Yet Benson continues in his own way to attack those who believe the Government should continue to aid the farmer. If you want to argue with Benson, you'd better have your facts well in hand. He has his facts that way, and unless you can quote him facts, he can tear your arguments into ribbons.

Suport for Benson's programs may be stronger than many folks would even realize. Support is apparently coming from all walks of agriculture—from the small-size farmer to the businessman engaged in doing business with farmers.

Results of a recent nationwide poll by a nationally circulated farm magazine at least point that way. In tht poll, 80 percent of the farmers asked for less Government control. In the South (where many think the trend is for more Government control) the magazine's results show 81 percent in favor of less Government control.

"I don't know what to believe," one innocent bystander at the ginners' association meeting said Tuesday. "I do know this. Something's got to give pretty soon in the farm business. Benson is either 100 percent right—or he's 100 percent wrong. Either way, you've got to admire him for standing up for his beliefs."

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer, plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Appendix

Address by Hon Steve McNichols, Governor of Colorado, Before Western States Democratic Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 21, 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, during the constructive Western States Democratic Conference held in Denver last weekend an impressive presentation of western problems was made by Gov. Steve McNichols of Colorado—along with a plea for the kind of attention the growing West needs in the Halls of Congress.

I so enjoyed reading Governor McNichols' fine address that I want to share it with my colleagues by asking unanimous consent for it to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY GOV. STEVE MCNICHOLS, OF COLORADO, BEFORE WESTERN STATES DEMOCRATIC CONFERENCE, DENVER, MAY 15–17, 1959

Distinguished Senators and Congressmen, honorable Governors, Chairman Butler, Vice Chairman Loucheim, national committeemen and women, State Democratic chairmen, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, we are engaged in a novel and far-reaching enterprise this weekend. We are taking part in a new development that can help bring new growth and maturity to America's two-party system.

Regionalwide meetings have been held before by political parties. But only in the last several years has the purpose of such meetings been to analyze public problems, to study proposals, and to close the conference with recommendations for platform planks on vital topics.

This weekend will witness no oratorical exercises, no snake-dance contests, no stampede of delegates. We are here to win the confidence of all the voters by clearly demonstrating that we are willing to probe, anxious to understand, and ready to work out and accept new solutions to old and new problems. We are here to find answers to today's problems, and to put those answers to work tomorrow.

I, for one, welcome this strengthening of principle and platform in our party system. To maintain decent competition between the two major parties, I hope that the Republicans copy our new way of finding answers. The "me too" party probably will do it automatically—a habit it first began cultivating following the election of Franklin Delano Roosevelt in 1932.

We should applaud a Californian for pioneering this new type of political conference in the West. We should be thankful that we have a national chairman who recognizes the important role of such conferences as this and does all in his power to make them a success. You know I am referring to the two Pauls—Paul Ziffren and Paul Butler.

The subject matter of this conference has wisely been limited to three major topics—natural resources, small business, and transportation. Each of these is of vital importance to the West, and of equal importance to the rest of the Nation. Each is vitally related to the other.

The three topics are highly suitable for another reason. Each has been the victim of serious mishandling, mismanagement, or just plain neglect by the present administration. The administration's approach to each of these topics has clearly demonstrated that Republican leaders are timid when they should be bold, thoughtless when they should be full of ideas, and asleep at the switch when they should be fully cognizant of a new era approaching.

I believe that this is one of those rare times in American history when the general public is far in advance of the present leadership in its understanding of key problems facing the American people. More important, the public is far in advance of the present administration in its willingness to move forward aggressively to solve problems both at home and abroad.

I believe the American people feel that they are trapped in an administrative vacuum that is choking America's internal development and shrinking our stature before the rest of the world. This is a serious charge. Let us briefly document the case as it relates to the three topics of this conference.

There is a growing awareness of resource use across the land. This awareness is greatest here in the West, because more of the resources are in the West. Fifty years ago enlightened conservationists were concerned with the overuse of our resources. Now, many are concerned with nonuse and nondevelopment of our resources.

Our administration seems to be too busy with international problems to devote much time or energy to domestic problems. Proof that an administration can do both quite handily—if it only has the imagination and the courage to invite progress—is very close at hand. We have only to look at the years that Democrats occupied the White House to see the difference. Here is a party whose work and decisions on international policy are now chapter headings in the history books—such historic phrases as United Nations Charter, Marshall plan, Truman doctrine, NATO, point 4, Korea, and Berlin airlift.

Yet, the Democratic Party moved forward on the homefront at the same time it was projecting the image of a strong, forthright, squareshooting America across the world. Reclamation and resource development moved forward under the Democrats. America gained postwar recovery under the Democratic Party. It looked forward with Party. * * *

President Truman's Materials Policy Commission also known as the Paley Commission. This Commission published the five-volume landmark report titled "Resources for Freedom"—a title that still can and should guide America's resource policy. The Paley Commission foresaw the time when America might join the other have-not nations because of its unwise resource use policies, its skyrocketing population, its huge consumption of raw materials.

Another important resource landmark under the Democratic Party was the President's Water Policy Commission, headed by Morris Cooke, which produced the known and respected work titled "A Water Policy for the American People."

The meaning of these studies to the West was obvious then. It is even more obvious now, since the present administration has let valuable years roll by while our resource and water policies have simply drifted along on the current of time. The ancient Shakespearian phrase, "Time is not measured by the clock, but by the intensity of experience," was never more appropriate.

I know I do not have to sell this audience on reclamation. We all know that it has triggered the development of the West we know today. It has made the desert bloom and lighted our farms and our cities. It drives the wheels of our industries, and creates jobs and wealth that help support all of us. It is the best investment in the present and the future that any government has ever made in addition to providing huge tax sources to broaden the tax base and lessen individual tax burdens.

In contrast to this progress under Democratic leadership and sponsorship, the Republicans advocate the backward policy of no new starts.

What the present administration overlooks is that reclamation is an investment in the Nation's future. And, every day that goes by with reclamation at a standstill means revenue lost, opportunity shunned, the future postponed.

It seems that this administration is content to add up the costs of past achievements, ignore the benefits they have brought to the whole Nation, and then warn everyone that such programs cost money. They are looking backward at ledgers when they should be looking forward at blueprints.

These great projects should be carried on our books as self-liquidating assets, as the underpinning of national defense, and as guarantees against future depression.

The virtual elimination of funds for reclamation investigation has relegated new projects to the dead files and thick layers of dust gather year by year on the drafting boards of the Reclamation Bureau.

When he was dedicating Hungry Horse Dam in Montana, Harry Truman told the audience to take a good look at this latest reclamation achievement in concrete and steel. "Because," he said, "if General Eisenhower is elected, it will be the last one you'll see in a long, long time." History again proved Harry Truman to be right.

I am not alone in opposing the administration's "no-new-starts" reclamation policy. Don't make the mistake of thinking only one western Governor is complaining. Just last month, in a meeting at Council Bluffs, Iowa, the Governors of the 10 Missouri River Basin States went on record with a strong resolution condemning the administration's no-new-starts policy. Here are some words from that resolution:

"The no-new-starts policy impairs the economic strength of the entire country by preventing the development of natural resources as an investment in the future welfare and security of the United States as a whole. Full development of the resources of this country is required in the struggle between the free world and the Communist-

dominated areas of the world * * * and delay in construction of planned projects weakens the economic base of this region and that of the entire Nation."

The general public must be reminded frequently that reclamation is far, far different from most Government-supported programs. Since reclamation was started in 1902, the Government has spent a total of $7.8 billion on reclamation in the 17 reclamation States. In today's Federal budgets, this does not sound like very much even for a single year—and this expense is spread over a 57-year period.

But the clincher is that $7.3 billion of this $7.8 billion is paid back to the Federal Treasury. Putting it differently, only $500 million of this total is not paid back to the Federal Government. Just one of the many benefits from reclamation justifies this $500 million expenditure, in my opinion, and that is flood control. This is certainly a Federal problem, since rivers do not respect State lines, and $500 million is a small investment to avoid the catastrophies in human life and property damage caused all of us by uncontrolled water on the rampage.

It should be obvious why we call reclamation an investment in the future. We need only to point to the thousands of industries—private enterprise industries—that power from reclamation projects has made possible.

We should also remember the vast scope of reclamation. The spur to the fantastic industrial and population growth of southern California came from Hoover Dam, hundreds of miles away in Nevada. It can truly be said that in the far western United States the desert can make the seacoast bloom. We strongly support the principle of full basin development of all river basins in the Nation.

I have spent much time here speaking on reclamation for a purpose. It deeply affects the 13 Western States represented here, plus 6 others. In all, reclamation is vital to 60 percent of the land area of the old continental United States—to which we can now happily add the great new States of Alaska and Hawaii.

This neglect of reclamation is a blow to the development of the whole Nation. For those of you who like to look at problems such as this from the standpoint of numbers and political action, let me remind you that the reclamation and Missouri Basin States represent 135 electoral votes. And to this we can now add six or seven more electoral votes for Alaska and Hawaii.

In brief, the long end of the country is getting the short end of the stick from these shortsighted policies.

Almost any phase of America's resources policies of the past 6 years shows the same signs of indifference and determination. On minerals, we are still stumbling along on a quasi-emergency program. More of our mines are closing every week. Our mine labor force is dispersed now into other lines of work. Reconverting to mineral production, in case of national emergency, would be cumbersome and costly.

Our mineral import-export policy is confusing at a time in history when our trade policies should be clearly drawn for the rest of the world.

We need a national fuels policy to go with a sound minerals policy. We need to utilize our abundant coal supplies, to supplement other fuels that have a shorter lifespan and fewer proved reserves. At a time when oil production is spread out thoroughout the world, and our Nation depends heavily on imported oil, our domestic oil industry is languishing because our import program is in serious imbalance. Commercial production from our vast oil shale reserves in Colorado, Utah, and Wyoming should be encouraged and developed as one of our Nation's greatest resources.

Our national mineral policy is similar to our national farm policy in that it is the same patchwork collection of inadequate measures designed in a hurry to meet an emergency. We need long-range programs our Nation can run on, not short-term plans that cause us to hobble, stumble and limp.

During the years 1947 to 1952, Colorado had an average of 153 lead, silver, and zinc mines in operation. Between 1953 and 1958, this number declined to an average of 98. Today, we have only four major mining operations in the whole State of Colorado. And this general situation is true in virtually every State with a mining economy.

We face a national dilemma here. The original cure for domestic mining problems was the high protective tariff. Today this policy places us in an untenable position in international affairs. We can't tell the world to follow our lead in developing resources, and then shut them out completely on marketing those resources.

Another proposed cure is to reduce wage levels in our domestic mining industry so we can compete pricewise with foreign minerals. This is not only misguided, but is totally beyond the pale of American traditions and concepts.

A third approach is to abandon the domestic minerals market to foreign producers, and closing down our own mines. The effect of this on our local, regional and national economy would be disastrous. It would also be foolhardy from the standpoint of national security.

There is a fourth approach which, I believe, is not only practical but realistic. It lies between the protectionist theory and the free trade philosophy. I refer to a quota production program for the domestic mining industry.

Production could proceed under such a system, with a balance struck between both foreign and domestic consumption, and such special measures as stockpiling for defense. This would require great cooperation between the minerals industry and our Federal Government. But it is not a new or radical idea.

The sugar industry has been operating successfully on a quota production basis for many years. And sugar has the same basic problems of export and import.

I believe the West is willing to move ahead on reasonable programs which will put our boom-bust mining industry on a solid foundation. And, America's position in international affairs could be immeasurably enhanced in the process.

The West has certain problems that are peculiar to it because conditions in the West are so vastly different from other parts of the country. Because of our topography, all of our surface heavy freight transportation consists of trucks that must run on long, expensive highways or freight cars that must run on long, expensive railbeds. We lack the lowest common denominator in freight handling—low-cost waterway transportation.

In other parts of the country, water transportation provides an efficient and cheap means of freight movement. It also is a compelling factor in providing lower rates on other modes of transportation. As a result, the other areas enjoy a freight rate advantage that the West cannot match.

For these reasons it is essential to the future of the West that the Federal Government recognize our freight rate problems as unique and give special study and attention to them.

For instance, the West should be given the benefit of our natural advantage of long hauls on a basis of per-ton-mile cost, especially on intraregional transportation. We need to integrate our transportation systems for economy and better service, thus stimulating commerce within our own region and strengthening our transportation ties with other regions.

In short, transportation should be viewed by the Federal Government as vital to all parts of our society and commerce. Transportation rates should not be set according to artificial and archaic rules laid down to benefit or relieve only one segment of industry in any single part of the Nation.

We of the West need and want a fair deal on freight rates, which also is consistent with and in contemplation of the critical problems facing the railroads and truckers themselves. Until we get such a fair deal, we have an automatic ceiling on our industrial and commercial development that holds back economic expansion of the entire United States.

In 1956 Congress passed the Highway Act which affected 41,000 miles of Federal Interstate Highways. This act created the Highway Trust Fund to finance new highway construction, and Congress raised certain highway user taxes and inaugurated new ones to support this trust fund. For instance, the Federal tax on motor fuel was raised from 2 to 3 cents per gallon.

Before this act, Federal money for roads came from the general fund. The Highway Trust Fund marked a distinct change—an improvement—in supporting highways. Congress knew that the highway trust would not be large enough to support construction planned for the years between 1960 and 1968. Congress anticipated that the extra funds needed for construction during this period would have to come from the general fund—all to be paid back later from the revenues from bigger Federal highway use taxes that will flow into the Highway Trust Fund.

In other words, everyone knew that the ambitious and much-needed highway construction campaign authorized in 1956 could not be paid for on a current basis. The peak construction years would demand more funds than those amounts coming into the Highway Fund during those peak years. For this reason the new and increased highway user taxes were to be in effect through 1972—3 years beyond the construction timetable.

Highway Trust Fund receipts during fiscal 1960 are expected to be about $2.3 billion. Construction expenses for the same period will run to $3.1 billion.

Now we are at the crossroads. Under the present, geared-up road construction program the Highway Trust Fund will be exhausted by June of 1960. Either additional money must come from the general fund or we must cut back the construction program to match the meager amounts collected in the trust fund at that date.

The bottleneck in this mammoth construction job is failure of the administration to follow the plans mapped out by the Congress. The administration does not want to provide the needed money from the general fund. Instead, the administration wants to hike highway user taxes even further—despite the fact that Congress did this in 1956 to finance the new construction.

For instance, the present administration is now asking Congress to tack another 1½ cents per gallon increase on Federal motor fuel taxes, which, incidentally, is a poor measure of highway use. To give you an idea of how much more this would cost taxpayers, this increase would mean that Coloradoans would pay an additional $9.5 million per year. For Texas, the increase amounts to $137 million. The crowning injustice is that the Federal Government is now diverting—every year—more than $1.5 billion of revenue from Federal highway user taxes into nonhighway purpose.

We need some imaginative, creative thinking in the planning of these vital programs and a willingness to accept new and dynamic

action concepts in executing them. Ramifications of this stop-and-go approach to highway construction range from greater highway fatalities to a slowing down of commerce and industry at a time when we need to give business, industry, and employment full throttle ahead.

It is no political accident that 35 Governors have agreed to oppose the new highway user taxes that the administration wants to add to the motorists' bill. Failure of the administration to plan and act has badly upset plans at the State level and will be disastrous to private industry and employment in critical areas.

This same lack of planning has placed small business in trouble. Lacking time to go into detail about its problems, let me say only that small business has been the victim of the same indifference and inattention and a monument of bankruptcies stand as evidence of this national tragedy.

Let us remember why we are here. We are here to speak for the West in clear, loud tones. We must remember that this is a dramatic "new West" we are talking about. We are the growing, expanding part of a great Nation. We now can happily boast that resource-rich Alaska and beautiful, productive Hawaii are our sister States in an unwritten economic and political pact.

The West is no longer a poor country cousin. We have markets, as well as resources—we have spirit, as well as know-how—and we have votes, as well as political savvy.

The man who is elected President of the United States in 1960 will be guiding the destinies of 25 million more citizens at the end of his term than were on the census rolls at the beginning. The political party that will be chosen by the citizens of this Nation must have this vision and foresight to assure our citizens ample food and clothing, services, schools, jobs, homes, plus automobiles and the other luxuries that have become necessities of American life.

The Democratic Party must be ready and willing to establish programs and policies designed to develop our resources, encourage mineral development, and expand our sources of raw materials for the benefit of all the people. We must have the optimism that comes from self-confidence, and the courage that comes from faith in America. In short, we must know the needs of the Nation and the ability of the West to fully participate in and meet those needs. We are gathered here this weekend to draw the political blueprints of the West's future, and to forge programs and policies that will insure full participation in a dynamic and peaceful America. We will do our part in fulfilling the destiny of the Democratic Party by bending every human effort to make this Western States' Democratic Conference productive and fruitful.

Thank you.

Tributes to George E. Stringfellow, Imperial Potentate of the Shrine of North America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 21, 1959

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, on last March 9 a former colleague of ours here in the Senate, Albert W. Hawkes, of New Jersey, gave a reception and dinner in honor of the Imperial Potentate of the Shrine of North America, Sir George E. Stringfellow, at the Sheraton-Carlton Hotel here in Washington.

Senator Hawkes tried to have all the Masons and Shriners in both branches of Congress present, but the pressure of business permitted only 58 Members of the House and approximately 23 Members of the Senate to be present with many of the outstanding officers of the Masonic fraternity and the Shrine throughout the United States. In Senator Hawkes' invitation he recounted that he had become a Mason at 71 years of age and a Shriner at 72, and while in the Senate he was impressed by the fact that George Washington was a devout Mason and gave much credit to his teachings in Masonry for the maintenance of principle on the battlefield and in public office. It was recounted that a majority of all those who signed the Declaration of Independence were Masons, and a majority of those who signed the Constitution of the United States were Masons, and his theory was that inasmuch as our Masonic forefathers had so much to do with the creation of our American form of liberty and opportunity, perhaps we, as the benefactors of their work, might do our share in helping to preserve our Americn constitutional government and way of life.

Briefly, I wish to call attention to the fact that the Shriners Crippled Children's Hospitals draw no lines based on color, race or creed in their splendid work to help those with physical infirmities get the most possible out of life.

Senator Hawkes tells me he has in mind bringing together all of the Masonic and Shrine Members of the Congress and many of those in the executive and judicial branches of our Government once a year in the hope that this group of well intentioned citizens can be of greater benefit in their public services to the Nation and every group of citizens composing it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the transcript of the minutes of the dinner in honor of the Imperial Potentate of the Shrine of North America, Sir George E. Stringfellow, of East Orange, N.J., may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, although it is estimated by the Public Printer to be over two pages and will cost $283.25 to insert.

There being no objection, the proceedings were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RECEPTION AND DINNER GIVEN MARCH 9, 1959, IN HONOR OF THE IMPERIAL POTENTATE OF THE SHRINE OF NORTH AMERICA, SIR GEORGE E. STRINGFELLOW, AT THE SHERATON-CARLTON HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Hon. ALBERT W. HAWKES. Will you all please stand for the invocation by my very dear friend, Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, the Chaplain of the U.S. Senate? I want to say about Dr. Harris that our friendship has been one of the choice things in my life. I consider him one of the most unselfish ambassadors of Christ on earth and one of God's chosen servants. He is also a Mason and has been a working Knight Templar for years. Dr. Harris, will you please offer the invocation?

Dr. FREDERICK BROWN HARRIS. Let us lift our hearts in prayer. Our Father, God, who hath made and preserved us a Nation, our fathers trusted in Thee and were not confounded. In Thee we trust. Thou hast made us to love truth and beauty and goodness. May Thy truth make us free, free from pride and prejudice and from all the ugliness of disposition that does so easily beset us.

Lift us, we pray Thee, above the mud and scum of mere things with the holiness of Thy beauty so that even the common task and the trivial may be trimmed with crimson and gold. Lead us in Thy paths of righteousness for Thy name's sake.

Enrich us, we pray Thee, with those durable satisfactions of life so the multiplying years may not find us bankrupt in those things that matter most, the golden currency of faith and hope and love.

In these desperate and dangerous days, when the precious things we hold nearest in our hearts are threatened by sinister forces without pity or without conscience, help us to give the best that is in us against the wrongs that need resistance and for the right that needs assistance and to the future in the distance and the good that we may do.

We ask it in that Name that is above every name. Amen.

Hon. ALBERT W. HAWKES. Now, gentlemen, will you please remain standing for just a moment while we have the national anthem?

(The assembly joined in singing the national anthem.)

Hon. ALBERT W. HAWKES. Be seated, gentlemen.

(The assembly was seated and dinner was served.)

(Selections by the quartet of Crescent Temple.)

Hon. ALBERT W. HAWKES. Gentlemen, I was supposed to say a few words of welcome, but I thought that everybody acted so much at home that it wasn't necessary. [Applause.] I do want to say this: that I am particularly happy that you very busy men, who have great burdens on your shoulders (and I know something about them) have seen fit to come out tonight to honor our distinguished imperial potentate, Sir George E. Stringfellow, of the Shrine of North America. [Applause.]

Now I know you don't want to hear very much from me, but I must say this: that I hope the fact that we can come here as free men tonight shows, regardless of what party we belong to, or what our ideas regarding some of the chosen representatives of the American Government may be, still we are free agents to come and go as we choose and show to each other brotherly love and consideration. I hope the fact that you can do that will never be out of our minds when you are voting and working to keep good in the saddle as against evil that is trying to control the world. I want you to know that I think we are living in the greatest county that God ever helped man to develop, and I trust that no man in our Congress will ever fail to have the courage to vote to preserve the American system of free men. Thank you very much. [Applause.]

(Selections by the quartet of Crescent Temple.) [Applause.]

Hon. B. CARROLL REECE. We have great men in public life and private life. In public life we have none greater than Albert W. Hawkes, who served so faithfully and devotedly in the U.S. Senate for what made America great; and in private life we have none who has served his country more faithfully and devotedly than our imperial potentate, Sir George E. Stringfellow, and to the Masons and Shriners and their purposes of good will to all mankind.

(The assembly participated in the toast.)

Hon. ALBERT W. HAWKES. Thank you very much, my friend Carroll, for your fine toast.

Senator MUNDT, would you like to make a few remarks now? If you would, I invite you to the microphone. KARL, what you say is worth hearing, and I would like to have you come up here. [Applause.] I wish to offer a toast.

Hon. KARL E. MUNDT. Our genial and beloved host Al, and imperial sir, this is indeed a surprise to me, but I have never yet known a Senator who would decline the opportunity to say a few words. Usually we like to get the food before we talk, because then we are sure of being fed, but it is a pleasure to address such a distinguished group at any time.

I would like to say for those assembled, if I may speak for you all, that this is in many ways one of the most delightful occasions that I have been able to attend for a long time. It is good to be here with Al Hawkes and his good neighbor, who have no axes to grind and who would like to have the same America we all believe in. I think it is nice to come out to a banquet and not be pressured in this direction or that direction, but just be with good fellows who are enjoying good fellowship and who, being members of the shrine, as we are, have this opportunity to pay a tribute to the imperial potentate whom we have all watched through the many years that one has to go through the chairs before he reaches that distinguished position.

I have met George Stringfellow many times as I have traveled around the States trading a cool speech for a cold steak. I met him in Shreveport and all through the South. To me he typifies what the shrine stands for, that wonderful spirit of comradeship, that genuine affection for his fellow man. He carries out that concept for which Shriners stand with great credit to our craft.

So, Al, I want to thank you as one member of this company for your thoughtfulness in inviting us to meet and pay our respects to a man who is doing a great job as the head of a great organization.

I have known George Stringfellow and his wife for a long time, and it has been my privilege to visit with him in his home.

I know he is respected in his hometown, as he is throughout shrinedom, as a man with the courage of his convictions and a man whose convictions can always be found on the right side as far as the concept of preservation of America is concerned.

Thank you for the privilege of saying what I have felt for a long time. I never expect to be surrounded by two better Americans than Al Hawkes and George Stringfellow. [Applause.]

(Selections by the quartet of Crescent Temple). [Applause]

Hon. ALBERT W. HAWKES. I am going to ask my very good friend, Senator BOURKE HICKENLOOPER, of Iowa, if he would like to make a few comments—you can say the limit about our good friend, the Imperial Potentate. [Applause.]

Hon. BOURKE HICKENLOOPER. Noble Al, Imperial Sir, Al came around just a moment ago and asked if I would like to say a few words. I said, "Not necessarily." He said, "Would you?" And I said, "Yes."

This gathering tonight is a meeting of people who are dedicated not only fraternally but politically, regardless of partisan politics, to the preservation of the American system of government, and I think it is remarkable. A great patriot once said, "My country, may she always be right but right or wrong, my country." I think those of us who are gathered here under the banner of the Mystic Shrine may say, "My politics, may they always be right, but right or wrong, may they lead to the preservation of my country." This is the thing we hold most dear.

Tonight I am delighted to be here, and not only be with my dear and Noble friend, Al Hawkes, who is one of the most dedicated Americans I have ever known, but to be with Imperial Sir George E. Stringfellow whose acquaintance and friendship I have enjoyed for a good many years. To all of you, I say that the renewal of this fraternal association, which most of us renew so infrequently, is a stimulus and a pleasure. Al, all I can say is that I, for one, thank you for this opportunity to meet with George Stringfellow, with you, and with the others who have made the Mystic Shrine one of the greatest humanitarian organizations that the country knows. Thank you. [Applause.]

Hon. ALBERT W. HAWKES. BOURKE, we all appreciate very much your kind and thoughtful remarks.

Now my very dear friend, a Democrat—I have some very good friends who are Democrats—Senator JOHN SPARKMAN is going to say a few words from the South, which is in my opinion, one of the finest American sections of the United States that we have left. Thank God we have the South. [Cheers and applause.] I am talking right from the heart now. I think we ought to thank God that we have the Americanism that is in the South of this country. I don't say the South is always right, but I do think the South has as many and as deep convictions of the fine things of the American system of freemen and our constitutional form of government, as we can expect to find anywhere in our country.

Senator SPARKMAN, come up here, will you? [Applause.]

Hon. JOHN J. SPARKMAN. Thank you, Al Hawkes. I am delighted to have this opportunity, but I want to explain one thing before I start. There is one reservation I have about making this speech. He said, "Just a few words." We southerners don't accept a speech on that basis.

I think it is a great occasion to be here tonight. I was delighted when I had a letter from Al Hawkes some time ago telling of his plan to set up this get together honoring our imperial potentate, whom we are glad to have with us tonight. By the way, Al, he is a great southerner from the State of Virginia. Of course, I have no idea of drawing the line tonight. I am just carrying out what you suggested by your remarks. There is no line with Shriners.

I had the pleasure of serving in the Senate with Al Hawkes. He sat on the other side of the aisle, but I never knew a person of greater integrity or finer friendship than this man from New Jersey. By the way, I can tell you a little practical incident that happened after he got out of the Senate. One day I had a telephone call from him while I was down in Huntsville, and he asked me about a little business in my part of the State. The business was in trouble, and somehow it had gotten to him; I don't know how. Well, he pulled it out of the ditch and it is doing all right today.

It is great to be here tonight. By the way, we from Alabama are particularly pleased to have here with us the imperial chief rabban, George Mattison, and the imperial captain of the guard, Orville Rush, so I think we are doing pretty well in this lineup.

I am glad to be here to pay tribute to George Stringfellow and the tremendous job that he has been doing as imperial potentate. We are delighted to be with you. We are glad to have this chance to be with one another without any mention of legislation. You know, the only word I heard about legislation I got when I rounded the table down there, and it was from EVERETT DIRKSEN whispering to me. He didn't want me to take advantage of this microphone on some of the things we have been talking about on the Senate floor. But it is great to be here, and I appreciate the privilege of being with you.

By the way, a toast was drunk to our imperial potentate. That reminded me of an incident when I was in London one time with a small group. We were having a little luncheon in London County. We had this master of ceremonies, a great stately fellow. He had a great time announcing us every time, but he was scared to death that these Americans were going to smoke before the King had been toasted. Well, he managed to keep them from smoking, but just as quick as the King was toasted he made this announcement: "Ladies and gentlemen, the King being drunk, you can smoke." So George Stringfellow "has been drunk."

I would like to propose a toast, if I may, Mr. Chairman. I would like to ask you to lift your glasses and drink with me to the hundreds of thousands of crippled children who are receiving benefits by reason of the existence of our organization and the great leadership of Imperial George Stringfellow.

Thank you, sir. [Applause.]

(The assembly joined in the toast.)

Hon. ALBERT W. HAWKES. John, both the imperial potentate and I think you very much, and we are very happy you are here tonight, very happy. [Applause.]

(Selections by the quartet from Crescent Temple.) [Applause.]

Hon. ALBERT W. HAWKES. I want to thank the quartet from Crescent Temple of Trenton for the rendition of these fine songs, and tell them how much I think they have added to our pleasures.

Gentlemen, I want to introduce one of our most distinguished Members of the Congress of the United States, a man who is chairman of one of the most important committees in the House of Representatives, the Appropriations Committee, CLARENCE CANNON, from the wonderful State of Missouri, which attracted me enough so I went down there and found a bride almost 58 years ago. She and I will have been together 58 years on the 15th of the coming May, if we are both alive at that time.

There is a strange thing about Missourians. They never forget each other. If you once know them, you will always like them.

So, CLARENCE CANNON, I am going to ask you if you would like to say something about our fine imperial potentate, and the wonderful shrine which has contributed so much to the welfare of those who are afflicted. Mr. CANNON. [Applause.]

VOICES. Our chairman. [Laughter.]

Hon. CLARENCE CANNON. Mr. Toastmaster, and if I may paraphrase Senator MUNDT'S salutation, my lightheaded and lighthearted friends:

It is always a pleasure to salute the nobility. And it is a special privilege tonight on this happy occasion as the guest of Noble Hawkes and in honor of the imperial potentate of the mystic shrine. He is not only the imperial potentate of the mystic shrine, but he is one of the profound philosophers and one of the greatest philanthropists of our times.

Among the many notable and extraordinary things about our host is that he became a Mason when he was 71 years old. I think he is the only man I have ever known in my life who has that distinction. I trust every member here tonight will be present when we award him his 50-year pin.

You know, Al, Mr. Toastmaster, the shrine is the playground of masonry, but even the shrine has its serious side and its inalienable responsibilities. Just now we are at a critical period in national affairs, a critical time in world affairs, requiring the thoughtful attention of noble and brother.

For there is one thing about freemasonry, freemasonry never dodges an issue. You always know where freemasonry stands. In time of greatest stress its lights burn brightest. There can be no doubt as to where freemasonry stands on world issues at this crit-

ical time—a time at which we may expect every man to stand up and be counted.

Every dictator who has sought to establish a despotism has initiated his campaign by destroying all local units of Freemasonry. Hitler drove Freemasonry from Germany and Mussolini exterminated every Freemason he could lay hands upon. Hitler and Mussolini have passed on—and with them the tyrannical dynasties which they created. But Freemasonry still stands a power and an influence for democracy and freedom.

Washington enlisted the benovelent and majestic influence of Freemasonry and established the greatest Nation and most enduring civilization of all time.

You will be interested to know that at the Capitol today we uncovered the cornerstone of the Capitol laid by Brother George Washington with Masonic ceremonies. You may be certain, Brother Toastmaster, that we depend on you and our imperial potentate as sentinels and guardians on the watchtowers of Freemasonry, who like the keepers of Israel neither slumber nor sleep.

Whether through the vicissitudes of the day or across the burning sands of the desert, we know we may follow you safely and securely. [Applause.]

Hon. ALBERT W. HAWKES. We appreciate your very fine remarks, and I am very happy that you have emphasized what would happen to Freemasonry and the Shrine if dictators and slavedrivers are ever allowed to take over the control of world affairs. Our deep thanks to you for giving up this evening to be with us. CLARENCE CANNON.

We have at this table a man whom I have known for many years, and with whom I served in the U.S. Senate for 6 years. I think he exemplifies America at its best. I am one of those who believes an American who is conservative enough to try and save his country as an example to the rest of the world of what freedom under God can do, is a liberal. We call a lot of people liberals but I think of true Americans as liberals in the interest of the freedom of man.

STYLES BRIDGES is the senior Republican Senator in the U.S. Senate at the present time. He is a very dear friend of mine, and I am one of the fellows who is only 80 years old, but is going to work as hard as I can to keep him where he is as long as he is willing to serve and sacrifice, as he is doing. [Applause.]

I would like my dear friend, STYLES BRIDGES, to say a few words about our imperial potentate. [Applause.]

Hon. STYLES BRIDGES. Mr. Toastmaster, it is a pleasure for me to be here this evening to say a few words on this occasion, not only in tribute to our imperial potentate, but also to our host of the evening.

Our host, Al Hawkes, is one of the men who was wise enough to retire from public life to spend some time enjoying himself, after devoting years of service to his country in the U.S. Senate. He has continued, however, to work for his country which he loves so much. Most Senators, as you know, stay in the Senate until they are either defeated or have to be carried out. He is one of the rare exceptions to the rule. Al is a great patriot. He is one of the great patriots of our time.

Now, as to our imperial potentate, Sir George Stringfellow, he is a man who has been successful in business. In recent years, he has devoted more and more of his time to civic and fraternal affairs, and he has made gerat contributions to Masonry.

You and I know the most important thing to every American today is the survival of this Nation. Freemasonry had a great deal to do with the building of this Nation in the early days. George Stringfellow is the type of leader in Masonry and in the Shrine who is attempting to continue the same patriotic spirit established by our early brothers and built upon a sturdy foundation.

I think it is fitting for the Members of Congress of the United States, of both political parties, of both Houses of Congress, to come here this evening to pay tribute to this great Masonic leader, the Imperial Potentate of the Shrine, and to one of the most beloved patriots of America, our host, Al Hawkes. [Applause.]

Hon. ALBERT W. HAWKES. STYLES, I thank you very much. You know, it isn't too often that a fellow, who can't help standing for what he believes in, gets any plaudits or accolades from anybody, so I deeply appreciate those kind remarks and I am sure the Imperial Potentate, George Stringfellow, appreciates them also.

We have with us tonight Justice Tom C. Clark, of the Supreme Court of the United States, whom I considered one of my good friends when I was serving here in the U.S. Senate, for he was trying to keep corporations functioning in line with legal requirements and fair American practice. We are highly honored that he would give up an evening in a busy life to pay his respects to the Imperial Potentate, and as an old friend of mine, I am going to call upon him to make a few remarks relative to Shrinedom and our Imperial Potentate. Hon. Mr. Justice Tom C. Clark. [Applause.]

Mr. Justice TOM C. CLARK. Senator Hawkes, my good friend and brother Shriner, George Stringfellow, and fellow Masons. Unaccustomed to public speaking as I am after a decade on the Court, I cannot forego this opportunity afforded by our genial host to say a few words concerning our guest of honor. In so doing, I break a long precedent started when I went on the Bench; namely, to be a good listener. The Lord gave us two ears and but one tongue so we might listen twice while talking once. Perhaps the world would be happier if each of us had the same capacity for silence as we have for speech. Thomas Vaux put it clearly when he said, "He speaks best that hath the skill when for to hold his peace."

In fact, our honored guest, our Imperial Potentate, was reared in that school. Taught by the great inventor, Thomas A. Edison, with whom he was associated at Menlo Park, he has practiced the true virtues. Edison, Brother Stringfellow tells me, was a man of few words devoting some 18 to 20 hours of each day to the development of discoveries that brought much to his fellow man. He instilled in our honored guest this indefatigability for work and so today he devotes long and ardous hours to the betterment of our democratic system. In this he is but the chosen instrument of the thousands of us brothers who have crossed the sands and entered the mystic order. It is said that we are but the playground of Masonry, but if that be so, our answer is that it is there that most of life's lessons are learned. The rules of the playground soon become the laws of men, and if we have learned our lesson well in the first, it follows—as the night the day—that we will obey those of the latter. Our distinguished guest well knows this for today he tours the country as a crusader for our democratic form of government as contrasted with that of the totalitarian Soviet. His message has been one of devotion to our principles, or understanding of the realities of life today and the use of a firm hand and determined mind in protecting ourselves from such destructive forces.

Personally, I have learned much from Masonry. In its deep reverence for those spiritual values that weave the tapestry of our life together it places the strong cord of respect for constituted authority so necessary in the attainment of that ordered liberty to which we aspire. In the inner sanctum of my being it has placed a seed, that of understanding—understanding for human souls—and in so doing, it has taught me how we may obtain for each of them that freedom and justice the attainment of which brought our country into being. It is in this effort that I am happiest and in it that I am most serviceable.

And so to the success of your crusade, Imperial Potentate, Sir George Stringfellow, we drink; to your continued good health each of us bring our prayers; and to that ordered liberty which you support we lend our arms in firm salute. So mote it always be. [Applause.]

Hon. ALBERT W. HAWKES. Thank you for your fine remarks, Mr. Justice Clark. I don't know very much about Washington any more, but I heard from a lady, who knew you were going to be here tonight, that you were doing a great and effective work in connection with the Patrick Henry Clubs. I congratulate you on this work.

Now, I am going to call on Senator EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN to say a few words. He is from Illinois, the State of my birth, you know. EVERETT, come up here where we can see and hear you. [Applause.]

Hon. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN. My old friend, Al Hawkes, fellow Democrats—and I should make special reference to my old friends, CLARENCE CANNON and JOHN SPARKMAN—I am delighted to be here as your guest. I just asked Eddie Rickenbacker how long you might want to be here, before I rose to my feet, and he siad, "Not too long, why?" I replied, "Because I thought I might make a speech on housing or some other appropriate subject."

Al—and I like to call you Al, it is truly a delight to be here as your guest. I was a sort of freshman tenderfoot when I came to the Senate and you were still here. As a pupil I used to sit at the feet of the master—meaning you—and imbibe wisdom and understanding in the hope that I would follow a proper and durable path.

I used to sit at the feet of my old friend, STYLES BRIDGES also, who is here tonight. He is our senior Republican in the Senate and a great citizen. I probably have been in the Congress a little longer but STYLES is our ranking Republican. He is such a two-fisted American that he deserves a big hand. [Applause.]

I could wax quite philosophical tonight and especially so when Dr. Harris, the Senate Chaplain, is here. What an inspiration it is to hear his invocational prayers when the Senate session opens each day. On occasions some people become cynical about the opening prayer, as indicated by the old story of a father and his young son in the Gallery. The son inquired of the father who the man was standing up before the Senate and his father said, "That is the Chaplain," and then added, "He takes a look at the Senate and then prays for the country."

Such are the moods of cynicism that sometimes engulf us, and over and oyer we must search for apropriate and durable answers. I find much of the answer in what I have received from Masonic teachings. In a way, I am not too good a Mason in the sense that I have not attended Blue Lodge for a long time. Manifestly, long sessions in Washington make it difficult to attend lodge back home. I try to make up for it by going to the Grand Masters' meetings which are held here and to neighboring Blue Lodges in the hope that I can expiate and wash out the sins of neglect.

When I reflect on what I have gotten out of the Masonic Order it goes back to one fundamental principle, and that is that the hope of the universe and the hope of society reposes in the individual, in his integrity, his dignity, his peace of mind and the power that he can wield in the area where he lives and serves.

A great many years ago a visiting chaplain came to open a session of the House of Representatives. His prayer impressed me. I made inquiries about him. They said his name was Joshua Liebman, a Jewish rabbi from Boston. He was then only 43. I visited

with him. About 10 days later while in Chicago my eye caught the title of a book in a bookshop by Joshua Liebman. The title was "Peace of Mind." In the very first pages of the first chapter Rabbi Liebman spoke of an old, distinguished rabbi who had been sought out by a younger man who was so ill at ease and uneasy about the world. He had certain objectives in life. The good rabbi told him to make out a list, which he did. Together they examined the list and after a time the old rabbi struck out every item, such as fame, security, acquisition, glory, and at the bottom he wrote one great, golden and glorious objective, and that was peace of mind.

How does one achieve peace of mind? I believe one gets it best through service to his fellow men. That goes right back to the individual. What else is there when all is said and done? The individual in his community from the days of his youth, the radiance and influence which he can shed, his exemplification of the teachings of our craft, becomes a massive radiating force that goes out into the community even as common coronary attacks quickly race into the arms and legs of one who suffers this distress.

Every day we read of someone, especially people close to us, who have had a heart attack. Just what does happen? It is rather simple. Something touches that life-giving pump and pains begin to radiate into the members of the body. There is pain and agony, and it is this little difference, this little affliction to the pump, to the auricles and ventricles that spells the difference between life and death.

The individual in his relation to the social system and for that matter to the whole country and the whole world is like that. One person radiating and exemplifying in the community-where he lives the things he absorbed in the lodge room and the amplification of the teachings which he gathers as he goes along life's course does become the last and best and noblest hope of mankind.

Think of the things that men have tried to reduce to paper in the form of treaties and agreements and sanctions and codes of conduct and ethical standards in the hope that leaders in their thoughts and actions everywhere would respond to this kind of discipline.

The arch leader of the Soviet Union, Nikita Khrushchev, is a case in point. Only late this afternoon the press called me for comment on the fact that Khrushchev has changed his mind again. His latest fulmination seems to be that he was willing to guarantee the security of Berlin either through the troops of neutral nations or the troops of major nations acting in concert. It was the seventh or eighth time that he has changed his mind in recent weeks.

Somehow in our search for peace in the world we constantly go back to a personality in whose actions and words there reposes not only much of peace for mankind, but whether there will be a thaw in the cold war.

This in itself should be a great lesson for us who are identified with a craft that goes back to Hiram Abiff. Each of us in one dimension or another, and in one degree or another, can by exerting the power of influence and personality, condition the communities where he livies and radiate a degree of integrity and confidence which must manifest itself upon his fellow beings.

At the convention in Chicago in 1952 a thought came into my mind. It was from Solomon. He was supplicating the Lord and the greatest thing he asked was this. He said, "Give them Thy servants an understanding heart." The understanding heart is but a part of individual equipment. In proportion as we understand and reflect that understanding, we become tremendously influential in the reconstruction of society and the reconstruction of the world.

In our search for words to put on pieces of parchment in the hope that the desirable objectives so uttered may not be ephemeral and a vain thing, we must never forget that salvation in every facet of human experience goest back to the simple fundamentals of our craft because all of the emphasis is on the individual and his constant efforts at perfection.

Illustrious Imperial Potentate, that is what I got in the simplest unit of our craft; namely, the Blue Lodge. I came to Washington 25 years ago with several suitcases full of clothes and a suitcase full of ideals. The clothes have long disappeared and changed and been replaced. I feel pretty sure that the ideals are still intact, and among the ideals is this abiding and constant conviction that the salvation of the universe leads to the door of the individual. How else shall we regenerate society, except to start with a nucleus, and that nucleus is the individual? There is in him a spiritual nuclear power of undreamed influence and effect.

At the grand masters' breakfast meeting one morning recently, I mentioned that 19 centuries ago there was a great light in the sky as a star directed humbled people. It was early in the morning, when there was a touch of darkness. That light directed the sheperds to the manger where that great event, the birth of Christ, took place. Ever since then He has, through His teachings, His disciples, and His followers, shed light and hope and dissipated the darkness in every corner of the earth.

It took 19 centuries for another light to illuminate the sky in the semidark of early morning in July of 1945. It was in that dreary desert area of New Mexico and the light that illuminated the countryside that morning ushered in the nuclear age and the age of fission. Through it there quickly developed an instrument of destruction that destroyed an estimated 80,000 people in Hiroshima and Nagasaki, and brought to an end one of the most terrible conflicts ever visited upon mankind.

In this concatenation of events there should be another light. Nineteen centuries ago came the light to generate hope. Then came the nuclear light to bring end to conflict. What we need now is another light in the field of spiritual fission to carry on and through the individual and the fission of that power which lights in the individual spirit to bring reconstruction and good will. It is impossible to believe that the mind which created such a destructive force in 1945 cannot also generate a spiritual force in accord with all Masonic doctrine, which will bring new hope and peace and understanding and brotherhood.

I pray for the day when these things which constitute the living force in the human heart and the human mind can be directed to resolving the problems which beset us today. It will eclipse everything ever achieved at Alamogordo and ever since by the expenditure of billions to perfect and make even more powerful this nuclear force, and that spiritual fission is the very essence of our craft and of the things that I learned in the Blue Lodge long ago.

So, Illustrious Potentate, no matter what the degrees to which we address ourselves, all of us must go back to the foundation truths which we learned in the simplest foundation unit of the fraternity. That is where we get our philosophy. That is where we secure the real drama of truth and that is where these truths are so deeply imbedded in our consciousness to make us proof against all frustrations and disappointments. It will come as it must come in proportion as these basic truths are applied.

You, Illustrious Potentate, have a great responsibility, and I know you will discharge it well. As a humble member of our craft, I shall try to help in my modest way. I thank you. [Applause.]

Hon. ALBERT W. HAWKES. Thank you very much, Senator DIRKSEN, for those wonderful remarks which will long remain in our minds as coming from one of the most loved and respected men in our Congress.

Now we have with us tonight one of the great Americans, I think, of my generation; I am a little beyond him in years, but I always think of him as being a great American World War I veteran. He has since been a captain of industry. He has served well in whatever he has done and in accord with American tradition. I refer to Captain Eddie Rickenbacker. [Applause.]

Eddie, if you would like to come here and say just a few words, we would be happy to have you. [Applause.]

Capt. EDDIE RICKENBACKER. I think you are wonderful, Al. I think you are wonderful too. [Patted Imperial Potentate Stringfellow on the shoulder.] I never had the privilege of being associated with so many Communists at one time in all my life. [Laughter.] All I have heard tonight is communism being preached. I am amazed that my good friend—what is his name? He is from Illinois—would think such thoughts. All right, EVERETT.

I am grateful for the privilege, seriously, of being present. I have known George and I have known Al for a great many years. I hope the good Lord will permit me to know them for many more. I am sure that all of us in these trying times, when the fate of our Nation is in balance—regardless of how you may think, it is, and it can go in either direction in the not too distant future—we realize it will depend upon men like you, men that you individually have expressed yourselves about here this evening and your convictions and your courage to follow them, whether we go the right way or whether we go the wrong way.

All of you in my opinion, regardless of your party, are Americans. You are Patrick Henrys, give me liberty or give me death, and that is Americanism. It is the American way of life and I hope when the candle of my life dwindles to the flickering stage that I will be blessed, George, as you are being blessed tonight, with the presence of a group of friends that have no equal. Thank you. [Applause.]

Hon. ALBERT W. HAWKES. Thank you, Eddie, for your very fine remarks. We all love and respect you.

I was expected to say a few serious things about Masonry and our beloved country.

The essence of Masonry and the Shrine and their purpose and objective is to help good prevail over evil in our actions to exemplify and prove the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. That is all the people of the United States have been trying to do in spending their material resources and sacrificing the finest blood of the Nation the greater part of this century. How wonderful it is that we have men in public office who may have tremendous differences of opinion in connection with the domestic issues, who belong to different political parties, and yet are big enough to realize that the international situation and cold war confronting us requires our complete and undivided attention, and so they are willing to put all these domestic differences in second place and be a harmonious united people in resisting all outside forces that would destroy us and our Government of freemen.

When the men at Valley Forge were deserting, and George Washington was about as blue as he ever was in his life, Tom Paine went to him and said, "General, may I talk to these men about their desertions?" George Washington said, "Yes, Colonel. If you can say anything to them to stop their desertions, it will be wonderful." Colonel Paine went to them. We could go into great

detail. He went to these men who had deserted, and some of whom had come back, and to the ones contemplating desertion because they had empty bellies, ragged clothes, were not being paid, and were in misery. He said this one thing, and I say it to you. He said, "If you desert this great cause and we lose our fight for freedom, I want to ask you, where are you going from there?" Most of the men came back and won our liberty.

And I say to every American that if there ever was a time it is now when a psychiatrist is needed for the well intentioned American people who can't recognize the difference between our great God-given liberty and the misery and suffering of living under a tyrant and a thing like communism. I just can't understand any people not realizing that we have to give our lives, our fortunes and our sacred honor; and everything to preserve our system of human freedom for mankind. Remember, gentlemen, you can't be sorry afterward. It will do no good. You have to take the right action now on time.

I take my hat off to the distinguished majority leader, LYNDON JOHNSON, in the U.S. Senate, and the distinguished Speaker of the House of Representatives, SAM RAYBURN, who both immediately and without delay, publicly announced that we are a united nation on the Berlin crisis and that they support the stand of our Republican President and his advisers in this crisis. [Applause.] Gentlemen, we must stand together. There is no hope for us if we don't stand together. I know we have differences that are tremendous, but we can solve them if we keep our liberties. If we can't solve them, then our way of life, that I have always loved, is not as strong as I thought it was. But with intelligence, time and cooperation we will find a solution, because time is the balm in Gilead that heals all wounds.

We must find leaders not only with intelligence, but with courage and leaders who realize that we all get our true source of power from God Almighty, as Abraham Lincoln did. That reminds me of a little story about him. When he was about to sign the Emancipation Proclamation, a group of powerful clergymen called on him and told him he was making a serious mistake. The reason they were sure was that they were men of the cloth and on their knees asking guidance from God. Lincoln replied, "I have no doubt about your sincerity in asking me not to sign the Emancipation Proclamation but, gentlemen, I am likewise on my knees several times each day asking God for guidance. If there is a God, and I certainly believe there is one, then He knows I am President of the United States and you are not, and if He has any guidance to give, He will give it to me and not to you. Thank you, gentlemen. [Applause.]

Few people have ever expressed more succinctly and clearly the danger surrounding a government or state of free people in this world than did Lord Byron when he said, "A thousand years scarce serve to form a state; and hour may lay it in the dust." I think it is one of the choice statements of all time. How true this is and how certainly history records nation after nation where people toiled for centuries to create a state, and then a single mistake laid it in the dust. Let us not make that mistake. There is no use in our discussing for the moment what mistakes we have made by overplaying the hand of charity, consideration, and generosity, because right now the big things before us is to win the cold war without spending the Nation into bankruptcy. I repeat that. To win the cold war without spending the Nation into bankruptcy. We can do it if we will to do it, and if we are willing to pay the price to preserve liberty and opportunity—the most precious things in life. I say we can do it if we will to do it; by that I mean if we have faith in ourselves.

Here I give you John Freeman Clark's classic definition of faith, and I think it is one of the choice definitions of all time.

"All the strength and force of man comes from his faith in things unseen. He who believes is strong. He who doubts is weak. Strong convictions precede great actions. The man strongly possessed of an idea is the master of all who are uncertain or waivering. Clear, deep, living convictions rule the world."

Masonry means to me the resolution to observe, so far as possible, the Commandments of God in our dealings with our fellow man. It means the recognition of the brotherhood of man. It means the reaching out of a helping hand when one is down and needs our help and one is in a position to give that help. It does not mean the carrying of one's burdens who is able to carry his own, but in the case of the Masons it means help to those in distress, and in the case of the Shriners it means to supply aid to the crippled children in the hope that it will bring to them some of the enjoyments of life. It means the invoking of the Golden Rule which is the foundation of all equity. Take any rule of equity and you will find it in the Golden Rule.

After watching for 65 years of my 80 years of life, and noting the trends of people's efforts, I believe unless we can put back into first place in our lives as a free people the building of character and maintenance of moral standards, and take the mad race for money, place, and power out of first place, and put it in second place where it belongs regardless of its importance, then, in my opinion, we are doomed to follow the course of other great nations which have become leaders of the world only to lose their power and disappear on the horizon of history. The time of life is brief at best. The objective should be to help good predominate over and destroy evil, thus adding to the improvement of the quality of man and civilization.

I salute you chosen representatives of the people and our public officials and the imperial potentate and the members of our Masonic order and Shrine, and I hope, in the words of George Washington, the Father of our country, that inasmuch as you are on guard in a critical situation facing our beloved country you will, none of you, be found wanting in the wisdom, fidelity, and courage which may be necessary to do your duty at this difficult time. One of the finest things Robert E. Lee ever said is in nine words, "Duty is the sublimest word in the English language." Let that sublimest word be emblazoned in the hearts and minds and souls of all Americans. Let us remember when bad men join hands to destroy the inalienable rights of men under God those of good intent and purpose must unite and pledge their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor in support of good and the destruction of evil. Unless we do that, the lamp of liberty and opportunity will be temporarily extinguished. Let us all answer that evil shall not prevail. [Applause.]

After all—I would leave this admonition with this group and every American group—our national character can be no greater than the composite of the individual character of our citizens. This leads to the conclusion that our biggest job is to get hold of ourselves and see that we each are doing our duty; that we each are making our contribution in such a way as not only to save all the fundamentals in the American system and way of life, but to improve those things which need improvement, at a rate of speed which will not destroy the house while we are making the repairs.

This is the need of the Nation; this is your need; this is the need of your family; and this, if carried into effect, will write a page on history which you will be proud to have posterity read.

In closing, let us ask God to give us the patience to accept those things which we cannot change; the courage to change, when we can, those things requiring change; and the wisdom to know the difference.

Now, gentlemen, I have the honor and privilege to introduce to you the potentate of Crescent Temple at Trenton, N.J. I was amazed to find that a man who has accomplished as much as he has is still under 40 years of age. He is a man worthy of the best there is in Masonry and the Shrine. He served his country in the war. He came out with honors and the oak-leaf cluster and a Bronze Star. He is at the head of many organizations, and the thing I like best about him is that his biography shows as fine advancement of a young man as I have ever seen, and yet he sent it to me and said: "Dear Senator: These are some of the things in my biography. Use them all or none. Either way will be perfectly agreeable to me." That is why he has done a job, gentlemen, because he hasn't wasted his time looking for praise.

I want to tell you that this young man has been elevated to the honor of 33d-degree Mason. Without more adieu, Lee, I am proud to introduce you. [Applause.]

Noble LEE WILEY. Thank you, Senator Hawkes and imperial sir,

It seems almost like carrying coals to Newcastle for me to speak after so many fine and distinguished speakers, but I do want to say a few words about a very good friend of ours. It is a great honor for me, as potentate of Crescent Temple, the 10th-largest temple in Shrinedom, to greet you and to extend to you the best wishes of our temple. With over 11,400 members, including such dignitaries as our good friend Senator Hawkes here, Norman Vincent Peale, and our imperial chaplain, Dan Poling, we feel that we enjoy a very enviable position.

But lately we have had one more jewel added to our crown. A member of Crescent Temple is our imperial potentate. We are proud that we can number among our nobility a person such as George Edward Stringfellow. That he is imperial potentate is only part of the story. You know many aspire and reach high positions, but most of the time they are done with cruelty and selfishness and they add little but tarnish to the world in which they live. Fortunately, there are men, like George Stringfellow, who are lifted up by the willing hands of their friends to high positions who remove the tarnish and add new luster.

There are many things about our genial Virginia gentleman that cause men to look up to him and respect him. I heard someone talking about our Virginia man here but actually we consider him a New Jerseyite and we have adopted him as such and I hope he has adopted us.

I think the things you think of when you refer to George can be best summed up in two little words, "He cares." He cares about others. In the Shrine we all know his extraordinary interest in our Shrine hospitals but beyond that his care for disabled veterans in the New Jersey Home for Disabled Veterans is also well known. He has cared that Protestants, Catholics, and Jews should know, understand, and respect one another. He has cared that there be better understanding between labor and management. He has cared for the health of others with his great work in the American Cancer Society. And he cares that this great country of ours should maintain its wonderful way of life. In any and every field of endeavor he has and is showing that he cares. Moreover and most important, he backs his care and concern with positive action.

It so happens that I am a president of the Rotary Club of Trenton and unfortunately I have found one flaw in George's character. He is a Kiwanian. And shame of shames, he has even been president of the New York Kiwanis Club for two terms. One credit I

can give to Kiwanis, when they finally found a good man, they knew it.

But seriously, may I quote to you something written by Louis Austin in "This I Believe":

"Our Maker gave us two hands, one to hold to Him, the other to our fellow man. If our hands are full of—or struggling for—possessions, we can hold to neither God nor humanity. If, however, we hold fast to Him who gave us life, who is our ever present Partner, His loving Spirit will flow through us and out to our neighbor. That is the way of joy, love, achievment, and inner peace."

This then is the way of George Stringfellow, with one hand in God's hand and the other for his fellow man, he walks his quiet way, serving others unselfishly in countless ways because he cares. Thank you. [Applause.]

Hon. ALBERT W. HAWKES. Thank you, Potentate Lee Wiley, for those stimulating remarks.

Gentlemen, it looks as though we are going to get under the wire in the time I agreed upon. I want to introduce our distinguished guest in a few moments, but I do want to thank the quartet from Crescent Temple for the fine songs and music they have given us.

May I say to you that we are not going to have any benediction because the beloved Chaplain of the House, Dr. Bernard Braskamp, is in the hospital tonight, and so is our distinguished and beloved chaplain of the Shrine, Dr. Daniel A. Poling, in the hospital for a very major operation. We wish them both speedy and complete recovery. We are going to ask our quartet, which rendered such beautiful service tonight, to close the meeting after the Imperial Potentate speaks, with the song "I Believe," which is a benediction in itself.

Now we come to my very dear friend, George Stringfellow, who is a regular human being. He has virtues and faults like all of us, but his virtues strongly predominate. He has done a wonderful service in the world. I have watched George for a great many years. I could take your time by introducing him with the words in the biography I sent to all of you, but a man who has really done things for his fellow men to a great extent doesn't need much eulogy, even from a friend.

You know, George, when I think of you I think that you were born in a wonderful State, Virginia. My great friend, HARRY BYRD, has represented that State for many years, and he and I have had a relationship for many years that very few men have had in this world.

You gained your educational experience, as I did, in the school of hard knocks. You graduated from what my friends call "Knocks College." You have rendered great service to the free enterprise system. You have rendered great service to your fellow men, not only through the Shrine, but through every department in business and as a member of the Cancer Society, Tax Payers Association, on the board of trustees and directors of several colleges and churches, and other institutions of note.

I was thinking of you this afternoon, George, and the story they told me out in California about Sam Goldwyn. You went up to see Thomas Edison. Most everybody thought you wouldn't make much impression, but you did because you were honest and had the courage to criticize things, and he liked you because you had that honesty and courage and ability. Out in California this young fellow wanted to see Mr. Goldwyn, and tried to get to his office but never could. Finally he got a very influential man to make an appointment. This man took him down to the office and Sam said, "I will give the young man 10 minutes and that is all." Well, the young man went in and the older man stayed outside waiting for the boy. He waited more than an hour. Finally the door opened and the young man and Sam came out. Sam patted him on the back and said, "I hope to see you again." So the old gentleman and the young boy started down the walk. Sam had two or three vice presidents sitting on the porch. He said, "You see that young man going down there?" They said to him, "Yes, Mr. Goldwyn." He said, "That young man is a genius; and smart, too." [Laughter.] And that is what Edison said. You are a genius; and smart, too.

George, we love you for what you understand about humanity. We love you because you have that faculty that Henry Drummond spoke about in his wonderful sermon called The Greatest Thing in the World, Love. He said, "In my opinion, on the Resurrection Day, when all souls appear before their Maker for judgment, the great question will not be so much have you violated the Commandments, but what have you done to help your fellow man? When it has been your privilege to reach out a helping hand to someone who has fallen and needs help to stand on their own feet again, have you given that hand and given that help?" Sir George, this group knows you have.

Now with those few remarks, Mr. Imperial Potentate, and my very dear friend of many years, who bled and almost died with me when I ran for the Senate, I present you to this audience. [Standing applause.]

Imperial Potentate Sir GEORGE E. STRINGFELLOW. Senator Hawkes, Mr. Justice Clark, Senators, Congressmen, and other distinguished guests, I bring to you the greetings and the good wishes of the board of trustees of the Shriners Hospitals for Crippled Children, and I bring to you the good wishes and the greetings of the 830,000 Shriners of North America, which I have the privilege to represent.

I thank you sincerely for your most complimentary introduction and I certainly thank you for the warmth of your reception. You have made me feel at home in this Nation's Capital where I had the privilege of spending my childhood. I am deeply grateful to my good friend, the Honorable Albert W. Hawkes, who has served the people of this Republic in many ways, always effectively and always with integrity. It is through his generosity and it is through his desire to promote our way of life that he has assembled here tonight a great group of citizens who have, to a large extent, in the palm of their hand our way of life. I have yet to address a group of citizens who have a greater influence and, therefore, a greater responsibility than those of you who are assembled here tonight. For there is in your hands peace with honor, and there is in your hands the right to declare war to preserve our honor.

Our forefathers gave us our way of life, but it wasn't without cost that they labored and many of them gave their blood and their lives that we might live in liberty. The question that should be in the mind of every American is this: Are we worthy of our heritage? And if we are worthy of our heritage, we will all stand up and be counted. I know of no man who has ever taken the obligations of Masonry and who has implemented those obligations in his daily life who is not worthy of our heritage.

I should like to point out that I have felt for a long time that the 4 million Freemasons in the United States have a greater responsibility to keep America American than any other group of citizens, for the reason that our way of life to a large extent was born in the atmosphere of Masonic lodges. It is a historic fact that a majority of those who signed the Declaration of Independence, and a majority of those who signed the Constitution of the United States were Masons—more than any other group. Therefore, if we are worthy of our heritage, if we live up to our obligations, we will stand courageously for what is right and be counted. The time has arrived in America when we must stand for principle, or we will fall for everything.

Now, the Shrine is a great organization, for it incorporates into its membership only those men who have been thrice tested and approved by their fellowmen. First, they must pass the rigid requirements of honor, integrity and brotherhood of the Blue Lodge of Freemasonry. Then they must pass the additional tests to enter into the realm of either the Scottish or York rites of Freemasonry. And of course, finally, they must be accepted once again by those who already have passed the tests of the Shrine. And I say to you that nowhere in the world does the spirit of brotherly love, honor, integrity, charity, and freedom of man beat stronger than in this organization which it is my privilege to head this year.

Since I was elected to this office last July, I have traveled up and down and across this Nation, visiting the temples of this order. I have talked with the officers of the temples. I have talked with the nobility. I have talked with many of the Grand Masters and the heads of other Masonic orders. And wherever I have gone, there has come to me the plea that I speak forth in the name of the Shrine for a more militant Masonry, a militancy that in some manner must restore—or help to restore—those freedoms for which Masons sacrificed so dearly.

I cannot and do not, however, speak for Masonry or the Shrine in their attitude toward political philosophy. But I can speak to you as a Mason and as a Shriner on what I have learned to be their moral philosophy as it may be applied to the world we live in.

Freemasonry is the oldest secret fraternity in the world, and it is predicated on the fatherhood of God, the brotherhood of man and the dignity of the individual. Freemasonry is therefore outlawed whenever dictators seize control. The lamp of liberty burns low today throughout the world. Two out of every five of the citizens of the world are directly or indirectly under the heel of communism. And if communism in any form or by any other name should come to this Nation, you may be assured that the first group to know its venom will be the Free-masons, for the dearest tenet of Masonic thought is freedom. And by freedom, I mean the right to do what we want to do so long as what we do does no harm to the brotherhood of man. And we can lose that freedom, not only to an invading horde from the Kremlin, but also to Americans who may have succumbed to the mysterious drug of power, and through that power maintain control over their fellowmen.

Our brother Masons who helped to found this Nation foresaw such a calamity and they sought to protect the future liberty of the people against the machinations of such power-mad people. Our Constitution, as originally written and with the addition of the Bill of Rights, was, as Gladstone said, the greatest instrument ever conceived by the minds of men. And why? Because, my brethren, such men as Washington, Franklin, Revere, Hancock, Madison, Henry, the Lees, and hundreds of others, had learned at the altars of Masonry the holy tenet of freedom.

Washington once said that "the Masonic lessons I learned on my admission to Masonry and my contact in conversation with prominent Masons thereafter were of great encouragement in after years when I encountered and was under severe trials, especially those of the commencement and during the Revolution." He continued by saying that "There is no doubt in my mind that Masonry and its lessons were helpful throughout the Revolution both on the battlefield and in the legislative halls."

In further reference to Masonry, Washington, who became master of his lodge said: "Friendly counsel reached my ears that some of the men regarded me as an aristocrat. I decided to dispel such thoughts from my comrades' minds and on one occasion, I sat in a Masonic lodge in Cambridge in which an orderly sergeant was the master. I made it a point to meet upon the level"—and that means much to every Mason—"and part upon the square with all my comrades regardless of rank and regardless of position. My reward was the loyalty and friendship of all far beyond my expectations."

We citizens today, in my opinion, can do no better than to emulate our Founding Fathers, who did so much to bring us freedom. Freedom is our greatest asset, but freedom must be earned anew by each succeeding generation, if in fact it is to be retained. Freedom is not something that can be taken for granted. Freedom is not free. Freedom is costly, but slavery is more costly. Freedom can be crushed by treachery from within as well as from without. Freedom can be weakened and finally destroyed by apathy of the people; and many of you in public life have witnessed in the last few years apathy to a degree that has been serious.

Many of us today are confused by the complexities of life. We sometimes think that if we could get back to the simplicity of life as Jesus knew it in the quiet hill country and by the shores of Galilee, that life indeed would be easy, but I would remind you that life in Palestine 2,000 years ago was neither serene nor simple. Confusion and strife then, as now, was suffered by the people. Tyranny then, as now, existed.

Our Constitution in its wisdom specifically begins the Bill of Rights by saying "Congress shall make no laws respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances." There was a reason. The people had just fought a war for independence from one tyrannical government, and wanted no other from those among them who might wish to resort to tyranny. The Constitution also says that: "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people." And listen to the ninth amendment: "The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people."

Despite these statements, and over the protests of many citizens of this land, ever so gradually, but nevertheless surely, the power of Government has been and is being transferred to an oligarchy, controlled from Washington, the extent of which no one knows.

Woodrow Wilson pointed out many years ago that freedom never comes from the Government, but rather from the subjects of Government. It is a fact that as Government grows larger, it grows away from the people. To preserve themselves in office, elective or appointive, some of our officials kneel down, bow their heads and do the will of those sections of our society which control the vote or have been organized by power-hungry individuals for their own aggrandizement.

Those of you who have studied the history of this Nation must be aware of the drift to socialism that began in the middle of the 19th century and is moving ever more rapidly as each year passes. You say this isn't true? That there is no such thing as socialism in America? Consider, my friends and brethren: The Government operates the biggest business in the world. It is in competition—direct competition—with taxpaying electric companies. It owns the nuclear program. It owns farms and forests. The Government forces participation for most of the citizens in various insurance programs. Is there freedom of the individual if he is forced to take insurance that may not be wanted or needed? Is it freedom that we are forced to collect taxes from our fellowmen so that the fuzzy minds may redistribute to less qualified but more expediently important voters, the rewards of our sweat?

My brethren, the great American experiment of 1787 has been almost lost because there are too few great American leaders like Washington and Randolph and Calhoun who will raise their voices to tell the truth that equalization is against all the laws of nature; leaders unfearful of the jibes and taunts of those who by political chicancery have reached positions of affluence; great leaders who put their intellectual integrity above the cries of those who seek and promise something for nothing. [Applause.]

Alexander Pope says, "Order is heaven's first law; and this confessed, some are and must be greater than the rest. More rich, more wise, but who infers from hence that such are happier shocks all commonsense. Condition—circumstance, is not the thing; bliss is the same in subject or in king." There is no socialism in God's plan for life.

The answers to all of these conflicts in my opinion, is the application of the principles of Freemasonry so ably set forth by the senior U.S. Senator DIRKSEN, of Illinois a few moments ago. The fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man is what is needed in the world today. Spiritual light is needed today behind the Iron Curtain and in our own Nation. We must by our conduct and example create a moral climate which will sustain free institutions.

We were very fortunate in the early days of our history when we had a small group of leaders whose like had not been seen before, and I regret to say, not enough of them have been seen since. We who love our country are justly thrilled by the courage of our Founding Fathers. They had granite in their character, and they had iron in their background. Individual enterprise, courage, daring, and incentive were the order of the day. Individual freedom and dignity of the individual were uppermost in their minds. Patrick Henry's declaration that "I know not what course others may take, but as for me, give me liberty or give me death" represented the atmosphere in which our way of life was born. And if we are to be worthy of our heritage, and if we are to continue to enjoy our liberties, we must recreate that atmosphere. You know, there is something greater than life—our fathers told us what it was—and that is liberty. If we are to save our country and make our contribution to the peace of the world, we must emulate St. Paul, who, finding that the days were evil, labored to improve them. We must not follow Hamlet, who cried that the days were evil and cursed them. Nor should we forget William Penn's assertion, when in his wisdom he said, "People who are not governed by God, will be ruled by tyrants." Penn's statement has been true from Herod to Hitler. Our way of life and our fraternity are held together by a spiritual thread the Communists would sever. I believe in the traditions of America established by Washington, the Master Mason. I believe that unless and until we return to the principles of Washington and those other great men who gave us our heritage, we will lose it and will be unable to perform our duty to pass it on to our children.

More than 2,000 years ago, Confucius said, "With righteousness in the heart, there will be beauty in the character. With beauty in the character, there will be harmony in the home. With harmony in the home, there will be order in the Nation. With order in the Nation, there will be peace in the world." [Applause.]

Every Shriner, whether he knows it or not, subscribes to that proverb. I submit there is no group of men in the world which is more interested in producing a righteous peace—a peace with honor—than the Free Masons and the Shriners. They are interested in freedom, justice, and happiness, for all men and women, regardless of color, race, or creed.

We cannot compromise with principle, for whenever we compromise with principle, we lose honor and liberty. Often the temptation to compromise is great, but the reward is always the same—heartaches and tears.

Alexander Pope, in his "Essay on Man," said these few meaningful words regarding compromise with principle—"What then is the reward of virtue—bread? What nothing earthly gives or can bestow, the soul's calm sunshine and the heartfelt joy—is virtue's prize."

I am sure if we keep faith with the vows we took in Masonry and and in the Shrine, our conduct will be helpful in building a better world for all. "So mote it be." Thank you. [Applause.]

(The quartet of Crescent Temple sang "I Believe" as the benediction.)

Hon. ALBERT W. HAWKES. Gentlemen, I want to thank all of you for coming here. I hope that some good has come from this meeting. It is fine for me to be back here with so many of my friends and meet some new friends. I am going to try to bring together once a year as many of the Masons and Shriners in Congress and the executive and judicial branches of the Government as care to join together in the hope it may be beneficial for us all. "So mote it be." [Applause.]

(Adjournment at 10:40 p.m.)

Human Carnage on the Racetracks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 21, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, in past years I have occasionally mentioned the unnecessary fatalities which result from automobile racing on the Nation's speedways. Sometime my comment about this needless waste of human life have met with criticism by so-called sports fans, who claim that automobile racing is a valuable competitive outlet.

I was pleased to note that the outstanding sports editor of the Washington Post and Times Herald, Mr. Shirley Povich, in his column, "This Morning," of May 21, 1959, has expressed a viewpoint which parallels my own. Mr. Povich points out that the 50th driver has been killed at the Indianapolis Motor Speedway, and this fatality occurred in the preliminaries of the annual Memorial Day racing event.

I ask consent, Mr. President, that Mr. Povich's column be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald, May 21, 1959]

THIS MORNING WITH SHIRLEY POVICH

Now the number is 50 for that senseless purge the motor speedway people have been conducting for too many years in their brick abattoir at Indianapolis. Bob Cortner got it on Tuesday during the preliminaries for the annual Decoration Day speed carnival.

He crashed into a concrete retaining wall at high speed and that was the end of Bob Cortner. Back on May 2, Jerry Unser was banged up in a practice spin and died last Sunday. He was number 49 in the history of the speedway. That takes into account drivers only. Dead spectators hit by flying automotive parts are in a different category.

This has been going on for 50 years now, with driver deaths averaging one a year, and the big race on May 30 yet to come. At this time of year, the sports pages are too often difficult to distinguish from the obituary pages. Americans outraged by the barbarism of bullfighting can heed the inhuman carnage in their own backyard.

The big race on Decoration Day will draw upwards of 200,000 people. Two deaths in the preliminaries won't hurt the attendance. Such things never do. With speedway crowds, the pull of morbidity is always a factor. Most remembered are those races in which death takes no holiday.

There used to be valid reason, perhaps, for the pioneer speedway races at Indianapolis and the multitude of other tracks that now are promoting the American craze for speed. That was when the automotive people could honestly point out that the speedway was a crucible for the testing of motor performance, brakes, tires, carburetors, fuel, and the other components in the infant automobile industry.

That doesn't hold now. The big auto manufacturers have training tracks of their own better engineered than the speedway for proving out all that they seek about their products. The speedways now are merely high carnival for the heavy-footed drivers and the lightheaded spectators.

The hazards of speedway racing have been proven the greater for the fact that these aren't the Sunday drivers or the amateurs who are getting killed. They are the pros, hardened, icy-nerved and with best command of their monster hardware, who are losing too many bouts with death on the tracks.

They are at the mercy not only of the high speeds and the brick walls, of tire and mechanical failure, but also of the poor devil among them who might lapse into foolhardy tactics. Last year there was a 15-car pileup at Indianapolis, causing one death and a grist of injuries. It was scant comfort to the next of kin that an errant driver was later suspended.

Bill Vukovich, a great driver who won two speedway classics in a row, got it in 1955 while trying for his third straight. It wasn't his fault except for the fact that he entered the race. He couldn't skirt a pileup caused by a less efficient driver and became the fourth car in it. He was killed. All of his driving skill couldn't get him past a cluttered track.

There has to be admiration for the courage of the drivers and their skill as well. The track and the money they can earn have to be a powerful challenge. One of them asked why he was so intent on going for a new record on the Indianapolis track, explained simply, "Why do they try to climb Mount Everest? Because it's there, that's why."

For the spectators, there is less excuse for being at Indianapolis. They aren't trying to climb Mount Everest or challenge anything. They simply want the roar of speed in their ears and the close calls in their sights. They may not be asking for crashes but neither do they turn their heads away.

The automobile industry has pandered to the craze for speed to the point that it is giving American drivers more horsepower than ever has been useful on the highways. They have promoted it as a selling point for new cars, nurturing the small-boy complex of the auto buyer that enables him, like the lad with the all-day sucker, to boast "mine is bigger than yours."

At Indianapolis on May 30, the big sloping track and all that speed under the hood will again be sniping at the brave guys behind the wheel. They can set new records but they can't always outrun those hidden bullets that are triggered by so many things that can happen to men and machinery, at those speeds.

Gallaudet: Only College for Deaf Offers Ultimate in Education Fields

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER THORNBERRY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 6, 1959

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the Members of Congress will be keenly interested in the excellent story about Gallaudet College, the only senior college for the deaf in the world, which appeared in the May 11 issue of the Houston Post, Houston, Tex., a well-known and important daily newspaper of our Nation.

As you know, the Houston Post is owned and published by our distinguished and beloved friends, Gov. and Mrs. William P. Hobby. While Mrs. Hobby served as Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, she took an unusual, personal interest in Gallaudet. While she served in the President's Cabinet, Mrs. Hobby took time from her very busy schedule to visit the campus of Gallaudet and to talk to the students. Because of her great interest in an adequate program of higher education for the deaf, as Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, she urged legislation which the Congress passed, the effect of which has been to bring Gallaudet College accreditation and a modern building program. The deaf will always owe a great debt of gratitude to Mrs. Hobby.

This splendid article about Gallaudet College was written by Mr. Jim Mathis, the able chief of the Houston Post Washington bureau. Mr. Mathis spent several days on the campus of this great college talking to officials, teachers, and students, and has written a moving and graphic story about what Gallaudet College is accomplishing for a wonderful group of students.

It is a privilege for me to insert this article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

It is as follows:

GALLAUDET: ONLY COLLEGE FOR DEAF OFFERS ULTIMATE IN EDUCATION FIELDS

(By Jim Mathis)

WASHINGTON.—In the vaulted chapel, stained with age and creaky floored, are gathered 23 students.

To the right of the entrance a varicolored jukebox glares with light and pulsates with dominating sound.

A sweatered young man sits beside the machine, his arm and hand resting upon the glass top.

On the lower level of the stage, across and to the left, a clump of youngsters freeze from gesticulating happiness into the rigidity of a posed Othello scene.

A photographer's bulb flashes. Feet shuffle. The floor complains. Old portraits of past professors look down from the wall.

But in the ocean of sound sprayed out by the music box, not one voice is heard. Only here and there a thin, false-toned laugh.

LUNCH BEING SERVED

In the next door dining room, lunch is being served. There are no voices here, either. Only the clink and clank of dinnerware.

This is high noon at Gallaudet College, the only college in the world for the deaf.

Not one of those 23 in the chapel could hear a voice without artificial aid. Many are totally deaf, and have been so since birth. Most of them are unable to speak recognizable words. Their basic communication is the sweeping gracefulnes of their sign language.

On this curious campus—called Kendall Green after its founder—there are 409 youngsters in the process of education, moving from the 5-year-old just learning to speak to polished seniors with fully accredited degrees.

Gallaudet College was officially founded in 1864 on a charter signed by President Abraham Lincoln. It is one of five higher education institutions operated by the Federal Government. Others include the three Military Academies and Howard University here.

On 92 acres, and in the midst of a changing plant now halfway between the traditional and the functional modern, Gallaudet provides the ultimate in educational opportunities for the Nation's estimated 75,000 deaf.

BEST PUPILS ENROLLED

To Kendall Green and Gallaudet come the best in pupils from among the 23,000 enrolled in secondary schools devoted to the deaf. Available are degrees in 19 fields, all fully approved by the Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools.

When Gallaudet students graduate, as about 40 will this summer, their degrees bear the signature of the President of the United States.

Since 1954, when the charter was changed to make the Government responsibilities more explicit, Gallaudet has been growing fast toward its hoped for enrollment of from 700 to 1,000 students. Construction now underway would move the school fully toward that student capacity.

Meanwhile, the college has accepted as its responsibility the great untapped area of research into the problems of the deaf and the education of the deaf. A small, vigorous staff is building the nucleus of a future in research.

It is a long way from the one-man student body with which Dr. Edward Miner Gallaudet began.

JOKES ABOUT COLLEGE

Gallaudet, 21-year-old son of a minister who first brought the sign language to America, jokingly referred to his lone full-time student as "the college."

"The college," he was likely to report, "has a toothache today."

Since Gallaudet's death in 1917, only two other men have held the presidency of Gallaudet College, Dr. Percival Hall stepped out after 35 years, short of Gallaudet's 43.

Today's president is vigorous, dedicated Dr. Leonard M. Elstad, who came here originally 37 years ago from Minnesota, to learn to teach the deaf. Elstad has been president for 14 years.

The students are divided broadly into four groups, the Kendall School for District of Columbia children, the preparatory school, the undergraduates at college level, and the graduate school.

Not all the youngsters who seek to enter Gallaudet make it. There are a series of stiff examinations to pass, and then preparatory school. About half who apply make the preparatory school.

NO SPEECH PATTERN

Because a child who is deaf at birth or becomes deaf before he is 5 has no knowledge of sound or language, or no fully formed speech pattern, he usually winds up from 3 to 5 years behind the average hearing student in education. First he must go through the tortuous process of learning by sight objects and connecting them with letters and words. Few ever catch up in the early grades with the hearer who gets off to a running start at 5 or 6.

State or private schools usually find, then, that their students become 18 and older far too soon to finish a complete high school course. Their interests turn to jobs and marriage. Most schools at a State level cut their education off at around the 10th year, as compared to 12. Few then are ready for college work.

The preparatory student at Gallaudet gets 2 fierce years of work poured into 1 to ready him for college courses. It is a difficult and trying year for many reasons.

"When we get them here, many think because they have had extra attention in the family or smaller schools that they are something special," Dr. Elstad notes. "Our first task is to let them know they are just like any other person."

HOUSTONIAN TYPICAL

Typical of the preparatory class here today is Jeanette L. Padgett, a tall, stately 19-year-old daughter of Mr. and Mrs. G. W. Padgett of 4405 Downs Street, Houston.

Jeanette went to the Texas State School in Austin, and spent considerable time in special speech classes at the University of Texas. She can speak brief, pearl-shaped words, but has found the prep courses tough at Gallaudet.

Along with two other Austin graduates here now—Melvia Miller, 18, of 2007 North Main, Houston, and Joy Gibson of Humble—Jeanette feels the Austin school should better prepare its students for Gallaudet. Especially should the school stress literature and science, the three insist.

California, Gallaudet instructors say, does more to prepare its students for college than any other State. There are 38 enrolled here from California now, as against 12 from Texas.

Undergraduates pay a $1,200 a year tuition. If parents are unable to pay, the State vocational rehabilitation takes up some slack and the Government the remainder. It costs about $2,000 a year for each student. Dr. George Detmold, dean of the college, figures these are about average for colleges the size of Gallaudet.

STUDENTS ARE TESTED

By the time students are ready for college entrance, they have been tested and characterized in their abilities to speak, hear and lip read. An intense young doctor of philosophy, D. Robert Frisina, director of the hearing and speech center, is gradually reducing the studies in his area to direct application in education and training. Frisina, only 34, is part of the bright future Dr. Elstad foresees for Gallaudet to become a national research center on deafness and its accompanying problems.

One of the young undergraduates who had been taped, studied and tested and has moved quickly to the top of his class is Robert Bevill, a small intense fellow of 21. Bevill's parents live at 1913 Priest Road in Pasadena, Tex. He is a freshman.

In his freshman year, Robert has been chosen as head of his class, one of its representatives on the student council, member of the intramural board, social committee, reporter for the college paper, the Buff and Blue, and wrestles in the 123 pound weight class. Instructors count him one of the better students. He is here by virtue of rehabilitation grants from both Texas and Arkansas.

EARLY INDOCTRINATION

Students get early indoctrination in the pure sign language and in lip, or as instructors prefer to call it, speech reading.

Classes are taught through the simultaneous use of the spoken word, sign language and liberal use of the classroom blackboard. They differ in specific form, however, from professor to professor.

Dr. Robert F. Panara is totally deaf, and has been since he was 11. He is one of the 23 deaf instructors on the faculty. He teaches English and literature.

One day last week Dr. Panara brought his class into the yellow-chaired amphitheater classroom for a lesson on American poets. His first 10 minutes were devoted to copying the assignment on the blackboard. His class of 30-odd drifted in casually and began copying. The silence was broken frequently by speaking students, who had no hesitancy in speaking out to their colleagues in the next seat or across the room. One thing that doesn't bother these classes is noise.

STUDENTS CONCENTRATE

"Once my lecture begins, they must watch my hands and face to get the content," Panara said.

"They cannot copy notes and listen at the same time like other students."

When the lecture began it was impressive and full of impact. On that particular day Panara was explaining Emily Dickinson. Anyone could have learned more about Dickinson's brilliant choice of words on little things by listening for half an hour to Panara than in several full courses.

His explanation of "The sweeping up of the heart and putting love away. We shall not want to use again until eternity" was visible and with movement of emotion.

His description of a "narrow fellow in the grass," the famed snake, and "Zero in the Bone" were precise and chilling. And when he took Dickinson's train around the mountain, it was with giant steps and with supercilious eyebrows at the shanties along the tracks as he choo-chooed along.

"These are abstractions, and the most difficult for deaf students to understand. For that reason, I must spell them out and act them out. Even with a little ham acting," Panara admits with a grin.

ABSTRACT IS HARDEST

Like Panara, Dr. Powrie Vaux Doctor, who has been teaching history for 30 years at Gallaudet, finds the concepts and the abstract the hardest to get over.

Dr. Doctor is gray-haired and husky, and he doesn't act out his lectures as vehemently as Panara. But when he gets to the word "hammer" his heavy brows come together and his fists strike a blow that goes whack. There can be no doubt about hammer.

Dr. Doctor has promoted and teaches by a structural method in which he links up the abstractions in each day's lesson. But he is still confronted with the disability to assimilate the concept, after all these years.

"How can I teach them what regimentation means? Or democracy? The hearing person takes in his concepts through his ears, by radio, television, movies, the spoken language. These people learn with facts, and find the transition most difficult," Dr. Doctor says.

That he is still going about it after 30 years, and with obvious success judging from some of the papers handed in by his students that day, is a credit to his dedication.

NINE SEEKING MASTER'S

There are currently nine graduates—all hearing persons—pursuing the Gallaudet course toward a master's degree, preparing to dedicate their lives to the deaf. Many come from State institutions. Most of them realize that as teachers they seldom can reach a superintendency of a deaf school without a Gallaudet degree.

In its 95 years, Gallaudet has sent instructors fanning out all over the Nation, along with its alumni. Although different schools of thought exist on matters like sign language versus speech reading, and whether or not the deaf think and dream in their sign language, the Gallaudet theories generally prevail.

In order to train teachers, a college must have a secondary school, on campus if possible, for its students. Kendall School serves as both training ground and a conscientious teacher of the District of Columbia deaf. Under its current program, the District school system pays Kendall for each of its resident pupils. Others come in from parents about the world.

The youngsters, ranging in age from 5 to 16 or thereabouts, live on campus in dormitories during the week. Most of them go home on weekends.

IMPRESSIONS VIVID

Under the guidance of John Gough, principal of Kendall and chairman of the college education department, a visitor gets a first hand view of the cloak of patience required in teaching the very young to speak, and a vivid impression of the intelligence and natural desire to learn expressed by most of the children.

Mrs. Harriet N. Gough, wife of the principal, had on this particular day a half dozen children in the age range of 9 to 11. The highest IQ among them was 101, ranging downward to 76.

John A. Slender, Negro boy with the 101 IQ, is beginning to speak intelligible words. In this class, the short story of the day concerned one Tom who had a red ball, threw it; his dog ran and got it and Tom laughed. John, with clear pride in his growing ability to communicate, ran ran through his lesson with a few boosts from Mrs. Gough.

Each child spoke into a tape recorder and amplifier hooked up to desk sets for those who had hearing.

PATIENCE EXHIBITED

Across the hall, Mrs. Della Norris was exhibiting infinite patience with the 5-year-olds, many of whom come to the school spoiled or in silent retreat from mishandling at home.

Funds are now being sought for a new Kendall school building. Some students live in wooden dormitories, with their only protection from fire the blinking red lights which serve as bells for the awakening of the deaf in times of danger.

One of the two more important features of the college are its physical education program and classes in dancing and drama.

Dr. Peter R. Wisher, head of the physical education department, says he has usually 150 boys from which to draw a football team, and teams for soccer, track, baseball, golf, basketball, wrestling, and cross-country races.

The school competes in the Mason-Dixon Conference.

Like any coach, Dr. Wisher describes the results of this competition as "representative." Actually, Gallaudet has a tough time competing, as its records indicate. In football, a silent count is necessary, and the team has trouble with off-side penalties and its lines can't fully utilize the quick charge. Other team sports have similar problems for the deaf players.

INDIVIDUALS DO BETTER

Where individuals are involved only, Gallaudet does better. Its wrestling teams hold their own with its conference opponents.

Wisher discounts partially reports that deafness also creates difficulty in balance. His department develops good fancy divers and tumblers.

Wisher also heads up the Gallaudet dancers, who have built an enviable record in showings across the country. The use of hands and body by the deaf or nearly deaf students, is more fluid and expressive, Dr. Wisher contends. The rhythm and beat of music comes through to a student leader not totally deaf. Others follow that lead, or pick up the rhythm and beat through vibrations from a loudspeaker placed against the stage floor.

A moving version of the Lord's Prayer is danced, almost wholly by use of the hands. It has been given wide acclaim in many demonstrations.

The Gallaudet dramas, traditional Shakespeare in the sign language, draw capacity crowds several times a year. Many in the audience are deaf from up and down the east coast, who have never seen the classics in that particular form of communication. But hearing persons crowd in also from Washington and sit entranced.

PARTS LEARNED FAST

Student players are fast to learn their parts, Dean Detmold says.

"We can put Othello on after only 3 weeks of rehearsal," the dean says.

This version of Othello will be on NBC for half an hour on May 21. The Gallaudet production of Hamlet last year was aired on the same network. Detmold says there are dozens of requests for performances, so many that they would disrupt normal classes, and therefore are turned down.

Gallaudet, as noted earlier, is largely financed by the Federal Government. But Dr. Elstad has made a strong effort to draw upon private foundations, particularly in the field of research. An outline of funds needed for research in the field of language, acoustics, speech reading—no one knows why some are able to pick up lipreading and others fail—and application of research show a total of $549,000.

Also badly needed at the college are graduate fellowships to pay hearing persons, funds for faculty leaves for study, and a student loan fund endowment.

CAN'T COMMUNICATE

One great difficulty in aiding those students who come up with mental disturbances is the inability of psychologists and psychiatrists to communicate with them. There aren't enough deaf in the Nation for a psychiatrist to specialize in treating the deaf. An estimated $50,000 would carry such a program for 5 years.

Right now, Assistant Secretary Edward Foss Wilson of the Health, Education, and Welfare Department, a member of the Gallaudet board of directors, is personally underwriting a chair in comparative religion. Wilson is a member of the family which owns the Wilson Packing Co.

Representative HOMER THORNBERRY of Austin, whose parents were deaf, has started a fund in memory of his mother, Mrs. Mary L. Thornberry. THORNBERRY serves on the board, and has since 1949. The new hearing center, a 16-sided building under construction, will be named for Mrs. Thornberry, who was also a dedicated teacher of the deaf.

While Gallaudet has turned out many graduates who would otherwise have been a waste of human resources, its alumni have never been great moneymakers. There just aren't any multimillionaires to turn to for private donations in the group.

Any assistance, Dr. Elstad points out, will move the one hope for bringing to the Nation able, understanding deaf, further along the road traveled since 1864.

Important Markets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 21, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, as we know, direct mail advertising, over the years, has been a valuable channel of contact for thousands of small businesses throughout the Nation.

In Wisconsin, for example, our gift cheese shippers—one of our outstanding industries—annually sells millions of dollars worth of cheese by mail. This includes the finest varieties of tasty, delectable cheese, such as: American, Swiss, brick, Gouda, Edam, Blue, Camembert, and others.

Recently, the Federal-State Crop Reporting Service of Wisconsin published a special report of the volume of Wisconsin cheese sold by mail. In 1958, for example, our Wisconsin gift cheese shippers spent over a million dollars for postage, shipping, advertising, and special packaging material.

The report illustrates the great degree to which people not only in Wisconsin, but throughout the country, respond to third-class mail advertising, and also the extent to which industries depend on such advertising to carry on their activity.

As an indication of the importance of third-class mail to our Wisconsin cheese shippers—representative of such business throughout the country—I ask unanimous consent to have the report by the Federal-State Crop Reporting Service printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WISCONSIN CHEESE SOLD BY MAIL PROVIDES IMPORTANT MARKETS

Gift cheese shippers are a multimillion dollar industry in Wisconsin, according to a survey made by the Wisconsin Crop Reporting Service. Sales in 1958 added up to over $5 million based on the establishments reporting in a special survey made for the first time this spring.

American cheese was the most popular in sales by gift cheese shippers in 1958. Three-fifths of the sales were American, but all of the kinds of cheese made in Wisconsin were represented in the 1958 sales reported. Some kinds are well known but sales included many cheeses not so well known such as Gouda, Edam, Port Salut, French, Blue, Camembert, and, of course, the whole family of Italian cheese varieties with their interesting names and different flavors were well represented. In addition, reports of 1958 sales of cheese included many specially processed cheeses and cheese-food compounds. Shown below is a breakdown of the estimated 1958 sales:

Wisconsin gift-cheese shippers sales 1958[1]

[Thousand pounds]

Kind	Total	Mail-order sales	Direct sales[2]
American	2,811	2,042	769
Swiss	917	787	130
Brick	585	452	133
Other	406	216	190

[1] Wisconsin has several firms producing cheese for the gift-cheese industry. Their sales are nationwide at the wholesale level and are not included in these figures. Estimates are intended to cover only mail-order and retail sales of gift-cheese establishments actually located in Wisconsin. Wholesale gift-cheese business by Wisconsin firms is not covered in this report.

[2] Gift-cheese shippers are primarily engaged in selling cheese by mail but many operate cheese stores in addition and sell direct to consumers over the counter. Estimates of these sales are shown in this column. Only a small part of the retail sales of cheese in Wisconsin is represented.

Merchandising cheese by mail involves many expenses for postage, shipping, advertising, and special packaging materials. Wisconsin Gift-Cheese Shippers, according to the reports, spent over a million dollars in 1958 to cover these costs. Largest item of advertising expense was for printed brochures which totaled about $700,000 last year. In addition, postage for solicitation of sales through the mails was $175,000. Another $200,000 was spent on advertising through newspapers, radio and television, and other media. Advertising costs in 1958 averaged $13,154 per firm reporting in the survey.

Nearly as much money is spent in shipping charges as for advertising costs. The parcel post cost in 1958 was $760,000 and this was the predominate means of shipping cheese to mail-order customers. Express costs were also large, and added up to $58,000 and other means such as truck and special package deliveries added another $37,000 to the cost of shipping gift cheese to customers. The average overall shipping charges per firm reporting was $12,200 in 1958. Parcel post charges averaged $10,847 per firm reporting and express and other shipping charges were $1,353 per firm reporting.

Need for Flood Control Measures in Taylor County, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 21, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the location of the busy city of Abilene and Dyess Air Force Base in Taylor County, a vital part of our Nation's defenses, lends an imperative argument to the need for completion of a flood control survey in Taylor County, Tex.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution passed by the Commissioner's Court of Taylor County, Tex:

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF THE COMMISSIONER'S COURT OF TAYLOR COUNTY, TEX.

Whereas Taylor County is daily threatened by catastrophic floodwaters; and

Whereas the U.S. Corps of Engineers has undertaken a survey of the possible remedial action and is contemplating the completion of said survey by June 1961; and

Whereas the city of Abilene and the county of Taylor and Dyess Air Force Base are growing at such a rapid rate that any action taken in 1961 will cost twice as much as it will to take such action in the immediate future; and

Whereas we are deeply grateful for the appropriations that have been made in our behalf: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Commissioner's Court of Taylor County, Tex., That the Congress of the United States and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers be urged in the strongest possible terms to accelerate this flood survey so that it will be finished in time to avert another catastrophe.

This motion was made by County Commissioner Floyd Tate and seconded by County Commissioner Grover Nelson and unanimously adopted by the entire court in regular session assembled.

REED INGALSSE,
County Judge.

Attest: Mrs. CHESTER HUTCHESON,
County Clerk.

Dr. Conrad M. Barnes, Kansas' 1959 Nominee for General Practitioner of the Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 21, 1959

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, it is with pleasure that I bring to the attention of Members of Congress the name of a citizen of Kansas who is the 1959 nominee of Kansas for the title "General Practitioner of the Year." He is a man who in belief and practice believes that medicine is more than a professional practice—that it is an art. He believes it is an art in helping others.

Dr. Conrad M. Barnes, of Seneca, Kans., is remarkable in that he exemplifies the true physician in a complete sense, combining the proper physical care of the patient with proper counselling of his emotional problems.

Dr. Barnes has continued his own education from year to year, even taking time out to teach classes in the University of Kansas Medical School, his own school. He loves his patients.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article relating to Dr. Barnes entitled "Medicine is Art to 1959 Nominee," which was published in the Topeka Daily Capital of April 18, 1959.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Topeka Daily Capital, Apr. 18, 1959]

MEDICINE IS ART TO 1959 NOMINEE

Kansas' 1959 nominee for the title "General Practitioner of the Year" is a man who believes medicine is more than a professional practice—that it is an art. He believes it is an art in helping others.

He is Dr. Conrad M. Barnes, 47, of Seneca.

Although a native of Missouri, he earned his medical degree at the University of Kansas School of Medicine. Following his internship in 1936 and 1937, he selected the Kansas town in Nemaha County to begin his practice. He's still there.

Nearly everyone knows him simply as "Connie"—the telephone switchboard operator will vouch for that.

A professional associate describes him as a great man with a great heart and dedicated devotion to his chosen profession.

The quality of the medical care he gives is attested to by the honors his colleagues have placed upon him. But beyond that lies the humanity, that art of medicine which gives him infinite distinction.

Connie Barnes is a reticent, modest man, but when you know him well you may hear him say:

"Yes, I worked hard to get this fine new hospital at Seneca. Perhaps because I got tired of climbing stairs.

"I used to have my own little hospital right here. Thirty-two steps from this very spot to the second floor. No elevator, I carried every single patient, too sick to walk, those 32 steps to my hospital. The farmer with the broken hip, the obstetrical case, all of them. Had to.

"We couldn't manage a stretcher around the corner turn. And I wouldn't take a chance on anyone else doing it, so I carried them all."

Connie Barnes' philanthropy has included the gift of a washing machine to a needy patient simply because there was no other way for her to get one. There have been gifts of TV and hi-fi sets, because they would provide more therapy in these instances than the pills he could give them.

As for his doctoring bills, he never sends them to anyone. He says, "They'll pay me when they can. And if they don't their kids will. I've had adults come in and pay for their own delivery. They think it's a big joke."

Professionally, he is one of the men who has given of his time to teach classes at the University of Kansas Medical Center, where he has driven many miles to make this contribution.

He was one of Dr. Franklin Murphy's first lieutenants in the development of the preceptorship in Kansas. He served as the first chairman of the Kansas Medical Society's Committee on Rural Health.

He has held the presidency of the Kansas Medical Society, Kansas Academy of General Practice, and Kansas Blue Shield.

Dr. Mahlon Delp, professor of medicine at the Kansas University Medical Center, says of him:

"His work in Kansas school health has been more productive than that of any other single physician in the State. * * * No man in our entire area so conscientiously and successfully bears the wide responsibility for proper care and patient counseling for the mingled organic and emotional problems which patients have.

"He also has demonstrated constant concern with continuing his own education. None in our State has accumulated more hours of postgraduate continuation education."

A professional colleague says of him: "To my knowledge he has never been too busy to see a patient or any person who needs help. His all-encompassing understanding and love of the human being not as a unit but as an individual (explains) his special interest in the psychosomatic aspect of medicine.

"He has a particular philsophy of living each day to its fullest and he is the one person whom I have met who could and does follow this philosophy."

Physically, Connie is endowed with a large body that instantly separates and distinguishes him from all other persons. Yet he moves with dexterity. For him, his size is natural, even an asset.

Last year he drove 800 miles to Dodge City simply to shake hands with the actor who plays "Doc" on the popular television Gunsmoke program. This was no surprise to those who know Connie because this western character typified something fine that now is all but forgotten in the practice of medicine and Connie wanted to thank the actor for his fine portrayal.

Married and the father of two children, this smalltown Kansas doctor also is described as a real family man. His devotion to his profession is said to be equalled only by his love for his family.

He frequently takes other people into his home—currently, for 1 year, a German exchange scholar is living there.

This is Kansas' Doctor of the Year—its nominee for the American Medical Association's 1959 "Oscar" in medicine.

Nuclear Test Ban Issue—A Course for United States Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 21, 1959

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I take this means to call attention to my remarks in this RECORD following the day's legislative business under title "Nuclear Test Ban Issue—A Course for United States Action." They set out the moral, practical and military reasons for a four-point program suggested for United States action involving:

First. Announcement of indefinite cessation of the only kind of nuclear testing producing fallout, namely, testing in the atmosphere, attaching reasonable conditions regarding problems arising from future actions by other powers.

Second. The diligent seeking of international agreements amongst the nuclear powers, including Soviet Russia, likewise to ban atmospheric tests, as proposed by President Eisenhower to Premier Khrushchev.

Third. The declaration of a moratorium on talks aimed at banning below-ground and above-atmosphere testing until the air is cleared of emotion, propaganda and misinformation regarding fallout, until the problem of detecting violations is understood, and until the other military and moral question inhering in the issue are debated and answered.

Fourth. The candid release to the public of data regarding testing, detection and other aspects of nuclear weaponry

which are not properly of a restricted security classification.

I also call attention to the following related materials to be found in the RECORD:

"The Case Against the Nuclear Test Ban," an editorial from Air Force magazine, Wednesday, April 29, at pages A3631–A3632.

"Communist Diplomatic Perfidy," my compilation of Soviet treaty violations and reasons therefor, Thursday, May 14, at pages 7373–7376.

"Nuclear Test Ban Pitfalls," a memorandum by Joint Atomic Energy Committee Consultant Thomas E. Murray evaluating the United States inconsistencies regarding the issue of nuclear test bans, Wednesday, May 20, at pages 7812–7815.

Vacation Opportunities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 21, 1959

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, in the midst of the hustle-and-bustle of the workaday world in which we find ourselves, come far-off thoughts of finding the perfect environment to spend the precious vacation days.

Where can we find the greatest opportunities for recreation to suit our needs, we wonder? To come to the aid of those who find themselves in such a predicament, I point out for them that in the State of New Jersey the opportunities for a variety of recreational opportunities are unlimited. Here is scenic grandeur, sandy beaches, and all other types of satisfying diversions which will delight the heart of the tourist.

An article from the Atlantic City Press describes these recreational opportunities in detail, and for those of you who ponder this question, I ask unanimous consent to have the May 11 article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VACATION OPPORTUNITIES

One could travel far and spend much without encountering a wider variety of scenic grandeur than New Jersey has to offer.

We are reminded of this happy circumstance by the new "Vacation Guide to Fun in New Jersey," issued by the New Jersey State Department of Conservation and Economic Development.

The recreational opportunities afforded vacationists along the Jersey shore, particularly in south Jersey and even more particularly Atlantic City and neighboring resorts, are familiar to all. The miles and miles of wide beaches, boardwalks, hotels, motels, restaurants, amusement places, fishing and boating facilities annually attract millions.

Tourists in large numbers are also drawn to the natural beauty of mountains, lakes, and rivers in this State. The Jersey pine belt has its own allure.

Resort communities, coastal and inland, plan full schedules of regattas, beauty pageants, golf tournaments, contests, and special events designed to attract visitors from out of State.

In addition, New Jersey's 23 State parks and 11 State forests contain facilities for camping, hiking, horseback riding, boating and swimming. Picnicking possibilities exist from one end of the State to the other.

They all make for a diversified and satisfying vacation in the Garden State.

As the Vacation Guide points out, economy is one key feature of a spring vacation in New Jersey. A wide range of accommodations, cuisines, and diversions appeal to varying tastes and pocketbooks. To top it all off, New Jersey is easy to reach by car, bus, train, or plane.

A great many States make a bid for tourist trade, but New Jersey really has the merchandise.

The Matson Navigation Co. and Trade With Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
Hon. EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 21, 1959

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, some time ago I called the attention of the Senate to the fact that the Matson Navigation Co. has a near-monopoly on trade between the west coast and Hawaii.

I am happy to inform the Senate that the Department of Justice has now taken the lead in seeking to end a situation which cannot be tolerated now that Hawaii is a State of the Union.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a news item from the New York Times of April 12, 1959, concerning this matter.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LINE RENEWS BID FOR HAWAII RUNS—PACIFIC FAR EAST GETS HELP OF JUSTICE DEPARTMENT IN 3-YEAR BATTLE

(By Arthur H. Richter)

Another round is about to begin in the 3-year struggle by the Pacific Far East Line to get a foothold in the Pacific Coast-Hawaii trade.

The company has been thwarted thus far in all of its efforts to gain Government approval for steamship cargo service from the West Coast to Honolulu. The proposal has been twice rejected by the Federal Maritime Board. It also lost in the Federal District Court and the Court of Appeals, both in the District of Columbia.

The current move is being made in the Court of Appeals, also in the District of Columbia. The Justice Department is scheduled to file a brief in the case by Friday and a further bill of particulars 10 days later.

Oddly enough, the prime mover in the case is now the Justice Department rather than the Pacific Far East Line. The department originally supported the Maritime Board, but then withdrew from the case.

It has reentered as an intervenor and is seeking to show that the Maritime Board erred in holding that approval of the application would result in unfair competition to the Matson Navigation Co.

APPEAL CONSIDERED SURE

Pacific Far East is to submit its brief to the court by May 27 and full arguments will probably follow about 10 days later. The concensus in local shipping circles is that the loser in the coming round will certainly take the case to the Supreme Court.

The case began when Pacific Far East, which holds a Government subsidy contract for operation between Pacific Coast ports and the Far East, petitioned for the right to make two unsubsidized calls a month at Hawaii. After a lengthy hearing, which covers 7,500 pages of transcript and 1,900 pages of exhibits, the Maritime Board's trial examiner and the public counsel approved the move.

However, on May 10, 1957, the Maritime Board, by a 2 to 1 vote, overruled the examiner and public counsel and denied the application. A petition for reconsideration was denied by the board the following July 30.

The company went to the court of appeals a year ago but lost again, this time on the basis of jurisdiction, and the case was heard in Federal District Court last November. The latter ruled simply in two words: "Petition denied."

JUSTICE DEPARTMENT ACTS

At this point the initiative was taken by the Department of Justice, which returned the action to the Court of Appeals. The Department's move was viewed as "double-edged" in shipping circles. Leaders in the field see it as both an attack on the alleged monopoly held by Matson in the Hawaiian trade as well as an attempt to upset the Board's ruling against Pacific Far East.

The papers filed by the Department in the action in district court said that Matson was closely interlocked with major sugar, pineapple, and other important economic interests in Hawaii. The papers said the line, which has been in the service for 73 years, carries 98 percent of the cargo in the trade.

Although Matson is unsubsidized, it operates a subsidized service to Australia through a wholly owned subsidiary, the Oceanic Steamship Co. Matson and Oceanic, it was pointed out, have identical officers, directors, management.

Also, with minor exceptions, they have identical freight traffic staffs in the United States, and have common offices, agents, and terminals.

MONOPOLY CHARGED

There is nothing in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, the Department held, that gives the Maritime Board rights or powers that include the "preservation of monopoly." It added that the Board's report contained no indication that the agency had given any consideration to the fact that the granting of the application "would help to break Matson's stranglehold on this trade."

The Department further contended that the ordinary methods of determining unfair competition cannot be applied in this case since both Matson and Pacific Far East enjoy Government subsidy for foreign operations.

"We do not believe," the Department has said, "that a monopolist property can be viewed as fundamentally entitled to maintain its monopoly against a competitor whose alleged unfair competition is, in the final analysis, nothing more than the fact that it will be competing effectively."

Spokesmen for Pacific Far East contend in support of the companys' application, that it is asking nothing more than what Matson already has, namely the right to operate an unsubsidized run to Hawaii independent of its subsidized operations to foreign ports.

Address by Senator Humphrey Prepared for Delivery to the California Legislature

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 21, 1959

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, the California Legislature extended to our colleague, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] an invitation to address its membership on Friday, April 24, 1959. His speech was keenly awaited, and it was with genuine disappointment that the legislators received word that Senator HUMPHREY could not appear before them because of his hasty return to Washington for the Senate debate on the labor bill.

Senator HUMPHREY's remarks prepared for that occasion are a salute to our growing State, and call attention to California's increasing importance in the American scene. I believe that his text will interest Members of Congress and other readers of the RECORD, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS PREPARED FOR DELIVERY TO THE CALIFORNIA LEGISLATURE BY SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, SACRAMENTO, APRIL 24

It is a pleasure to return to California.

Actually I—along with thousands of other Democrats—have plans to be out here in July, 1960—in Los Angeles, to be specific. But I find the magnetism of California irresistible, and, like many other Minnesotans who have been drawn to your State, I decided not to wait.

It is one of the greatest honors of my public life to appear before the California Legislature, and I am deeply grateful for your invitation.

As a fellow legislator, I can well appreciate the tremendous problems that face a legislative body in a dynamic and fast-growing State. Representative government finds its heart in legislatures, which most directly represent the people.

You and I know that the process of legislation is one of the most delicate and difficult in the art of government.

I am tremendously impressed, as are many millions of Americans, by the magnificent record Governor Brown has established in his first few months in office. He has faced up to what is obviously a serious fiscal problem, and with your cooperation and counsel, I am sure that together you will solve it. Surely Governor Brown will rank among the great Governors of the Golden State.

And I enthusiastically acknowledge to you here today, again in common with many, many Americans, that the roster of great Governors of California—indeed, of great American leaders—carries the name of the present Chief Justice of the United States, the Honorable Earl Warren.

You have given us many fine leaders and public servants in both political parties. We in the Senate welcome your capable and energetic new junior Senator, CLAIR ENGLE, whose previous congressional experience has been recognized in his assignment to two major committees so vital to California's future—the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

I might add, in a nonpartisan spirit, that I was pleased that our Republican colleagues have honored one of your former members, Senator THOMAS KUCHEL, by making him assistant Republican leader in the U.S. Senate.

It has been my good fortune within the past few days to visit the States of Washington and Oregon. Very soon I shall stop off in Utah and Wyoming on my way back to Washington, D.C. But no trip to the West is complete—does not even begin, some might say—until one visits California.

To me California symbolizes America's future, her greatest hopes.

For California is a social cross section of the Nation. Here are gathered peoples of all races, religions, and origins, living together with a remarkable absence of strife or friction.

You have marked geographic diversity in your State—towering mountains and flat, fertile valleys; lakes and deserts.

You even have a North and a South, but happily you exhibit—to the visitor at least—no sign of civil war.

California's way of life is an example to the rest of America. Indeed the strength, vigor, and pioneering spirit which it represents is the answer to the repressiveness and deadness of spirit of the Soviet Union.

The answer to the Russian Bear is the Golden Bear of California.

You here in the West—and particularly in California—have cared about and mastered the problems of living with other people, respecting their opinions and traditions, fostering and taking pride in the diversity of your people. For this, you deserve the respect of the Nation and of the world. This is America at her finest.

Symbolic of this is the passage by this legislature, under the leadership of Governor Brown, of a measure to assure equal opportunity in employment for every person, be he rich or poor, black or white, Catholic, Protestant, or Jew. For this effort, I salute both of you and Governor Brown.

I respect and admire your vitality and your eagerness to meet and solve problems. You seem unhampered by convention or shibboleth or by the doubters who so facilely catalog the obstacles but seem incapable of devising the answers.

To me the doubters hold sway altogether too much in America today. Their appeal is to the timid and the cautious in us, not to the venturesome or the daring.

This Nation and this State face new problems, big and difficult problems very different from those we overcame in the past.

These problems will not be solved without looking ahead, without planning for the future.

For everyone except the Federal Government, planning is considered a virtue.

Parents plan for the education and security of their children.

Businessmen look ahead to plan new expansion, new products, to anticipate new conditions.

More and more localities have their planning commissions and staffs.

But at that point, the logic of planning seems, to many people, to come to an abrupt stop. Planning by the Federal Government seems tantamount to original sin. The same is true, to a degree, of planning by the States.

We will yield to such thinking only at our peril and to our future regret. For problems of the future will not solve themselves.

But I have faith in America's ability to solve them—and particularly in California's capacity to meet them.

For the spirit of California is still one of enterprise, of pioneering. Your continued growth is inevitable. Your material success is assured.

But I raise this question with you: How will you grow? How will America grow?

We can build the material things. Given proper leadership, we can reach levels of adequate housing for all, enough school buildings to house all our children, maximum development of natural resource potentials. Science and technology inevitably will make greater inroads on disease and untimely death, hunger and intolerable living conditions. These will eventually be conquered through physical changes in the material conditions of life.

If we live in the grandest houses and attend the most modern schools, but still have not learned to live with each other, to respect differences of opinion, to honor intellectual attainments, we have built upon sand and not rock.

I speak, in short, for building on the inner qualities of our people—those qualities of mind and spirit that encourage man to live at peace and in harmony with himself and his brothers.

There is much unfinished business to take care of in this country. As we go about it, new issues will arise. The human enterprise never finally solves its problems, so long as it remains a going concern. Progress involves not merely the solution of old problems, but the discovery of new ones.

But even if we solved all our domestic problems, our troubles as a nation would not be over. The paradise of our domestic security, as a noted theologian, Reinhold Neibuhr, recently said, would still be suspended in a hell of global insecurity.

So, as we strive to put our house in order, let us not forget our neighbors in other lands. Our material accomplishments must not become ends in themselves, but the means to achieve the ideals we share with peoples elsewhere. Our goal must always be to bolster the faith of peoples everywhere in free institutions and the democratic way of life.

Justice for Retired Military Officers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 21, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, Congress last year wisely provided increased pay for active duty officers and men of our Military Establishment. One of the injustices in that legislation was that it did not provide for similar increases for retired officers. Military retired personnel received only a 6 percent increase in retirement benefits while those on active duty and those who retired after June 1, 1958, received much larger benefits. The military pay legislation unwisely, in my opinion, established two classes of retired military officers—those who retired prior to June 1, 1958, and those who retired subsequently. Furthermore, the legislation destroyed the historic relationship that retired pay is a percentage of active duty pay. All service pay laws of the past have extended benefits proportionately to both active duty and retired personnel. Different rates of pay for retired officers of the same rank and with the same number of years of service now ex-

ists, depending on whether retirement took place before or after June 1, 1958.

It is for this reason that I have joined with my good friend, the distinguished junior Senator from Washington State [Mr. JACKSON], in sponsoring S. 541 which would correct this injustice and provide full retirement benefits to officers retired prior to June 1958. I hope that the Armed Forces Committee of the Senate will take prompt action on our proposal.

One of the finest statements that I have seen pointing out the injustices to our retired military officers appeared recently in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch on May 16, 1959, and was written by Lt. Gen. Samuel D. Sturgis. While on active duty, General Sturgis was with the Army Corps of Engineers and he served with distinction in our Pacific Northwest. He helped plan and develop the many Federal power and resource development projects on the Columbia River which have meant so much to my part of the country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article by General Sturgis from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, May 16, 1959]

RETIREMENT INJUSTICE TO OLD SOLDIERS—WORLD WAR II COMMANDERS RECEIVE SMALLER PENSIONS THAN OFFICERS RETIRING NOW

(By Lt. Gen. Samuel D. Sturgis (retired) in the Washington Evening Star)

The 85th Congress was particularly hard working and diligent, but one of its most grievous errors, although of little direct consequence to the taxpayer, was the tremendous injustice done retired officers of the armed forces under the new pay bill, effective June 1, 1958.

For the first time in a century, retired officers of the armed forces were not accorded the usual compensation based on 75 percent of the current base pay of the grade held on retirement.

The savings for which Federal agencies were willing to commit a gross breach of faith, as well as a hardship from the rapid increase in cost of living, averaegs only $13 million a year until these retired men die.

An important point receiving little or no consideration by the press is that the larger part of the regular officers of this retired group not only saw service in World War I, but furnished the top leadership in World War II and Korea—officers like Ridgway, Krueger, Bedell Smith, Mark Clark, J. Lawton Collins, Leslie Groves of atomic bomb fame, and scores of other army, corps and division commanders; distinguished naval leaders such as Radford, Denfeld, Fechteler, Settle, Carney, and Hewitt; and those who pioneered air power to its present heights, like Spaatz, Kenney, Baker, and Quesada.

To illustrate, a major general or rear admiral retiring after June 1, 1958, draws his retired pay at 75 percent of the new active duty rate of $1,350 per month, as against the pay drawn by a major general retiring on or before May 31, which allows only a 6 percent increase over the old retired pay of $807 a month.

This spells out to $1,014 per month retirement pay for a major general or rear admiral now on active duty, who may not have commanded more than a battalion in war, as against a retired major general drawing $848 per month who commanded a division or task force during World War II and Korea.

Some witnesses before the Armed Forces Committee have purported to say that the new schedule's primary objective is to retain scientific and professional personnel.

Such argument is largely specious. For the increased pay differential for these technicians is still far from comparable with corresponding pay scales in civil life. In the case of officers, the very fair and justifiable increases, will have little effect until the services make available to such professional officers a much larger proportion of general officer grades.

It is only necessary to cite the case of Admiral Rickover of the Navy and Major General Medaris of the Army Guided Missile Agency to demonstrate this fact. In spite of their distinguished services (*Nautilus* and Explorer), neither has ever been accorded three-star rank.

How can the Budget Bureau or the Department of Defense, in their recommendations to Congress, ascertain in dollars the difference in the measure of value of officers retired before and after June 1, 1958?

For example, take Maj. Gen. William Dean, whose exploits in command of the 24th division during he early days in Korea won him he esteem and gratitude of the entire Nation as well as the award of the Medal of Honor upon his return from captivity. What possible reasoning could the Bureau of Budget or Deparment of Defense employ to evaluate this gallant officer's worth in terms of retired pay at $848 per month, as against a 25 percent greater retired pay of $1014? That, under the new pay bill, will be paid to any run-of-the-mill major general who retires on or after the mystic date of June 1, 1958.

Plan To Aid Our Lagging Culture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 21, 1959

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on April 7 I introduced for myself and the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the U.S. Arts Foundation Act (S. 1598) to establish a U.S. Arts Foundation designed to stimulate throughout the United States the study and advancement of the performing arts. The Foundation would assist and encourage productions of plays, concerts, ballet and other performances by marshaling professional advice, compiling registers of theaters and personnel, and providing modest subventions to help with the difference between box office receipts and costs, both from its own appropriations and from contributions made by private sources.

Appended hereto is an article from the April 5, 1959, issue of the Sunday New York Times magazine describing this Foundation, the need for it, and what it could accomplish to stimulate artistic achievements in the United States, both for the sake of communities now neglected and for the benefit of our position in the world.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PLAN TO AID OUR LAGGING CULTURE

(By JACOB K. JAVITS)

WASHINGTON.—Culture only too often has been a suspect word in the American language. At the very beginning of the Nation, we acquired a reputation—now undeserved—for being crude and "rock-ribbed." As far back as 1842, when the New Orleans musical prodigy, Louis Moreau Gottschalk, applied for permission to study piano at the Paris Conservatoire, he was laughed down. He had come from America, and that was enough. "America is a country of steam engines," snorted the famous Prof. Pierre Zimmerman, who refused to take Gottschalk as a pupil.

The old traditions linger. We as a Nation are still, sometimes, looking for a practical return on a cultural investment. Unless something will "pay off" concretely, we often will have none of it. This attitude has long tended to persist in the thinking of our Government on cultural matters, and since the notes of a Beethovn symphony cannot be weighed and assessed, since the tread of an actor's foot on a stage does not rock the earth, our cultural institutions have been left by our Government largely to shift for themselves. Whatever men and women have done in the arts, they have done largely on their own.

Except for some tentative help during the WPA days, our Government has never given official recognition to the arts. Where most other civilized nations in the world have lent a helping hand to their artists, we have stood aloof. That our culture is in as healthy a state as it is remains a miracle. For, with practically no government help, we have created symphony orchestras, dance groups and a threater that the world regards with respect. Certainly it is a tribute to our people, and a testament of their aspirations toward the better things in life, that they have accomplished so much on their own.

But in a country of our size, the sum total of artistic accomplishment is not nearly what it should be. A few great orchestras in a few great cities, with large sections of the country foreclosed to serious performances of music, dance, and theater—this does not make for cultural adequacy. Our culture needs help and needs it badly. The time has come when the Federal Government must lend a hand, in accordance with the widely accepted Lincolnian philosophy that the Federal Government has the responsibility to help people do those things that they cannot do for themselves.

I believe that we can best accomplish this objective of strengthening American culture through the establishment of a U.S. Arts Foundation that would bring the prestige of the Federal Government to bear to develop more fully and to disseminate more widely our cultural heritage. To that end, I will shortly introduce in Congress a bill calling for the establishment of such a foundation.

Never has the time demanded such a project more urgently. In self-defense, if for no less selfish reason, we must be prepared to meet the cultural challenge of our competitors. Private enterprise has done a noble job up to now, but we found private funds could not do the job in the international arena. And private funds cannot take care of nurturing all the talent we now have, nor assure the next generation of every possible chance to develop itself to its full potentiality. If we are to measure up to the stature of leader of the free world, we must act as such; and a nation's civilization is equated in many places with its degree of culture.

Our performing arts need support in virtually every area. Our major opera, symphony and ballet groups struggle from year to year with deficits that become increasingly hard to meet only with private funds. Our young artists and creators must fight all kinds of obstacles to make careers; and many give up the fight. A helping hand must be extended to talent. A correspondent to the New York Times, writing about the woeful lack of string players in this country, points out that "the American Federation of Musicians will hold a string congress in Oklahoma this summer. We have almost 180 million people in the United States, and 50—yes, 50—children will have scholarships to the congress. It should be 5,000."

The American Federation of Musicians is doing all it can, and so are other worthy groups devoted to helping the musician, actor, and dancer. But ars longa, vita brevis—and their efforts are a pail of water in the ocean. The cultural surge in America is too big and private funds alone cannot keep up with all the needs of the national interest. For every city that has a theater movement, there are 20 that need one. Opera, even on a semipermanent basis, is missing from all but six or seven cities in America (even the proud Metropolitan, our leading opera house, operates only about 6 months of the year, whereas most opera houses in Europe have much longer seasons, often 11 months).

The ballet renaissance in America has seen the emergence of lively groups in representative sections of the country, but all of them, even our three big touring companies, work gallantly on a shoestring and would go out of existence if private funds were not wearily dredged up, funds that are not nearly sufficient to give the companies a sense of security or scope.

It should not be left to private enterprise alone to integrate the arts on a full-time communal basis, no more than it should be the job of private enterprise alone to support all the museums and libraries. It is true that, in a relatively few metroplitan centers, we have developed a rich and flourishing cultural activity. But the majority of Americans around the country face a meager cultural fare and, indeed, are blacked out of professional cultural activities for a good part of the year.

We are probably the only large nation in the world that does not have a Government-sponsored opera, theater, or symphony. England and Canada have their Arts Councils, Russia supports well over 30 full-time opera houses, not to mention orchestras, theaters, and dance groups. Nearly every country in Latin America pitches in to help its cultural organizations, often with results that achieve worldwide fame. Because Mexico, for example, engaged in a large-scale program of commissioning murals for its public buildings, the Mexican school of mural painting was stimulated to a point where it developed into one of the most significant contemporary artistic manifestations.

In Italy, one cannot go far without encountering a subsidized opera house. Virtually every city in Germany has its state opera, theater and orchestra, financed by grants from the federal, state, and local governments. In France, the Opéra and Opéra-Comique enjoy grants the size of which would make the director of our major opera house turn cartwheels of glee down Broadway.

Last year Austria spent $5,800,000 on its four state theaters in Vienna and plans a slight increase for 1959. This was larger than the sum Austria paid to its entire foreign service. Imagine: $5,800,000 out of a total national budget of $1,500 million.

Thus, while the proposed bill for an Arts Foundation might be considered precedent-shattering in the United States, it would be taken for granted nearly anywhere else in the world. An Arts Foundation in this country can be instrumental in helping to create a truly national establishment of theater, music, opera, and dance. It would give assistance to both professional and amateur segments of the performing arts. It would encourage performances of the best we have in great areas of the country where little is now available. And it would encourage widespread training and teaching of the arts so that more young people may receive encouragement and direction in realizing to the full their artistic potential.

The bill would provide for Federal assistance to private, nonprofit theater, opera, symphony, dance, and other arts groups; to accredited nonprofit colleges and universities and municipally sponsored arts councils and commissions for the presentation of and instruction of the living arts.

After the program is under way, it is estimated that expenditures under the bill would not exceed $5 million annually. (There is every indication that this amount would stimulate as much as $50 million in private activity in the performing arts, over and above what is now being spent.)

Responsibility for making the necessary artistic judgments and for channeling the funds would be in the hands of panels of specialists in the various arts, functioning under a 12-member board of trustees composed of distinguished private citizens appointed by the President. Those trustees would select the chief officer of the foundation. Naturally, the foundation would be expected to function with compelte freedom. Politics can and must be kept out of its operations, as politics has been kept out of the International Exchange Program of the American National Theater and Academy under the aegis of the State Department.

Such a program would, of course, be only a modest start. I do not envisage a series of Government-sponsored theaters and musical organizations. Nor would the Arts Foundation compete with existent organizations. It would instead complement them in the nonprofit field. College theaters would be given small supplementary grants for tours to localities seldom visited by the large organizations. Small cities would be encouraged to set up cultural projects along the lines established by the New York City Center of Music and Drama. Perhaps a grant to some of our important musical organizations would enable them to extend their tours of the Nation. If the box-office receipts did not cover the costs, the Government would help to meet a loss.

Professional help could be supplied to some of the more than 2,000 community theaters in the country. Eventually some of those theaters might become the nucleus of professional companies able to support a full season of theater. Traveling repertory companies would be established. Scholarships could be provided to some of the talented students of the more than 400 colleges and universities that offer degrees in the drama. Young musicians could also be helped by scholarships. Above all, so many neglected audiences of America could have the chance to breathe some of the cultural air they now lack. Who knows but that such exposure to the arts might stimulate the emergence of an American Mozart or Corneille?

The initial sum of $2,500,000 is, as noted, small—about one three-hundredth of 1 percent of the proposed Federal budget for 1959–60. But, small as it is, it would be a tremendous stimulus to the arts in America, if only by assuring the artist—and the whole world—that the American Government has taken, for the first time, an affirmative position toward our cultural heritage.

Perhaps the events of the last few years may have prepared our legislators for the creation of an Arts Foundation. For, within the last decade, our Government has lent a helping hand to art and artists through the international exchange program, supplying financial assistance to get them overseas. We were, indeed, almost forced to do so. For it is a moot question whether the Government would have been able to get the money, even at this late date, to show the world some of our cultural resources had not our great rival, Russia, started sending battalions—no, divisions—of its cultural armies all over the world.

It is not the specific purpose of the proposed Arts Foundation to send American artists abroad. But the Arts Foundation could certainly help to create such a renaissance of cultural activity in the United States as to increase materially our cultural stature in the international arena. The Russian artists, of course, do a tremendous propaganda job. Everywhere they go—and they go everywhere—they instill in the minds of their hosts, by word or deed, the argument that Russia, far from being a warlike nation, is interested primarily in peace and culture; that the great Russian bear would spend all his time and energies sniffing flowers if given the chance.

Repeated often enough, any message begins to be believed. The fact remains that the cultural message is international, and Russia spends enormously more on its culture than we do on ours, to the applause of people throughout the world, and to our detriment. Of course, the cry will go up in certain quarters that the Federal Government has no business engaging in an arts program, just as similar objections were raised against all of the new programs that the Government entered into to keep pace with the times and with the development of America.

Critics blasted the social-security program as Government encroachment upon free enterprise and the private lives of our citizens. Critics blasted the establishment of Federal minimum-wage laws as a violation of industry's prerogatives. Critics blasted the advent of unemployment compensation, of Federal aid to hospital construction, of the Rural Electrification Administration and of the Federal Reclamation Service as unwarranted interference by the Federal Establishment with the national economy or the rights of the individual. Yet today all those programs are accepted and regarded as integral parts of our society.

There are peripheral arguments against an Arts Foundation, some of them well-meaning but certainly refutable. Federal participation in the arts, some lament, means the suffocation of the creative genius of the artist. As if Beethoven, or Van Gogh, or any creative artist who ever lived was in the habit of turning down commissions.

An artist will create best when given the most opportunities, and happily, as long as he has entire freedom to create what he wants. He is his own master, not the servant of the state. In Russia, where the creative artists is the servant of the state, the esthetic worth of much of that country's serious art has been highly dubious during the last generation. As long as America remain America, that cannot happen here.

And what about Federal competition with private industry? The musicians in America will respond to this with hollow laughter. "What private industry?" they will ask. Virtually all serious, large-scale musical organizations in America today are nonprofit and are run at a loss. As for so-called competition with the private theater, the proposed Arts Foundation will not be interested in the big cities, where the commercial theater operates, but in the smaller communities, where it does not. The aim is to build up an audience away from New York—and a body of performers and crea-

tors—that will in the long run help the commercial theater.

In short, the Arts Foundation, which will not be controlled by a Federal bureaucracy but by distinguished private citizens active in the arts, will operate within the framework of private enterprise and voluntary association, strengthening and supplementing their efforts. It is our duty to help the living arts flourish at home so that they may flourish abroad, demonstrating to ourselves and the world the enlightenment and maturity we have and should enjoy.

We have already begun to recognize the fact that the world judges us as much by our culture as by our machinery, perhaps more so. The times are ripe for such an undertaking. Some Congressmen say that only 4 years ago they could not have supported an arts program without being laughed at back home. Practically nobody is laughing any more.

The Persecution of Strauss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 21, 1959

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Peoria Journal Star of May 18, 1959:

THE PERSECUTION OF STRAUSS

After months of delay and more than 2 weeks of stormy committee hearings, a committee vote is promised tomorrow on confirmation of Lewis Strauss, Secretary-designate of Commerce. Washington newsmen say Admiral Strauss will be confirmed in spite of all the fuss. Why, then, has there been such a sustained effort to smear him?

One member of the Senate committee has said frankly that back of the Democratic opposition to Mr. Strauss is the old Oppenheimer case. It still rankles the leftwingers. They never forget.

When Admiral Strauss was head of the Atomic Energy Commisison, it was he who declined to renew the commission's contract with Dr. Robert Oppenheimer.

A subsequent investigation brought out some strange and interesting facts. One was that Oppenheimer had lied about some important matters relating to his Communist sympathies and connections. The investigation confirmed Admiral Strauss' judgment. He had performed a service of inestimable value to the people of the United States. But he had also got himself on the permanent blacklist of Communists, fellow travelers, and leftists, just as Vice President NIXON did in the Alger Hiss case and as the late Senator Joseph McCarthy did in exposing a number of Reds in Government jobs.

Putting the finger on Oppenheimer is the real sin of Admiral Strauss, in the eyes of those who have been persecuting him. They have found other grounds for smearing him but he is being punished for only one thing—he raised his voice against Oppenheimer.

That this is the background of the opposition to Strauss is no secret. It has been buzzing around Washington for months. Newspaper columnists have published it. Editorials have discussed it. But nothing has been able to neutralize the implacable hatred of the leftists for Admiral Strauss.

The lesson for Americans is plain enough but many fail to grasp it. The lesson is that the man in public life most devoted to the interests of his nation is likely to be the man most savagely persecuted.

We shouldn't let that happen—but we do.

Testimony of Albert Mayer Before Senate Foreign Relations Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 21, 1959

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the Committee on Foreign Relations today heard the testimony of a number of witnesses in connection with its consideration of the Mutual Security Act of 1959.

Unfortunately, the questioning of some of the witnesses was so prolonged that it was not possible orally to receive the testimony of one of the private witnesses with unusual background and experience. I refer to Mr. Albert Mayer.

I have read Mr. Mayer's statement. It is excellent. I commend it to my colleagues.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Mayer's statement may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, so that it may be readily available to Members considering their attitudes toward the mutual security program.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TESTIMONY OF ALBERT MAYER BEFORE THE SENATE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE, THURSDAY, MAY 21, 1959

My name is Albert Mayer. I have come down here at my own expense and representing no organization. Generally, public or official organizations are heard at such hearings. It seemed to me that a private professional man with considerable experience in underdeveloped countries might be of value.

I am senior partner in Mayer, Whittlesey & Glass, architect-engineers-town-and-rural planners. We have done work over the last 13 years or so: in India, Philippines, Israel, Morocco, Ghana. The work has been for foreign governments, private business both foreign and American, for the U.N. and with both the Rockefeller and Ford Foundations.

I would like to speak about the importance and urgency of the Development Loan Fund. This is absolutely indispensable because it provides for types of development that are not bankable, but that must be undertaken if the development is to be systematic and consistent and not with enormous gaps and holes in essential aspects. Private enterprise cannot yet be counted on to step in, in anything like an adequate way:

First, because a lot of infra-structure must be made ready so that these enterprises can operate efficiently. A lot of work on roads, railroads, large-scale water supply, housing, etc., must be available if a new steel plant is to operate efficiently. These underlying operations private enterprise cannot afford to undertake on adequate scale.

Second, no matter how hard we push things, it will be a number of years before American or other foreign private enterprise will be getting under way on anything like a really adequate scale in those numerous new underdeveloped countries in which it is now operating only very minimally. Reasons: the one just given; the fact that it takes time to develop that infra-structure adequately; and because just to change the climate and to change gears from the present very low level to the necessary massive, adequate scale of operations by private enterprise, will take not less than 10 years, and probably a good deal more.

I strongly urge that the vote for the Development Loan Fund be to authorize it for a period of 5 years. No development work whether public or private can possibly operate efficiently and economically on a year-to-year basis, and it is only the most minor development project that does not take far longer than a year. Three years is a virtual minimum, and some take longer. No private industry could operate on the basis of year-to-year capital allotments. It is indeed wasteful, painful, and frustrating to work in a project and to watch the effects on personnel at highest levels to the lowest workers, of this year-to-year system. I have seen it myself in numerous places. That imaginative dash, that enthusiastic devotion which are really needed if the new democracies are to make and sustain the needed surge forward, these fail to develop under the stop-go system. We must not only give material help but fire people's imaginations, fire the imagination of a whole people. That is what gets things in motion, sets up a momentum.

Also, the year-to-year debate in this country, with its free-for-all, that inevitably precedes a vote on such matters, with its sometimes fearsome abuse by individuals of the countries we are later going to help, this is a drastic morale destroyer. The help which finally comes and often comes generously, is greatly appreciated, but one might say, in a sense, it is almost an anticlimax to the tension and sense of humiliation that often precedes the finally generous grant or loan. I have been on the ground and observed this, experienced what seemed to me this unnecessary dilution of what should be an event of unadulterated importance and excellence. I would be the last person to advocate anything but full democratic discussion. But there are certainly these drawbacks to it, and I see no reason why the vote for DLF could not then authorize it for a period of at least 3 years. I would prefer to see 5 years, during which time there would not be these concentrated unbridled free-for-alls in our country. We must certainly have these, but please don't let us have them annually or even biennially.

I would add these points: We must have the Development Loan Fund to plug one large gap in the massive development need of the world. But the proposed International Development Association fills another gap, and not quite the same gap. Let us by all means do our level best for both.

Finally, again as to our own Development Loan Fund, I believe there are other advantages in making it a longer-term enterprise rather than an annual one. We need better personnel than, by and large, we are getting for foreign work. I think better personnel could be found. One could write a fair-sized book on this subject. But one reason for this situation is uncertainty of tenure, reluctance to arrange leave going beyond a year or two. A long-term commitment which would be possible in the kind of Development Loan Fund I have tried to visualize, would make it possible to attract the kind of men we must have, and would make possible a stay by such men of a duration much more fruitful than the present

customary year or two. From this we must deduct the initial orientation or getting adequately acquainted period, and then the windup period at the end. Thus the actual fruitful period is very short indeed, excessively short; the waste may be up to 50 percent.

This Development Loan Fund idea is both thoroughly imaginative and thoroughly practical and urgently necessary. Adequately implemented in time and in amount, it can, as it must, lift both the sights, the tempo, the actual material accomplishments, in the underdeveloped countries, and above all lift their own conscionusness of and confidence in their accomplishments and in their ability to accomplish. This added dimension of confidence, of enthusiasm, of momentum, is what is needed to give real inner life, substance, and conviction to the democracies in underdeveloped countries. Help that is ladled out in small doses, that is drastically argued over each time at excessively short intervals, simply won't do this job.

Our Flourishing Maritime Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1959

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I enclose therewith a very fine speech by Capt. Gilven M. Slonim, USN, the commanding officer of the U.S.S. *Everglades* (AD-24).

Captain Slonim delivered his speech before the Propeller Club in Charleston, S.C., on May 19 on the occasion of Maritime Day:

OUR FLOURISHING MARITIME FUTURE

I appreciate the honor of your invitation to speak before the Propellor Club of the United States, port of Charleston. Adm. E. B. Taylor, commander, destroyer force, Atlantic Fleet, sends his regards. He asked me to express his pleasure with the progress toward the full deployment of several destroyer squadrons and tender to Charleston. Both he, and Adm. Harry Smith, our flotilla commander, as well as the entire destroyer force, look forward to future fleet operations from your naval base as a southern spearhead of seapower.

As a destroyerman and longtime local naval citizen, it is a real pleasure and opportunity to talk with you friends about your leadership in maritime matters.

The courteous and progressive actions of your Greater Charleston Chamber of Commerce have already given us aboard the *Everglades* a feeling of the warmth of your hospitality. Your enthusiasm for the great maritime future of this historic seaport of Charleston I can assure you is indeed shared by my men. They look forward with pride to participation in the attainment of your aspirations for a flourishing future. I sincerely hope that you will call on us for whatever naval help we can provide in the development of your community.

A naval officer rarely has the good fortune to talk with people who share a common interest and understanding of the seas such as I enjoy tonight, so with your indulgence I want to wade in the water a bit.

Water is a lifegiving and a lifetaking commodity. Water affords a dynamic concept. As a nation, we are moving toward making the most of our God-given water resources. Limitless opportunties are unfolding, opportunities such as you are finding here in the port development project in the Charleston community.

Water gives us a lot of hope as citizens. The ideas about water that the Propellor Club is churning up in our Nation's thinking will mean progress. There is room for much more maritime thinking and influence in our national policies.

The promulgation of a National Maritime Day is a marked step forward. Maritime Day provides a symbol of what water means to our Nation as the leader of the free world maritime confederation. There is a lot of power of positive thinking for men who contemplate the sea—its exploration and exploitation. There is a naval challenge also—for as the trade of our ports like Charleston is stimulated and grows, more naval strength is required to control the seas and protect the increased shipping, and our Navy must find ways and means of doing a better job to fulfill its mission.

Tonight, here in Charleston, we are celebrating our first National Maritime Day together. Both facts seem significant. Contemplation of what Maritime Day means to the community of Charleston, what it means to the Navy, how the two are wedded into the fiber of national seapower, has been a stimulating exercise for me.

First, I wondered how we happen to be celebrating Maritime Day? What were the events that led up to a general in the Army, President Eisenhower, proclaiming National Maritime Day? Frankly, this point was an intriguing one for me. Had a salty President like Theodore Roosevelt, say, or F.D.R., proclaimed a maritime celebration perhaps the fact of Maritime Day would have been a lot less exciting. But Ike liked the idea and he did it.

Actually this in itself was not too surprising. All of us in naval planning, as I am sure Admiral Dietrich will attest, had the distinct feeling that General Eisenhower when he was Supreme Allied Commander in Europe had an unusually good grasp of seapower and how it worked. For example, he realized why he needed sizable carrier striking task forces to protect his flanks and support his ground operations. His acceptance of seapower showed that somebody did a fine educational job. This sort of success is always a matter of real encouragement for people, like us, who think in terms of exploiting the seas for the solution of security problems.

Apparently the word has been getting around, and it has been encouraging. For example, a recent policy pronouncement by the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff in a communication with Senator BUTLER seems to be of particular interest for the Propeller Club. Suppose I read General Twining's remarks since his statement is such an important maritime matter:

"It seems incredible to me that anyone could argue seriously or with justification that new concepts of warfare obviate the necessity of further fostering a merchant navy. I assure you that such views are not held by the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

"If the catastrophe of a general war should be forced upon us by the necessity of retaliation against surprise attack, the merchant marine, after the initial period of devastating nuclear exchange, would pay a most vital role. Indeed, it might very well be the one source of strength of the free world which would pluck victory from chaos. With land transport damaged beyond easy repair, only merchant ships, capable of plying the great highway of the seas, would be able to carry the essential raw materials and foodstuffs required for survival of the major population centers of the world as well as our Armed Forces overseas.

"The Joint Chiefs of Staff annually consider the requirements for sea transportation in support of current war plans. Their studies of these requirements have shown, consistently, a dependence on the merchant marine for support of plans in mobilization and wartime. They are cognizant that a profitably operated merchant marine will provide the best mobilization base for rapid conversion to military use.

"It follows that, in the opinion of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the American merchant marine does have an essential role in the nuclear age." Since General Twining was speaking in his capacity as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, this provides rather impressive evidence that the ideas of water are penetrating the thinking of all services. Better understanding is one of the fundamental hopes of a true concept of unification, and it certainly isn't something a single service or single Chief of Staff will supply. The cross-education of officers of all services is one of the features of unification that the Navy most wholeheartedly supports, and here, I think, we have the reason why.

We are making progress and I think the propeller clubs of this country, certainly the Navy League as the civilian arm of the Navy, and the Navy itself realize that we face real educational challenge in indoctrinating a basically land-conscious citizenry about the importance of seapower.

This fact is well understood by the people of Charleston. By virtue of historic interest and direct involvement in the seas, the trade of which the port of Charleston has been in the forefront for many centuries in our Nation's history. We understand this task of wading in the water enthusiastically and stimulating interest in the seas to exploit maritime potential.

I am somewhat of an optimist. Based upon the reality of the National Maritime Day we celebrate today as a start—symbolic of the growth of maritime importance—I would like to predict that within the next 10 years there will be a Cabinet member—a Secretary for Maritime Matters to counsel the President. As I envisage the position he would administer a Maritime Department. His mission would be to formulate maritime policies aimed at an achievement of maritime progress and a merchant marine second to none.

But back to Maritime Day, what were the current events that led to the designation of the national celebration? Unquestionably, the St. Lawrence Waterway played an important part in triggering this action. The propeller clubs for years have encouraged development of the seaway realizng that linking a broad cross-section of the country to the oceans will mean a marked increase in the volume of oversea trade and hence national economic growth.

While the seaway may have triggered the promulgation it in itself certainly wasn't the fundamental reason. Rather, the growth of maritime commerce, as reflected here since the last great Great War has been the real reason. We find that our trade has increased to approximately $18 billion each year—the equivalent of our Air Force budget. That is the financial stake that all Americans share in overseas trade. World events are causing constant increase in trade, in the importance of commerce. This trend is reflected perhaps I should say stimulated, by unprecedented port development—this too provides a real reason for Maritime Day.

The people of Charleston grasping this importance are to be congratulated on their progressiveness in initiating one of the most promising port development projects on the east coast, its importance to the community is manifestly evident, it is a significant part of the national progress that is leading to substantial maritime growth and dependence on water. This is both a matter of avail-

ability of water and the positive motivation of people.

As we study the historic growth of our major cities we realize that there is a direct relationship between the availability of water for transportation, and the cities' progressive development. Very few of our major cities are far removed from the water. Most of them, as Charleston has grown up on water. The history of Charleston as a world famous seaport emphasizes this fact. An intriguing aspect for me is that this growth in importance is accentuated in the nuclear-missile-space age in which we are living. Fortunately the sea air still stimulates people to get up and go even though a spirit of defeatism and doom through massive destruction is still emphasized by some. The explanation of maritime opportunity and optimism seems very simple though, again it is a matter of what water means in terms of mobility. You must keep moving in the missile age. The man who is fixed is finished. That is why we are moving toward a national maritime strategy.

There is a technological explanation also—the President's mention of the nuclear merchant ship *Savannah* in his formal promulgation of Maritime Day reflected, I believe, a recognition that the full realization of our maritime future gravitates around nuclear power—and the capacity for sustained high speed strategic movements on the sea. We are moving rapidly into the age of nuclear power—and I would emphasize that we lead the entire world in nuclear power, it is our greatest strategic advantage—these are significant maritime facts, military facts of transcendent importance. The fact that Charleston recognizes this, and that nuclear power is vital part of its developmental programs is a matter of much encouragement.

We know that a nuclear division is being incorporated in the Charleston Naval Shipyard. Also that a $10 million Polaris project is part of Charleston's growth. Our Navy has progressed—perhaps somewhat slowly—but today we are building only nuclear submarines to steam under the surface of the seas. We are building a nuclear carrier, the *Enterprise*. The *Long Beach* will be the world's first nuclear powered guided missile cruiser—the people of Charleston were interested I'm sure to learn that this ship may carry Polaris.

But most significant of all of these historic events was the laying of the keel of our first nuclear frigate just last Friday. At last the nuclear task force of the future is taking shape—the task forces that will ensure control of the seas. I say the nuclear frigate is most important because it makes the most of the potential of nuclear power. By eliminating the strangulating necessity for almost continuous fueling of screen ships in fast moving naval operations, the sea keeping qualities of the entire fleet are vastly improved. So, too, is its sustained strategic mobility. Our ability to maintain the seas year round in the rough waters of the North Atlantic will now be assured. This will be a signific step forward toward solving the problem of the submarine menace of the Soviet colonial empire.

This will also mean a significant improvement in our readiness for limited war and hence our ability to limit war. Timing in limited situations is paramount. The prime lesson of Lebanon was that by landing the Marines of the 6th Fleet within 7 hours after Admiral Burge received the green light to go, Mr. Khrushchev was put back on his diplomatic heels for the first time in the cold war.

In nuclear power development, I am delighted that the merchant marine is pushing the Navy hard. This competition will insure progress as part of our program to achieve adequate strength at sea and a flourishing maritime future. The mobility afforded by nuclear power is a key element of the dominant defense role our Navy is bound to play in the future.

There is a particular point I would like to churn up a bit with you friends tonight—the first nuclear frigate is being built in Quincy, Mass. We are going to need many more. Frankly, I'm going to be mighty disappointed if we are not building nuclear destroyers right here in Charleston before too many months have passed. I know you and your representatives in Congress are keenly aware of what shipbuilding means industrially and economically to a community—what it means to our national strength at sea—and free world security.

The *Everglades* is moored just aft of the *Tidewater* at the destroyer-submarine piers in Norfolk. She has been ever since our return from the Mediterranean tour with the 6th Fleet. The *Tidewater* is a fine ship. The *Tidewater* is a floating example of splendid shipbuilding in Charleston. She provides convincing and conclusive evidence that Charleston must be geared to building its share of nuclear powered ships—for our future Navy.

I sincerely hope you members of the Propeller Club will push hard to get in on the nuclear raffle. There will be plenty of room for all—we will need many of these modern ships. It will be a rewarding contribtuion to our national maritime strength and the future of greater Charleston. This is, of course, the real reason for our getting together tonight to celebrate national Maritime Day.

In closing, I would like to say the wonderful work you are accomplishing in the development of Charleston's great port will help make our country conscious of a fact we know. The future of our maritime nation depends on how well Americans understand that our destiny must be found at sea, where the use of nuclear power, not nuclear weapons, can insure our strength, security, and freedom.

Highway Construction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 21, 1959

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I have brought to the attention of the House several times this session the precarious condition of the highway trust fund and that because of the upcoming $241 million deficit in 1960 there will be a serious breakdown in the highway construction program unless we take appropriate action.

The President has proposed an increase in the gasoline tax but I take the approach that we ought first to transfer to the trust fund the roughly $1.5 billion in automobile and truck excise taxes which yearly go into the general fund before we raise taxes again. Early in the session I introduced H.R. 4389 which would accomplish this purpose and I am happy to report that Chairman MILLS of the House Ways and Means Committee will draw his full committee's attention and consideraiton to my proposal when the committee seriously goes into this problem.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I insert an editorial at this point which certainly expresses my sentiments relative to so-called temporary tax increases:

[From the Peoria Journal-Star, May 18, 1959]

BEST WAY'S TO KEEP IT OFF THE BOOKS

President Eisenhower has asked Congress to enact a 1½-cent-per-gallon increase in the Federal gasoline tax for the next 2 years in order to help speed up the construction of interstate highways.

The President says he wants the tax only to be temporary. That sounds fine. Many motorists probably wouldn't complain too greatly about paying an additional cent and a half a gallon for a couple of years in order to get improved highways constructed.

The trouble is that everyone—and we think this must include the President, too—knows that there is no such thing as a temporary tay. There are scores of examples of taxes which were designed to be temporary and which were leived for a specific purpose which have lasted many long years after the time they were supposed to expire.

The luxury taxes levied in wartime are temporary taxes which came to stay. Admissions taxes to theaters and sports events are others. And even some of the gasoline taxes we now are paying were supposed to be temporary, but we still are paying them.

The intention when a temporary tax is enacted usually is good. It is designed to bridge the Government over a certain emergency. But when the time comes for the tax to expire the emergency either is continued or a new one has arisen and once it has been demonstrated that a tax can be collected it is easy to turn to it again for another "temporary" period.

There is only one way to guard against having a temporary tax become a permanent one. That is to refuse to enact it in the first place. And that is the only way in which Americans can hope to avoid having a cent and a half added permanently to the price of their gasoline. Don't enact it to begin with.

Resolution Urging Enactment of the Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN TOLL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 21, 1959

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, a resolution calling upon the 86th Congress to enact S. 1046 and H.R. 4488, the Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1959, has recently been adopted by the following organizations in Philadlphia: Local No. 30, Philadelphia Leather Workers Union; Hotel and Club Employees Union, Local No. 568, AFL-CIO; District Council 33, Municipal Workers Union, AFL-CIO.

I believe the resolution to be important and I wish to call it to the attention of Members of Congress. It reads as follows:

Whereas all Americans must be assured of a basic minimum standard of living if we are to maintain a healthy economy at home and a position of moral leadership in the world; and

Whereas the present Federal minimum wage of $100 an hour is inadequate to pro-

vide a bare subsistence in the United States today; and

Whereas more than 20 million Americans lack the guarantee of even this inadequate figure and are without any legal limitation on their works of work; and

Whereas these shocking facts constitute a grave threat to our national economy, a challenge to our moral standards as a people and a peril to our reputation as democracy's showcase throughout the world; and

Whereas the existence of underpaid and overworked wage earners is a particular danger to the well-being of the citizens of Philadelphia; and

Whereas there is now before Congress a bill introduced by Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY and Representative JAMES ROOSEVELT and cosponsored by many of their colleagues in both Houses, S. 1046 and H.R. 4488. This bill would greatly ameliorate this problem by raising the Federal minimum wage to $1.25 and including nearly 8 million additional workers under the protection of the Fair Labor Standards Act: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we call upon the Congress of the United States to give prompt and favorable consideration to this bill without delay, so this serious threat to the economic and moral strength of our Nation will be swiftly met and that the conditions above described can be corrected.

United States Can Use Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1959

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Camden Chronicle, Camden, S.C., of Monday, May 18, 1959:

UNITED STATES CAN USE FOREIGN AID

A double-barreled fact of life in this jet-space age is beginning to dawn on those Americans who are concerned with the health and vigor of our economy and our democratic way of life, and that, we hope, is most of us.

As the inventors of mass production, the natural offspring of an expanding, isolated Nation and unfetted initiative, we are no longer the proprietors of it. The techniques we developed are, for better or worse, now largely in the global domain. And their products, made in countries with wage scales a fraction of our own, are coming home to haunt American producers and to gobble up increasing portions of what had been our markets, both at home and abroad.

More and more in the postwar years American companies have been turning to the establishment of foreign branches or subsidiaries as a hedge against this encroachment. Probably the first frank recognition by American industry of the existence and importance of this trend came out of the World Trade Conference held in Chicago early this year.

Yet this is only the economic side of the problem. Arrayed against the determination of Americans to maintain our earning and living standards is the drive of the Soviets to win over the uncommitted nations and those who are wavering through trade deals that are based on political rather than economic gain, that can be made as attractive as necessary by the Reds, to whom profit and progress is nothing as compared with global domination and the enslavement of all under communism.

As a measure of aid in this unequal battle, Representative HALE BOGGS, in his omnibus foreign trade and tax incentives bill, H.R. 5, has incorporated the basic concept of a tax deferral corporation, an overseas subsidiary of a U.S. corporation which would be allowed to defer payment of U.S. income taxes until such time as this income is distributed to the parent company back home. At this time, payment would be made at the full 52-percent corporation rate. Such consideration would permit these overseas companies to accumulate earnings for expansion of the business, would check the flow of U.S. investment capital to foreign corporations, and, in the view of experts such as Robert M. Mitchell, vice president of the international division of the Whirlpool Corp., would even repatriate American firms that have sought profit sanctuaries in various foreign countries.

Previous to the Boggs bill, tax reductions have been urged to provide both these overseas benefits to our whole national economy and a new U.S. weapon in the ruble war, which is getting colder every minute. But, if we can accomplish these advantages through deferral, and with ultimate increases in Federal income, what are we waiting for?

For one thing, our Congressmen are waiting to hear what their constituents think of H.R. 5. Silence may constitute consent, but it's not much encouragement.

Minimum Wage Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT N. C. NIX
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1959

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am privileged to include three resolutions passed by outstanding labor organizations in my district. One by the Philadelphia Moving Picture Machine Operators Protective Union, Mr. Harry J. Abbott, president; another by the Compressed and Open Air Caisson, Subway, Underpinning, Foundation, and Tunnel Workers' Local Union No. 420, Mr. Harry Foy, financial secretary; and the third by the American Federation of Technical Engineers, Local 13, Henrietta E. Wahl, executive secretary:

RESOLUTION OF THE PHILADELPHIA MOVING PICTURE MACHINE OPERATORS PROTECTIVE UNION, LOCAL NO. 307, PHILADELPHIA, PA., CALLING UPON THE 86TH CONGRESS TO ENACT S. 1046 AND H.R. 4488

Whereas the present Federal minimum wage of $1 an hour is inadequate to provide a bare subsistence in the United States today; and

Whereas the existence of underpaid and overworked wage earners is a particular danger to the well-being of the citizens of Philadelphia; and

Whereas there is now before Congress a bill introduced by Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY and Representative JAMES ROOSEVELT and cosponsored by many of their colleagues in both Houses, S. 1046 and H.R. 4488. This bill would greatly ameliorate this problem by raising the Federal minimum wage to $1.25 and including nearly 8 million additional workers under the protection of the Fair Labor Standards Act: therefore be it

Resolved by the Philadelphia Moving Picture Machine Operators Union, Local No. 307, I.A.T.S.E., That we call upon the Congress of the United States to give prompt and favorable consideration to this bill without delay, so this serious threat to the economic and moral strength of our Nation will be swiftly met and that the conditions above described can be corrected.

HARRY J. ABBOTT,
President, Local No. 307, I.A.T.S.E.

RESOLUTION OF THE COMPRESSED AND OPEN AIR CAISSON, SUBWAY, UNDERPINNING, FOUNDATION, AND TUNNEL WORKERS' LOCAL UNION NO. 240, PHILADELPHIA, PA., CALLING UPON THE 86TH CONGRESS TO ENACT S. 1046 AND H.R. 4488

Whereas all Americans must be assured of a basic minimum standard of living if we are to maintain a healthy economy at home and a position of moral leadership in the world; and

Whereas the present Federal minimum wage of $1 an hour is inadequate to provide a bare subsistence in the United States today; and

Whereas more than 20 million Americans lack the guarantee of even this inadequate figure and are without any legal limitation on their hours of work; and

Whereas these shocking facts constitute a grave threat to our national economy, a challenge to our moral standards as a people and a peril to our reputation as democracy's showcase throughout the world; and

Whereas, the existence of underpaid and overworked wage earners is a particular danger to the well-being of the citizens of Philadelphia; and

Whereas there is now before Congress a bill introduced by Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY and Representative JAMES ROOSEVELT and cosponsored by many of their colleagues in both Houses, S. 1046 and H.R. 4488. This bill would greatly ameliorate this problem by raising the Federal minimum wage to $1.25 and including nearly 8 million additional workers under the protection of the Fair Labor Standards Act: Therefore, be it

Resolved by Local Union No. 420, That we call upon the Congress of the United States to give prompt and favorable consideration to this bill without delay, so this serious threat to the economic and moral strength of our Nation will be swiftly met and that the conditions above described can be corrected.

RESOLUTION OF THE AMERICAN FEDERATION OF TECHNICAL ENGINEERS LOCAL 13, PHILADELPHIA, PA., CALLING UPON THE 86TH CONGRESS TO ENACT S. 1046 AND H.R.4488

Whereas all Americans must be assured a basic minimum standard of living if we are to maintain a healthy economy at home and a position of moral leadership in the world; and

Whereas the present Federal minimum of $1 an hour is inadequate to provide a bare subsistence in the United States today; and

Whereas more than 20 million Americans lack the guarantee of even this inadequate figure and are without any legal limitation on their hours worked; and

Whereas these shocking facts constitute a grave threat to our national economy, a challenge to our moral standards as a people and a peril to our reputation as democracy's showcase throughout the world; and

Whereas the existence of underpaid and overworked wage earners is a particular danger to the well-being of the citizens of Philadelphia; and

Whereas there is now before Congress a bill introduced by Senator JOHN F. KEN-

NEDY and Representative JAMES ROOSEVELT and cosponsored by many of their colleagues in both Houses, S. 1046 and H.R. 4488. This bill would greatly ameliorate this problem by raising the Federal minimum wage to $1.25 and including nearly 8 million additional workers under the protection of the Fair Labor Standards Act: Therefore be it

Resolved by Local 13, American Federation of Technical Engineers, AFL–CIO, That we call upon the Congress of the United States to give prompt and favorable consideration to this bill without delay, so this serious threat to the economic and moral strength of our Nation will be swiftly met and that the conditions above described can be corrected.

HENRIETTA E. WAHL,
Executive Secretary,
Local 13, AFTE, AFL–CIO.

Speech in the Senate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 21, 1959

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, Prof. Philip K. Tompkins, of the department of speech and drama of the University of Kansas at Lawrence, Kans., recently conducted a study of speech in the Senate.

A year ago Mr. Tompkins sent to every Member of the U.S. Senate a questionnaire in which he requested information on such subjects as—

First. "To what extent does speech influence legislation in the Senate?"

Second. "Is speech in the Senate today more important, equally important, or less important than 100 years ago?"

Third. "In the future, do you expect speech in the Senate to be more important, equally important, less important than today?"

These findings have been summarized into a very interesting article which appeared in the February issue of the magazine entitled "Today's Speech."

I ask unanimous consent that the article be made a part of these remarks and printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH IN THE SENATE

(By Philip K. Tompkins and Wilmer A. Linkugel)

(Two Kansas University speech professors team up to present a survey of what speaking ability means to U.S. Senators.)

Authors of speech textbooks frequently justify the study of speech because of our system of self-government. Speech, they say, influences men and their decisions. We decided to test this concept by asking the Members of the world' most exclusive debating society—the U.S. Senate—how important speech is in this legislative body. We sent a questionnaire to each of the 96 Members of the Senate; 36 Senators replied.

Eight questions asked for points of information of interest to the members of our profession. Some of the questions were of the "open end" type; we hoped that such questions would elicit more than just a "Yes" or "No" answer. They did. The following is a summation of the Senators' responses:

1. "To what extent does speech influence legislation in the Senate: Very little, little, a fair amount, much, very much?"

Thirty-four Senators answered this question:

Very much	0
Much	4
A fair amount	17
Little	8
Very little	5*

2. "Is speech in the Senate today more important, equally important, or less important than 100 years ago?"

Thirty-two Senators answered this question. One declined to answer it because, he said, "I wasn't here."

More important	0
Equally important	7
Less important	25

3. "In the future, do you expect speech in the Senate to be more important, equally important, less important than today?"

Thirty-one responded to this question:

More important	0
Equally important	27
Less important	5

It is interesting to note that while the Senators feel that speech is less important in the Senate than it was 100 years ago, they believe that in the future it will remain as important as it is now. One Senator wrote:

"Speech in the Senate is assumed to refer to floor speeches. The importance of effectively presenting an argument or information is more important today in presentations before various committees. The general importance of speech is increasing—as a tool to present data and positions in a concise and effective manner, but the place of most decision making is in the committee room. The increasing complexity of legislation (on more complicated subjects) calls for effective use of the language."

Another Senator added: "You will notice that I mentioned that speeches on the floor influence legislation only slightly. This is so because most of the work is done in committee and unless a bill or any particular amendment is very controversial the Members of the Senate will generally go along with the committee recommendation."

According to the Senators' answers and comments, speech does influence legislation. We feel that the declining influence of speech is due to the declining influence of floor speeches. The loss of influence of floor speeches has been made up by the increasing influence of speech in the committee room. In fact, the importance of speech in the Senate may be increasing because of this shift of emphasis.

4. "What method of presentation do you use in the Senate: speaking from notes, speaking from memory, speaking from manuscript, speaking on the spur of the moment, all of these methods?"

Numerous Senators use various combinations of these methods. Those who use one method exclusively, or all of them, are as follows:

Notes	7
Memory	0
Manuscript	0
Spur of moment	1
All	11

Two Senators speak from memory and on the spur of the moment. Two Senators speak from manuscript and spur of the moment. Two Senators speak from notes and manuscript. Two Senators speak from memory and manuscript. One Senator speaks from notes, memory, and manuscript. One Senator speaks from memory, manuscript, and spur of the moment. One Senator speaks from notes and spur of the moment. One Senator speaks from notes, manuscript, and spur of the moment.

The answers to this question support the practicality of giving extemporaneous speaking assignments in speech courses; but they also reveal that other methods of speaking are used by Members of the Senate and therefore merit attention, at least if it can be assumed that other men in public service use similar practices. A reevaluation of some of our courses may be in order.

5. "Do you employ a speech writer? A. In preparing speeches for the Senate? Yes ____ No ____. B. In preparing speeches for your constituents? Yes ____ No ____."

To question A (Senate addresses) they answered: Yes, 14; no, 20. To question B (addresses to constituents) they answered: Yes, 12; no, 22. Many qualified their answers with such remarks as "sometimes," "at times," and "my staff helps." One Senator sent us a copy of an article from the New York Times of April 20 which was reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. We quote excerpts from it because they shed much light on some speech writing practices of Senators.

"The official transcript of debates in the Senate and House is frequently revised, amended, subtracted from, and even embellished with lengthy additions. These changes occur before the transcript ever reaches the printed pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Senators and Representatives are permitted to doctor and edit their speeches at will. It is for this reason that I (Senator NEUBERGER) have introduced a resolution to write into the rules of the Senate that no changes of a substantive nature can henceforth be made in the text of what is taken down by the Senate's staff of skilled shorthand reporters. * * *

"After a major debate in the Senate over an issue which stirs profound emotions, such as civil rights or foreign aid, I have seen many Senators sitting around a circular glass-topped table in the reporters' workroom, virtually rewriting the speeches and retorts just delivered on the floor of the Senate. Some will totally expunge comments made in the heat of debate that may seem indiscreet or unwise in the cold, gray light of the next dawn and in the inflexible type of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Others will be adding afterthoughts, which may furnish an extra fillip to a reply that was flat or ineffective when uttered under the duress of argument in the Senate Chamber. This entire process of addition and revision has impelled one Washington wit to suggest that a U.S. Senator, or his counterpart in the House, is evidently the only person on earth who can sigh, "I wish I'd said that," and then actually say it. * * *

"Indeed the practice of altering the text of debate in the Senate and the House is so prevalent that it actually has been sanctified in the rules which regulate the publication of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. These even allow Senators and Representatives to take home transcripts of speeches delivered in the halls of Congress, to be leisurely reconstructed at the fireside in the presence of handy reference volumes and one's family and counselors. If this is not rewriting contemporary history, then what is it? * * *

"Senator LYNDON JOHNSON of Texas, majority leader of the Senate, has said that there are few documents more important than the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Locked in its pages are the debates, the resolutions, the bills, the memorials, the petitions, and the legislative actions that are the reason for the existence of the Senate. It is a document which affects our laws, our precedents, and our judicial decisions. But

would not the RECORD be of far more value if it were immune to self-serving alterations? * * *

"The House of Representatives allows far greater latitude even than the Senate in tolerating distortion of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. A Member of the House can speak perfunctorily for 2 minutes on the floor and then receive unanimous consent to 'revise and extend' his remarks. He later can transform such sweeping permission into an address of 60-minute proportions which is published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as though spoken in its entirety on the floor."

Senator NEUBERGER labeled this practice "phantom speeches."

Authenticity of text is of utmost importance to the speech critic. He needs to take into account the widespread practices of ghost-writing, rewriting of speeches, and delivering of "phantom speeches." Since such practices make research difficult, members of the speech field might well urge their Congressmen to support Senator NEUBERGER's proposal.

6. "What course would you advise a college freshman to take in preparation for a career in politics? Rank in order. Place (1) behind your first choice; (2) behind your second, etc." The following five subjects were listed: Economics, English, history, political science, speech, others (please name them).

Typical replies were, "all are important," and "I can't rank them," or, "I think all have merit." Some of the Senators ranked two and three items first. They were tabulated as such. A first-place vote received five points, second received four points, third received three points, etc. On the basis of such a point system the results are as follows:

1. History, 128 points (13 first-place votes).
2. English, 109 points (12 first-place votes).
3. Speech, 89 points (8 first-place votes).
4. Political science, 86 points (5 first-place votes).
5. Economics, 78 points (2 first-place votes).

Others named (but not with frequency enough to tabulate) were: Journalism, science, languages, psychology, law, philosophy, and "hard work."

7. "Who is the most effective speaker in the Senate today?"

Many of the Senators were reluctant to answer this question. We had hoped to check their votes along party lines, but this was rendered impossible because some of the Senators failed to sign their names. There were 33 votes, as follows: HUBERT HUMPHREY (9); RICHARD RUSSELL (4); EVERETT DIRKSEN (3); WILLIAM KNOWLAND (3); PAUL DOUGLAS (2); ROBERT KERR (2); MIKE MONRONEY (1); JOHN WILLIAMS (1); LYNDON JOHNSON (1); FRANK CHURCH (1); HARRY BYRD (1); WAYNE MORSE (1); FREDERICK PAYNE (1); FRANK LAUSCHE (1); JACOB JAVITS (1); MIKE MANSFIELD (1).

This question gave the Senators trouble. A frequent reply was, "No one—depends upon matter under debate," or, "Anyone who knows the subject on which he speaks," and, "This depends on the subject being considered." One statement tends to support our earlier conclusion in regard to speech in committee: "Those who are best known for their speaking ability are often least effective. Those who are most effective in committee are generally speaking with the greatest influence." An interesting comment was:

"If you want to know my opinion as to the most effective speaker in the Senate today I would have to answer that it is Senator JOHNSON. Senator JOHNSON, however, is not as good an orator as are Senators DIRKSEN, RUSSELL, TALMADGE, PASTORE, HUMPHREY, and MORSE. He is the most effective speaker because of the position he commands as majority leader. That is the way effectiveness works to a large degree in the Senate."

8. "What former Member of the Senate (whom you did not hear speak) would you have most liked to hear speak?"

This question gave the Senators no trouble. They voted as follows:

Daniel Webster (17); John C. Calhoun (5); William E. Borah (2); Thomas H. Benton (2); Henry Clay (2); Henry Fountain Ashurst (1); Edward Costigan (1); Huey P. Long (1); George W. Norris (1); and Zebulon B. Vance (1).

In summary, the Senators do think speech influences legislation in the Senate. The increasing importance of speech in the committee room probaby compensates for the declining influence of floor speeches. The Senators use all methods of presentation. The practices of ghostwriting, rewriting, and the delivery of phantom speeches are prevalent. The Senators consider speech, as academic training, important to a career in politics. Of all their forerunners, the current solons would have most liked to have heard Daniel Webster.

The Members of the U.S. Senate—at least those Members answering our questionnaire—consider HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, the most effective speaker in the Senate. When informed of this result, Senator HUMPHREY wrote to us, "I am most flattered by your findings." We asked Senator HUMPHREY for his secret of success as a public speaker. Senator HUMPHREY wrote that public speaking has always been easy for him, but he was never satisfied with being just a "good" public speaker; instead, he says, "I have tried to develop my capabilities in this area by study and just plain experience."

Alaska: Eagle State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 21, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, one of the organizations which campaigned most actively in favor of statehood for Alaska was the Fraternal Order of Eagles. Now, the issues of Eagle magazine for March 1959 has paid tribute to our new 49th State in an extensive article by Mr. Raymond Schuessler. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Schuessler's informative essay, "Alaska: Eagle State," as reprinted from Eagle magazine, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

I am particularly pleased that Mr. Schuessler's article has paid tribute to the persistence of the junior Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] in crusading for statehood, an advocacy which Senator GRUENING also has shared with the able senior Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT].

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALASKA: EAGLE STATE

(By Raymond Schuessler)

Alaska's admission as the 49th State means a bright new future for our Arctic outpost and many eager hands and dollars are rushing there to aid in the job of developing this virgin Territory. Many of the hands and the dollars belong to Eagles who are helping to fashion our youngest State.

Pioneering already are six sturdy aeries throughout the State, who are tugging at the bootstraps of this vast untapped lode.

"It's a future we are all glad to share in," says John W. Gilson, secretary of Valdez, Alaska, aerie and president of the local bank. "Alaska's future is unlimited but it belongs to those who aren't afraid of hard pioneering work now and to those who know their gain will be over the long haul and not overnight."

One of the past aerie presidents of Valdez aerie is William A. Egan, now recovering at a Seattle, Wash., hospital after a serious illness, who is currently Governor of Alaska. "Just about everyone who ever lived here in Valdez has been a member," says Gilson. That's how important an Eagle aerie is in this undeveloped Territory. It's just about the only source of recreation in town.

Their clubroom is a hall roughly 100 feet by 35 feet. The downstairs part is used as a theater as well as the lodge room. "With the exception of the elementary school, we have the only hall in town for community dances," says John.

Like forts in a wilderness the Eagle aeries are bringing together the communities all over this frigid frontier, not only in recreation, but in civic betterment. "We have always sponsored community projects," says Gilson. "Right now we are sponsoring the Cub Scouts and the Boy Scouts. Whenever a community project is to be sponsored they contact us first."

There are six Eagle aeries up here at Skagway, Douglas, Ketchikan, Fairbanks, Valdez, and Spenard and all are working as hard as Valdez and Fairbanks (subject of a Home Town article in last October's Eagle) to give Alaska its proper stature.

Valdez came into being in 1898 as the result of the gold rush to Alaska, and Eagles opened their clubroom in 1913. Miners outfitted there for the hazardous pack-trail trip that led over the Valdez Glacier. Some of the flavor of the old town remains yet, and even the old road can still be seen. It has an area population of around 1,500 and is located at the head of a beautiful fiord almost surrounded by rugged mountains and glaciers. Its economy is based on fishing and trucking cargo to the interior. Valdez has stores, curio shops, a school, hospital, motel, dock, and airport. Average summer temperature is 53°, winter 19°, and snowfall about 60 inches.

Alaska is the new American adventure. It has been 46 years since travelers could visit a new State. Tour bookings indicate that 1959 will see the largest migration of travelers to Alaska since the gold rush. Alaskans who have not heard from the folks and friends back home in ages, suddenly find their mailboxes full.

Alaska is the only place in the world where the Arctic may be visited in comfort and on regular tours. This is the real top of the world where there is around the clock daylight in summer and twilight at noon in winter. At Point Barrow the sun stays above the horizon for 82 days each summer. We saw miles of the highest mountains on the North American Continent, an endless vastness of Arctic tundra, Eskimos in their unspoiled native villages, the largest bear and moose in the world, chipped ice from the age-old glacier that probably had parts of Brooklyn under its belly, talked with grizzled pioneer miners and alert young businessmen, and visited old sourdough cabins that stood in the shadow of modern 10 story concrete apartment houses. You can almost see the country growing while you watch.

Alaska's fight for statehood, ever since the first bill was introduced in Congress in 1916,

has been long and arduous. But in 1958 Congress finally turned our Arctic outpost into our 49th State.

Many times during the last 42 years the statehood bill was pigeonholed, other times it was defeated by Congress. Opposition came from steamship lines, some Federal employees who would lose their jobs, small Alaskan businessmen who were afraid of big chainstores, and, most of all, outside salmon canning interests.

Salmon canners from Seattle fought statehood to prevent taxation on their lucrative industry and possible loss of the entire fishing resources itself, since they had been using controversial traps (outlawed in the States) which shoveled in enormous loads of fish at the risk of exterminating the species. These U.S. commercial interests which have prospered from special consideration in a distant colony will now be subject to reforms.

Statehood proponents also had to buck military opinion which insisted Alaska was more "militarily maneuverable" if left a territory. Opposition to this view came from Gen. Douglas MacArthur, Adm. Chester Nimitz, Admiral Byrd, Air Force Gen. Nathan F. Twining, and others.

It is believed by many that Interior Secretary Fred Seaton, working zealously behind the scenes, masterminded the passage of the bill. One of the strongest protagonists through the years was ERNEST GRUENING, a former Governor of Alaska for 14 years, who campaigned vigorously throughout the United States for statehood. Ever since Alaska was purchased from Russia in 1869 for 2 cents an acre, the public has associated "Seward's Folly" with a forbidding outpost where only Eskimos and polar bears could survive.

But during and since World War II the public has become aware of its strategic and economic importance. We have learned that Alaska has enormous timber stands, 31 out of the 33 strategic metals, including America's only tin deposits, possibly more oil than Texas, more coal than Pennsylvania, hundreds of thousands of potential agriculture acres, salmon, great sites for water power, and tremendous game and fur resources. As Anthony T. Lausi, Director, Office of Territories, has said:

"Alaska is as challenging today as the interior of the United States must have been to the pioneers who pushed across the Alleghenies."

The big problem at the moment is the lack of people, capital, and transportation. But with statehood now a reality, Alaska may now burst forth commercially and populationwise.

Weather: Alaska connotes to many a land of igloos and icebergs. But temperatures in Alaska have the widest range in the world. For short periods in the winter it will sink to 70 below in some areas, and rise to 99 above in the summer. Some spots get 14 feet of precipitation, and others only 6 inches. Some spots are frozen to a depth of 300 feet below the surface and other spots do not freeze at all.

Alaska certainly is not a frozen wasteland. After all, three-quarters of Alaska is in the North Temperate zone. The southern area has the same average temperature as Baltimore and Philadelphia; the western area is similar to New England, and the interior is comparable to Montana and the Dakotas. Alaska's proximity to the North Pole is about that of Scotland, Norway, Finland, and Sweden.

Alaska's 210,000 population represents a tripling of population since 1943. With statehood now a reality, a population boom is expected. In time it hopes to support a population of 12 million. Women will find Alaska with a ratio of 16 men to every woman, a mecca for males.

The present population is young; about 42 percent are in the young family age compared with 32 percent of the population in the United States. The median age of the Alaskan population is only 26, 5 years below that of the United States.

It may come as a surprise to many, but this Arctic outpost which boasts only one college is very near the top in the education field. About 7.5 percent of its population are college graduates in contrast to the 6.2 in the United States. A second university, Alaska Methodist, is now going up.

Alaska's towns have the same pattern of schools, churches, civic organizations, Little League baseball, football, hockey (some unique sports such as sled dog races, curling, a $100,000 ice-breaking-up contest), department stores, bus lines, hospitals, and night clubs that are found in almost any town in the States. The exception: Alaskan towns are separated by vast areas of sparsely populated land sometimes connected only by ship or airplane. Here where nearly all professional people own their own aircraft, is the greatest per capita number of fliers in the world. In fact, some 20 percent of all seaplanes in America are concentrated here.

The real hardship in Alaska is the high cost of living, one and a half to two times as high as in the States. Orange juice costs 40 cents a glass, milk 35 cents a quart, gasoline 45 cents a gallon, a one-bedroom unfurnished apartment from $130 to $180 a month. However, wages are equally high; carpenters get $5 an hour, truckdrivers $5 per hour. Food costs may be alleviated somewhat when cattle raising and new, tough, hybrid wheat becomes established. But Alaska will never be able to produce all its own food.

HISTORY

Alaska has no history steeped in heraldic legends and centuries of glorious strife and heroism. It was only in 1728 that Peter the Great of Russia commissioned a Dane, Vitus Bering, to explore Siberia and discover where Asia ended and where North America began. Bering sailed through what is now Bering Strait and established the fact that this narrow channel separated Asia from America. When fur traders began to chase the sea otter along the Aleutians they set up the first permanent Russian settlement in the New World on Kodiak Island in 1784.

In 1867 Russia ceased its expansionist policy and sold Alaska to the United States. It was far from a folly. In 1859, Robert Kennecott, a young biologist, had explored Alaska for the Smithsonian Institute and the Audubon Club of Chicago, and 6 years later he headed the scientific section of the American exploring expedition which surveyed a route for a proposed overland telegraph line to Siberia. Kennecott had obtained valuable information on Alaska and gave it all to Congress and Secretary of State Seward.

When gold was discovered in Juneau in 1880 and later in the Klondike in 1898, some 30,000 prospectors rushed here, many doomed to chase only golden rainbows. Fortunately 20,000 remained to build up the Territory.

Today the country desperately needs settlers: farmers, professional people and just plain workmen. Millions are needed to help in developing Alaska's forests, oil and mineral resources; to fabricate timber, furs, and nonmetallic minerals; to cultivate the lands; to build roads, airports and homes; to develop hydroelectric power, and to build a tourist industry.

There are definite opportunities in this virgin country, but there are no get-rich-quick bonanzas lying at every corner. Most of all, Alaska needs pioneers who are not afraid of work, and who will not expect success the very first year.

Professional men and investors are urgently needed. With much work only seasonal, unskilled help must sometimes shift between two or more jobs. Odd and seasonal jobs are available in stores, garages, restaurants, trucking, construction and building (an extreme housing shortage exists), fishing, mining, railroad, schoolteaching, and office work. The wages are high, in keeping with the high cost of living.

Any citizen of the United States, 21 years of age or over, is eligible to secure a lease of not more than 5 acres of public land in Alaska for home, cabin, health, recreation, or business purposes. The only cost is $2.50 per acre and the cost of surveying it. Up to 80 acres can be purchased for business purposes.

Under Federal law a man can homestead 160 acres if he will live on the land several month out of each year, cultivate a part of the land each year, and build a structure on it. To many there will be new hope and adventure in the 103 million acres thrown open to settlement.

As Robert Service once said of the Yukon:

"There's a land—oh it beckons and beckons,
And I want to go—and I will."

Militarily, Alaska, at the crossroads of the polar skies, is of great strategic importance, for this is the shortest route that Soviet bombers would take to America's industrial heart. But aside from any strategic defenses, perhaps here where Asia and America are only 3.5 miles apart at the Diomede Islands, we can build a better bridge to Asiatic understanding.

Alaska is America's land of the future. It has the industrial and commercial resources to develop within the next generation into a well-balanced self-reliant economic State that will enrich all the 48 States it has joined.

Needed: Research To Prevent Disease in Forest Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 21, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, my colleagues will recall that earlier in this session I stressed the need for adequate research to prevent loss of the forest resources of our country as a result of blight and disease.

According to estimates, the annual loss from disease in the Lake States region is about 674 million cubic feet. Blight and disease, too, are often the cause of low quality wood supply.

Effective control of such hazards to our forest resources, of course, can best be accomplished by a sound, expanded program of research.

Recently, Mr. William A. McGraw, secretary-manager of the Northern Hemlock and Hardwood Manufacturing Association, forwarded a statement on the need for expanding antidisease research. Specifically, this fine association has recommended an additional annual appropriation of $290,000 for the Lake States Forest Experiment Station, aimed toward expanding the work of this fine station to provide an adequate program of research to protect the tree species of the lake region.

To call the attention of my colleagues to this real need, I ask unanimous consent to have a letter on the subject by the association printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NORTHERN HEMLOCK AND HARDWOOD MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION,
Green Bay, Wis., May 7, 1959.

GENTLEMEN: Today, on both the State and Federal levels, assemblymen, Congressmen and Senators are all striving to solve the problems of the independent logging and sawmill industry by creating committees to study the problems of timber marketing and forest management. In actuality, a problem of far greater magnitude faces the entire industry—the destruction of our forests by disease. It is estimated that the annual loss from diseases in the Lake States region, is about 674 million cubic feet and 1,987 million board-feet. This loss of timber through diseases actually exceeds the volume cut and utilized by the entire industry.

In addition to the current loss of wood volume, there are other serious aspects to the disease problem. Much of the low quality in the wood supply is caused by diseases. In hardwoods the volume reduced in quality is probably as great as that destroyed. Some new diseases that are causing severe damage locally in forest stands threaten to spread and intensify. The possibility continually exists that new and serious diseases will invade the region.

Any effective control of these diseases must be based on a sound foundation of knowledge that is largely lacking at present. This knowledge can only be obtained by research—both fundamental studies to provide a basic understanding of each problem and applied research to develop practical control methods based on sound principles.

There are many important and serious disease problems in the Lake States at present, and the small staff of scientists working on them is not sufficient to cope with the problem. The Lake States Forest Experiment Station has a disease research staff of three located at the station headquarters at St. Paul, Minn., and one located at the University of Wisconsin. We feel this research effort is very inadequate in relation to the magnitude of the problem and the damage caused by diseases.

To mention a few of the diseases that are causing much concern in the forest industry in the Lake States—Maple flight, nursery root rots, hypoxylon canker of aspen, white pine blister rust, dwarfmistletoe on black spruce and oak wilt. Maple blight is a new disease of hard maple that first appeared in 1957. It has caused severe and rapid mortality in a local area in northeastern Wisconsin. Although intensive study of the problem got under way in 1958 at great expense to industry, the cause of this disease has not been determined. It presents an unknown potential for spread and damage in the northern hardwood types which cover 9,308,000 acres in the region. Hard maple is the predominant species in this most valuable forest type in the region. Maple blight is not only injurious to adult trees, it also kills poles, saplings, and seedlings, and in some localities it has caused almost 100-percent mortality. The ability of this disease to kill trees of all sizes and classes and thus destroy reproduction as well as merchantable trees is the principal reason for the serious alarm this disease has caused. Some salvage is possible in merchantable trees, but there is no way to minimize the loss of reproduction.

The magnitude of this problem is of such proportions that it would be imopssible for industry itself to finance a program that would be effective. We are well aware of the great demands for a balanced budget and it is necessary to weigh very carefully each proposal that involves additional spending. We do feel, however, that a much greater loss to the Government in taxes would would be felt with the devastation of the important forest industry in the Lake States by disease.

We, the Northern Hemlock & Hardwood Manufacturers Association, along with the entire forest industry in the Lake States, do hereby recommend that Congress take steps to make an additional annual appropriation of $290,000 to the Lake States Forest Experiment Station which would lead to an adequate program of research for the study of the physiology of the hardwood tree species and the control of diseases of all tree species important to the region. This should also provide necessary programs and facilities and to sustain a staff of scientists trained in the skills needed for the solution of the problems involved in forest disease control. We feel that most of the disease problems requiring attention center on the northern hardwood type; it is therefore recommended that much of the work and necessary facilities be located within the northern hardwood zone of the Lake States region.

Sincerely yours,
NORTHERN HEMLOCK & HARDWOOD MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION,
WILLIAM A. MCGRAW,
Secretary-Manager.

Jake Waters: An Educator Who Has Guided the Training of Two Generations of Good Citizens in Houston, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 21, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, Jake Waters has been principal of George Washington Junior High School in Houston, Tex., since 1926.

He will retired at the end of this school year after guiding the training of two generations of good citizens.

This man is a fine example of the dedicated, industrious educators who staff our Nation's schools. I request unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Zarko Franks of the Houston (Tex.) Chronicle for Sunday, May 10, 1959, entitled: "A Hard Goodby—Waters And 'His' School Part After 33 Years."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Houston Chronicle, May 10, 1959]

A HARD GOODBY—WATERS AND HIS SCHOOL PART AFTER 33 YEARS

(By Zarko Franks)

A public school and its headmaster dissolve a 33-year-old alliance this summer.

He would want the school mention first. It's George Washington Junior High, Shepherd and Dickson.

Jake Waters came to it as its first principal in 1926.

Now he must say goodby at the end of the school term because he has reached 70, mandatory retirement age.

Today the man and the school reflect a satisfied weariness.

He speaks of the school with a reverence reserved for a dear friend. His goodby will come hard.

This school serves students from a humble area, including Old Heights and San Felipe, a public housing project.

Jake Waters has seen two generations pass through the big doors on the Dickson Street entrance.

He sat in his second flood office the other day and discussed education, his life work. He was asked:

"Which of your students have distinguished themselves in the community?"

"What is the measure of distinction?" he parried. "Is the jurist or lawyer or banker more distinguished than the San Felipe mother who is raising her seven children to fear God and respect man?"

He warmed up on his subject. "Is the personal life of the man who has gained fame as honorable as that of the mother who makes daily sacrifices for her young?"

He discussed his philosophy on education: "I am not an advocate of compulsory education. I do not believe the law requiring attendance is wise. A number of students are either not equipped or have no desire for academic learning.

TO BE HONORED

Waters will be honored at retirement ceremonies at 7:30 p.m., Thursday, at the school.

He says he and his wife plan to go to his "shack" near Boulder, Colo., after he leaves the school system.

They have no children.

VOCATIONAL NEED

"There is a crying need here for vocational schools that require no entrance standards, such as ninth-grade English."

He asked, "What's wrong with the old-fashioned apprentice system, whereby a boy is assigned to a good craftsman?" Then he hastened to explain, "I don't want to leave the impression that every child shouldn't be given an opportunity for an education. I do feel many don't belong in school. They should be allowed to go to work and learn a trade.

FALSE PRIDE

"The tendency today is to take a pride in turning out a good secretary for Humble Oil, rather than a good plumber."

Walters says he believes in wise discipline of unruly children.

"I've paddled students," he says, "and I've never had a complaint from a parent."

The major problem today, he says, is created by the working mother.

"Our economic situation, of course, forces the majority of mothers to seek jobs," he said, "thus, the children are deprived of their greatest need: Guidance in the home."

This results in problems to teachers, he said, and to the community as a whole.

Israel's Independence Day

SPEECH
OF
HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 14, 1959

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the most significant event in the postwar history of the Middle East was the birth of the State of Israel 11 years ago. That historic event marked the realization of the 2,000-year-old aspiration of the Jewish people. Today, on the 11th anniversary of its independence, we and the whole free world watch it grow, prosper, and

become the home of refugee Jews, and the hope of world Jewry. There it stands, in place of the old Kingdom of Israel, as a living monument, an inspiring symbol, erected by wise Jewish leaders with vision and foresight. Let us hope that more than 1 million homeless Jews who have found refuge in Israel, and have become its hard-working patriotic citizens, will live and enjoy their life in peace and prosperity.

Statement of Facts Concerning Alleged Abuse of Conservation Reserve Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 21, 1959

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks, I here include a statement by Mr. Don Williams, Chief of the Soil Conservation Service, which clears up certain published misinformation of great concern to his agency and others.

The statement follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., May 15, 1959.

STATEMENT OF FACTS CONCERNING ALLEGED ABUSE OF CONSERVATION RESERVE PROGRAM

Implications of unethical use of the conservation reserve program for personal gain by a Soil Conservation Service employee in New Mexico, as contained in an article in Scripps-Howard newspapers on May 13, have proved completely misleading and unfounded.

Ray C. McDaniel, Soil Conservation Service deputy State conservationist, Albuquerque, N. Mex., was named by Dickson Preston, Scripps-Howard staff writer, as one of a number of people who have been collecting what the newspaper termed "huge farm profits" by leasing State-owned lands at 25 cents per acre and then collecting an average of $8 per acre by placing the same land into the soil bank.

A thorough investigation has been made by the Department of Agriculture and has revealed the following:

1. The State-owned land, 640 acres, including 135 acres of cropland, was originally purchased by Ray C. McDaniel's father in 1930. Farm buildings were placed on the land but Mr. McDaniel was unable to complete the purchase and the tract reverted to the State. Since 1935 it has been leased by Ray C. McDaniel and continued as the homesite and headquarters for a farm enterprise operated by the elder McDaniel for himself and four sons, each of whom owns adjacent tracts which are farmed together.

2. The State-owned cropland in question (135 acres) is only a small part of the total cropland (1,107 acres) placed in the conservation reserve. Originally (1957) only 460.8 acres of private land were placed in the conservation reserve. Then, in 1958, when the Department of Agriculture was encouraging placement of entire farms in the conservation reserve, the elder McDaniel placed the remainder of the farm, including the 135 acres of State-owned land in the program.

3. Ownership of land has not been a condition of eligibility in the conservation reserve. In addition, in most Western States, State-owned lands are interspersed among tracts of private land and it is customary to operate State-owned lands, under lease, as completely integral parts of the private land operation. In many cases, land leased from the State stays within the same farm or ranch unit for generations.

4. It has been determined that conservation reserve payments made on this contract were normal, proper payments and that all provisions of the contract were in complete accord with policy and law. Furthermore, under the arrangements for receiving the conservation reserve payments, all payments on the State-owned land go to the elder McDaniel.

Thus it is clear that:

(a) The State-owned land was not leased for the purpose of profiting by the conservation reserve program since it was leased by this family many years prior to the beginning of the soil bank program.

(b) Ray C. McDaniel neither sought nor obtained any special consideration as a Department of Agriculture employee in connection with conservation reserve payments on lands either owned or leased by him.

D. A. WILLIAMS,
Administrator.

Steelworker Asks Why

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER M. MUMMA
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 21, 1959

Mr. MUMMA. Mr. Speaker, here is a letter to the editor that was printed in the Lebanon Daily News.

Mr. John P. Schauer, Jr., as a steelworker, union member, and employee of Bethlehem Steel, has brought out in his letter some interesting thoughts which undoubtedly run through the minds of many of his coworkers.

We always hear so much about what the top dogs in the unions are doing or saying and their feelings, but these little fellows in the union who just pay their dues do not have access to that type of publicity.

His letter, while not only very interesting, reflects his opinions which are thought-provoking.

Mr. Schauer's letter follows:

[From the Lebanon Daily News]

PUBLIC FORUM

DOESN'T WANT STRIKE

EDITOR, DAILY NEWS:

I am an employee of the Bethlehem Steel Co. I am also a member of the union. It is my desire as a union man to say that I am opposed to a wage increase at the present time. I have a lot of friends who are not employed in steel work and yet they will be affected more than I am will as I will be earning more but they, more than likely, will not get raises. I would also like to say that I am quite satisfied with my present wages. I am not alone when I say these things, about 70 percent of the workers would like a better pension plan, sick leave benefits, revert back to starting at 7 o'clock in the morning and other minor grievances. I also wish to state that if all the men were to vote there would be no strike. I also feel that a lot of the men who are presently working in steel plants cannot afford to go on strike due to buying new houses, cars, appliances and other things that are needed in the household.

I cannot see why almost 600,000 men should go out on strike because a few big shots say they must: it just does not make good commonsense. Right now the Government is trying to curb inflation, but if the demands of the union are met, prices will go even higher making it all the harder for people who are not working at steel plants.

I am writing this letter because I cannot see why a few big shots should dictate to the whole country—as I have stated before, if the union's demands are met. The benefits that I have mentioned in this letter would be satisfactory to everybody and would also help curb inflation.

I also think that the Bethlehem Steel Co. would be satisfied with these demands as they are not too stiff to comply with. I have one more thing to say and that is this: If the few big shots who draw up the demands of the union had to go out on strike with no pay they would soon lower their demands. They say that they do not draw their salaries; that may be true but their salaries are in the five digit class which is far above the average steelworker's pay. Consequently they do not miss a month's pay. However, the average steelworker cannot afford to lose a month's pay. Thank you for printing this letter.

Respectfully yours,
JOHN P. SCHAUER, Jr.

Lincoln as a World Figure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 21, 1959

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday night, May 20, I had the distinct privilege of hearing a scholarly presentation on "Lincoln as a World Figure," delivered by David Mearns of the Manuscript Division of the Library of Congress.

As I listened to Mr. Mearns' delineation, I couldn't help but be moved by the idea that the universality of Lincoln is certainly an exportable product which we can sell in the market place of men's minds the world around, and as the product is used we know that it will accrue to our benefit and help tip the balance of good will in our favor.

With that thought in mind, under unanimous consent, I include Mr. Mearn's remarks on Lincoln in the Appendix of the RECORD so that other Members can be prompted to explore ways and means to make the worldwide acceptance of Mr. Lincoln one of our most important exports.

LINCOLN AS A WORLD FIGURE

(Address by David C. Mearns, delivered before the Lincoln group of the District of Columbia at the Library of Congress Wednesday evening, May 20, 1950)

Dr. SCHWENGEL has, for reasons known only to himself, decreed that I shall discourse on Mr. Lincoln's place in the minds and consciences of the other peoples of the earth. It is, let me hasten to interject, a subject about which I am imperfectly informed, but it is one about which I have

some distinct impressions, probably unsound, and a few misgivings, probably unfounded. These I must proceed to pronounce but, mercifully, only for 10 minutes.

That abroad Mr. Lincoln should be the best-known American is, it seems to me, only natural and results, as it must result, from the position of primacy he holds in our own mythology. Here at home, the bewhiskered, awkward, listless giant has displaced those other fabulous creatures, the Noble Red Man, the megacephalic bison and the draped and Frenchified Goddess of Liberty. Symbolically, the festooned eagle, holding in its sinister claw the tools of war and in its dexter grasp a contradictory branch of olives, has flown away, leaving the field to groupings of a battered stovepipe hat, a rolled umbrella and a rumpled shawl. In consequence, it is not surprising that the image on the penny—the image on the 4-cent stamp—the image on the $5 bill—should be recognized in other lands as the image of America. Who of us would have it otherwise? He remains, as he will always remain, the most perfect product of our institutions.

But it is not only in counting-rooms and marketplaces and post offices that Mr. Lincoln is encountered in countries other than his own. Actually, he is a familiar figure everywhere: his statue looks down on passersby in London, Manchester and Edinburgh; plaster busts are distributed throughout the globe; his portrait hangs in the Prince of Wales Museum in Bombay; a cast of his hand adorns Nehru's desk. For more than 20 years a Lincoln fellowship has flourished in Hamilton, Ontario.

Carl Sandburg has written that "the facts and myths of his life are to be * * * shared widely over the world, for thousands of years, as the tradition of Knute or Alfred, Lao-tse or Diogenes, Pericles or Caesar, are kept. This because he was not only a genius in the science of neighborly human relationships and an artist in the personal handling of life from day to day, but a strange friend and a friendly stranger to all forms of life that he met."

Mr. Lincoln has always had his foreign partisans. It is only necessary to remind ourselves that his contemporaries included such advocates as Dicey, Goldwin Smith, Earl Russell, the Victorian widow of the Prince Consort, the workingmen of Manchester and London, Sir John Tenniel in the United Kingdom; Garibaldi in Italy; Louis Blanc and Victor Hugo in France. The Rev. William Makepeace Thayer's "The Pioneer Boy" was published at Athens in a Greek translation in 1865. The Emancipation Proclamation had appeared in Nestorian Syriac at Oroomiah, Persia, as early as 1863.

Fifty years ago the Lincoln centennial was widely commemorated. The Lord Mayor of London cabled President Roosevelt: "The Lincoln city flag waves over the Guild Hall today in sympathetic commemoration of the event." His Britannic Majesty, Edward VII, paid "a tribute of honor and appreciation to the strength and simplicity of President Lincoln's character." In Paris there were appropriate observances at the Lyceum Club. In Rome, Signor Nathan, the mayor of the city, attended a festive banquet. There were celebrations at the University of Berlin.

On this side of the sea, the incomparable Jean Adrien Jusserand quoted Plutarch: "It is the fortune of all good men that their virtue rises in glory after death, and that the envy which any evil man may have conceived against them never survives the envious;" adding, "Such was the fate of Lincoln." Baron Kogoro Takahira, the Mikado's Plenipotentiary, told a distinguished audience that "Lincoln left in his life a great example of a public man, not only for his own, but for all countries. So it is no wonder that his fame is worldwide and adorns the universal history of the modern age, as one of the greatest men that ever lived." At the Capital of Mr. Lincoln's Union, that magnificent Brazilian, Joaquim Nabuco, uttered prophecy, saying:

"With the increased velocity of modern changes, we do not know what the world will be a hundred years hence. For, surely, the ideals of the generation of the year 2000 will not be the same as those of the generation of the year 1900. Nations will then be governed by currents of political thought which we can no more anticipate than could the 17th century anticipate the political currents of the 18th, which still in part sway us. But whether the spirit of authority—or that of freedom—increases, Lincoln's story will ever appear more luminous in the amalgamation of centuries, because he supremely incarnated both those spirits. And this veneration felt for Lincoln's memory throughout the world is bound more and more to center in this city—which was the exclusive theater of his glory, and which alone could reflect the anxieties and elations of his heart during the whole performance of his great part in history—as holding the great preeminent title of being the place of his martyrdom."

I do not find that the Czar of Muscovy took any special notice of the event, but one of his subjects, Leo Tolstoi, told Count Stakelburg, at Yasnaya, that Lincoln * * * was a Christ in miniature, a saint of humanity, whose name will live thousands of years in the legends of future generations. We are still too near to his greatness, and so can hardly appreciate his divine power; but after a few centuries more our posterity will find him considerably bigger than we do. His genius is still too strong and too powerful for the common understanding, just as the sun is too hot when its light beams directly on us.

Mr. Lincoln's universality is profoundly indebted to his foreign friends. It was, for example, an Englishman, Lord Charnwood, who gave to a generation, the best one-volume biography; it was, until the advent of Robert Sherwood, another Englishman, John Drinkwater, who gave the most dramatic presentation of Mr. Lincoln's career; it was still another Englishman, Colin Ballard, who discovered his military genius. It was a Cuban, Emeterio Santavenia, who found Mr. Lincoln to be the precursor of the good neighbor policy. (Poor Santovenia. At last report, he was languishing in one of Fidel Castro's dungeons.) It was a Frenchman, the Marquis de Chambrun, who left us the best account of Mr. Lincoln's visit to City Point. It would be easy to prolong the list, but the hammer would fall before it could be completed.

In recent months, Mr. Lincoln has proved himself to be our most popular and our most acceptable export. Mrs. Benjamin Thomas told me a few weeks ago that her husband's book was been translated into, and published in, 13 foreign languages.

In furtherance of his sesquicentennial, the Voice of America has told the Lincoln story in every tongue; Radio Free Europe has carried it into the forbidden places. The U.S. Information Service has disseminated a ponderous packet of Lincoln essays and pictures (the work of experts) wherever there are reasonable signs of life. The Department of State has dispatched authorities to lecture on the Lincoln theme: Roy Basler to Ireland, England, Scotland, Europe; Lloyd Dunlap to Africa; Richard Current to India; Paul Angle to Japan. Everywhere they have been greeted by large, interested, and intelligent audiences.

Even in the press of the Communist-dominated world, Mr. Lincoln is currently publicized as an orthodox, card-carrying Commissar, foully and blasphemously betrayed by his successors. But the point to be made is the point that despite their orwellian perservity, hallucination, distortion, disfigurement, and procrustean mistreatment, Mr. Lincoln is nevertheless represented in their Russian accounts as a man without blemish, fault, or eccentricity. That is something of a personal accomplishment.

Yes, the name of Mr. Lincoln gets about. It may be now unknown to some lonely penguin, adrift on an Antarctic floe. But not for long. A nuclear submarine will surface at any moment bearing happy tidings from the prairie. Neither must the moondwellers remain indefinitely in ignorance. The first lunar probe can and will dispel it. There will soon be a Lincoln fraternity on Mars.

Mrs. Lincoln once related how, on his last day, her husband had expressed an intention "when he was through with his presidential terms, to take me and the family to Europe." If that journey might be made now, what a welcome would be accorded them.

Dr. John Wesley Raley Completes 25 Years as President of Oklahoma Baptist University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOM STEED
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 21, 1959

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, one of our Nation's most dynamic educators, Dr. John Wesley Raley, this month completes his first 25 years as president of Oklahoma Baptist University. Oklahomans and admirers of higher learning everywhere join in saluting his achievement and wishing him continuing success.

Under his leadership the Oklahoma Baptist University campus on Bison Hill at Shawnee has been transformed by an expanding array of new structures matched by an equally inspiring sequence of new ideas.

When Dr. and Mrs. Raley first came to Shawnee in 1934 he was among the youngest of university presidents. But already he had compiled a distinguished record that foreshadowed the years to come. He has built not only in material terms but in terms of an environment that has produced citizens equipped to struggle with the problems of our age. Mrs. Raley has recorded the highlights of these years of work in her three books.

As he begins his most massive project thus far, the new Oklahoma Baptist University chapel, Dr. Raley stands as an embodiment of the characteristics of an outstanding university president—forceful, wise, responsible, farseeing.

In the magazine section of the Sunday Oklahoman, Oklahoma City, of May 17, 1959, Jack Spencer has appropriately depicted Dr. Raley's work in an article entitled "The Little Giant of Bison Hill." Mr. Spencer's article is as follows:

SHAWNEE.—Atop a windy hill at the north edge of Shawnee, Dr. John Raley in the last 25 years has built Oklahoma Baptist University into a thriving and ever-expanding college.

No Oklahoma prexy, past or present, has held his place so long as the "Little Giant of Bison Hill" and but seven denominational

presidents in the Nation surpass his longevity. In a profession whose average tenure is 4½ years, the Shawnee educator has gained continually in friendship and general support.

What's good for Oklahoma Baptist University has always been the guiding star of the Raley philosophy. From that day when the young educator came to Shawnee from Bartlesville June 1, 1934, and found the university facing a financial crisis, the Little Giant has given unstintingly of a dedicated wisdom.

"The school owed $40,000 in floating indebtedness when I came," Raley recalled. "There was a refunding drive on, but it had bogged. I told the Shawnee Chamber of Commerce that never again would I ask them to help pay for a dead horse, that I would ask for funds with which to build and expand, but not for debt, I've kept that promise."

Oklahoma Baptist University then had total net assets of $428,000 when Raley, eighth president of the school took over.

Today, a quarter of a century later, the little Scotch-Irish leader has guided the Baptist school to a point where it has $8 millions in assets including $1,600,000 in endowments. Inflation, of course, has expanded the school's property valuations, but that, after all, was a minor factor.

At first, the new president of the Shawnee University had slow, rough going financially. But gradually, the tide turned. The first big gift, $10,000, came to Oklahoma Baptist University from the late T. A. Thurmond, of Ardmore, and that sum was the beginning of the Raley magic which has transformed a small Oklahoma university into one of the most vigorous and useful in the Southwest.

Mrs. W. L. Brittain, of Oklahoma City, then gave $25,000 as the base of the Britain Memorial Library and Art Center and the late J. Lloyd Ford, of Shawnee, one of Dr. Warren Angell's many admirers, contributed $50,000 toward construction of the new Ford Music Hall which now houses the Warren Angell fine arts department.

Angell, who has the distinction of being the only Oklahoma Baptist University faculty member for whom a school was named, has been a constant help and inspiration to Raley in building Oklahoma Baptist University. The far-famed Bison Glee Club and the equally talented Bisonettes, have carried the name of the school—and of Oklahoma—into many States in recent years. There are many who contend that other choral groups are positively amateurish when compared with Angell's beautifully coached aggregations.

Mrs. Rheta Mae Dorland, semiretired after 41 years, is the oldest in tenure of a talented OBU faculty which includes Caroline Meade, mother of television's star saleslady, Julia Meade. Miss Caroline Meade, incidentally, was a member of that first OBU class in 1911 which included the State's senior Senator, ROBERT S. KERR.

In recent years, much of Oklahoma Baptist University's expansion can be traced to KERR's generosity. He has made three gifts of $250,000 each and about $50,000 more in comparatively small donations. A new girls' building, the Mrs. W. S. Kerr Memorial dormitory, was almost entirely fueled by the senior Senator's contributions.

In the past few years, Raley has spent more and more of his time on the highways and byways of Oklahoma in search of money for his beloved school and to deliver speeches before religious or academic groups. The burden of administration at Bison Hill has fallen on the shoulders of young Dr. James Ralph Scales, executive vice president, one of the many outstanding younger men the 56-year-old prexy has developed.

But the placement of Oklahoma Baptist University as beneficiary in wealthy persons' wills, is not Dr. Raley's only interest in life. Above all else, he is a scholar, a deeply learned Christian gentleman. As far back as 1935, he was elected a fellow in the Royal Society of Arts of London, and his doctor's thesis is still regarded as a model at Eastern Baptist Theological seminary, Philadelphia.

The Little Giant's growth to his present prominence can be traced in his personal history: Farmed at Rosebud, Tex., his birthplace, in 1918–19; principal, North Prairie rural school, Chilton, Tex., 1922–23; teacher, American history and Spanish, Carlsbad high school 1923–24; pastor, First Baptist Church of Smithville, Tex. in 1927 to 1930; pastor, First Baptist Church, Millburn, N.J. 1930–31 and then pastor of First Baptist Church, Bartlesville, 1931–34, when elected president of the struggling Baptist University at Shawnee.

The $1 million chapel Raley is now building is the culmination of all that has gone before. It will be the heart of Oklahoma Baptist University, the beautiful and inspiring symbol around which the entire university rotates. The little giant has dreamed of it many years, and few Oklahoma Baptists will not be represented financially when the spire at last is lifted.

A great expansion of Oklahoma Baptist University's College of Fine Arts, headed by Angell, will come about when the chapel is completed. There will be 20 rooms in the new building especially designed for music teaching and all members of the fine arts department, except Angell, will shift to the chapel.

There will be a seating capacity of 2,000 in the chapel and a pipe organ for Mrs. Jack Reese, talented Oklahoma Baptist University teacher, will be a major item of the estimated $250,000 the chapel equipment will cost.

Members of the chapel building committee, some of them former students and all close personal friends of the little giant, are Harry J. Ellis, Okmulgee; Dr. Bruce Carter, Miami; R. C. Howard, Oklahoma City; Dr. Richard Hopper, Ardmore, Ex-Governor Raymond Gary, Madill; Dr. Warren Hultgren, Tulsa; Dr. Jack Baxter, John Goode, J. Frank Buck, and Judge J. Knox Byrum, all of Shawnee; Miles Jackson, Ducan and Mrs. C. A. Summers, Muskogee.

But though raising a million-dollar structure might seem climatic, Dr. Raley already is looking ahead to new buildings at Oklahoma Baptist University. The student union, though recently remodeled, is too small for the school's increasing student body, and an additional wing to the west is contemplated by Raley.

"We can never stop building," he declared, "because the school keeps on growing and one improvement begets another. What was adequate a few years ago is barely sufficient today and will be outgrown tomorrow. We have no way to go but ahead. I hope I never reach the place where I can fold my hands and feel that everything which should be done, has been done."

But it is not in beautiful buildings that the little giant finds his chief pleasure. It is in the knowledge that the school has produced and is now producing some of the finest Christian citizens of Oklahoma.

"I love these kids," Raley confided. "It's an infinite pleasure to watch them develop and go out into the world to build useful, happy lives. No, it's not the buildings that I'm most proud about. It is the graduates and the lessons we were able to instill in them and which they carry with them throughout life."

Dr. Raley has always believed that a strong faculty is all-important. In earlier years, like many Oklahoma school heads, he saw some of his finest educators lured to other States. But as time goes on, there will be less and less of that, Raley vows. He hopes to make the Oklahoma Baptist University faculty one of the highest paid in the Southwest.

A talented musician and writer of three books, the most recent of which, "As the Years Go By," will be out tomorrow, Mrs. John Raley has been a full partner in the Little Giant's career.

Together they have reared a son, John, who joins the Bill Atkinson enterprises on graduation from Oklahoma University law school June 1. The Raleys were delighted recently when John's wife, also an Oklahoma University senior, won the gold Letzeiser award as the outstanding woman of her class.

They also take great pride in their only daughter, Helen, who is now Mrs. James Robert Nash, of Waco. The Nashes have for a century been prominent in the life of Baylor University, and it was at the Texas school where Helen, a receptionist, met her husband.

John was 2 years old when the Raleys came to Bison Hill, and Mrs. Nash was born here. Both, of course, grew up on the Oklahoma Baptist University campus, and both were graduated from it.

For the past 10 years, the Raley family has lived in the handsome new residence north of the university. Prior to that, their home was the modest official mansion south of the school oval.

Ability to leaven every situation with humor as well as commonsense, seems a Raley characteristic. Recently, Dr. Scales was at an educators' meeting in Chicago; dean of men, L. E. Solomon, was likewise out of town, and when it came time for the weekly chapel, Dr. Raley inherited the unaccustomed task of conducting the program:

"Everybody's gone but me," he told the delighted students. "So there's nobody to prevent me from making a speech, and that's exactly what I'm going to do."

The student is all-important on Bison Hill. No matter how busy, Raley always finds time to talk with any who want his counsel.

Recently, when a group of youngsters came to Raley's office for what they called a summit conference, the prexy gave his full attention. Their every question was answered fully and graciously.

"Who knows?" grinned the Litte Giant. "Some of you boys may eventually be on my board of trustees."

Resolution Supporting the Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. BARRETT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1959

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a resolution adopted by the following four local unions in Philadelphia in support of S. 1046 and H.R. 4488, the Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1959: Philadelphia Newspaper Printing Pressmen's Union No. 16; Sheet Metal Workers Local 97, A.F. of L.; Laborers Local Union 57, A.F. of L.; and United Garment Workers of America Local Union 263:

RESOLUTION CALLING UPON THE 86TH CONGRESS TO ENACT S. 1046 AND H.R. 4488

Whereas all Americans must be assured of a basic minimum standard of living if we are to maintain a healthy economy at home

and a position of moral leadership in the world; and

Whereas the present Federal minimum wage of $1 an hour is inadequate to provide a bare subsistence in the United States today; and

Whereas more than 20 million Americans lack the guarantee of even this inadequate figure and are without any legal limitation on their hours of work; and

Whereas these shocking facts constitute a grave threat to our national economy, a challenge to our moral standards as a people and a peril to our reputation as democracy's showcase throughout the world; and

Whereas the existence of underpaid and overworked wage earners is a particular danger to the well-being of the citizens of Philadelphia; and

Whereas there is now before Congress a bill introduced by Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY and Representative JAMES ROOSEVELT and cosponsored by many of their colleagues in both houses, S. 1046 and H.R. 4488. This bill would greatly ameliorate this problem by raising the Federal minimum wage to $1.25 and including nearly 8 million additional workers under the protection of the Fair Labor Standards Act: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we call upon the Congress of the United States to give prompt and favorable consideration to this bill without delay, so this serious threat to the economic and moral strength of our Nation will be swiftly met and that the conditions above described can be corrected.

Mr. Speaker, this type of legislation has long been needed and would do much to raise the living standards of our working men and women. I urge that you and the Members here today give these bills your full support and do your utmost to obtain their speedy enactment into law.

A Tribute to the Good Citizens of Maywood, Ill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 18, 1959

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, May 17, the people of Maywood, Ill., joined in a ceremony which should long be remembered in the history of this fine residential community. The occasion was the dedication of a memorial to Company B of the 192d Tank Battalion at the site of the old Maywood Armory from which the gallant band of young men left to play an historic role in the bloody defense of the Philippines.

Veterans organizations with their service auxiliaries, boy scouts, girl scouts, civic organizations, fraternal societies and church and school groups of Maywood and its environs assembled for the colorful and solemn program. Thousands of folks turned out to watch the dedicatory parade as it moved through the heart of the community and others joined at the site of the ceremony for the climax of the program.

It was an occasion of mixed emotions, one of many recollections for the families and friends of those who made the supreme sacrifice at Bataan or on the "death march" after its fall. Yet there was a feeling that the event embraced more than a tribute to the members of the fighting Maywood Corps which is recorded in the annals of heroism in World War II. It was a symbol of solemn gratitude of the folks of this village to every veteran who contributed in any measure to the preservation of the ideals of this great Republic.

There on the site of this historic old armory now stands a bronze plaque with the names of each member of this gallant company there inscribed, and the "eternal light" which will illuminate this plaque after the light of day has passed will serve as a reminder of the gratitude, respect and honor which will be indelibly written upon the history of this typical American community.

Spain's Admission to NATO Should Not Be Delayed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 21, 1959

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, when the North Atlantic nations who are associated in NATO recently celebrated the 10th anniversary of the international organization, many people on both sides of the Atlantic deplored the fact that Spain had to this day not been admitted to membership. To achieve complete Atlantic cooperation for the mutual defense of all nations concerned and yet leave out Spain from this very vital defense setup is difficult to comprehend. It is neither logical nor practical.

I have always favored the admission of Spain into NATO, primarily for reasons of national security and military cooperation. In fact, in January 1957 I had introduced a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the United States urge NATO to invite Spain to membership. Unfortunately, our State Department never followed through on this proposal.

In recent months there is again considerable talk of the need to admit Spain into NATO, and this has now been further highlighted by the fact that Gen. Charles de Gaulle, President of France, favors Spain's entry into the Atlantic family of nations. The importance in the stand taken by General de Gaulle is due to the fact that up until now France had all along been one of the strongest opponents to Spain's membership in NATO.

What has become clear to General de Gaulle is gradually also dawning on other Western European nations who had heretofore been opposed to Spain. I believe that this is the ripe moment for the United States to take a firm stand in the matter and to point out to our undecided allies that in the interest of their own security and of the whole free world action on Spain's admission should no longer be delayed. We have important air and naval bases in Spain today which should be a great reassurance to all of Western Europe. In addition, Spain is now a member of the United Nations and other international organizations, so that there is no longer any valid reasons for denying her admission into NATO.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD an article on the subject from the Washington Star of April 1, 1959.

[From the Evening Star, Washington, D.C., April 1, 1959]

SPAIN SHOULD BE NATO MEMBER—EUROPEAN ALLIANCE VIEWED AS HURT MORE BY ABSENCE THAN IS SPAIN ITSELF

(By Constantine Brown)

Missing from the celebrations of the 10th anniversary of NATO's birth is Spain, which should be a member of that defense organization. This was recognized by the Senate some time back when it passed a sense of the Senate resolution suggested Spain's admission.

Last week Senator STYLES BRIDGES, the senior Republican in the Senate, asked in a speech on the floor that serious consideration be given to inclusion of Spain in the European defense organization. The State Department has favored such inclusion for some time, so did most of the other major members. But admission to the NATO "club" can be denied by one single black ball. It was cast by Iceland, which objected to Spain's participation in the Western defense system because that country was under a "Fascist regime."

The words "Fascist" and "fascism" have been applied indiscriminately in the Soviet lexicon to all who oppose the "democratic" views of the international communism. The government of the small but strategically important island of Iceland is leaning to the left, more from fear of the might of the USSR than from conviction. But it used the current Soviet expression when it remained adamant on the matter of Spain's entry into the NATO family.

The rest of the NATO members, particularly those who will have to bear the brunt in the event of a show-down, are anxious to have Spain included in the alliance, even if some of the governments may have some reservations about the Madrid government. But to the United States in particular, Spain's adherence to the NATO is of paramount importance. This for three reasons: one ideological and the two others practical.

Ideologically, regardless of what political fermentation may exist in Spain today, its people are strongly opposed to the Communist tenets. They will oppose with the same determination as shown in the past any Red infiltration or attempt to change the present regime to suit Moscow.

From the practical point of view, Spain offers us invaluable real estate and potential manpower. We already have 5 air bases and 3 naval bases in Spain. The Spanish government was more than cooperative with us when we suggested that we would like to base some of our fastest and most powerful aircraft in their country as well as create important bases for our naval forces. This brought about an agreement and Spain's participation in military and economic aid. But the advantages we obtained in establishing those bases far outstrip the more than $1 billion economic and military aid we have given Spain over the last 5 years.

We don't know how much longer we shall be able to keep our air bases in Morocco. If the Algerian strife ends soon with a victory for the French the chances are that the present Moroccan regime will survive

and we can keep our bases. But if the Algerian rebellion is protracted, the rule of the Sultan will be threatened and we may be forced out. These were among the considerations which prompted us to approach Spain in 1953 with the suggestion that we establish air and naval bases in its territory. The resulting agreement brought something which is tantamount to an alliance between the United States and Spain.

President Eisenhower and the Joint Chiefs of Staff have repeatedly stated that we cannot possibly match the Russians in ground forces. We have today 15 divisions to the Soviet Union's 176. But our allies in the Far and Middle East have a sizable number of infantrymen under arms. Not so in Europe.

Besides our 5 divisions, there are fewer than 10 others available for immediate action between the Elbe and Rhine. The Italians are developing an imposing military defense. Their role is confined, however, to only one particular area.

Spain could provide with ease 18 full-strength divisions available for the defense of Western Europe as well as the Mediterranean. These men are conscripts who serve in the Spanish army between 2 and 3 years. But except for one division all are, equipped with pre-World War II arms. And Spain, not being a member of the NATO, cannot benefit militarily from the United States as the NATO members do.

We want Spain in the NATO. Some of the major members want her, too. Yet she is being kept out to the detriment of the NATO more than to her own.

Invasion of Homes Without Due Process of Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES A. HALEY
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 21, 1959

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, the American people are becoming very concerned over a matter very close to them. The issue that has caused their concern is freedom, liberty, and rights of the individual. As a result, organizations of private citizens are being formed all over the country. Many of these groups adopt a name such as, "Fighters for Constitutional Rights," and the like. They constitute a group of fine solid citizens, and their voices are beginning to be heard.

I bring to the attention of my colleagues a petition which I have received from one of these groups, Sarasota's Fighters for Constitutional Rights, which has been organized in my congressional district:

SARASOTA'S FIGHTERS FOR CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS,
Sarasota, Fla., May 12, 1959.

Congressman JAMES A. HALEY,
Office of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HALEY: We respectfully request you to introduce the following on the floor of the Congress and have same read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

"To the Senators and Representatives of the People, in Congress Assembled:

"Replying to the integrity of the first amendment to the United States of America, which we, at least, choose to interpret as guaranteeing, among other things, the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances * * *.

"We, Sarasota's Fighters for Constitutional Rights, have so assembled, deliberated and now wish to record with the Congress our deep-seated grievance with the recent action of our Supreme Court in overriding the fourth amendment by affirming the power of a health inspector to invade our homes without a warrant, or without our permission.

"It is, and has long been, a cherished aspect of our feelings of freedom and security, that no one may invade our homes and our privacy without due process of law. The breaking down of this constitutional barrier to the unauthorized inroads of petty bureaucrats strikes at the very heart and soul of the moral fiber of this free people, and opens the door to those graver transgressions which history shows are bound to ensue if this trend is allowed to go unchecked.

"It is high time the Congress takes not only cognizance of, but action to stop, this continuing amending of the Constitution in a direction contrary to its original intent, in a direction which is nullifying one after another the limitations on governmental power which the far-seeing Founding Fathers in this wisdom so wisely imposed, in a direction which is completely reprehensible to the people that call themselves free, and which is being carried out by our Supreme Court by the flagrant, and admitted, abuse of the term interpretation.

"We, therefore, petition the Congress to act, not only in this, but in all prior and similar matters, and to regain for themselves, the duly elected representatives of the people, the legislative powers which have been and are being usurped by our Supreme Court.

"Adopted by unanimous vote and acclaim this seventh day of May 1959.

"SARASOTA'S FIGHTERS FOR CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS.
"MRS. ROBERT DE VANEY,
"Secretary."

Wheat Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED MARSHALL
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 21, 1959

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include correspondence between the Honorable ROY W. WIER, Representative of the Third District of Minnesota, and Mr. M. W. Thatcher, general manager of the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association and president of the National Federation of Grain Cooperatives.

In response to a telegram received by a number of us from Mr. Thatcher, Congressman WIER wrote a letter which goes to the heart of the present trouble in agriculture. Once again, he displays an understanding of farm problems which has made him a true friend of agriculture in the House of Representatives.

The telegram and letter follow:

ST. PAUL, MINN., *May 18, 1959.*

Representative ROY W. WIER,
Washington, D.C.:

Last week the House Agriculture Committee gave the President what he asked for—a wheat bill to meet an impending disaster in wheat. The bill recommended that wheat acreage be cut 30 percent next year and the price support be boosted as much as 20 percent. While this would reduce the wheat surplus there is some question as to whether the price increase is enough to protect family-farmer income.

But since then there has been too much jockeying around—too much backing and filling—and too much evidence of retreat in Congress. The House Agriculture Committee has recalled its bill. The Senate Agriculture Committee has reported out a bill that is unsatisfactory to farmers—and could well play into the hands of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Congress ought to know how farmers feel. No wheat farmer can willingly accept a big cut in acreage unless he is sure of a substantial increase in the support price—to protect his income. Every farmer knows the Senate Agriculture Committee bill will not reduce production by a single acre or a single bushel. It only cuts the farmer's pay. This kind of a bill is doing just what the Secretary of Agriculture wants. It is the kind of a bill that will help kill all price supports. Farmers in our spring wheat States expect their Congressmen to stand up and be counted. They expect something more from the Agriculture Committee members than committee room politics. To say that this bill—or that bill—will not pass Congress or get by the President's veto will not satisfy farmers.

Farmers expect the House and Senate Agriculture Committees to agree on a sound and reasonable wheat bill that will protect the income of producers and reduce wheat production. Anything less is unsatisfactory. At the moment, farmers are wondering whether many of the committee members do not know what they want, or are pliable to pressure from the Department of Agriculture. To argue that a good farm bill is not politically acceptable is no argument at all. Let the farm committee members do the best job they can and then let Congress decide whether the bill will give farmers a fair break. Then it is up to the President to decide whether or not he will veto a fair break for farmers, then the record is there—for everyone to see.

M. W. THATCHER,
General Manager Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association and President, National Federation of Grain Cooperatives.

MAY 19, 1959.

M. W. THATCHER,
General Manager, Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association, St. Paul, Minn.

DEAR SIR: I have read your telegram of May 18 covering the agricultural situation as it exists today with a great deal of interest. As one who watched the agricultural decline and crash in the 1920's and the early 1930's, I cannot help but be deeply concerned at the present agricultural trend. Following the last crash, when the farm land, to a large extent, fell into the hands of the mortgage holders and the big insurance companies as well as the State of Minnesota through its Rural Credits Act, the farmers to a large degree thanks to their industry, thrift, and energy, were able to pull themselves out.

Just what the results of the present situation will be is something for one gifted with prophecy. I hesitate to contemplate it as I have no desire to be known as an apostle of gloom. Nevertheless, if the farmer is able to pull out of this one that is now pending due to the 6 years' efforts of the present administration led by Mr. Benson to destroy the very minimum of protection the farmers might enjoy, is beyond my capacity to foretell.

Sometimes I wonder just how many beatings the farmer can take and still hold up his

head and be recognized as a desirable citizen. Wherever communism might hold sway in the world, nothing in my estimation has been more unjust in economic effects than the treatment of our American farmers.

Not being a member of the Agriculture Committee, I have little to do with the formulating of a program calculated to meet the present emergency; but I assure you, and I think that you will recognize this from the record, that I shall at all times be found in their battle, for the farmer when the chips are down. And I must say that I feel a deep appreciation to you and the Farmers Union for helping and guiding me through the better than 10 years I have been in Congress in matters affecting our agriculture.

Very truly yours,

ROY W. WIER,
Member of Congress, Third District, Minnesota.

Townsend Plan, H.R. 4000, Is the Essence of the Golden Rule

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. OLIVER
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 21, 1959

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call my colleagues' attention to a report recently issued by the Heller Committee for Research in Social Economics of the University of California. The researchers found that in 1958 a wage earner with two children needed $6,086.88 a year if he lived in a rented home, or $6,435.11 a year if he owned his own home, in order to give his family the standard of living that public opinion currently recognizes as necessary to health and reasonably comfortable living.

To put it another way, the man who rented his home should have had $117 a week and the man who owned his home needed $123.75 a week. The actual average weekly earnings of factory workers in California in 1958 was $83.71—a far cry from the standard the Heller committee deems desirable.

It is quite obvious that even people who are engaged in gainful employment are victims of the gap which separates income and the costs of living—this despite the fact that employed persons often are able to adjust to some extent by obtaining increases in wages and salaries.

The Heller report, it seems to me, also serves to dramatize a situation with which it is not even concerned. I refer to the plight of persons who are retired and are living on fixed incomes such as social security benefits. There is no way for these people to adjust to increasing costs of living.

I am familiar with the argument that the 85th Congress took cognizance of rising costs by increasing social security benefits an average of 7 percent. But this was a "cost-of-living adjustment" in name only, for at the time we passed the bill, costs already has risen by 8 percent since the previous social security increase, and since last summer they have continued to rise, with the result that social security benefits were outdated before the increases became effective. Moreover, the old level of benefits was so palpably inadequate that the tiny 7 percent increase amounted to scarcely more than a drop in the bucket.

This whole problem of relating income to living costs has achieved the dimensions of a national challenge. People still on a payroll may perhaps enjoy some protection, but those already retired are at the mercy of an expanding society. Naturally, we want our economy to expand, but expansion seems to bring with it, higher prices. Surely we are not going to accept the blessings of expansion by penalizing those who are helpless to accommodate themselves to the price spiral.

I believe there is an answer to the problem and that it is contained in H.R. 4000, introduced by our colleague, Congressman BALTNIK of Minnesota. This proposed legislation, more familiarly known as the Townsend Plan bill, would correct what I believe to be one of the major shortcomings of the present Social Security Act. It would create a system under which retirement benefits would keep pace with the cost of living. H.R. 4000 proposes a modest tax on gross receipts. In times of high prices, and thus a high volume of gross receipts, the tax naturally would raise more revenue, and since this revenue would be immediately distributed in the form of benefits, it would enable recipients to cope realistically with the higher level of payments.

We have accepted the principle of parity for farmers; why should we not also provide parity for pensioners? We have been unable to do this under the present social security system, and the result has been grave discrimination against those saddled with fixed incomes. But we can provide a measure of parity with H.R. 4000.

It is the only retirement proposal I know of which has a built-in system to guarantee that pensioners will always, and at any given time, receive benefits in terms of purchasing power geared to price structure at the time the benefits are received.

It was over 25 years ago, Mr. Speaker, that I first was convinced that a retirement income or old-age pension system, as you may prefer to label it, could be the vehicle for the distribution of dollar dividends which would mean security for our senior citizens and jobs for our youth. Since then and to some substantial extent because of the organizational work of the national Townsend leadership, social security was enacted. Today, even though inadequate, this social legislation is the sole support and hope of millions of our worthy citizens. But we need to do more. We can do more. Our economy will prosper to such extent as we improve the living standards of those of our people who are now only existing on poverty-ridden and disease-infected levels. While in Maine recently, I was continuously approached by my constituents in the retirement-age brackets, asking when could they expect more realistic pension incomes.

The principle outlined in H.R. 4000 is a humanitarian principle. It is the essence of the Golden Rule written into a legislative proposal. But, more than that, it has the economic promise of a social dividend taken from the top of our gross national product, which would serve as a most effective built-in stabilizer against recessions, unemployment, and stagnation of our economy. H.R. 4000 means real security for our retired citizens and growth and expansion for all.

The Eve of St. Bartholomew and Its Aftermath

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 21, 1959

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speak, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by Chaplain (Col.) Robert S. Hall of the Citadel, before the South Carolina Huguenot Society, April 13, 1959:

THE EVE OF ST. BARTHOLOMEW AND ITS AFTERMATH

The massacre of the Huguenots in Paris occurred on the night of St. Bartholomew's Day, August 24, 1572. The marriage of Catharine de Medicis' daughter started the bloodshed. A bell called the citizens to arms and the battle raged with the fury of despair which grew out of the feud in France between the house of Guise and the Catholics, on the one hand, and the house of Conde and the Huguenots on the other. The mortality cannot be determined with even approximate accuracy, as estimates, varying from 2,000 to 100,000, show. Coligny, sought out by Guise himself, was among the first to fall. The two young Huguenot princes, Conde and Henry of Navarre, are said to have ransomed their lives by denying their religion. It is not likely, however, that this would have saved them, had not Catharine, preceiving that their death would have reacted against her by demoralizing the party opposed to Guise and leaving him with unlimited power, induced her son to knowledge before the Parlement his sole responsibility for the deed. The real part which the king took is hard to determine. The pope ordered a medal to be struck in commemoration of the event and sent Cardinal Orsini to convey in person his felicitations to the queen mother.

French Protestantism was a native product of 1512–59. It had no roots in the past, for the Albigenses had been exterminated, the Waldenses had emigrated, the University of Paris was the center of scholasticism, and the reforms of Gerson contemplated no breach with medieval theology. Except for the encouragement given by the sight of other successful revolts from Rome, it owed little to foreign influences. On the other hand, the system of doctrine thought out by Calvin, and the organization elaborated in Paris, have been adopted to some extent in every Protestant country except Scandinavia; while French Protestant exiles have enriched, not north Europe alone, but America and South Africa.

Jacques Lefevre was the Erasmus of the French reform, laying billets he feared to kindle. By 1512, following the example of Colet, he published a new annotated Latin version of Paul's epistles, recognizing his doctrine of justification. In 1523 he began to revise the classical French version of the Vulgate.

The leader was John Calvin (1509–64), a Picard, trained in theology and law; but in 1534 he had to flee owing to his friend Nicolas Cop advocating evangelical views in his rectorial address at Paris. Finding that the movement was imperiled by the supposed anarchism of the Anabaptists and by some of their tenets, he published in 1536 the Institutes of the Christian Religion, casting the purified metal into the old molds, but adding two selections dealing with the current slanders, and dedicating the work to Francis. The book was the first valuable dogmatic treatise, and soon was enlarged and translated widely.

Some adherents were exasperated by the refusal of the clergy to reform, and their placarding of handbills attacking the old doctrines and usages irritated the Catholics. A confession was adopted, reflecting the influence of Calvin. His plan of governing each congregation by minister and elders was followed, and a system was begun of linking the congregation by synods of ministers and elders, much as the South German Anabaptists had arranged a generation earlier. As the movement extended, local synods grouped naturally by the civil provinces and the provincial synods were finally merged in one national synod. The plan was rapidly adopted by Presbyterians everywhere.

The synod of 1559 is a landmark, inaugurating a period of 70 years when the Reformed Church was an important political factor. With the accession of Francis II, a few weeks after the synod, the family of the Guises came to power, and steadily opposed the new religion. By this time several nobles had declared themselves, including Admiral Coligny and two princes of the blood, the Dukes of Bourbon and Conde.

With the accession of Charles IX (1560–74) the queen mother, Catherine de' Medici, brushed aside Bourbon, the first prince of the blood, and became regent. For a year there seemed a chance that she would belie Knox's fears as to the monstrous regiment of women, and imitate the revolution just carried through by Elizabeth in England.

For more than 60 years France was rent by the struggle, though it was suspended so often that nine successive wars are reckoned. The outbreak was at Vassy, where a congregation meeting publicly within a walled city, and therefore illegally, was massacred by the Guises without ceremony. In the intervals of fighting, it became clear that a counter reformation had begun, and that the zeal of the preachers trained at Geneva was offset by the subtlety of the Jesuits. The movement was much transformed in 1572, when Catherine was hurried by Italian advisers into authorizing a general massacre of all Huguenots, beginning with the royal guests. The princes of the blood were saved by a forced conversion, but every other leader of note fell, with thousands of humbler adherents. The survivors perfected their organization on quite representative lines, till there appeared a state within the state, independent of the feudal nobility and of the crown.

With the accession of Henry III (1574–89), two other parties defined themselves: the league of thoroughgoing Catholics, who copied the Huguenot organization, and the politicals, who aimed at internal peace and the exclusion of foreign influence, as of the Guises and Catherine. When Henry of Navarre, who had retracted his forced conversion, became heir-presumptive in 1584, the league was driven to a policy of exclusion. Four years later, the States-General declared against even toleration; but the arrogance of the Guises led to their assassination of the king. Navarre succeeded as Henry IV. (1589–1610.)

The league was so strong that Henry found it politic to become a Catholic in 1593; he was able to banish the Jesuits next year, and in 1598 to grant the Edict of-Nantes, destined to continue for 87 years, in great contrast to its many ephemeral predecessors. This declared Catholicism to be the established religion, maintaining the obligation of tithes and of the marriage laws; but it stopped persecution and recognized freedom of conscience, with the right of private worship anywhere. The so-called reformed public worship was legalized in every place where it was then actually practiced—about 200 towns, with 5 chief cities excepted; also in many thousand castles of the nobles, and in two places within every bailiwick. All synods were authorized to meet. On the civil side, not only were full civic rights guaranteed, and for ministers such treatment as the clergy received, but committees of Parliament dealing with cases involving Protestants were to have Protestant members. As a temporary measure, about 200 towns were left in their military possession, the garrisons being paid by the state.

With the assassination of Henry IV and the accession of his son, Louis XIII (1610–43), the tendency to absolute royal power increased, as was shown by no States-General being convoked after 1614. During the minority, the Jesuits quietly returned, and won many of the clergy to Ultramontane views. The rise of Richelieu in 1624 frightened the Huguenots into revolt, and when La Rochelle fell after 4 years, their separate political existence ended, and their fortifications were demolished everywhere. The peace of Alais in 1629 inaugurated a third period, when they were merely tolerated as inferiors, without any guarantee that the Edict of Nantes would be observed. Henceforth the nobles dropped off, as with the English Puritans after 1660, and the party became chiefly middleclass.

Richelieu and Mazarin, however, gave the Protestants fair play, so that in the troublous days of the Fronde they were loyal. Devoting themselves to manufacture and trade, and not being handicapped by cessation of work on saints' days, they gained nearly a monopoly of weaving wool, linen, and silk. Though they can hardly have mustered more than 1 million people out of 15 million, their importance was far greater. The Edict of Nantes was construed liberally, and public worship was actually maintained in 631 principal places, with 231 others subordinate. The synods met freely, though the National Synod needed special authorization, and a royal commissioner presided. Thought ripened apace under these conditions, and, while in Britain the doctrine of the divine right of Presbyterianism was hardening, the Huguenots preserved a more open mind.

At this time the Huguenots were important enough even to influence foreign affairs. These halcyon days ended soon after the collapse of the English Commonwealth withdrew the only possible external protector. When Mazarin died in 1661, Louis XIV (1643–1715) assumed power, and declined to receive a deputation of pastors come to congratulate him. Local self-government and constitutional methods were rapidly vanishing. Nobles and gentry were invited to court and led into provincial governors were practically superseded by obscure lawyers (intendents) wielding powers as absolute and as illegal as Cromwell's major generals, like whom they were backed by an irresistible army. As the States General never met, National Synods also ceased after 1660; provincial states and parliaments declined in importance; and arbitrary edicts became the only laws. When, therefore, an aggressive company of the Holy Sacrament set itself against toleration, and the one survival of the old times was the estate of the clergy, often convoked to tax itself, the danger was obvious, and there was no constitutional protection.

Emigration was forbidden, and all refugees caught were sent, men to the galleys, women to prison, their property being confiscated; but, though every frontier was patrolled, the exodus was general. Paris alone lost 1,200 Huguenot families out of 1,933; the intendant of Normandy soon reported 20,000 people missing from Rouen, 184,000 from his province; Nantes bewailed the loss of her workmen, Lyons had 14,000 looms silent and only 4,000 working.

These exiles rallied round the prince of Orange, and for a generation cherished the hope of compelling some restoration and even of reforming the whole Gallican Church. New Huguenot regiments were soon embodied in Dutch pay. When William went to the rescue of England in 1688, his aides-de-camp were all French.

Huguenot influence was diverted in its flow from the main stream into many other channels. This began far back in its history; as early as 1536 some preferred England to France; 30 years later many silk weavers set up their looms in the crypt of the metropolitan church of England, where Coligny's brother is buried and where their descendants worship today; Southampton has a God House whose records begin with 1567. Shakespeare lodged in London with Montioy of Crecy, and his "Venus and Adonis" was printed by the successor of Vautrollier. James I had two Huguenot doctors, Chamberlen and Mayerne.

The immigration to Brandenburg down the Rhine left many settlers by the way. Geneva gained 3,000 inhabitants and the watch trade as some recompense for boundless hospitality; a score of colonies arose in Wurttemberg, where French synods met until 1822; Homburg still maintains a French service; a village in Fulda yet keeps up the speech and customs of its founders. But the ravaging of the Palatinate hastened the steps of most of the exiles on to the Mark or the Netherlands.

ONE FOUND AT LAST

The king thought it would be a good idea to find a home in America for the Protestants, called Huguenots by the French. He was also interested in increasing the power of France against Spain.

Jean Ribaut, a brave Protestant captain in the French Navy, was chosen as the leader of the French expedition. Ribaut sailed from France in February 1562, with 150 men. In May Ribaut and his men sailed into the wide arm of the sea that we know as the Broad River. Impressed with the splendid harbor, Ribaut named it Port Royal. It still bears this name. The Frenchmen landed on a small island we know as Parris Island. Here they built a small fort, naming it Charlesfort in honor of the French king, Charles IX.

Ribaut made friends with the Indians at once. He gave them gifts such as hatchets, knives, bracelets, and bead necklaces. In return the Indians brought him pearls, balls of cotton, deerskins, and food.

Ribaut then called his men together and told them he was going to sail northward to explore the country. After that, he said, he would go back to France for more settlers and provisions. He asked who would volunteer to stay at the fort. Here in the new land, he told the men they had not only freedom to worship, but opportunity to improve themselves. Nearly all the men wished to remain. Ribaut chose about 30 and put them under the command of Capt. Albert de la Pierria. Then he sailed for France with the rest of his men.

Things went well, for a while after Ribaut's departure. The Frenchmen visited the Indians and were hospitably entertained. Before long, however, the Frenchmen quarreled among themselves. The captain turned out to be a cruel, harsh commander. He had a drummer boy hanged and sent a soldier named La Chere, a great favorite with the men, to a desert island to starve.

The men began to fear for their lives. They killed the captain, rescued La Chere, and held a council to decide what they should do next.

The Frenchmen had failed to raise crops for food, depending on the Edisto and Yamasee Indians to provide it for them. Now the redmen had little left even for themselves. Conditions had become impossible at Port Royal. Like the Spaniards of San Miguel, the Frenchmen decided to go home. But the Spaniards had had ships, and the French did not even have shipbuilders. They did, however, have a few carpenters. They set to work, the Indians helping them. The Indians were so glad to see the white men go that they gave them the last food they had.

At last the boat was finished. Everyone climbed on board except a boy named Bouffi, who decided he would rather stay with the Indians than risk his life in such a ship. The rest set sail. All went well for a time, but one day the wind stopped blowing, and for days the ship scarcely moved. The store of food ran low. The men gnawed their leather jackets and tried to drink sea water. A dreadful storm blew up and the ship began to leak. The men were by this time so weak that they could scarcely bail out the water.

The time came when there was no more food. After 3 days of starvation, La Chere told the others that, unless one man was willing to sacrifice himself, they would all die. The men drew lots, and La Chere was the one who lost. Without a word, he allowed himself to be killed so that the others might eat and drink of his flesh and blood. A few days later the men were picked up by an English ship. By this time they were nearly mad from starvation and hardship.

The French, however, were not ready to give up their plan of starting a settlement in the New World. A new expedition under Rene de Laudonniere, one of the men who had sailed with Ribaut, made a settlement in what is now Florida. Later Ribaut came with 300 settlers to this colony, Fort Caroline.

In 1680 a group of 45 French Protestants, or Huguenots, arrived. They were followed by many more. The Huguenots were the first group of French settlers to come to this part of the New World since Ribaut's settlement had ended so tragically.

The French Huguenots had come to South Carolina to seek freedom of religion. They had been bitterly persecuted in France because they were Protestants. Their settlements, for the most part along the banks of the Santee River, became known as French Santee. The Huguenots contributed greatly to life in South Carolina. They built six churches of their own. Some Huguenots came from Bordeaux, France. Their leader was a minister, the Reverend Jean Louis Gibert. The French named their town New Bordeaux after their home in France. In time, however, most of the Huguenots joined the Anglican Church.

We must now attempt to pull together various strands of Calvin's thought and make some estimate of his contemporary influence in America.

Calvinism came to our shores through several channels. The French Huguenots, fleeing from persecution after the massacre of St. Martholomew's Eve and again after the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, settled all the way from the Canadian border to Florida but chiefly in North and South Carolina. Another line from Geneva to America is by way of the Netherlands. This comes most directly through the Dutch who settled in and about New York, but there was an interpenetration of Dutch and Puritan thought when the Dutch Calvinists fled to England to escape the persecutions of the Duke of Alva, and later our Pilgrim Fathers took refuge in Holland before coming to America. The third main line—that in which Calvinism is most fully preserved—is that of the Scotch and Scotch-Irish Presbyterians. Thrifty, canny, and resolute ,they settled everywhere save for the fact that their brother Calvinists in New England gave them a cold shoulder and shoved them west. Though New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania became the main centers of settlement, they pushed southward to the warmth of the Carolinas and westward to become the main line of advance beyond the Alleghenies and in the second tier of colonies. The fourth channel is, of course, the Congregationalism of the Plymouth and Massachusetts Bay colonies, which came to dominate New England except for the Baptist stronghold in Rhode Island. Together these four groups formed the chief substructure for the erection of the American Republic.

What have they given us? Though any evaluation must of necessity be a wholly inadequate summary, five contributions stand out:

1. A type of character suggested by the phrase "the Puritan virtues." Common to both Puritan and Presbyterian strains (shared by the Dutch and Huguenot, though these are far less influential), these virtues became the implicit standard of respectability and decency in the American way of life. Though we are now far removed from the discipline of Geneva or Massachusetts Bay, it is still the assumption of the majority of our laity in American Protestantism that to be a Christian means to work hard, to save one's money, not to break the law, not to drink (perhaps, also, not to smoke), to be the faithful husband of one wife, and to attend church regularly on Sunday.

2. A strong reinforcement to our capitalistic economy. Though I believe Weber overstates the case for regarding Calvinism as the chief foundation of capitalism, there can be no doubt that the Puritan virtues are primarily middle-class virtues. This conjunction goes far toward explaining why American Protestantism is, on the whole, on the side of capital rather than labor. It explains also why the churches have so firmly undergirded the morality of small-group relations while leaving almost untouched the wider Christian obligations regarding war, race, and economics. John Wesley saw that "religion must necessarily produce both industry and frugality, and these cannot but produce riches." To avoid the resulting corruption Christians, he thought, must be exhorted to gain all they can, to save all they can, to give all they can. Calvinists and Methodists alike have tended to follow this pattern, at least in its first two items. The result is that philanthropy rather than economic justice is the primary economic virtue in most of our churches.

Mention should also be made of Calvin's contribution to capitalism by another channel—the lifting of the medieval ban on usury. The sanction Calvin gave to the taking of interest on investments is regarded by R. H. Tawney as a watershed in the history of capitalism. Calvin did not materially change the practice, for money had been loaned at interest long before his time. What he did was to lift the ban and place responsibility upon the Christian conscience, shifting restraint from ecclesiastical prohibitions to the Golden Rule. The door was thus opened for those who wished to let conscience be their guide. This transition in economic practice was for the most part completed before the settlement of America.

3. A foundation for American democracy. Our political theory stems from two main channels: (a) A Greek (primarily stoic) conception of the natural rights of man, which came to America by way of the enlightenment and had its chief exponents in Thomas Jefferson and Benjamin Franklin; (b) a Christian conception of the equality of all men before God. To the second, Calvinism made a major contribution, though not by the route of the exaltation of human dignity, which is a familiar note in liberal preaching. The present-day call to repentence for our common sin as the basis of any right ordering of society is in keeping with Calvin's spirit. As for the Christian's duty to resist tyranny, a straight line runs from Calvin's Geneva to Cromwell's England, to the Boston Tea Party, and to the interventionism of our time.

4. Emphasis on an educated ministry and an educated laity. We have noted Calvin's concern to establish the university in Geneva. He would not countenance sloppy thinking; for one must offer his best, intellectually as morally, to the glory of God. This spirit was shared by our Founding Fathers.

Among the Puritans and Presbyterians who migrated to our shores the educational level was high. In New England, Oxford and Cambridge men were numerous, and a profound respect for learning was in the heritage of a Christian home. Harvard University was founded, primarily to prepare young men for the ministry, only 16 years after the landing of the Pilgrims. By 1647, Massachusetts had made public instructtion compulsory and had established an educational system extending from the elementary school to the university.

Among the Presbyterian frontier settlers the school had a place second only to the church. Their ministers were men of scholarship, often trained in Edinburgh or Aberdeen; and as the second and third generations came along, a great crop of Presbyterian colleges emerged to give higher education near the homes of the people. Their estimate of the importance of an educated ministry is evidenced by the fact that seminary training has long been required for ordination in the Presbyterian Church.

5. A dogmatic but powerful theology based on the authority of the Bible—In congregationalism predestination gave way before the claims of liberal thought; and, after being strongly influenced in New England by Unitarianism, the Congregational-Christian Church now stands for freedom of religious thought as of ecclesiastical structure. Presbyterianism has followed a course much closer to the genius of Calvin. Though predestination has receded, theological rigor and biblical authority have not. As a consequence of the conjunction of these notes with insistence upon an educated ministry the Presbyterian Church has been more sharply divided by the fundamentalist-modernist controversy than has any other in our time. The liberalism of the clergy far outruns that of the laity. Though the theological stamp of the clergy varies greatly, depending not only on which seminary was attended but in which decade, Presbyterians can usually be counted on to have convictions.

The emergence of neo-orthodoxy is, for the most part, a reappearance of Calvinism but without Calvin's doctrine of election or his biblical literalism. Distinctions between Lutheran and Calvinist thought are less sharp than they once were, yet it is significant that the chief centers of neo-orthodox influence in this country are in seminaries that are Calvinist in background. Emphasis upon God's glory and sovereignty, the sinfulness and helplessness of man, the divine initiative in revelation and redemption, the saving work of Christ, and the Bible as basis of religious knowledge—these concepts, though not exclusive prerogative of Calvin's, were central to his thought. The truth that lies in them is being increasingly recognized by those who stand outside the Calvinist tradition.

When Calvin died in 1564, his grave, by his own wish, was left unmarked, and "no man knoweth of his sepulcher unto this day." Yet, like Moses, with whose spirit he had much in common, he was permitted to catch a glimpse of the Promised Land. Neither could foresee to what magnitude his work was predestined to grow. They belong among the immortals because with total devotion they served God and his people, consenting to have no other gods before the Most High.

Poland's Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 21, 1959

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, recently the people of Chicago had the pleasure of playing host to a distinguished Member of the U.S. Senate, Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY of Minnesota, who delivered the major address at the commemorative services observing the 168th anniversary of Poland's Constitution, sponsored by the Polish National Alliance and its president, Mr. Charles Rozmarek.

An estimated 100,000 citizens of Chicago assembled to hear Senator HUMPHREY speak on this historic document, which for the first time in history introduced to the people of Europe, and specifically to the people of Poland, in 1791, those principles of freedom and constitutional law which had been adopted by our own Nation only 4 years earlier.

I have the pleasure of introducing into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD today the text of Senator HUMPHREY's remarks which follow:

ALLIES BEHIND THE IRON CURTAIN

(Excerpts from remarks of Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, prepared for delivery before the Polish National Alliance, Chicago, Ill., May 3, 1959)

I am pleased to join you in celebration of the 168th anniversary of Poland's adoption of the Constitution of May 3, 1791. This great document, so much like our own basic charter, stands as a beacon light in the darkness of Soviet oppression. It inspires the hope that a free Poland will one day live again.

Few people on earth have over the years shown a greater love of liberty than the Polish people. Neither partition nor persecution has been able to stamp out the flame of liberty.

No American citizen can recount the glory of the American Revolution without paying tribute to those two great men who contributed so much to the success of Washington's armies—Generals Kosciusko and Pulaski.

Poland has been called a pioneer in European liberalism. Certainly freedom-loving peoples everywhere in the world must take satisfaction from this passage in the Constitution which you commemorate today:

"All power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty, and the good order of society, on an equal scale and on a lasting foundation."

Yes; the peoples of the world know and respect the aspiration of the Polish people for liberty, and are bound in spiritual ties with all the unfortunate peoples who remain behind the Iron Curtain. I can assure you that during my recent visit in the Soviet Union, I did not and could not forget the plight of the 100 million people of Eastern Europe who suffer under the cruel yoke of atheistic and imperialistic communism.

The American people will never forsake them. The American people honor the peoples of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Bulgaria, Hungary, the Baltic States, and East Germany for their devotion to the cause of freedom and independence.

But, above all, our thoughts go out to the devout and patriotic people of Poland—that brave country which was first to take up arms in the defense of freedom in World War II, the country which was subjugated not by one oppressor, but by two; yet, the country whose spiritual voice still speaks so eloquently, so courageously through Cardinal Wyszinski.

Yes; our hearts go out to Joseph Cardinal Mindzenty too, and to all the people in martyred Hungary.

The Polish people, too, have eloquent voices speaking for them here in the United States. Certainly none has beeen more effective in moulding the thinking of the U.S. Senate on the problems of central and eastern Europe than Mr. Z. Stypulkowski, Vice Premier of the Polish Government in London, and representative of Free Poland in Washington. His insights and wisdom have stimulated much constructive thinking among my colleagues in the Senate.

Yes, the plight of the captive nations is a subject close to the hearts of all of us.

It is unthinkable that we in the West should abandon these great peoples behind the Iron Curtain. There will come a day of eventual emancipation, and we must take all prudent steps necessary to hasten that day.

And it is not enough simply to voice this hope and declare our dedication to their cause. The peoples of the captive nations need something more tangible to give them faith for the future.

The peoples of the captive nations need a charter of hope from the West—a declaration of intent and concern from the leadership of the West.

First of all, we should place the fate of Poland and other countries behind the Iron Curtain on the agenda of every conference called to consider the problems of European security. We must never let the captive peoples nor their Soviet masters forget that we do not accept as right or final the imposition of Russian Communist rule in eastern and central Europe.

Secondly, we should actively counter Soviet demands for recognition of the status quo in Eastern Europe with our own insistence that Soviet occupation forces withdraw and that free and democratic elections be held in accordance with our solemn wartime pledges.

Yes, our constant objective must be the withdrawal of the Red army from Eastern Germany and Central Europe.

Third, we must not permit ourselves to bargain with the freedoms of other peeoples in order to maintain a conqueror's peace. We must remain loyal to our highest principles—that all peoples have an inalienable right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Fourth, we must never lose the opportunity to point out to the world the monstrous hypocrisy of Soviet imperialism and colonialism. The Soviet leaders, who shed crocodile tears over the remnants of Western colonialism, have imposed in Eastern Europe the most savage and brutal colonialism the world have ever known.

Finally, the charter of hope to the captive nations must include the unwritten assurance of courage on the part of the West—the demonstration that the Western democracies will not yield in the face of force or terror, will never submit to blackmail, and will always stand firmly on what we know to be right for us and for all men.

Speaking of Poland, I have already proposed the establishment of a binational Polish-American Foundation—to put to work the funds which have accumulated to the credit of the United States in the form of zloty, these funds from sale of our agricultural commodities. This foundation should be devoted to the building of creative institutions for the welfare of the Polish people.

As we approach the one thousandth year of Polish christianity what greater contribution could the West, and particularly the United States make, than to assist in the reconstruction of Poland's historic capital city—Warsaw?

There are many concrete things we could do in historic Warsaw which would stand as living symbols of American concern, and vivid demonstration of American friendship for the courageous peoples of Poland.

I am thinking, for example, of the rebuilding of Warsaw's famous Royal Castle—nearly destroyed during the Nazi siege of the capital city in 1939, and reduced to rubble during the Warsaw uprising in 1944. The plans for rebuilding this ancient castle in Poland's five-year economic plan have had to be abandoned for lack of funds. Let us step forward with an offer from Poland's friends in the West to rebuild the Castle in recognition of Poland's great contribution to European civilization.

A second undertaking could be the provision of a home for national army veterans. While the present Polish regime has changed the policy of persecution of the underground army of World War II, nothing has been done to improve the conditions under which hundreds of thousands of these veterans live. These men and women were "our companions in arms" equally against the tyranny of Nazism, and the oppression of the Soviet armies.

We could undertake a great humanitarian task in the building and financing of a large modern hospital in Warsaw—perhaps a children's hospital. Not only would it give direct aid to many tens of thousands, but it would be another symbol of American compassion and friendship in a nation suffering from the effects of Soviet colonialism—a nation disastrously short of hospitals and medicines.

How dramatic it would be to replace the war-damaged buildings that now face the monument of Stalin in a public square in Moscow with a children's hospital—a permanent reminder to the Polish people of the blessings of freedom—directly across the square from Stalin's tragic reminder of oppression.

Yes, and we could build workers' settlements based on western models—yes, homes for workers and yet displays of western living, western concern for people, western initiative.

These things we could do. These concrete acts of friendship for the Polish people we could undertake. No Communist leader would be able to explain them away. Every Polish man and woman and child would know they came out of the open hands and heart of America.

Yes, indeed, I believe that Poland will one day be free again.

I believe the whole world will one day be free of Communist oppression. I believe that mankind has the capacity to live in peace and justice.

But this will not come just by wishing for it. What we must do is to prove to the world—to the free peoples and the subjugated peoples, too—that our free system can beat the Russian system on every front.

What we must do is compete with the Russians—in fact, out-compete them. This

competition is being forced on us by the many faceted Soviet challenge.

We must meet and overcome the Soviet challenge in every area—economically, culturally, militarily, and in the important field of international persuasion.

Competition with Russia will be a long, hard pull. We cannot hope to win with a business as usual attitude. We must have a new sense of urgency and purpose. The struggle is, after all, a struggle between freedom and tyranny.

We cannot win this struggle alone with H-bombs and missiles and the other engines of war—we need also machines, farm products, technology, economic assistance, and above all a renewed devotion to the human values that will endure.

We will do it by helping to create an atmosphere which gave birth to the Polish Constitution of 1791 and the American Constitution of 1789.

How can we prevail in this mighty struggle with Russia?

First, we must compete effectively in the fields of science and technology.

Let us not make the error of underrating Soviet advances in these fields. While we and our allies are still ahead, we must admit the gap is narrowing, and they are breathing down our necks.

We cannot afford to be complacent. We must build the greatest educational system ever known to free peoples and we must do it now.

Second, we must compete in the field of international persuasion, and by this I mean not only mere words, but words backed by deeds.

The propaganda of the deed, such as the launching of a tangible food for peace campaign, will be far more convincing than 10 million words bleamed to the world by shortwave radio.

There is no reason why our agricultural surpluses should pile up in storage bins while millions of human beings are suffering from undernourishment and stark hunger? That is the heart of the food for peace plan which I am sponsoring in Congress. According to my plan America's abundance of food and fiber should be used as a positive instrument of foreign policy and a construtive force for peace.

Third, we must compete with Russia economically.

The dollar competes with the ruble not only in the production race, but also in providing development capital for impoverished economies in the politically uncommitted areas of the world. We cannot compete effectively with more than 4 million workers unemployed and with our industrial plants operating considerably below capacity.

Finally, we must compete militarily. We and our allies must be strong—yes, have superior strength. We will help our allies to maintain adequate forces. Measures of military strength—missiles, nuclear power, strategic and tactical aircraft, and naval forces—will weight in our favor if we make sure the defense budget is based on the power we need and not trimmed to meet somebody's conception of a balanced budget.

I have always supported adequate funds for the military defense of this Nation and the West. Indeed, without a strong shield of military strength we would be helplessly at the mercy of the Soviet Union.

Incidentally, one of the great deterrents to military action by the Soviet Union is its lack of confidence and distrust of the situation in Eastern Europe. The Soviet leaders know that they would have to keep scores of thousands of troops tied up to protect their rear and their supply lines from the freedom fighters of the captive nations if they launched a military attack on the West.

But military strength can in the long run only buy the time for more constructive approaches to peace.

I have spoken about the accumulation of Polish zlotys which has built up in past years—now useless—which has reached more than $150 million in value. And I have proposed a Polish-American Foundation to put these zlotys to work in the interest of improving relations between the Polish peoples and their friends in America, through such projects as the participation in the rebuilding of Warsaw.

But there is far more that we could do, in a less dramatic fashion—but, nevertheless, in ways that would build hope and friendship for the West in Poland.

The foundation would stimulate programs of travel between the two countries. The best way for us to tell our story to the people of Poland and for them to tell their story to the people of America is by personal visits on a people-to-people basis. And there are no better ambassadors from our side than the Polish-Americans who know and love the democratic processes of our great country.

Yes; through such a foundation we could help in many ways to provide medical education, public health facilities, medicine for children, school lunch programs—deeds, and not just words, in the finest tradition of Western civilization and American ideals.

It is the people we must reach. Yes, it is the people of Poland and the other captive nations whom we must hold to the west, shield from despair, show the light of eventual freedom.

Here and now we must rededicate ourselves to strengthening America's ties to these peoples in the darkness of Soviet tyranny, these brave peoples whose tenacious courage has never failed in the face of repeated invasions and tyranny, and who hold silently to the hope of freedom yet again.

Let us take inspiration from these silent allies, from their courage, from their determination, from their toughness and tenacity. They are our brothers: we shall never forget them or give up working for their freedom.

Their cause is the cause of every man and woman in the world who loves liberty.

The Dangers of Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I am placing in the RECORD a copy of a letter written by a local citizen of St. Louis.

I believe it is important to realize just why the battle of the budget has to be fought and won. If we do not balance our budgets in times of prosperity, we will never balance them. Fiscal year 1960 seems destined to set new records of prosperity. Really we should be paying off some of the Federal debt in these times, not teetering along on a proposed budget with a mere hundred million in the black.

The letter follows:

HELLO SAM: Friendship is a wonderful thing, and truly it is not earned without the sincerest efforts of those involved. But, little did I realize it would cost me so many hours of extra work. Your comments about inflation, at our recent luncheon date, gave me no alternative but to try and evaluate my personal position in regard to this matter. The interest you aroused about this subject caused me to pull off to one side of the highway on a recent sales trip, to make notes on the thoughts that came to mind as I drove—and by the way, this almost made me late for an appointment. At first, I thought it would only take an hour or so to organize and resolve my position—my thoughts—on how I've been affected and have reacted to life during an inflationary period. But, believe me, it has taken considerably longer than any 1 hour. It took longer than 1 hour just to realize that there might even be some importance attached to it. In any event, this didn't come easy.

I can't speak for others, but I can speak for my family. Before now inflation meant something you read out of any book, "a disproportionate and relatively sharp and sudden increase in the quantity of money and credit, or both, relative to the amount of exchange for goods or services; resulting in or producing rising price levels." I'm not so sure it's really that simple or concise in either definition, direction, or results.

For the past 16 years I have earned my own way, and for the past 11 years my personal responsibilities have included a wife and family. I've always considered myself fortunate, and thankful, for what material gains I've made. My starting pay back then was $3,000 per year, but now, if statistics mean anything, our family unit is one that earns $10,000 or more per year, and I understand this puts some stigma on me as the unapproachable upper 10 percent of our society. We have a nice home, a 1954 automobile, and the usual necessities to run our home, like refrigerator, range, washer, dryer, television, etc. Our social schedule is normal and far from elaborate, and we enjoy taking part in church and a few other civic affairs. But Sam, we don't feel privileged—thankful for the opportunity to earn our way, yes—but privileged, no.

Thus, why should I feel concerned about inflation? I'm growing up in it—it has treated me pretty well—we're not hungry. I've read the history books about mass ruination of the homeowners with mortgages, the middle income classes and the like, in Germany, France, China, and other countries, and even heard of the "fairy tale like" stories of a wheelbarrow full of money needed for one loaf of bread. But this happened over there, and couldn't happen over here, at least, I don't think so. We're too smart to let that happen, and anyway I've been so busy trying to grow in my job and accepting new responsibilities that I haven't paid too much attention. So, I guess this necessitates my going back and looking at the past 10 or so years in retrospect.

For example, that candy bar I ate the other day (stole it out of the pantry when the kids weren't looking) was only half as large as the ones I used to buy as a kid—and for the same nickel. Oh well, kids shouldn't have too much candy anyway.

Two years ago, we paid $27,100 (with a $19,000 mortgage) for our 16-year-old home, and we love the home. However, my neighbor across the street made me feel bad when he told me recently that he had paid only $8,900 for his (new) home when he moved in back in 1941—and it is identically the same house. Let's see, that means he paid for his house about the same amount that I had to make as a downpayment, and which took me 14 years to save.

In 1954 we purchased a Ford Ranch Wagon with automatic shift, radio, and heater, and paid about $2,400 in cash for it. I can still remember the lecture I received when the folks turned over to me their new 1939 Studebaker Commander with overdrive, radio, and heater, for use on social occa-

sions in high school: "Son, you are not only responsible for the lives of those who ride with you, but remember that car represents an investment of $900, so be careful." Guess I had better be 2½ times as careful today.

Mom used to wonder where a growing boy put so much milk—at 9 cents a quart. Today I'm wondering the same about my three kids—at 25 cents a quart. Bread was, as I recall, about 9 cents per loaf, and today it's between 24 cents and 29 cents—unless we want it over 1 day old, then it is about 21 cents. As Marie Antoinette said, "If there is no bread, feed them cake."

It was quite a financial struggle for my folks to start me in college, as tuition was about $125 per semester, or $250 for a school year. I just called the university and asked them what tuition is now, and I am informed it is going to be $450 per semester this coming fall, or $900 per school year. What will it be 10 years from now when my kids start? If it continues for the next ten years to increase at the same rate as it did the past 20 years, tuition will be about $750 per semester, or $1,500 per year. Let's see, that means starting ten years from now, and for the next 7 years after that, I'll need about $18,000 available for tuition only, for the three children. If I don't want to borrow that amount, or pay for it out of yearly income at the time, I must start saving about $1,800 or so a year right now! (Or, should I wait for some of the proposed Federal grants for education and let all the populace send my kids to school!)

I could go on making price comparisons for shoes, clothing, utilities, gasoline, coffee, meat and medical expenses, but like I indicated Sam, I haven't been too disturbed, for we're still a happy family with means for providing ourselves with the necessities of life—and with some left over to support church and charitable organizations, and a rather limited (but satisfactory) social schedule.

Suddenly, however, I came to realize that I couldn't comprehend or define inflation by the mere means of price comparisons. Inflation can be responsible for more than the juggling of figures and the amassing of statistics. It's a way of life. It's an attitude. Perhaps I can try to make that more clear by trying to condense my thoughts these past weeks into writing.

Somewhere in the process of mental maturity, I seem to have acquired some standards, principles, or values about an "economic" way of life for our family. Whether these standards were grasped from the environment of my folks' home, my church affiliations, my educational background, or from my intimate friends, I can't recall. More than likely these standards are the result and overlapping of all these environments. In any event, frugality, thrift, and solvency have always seemed important virtues—important standards for running our home—and I might add, these same standards seem to lap over into my day to day business discernment.

Frugality: This is a tough one: I'm as "hungry" for the finer things of life as anyone—yet our family tries to keep a restraint on our desires and appetites for material comforts beyond our means. We don't suppress the ambition for those comforts or luxuries, but we do abstain until their realization is within the economic scope of possibility—and believe me, this requires constant evaluation and decision of need versus luxury—and sequence of participation.

Thrift: This is a tough one too: "It isn't how much you earn, it's how much you save that counts", seems to stick in my mind from away back somewhere. Savings is like a preparedness program—a step necessary to overcome some of the abstention mentioned under frugality.

Solvency and independence: And so is this a tough one. Having enough to pay the bills—to save a little—and to be prepared to meet some uncertain storms of financial adversity; means in short, earning your own way and paying your own way.

Obviously, all three of these standards work hand in hand, and a failure to observe any one of them can lead to the destruction of the other two—and obviously too, we are concerned with degrees of action and decision. How much each month should we save—in life insurance, in savings account, in stocks and bonds, in real estate—in any or all of these programs? Should we trade our 1954 car for a new car, instead of going on a vacation, or buying a new TV? How long before we have to replace the washing machine, the refrigerator, the dryer, for some of these are getting rather old? Can we or should we wait until we can pay cash for that extra room on the house, or should we go ahead and borrow the money? Should I cash in some investments I have, to buy a part interest in a flying club, so as to continue a hobby and sport in which I would like to participate? Should we try to save toward our children's future education, or should we hope to pay for it out of current earnings or borrowings when the time comes? Should we try to pay our home mortgage off fast, or take the full 20 years?

And so the questions go, and so they get bigger and bigger as your income increases, as your responsibilities mount. Frugality, thrift, and solvency are not easy to come by, and at times a decision or action involving any one of them leads to family arguments. (I try my best Sam, to think I am head of the household, but I've come to respect and recognize the power of my partner in life.)

Our family decision—our family choices—will be different from all other families, because our material desires are to our own satisfaction and not to the satisfaction of others. Our standards are not ours alone, however, for they belong to all who wish to practice and maintain them, but even here the degree may vary. We prefer to adhere to a strict savings program—we prefer to pay cash before we buy, and today, and since we've been married, we have had only one outstanding loan—the mortgage on our home. We try to cover the unexpected setbacks by various forms of health, casualty, and life insurance. We try to remain solvent by maintaining more money in cash in the bank than we need for current living expenses. We try each month to set aside $50 or $75 to invest for our children's future education. We pay all current bills and charge accounts promptly and as they come due. We don't think we are unusual, or even different from many millions like us. Out of it all, we feel the pride, proudness, and exhilaration in being able to maintain our own, and in knowing that before we can be our brother's keeper—we must first and foremost try to be our own keeper.

But, Sam, not until our discussion several weeks ago did I question the moral or ethical implications of what I've been writing. Now I wonder, not about the rightness or wrongness of what I'm doing, but the ultimate results of what I'm doing and what inflation might do to me and to my children.

Inflation seems to encourage my desire for consumption. After all, if the prices of real, material goods are increasing constantly, then perhaps I'd better go ahead and get that appliance, or automobile, or new addition to my home now. No longer do my decisions rest merely upon the evaluation of need versus luxury and sequence of participation, or upon waiting until they come completely within my financial scope; but more and more upon mental justification of comparative or expected prices. It is common knowledge that ownership of material goods (without mortgages attached) is better than money if we have real inflation. I might as well keep up with the Joneses, because I can't eat money, and, hand in hand with this, inflation seems to encourage my desire to use credit and installment buying. Why should I have a preparedness program, when by the time it takes me to get enough in savings to purchase something, it can no longer be bought for that amount. It seems more logical to borrow to the limit of my income, and pay the lender back with cheaper dollars (of course assuming I can keep my job and salary going up all the time). Why put my money into investments, insurance, and bonds that pay back cheaper dollars than those I put in? And, this goes hand in hand with inflation, seems to encourage my feeling of dependency. Why worry about the possibility of financial adversity. If I'm out of work, there's unemployment aids; if I'm sick and can't work, my company insurance will pay bills for a while, and following that there are charitable organizations to take over, and if I die there's social security to take care of the wife and kids. And, if I can't pay the bills, everything is bought on time up to the limit of my credit and has a lien on it, so they can't sue—only take back used merchandise.

As I said before, inflation seems to me to be more than the comparisons of prices, the amassing of statistics, it's very definitely and more evidently appearing to me to be a way of life, on attitudes, teaching or requiring standards, principles, or virtues entirely opposite to those which I believe.

Are these the signs of our times?

The public, far from resisting such increases (in prices) goes meekly along, when current income and savings are not enough to pay for what's desired, the consumer will borrow without hesitancy, thereby helping to inflate the economy and make price raising easier. (And after all there's as much money to be made on the financing plan as on the object itself. And today there is no incentive for paying cash—they'd rather you pay on installment anyway.)

Investors, in large numbers, are taking inflation for granted. Stocks are being bought, not primarily for their earnings, but in the belief that the stock market will inevitably go higher because of inflation. (Seems to me this is imprudent speculation with increased risk to all who deem it desirable to have ownership in American business.)

"The criterion for consumption is no longer the needs of the consumer, but the need of the economy to maintain an ever-increasing flow of goods." (But what if I don't want one?)

"The modern American is relying upon others to prepare for his old age, he is apt to let social security take care of his old age, and the basic fact is that he does not save his own money, put it in his own bank account and prepare to tide himself over life's rough spots." (The world owes me a living.)

"It probably would be advisable to own a house with the biggest mortgage you can safely carry. Years from now you will be making payments on the mortgage in cheaper dollars." (Those bankers are too rich anyway.)

"Spend the least amount of money on life insurance for the largest amount of coverage. Do not use insurance for savings." (In 1939 the life insurance ads read, "Retire on $150 a month for life"—today those same ads read, "Retire on $300 a month for life." (I'd sure hate to earn my living selling life insurance today.)

"Congressmen are unwilling to take unpopular steps necessary to limit spending on farm relief, veterans' benefits, public housing, and other long-standing programs." (Regardless of the issues, it is more important to be "in" than "out.")

"A Harvard economics professor estimated that in recent years hourly compensation of employees (including fringe benefits) has risen more than twice as fast as output per man-hour."

"Now that business has increased, we prefer to work our present employees 6 days a week rather than hire new ones, because of the high cost of fringe benefits."

"To raise an additional $12 billion (the amount of this year's deficit) from the present Federal income tax would require the confiscation of everyone's taxable income in excess of $4,000, or an increase in the corporate rate from the present 52 percent to 82 percent." (This could easily redistribute the wealth and provide us only one political party—the Socialist.)

"The Federal Government has paid much of its way by borrowing ever since 1931." (If it works here and this is the most esteemed organization today, why shouldn't I do it as an individual?)

"In the last 5 years, nondefense spending has jumped by a startling $12½ billion, from 20 to more than 32 billion—farm programs, housing programs, welfare programs, veteran services" (and as E. W. Howe wrote, "There is nothing so well known as that we should not expect something for nothing—but we all do").

"The form of success is more in front of us than the spirit." (The extent is more important than the intent.)

Inflationary trends: Who's to blame for it? Who's setting the example against it? Where do we point the finger?—at Congress, at the investor, at the bankers, at management, at labor management, at the farmers, at the veterans, at the whole system? Who cares, for there seems to be too much of the pointing of the finger, pitting person against person, class against class, management against labor, organization against organization, motive against motive—which in essence is merely the fulfillment of the age-old law "That for every action, there is an opposite and equal reaction."

And, I'm beginning to see out of confused mumble-jumble of words, out of the countless facts and figures, out of the pointing of fingers, out of the age-old promises, "for all the people," that today's inventive genius and scientific progress, makes demands even greater on the need for human controls; for nothing scientific, or mechanical, or monetary, will substitute for the communication of principles and the dignities of man.

Yet, inflation becomes a symbol—and like most symbols it tends to become represented as a power beyond that of the individual; a colossus that makes rich men out of poor, that redistributes the wealth, that provides security to the aged and to youth at the same time; a "Savior" to all the people, attaching to itself, as to some martyr, loyal, devoted followers, extolling its claims, echoing its virtues, and banishing its adversaries. Yet, it feeds with one hand and eats with the other, upon its unsuspecting victims at the same time, giving no warning of its creeping, insidious manifestations.

I don't want my children to become slaves, admirers, followers of this symbol. Thus, our communications must start at home. Somehow, someway, my wife and I must get across to them the pride in ownership, the pride in excelling at something, the pride of responsibility, and the pride in being an individual. I want them to know they are not equal just because the laws of this land say they are, but because they earn the right to be equal. I want them to know they can be more fortunate than others, but only because they earn that position. I don't want them to believe that they—or any systems—can be all things to all people. I want them to know that they have a responsibility to others, not because they should support a welfare State, but because one cannot live with others, without consideration and understanding. I'd be more interested in the intent of their giving than the extent of their giving. How can they respect the rights of others, and the responsibilities that are theirs if they don't first earn this respect for themselves. They must know that frugality is deeply rooted in our way of life—that it is a calculated step by step process of growing, and not an irresponsible satisfaction of desires—that it represents a responsibility to one's self as well as to others. They must know that thrift is an act of earning your own way—that it creates respect, that it demands responsibility. And, they must know solvency and independence as the ability of paying their own way and the way for others.

I believe this country was conceived and has prospered on these basic principles, and not on the principles, symbols, mind you, of inflation. As John Ruskin said, "Therefore when we build let us think we build forever. Let it not be for present delight, nor for present use alone. Let it be such work as our descendents will thank us for and that men will say as they look upon this labor 'See, this our fathers did for us'."

Sam, inflation means more to me now than it did some weeks ago—and I find its existence even more distressing, and inbred in our way of life than I thought! As I said, "I can't speak for others, but they too can speak and act for themselves."

Best personal regards.

A. W. GRUER, Jr.

Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH J. RIVERS
OF ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1959

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, highlighting the recent graduation exercises at the University of Alaska was the presence of our distinguished colleague, the Honorable LEO W. O'BRIEN, from Albany, N.Y., on which occasion the University of Alaska conferred upon him an honorary degree of doctor of laws. This was done in recognition of the inspired, dedicated, and brilliant work of Representative O'BRIEN in support of the Alaska statehood bill during the 85th Congress. I wish to join in this expression of gratitude from the people of Alaska, and further take this opportunity of extending a hearty salute to the whole Congress for the passage of the statehood legislation which has reaffirmed the basic American principles upon which our great Union is founded. I also wish to make available to my colleagues the meaningful and significant message of LEO O'BRIEN in his address to the 1959 graduating class of the University of Alaska, as the thoughts so vividly expressed in that speech are pertinent to the problems with which the people of America are confronted and to the hopes and ideals for which we all stand. The text of the address of our distinguished colleague, Dr. LEO W. O'BRIEN, follows:

President Patty, members of the board of regents, distinguished guests, members of the class of 1959, ladies and gentlemen, I am deeply moved by the great honor you have conferred upon me today, although I realize that in recognizing in this distinguished way the part played by two men in the creation of a new State you have also extended that recognition, in absentia, to many who had vital roles in this historic endeavor.

It is a signal honor, too, to be permitted to address the first college graduation class in the history of the State of Alaska.

You were only freshmen in the fall of 1955 when I paid my first—and until now my last visit to Alaska. I was then, as now, Chairman of the Subcommittee on Territorial and Insular Affairs.

We came to Alaska to investigate the readiness of that great Territory for statehood. Many committees, through the years, had journeyed here on similar missions and, if some of those who greeted us in 1955 were a trifle bored or disillusioned, I did not and do not blame them. Only a few months before we arrived, the House had killed, by a margin of 48 votes, a bill granting statehood both to Hawaii and Alaska.

I have a confession to make. When I came to Congress in 1952, it was a matter of complete indifference to me whether Alaska would or would not become a State. I neither sought nor relished a place on the Interior Committee, dealing as it does with places farther from my home city, Albany, N.Y., than are London, or Paris, or Berlin.

How, then, did the congressional freshman of 1952, who thought only of an early escape to a committee dealing with problems closer to my district, become in 1958 the author and House floor manager of the bill which added the 49th star to our flag?

My first stir of interest in statehood came with the realization that, as chairman of a somewhat obscure committee in Congress, I, a man from Albany, had, in a sense, more power over your affairs than your elected Delegate and your elected legislature. And I had never seen this great land over which I had so much authority.

Then came resentment. Some of you may recall the famous fight over whether the Territory of Alaska should be given control over the treatment of its own mentally ill or whether we should continue a system of Federal control which smelled of the Dark Ages.

The issue seemed simple and those of us who fought for Alaska control over Alaska's mental health program believed we were doing the right, the decent, the American thing.

But, from a dark depth in our national life I did not know existed, there came wild, excited cries of subversion and treason. The hate groups of our land joined forces and carried with them an army of the unthinking and the neurotic. I, who wanted only to help the unfortunate, found myself in the well the House answering claims that we were part of a sinister plot to create in Alaska a million-acre concentration camp to which loyal people could be whisked in the dead of the night, no matter where they might reside.

Absurd? Yes. Childish? No. Many believed those things and the knowledge that they did not only saddened me, but lighted a torch of anger which made me resolve that a Territory which could be attacked because it sought only simple justice should be rid of the shackles which led some to believe that Alaska was a colony populated by serfs and inferiors.

I shall not detain you with a repetition of the strategy which won the statehood battle. It all lies in the record for our children to read.

Rather, I should like to speak of the pride most Americans feel that the United States now reaches to the very border of Siberia and 2,000 miles out into the Pacific.

Why were our people so excited when we admitted the largest State in the Union and, later, the exotic place which is Hawaii? I think it was their realization that our feet

were not cemented in the status quo and that the United States was not frozen into the past.

The responsibility of the other 48 States did not end when their representatives in Congress voted to add the 49th State.

When I and others pleaded with our colleagues last year to give Alaska the dignity of statehood, we said that the resulting economic benefits would flow through the entire Nation. We painted a glowing picture of things to come from the bowels of the great land.

But, this State is very new. Its rich resources will not pop from the earth and leap to market by themselves.

We have taken to us a new brother, but he must be helped as he struggles with the immense new problems of statehood.

But, I am very sure, that every ounce of help we give Alaska, financial, and otherwise, will be repaid in pounds or even tons.

Alaska, in my considered judgment, will, in the lifetime of our children, be one of the greatest and richest States of them all.

I have talked so far of new geographical frontiers. My special message to these young men and women today has to do with the desperate need to establish a new frontier of the American mind.

A great scientist, such as Dr. Teller, and great educators, such as those who have brought you to this point in your desire to know, can give you facts by which you can you can walk toward fuller knowledge.

A politician, such as I, must deal with less solid things. His life, in large measure, has been spent in the observation of human moods and shifting sentiments. During that period of observation, which included 30 years as a political writer, I have come to the considered conclusion that the ugliest word in our language is mob.

Its employment raises unclean pictures in our minds, pictures of temporarily maddened men, with hatred and blood lust in their eyes, killing fellow men because of their color or creed; pictures of hypnotized throngs swaying to the frenzied words of a dictator or demagog.

But I do not speak of those things today. I speak rather of mob thinking, of huge masses of our people bemused before television sets buying their ideas as they would toilet soap.

I speak of mass fixations, the acceptance of unproven facts that all scientists are crackpots, that all politicians are rogues, that all educators are eggheads, that new ideas are subversive.

We are approaching a point in our national thinking where indictment is conviction and a charge is a proven fact. Those who rebel and dare to challenge commit the cardinal sin of questioning the status quo and, therefore, must be anti-American.

We substitute labels, labels such as radical and reactionary, for ideas. Every man must have a pigeon hole and in he goes, though he be round and the hole square.

One of the cynical bits of advice given a freshman Congressman is that he participate sparingly in debate.

"The things you don't say can never be used against you," he is warned.

What a commentary on our times. Remain silent or the mob will throw your words back in your teeth. Repress the expression of new ideas, lest the mob turn on you for disturbing its complacency. Wave your flag but be very careful about defending those parts of our Constitution which stand in the path of mob action. Assert your own patriotism, but don't bother to defend that of persons unjustly accused. The mob may not like it.

Who are responsible for this sorry state of affairs? What elements among us have developed this passion for conformity?

We have, in this great Nation of ours, a group of self-righteous, self-appointed people who believe they, or their leaders, are the keepers of the public conscience.

They say they are against sin, so all who disagree with their views on anything from a local ordinance to foreign policy, are for sin.

They say they are 100 percent American, so all who fight their ideas are automatically trying to destroy our country.

In their arrogance, they would pin the label of treason on our highest officials, our courts, our President, and our Congress if they make a single move contrary to the dicta of their leaders.

They are the annointed of the Lord, the saviors of democracy, the referees of public morals, the last voices of freedom in the land.

I do not suggest that these people are in the majority, but they are dangerous as long as the majority of us remains indifferent and allows their policy of sterility to go unchallenged.

Most of us have had the experience, at a baseball game, of being humiliated by the crudeness and cruelty of a few loud-voiced booers.

We have cringed but remained silent, giving the impression that all of us are ignorant.

That was my experience during the contest over the Alaskan mental health bill. I knew the great body of decent American opinion would be on our side, given the facts, but I still had to go through the strain and heartbreak of false accusations, because the good people were silent and left the arena to the booers.

I know not where life will lead you graduates of today. You will follow many different paths. Some of you will never see one another again.

But it is my earnest hope, as you leave here with your diplomas, that you will also take away a common resolve, to speak up when the self-righteous attack unfairly; to defend new ideas; to avoid—as a very pestilence—condemnation without knowledge.

If you do this, you will be keeping open the most important frontier our Nation has, the American mind.

Michigan: A Study in Character Assassination

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 21, 1959

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I am moved to make this statement by my grave concern over the increasing—but completely unwarranted—assaults on the good name of the sovereign State of Michigan. As a citizen and Representative of the State of Michigan, I feel it my duty to come to her defense and to clear the air of the smoke from the various barrages which have been leveled against her. For whether these attacks are merely misguided, misinformed commentary or the conscious, self-serving efforts of some who would reap gains at Michigan's expense, they have the single effect of a deliberate character assassination of the fair State of Michigan.

Even a brief consideration of the charges to which I refer will readily show them to be not only unwarranted but, in large part, untrue, or at best, highly distorted versions of the real facts. Allow me, then, to take up the most prominent of these anti-Michigan allegations and see how they hold up under examination.

One frequent assertion is that Michigan is a welfare State—this with a derogatory intonation. This accusation has a twofold meaning to the critics who make it. First, of all these accusers mean to point a contemptuous finger at what the Los Angeles Times has termed the "highly advanced concept of paternalism" in Michigan and the invasion of local responsibilities they say it involves. Second, they point to a 100-percent rise in State spending in Michigan over the past decade and proceed, by implication, to attribute this increase to the support of various welfare programs by the State. From here it is an easy jump for these critics to assert that the State is broke and that this bankruptcy is directly due to Michigan's welfare activities. These are harsh and harmful words, indeed. Let us examine them. If they are accusing Michigan of being interested in the well-being of her citizens, Michigan gladly and readily admits to her guilt. The only real fact to be found in this diatribe is that State spending has doubled in Michigan in the past decade. However, this would seem to compare rather favorably with the fact that State spending—for all States—now totals more than 5 times as much as it did in 1946. Consider also that, in terms of dollars and cents, welfare costs each Michigan citizen $16.30—State and local taxes combined. According to a new U.S. Census report, this figure puts Michigan 34th among all the States in this respect—lower than 33 others.

Another charge, "taxes are out of line," can easily be disproven in the same fashion. The dollars and cents total of State and local levies in the State of Michigan is $181.13 per citizen. In terms of cash outlay this figure ranks 12th in the Nation. However, this same figure, when considered as a percentage of personal income, is 31st on the national scale—behind 30 of her sister States.

There is a companion allegation that the tax burden in Michigan is stampeding business out of the State. This is patently false. Industry in Michigan spent $110 million for expansion in 1958. This represented a jump of nearly $30 million over the 1957 figure and placed Michigan fourth among all the States in industrial construction in 1958.

The epithet, "unhealthy business climate," is another fusilade of the anti-Michigan invective. This is hardly worthy of our consideration since it is too vague to have any real meaning. If this charge has not already been rendered completely without substance by what I have said thus far, let me point out a few simple facts that will complete the annihilation. The well-known Big Three of the automobile world alone have invested in excess of $3½ billion in Michigan facilities since 1950. The announced intentions of but a few of the leading businesses in Michigan have earmarked in excess of $425 million for investment and expansion in Michigan. Does all this smack of an unhealthy

business climate? Hardly. Rather these are the past facts and the future plans of the leading business leaders of the country who, better than anyone else, are able to gage the business climate in which they exist.

It must, by now, be abundantly clear to all that the charges leveled against the State of Michigan in all of these areas are simply untrue. With States, as with men, no possession is more precious than a good name. I sincerely hope that in demonstrating the utter falsity of the attacks on the good name of the State of Michigan I have fully vindicated her character and integrity in the eyes of the whole Nation.

Virginia Rescue Squad Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. PAT JENNINGS
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 21, 1959

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, the people of Virginia are observing Rescue Squad Week during this week of May 17–23, and I wish to call this special observance to the attention of my colleagues in the House.

As far as can be determined, Virginia is the only State known to honor each year the humanitarian work of organized rescue and first aid groups.

Because of the extreme importance of the work carried on by this volunteer organization in assisting those in need and distress, I take this occasion to commend the many squads in Virginia and their many, many devoted members.

The Governor of Virginia, the Honorable J. Lindsay Almond, has issued the following proclamation on this special observance. It is included as a part of these remarks:

RESCUE SQUAD WEEK

The people of Virginia are grateful for the fine service being rendered in a great variety of emergencies by members of the lifesaving and rescue squads. These groups, day or night, are available to answer calls from their fellow citizens and also give generously of their time in presentation of demonstrations in first aid and safety measures. They also constitute a corps of readily available personnel for civil defense service in event of major disaster.

I salute these crews and members of the Virginia Association of Rescue Squads and their Ladies Auxiliaries and invite the citizens of the Commonwealth to join in tribute to them by appropriate observance of Rescue Squad Week May 17–23, 1959.

J. LINDSAY ALMOND, Jr.,
Governor.

Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill in this session of Congress to materially assist the rescue squads of the Nation in their work. This bill is H.R. 105 and would provide that surplus Federal property could be donated to rescue squads; it is presently pending in the Subcommittee on Donable Property of the Government Operations Committee.

Recently, the International Rescue and First Aid Association—IRFAA—endorsed the provisions of H.R. 105. I called attention to this endorsement in the RECORD of March 12, 1959.

The IRFAA has now advised me that endorsement of H.R. 105 has also come from the Minnesota Rescue and First Aid Association. The Minnesota endorsement is the latest of several endorsements from such State organizations.

It is my sincere hope that hearings will soon be held on H.R. 105 and the measure reported to the House.

There is printed in the International Rescuer, monthly publication of IRFAA, the following quotation from the Bible:

> And a certain Samaritan * * * going up to him bound up his wounds, pouring in oil and wine; and setting him upon his own beast, brought him to an inn and took care of him. (Luke 10: 33–34.)

This perhaps sums up the spirit that is typical of the rescue squads in the Nation as they go about their dedicated work of assisting people in distress.

I know that each of my colleagues joins me today in paying this brief tribute to the rescue squads of Virginia and America during Virginia Rescue Squad Week.

Congressman Gerald T. Flynn, Democrat, of Wisconsin, Defends the Richard I. Bong Airbase

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD T. FLYNN
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 12, 1959

Mr. FLYNN. Mr. Speaker, I have noted with much dismay remarks made in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD relative to waste, frills, and extravagance in the construction of the Richard I. Bong Air Force Base at Kansasville in the First Congressional District of Wisconsin. These remarks were filed by a Congressman representing a district in which the base is not located, and were apparently made by him after examination of blueprints and plans furnished by the Leo A. Daley firm of architects of Omaha, Nebr. I also have a copy of these plans, and I have examined them thoroughly. It is with much displeasure that I take issue with remarks printed in the RECORD by a Member of Congress from Milwaukee. None of us favor spending for nonessentials. None of us favor military boondoggling. However, we are all in favor of building adequately and soundly for current needs with an eye open for future needs. The Bong Airbase anticipates a complement of military personnel and civilians working on the base, together with their families, of approximately 20,000 people. This base is being built in a country area and is approximately 20 miles from any metropolitan center.

The criticism contained in the RECORD was to the effect that money is being spent for a theater, bowling alley, hi-fi shop, gymnasium, and indoor swimming pool, steamroom, and squash court, and these facilities are not essential spending. I do not concur in this conclusion, and I allege that 20,000 people located in a country area some 20 miles from a metropolitan city must have on the base reasonable opportunities for relaxation and recreation. The building of a bowling alley or a gymnasium, including a swimming pool and massage room, is not a foolish expenditure of money. The Government of the United States has over $40,000 invested in the training of every one of these air cadets. Because of poor, uninteresting, and inadequate facilities, the Air Force has witnessed its fully trained and highly competent personnel, including those flying the planes, leave the service as soon as their tour of duty was completed. The Government then is compelled to spend another $40,000 to train a replacement. If the Government offered reasonable housing, as it is now doing under the Capehart housing program, and reasonable facilities for recreation, the percentage of those signing up for a second, third, and fourth enlistment would materially increase. The Air Force has experimented and has found a great increase in the reenlistment rate when living conditions have been improved, and this has accounted for a huge saving to the taxpayer. It, therefore, would be very foolish for the Air Force, in building this fine and modern new airbase, to fail to include therein a gymnasium. A bowling alley for the relaxation of the airmen and their families, and even a hi-fi shop in which junior can buy a record for his record player, and even a swimming pool for the airmen's use is not extravagance.

It is proposed in the bill of criticism that the airmen use gymnastic and swimming pool facilities located in cities 20 miles from the base. Imagine, an airman returning from a flight and getting into his car, or if he does not have his own car, of taking a bus into the nearest town some 20 miles away to find a gymnasium and swimming pool. From firsthand knowledge I can state, without fear of contradiction, that the swimming pools and gymnastic facilities in the cities of Racine and Kenosha, are inadequate for their own population, without taking into consideration the 20,000 people the base will bring in.

Most bases have a theater—and a theater providing a seating capacity for 650 people under modern conditions is not unrealistic or extravagant. It is merely building for present needs with an eye to the future, with a thought of taking care of normal needs of the 20,000 people who will live on or near the base. The criticism also includes a community service building wherein there are retail stores, snack bars, maintenance shops, warehouse, laundry and drycleaning shops, concessions, barbershops, a central post office, reading room, Red Cross office, and so forth. It is inconceivable to me that any Member of Congress would propose that a modern up-to-date Strategic Air Command base which will attract 20,000 people should be built in a country area 20 miles from any large city without such facilities being built into the base, and I do not feel it fair to criticize those who designed the base for this expenditure in money, any more

than I would criticize the Air Force for building a modern SAC plane instead of duplicating the Kitty Hawk. We are living in the modern age of 1959, and looking forward to the sixties, and our bases must represent modern needs and facilities, and not the needs of World War I.

I have gone carefully over the plans and I believe that the SAC and the architectural firm should be highly complimented for the designing of a modern SAC base with modern facilities—and on the other hand for the construction of a base that is not extravagant or wasteful, and that does not have needs above and beyond the requirements of the boys who are going to man and staff the base.

In answer to the question of whether the Richard I. Bong Air Force Base really needs these facilities, I say that the Bong Airbase and any other modern airbase built in a similar location definitely needs a swimming pool, a gymnasium, a bowling alley, and the other facilities described herein—and it would be preposterous and unthinkable to have military personnel who are on a 24-hour alert required to go to cities 20 miles away and attempt to use the inadequate facilities that those cities have. I feel it would be nearsighted and would do nothing to prevent the thousands of airmen, trained at great expense to the Government, from leaving the service. Whereas the facilities of a modern base will help to keep trained personnel in the service and will result in a large saving to the country. I earnestly solicit the examination of the Bong Airbase plans by any Member of Congress who has an interest therein.

New York State Supreme Court Justice J. Vincent Keogh

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1959

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, New York State Supreme Court Justice J. Vincent Keogh, a brother of our distinguished colleague from New York, the Honorable EUGENE J. KEOGH, has been given a tough assignment. In order to be able to build the $330 million Narrows Bridge from Brooklyn to Staten Island, New York City had to take title to home involving 1,577 families who are to be dislodged.

Under the most favorable circumstances this would not be an easy matter to accomplish satisfactorily for all concerned. With the housing situation such as it is in New York, it means additional dislocations and discomfort for these many hundreds of families, and in numerous instances it may involve economic losses. It is not surprising that many of the homeowners in the area are upset.

Justice J. Vincent Keogh has been appointed as arbiter to handle this situation and make sure that the homeowners receive fair treatment. I can think of no one more able and more fair to handle this kind of a "sticky job" than Justice Keogh, and I am glad this task has fallen to him. There is no doubt in my mind that he will be just and fair in his efforts to satisfy the ousted residents of the area.

Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege for me to tell this body, in which another Keogh serves with great distinction, that I have known Justice Keogh for over 20 years and have followed his career with keen interest. I knew him as Assistant District Attorney for Kings County and later as U.S. Attorney for the Eastern District of New York to which post he was appointed by President Truman in 1946. He held that office for nearly 5 years until he was chosen for the State Supreme Court, where he has been serving with great distinction for almost 9 years.

Justice Keogh is also known for his fine human qualities and his deep interest in the welfare of youth. For a number of years he has served as Commissioner of Boy Scouts for the Borough of Brooklyn and as President of the Brooklyn Council of Boy Scouts. He is never too busy to do a favor for those who need his help or seek his advice. He is always friendly, gracious, pleasant. The ousted residents can be assured that their problem will be in good hands and receive just treatment.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert into the RECORD a brief editorial from the New York Journal American of May 1, 1959, dealing with the matter discussed above and Justice Keogh. The editorial is as follows:

A FAIR "SHAKE"

The people of Bay Ridge have had their share of tribulation fighting the planned $330 million Narrows Bridge.

Now that the city officially has taken title to homes along 7th Avenue, from 60th Street and the Fort Hamilton ramp, we hope the 1,577 families involved get a better than fair "shake" in the condemnation awards.

The "sticky" job of satisfying the soon-to-be-ousted residents falls to Brooklyn Supreme Court Justice J. Vincent Keogh. He is in a "spot" we wouldn't wish on anybody.

Based on Judge Keogh's record, Bay Ridge residents should feel assured that a more fair-minded arbiter could not be found to handle their problem.

So, when he notifies homeowners they will receive a "fair market value" for their property, it should provide some balm to the displaced in their hour of anguish.

It has been a bitter battle for the residents. They fought hard and clean in a sincere drive to maintain the dignity and beauty of their community.

We hope they are adequately paid for their efforts by an honorable settlement with the city.

Newsman Backs Snyder Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1959

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Illinois State Journal-Register, Springfield, May 17, 1959:

NEWSMAN BACKS SNYDER POLICY

(By Robert W. Richards)

WASHINGTON.—It's simply not true that Assistant Defense Secretary for Public Affairs Murray Snyder gags news out of the Pentagon that American people have a right to know.

Snyder has taken a verbal kicking around from Representative JOHN B. MOSS, Democrat, of California, and J. Russell Wiggins, editor of the Washington Post and Times Herald and the new president of the American Society of Newspaper Editors.

Both have made something of a career out of the freedom of the information refrain, with exaggerated claims that the Government is hiding too many secrets on the grounds they would jeopardize national security if released to press and television-radio reporters.

This correspondent, after observing the Capital scene for 16 years, can't buy the plaint. Washington is a sieve, with the only secrets kept those not worth telling. The whole town, as the late Sir Wilmot Lewis of the London Times used to say, is a whispering gallery.

So long as the political "outs" continue their incessant striving to expose the sins of the "in," secrets in places high and low, like murder, will out.

In no other administration, it should be remarked, has there been such a ready dissemination of information.

President Eisenhower's several illnesses, were quickly announced and handled on a play-by-play basis.

The policy of telling all—save that which would imperil the U.S. military safety in the cold war with communism, was set at the very beginning of the Eisenhower administration by White House Press Secretary James C. Hagerty, former New York Times man.

Snyder, himself a veteran reporter for the New York Herald Tribune, served as Hagerty's first assistant for several years until the President, angered that too often the Pentagon brass rushed out their latest weapons to the press at budget or appropriation time, sent him to the Defense Department to put a stop to this.

Mr. Eisenhower, it can be said, conceded that Russian espionage probably would in due course learn all about the new U.S. hardware, as they did the nuclear bomb, but he didn't want to make it available to Soviet spies for the nickel or dime it cost to buy a daily newspaper.

It is also the policy, though there have been exceptions to it during the past few years when some exclusives have been fed out to favorites, to provide that all media get all the news at the same time.

Snyder, for example, arranged that reporters have a second-by-second countdown on the first Vanguard satellite blastoff which fizzled ignominiously.

The same congressional gentlemen, who and criticized him for suppressing information, then clobbered him for advertising to the world the American failure. They wanted it both ways.

When an attempt was made to tie up the seven Mercury astronauts to prevent their giving out information for free. Synder acted with dispatch to squelch the arrangement.

Though the astronauts, one of whom will ride the first man-made moon into orbit, are not under defense and his jurisdictions. Snyder called on the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to step hard on their agent.

Of course it was ridiculous to think that employes of the U.S. Government could make stick any such arrangement.

But it was Snyder who applied the paddle and quickly. He also promised like sets of rules for defense personnel whose epochal feats in a nuclear-space-jet age might be sold for publication.

Consumers Have the Power To Kill Fair Trade Move

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 21, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial appearing in the Nashville (Tenn.) Tennessean on March 26 of this year pointing out that consumers have the power to kill fair trade if they so desire.

Unfortunately, the American consumer is not organized and has no lobby to represent him in the Congress of the United States. Those who seek to destroy the free competitive system and to gouge the consumer are well represented with well-paid and well financed lobbies in Washington.

One of the most effective lobbies has been that behind the so-called fair trade bill, which is really not fair trade at all but which is a virtual repealer of the antitrust laws of the United States in the language of the Federal Trade Commission and the Department of Justice.

The so-called fair trade bill, H.R. 1253, if enacted is going to cost the consumers of this country $1 billion or more, according to the spokesman for the Department of Justice. It is nothing but a consumer gouge bill, and will authorize all sorts of economic coercion, blackmail, and interference of a most ruthless sort in the business of others. It will place a price floor under nationally advertised commodities which will not help the little man but which will actually only benefit the large producer and the large retailer. It will do nothing about the private brands which now cause the gravest of difficulties. H.R. 1253 should be defeated.

[From the Nashville (Tenn.) Tennessean, Mar. 26, 1959]

CONSUMERS HAVE THE POWER TO KILL FAIR-TRADE MOVE

People often write in to complain that, though things are not going to suit them in Washington, they have a feeling of helplessness when it comes to doing something about it.

Well, they are not as weak as they think; and they can do something about it.

They can, for instance, mobilize their strength to fight the lobbies which now are trying to push through Congress a bill to permit manufacturers to fix retail prices. This is the so-called "fair trade" law which has been tried and found wanting. It embodies the principles of the trusts against which sentiment is solidified, and it makes a mockery of free enterprise.

This new price-fixing bill is conceded a fair chance of passage unless the legislators are made aware of consumer opposition. If it should become a law, manufacturers would be able to fix the retail price to suit themselves—and do it by decree. Agreements from the retailer who believes in the old idea of free competition would not be necessary.

Recognizing the evils involved, several big manufacturers have abandoned "fair trade" practices which have already been outlawed as unconstitutional in 17 States. But the practices will be made constitutional if the manufacturers have their way.

Fortunately, the Federal Trade commission and the United States Department of Justice are now solidly lined up with the consumers. Chairman John Gwynne of the FTC has put the issue this way:

"The fixing of retail prices is inconsistent with the American system of free competitive enterprise and is contrary to public policy as expressed in the anti-trust laws since 1890."

But the manufacturers, who would cry "dictatorship" if the Federal Government went into the price-fixing business, refuse to see anything incongruous in their attitude.

If the lobbies are successful, the Nation's consumers will be in for multi-million-dollar losses which they can ill afford on top of higher taxes which threaten.

These consumers, however, have it in their power to stop the thing in its tracks by letting their Representatives in Congress know that they will be accountable for their votes on the issue. It is as simple as that.

There is nothing fair about "fair trade" and the people should insist that their welfare comes before that of the lobbies.

Remarks of Hon. Hugh S. Cumming on May 15, 1959, Armed Forces Day, at Langley Air Force Base, Va.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS N. DOWNING
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 21, 1959

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Hugh S. Cumming, Jr., former Ambassador to Indonesia and presently the Director of Intelligence and Research of our State Department, delivered an interesting and informative address at the Armed Forces Day banquet held at Langley Air Force Base last week. A careful reading of the remarks gives one a keener insight on the East German problem presently confronting us.

I ask unanimous consent that the address be made a part of these remarks and printed in the appendix of the RECORD:

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE HUGH S. CUMMING, JR., THE DIRECTOR, BUREAU OF INTELLIGENCE AND RESEARCH, DEPARTMENT OF STATE, AT THE ARMED FORCES DAY BANQUET, LANGLEY AIR FORCE BASE, VA., AT 8 P.M., EASTERN STANDARD TIME, FRIDAY, MAY 15, 1959

I need not conceal the fact that when I received through Congressman DOWNING the invitation of Mayor Brittingham and Mayor Bentley to address you tonight, I felt both honored and deeply touched; honored at the opportunity to be with such a distinguished and representative gathering of my fellow citizens, touched to be once again, and this time as your guest, in the corner of Virginia that I and my ancestors have called home. It was here that I attended the Symmes-Eaton Academy and Hampton High School; it was in the nearby waters of Hampton Roads and Chesapeake Bay that I learned to swim and sail and fish; and it was at Fort Monroe that I received my commission as a second lieutenant during the First World War.

Forty-one years later, on this eve of Armed Forces Day as we salute our Army, Navy, and Air Force here at home and overseas, I know you share with me, and with free people everywhere, the longing for a durable peace. Unfortunately, the values we cherish—individual dignity, religious and political freedom, economic well-being—do not remain inviolate simply because we wish it so. Inescapably from time to time the ideals of men and their institutions undergo vigorous and critical testing. Certainly no more demanding test has confronted us—as it has for more than a decade—than the hostility of the ambitious, aggressive, and heavily armed Sino-Soviet bloc, dedicated as it is to the premise that the future belongs to communism. With the whole world as its proclaimed goal, international communism stands as the greatest moral and physical peril in our history. Thus, never before has it been more imperative that we achieve a thoroughly united effort by the military and civilian power of our Nation. Only through joint, cooperative action may we meet and overcome this formidable challenge.

Fortunately, action of this sort is characteristic of the United States. Our President is at the same time Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces and Chief Executive in our foreign relations. I am happy to think that our joint action finds concrete expression in my presence here today, bringing a pledge of cooperation by the Secretary of State to our symbolic union of the armed services and the civil authorities in tomorrow's ceremonies.

Let me turn to another important factor in the strength of our country—a factor that it is especially appropriate to emphasize here in the Commonwealth of Virginia. One of the chief bases of our national unity and of the freedom and progress that characterize our society is our representative system of government. It is with no small pride that we in Virginia recall the contribution to American democracy made by our revolutionary forebears and by following generations of our fellow Virginians.

Never has this heritage been more critically important than now. As our environment grows increasingly complex, as the potentialities for political and social control by government become stronger, the problem of creating and maintaining institutions which truly advance individual freedom and dignity becomes more pressing. In our own case, and in the entire western world, individual liberty has been strengthened and individual dignity has been enhanced. No doubt government in the modern world has constantly extended its influence on the individual's well-being; it follows that the measure of a government's legitimacy can only be the degree to which it is responsive to the needs of those it governs. Fortunately for us, the architects and builders of our United States have constructed a system of government clearly dedicated through its representative character to the welfare of the individual.

On the other hand, wherever social and political institutions are shaped solely for the gain of a dictatorship, liberty and dignity are destroyed. At this very time when we are meeting together here, there is a meeting going on in Geneva that sharpens this contrast between nations that share a heritage of freedom and those that are totalitarian dictatorships. I think it might be appropriate this evening for us to con-

sider one of the puppet governments that has been set up by the rulers of the Communist bloc—a government which shows what those rulers are working to foist on free peoples throughout the world. Let us look at the so-called "German Democratic Republic," where a puppet regime seeks to control and dominate all aspects of life, in politics, business, art, and social activity.

At Geneva, our Secretary of State, Mr. Herter, is now meeting with the Foreign Ministers of France, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union on problems that result from the continued artificial division of Germany. The United States has welcomed the opportunity to discuss these issues peacefully and it hopes—as Secretary Herter has said—that the talks "will prove to be business-like negotiations and not a propaganda exercise." Given the long list of broken pledges by the Soviets, the allied West has wisely adopted a firm "I'm from Missouri" position.

German advisers from West and East, from the German Federal Republic and from the so-called German Democratic Republic, are present to assist the four foreign ministers. The Soviet Union claims that both sets of Germans should attend the conference as full-fledged participants, representing what the Russians call the two German states. As a first step in examining the character of the East German regime, let us have a brief look at the backgrounds of the advisers who have alleged that they represent the national interests of the 17 million Germans who live in the Soviet Zone.

Of the four principal advisers two are Soviet citizens; the third was educated in the Soviet Union and is married to a Soviet citizen. Only the fourth has a reasonably German background—but he is manifestly cast in the role of window dressing and very seldom heard from. You may well ask, "How can such men profess to represent the aspirations of a people who want to reunify their country, and exercise national self-determination—to choose their form of government, their own social and economic system?" The obvious answer is that they don't. What they do represent is a credo out of Moscow and allegiance not to the German people but an allegiance to communism and to the Kremlin. What they value is, in their own words: "Unbreakable friendship and deep love of the Socialist Soviet Union, of the Liberation Army (that is, the Red Army), loyalty to the cause of Lenin and Stalin and to the Communist Party of the Soviet Union." This langauge speaks for itself.

The self-styled German Democratic Republic, when established in October 1949, was justified by the Russian and German Communists as a response to the creation of the Federal Republic of West Germany. As a response it was strikingly inadequate. For proclamation of the Federal Republic in September 1949, followed on democratic elections and a democratically adopted constitution. In East Germany neither free elections nor free discussion preceded the formation of the regime. The entire process was manipulated from the Kremlin to orbit another satellite in the Soviet system. I want to emphasize how completely artificial the East German regime is. This mockery of a government was arbitrarily installed and is forcibly maintained. There is no background, either in historical precedent or international agreement, for any separate form of government in East Germany.

Following World War II, the declared purposes of the Allied Powers—Western and Soviet—with regard to Germany were: (1) denazification, (2) prevention of the rebirth of aggressive forces, and (3) assistance to the German people in recovering their national self-respect and standing in the community of free nations. But, long before 1945 and the Potsdam Conference, the Soviet Union had already cynically set to work to make Germany a Russian puppet. It selected, trained, and repatriated persons who are today the political and military leaders in East Germany.

Conspicuous among them and typical of these people, Wilhelm Pieck, President of the East German regime, has been a Communist since his early youth. Walter Ulbricht, First Deputy Prime Minister, is a Communist, was long a colonel in the Red Army, is probably still a Soviet citizen. Ulbricht was the prime mover in engineering the phony National Committee for Free Germany, which later was the instrument for the Communist takeover. Another is Hilda Benjamin. Red Hilda has been a Communist since 1924 and has a son who took his college training in Russia. She is now Minister of Justice, or—as the Germans prefer—"Minister of Injustice."

With the help of puppets like these, the Russians then proceeded to impose the present regime upon the helpless East Germans. As the uprisings of June 1953 demonstrated, the regime could and can be maintained only by force. There are 22 Soviet military divisions still in East Germany. While these divisions play their main role in the larger Soviet strategy towards Europe, they have also been an indispensable mainstay to the regime while it built up its own instruments of forcible repression. Here we see the Soviet contribution toward self-determination, toward letting the German people solve their own problems.

The East Germans do have a constitution. Among its principles are some that have a real democratic ring—until we catch the echo from the pious words of the constitution "granted" the Russian people by Stalin. Article 6, for example, speaks of the "exercise of democratic rights"; article 8 of "personal liberty"; article 9 of "freedom of expression and assembly," and article 14 of the "right of trade unions to strike." But this constitution is no living instrument like our own. Its principles remain a dead letter. Indeed, when the regime, with active aid from Soviet military forces, bloodily suppressed the uprisings of 1953, every one of these provisions were violated. There were no illusions about the value of these hollow promises in the minds of the patriotic heroes at that time who defended themselves with stones against Russian tanks. Who can doubt that the spirit of these heroes is still alive?

The constitution provides also for equal, universal, direct, and secret elections. But who are the people allowed to vote for? Only groups that meet the Communists specifications may nominate candidates, and at each election the voter is offered only a single list of candidates without choice of party. He cannot even vote "no," but to object must publicly refuse to drop his ballot in the box—with obvious consequences. This system has produced 99-percent majorities like those which have so long been a routine in the Soviet Union. It is the inventors of this system, by the way, who so loudly criticize the "mechanical majorities" of the West in the United Nations.

One might wonder why the regime bothers to hold elections at all. They are but a semblance of democratic process, representing no more than a political con game. To the overwhelming majority of the population they are the ultimate in intellectual humiliation. To the regime, however, they add one more means of inflicting discipline.

I have talked at some length about the political complexion of the Soviet Zone of Germany, the unrepresentative character of its regime, and the complete dependence of that regime on the Soviet Union. Despite this record of unresponsiveness to the needs of the people, we in the Department of State are sometimes asked, "Why doesn't the United States recognize East Germany? We recognize West Germany, don't we?"

The fundamental reason for not recognizing the German Democratic Republic is that it simply is not a national entity. It is—to repeat—an artificial regime created by the Soviet Union and imposed in the Soviet zone of military occupation because the Soviet Union has not been able to dominate all of Germany. The Federal Republic of West Germany, on the other hand, does not claim to be a separate German state, but is a temporary and partial federation which will be dissolved when a constitution and democratic government for the whole German people comes into force. The Federal Republic, with a population of 50 million, is accepted as the international spokesman for the entire German population by all the non-Communist countries of the world. Our recognition of the German Democratic Republic would mean our acceptance of the Communist thesis that Germany is not one, but two nations—it would mean, moreover, abandoning the population to communism.

In its unremitting campaign to control the mind and spirit of the East German people, the regime goes to extraordinary lengths. Let me give you an example of its attention to detail. For many years the Duden reference dictionary has traditionally been the one classical authority for Germany on the usage and meaning of words. Today, in the Soviet Zone, a second Duden has appeared. Even this homely device has been used to distort the simple and traditional meanings of Western concepts. Democracy, for example, is defined as "a form of government, the nature of which is determined by whatever class is in power." Individualism is "self-interest without any consideration for society." To enlighten is "to instruct politically." The word "atheism," which was defined originally as simply "denial of the existence of God," is given a new twist as "scientifically founded denial of the existence of God."

On a very different plane, religion is opposed by the regime, as it is, to be sure, by all Communists. The latest attack has taken the form of a ceremony, a confirmation of the young—but confirmation in atheism. Available evidence clearly shows that soon no boy or girl will be able to enter an institution of higher learning until he or she has received this confirmation.

Or take the law. Courts of so-called justice make a mockery in East Germany of due process, rules of evidence, and rights of defense counsel. Their nature was clearly revealed less than a month ago when five Dresden university students—aged 18 to 21—were given prison sentences totaling 37½ years at hard labor for allegedly promoting "anti-state" activities on their campus. Observers reported that the trial judge repeatedly attempted to influence the students in their answers, and that you couldn't tell the defense attorney from the prosecutor.

Such demoralizing and evil practices will in time pave the way for weakening and undermining the regime. As injustice continues—in the churches, the schools, the trade unions, the business community—the regime will be the loser. The freedom to work, to worship, and to study as one chooses is indivisible. History has repeatedly demonstrated the futility of attempts at infringement of these inherent rights.

Indeed, the Soviet Union would do well to pause in pressing its unreasonable and unwarranted demands on Berlin—to hesitate in urging its puppet regime to impose still further burdens on its subjects. The Soviet leaders might well ask themselves what is to prevent the East German people from rising again as they did in 1953, and, with greater force, demanding their rights and freedom.

The most eloquent testimony of a people in despair is told by the refugees who reach the West. These are the people of whom it has been said: "They vote with their feet." In 10 years 3 million Germans—teachers,

physicians, clergymen, engineers, laborers, even state officials—have fled from the Soviet zone. Many of you may recently have seen and heard some of these people tell their stories on television. The refugees are welcomed by the West and each arrival is a loss for the Communists.

These considerations make it all the more urgent to settle the problem of Germany in a way that will insure German reunification in peace and freedom. Secretary Herter and his Western colleagues at Geneva are approaching this problem with a clear determination to advance the cause of peace and freedom, by first standing firmly by the West's obligations in Berlin. Armed Forces Day symbolizes for us the military strength we possess to support this firmness. Provided we all play our part, military and civilian together, our diplomacy can effectively give expression to our determination.

President Eisenhower, as you know, has made clear his willingness, if progress is made by the Foreign Ministers, to participate in a heads-of-government meeting to further the cause of reunification and the overriding problem of European security. A divided Germany is a problem which extends beyond Europe alone; it has vital meaning for the entire world. And, as the President has said:

"We must avoid letting fear or lack of confidence turn us from the course that self respect, decency, and love of liberty point out. To do so would be to dissipate the creative energies of our people upon whom our real security rests. This we will not do."

Thank you.

The Labor-Management Performance Act of 1959, H.R. 7265

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1959

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, May 20, 1959, I introduced my new labor bill, H.R. 7265. I am submitting herewith an explanation of this bill which I hope each and every Member of the Congress will read.

THE LABOR-MANAGEMENT PERFORMANCE ACT OF 1959—H.R. 7265

Weeks of hearings in the House, together with the public reaction against the Kennedy bill as passed by the Senate, demonstrate the need for a new approach to labor reform.

The heart of the problem is the breakdown in performance under existing laws. Whether the failure is in the law or its enforcement is an open question. The result is that the fundamental rights of the working men and women of this country definitely are not being protected.

The breakdown is most serious when it fails to provide protection against internal union abuses and to oust the criminal elements from the union movement. Union members can sometimes obtain relief from internal union problems through use of the courts, but it is a long and expensive process. Few rank and file union members can afford the time or the money. In the criminal area congressional hearings have clearly exposed an appalling failure of enforcement.

Nevertheless, the Senate act relies on court enforcement of its watered-down bill of rights and on criminal penalties for most of the rest of its provisions. Such legislation is no more than a repetition of the same old theme song, "Let the House of Labor take care of itself."

H.R. 7265 offers a fresh approach. It is based on the recognition that, if the corrupt element is to be eliminated from the labor movement, the major part of the responsibility rests on the membership of any union to do its own house cleaning. They will do it if they are given the necessary tools and real protection while the job is being done. H.R. 7265 does exactly that.

The bill contains a simple but comprehensive bill of rights which will go a long way toward insuring that control of the union will be in the hands of the members rather than the officials. Independently audited financial reports are required, but the bill recognizes that regardless of where the reports are filed, only union members will be sufficiently well informed to question them. Thus it provides that the reports must be given to union members only. By far the great majority of union leaders and employers are honest Americans; therefore, no reports are required of labor officials or employers. Such reports are aimed only at wrongdoers, and it is ridiculous to think a criminal is going to write us a report of his crime.

Enforcement procedure is of paramount importance. H.R. 7265 contains a simple, well-tested method—the unfair labor practice procedure of the National Labor Relations Board. All the member need do is file a charge of a violation of the bill of rights or the reporting provisions, and the NLRB takes over the investigation and prosecution of his case. He is protected from retaliation while the case is processed. The confidence which rank-and-file workmen have in the Board is amply demonstrated by the fact that last quarter they filed 62 percent of the Board's unfair-labor practice cases. The bill also includes important changes in Board structure to speed up its case handling.

Any labor reform measure must include restrictions on organizational picketing and secondary boycotts. Emotions run high on these issues, but both unions and employers are inclined to forget the impact of such activities on the working men and women who suffer as a result. Their right to be free of such coercion must be preserved if the freedom of association guaranteed by the Wagner Act is to mean anything.

H.R. 7265 prevents picketing after a union loses an NLRB election and, at the same time, markedly speeds up NLRB procedure for holding such elections. It also stops picketing where the labor organization involved cannot establish that 30 percent of the employees want the union to represent them.

In the secondary boycott area, there are presently restrictions on inducement of secondary employees. They are retained, and a ban on threats, restraint, and coercion of any person added. "Hot cargo" contracts are also outlawed.

The time has come to assure a greater voice to the union member in calling strikes. It is obvious that union officials must compete with each other to get the maximum wage increase for their members. Too often the members lose money as a result, either from lost wages or inflation caused by the increase. Consequently, the bill provides for a secret ballot strike vote to be taken within 7 days prior to commencement of any strike.

There are many other provisions in the bill, which are explained in the following summary and explanation. They likewise provide practical methods of protecting the rights of individual workmen.

The Performance Act of 1959 is the least restrictive on the activities of legitimate unions of any bill presently before the House. It provides far fewer opportunities for harassment of honest unions. At the same time it provides the union member with the only practical, realistic method of enforcing his rights that can be found in any of the bills introduced.

SUMMARY AND EXPLANATION OF H.R. 7265—POLICY

Section 2. (a) The policy of Congress originally stated in the Wagner Act and in the Taft Hartley Act, is repeated. Briefly, it is to encourage the practice and procedure of collective bargaining and to protect the exercise by workers of full freedom of association, self-organization, and designation of representatives of their own choosing, for the purpose of negotiating the terms and conditions of their employment or other mutual aid or protection.

PERSONS SUBJECT TO RAILWAY LABOR ACT

Section 102. To assure uniform treatment of all union members, with a minimum of interference with existing law, persons subject to the Railway Labor Act are made subject to the bill of rights and reporting provisions only.

DEFINITION OF "LABOR ORGANIZATION"

Section 103(c). The definition of "labor organization" is amended to include intermediate labor bodies.

REVISION IN THE STRUCTURE OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Section 104. The addition of new unfair labor practices will increase the caseload of the NLRB. To increase the Board's capacity and to provide faster processing of NLRB cases, three changes the NLRB structure are made:

First. Section 104(a): The Board is increased from five to seven members with terms of office increased to 7 years. The additional members will increase the capacity of the Board substantially by permitting use of more three-man panels.

Second. Section 104(b)(1): The Board is authorized to delegate to its regional directors the processing of representation cases. Such cases account for more than 50 percent of the Board's workload. During the early years of the NLRA, the Board undoubtedly needed to handle these cases itself. More than 20 years later the rules of decision are well established and nearly all of the cases are decided on established precedent. To make certain Board policy is followed by

regional directors, provision is made for appeal to the Board. Action of the Director is not stayed pending the appeal, however, to avoid the taking of an appeal as a delaying technique. This change of procedure will materially decrease the time spent in processing representation cases and eliminate advantages which parties have long sought to obtain by delays. It should therefore encourage consent elections and reduce the number of formal proceedings.

Third. Section 104(b)(2): The Board is made a truly quasi-judicial body and the General Counsel is made responsible for the administration of the agency. The estimated saving in Board workload is 15 percent. Historically, there has been serious conflict between the Board and the General Counsel sufficient to impair the efficiency of the agency. Most of the conflict has arisen over administrative matters. The proposed change will eliminate the major reason for disagreement and, with administrative responsibility centered in a single individual rather than in a group, a more efficient operation will result. Full control of all judicial functions of the Board, including its rulemaking power, remain with the Board.

Section 104(c): Provision is made for an Acting General Counsel. At present, certain functions of the General Counsel, including the issuing of complaints in unfair labor practice cases, cease when there is a vacancy in the office. The bill will permit appointment of an Acting General Counsel in order that the business of the agency may be carried on.

"HOT CARGO" CONTRACTS

Section 105(b). It is made an unfair labor practice for an employer to enter into any agreement, including a "hot cargo" contract, to engage in a secondary boycott.

UNION DISCRIMINATION AGAINST NONMEMBERS

Section 106(a): Although a strong bill of rights is included, the right of a union to refuse membership to persons it believes undesirable is recognized. An amendment to section 8(b)(2) of the LMRA precludes the union from causing an employer to discriminate against such persons.

SECONDARY BOYCOTT AMENDMENT

Section 106(b): The present language of section 8(b)(4) of the LMRA is left in effect and inducement of secondary employees continues to be an unfair labor practice. In addition, a ban is placed on "threats, coercion, or restraint" of any person where the object is one of those proscribed by section 8(b)(4) and contracts which cause an employer to engage in a secondary boycott are outlawed. Thus peaceful persuasion of secondary employers would be permitted but could not be carried to the point of threat or made part of a contract. The line drawn is the one between peaceful persuasion by the union and "strong arm" tactics.

ORGANIZATIONAL PICKETING

Section 107(b): Picketing to force an employer to recognize or bargain with a union after the union has lost an NLRB election is banned by amending section 8(b)(4)(C) of the LMRA. The amendment would permit picketing prior to the election except where the union is unable to establish that 30 percent of the employees affected want the union to represent them. As in the case of the secondary boycott amendment, the line drawn is that between peaceful persuasion and force. Picketing prevented by the amendment has but one effect. That is to force employees to accept as their bargaining agent a union which they have shown they do not want. Whatever educational value the picket line has is, at that point, far outweighed by its coercive effect on the employees and its interference with their freedom not to associate for collective-bargaining purposes, a freedom which Congress has specifically guaranteed in section 7 of the LMRA.

ENFORCEMENT OF BILL OF RIGHTS AND REPORTING PROVISIONS

Section 104(c): Violations of the bill of rights and the reporting provisions of the Performance Act are enforced through the unfair labor practice procedure of the National Labor Relations Board. As stated previously, inadequate performance under existing law is a large part of today's labor reform problem. Many, if not most, of the evils sought to be corrected can be reached through criminal laws or by private civil suits. Neither remedy is of real practical value to the rank-and-file union member. For conviction, a crime must be proved "beyond a reasonable doubt." Because of this burden, enforcement officials will try only clear-cut cases. Few cases are clear where, as here, so many witnesses are afraid to testify.

In the past the right to civil remedies, while helpful in some instances, has been beyond the reach of the average workman because of the cost. He cannot afford to hire a lawyer and go through the long procedures necessary, particularly when he must first exhaust his internal remedies within the union which may take years in itself.

The unfair labor practice procedure is a much more practical method of enforcement. It is thoroughly tested in the courts, eliminating procedural uncertainly. It can be uniformly applied because, even while the substance of the new unfair practices is being tested, a uniform policy will be followed. The injunctive remedy is available but, based on past experience, the Board can be expected to use it very sparingly. Also, if used, a uniform policy may be expected. While the Board has very broad powers to tailor remedies to correct unfair labor practices, it does not award damages. Cases instituted for harassment purposes will be inexpensively disposed of through the power of the general counsel to refuse issuance of a complaint.

The individual workman will clearly benefit by use of the unfair labor practice procedure. Where he believes he has been wronged, he need only file a charge with NLRB and the expense of investigating and processing will be borne by the Government. He will also have the power of the Government to protect him and any witnesses who testify for him from retaliation. NLRB's interest will be in securing relief as quickly and effectively as possible, preferably by settlement.

Enforcement by the Secretary of Labor was considered unwise for two major reasons. First, an entirely new enforcement agency within the Department would have to be established and its procedures tested in the courts—an expensive, time-consuming process. Second, it is unsound to ask the Cabinet Member whose real function it is to cooperate and work with labor to be a policemen over labor. If factionalism in the labor movement were to increase, a Secretary sympathetic to one faction could seriously harass the other.

BUILDING AND CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRY PROVISIONS

Section 107(a), (b) amends section 9(c)(1) of the NLRA to permit prehire contracts in the building and construction industry. Two safeguards are included: (1) There must have been a history of collective bargaining, and (2) if more than 30 percent of the employees in the bargaining unit object, an election will be held.

Because of the temporary nature of employment in this industry, the election provisions of the NLRA have not been practical. Employers and unions have been forced into technical violations of present unfair labor practice law, but no general counsel of NLRB has issued complaints in such cases, recognizing the equities involved. For the protection of all concerned, however, the law should be changed.

Permitting such prehire agreements handles the problem but, if employees are to be protected in the freedom guaranteed by the act, the two safeguards are essential. With no history of bargaining required and no chance for the employees to object, the "sweetheart" contract could effectively be used in many areas where there are substantial numbers of nonunion workmen. It will not interfere with established building trades unions because they have acquired the necessary history and an overwhelming number of members of the bargaining units are loyal union members.

ECONOMIC STRIKERS

Section 107(c). Economic strikers not entitled to reinstatement are permitted to vote in NLRB elections for a period of 6 months. A cutoff date has been used to avoid problems of former employees continuing to return indefinitely to influence the results of elections. The 6-month limit is believed to be adequate to cover any but most unusual situations.

REPORTING REQUIREMENTS OF SECTION 9(F) AND (G) OF LMRA

Section 107(d) repeals the reporting requirements of section 9(f) and (g) of the LMRA. This section required reports of union constitutions, bylaws, etc., and of financial transactions. No reports to the Secretary of Labor are required by the Performance Act and there are no prerequisites to use of NLRB. In the past, these reports have been of little, if any, value and provide

many possibilities for raising procedural technicalities in NLRB cases.

NON-COMMUNIST AFFIDAVITS

Section 107(d) repeals the requirement of filing non-Communist affidavits as a prerequisite to use of NLRB. While this section may have served a useful function at one time, its advantages at present are far outweighed by its disadvantages. The present requirement can be used as a procedural device to interfere with NLRB processes. The clerical problems in handling the paperwork are many and expensive. To add an employer requirement of such affidavits would be of no practical value and would merely increase the waste of money and effort. The problem of ousting Communists from the union movement is handled by a criminal provision in section 308.

UNFAIR LABOR PRACTICE CHARGES

Section 108 contains necessary amendments to section 10 of the NLRA. Present law permits any person to file an unfair labor practice charge. To avoid possible use for harassment, the amendment limits to the members of the particular labor organization charged the right to file a charge of violation of the reporting provisions. The amendment further requires that, upon notification of filing of the charge, reports which were furnished to members under the reporting provisions must be furnished to the general counsel with an affidavit certifying their accuracy. To protect rank-and-file members, the identity of the charging party in such cases will not be disclosed without his permission.

BILL OF RIGHTS

Testimony of rank-and-file union members before both the McClellan Committee and the House Education and Labor Committee clearly demonstrates the need for clarify the rights of union members within their own labor organizations. While the great majority of unions and union officials are a credit to the labor movement, a small fringe of dishonest and corrupt officials have seriously interfered with the rights of individual workmen.

Section 109 provides a simple, yet effective, statement of the basic rights which union members should have. It preserves to the union, however, an unlimited right to deny membership regardless of reason. The rights listed will not interfere with the operation of legitimate unions but will provide members with the means to rid themselves of dishonest officials. It should be borne in mind that this section will be enforced through the NLRB unfair labor practice procedure. Therefore, some of the requirements are not set forth as precisely as in other bills introduced. NLRB, as an administrative agency, can take into consideration all of the facts and circumstances in a particular case and determine whether the rights of the individuals have been impaired. In other words, the agency can assess the conduct in the light of the surrounding circumstances and within the guidelines laid down in the section.

Section 20(1) requires each labor organization to have a constitution and bylaws.

Section 20(2) guarantees the right of free speech and assembly within the union subject to reasonable restrictions.

Section 20(3) guarantees every member equal rights within his union.

Section 20(4) guarantees the members adequate notice and a chance to vote on all matters pertaining to dues and initiation fees.

Section 20(5) protects the members in the right to use the courts and administrative agencies without retaliation.

Section 20(6) guarantees due process to members charged with violations of union rules.

Section 20(7) requires that each member of a bargaining unit be furnished a copy of the collective bargaining agreement.

Section 20(8) bans the use of union dues for political purposes within the union or in the election of public officials.

Section 20(9) guarantees members against threats or acts of violence by any other member.

Section 20(10) prevents employer delay in forwarding checked-off dues from being used to discriminate against members.

Section 20(11) guarantees free and uncoerced election of union officers while still providing labor organizations with flexibility in establishing their own election procedures to meet their individual requirements.

Section 20(12) assures members of a bargaining unit of a secret ballot strike vote within 7 days prior to the commencement of the strike.

Section 20(13) guarantees fair and just administration of trusteeships while permitting flexibility in their operation and length of existence.

Section 20(14) establishes the fiduciary character of union officers with regard to union funds.

Section 20(15) safeguards union funds by requiring bonds of those handling union moneys.

REPORTS BY LABOR ORGANIZATIONS

Section 109, section 21 sets forth the reporting requirements of the bill. These are that labor organizations report only to their members, not to the public or any agency.

The Senate bill and all bills previously introduced in the House have required labor organizations to submit detailed reports to the Secretary of Labor and for him to make public disclosure of the reports. Such requirements will be of limited value in labor reform and will provide a prolific source of harassment of unions in their legitimate activities. A union's primary responsibility is to its members and they in turn should have primary responsibility for seeing that it operates in accordance with their desires and within the framework of law. While unions also have a duty to the public because of their broad impact on the activities of every individual, this duty does not require that every act must be disclosed or explained to the public. Only the members are entitled to such information.

The reports in other bills are comprehensive and will probably number in the hundreds of thousands. It would be most unrealistic to think that any Federal agency or department would be able adequately to analyze the reports and determine which are questionable. From a practical standpoint, the enforcement agency will have to be altered to investigate particular reports, and it is only reasonable to expect that the impetus in such cases will uniformly be from interested members of the organization. Even public disclosure will be of little value to other than the members. Only they are likely to have sufficient knowledge of the true facts to raise questions concerning the reports.

Therefore, reports to the members will provide those who must raise questions of impropriety with necessary information. And the unfair labor practice machinery will provide a simple, inexpensive method by which an investigation may be set in motion. At the same time, reports to members only will require the great majority of unions to do nothing more than they do at present. These are the honest, properly conducted unions. There is no reason for the public or a Federal agency to become involved with their internal affairs.

Section 21(a) sets forth general information which the union must provide to its members, including lists of officers, amount of fees, and complete information on internal union procedures and rights of members.

Section 21(b) requires that the information be kept current.

Section 21(c) lists the financial information which the union must supply to the members.

Section 21(d) requires that copies of the foregoing reports, together with the union constitution and bylaws, must be furnished to the members.

Section 21(e) provides that the labor organization must keep for 5 years records on which the reports are based and must make them reasonably available to members.

VIOLATIONS OF REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

Section 109, section 22. While the principal method of enforcing the reporting requirements is through the NLRB, criminal provisions are also included in the case of knowing and willful violations. This section, a counterpart of which can be found in all of the bills introduced, is designed to be used in those few cases where the violations are so flagrant as to make a criminal remedy the only practical method of terminating the conduct permanently.

NONEXCLUSIVENESS OF REMEDIES

Section 109 includes an amendment to the LMRA (sec. 23) which provides that the rights and remedies included in the bill of rights and reporting provisions are in addition to any existing rights and remedies. If present remedies were adequate this bill would, of course, be unnecessary. The purpose of the bill is to add, rather than take away, protection for the individual worker. Therefore, Congress should not, as a part of the bill, impair present remedies.

PAYMENTS TO EMPLOYEE REPRESENTATIVES

Section 110, amends the LMRA to make it unlawful for an employer, directly or indirectly, to pay off (1) any representative of his employees, (2) any person or organization seeking to represent his employees, (3) any employee to influence other employees in the exercise of their rights to deal collective, and (4) any union official with the intent to influence him in his capacity as a representative of the union. It is also made unlawful for any person to seek such a pay off.

This provision is intended to prevent sweetheart agreements and other types of payments which interfere with employee rights. It goes to one of the serious evils disclosed by the McClellan committee.

EXTORTION PICKETING

Section 110 also makes extortion picketing a crime. Such conduct is already an unfair labor practice but, because of the criminal nature of the conduct, the provision is added.

EMBEZZLEMENT

Section 110 (sec. 306) makes embezzlement of union funds a Federal crime.

LOANS TO OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF LABOR ORGANIZATIONS

Section 110 (sec. 307) also forbids loans in excess of $5,000 by a union to its officers or employees, and by an employer to a representative of his employees in any amount. Such loans have been demonstrated to be one of the most common devices for abuse by criminal elements in unions and in union-employer relations.

EX-CONVICTS AND COMMUNISTS BARRED FROM UNION OFFICE

Section 110 (sec. 308) prohibits any person convicted of a felony at any time within the previous 5 years from serving as a union official. The section is intended as a further step in ridding the union movement of the criminal element which has crept into a few unions. It also bars Communists from holding union office.

NO MAN'S LAND

Section 112 permits State or Territorial courts or agencies to exercise jurisdiction over labor disputes regardless of the jurisdiction of NLRB unless there is a direct and positive conflict between the Federal and State or Territorial law. Where the Board declines to assert jurisdiction, a State or Territorial court or agency has jurisdiction irrespective of such conflict.

Proposed Wheat Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. FLOYD BREEDING
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 21, 1959

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, at a meeting of wheat people in Sublette, Kans., on Saturday, May 16, 1959, in my discussion of the proposed wheat legislation with many wheat farmers in attendance this resolution was drafted and given to me to bring before the Congress of the United States:

As wheat producers we seek not favoritism but justice. We are convinced there is a mighty arm for national defense in our present surplus of foods. Also, adequate food reserves contribute to nation-wide economic stability. These advantages seem to be overlooked in much of the discussion about curtailed production.

We all need to remember that without adequate food, even in reserve, we will be weak, both economically as well as defensively. As farmers and businessmen we are seeking to avert economic disaster.

There is danger of collapse of our present high standard of living and national income in a severe downward revision of the wheat program. We believe this danger is invited by a reduction in parity of from 75 to 65 percent if the present acreage limits are maintained. We believe if farmers voluntarily reduce plantings 30 percent, or even 20 percent below present levels they should receive 100 percent of parity. Otherwise we will be singled out to operate at a loss which we cannot long absorb.

This resolution is entrusted to Congressman J. FLOYD BREEDING for presentation to Congress.

ROLLAND JACQUART, *Chairman.*

This resolution was adopted by the following gentlemen who were in attendance at the meeting:

Sublette, Kans.: L. W. (Pat) Murphy, G. E. Cox, Rolland Jacquart, C. G. Dennis, W. O. Kelvan, Percy J. Gheen, W. F. Lindeman, Ed. M. Watkins, Kenneth Cox, Forrest Cox, Roy N. Love, James Kelman, Chester E. Ellsaesser, H. H. Garrett, Floyd Burgess, Laurence Meairs, W. O. Hainline, G. G. Sibley.

Syracuse, Kans.: Murlin Carter.

Meade, Kans.: A. W. Batman.

Garden City, Kans.: Clyde Mercer, E. W. Henkle.

Dodge City, Kans.: Wallace M. White.

Larned, Kans.: Anson Horning.

Sylvan Grove, Kans.: John H. Becker.

Kinsley, Kans.: Art Stiebe.

Scott City, Kans.: C. D. Luke, Mrs. C. D. Luke.

Ulysses, Kans.: Walter Ford, K. Fred Maxwell.

Satanta, Kans.: Orville Tunis, Herbert Foster, Lester N. Alexander, J. J. Moody.

Copeland, Kans.: Ray Ellsaesser.

The Land Grant Centennial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BYRON L. JOHNSON
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 14, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, with your kind permission I should like to insert in the RECORD an article in the Denver Post of May 13, written by its able columnist Roscoe Fleming, concerning Senate Joint Resolution 66. This resolution provides for the centennial celebration in 1962 of the establishment of the land grant colleges and State universities, and the establishment of the Department of Agriculture. Mr. Fleming feels, and I agree, that inclusion of the Homestead Act should have a major part in any 1962 celebration. But I will let Mr. Fleming take it from here:

It may be news to you that we have actually had massive Federal aid to education for nigh on to 100 years now, with no disaster yet to the Republic, but only great and enduring good.

This is the real meaning of the resolution now pending in Congress to create a commission to plan the centennial celebration, in 1962, of two great congressional acts of 1862.

Abraham Lincoln signed one act as of May 15, 1862. It established a National Department of Agriculture, dedicated to forwarding the science and prosperity of American agriculture.

Lincoln signed the next act on July 2, 1862; it provided for Federal contributions of land to establish in each State at least one land-grant college of mechanics, science, and agriculture.

This was the Morrill Act, named after its sponsor, Justin Smith Morrill, of Vermont, who spent 43 years in House and Senate.

In 1890, by the way, the same man followed up with a second Morrill Act, providing for Federal cash contributions to the land-grant colleges as well as of land.

Each State now has a land-grant institution, comprising in all an educational network unique and unrivaled in all the world. The centennial resolution says these now enroll one-fifth of all the Nation's college students; they graduate more than one-half of all its scientists, and nearly one-half its Reserve officers.

They have become so accepted and so proud a part of American life that it is hard to see how the Nation could have achieved its present leadership without them. The millions of country kids who might never have otherwise had a chance at higher education, have repaid the expense many times over.

There is another 1862 act which no one mentions so far in connection with this centennial, but which deserves a centennial all its own as a massive third pillar of national policy, with tremendous consequences for good.

This was the Homestead Act, by which the Government granted 160 acres to any man who had the courage to try to establish a family farmstead on it.

Sometimes it worked badly, or was applied to situations in which it wouldn't work at all, or was abused.

But all in all, it played a tremendous part in itself in the rapid settlement of the West and of the Nation; its offspring the Reclamation Act was all-important in settling the West, again despite abuses which still prevail, and despite would-be abusers who are still trying to tear down its principles, to their own profit and to the public loss.

There should be a Homestead Act centennial during 1962, or the Homestead Act should be included in the resolution providing for the other two.

In the Nick of Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. WALLHAUSER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 21, 1959

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, I hope that all of my colleagues will take the required 30 seconds to read the edi-

torial that appeared in the Newark New Jersey Evening News of May 19, 1959, included herewith, which is so well written that any comment from me would be superfluous:

[From the Newark (N.J.) Evening News, May 19, 1959]

IN THE NICK OF TIME

The House Ways and Means Committee, with zeal commendable and timing obvious, is going to take another look at our income tax structure. If the tax structure has eyes it will recognize the committee, for no band of legislators has looked it over more frequently, or for more reasons.

The lofty aim this time, we are told, will be to effect "* * * significant reductions in individual and corporation income tax rates without sacrificing the revenues needed by the Government."

And when may this courageous undertaking the commonweal be translated into tax relief for the suffering populace? Why 1960, of course, the very year we go to the polls to elect a president and a new Congress.

It couldn't come at a better time, certainly not for the Democratic chairman of a Democratic committee in a Democratic Congress that would like to extend its control all the way down Pennsylvania Avenue, to the White House.

An Editor Views Federal School Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 21, 1959

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, there is an increasing flow of mail and personal visits from educators—not parents—in behalf of Federal aid for education. The editor of the Bay City (Mich.) Times points out that only one State in the Union has more to lose under such a program than does Michigan.

The editor describes the situation by saying:

There is no reason to believe that increasing Federal grants for elementary and secondary schools would do anything more than further penalize Michigan and other States in its class, while relieving the "gimmie" States of a still greater share of their re-responsibility for education.

The editorial is very much to the point and I submit it for consideration of my colleagues.

It follows:

FEDERAL AID FOR OUR SCHOOLS

Michigan persons who continue to advocate an expanded program of Federal aid for schools should spend a few hours with a new report titled "Rankings of the States" published by the National Education Association. The statistics included in this document prove beyond question that only one State in the Union has more to lose than does Michigan from any such program.

In a listing of the States showing what proportion of the money spent on their public elementary and secondary schools now comes from the Federal Government, Michigan is tied for next to last place with New York and North Dakota at 1.4 percent. Only New Jersey, with 0.5 percent, gets a smaller share.

Heading the list is Alaska, which receives 14.7 percent of its school money from the Federal Government. New Mexico is next with 10.1 percent. Nevada, the country's gambling refuge, is third with 9.8 percent. Six of the next nine States are in the South. The seventh on the list is Virginia, which has been putting up one of the bitterest fights against desegregation. Of its total school funds, 6.8 percent comes from the Federal Government.

It is worth noting also that Arizona, which has been offering all sorts of wonderful inducements to industry to locate within its boundaries—including promises of no taxes for 10 years—is 15th on the list. It gets 5.2 percent of its school money from Uncle Sam.

Of all the Midwestern States, Indiana, which habitually boasts of its low State taxes, is the only one to rank higher than 39th. It is No. 27, with 3.3 percent of its school funds coming from Washington. Iowa gets 2 percent and all the other Midwest States get 1.9 percent or less.

Of course the amounts spent per pupil vary greatly among the States, from $164 in Alabama to $535 in New York. Michigan's per pupil expenditure is $375.99, of which only $5.26 comes from the Federal Government. By way of comparison, $17.245 of the $331.65 Arizona spends per pupil comes from Washington, and $10.725 of the $325 Indiana spends comes from this source.

There is no reason to believe that increasing Federal grants for elementary and secondary schools would do anything more than further penalize Michigan and other States in its class, while relieving the "gimmie" States of a still greater share of their responsibility for education.

Lincoln in Africa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 21, 1959

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, as further evidence that Abraham Lincoln is the best known American amongst the peoples of the world, I present this brief report by Mr. Lloyd Dunlap, consultant in Lincoln Studies, Reference Department, Library of Congress.

Mr. Dunlap presented the report at a meeting of the Lincoln Group of the District of Columbia on Wednesday, May 20, following an address by David Mearns who spoke so eloquently on "Lincoln as a World Figure."

Here is further proof that the image of Lincoln speaks volumes in every tongue and for that reason he continues to be an important factor in our acceptance in the world community:

On February 13 past I began a speaking tour under the auspices of the Department of State. The area to which I was sent was Africa; my subject was Abraham Lincoln.

It is perhaps appropriate, following Mr. Mearns' eloquent statement concerning the impact of Lincoln upon other nations of the world, to speak briefly of reactions and attitudes I found on my tour. It is indeed gratifying to report to all friends and admirers of our 16th President that the name of Abraham Lincoln was regarded with something close to reverence in the countries I visited—The Sudan, Ethiopia, and the troubled Rhodesias. Everywhere I found an amazing interest in Lincoln. In places which can best be described as unlikely I found persons with not only a deep respect for the man, but a considerable knowledge about Lincoln. Some examples may help.

In Khartoum each of my lectures was attended by an elderly Sudanese, dressed in native costume. He spoke no English and brought his own translator, but I was told that he was a life long admirer of Lincoln who had read with enthusiasm anything about him printed in Arabic. In Addis Ababa a schoolboy touched upon a controversial point in the Lincoln field when he asked me: "I have read that Mr. Lincoln's wife was a bit of a nuisance to him. Is that true?" In Salisbury, Southern Rhodesia, the great privilege of lunch with Chief Justice Sir Robert Tredgold, revealed a man with a deep understanding and appreciation of Abraham Lincoln. Americans can read with great national pride the remarks he delivered to his countrymen on Lincoln's birthday.

Audiences—in schools, libraries, service clubs, and cultural centers—held the memory of this great man in deep and sincere respect. It was humbling to have 500 African schoolboys break into applause after hearing the Gettysburg Address. Not, I'm sure, from its delivery, but because of the unparalleled beauty and promise of the words.

Newspapers carried editorials praising Lincoln as one of the world's truly great men. Radio broadcasts reached thousands more with the story of Lincoln.

Abraham Lincoln seemed to me the best known and most loved American in the hearts and minds of these people. Why this should be can be explained, I think, only in terms of Lincoln's life and career. His rise from obscurity to unmatched greatness is an example universal in its appeal. His words are cherished wherever there are men who cherish freedom. There is something in him with which all can identify. In Africa, at least, and I'm sure, throughout the free world, Abraham Lincoln is both the symbol and the spokesman for American democracy.

America's Moral Obligation To Unite Emigrant Families

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT R. BARRY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 21, 1959

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include in the RECORD a submission of the American Committee on Italian Migration, in behalf of emigrant families who are, under our present immigration law, likely to be forever separated from their families in Italy. In my belief this is an appeal which should be brought to the attention of this legislative body.

PROPOSAL TO RESOLVE A PROBLEM OF GOOD WILL IN THE AMERICAN NATIONAL INTEREST

(Submitted by American Committee on Italian Migration, National Catholic Resettlement Council)

The American Committee on Italian Migration (ACIM), a nationwide organization of 127 chapters, wishes to call attention to a situation which has grown into a serious and tragic problem—an accumulative result of many years—for many thousands of Americans separated from their close kin abroad.

ACIM refers to those Americans who have filed petitions for the entry of their sons and daughters, brothers, and sisters—classi-

fied in the fourth preference quota of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

Since the first, second, and third preference quotas of the act are allotted 100 percent of the annual entry quota, those who fall under the fourth preference section must depend on deficiencies in the first three to be fortunate enough to obtain visas—a rare and unlikely occurrence. Thus, there is frustration and despair resulting from the law that gives hope to Americans by permitting them to file petitions, getting them approved, and then compelling them to wait for their kin who may never come.

Of course, the heartbreak is not only felt by Americans—the petitioners—but is also shared by their loved ones abroad whose hopes for reunion are also dim. Consequently, thousands upon thousands of disconted people whose hopes are first raised and then dashed certainly cannot believe in the good will we try to engender through our foreign policy. They can become easy prey to the propaganda of our enemies.

ACIM states categorically that this is an ethical problem which—as far as the sons and daughters of Americans are concerned—is also moral and can be resolved by Congress both simply and speedily.

In September 1957, legislation, now known as Public Law 85-316, was passed, which includes a provision (sec. 12) to reunite spouses and minor children of aliens legally residing here (third preference cases) whose petitions had been approved prior to July 1, 1957.

Congress is urged to simply amend this provision to include fourth preference cases and thus provide for the immediate entry of the many thousands, the petitions for whom have piled up in a backlog at the American consulates through the years. Further, it is urged that in order not to create another problem of separated families, those applicants who are married and have families may be permitted to bring them.

For those who fear that this proposal may possibly affect our unemployment situation, we point out that it is never untimely to ask changes in our immigration laws when they work great hardships on American citizens who are close relatives of the aliens. In addition, economists prove that the entry of 80,000 or 100,000 immigrants would have negligible, if any, effect upon employment.

There was little or practically no opposition to "reunion," in 1957, by Congress which, in its wisdom, acknowledged the moral question inherent in the plight of separated families.

ACIM is confident that these same legislators will be motivated by the same concern to act favorably on this proposal which, incidentally, is in keeping also with the resolutons on immigration adopted by the AFL-CIO late last year and by which it still stands.

Michigan Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN LESINSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 20, 1959

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to call my colleagues' attention to the following excellent articles on Michigan industry written by Culver Bailey, staff writer of the Michigan Educational Journal:

AUTOMOBILES: A FABULOUS INDUSTRY

(By Culver Bailey)

Michigan is the seat of a fabulous industry—the automobile industry.

Once an unknown infant it lay cradled in Michigan's small, local machine shops. Today it is maintaining a progressive march that for half a century has been creating a social and economic revolution in all of America. Now one person out of every seven in the United States earns his living from the manufacture, sale, service, and use of motor vehicles, and one of every sixth business in America is automotive.

The automobile industry is Michigan's No. 1 business, and this is exemplified in the hundreds of acres of spacious manufacturing plants belonging to its three giant corporations—Chrysler, General Motors, and Ford—all located in and around its geographically oriented hub—Detroit. At the perimeter of this hub lies the cities of Flint, Pontiac, Dearborn, and Lansing. Likewise all staunch foundations of this fabled industry.

Firty years of progress on the automobile has been rapid, for today you lightly touch the starter, then go somewhere—anywhere. You can do this anytime you want and your car glides along, eating up distance, getting you to the next town before you know it. The more you thing about this little fact, the more impresisve it will become, for it has not always been this way. Children have not always had the easy access to schools they now enjoy; loved ones during the turn of the century living 40 or 50 miles away were rarely visited. A rarity, too, was adequate contact with medical doctors. Many advantages and comforts have come to us through the efforts of the great men of Michigan's automobile industry.

These were courageous men, and they gave romance to the sweat, dirt, and grime from which they brought forth a vehicle that has given vitality and progress to America. These automobile pioneers came up from the work benches, and they became the founders of Michigan's automobile companies—David D. Buick, the founder of the Buick car; Ransom E. Olds, pioneer of the Oldsmobile car; Henry Ford, who originated the Ford cars; Walter Chrysler, headman in the rapid rise of the Chrysler, De Soto, and Plymouth cars, and who later bought the Dodge car from John and Horace Dodge, two brothers who formerly had developed and manufactured that car. Henry M. Leland, engine precisionist who brought forth the Cadillac car; Edward M. Murphy, pioneer of the Pontiac car; and Louis Chevrolet, who developed the Chevrolet car.

The labors of these men bore fruit, as we see today. Back in the decade of the nineties, these men had something within their hands besides calluses, and they scented something in their nostrils besides greasy smells and pungent gasoline odors—their dreams have now been multiplied thousands of times, for presently there are enough cars in our United States to carry everyone with 3.3 persons riding in each car. They broke the long spells of lineliness for the farmer by giving him the automobile. Their product broke cultural barriers, and it has caused 3,418,000 miles of roads and streets to be built that have laced our Nation into a proud land.

R. E. Olds of Lansing headed the parade. He was the first to establish the production methods as we know them used today to manufacture automobiles. In 1899 he erected the first factory for manufacturing automobiles on Jefferson Avenue near the Belle Isle Bridge in Detroit. Olds had demonstrated before any other American car, that automobiles could be made and sold in quantity, and that fortunes could be reaped from their manufacture. Once that fact had been established, Detroit put its money on the automobile.

And well it did, for Michigan's copper, lumber, and foundry magnates, who backed the automobile pioneers financially, eventually gained millions of dollars.

In other parts of the United States during the experimental nineties, bankers seldom risked lending a dollar bill on this new industry, and the wealthy men kept their investments close to the New York stock market. Perhaps the one exciting automobile event in the East came in 1892, when Charles E. Duryea, of Springfield, Mass., became the first person in the United States to drive on a road a vehicle powered by a gasoline engine. The many automobiles born in other parts of the Nation died out quickly.

So the Midwest took hold, and automobiles flourished under the optimistic faith and pioneering spirit of the men in Michigan.

There were upward of 80 different kinds of passenger cars manufactured in the city of Detroit sometime between 1902 and 1928. Other cars manufactured in Michigan towns during this time included such names as the Mighty Michigan, States, and Barley, all produced in Kalamazoo. The Argo, Hollier, Earl, Fuller, Briscoe, and Gem were among the cars built in Jackson; the Deal was built and sold out of Jonesville; the Giroscope was developed in Adrian, and the Alamobile was produced in Hillsdale. There were many others manufactured in Michigan, and there have been more than 1,500 different kinds of passenger cars developed and manufactured in America from 1900 until this present day.

Now there are only five automobile corporations in America. Three of them—Chrysler, General Motors, and Ford—are in Michigan. The other two—Studebaker-Packard and American Motors—are located in other States.

Before the Chrysler Corp. was conceived, no one of note in the nineties had ever heard of Walter Chrysler—then an engine wiper. People soon did hear of him, however, for he became president of Buick, and later vice president of General Motors. He came out of retirement to form his own Chrylser company, and eventually incorporated the De-Soto, Plymouth, and Dodge cars into his product line.

The General Motors Corp. was formed in 1908; it was born in the mind of a young man from Flint named William C. Durant, a grandson of Henry Crapo, onetime Governor of Michigan. Durant, a former partner of the Durant-Dort Carriage Co. in Flint, was a millionaire by the time he was 40 years old. He combined the Buick automobile company, which he managed with Oldsmobile, Pontiac, Cadillac, and later with his own company, Chevrolet, into one corporation.

With the advent of the Model "T" Ford in 1907, the Ford Motor Co. was firmly launched in business. Money for this company—Henry Ford's third, final, and very successful one—was furnished by a Detroit coal dealer, Alexander Y. Malcohnson, and the coal dealer's car checker, James Couzens, and several others. Since that time this family-owned automobile firm has added to the Ford: the Mercury, Edsel, Lincoln, and Thunderbird lines.

Today, L. L. Colbert is president of the Chrysler Corp., Harlow H. Curtice heads the General Motors Corp., and Henry Ford II, grandson of the founder of the Ford Motor Co., is president of that company. These men carry on where the others before them left off, and now they are pioneering their wares with the same faith and optimism that, in the beginning, made Michigan the automobile capital of America.

MADE IN MICHIGAN

(By Culver Bailey)

This business of manufacturing is an important one to you and to me. Today it is the life bloodstream of Michigan.

Being Michigan's main artery, it indirectly plays an important part in your livelihood—it helps finance new school buildings for your work, helps pay your salary, and it creates the need to construct more school classroom space and hire additional teachers.

It is the only type of business that will generate, by itself, a significant employment increase within a community. Industry does this not only by hiring vast numbers of people to work under one roof, but, too, by creating the demand for additional community services—beauty parlors, supermarkets, etc. These services are needed, and it means employment for more people.

During the first half of the 20th century, Michigan became one of the Nation's leading manufacturing States. This can be attributed to the available supplies of water, the large amounts of electrical power, the richness of the State in natural resources, and the availability of skilled labor. Currently, the Wolverine State ranks sixth in America in industrial employment.

For each of the last 10 years Michigan has ranked first in the Nation in income derived from its manufactured products. This fact is reflected in the relatively high wages paid by the automobile industry and the dominance of manufacturing as a source of income for the people of Michigan.

The story of the beginnings of manufacturing in our State began with the automobile industry. From this beginning hundreds of associated industries supplying the automotive factories flourished in Michigan. These factories, in turn, led to the coming of still others to supply them. Today the auto industry is the No. 1 industry of our State. The metals industries and the furniture industry in Grand Rapids employ additional thousands.

In Battle Creek, the well-known cereal industry is outranked in employment by the fabrication of metal products and primary metals industries. In fact, Kalamazoo County is the only major manufacturing county in the State in which either the automobile or metals industries is not dominant. Kalamazoo's major manufacturing industry is paper and allied products. The story on the rapid development of the automobile industry appeared in the September Journal.

However, there is an element of weakness in this single-industry dominance of automobiles in Michigan. A slackening of consumer demand for automotive vehicles, or a stoppage of raw materials, due to wars or national emergencies, strikes Michigan an especially heavy blow.

Steps are continually being taken in this State to remedy this manufacturing headache. Michigan's government tries to create a favorable environment here for diversified industry so that manufacturers will select this State for their operations. During the past 10 years, this has not been attempted in vain, for of all the Nation's industry groups defined by the U.S. Bureau of the Census, 81 percent are operating in Michigan—364 out of 451. By comparison, only 74 percent of all the industry groups were represented in the State in 1939.

Today in Michigan there are manufacturers of electrical machinery; printing and publishing; lumber and products; stone, clay, and glass products; rubber products; machinery; chemicals and allied products; paddings and upholstery filling; wire work; wood products; and others.

The personnel employed by these many manufacturers are increasingly coming under the influence of education's contributions.

More and more education plays an important role in preparing manufacturing employees for their jobs.

EDUCATION'S ROLE

Education achieves this through 94 public school systems throughout the State. In each of these school systems there are coordinators who supervise cooperative educational courses in trade and industrial education and business education. Conducted under the auspices of the Michigan Department of Public Instruction, these cooperative school and work classes help increase the numbers of highly skilled persons for employment in industries.

Take, for example, Edward Delp, of Lansing, who is studying to become an impression die sinker. Delp's night class subjects include logarithms, mathematics, drafting and trigonometry. He puts into practice during the daytime what he learns during classtime evenings.

In Delp's case, as in others enrolled in cooperative evening classes, the Lansing school system works together with management and labor to set up and carry out the requirements which Delp and other students must meet.

Education and industry today have combined forces to fuse manufacturing into a way of life that is fresh and vigorous. Dozens of small Michigan communities have reaped handsomely due to the coming of industry.

Manufacturing is the only type of business that, by itself, will cause increased employment within a community. With this thought, it could be said that industry might be called the sourcespring for a majority of the occupations found in the State of Michigan, and, too, the sourcespring for many a happy home.

MICHIGAN'S CHEMICAL INDUSTRY: RESOURCES AND RESEARCH

(By Culver Bailey)

A $2 billion industry that is old in this State yet so new that its complexion sometimes changes overnight has made Michigan one of the top producers in a rapidly expanding field.

The new fabrics in your clothes, the new techniques for processing your food, the new and better materials in your home and auto—all can be traced to chemistry. To a large extent, you owe your life to chemistry and the drugs and medicines it supplies.

Michigan is one of the Nation's leading producers of chemicals, more than a billion dollars' worth annually. So for Michigan residents, the chemical industry means money and employment as well as goods and materials.

Led by the Dow Chemical Co. of Midland, the chemical industry ranks close to the top among Michigan's 20 major industries. It numbers more than 400 establishments, 240 of which are in the Detroit area and most of the rest in the southern half of the Lower Peninsula, making it the 11th biggest industry in number of companies in the State.

As the sixth largest employer in Michigan, the chemical industry provides jobs for more than 40,000 Michigan residents, including nearly 18,000 in Detroit. The Michigan Economic Development Department considers the chemical industry one of the best "growth" industries in the State. The potential for expansion is tremendous. Low has grown at the rate of 14 percent every year, and the chemical industry as a whole has expanded 10 percent annually. This compares to a 3 percent expansion for all industry over the past 30 years.

WIDE VARIETY OF PRODUCTS

Michigan turns out a wide assortment of chemical products from table salt through wallpaper paste and dishwashing compounds to wire and cable coverings. Nobody is sure exactly how many medicines, bleaches, insecticides, plastics, cleaning agents, preservatives, nutritional aids, and industrial chemicals are made here, but they are known to run into the several hundreds.

Basically, Michigan owes what has happened so far and the rosy promise of the future to natural advantages that have built its reputation near and far as "the Nation's salt cellar" and a "water wonderland."

Almost the entire lower peninsula is underlaid with solid beds of rock salt. They range from 400 feet thick at Detroit to 1,800 feet at Midland. Salt is a basic produce for the chemical industry. And the beauty of it is, nearly everywhere there is abundant water within reach to support salt recovery extraction methods and processing operations.

In addition to salt, the State is blessed with other basic ingredients of the chemical industry—limestone, gypsum, iron, copper, and wood. Importing some iron and copper from Minnesota and coal from Pennsylvania, Michigan relies on Louisiana to supply its sulfur needs.

Research is basic to the chemical industry's progress. The Manufacturing Chemists Association says the industry is the largest private investor in basic research, which helps it bring out an average of 400 new products each year. For example, casts for broken bones made by treating plaster of paris with a plastic resin instead of water are twice as strong with only half the weight. These casts resist water, permit better X-rays, and save the doctor's time. Remember, too, that the Salk vaccine was born in the research laboratory.

FIVE HUNDRED AND SIXTY MILLION DOLLARS FOR RESEARCH

The MCA estimates research spending for 1958 at $560 million and says even more is planned in 1959. A typical chemical company allocates 3 to 4 percent of sales to research. One chemical company said that for every $1 spent in research, development, and other experimental costs, it reaps at least $5.60 in new sales after 5 years.

Utilizing the wealth of raw materials in Michigan and investing heavily in research, the State's chemical manufacturers are not resting on past successes. They have big hopes for big advances in the next few decades.

THREE MAJOR CHEMICAL AREAS

Michigan's chemical manufacturers are geographically located in three major areas—Midland, Detroit, and Montague-Whitehall. All three are built over great deposits of rock salt and salt brine, which settled out of evaporating inland seas as long as 400 billion years ago.

Since salt deposits play such an important basic role, it is interesting that only a small fraction of Michigan's production from this resource is dried and evaporated for table use. The bulk of the salt recovered goes largely into industrial chemicals, dust and ice control, food processing, meat packing, textile production, and water softening. About two-thirds is used in the form of brine by chemical plants. All told, salt is estimated to have about 14,000 uses.

Ranking first in salt production, Michigan is second in output of magnesium compounds. Bromine (natural salt) is used in the manufacture of dyes, in medicine, metallurgy, and in chemical operations as a disinfectant. To Diamond Crystal, Morton and International Salt largely goes the credit for Michigan's repute as the No. 1 table salt producer, a mark of long standing.

DOW IS MICHIGAN'S GIANT

The backbone of the chemical industry in the State long has been Dow Chemical Co. at Midland, which employs approximately 10,000 persons, and a group of other estab-

lished firms such as Wyandotte Chemical Co., Parke-Davis & Co., the Upjohn Co., International Salt Co., Morton Salt, Union Carbide & Carbon, and the Diamond Crystal Salt Co.

In 1890 Herbert H. Dow, a Case Institute (Cleveland) graduate, thought bromines at Midland could be produced cheaper and better. Dow's thinking proved correct. The company that bears his name is one of the giants of the industry today with 15 plants in 10 States. Dow's main plant at Midland, believed to be the world's largest chemical facility, is a center for production of plastics, ammonia, calcium, hydrochloric acid, fungicides, weed killers, chloroform, and aspirin.

When World War II forced the American chemical industry into supplying needed plastics, synthetic rubber, and magnesium, Dow became an important leader. Today, one-third of Dow sales is in plastics and one-tenth is in magnesium. Dow Chemical is the world's largest producer of magnesium, its alloys, and semifabricated forms. It is also one of the Nation's largest producers of chlorine and bromine.

About 25 miles southwest of Midland is the Michigan Chemical Co. at St. Louis. Like Dow, this company initially took its raw material from the ground—natural brine. During World War II the firm expanded to produce DDT and magnesium compounds. Setting up its research departments in 1944, the company was an early producer of antihistimines, insecticides, solvents, and bromine compounds.

CONCENTRATION NEAR DETROIT

Michigan's second major chemical area is centered in the Detroit downriver area between Detroit and Trenton. There the State's chemical plant concentration is the thickest—240 plants. Salt there is taken from the earth in the form of artificial brine.

From the oldest and largest chemical plant in the Detroit downriver area—the Wyandotte Chemical Corp.—to the smallest firms, a bevy of chemical products are manufactured: soda ash for making glass, cleaning compounds, chlorine, dry ice, and phosphates.

The Wayandotte Chemical Co., second-largest chemical employer in the State, with 4,500 employees, is the world leader in specialized cleaners for business and industry.

Postage Stamp in Honor of Garibaldi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1959

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to provide for the issuance of a special commemorative postage stamp, of the Freedom Fighter series, in honor of Giuseppe Garibaldi, the famous 19th century Italian patriot under whose courageous leadership the people of Italy achieved national unity and independence. My colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey, the Honorable PETER W. RODINO, JR., joins with me in cosponsoring this legislation.

Giuseppe Garibaldi was born at Nice, France, on July 4, 1807, exactly on the date only 31 years after the United States had declared its independence. There is no doubt that he was greatly inspired by our concept of liberty and national independence, and used it to encourage the people of Italy to learn from our example. He died in Italy on June 2, 1882, at the age of 75.

Garibaldi came from a poor fisherman family and received little education in his youth. He was a sailor on various trading vessels and became a strong supporter of Mazzini to set up a Republic in Italy. In 1834 he was condemned to death for his support of Mazzini, but he succeeded in escaping from Italy and made his way to South America. He entered the service of the Republic of Rio Grande and aided the people of Montevideo in their struggle for independence. He was the leader of a famous Italian legion and eventually earned the title of "Hero of Montevideo."

At the outbreak of the revolutions of 1848 in Europe, particularly the uprising against Austria which then controlled important parts of Northern Italy, Garibaldi decided to return to Europe and join his countrymen in the struggle for Italian independence. He raised a group of volunteers and harassed the Austrians, but his efforts at this time did not succeed. He then proceeded to Rome where he was appointed by Mazzini to command the forces of the Republic. He fought against overwhelming odds and desperately defended Rome against the Austrian onslaught for 30 days, but finally had to retreat. As a result of this struggle he became known as the defender of Rome.

Garibaldi was once again forced to leave Italy, and this time he decided to come to the United States, which already then was regarded by the nations of the world as the champion of liberty and freedom. To Garibaldi, as to many others after him, America was both a place of refuge and strength; consequently, it was natural for him to turn to this country for support in his struggle to achieve freedom for his people.

He arrived in this country on July 30, 1850, and landed at New York, where his arrival had been eagerly awaited by people of all walks of life, not only those of Italian descent. Already at this time he had a great reputation as a fighter for freedom. On the day of his arrival in New York, the newspaper New York Tribune wrote as follows of him:

> The ship *Waterloo* arrived here from Liverpool this morning, bringing the world renowned Garibaldi, the hero of Montevideo and the defender of Rome. He will be welcomed by those who know him as becomes his chivalrous character and his services in behalf of liberty.

A huge demonstration had been planned for him, including an official welcome at the Battery, greetings by the mayor of New York, and a parade up Broadway to the Astor House—as we are in the habit of welcoming great heroes in our own day. But Garibaldi refused this honor on the ground he was only an exile from his native land and did not wish to cause this country political embarrassment. In a letter to the committee planning the demonstration, he said:

> No such public exhibition is necessary to assure me of the sympathy of my countrymen, of the American people, and of all true Republicans. * * * Though a public manifestation of this feeling might yield much gratification to me, an exile from my native land, severed from my children and mourning the overthrow of my country's freedom by means of foreign interference, yet believe me that I would rather avoid it, and be permitted to * * * await a more favorable opportunity for the redemption of my country from foreign and domestic oppressors.
>
> Next to the cause to which I have devoted myself, I value nothing so highly as the approbation of this great people, and I am convinced I shall enjoy that when they become satisfied that I have honestly and faithfully served the cause of freedom, in which they have themselves set so noble an example to the world.

Garibaldi remained in the United States only for about 10 months. During this time he refused to become a burden to his friends and insisted on doing menial work in order to support himself and to send money to his wife and children in Italy. He finally obtained a job in a candle factory on Staten Island—and to this day the great vat where this Italian patriot stirred tallow alongside his American coworkers has been preserved because of its historical interest and its significance for United States-Italian relations.

From the United States, Garibaldi proceeded to South America and ultimately made his way back to Italy again to fight for its freedom and independence. He participated in the war of 1859 in which he scored important victories in the Alps region. He helped free Sicily in 1860, occupied Naples, and joined the two Sicilies with Italy, but declined all honors for himself. He then retired to his farm on the island of Caprera, where he made his home for the remainder of his life. From there he came forth on few special occasions, such as in 1864 when he made a visit to Britain where he received an enthusiastic welcome; in 1870 when he offered his help to the French Republic in the war against Germany; and again in 1875 when he was seated in the Italian Parliament after Italy had become a united and independent nation.

Garibaldi is sometimes described as "the George Washington of Italy." Surely, a man of his caliber and his achievements, who was instrumental in winning freedom and independence for his people, deserves the title of "Freedom Fighter" and as such should be included in our list of those to be honored by special postage stamps. The issuance of such a stamp would add to the good will and the strengthening of friendship between the United States and Italy, which is one of our most important allies in the world.

In conclusion, I wish to express my appreciation to the Italian Historical Society of America for bringing this matter to my attention and for suggesting the issuance of a stamp in honor of Garibaldi. The society deserves to be commended for this proposal. I know that millions of Americans of Italian descent would welcome the issuance of such a stamp and would feel proud of this honor bestowed upon a man who has contributed so much to further the cause of freedom in Italy and in the world.

Michigan Editor Salutes J. Edgar Hoover

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 13, 1959

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, few if any Government officials have to their credit a career record comparable to that of J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Mr. Hoover recently completed 35 years as Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and in connection with that anniversary the editor of the Midland (Mich.) Daily News published an editorial entitled "J. Edgar Hoover Due a National Salute." The editorial follows:

J. EDGAR HOOVER DUE A NATIONAL SALUTE

The success of J. Edgar Hoover in administering the Federal Bureau of Investigation for 35 years is in the Horatio Alger tradition of the poor boy who made good, but beneath the surface melodrama is the serious story of the development of a responsible professional investigative body. His anniversary date is tomorrow.

Hoover has served as FBI Director under five Presidents and an even dozen Attorneys General without becoming a political figure. His name has been brought into political controversies, but never as a partisan. He is the Nation's top law-enforcement official, but he has publicly fought against a national police force.

When appointed acting Director of the FBI in 1924 by President Coolidge, Hoover was but 29. He had been in the Justice Department 7 years; he had a law degree earned in night school.

The FBI, created in 1908, after its 16 years of existence was a politics-ridden agency, tainted by scandal. Its personnel was largely composed of political hacks, riffraff, and ex-convicts.

Hoover accepted the appointment on the joint understanding that the Bureau was to be kept out of politics and that it would be responsible only to the Attorney General. He set about weeding out the incompetents and seeking out men of good moral character."

What Hoover at first had looked on as a temporary job has stretched out into a career, and the Bureau has become a great center for scientific crime investigation. Where once there were no fingerprint identification files, the Bureau now has some 150 million cards.

On the eve of his 30th anniversary as Director, Hoover was asked if he thought there was any danger of the FBI becoming a Gestapo. His reply was typical: "No, there is no danger * * * not if we have men of character in the organization and an alert public opinion." And today his attitude remains unchanged.

Hoover is one of a handful of Federal executives receiving an annual salary of $22,000, only $3,000 less than that of Cabinet members. The pay is by no means out of line with his responsibilities. And no other agency head has so long been so successful as Hoover in getting congressional approval of mounting requests for funds.

For all his emphasis on integrity and responsibility, Hoover is no prude, as his Washington neighbors are well aware. He has a reputation as a gourmet and wine fancier. In Washington he dines regularly at Harvey's, a fairly expensive steak and sea-food restaurant; in New York he is frequently seen at the Stork Club and other plush watering places.

He drinks Scotch and plain water, but rarely takes more than two. A racing fan, Hoover often appears at the nearby Maryland and West Virginia tracks.

For his World War II security work, Hoover won the Medal for Merit, a top civilian decoration. President Eisenhower presented the National Security Medal 5 years ago, and in January 1958 Hoover was one of the first recipients of the President's Gold Medal Awards for "distinguished Federal service."

He is the author of many articles and several books, the most recent being the best-selling "Masters of Deceit," which is called: "The most authoritative book ever written on communism in America." Perhaps more important to Hoover—and certainly to the Nation—is the fact that he has created his job in his own image, has become for his own contemporaries the model of the professional policeman.

Fair Trade Issue Up Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 21, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the Des Moines, Iowa, Register on March 28, 1959, setting forth many cogent reasons why H.R. 1253, the so-called fair trade bill, should be defeated.

That bill is not in the interests of the retailing industry, or in the interests of the consumers. Most manufacturers either oppose fair trade or pay it only lipservice because they are aware that it is both economically unworkable and inconsistent with our system of free competitive enterprise.

H.R. 1253 should be defeated.

FAIR TRADE ISSUE UP AGAIN

The argument over the claimed advantages and disadvantages of the fair trade system of legalized price fixing has been going on so long that it would hardly seem necessary for Congress to hold hearings on the bill before it.

It has been debated in the legislatures of most of the States. Forty-five States have at one time or another over the last 25 years enacted laws permitting the practice.

The issue of constitutionality has been argued again and again in the courts. In 16 instances, the State courts have held the law or some portion of it unconstitutional.

No State legislature has repealed a State fair trade act once it was passed, but in a good many States so little effort has been made to keep it in force that it has been virtually nullified.

Responsibility for enforcement has rested almost entirely with manufacturers of brand name products who have insisted on, or have been pressured by retailers into, maintaining a fixed retail price for their products. The practice suffered its most severe setback a year ago when a number of large manufacturers of electric applicances announced they would no longer attempt to make or enforce price-fixing agreements.

This break in the ranks of the price fixers is responsible for the renewed efforts this year to get Congress to enact a law that would impose the practice on all States irrespective of the desires of the States themselves. Heretofore the Federal law has merely authorized the States to pass fair trade acts or reject them.

Two features of the fair trade practice have aroused most of the objections to it. One is that it runs counter to accepted principles of competitive enterprise in business. The other is that it has subjected individuals to conditions in the conduct of their business to which they did not specifically agree. By signing a contract with one retailer in a State to abide by a fixed price for a specific product, the manufacturer of that product may automatically force all other retailers handling his product to abide by the terms of that contract.

Manufacturers admittedly have the right to attempt to persuade all retailers to sell their products at a fair price. However, the fair trade principle goes far beyond this. It involves an attempt by the manufacturers and dealers to get the State or Federal Government to enforce price agreements.

The years of experience with fair trade have made a valuable contribution to better understanding of the practice.

This experience has shown, according to a survey made by the U.S. Department of Justice, that where the fair trade laws are actively enforced the price that is paid by the public is exceedingly high.

The survey revealed that prices for a list of 132 common drug, household appliances, and other articles averaged 17 percent higher in cities where fair trade practices were in force than in cities where they were not.

In some fair trade cities the prices paid by consumers were much higher than that average. In a number of cities included in the survey where fair trade practices were not operative the savings to consumers were startling. In Washington, D.C., prices were 32 percent below those in fair trade cities. In Kansas City they were 31 percent lower and in Dallas they were 29 percent lower.

With that kind of experience on the record, it would seem that Members of Congress would be exceedingly wary of subjecting the entire Nation to a law that is already on the skids in most of their home States.

Taxes—Mostly the Bill for Crime and War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE SILER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 4, 1959

Mr. SILER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I would like to quote a thoughtful observation on the subject of the taxes we pay to our city, county, State and Federal Governments. According to the author of this observation, which was made by Dr. Raymond B. Drukker of Berea College, Berea, Ky., near my own congressional district, a substantial part of the taxes we pay is the result of crime and war. I am certain that Dr. Drukker is correct and I think it is well worthwhile to consider the thoughtful observation that was made by him on this subject. The statement by Dr. Drukker is as follows:

Have you ever totaled the bill you get from your city, county, State, and Federal tax offices which is for crime and war? Why not try to get this item because it would be very enlightening and frightening.

Why do we pay so heavily for these causes? We pay because we seem to prefer the luxury of sinful desires. We have made living very expensive because we and God are not on friendly terms, sometimes not even on speaking terms.

We are told sin is any lack of conformity to or transgression of the law of God. The creature is in rebellion to the Creator. Man substitutes his personal wishes for the will of God. It is our privilege to do all this. The bill collector, however, never fails to show up.

The next time you send in your check for taxes to your city, county, State, or Federal tax collector put down what you know you will be paying for human evil and write on the check, "So much for sin."

The Happy State of Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 20, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by Stanley S. Jacobs as it appeared in the ADI Bulletin, April 1959 issue:

THE HAPPY STATE OF HAWAII
(By Stanley S. Jacobs)

Public education for all, without racial or religious barriers, has helped make our polyglot 50th State a living lesson in American democracy.

As the girls pour out of the office buildings and round the corner of Bishop and Fort Streets in Honolulu, a bookkeeper of Japanese ancestry, a Caucasian file clerk, and a part Hawaiian stenographer walk arm in arm to a nearby cafeteria.

An observer from the mainland might notice them—and give second thoughts to the varied racial blend. But, in all likelihood, a citizen of Hawaii wouldn't give the subject a thought at all—he'd be so accustomed to the sight.

The policeman who holds up traffic for the girls is Chinese, the cafeteria cashier is Korean, and the other diners will be Filipinos, Puerto Ricans, Negroes, and Caucasians of many religious faiths and national origins.

On the beaches, in shops and theaters, people of differing racial backgrounds mix freely and in friendship. In the public schools, at the University of Hawaii, students and faculty are similarly heterogeneous.

Hawaii may be the only civilized place in the world where a nonwhite stranger will proudly—without a trace of self-consciousness—explain his racial origins and mixture in detail to a Caucasian. In Honolulu, the U.S. Marine Corps recruiting posters shows the face of an oriental. Honolulu's Danny Lee is the only police chief of Chinese origin in the United States. The local sheriff is the pure Hawaiian champion swimmer, Duke Kahanamoku.

Hawaii is the only State in the Union with an oriental majority. Every 1 of 64 racial combinations possible can be found there. Of the total population of about 600,000 civilians, most numerous are the Japanese or part-Japanese (38 percent), followed by Caucasians (20 percent), part-Hawaiians (15 perecnt), Filipinos (13 percent), and Chinese (7 percent), pure Hawaiians (2 percent), Puerto Ricans (2 percent), Koreans (1 percent). Only about 12,000 pure Hawiians still remain; many of them live on remote Nihau Island.

There are, occasionally, a few traces of old frictions—but these are increasingly rare. Generally, the picture is one of easy geniality. Hawaii proves clearly that people of many races and religions can live together in brotherhood. This happy lesson causes consternation and distress to the racist and bigot. Professional anti-Semite Frank Britton, for example, took one look at the Hawaiian picture and, in the March 1959 issue of his American Nationalist, made a belated desparate appeal: "Block Hawaiian statehood. Write your Congressmen."

How did the happy state of Hawaii come about?

Hawaiians, before and since the European discovery of the islands in 1778 by the famous English navigator, James Cook, have had their share of troubles. Their history indicates that they were a courteous and hospitable people who sometimes suffered under an autocratic, tyrannical nobility and priesthood. After discovery, they were, to some extent, hurt by the rivalry and contentions among the big powers, including England, France, and the United States. They were also subject to wars and disease. But, as in few places in the world, the arrival of outside civilization brought with it a high degree of spiritual and material growth.

Its polyglot, many-hued composition is largely due to the fact that, throughout the 19th century, Hawaii was subject to various experiments in immigration as part of the large powers' efforts to build up Hawaii's labor force. Polynesians were brought over from the South Sea Islands as part of an experiment in a cognate race plan. Later came Americans and Norwegians, Germans, Russians, Poles, and others. Portuguese were introduced in large numbers, starting in 1878. Today, they and Puerto Ricans—in addition to orientals—constitute the bulk of the Hawaiian labor force.

It was in the 19th century, too, that the foundation was laid for the happy State of Hawaii today. That was when the Christian missionaries came. In other areas of the world, missionaries have sometimes been charged with stifling indigenous culture, with covering beauty with Mother Hubbards. But in Hawaii, they came to have profound and benign influence. Among other things, they brought to Hawaii mass education, literacy, and new concepts of good government. Their work is directly responsible for the good intergroup relations picture in Hawaii today.

The first company of missionaries arrived from New England in 1820; 14 other companies followed in the next 35 years. In all, over 150 men and women came in those years to introduce churches, schools, and the press. The Hawaiian language existed only verbally; within 2 years after the first group arrived, the missionaries had learned the language, reduced it to writing, and began printing the first textbook. By 1840, 50 books had been published. In 1834, two Hawaiian newspapers were published; an English-language newspaper, founded in 1843, is still published today. The New Testament was completed in Hawaiian in 1832, the Old Testament in 1839. And always the natives of Hawaii were eager to learn. By 1845, less than two dozen years after the language was first put into writing, 80 percent of the population of Hawaii was literate.

The missionaries also tried to teach the science of government to Hawaiian rulers. In 1839—after hearing lectures on government gven by missionaries—the Hawaiian king promulgated the Declaration of Rights, Hawaii's Magna Carta. The first constitution was established in 1840; the first compilation of laws in 1842. Hawaii had started on the road to responsible and democratic government, the kind that would qualify it for statehood in 1959.

By 1958, there were 202 public schools with a total enrollment of about 130,000. Segregation is unknown in these schools; at Lei Day exercises at Maui High School one year, for example, seated on the queen's throne was a lovely girl, part Portuguese, part German. Her six ladies-in-waiting were Korean, Caucasian, Chinese, Japanese, pure Hawaiian, and Filipino.

The unsegregated school system has played a basic role in building and keeping good intergroup relationships—as well as making the heterogeneous citizens of Hawaii into Americans. According to Hung Wau Ching, a prominent merchant:

"Every one of us, every single Chinese, Japanese, or Puerto Rican, received a good education here. It made us Americans. The end products of our school system are just about as American as any boy from Vermont or Kansas."

There are, of course, a host of problems implicit in the polyglot situation. Instruction in public schools, naturally, is conducted in English. Some parents, particularly those with Chinese or Japanese backgrounds, send their children to foreign language schools as well. Through the years—and particularly after Pearl Harbor—restrictions were imposed on the teaching of foreign languages.

After the close of World War II, however, the territorial legislature itself took action to remove unreasonable fetters from foreign language schools. Under a 1949 enactment—still in force—any child who has graduated from the second grade may attend a foreign language school without restriction; younger children are free to attend these schools provided instruction does not exceed 5 hours a week.

The spectacle of an American State with a Caucasian minority was undoubtedly one of the major factors in holding up statehood for Hawaii.

In 1900, Hawaii's Governor Sanford Dole flatly declared that statehood was out of the question "because it might result in a Japanese Governor one day."

Despite martial law invoked after Pearl Harbor and feeling against Japanese at the time, today the AJA's—Americans of Japanese ancestry—are among the island's most respected and popular people. For one thing, they proved their Americanism during the war. Not only was there not a single case of disloyalty or espionage among them; the 442d Regiment Combat team—composed of Japanese-Americans—became one of the most decorated of all American military units, with 18,000 individual citations to its credit.

Not only Japanese, but all the other citizens of Hawaii operate as Americans first. And, as Dr. Andrew W. Lind, professor of sociology at the University of Hawaii, points out, "racial bloc voting simply does not exist in the Islands."

When racial problems do occur, they are usually quickly resolved. There was a minor fuss several years ago when a Chinese merchant moved into a Waikiki beach house owned by the president of the Hawaiian Pineapple Co. But the cry "It will cheapen land values" fell on deaf ears in the community.

In 1954, the Hawaiian Civic Club, composed of persons of full or half Hawaiian background, had a flurry of excitement over the rule that "non-Hawaiians" could not be admitted. This exclusion was primarily aimed at the Japanese. But good sense prevailed and the ban was lifted.

If any one group has inferior status in Hawaii, it is Puerto Ricans—one of the smallest of minorities—who, for a variety of sociological and economic reasons, have been compelled to take the lower-paying and more menial jobs. But their situation is the exception, not the rule, for Hawaii's minorities.

Today Hawaii is emerging from an era of paternalism and domination by a handful

of rich planting and business families. It is on the threshold of a new prosperity and boom, based in large part on its attractions as a tourist mecca.

And, as the 50th State—Hawaii will show the rest of the United States, by striking example, how well diverse ethnic and racial groups can live together, in harmony and understanding.

Our $9 Billion Headache

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 20, 1959

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the absurd spectacle of our Federal Government holding on to more food than has ever been accumulated before in history is a cause for great apprehension among many Members of Congress. The problem of these mountains of surplus food must be faced, because the American taxpayer simply cannot afford to foot this tremendous bill year after year.

Following are the list of two articles on this problem which appeared in the Detroit Free Press recently. It is my opinion that these articles very clearly point out the problem and what it is doing to our Nation:

OUR $9 BILLION HEADACHE
(By Ray Cave)

It is one of the miracles of modern international economics that the Government can have a $9 billion farm surplus and can't: (1) Sell it, (2) give it away, (3) destroy it.

The Government can do nothing but play mother hen to its fantastic pile of food and fiber. The only thing to do with an egg that big is sit on it.

The very act of sitting on it costs the taxpayer more than a billion dollars a year.

How is it possible that this land of plenty can't share its wealth with the less fortunate countries of the world? Here are two examples:

The price-support program has kept the price of American cotton well above that of cotton produced in other countries.

As a result, the American cotton-export market suffered disastrous cutbacks as buyers turned to other countries for cheaper cotton.

The Agriculture Department wanted a subsidy to be paid on exported cotton. With the Government paying some of the price, exported cotton would compete with other countries, and this would cut back America's cotton surplus, the Department argued.

Not so fast, said the State Department.

A fortune has been spent by the United States to start cotton growing in underdeveloped countries of the world.

Now these countries are selling cotton, and you want to use more U.S. taxpayers' money to take markets away from these small countries, the State Department argued.

The battle raged to the White House—and back to Congress.

Eventually a major export subsidy was approved for cotton, but not until America's share of the international cotton market had fallen drastically.

Surplus cotton stocks are now low, but in a few months are expected to total up to 7 million bales.

It's plain that the Government will have to be careful how it works off any of that surplus cotton in the international market. It couldn't give it away without threatening he cotton-based economies of many countries.

Why don't we give wheat away? People are starving and they need it.

But other countries sell wheat. Such as Canada. If the United States gave wheat to all of Canada's customers, then some other people might not be starving—but Canadians would be.

Several plans permit the United States to sell sizable quantities of its wheat overseas. Development of these markets, in fact, allowed the Nation not to increase its wheat surplus in 1957 and 1958.

But the plans didn't get rid of any significant amount of the surplus then on hand. And now the 1958 wheat crop has wiped out those gains and added a whopping new surplus.

"We're pouring these surpluses down every rathole in the world," said an official. "The only trouble is, they all fill up too soon."

If we can't sell it, and we can't give it away, why don't we dump it in the ocean? Wouldnt' that save storage costs?

The answer is: There's something basically repugnant about destroying food. Foreign affairs experts have told the Agriculture Department that America's prestige would never recover from the world's outrage if we destroyed what others could eat.

How long will we have the surplus? Agriculture Secretary Ezra Taft Benson hopes farm price-support programs can be changed to stop overproduction.

Changes which he hopes will have this effect already have been made in corn and cotton, though it now looks as if each change is going to increase production at least temporarily.

Once overproduction is stopped, the present surplus could be worked off slowly as marketing opportunities arose.

Even this will cause a stunning financial loss to the taxpayer.

The relatively small amount of Government surplus now being sold returns about 70 cents on the dollar the Government paid for it.

But as price supports are lowered—and this is Benson's main aim—the market value of commodities drops.

At the same time, of course, the value of the farm surplus drops. And instead of getting 70 cents on the dollar, you get 50, or 30, or 10. But even at that, it would pay to sell the surplus and stop the present storage costs.

A good summary on the outlook for getting rid of the farm surplus comes from a high Commodity Credit Corporation official. He is close to the statistical picture, and he says:

"No market appears in the immediate future which might allow us to capitalize those huge holdings."

"Only a major catastrophe could bring them into use."

That is the answer to the surplus problem.

You can't sell it, you can't give it away, you can't destroy it. You can only wait for a catastrophe.

"LITTLE FARM" PLAN HELPS RICH INSTEAD
(By Ray Cave)

WASHINGTON.—Ezra Taft Benson, for 6 stormy years the Nation's Secretary of Agriculture, told the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry recently:

"The (surplus) problem narrows down to a few crops in which, with the greatest of good will and the very best of intentions, outmoded programs have been too long continued."

It is this history of good will and best intentions which has made a shambles of the Nation's price-support program, unbalanced the economy of one-fifth of the Nation's agriculture and saddled the taxpayer with $9 billion worth of farm products the country can't use or even give away.

Eighty-five percent this money (it is more than the Army will spend this year) has been used to support the price of just three American crops: Wheat, corn, and cotton.

The first of this year, the Commodity Credit Corporation, which administers the price support program, owned wheat worth $2,192 million, corn worth $2,037 million, cotton worth $226,132,000.

The Government is about to add to this, from 1958 crops, about estimated $800 million worth of wheat and cotton and $310 million worth of corn.

Storage, interest, and transportation for the surplus alone will cost more than a billion for the year.

This, says Benson, is "what has resulted from clinging to outmoded, obsolete, ineffective price support and acreage control programs."

Worse yet, he says, "our price support programs, even though originally designed with the small family farms and low income farm people in mind, have resulted in huge expenditures for a few farm products produced primarily on a relatively few larger mechanized farms."

Statistics show that the program affects only one-fifth of American agriculture. It is of greatest benefit to the biggest, wealthiest farms.

This is the sad result of a program which started in the depths of the depression with a simple, sound idea.

The farmer always has had to market at harvest time—when prices were lowest. If the farmer could find a way to hold his crop and sell it later, he could get a higher price.

So, the Government decided: "We'll loan the farmer the value of his crop. Then he can wait, sell the crop when the market is better, and pay us back the loan. If the market gets worse, an unlikely circumstance, we'll keep the crop as forfeited collateral."

The value of the crop was determined by a percentage of parity. Parity is the amount a farmer would have to sell his crop for to live as well as he did in the fairly good farm years of 1910 to 1914.

The purpose was to keep the little farmer on his feet in hard times.

These early farm programs weren't working, but World War II saved the country from the first big surpluses.

The war ended, but the crops still grew. Congress set the price support level at a high percentage of parity.

By 1949 the Nation was threatened with serious farm surpluses (serious by 1949 standards, but not by today's).

In 1950 the Korean war caused surplus to be used. Some say that because of this the Nation needs farm surpluses as a stockpile in case of world war III.

In January 1953, Ezra Benson took office. Doing something about the $3 billion farm surpus was the major job the Republican administration set for him.

Six years later, the farm surplus is $6 billion higher. Next year it will go up another $1,400 million.

How could this have happened under an administration which believes in getting the Government out of the price-support business?

There are two main reasons:

1. Recent Congresses, like every other Congress since 1933, didn't have the nerve to tightly control farm production while making high support payments, or to sharply cut price-support payments while allowing high production.

2. More important, the farmer learned how to raise more on his land than any Congressman in history imagined.

The main control on farm production has been acreage allotments. Congress has changed these allotments, or restricted the

Secretary of Agriculture's use of them, to suit various political pressures.

For example, if the acreage allotment system which the Congress of 1958 felt was wise could be applied today, not a single acre of wheat would be planted in the United States this year.

Instead, 59 million acres of wheat will be planted this year 2 million acres more than last year when the wheat surplus and crop hit record highs.

It had been hoped that the acreage reserve clause of the soil bank would cut the surplus. Under this program farmers have been paid $1,570,234,000 over the past 3 years not to plant anything.

If a farmer had a 100-acre allotment he would put the 20 worst acres in the acreage reserve (getting paid for that) and dump 100 acres worth of fertilizer on the 80 remaining acres, increasing yields so much that he hardly missed the 20 acres.

But the technological advancement of the American farmer has proved the crushing blow to price-support programs.

Last year a record production in 14 major crops occurred on the smallest acreage planted to those crops in 40 years.

The high increase in yields per farm is so great that it is little wonder Congress hasn't realized the full effect on the price-support program.

If this program caused surpluses a decade ago, it is no wonder that the surpluses are many times bigger now.

Poison in Your Water—No. 80

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 21, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch of March 4, 1958, entitled "Pollution High in Mississippi River Here, U.S. Official Says":

POLLUTION HIGH IN MISSISSIPPI RIVER HERE, U.S. OFFICIAL SAYS—SITUATION SUBJECT TO CORRECTIVE ACTION UNDER FEDERAL COMPULSION—CONFERENCE EXAMINES PROBLEM

The Mississippi River in the St. Louis area is excessively polluted and, therefore, subject to corrective action under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, F. W. Kittrell, Chief of Stream Pollution Studies of the U.S. Public Health Service, said today. The act gives the Government power to compel abatement of pollution of interstate streams.

Kittrell spoke at a meeting of representatives of governmental agencies and private industry at Soldiers' Memorial, at which plans were discussed for reducing pollution of the Mississippi and Meramec Rivers and the Coldwater Creek watershed.

THOSE ATTENDING MEETING

Attending the conference were representatives of the States of Missouri and Illinois, the Bi-State Development Agency and the U.S. Public Health Service. The meeting was called under provisions of the Water Pollution Act.

The Mississippi River in the St. Louis area often is covered with oil waste and large quantities of floating garbage, Kittrell said. "An average drop of water in the Mississippi at St. Louis contains 20 sewage bacteria," he added.

The East St. Louis and Interurban Water Co. receives its water supply immediately below the Wood River refinery area, Kittrell said. Although both the refineries and the water company have invested much money in means of removing impurities, the water still is unsatisfactory "and plagued by taste and odor problems," Kittrell added.

PROBLEMS DOWN STREAM

Cape Girardeau, Chester, Ill., and Menard Penitentiary at Chester have serious water supply problems because of pollution of the Mississippi at St. Louis, Kittrell said. Besides making the water below St. Louis of bad taste and odor, sport fishing has been virtually ruined by St. Louis pollution as far south as Cairo, Ill., he added.

Industries have promised full cooperation in solving problems which inevitably will arise in connection with the pollution control program, the board of trustees of the Metropolitan Sewer District reported.

The Metropolitan Sewer District has filed application with the Housing and Home Finance Agency for a loan with which to undertake "preliminary engineering studies on the Mississippi River," the district's trustees said. "It is estimated that the studies will require 2½ years and will cost $270,000. It is anticipated that the money necessary for the studies will be available by July 1, 1958, and the studies should be completed by January 1, 1961."

BOND ISSUE NEEDED

At least 1 year would be necessary to review the report, select a plan, and complete arrangements for a bond issue, the trustees said.

"It is anticipated that such an issue could be presented to the voters in the spring of 1962. If successful, construction plans would be immediately authorized, and construction of the first units of the project could begin about January 1, 1963."

"The trustees said that on the assumption construction would require 4 years, the last sewage treatment unit would be placed in operation about January 1, 1967.

"Changes and improvements of the sewage treatment plant serving the Meramec River watershed are planned for this year, the trustees said. As soon as these revisions have been made and the plant operation can be studied, consideration will be given to the future needs of the area."

A bond issue is definitely planned for the Coldwater Creek watershed this year, the trustees said. If successful, construction could start early in 1959 with construction of the treatment plant facilities completed by January 1, 1961. The trunk sewer probably would require an additional 6 to 9 months for completion."

The major part of the drainage from the metropolitan sewer district goes into the Mississippi along a 22-mile stretch of the west bank, between the northern and southern boundaries of the district, the trustees said.

"There are more than 80 separate outlets which discharge into the Mississippi River in that stretch," the trustees said. They added that each of these outlets must be studied individually to determine how and where interception should take place and to determine the volume of wastes to be intercepted.

In addition, the trustees said, characteristics of the wastes must be ascertained to determine whether any unusual condition exists which might necessitate special consideration.

Studies must be made to determine the type and degree of treatment which must be provided, the trustees said. They noted that preliminary consideration indicates that as many as 11 small plants might be most economical, or as few as one large plant.

AFFECTS FISH, FOWL

Pollution of the Mississippi in the St. Louis area is having a damaging effect upon fish and waterfowl downstream, the Missouri Conservation Commission said in a prepared statement.

"Fish market operators along the Mississippi are buying fresh fish from other sources other than this river," the commission's report said. "Once a customer has the experience of getting bad-tasting fish, he refuses to buy more fish from the Mississippi River."

Untreated industrial and sanitary wastes have had damaging effects several hundred miles downstream, the commission said. "To make this great stream a virtual sewer represents a denial of a public right. It denies the right of all of the people to use it for fishing, hunting, recreation, and for food production."

No Small Affair

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 21, 1959

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Daily Press of St. Marys, Pa., of Thursday, May 14, 1959:

NO SMALL AFFAIR

While the State of Pennsylvania and the Federal Government seek a raise in gasoline taxes, based on the theory of "who cares about a few extra pennies per day" it might be well to take another look at what the tax can cost the car driver in actual dollars and cents.

And we have never seen the argument better presented than in an advertisement put out by the Associated Petroleum Industries of Pennsylvania, from which we take the liberty to quote:

"The most disarming thing about the gasoline tax is that it is so well camouflaged that even when a motorist knows he pays the tax, he does not feel that it is a very high levy.

"He overlooks a tremendously important fact:

"Motorists pay the gasoline tax in quarters and half dollars—not in pennies.

"The single fact points up the most vital aspects of motor fuel taxation. First, it emphasizes the burden—the everyday burden—of the gasoline tax. In emphasizing this burden, the statement also exposes the fallacy of thinking of the gasoline tax as a matter of mere pennies. The statement points up, too, that a veritable river of silver is constantly flowing into our Federal and State treasuries—money that is earmarked for improving and extending our system of roads.

"In Pennsylvania, every gallon of gasoline sold for highway use is subject to a Federal tax of 3 cents and the State tax of 5 cents. Consequently, every time a motorist here buys 5 gallons of gasoline, he pays 40 cents in tax. And when he asks for 10 gallons, he pays 80 cents in direct tax alone. Thus the gasoline tax he regards as a matter of a few cents actually costs him quarters and half dollars.

"Few will fail to recognize the economic importance of this fact—that the more money they must spend for tax, the less gasoline they will have available for business or pleasure.

"The fact that motorists spend quarters and half dollars for gasoline taxes has been

usually played down. Time and again the gasoline tax rate is referred to as "just a few pennies," or "the motorist never misses it." Thus, a more or less natural tendency has been discernable to perpetuate the myth that the taxation of gasoline is still a penny-ante game.

"However, the stakes are high and getting higher. The State gasoline tax alone takes almost $160 million from highway users in Pennsylvania and the Federal tax costs motorists here another $95 million.

"In these times, public discussion of multi-billion-dollar budgets and expenditures has dulled the public's sensitivity to the burden of taxation. And so a tax expressed as say, "5 cents per gallon" sounds like practically nothing at all. But at the point of purchase it means that on a "buck's worth of gas"—40 cents of that dollar goes for taxes.

"Highway users already are paying for roads, and paying heavily. And it is imperative—as a matter of actual survival—we keep a wary eye out for proposed tax and regulatory policies which could eventually stunt our business and our Nation. In the so-called old countries burdensome taxation and regulation has so killed incentive and initiative that the United States is forced to take the leadership in preserving freedom and progress. All too often, proposals are made in our country which would eventually raise the tax burden to the deadening level it has reached in other parts of the world.

"Actually, the gasoline tax is a small part of this overall tax burden picture. But to the motorist who will think ahead and who can envision to what monstrous heights this tax might be raised unless the public fights it off, the gasoline tax is no imaginary ogre. The threat is real—the tax is real.

"Yes, we are way past the stage where we can logically continue to think of the gasoline tax as a matter of pennies. Last year the average tax paid on gasoline in Pennsylvania was 40 percent of the retail price—higher than most luxury taxes.

"If that is surprising, it is because we forget that the stakes have been raised. We are throwing bigger coins into the gasoline tax pot nowadays."

Housing Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1959

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, in view of the vote on S. 57 earlier today, I am simply going to take about 2 minutes to make a matter of record facts pertinent to the housing legislation. Now that the action has been taken, it is ironical to note that there is today in the United States more than 6 percent vacancies in rental apartments and more than 1 percent in vacant houses. Percentagewise these may seem like minute figures but actually the number of vacancies across this Nation are many times over the number of units which are provided for in this budget-busting legislation. What many of us think was more reasonable and rational legislation in this area met overwhelming opposition on this floor today.

Certainly, everyone is aware of the fact that the building of houses and apartments are proceeded on a larger scale this year than last year so that at the end of this year we will have an oversupply of housing in this country.

I just wonder if anyone has stopped to consider how many rental property owners will be caught squarely in the squeeze by the vacant housing units and skyrocketing real estate taxes.

Speaking for that part of my district which reaches into the city of Chicago, it is interesting to note that statistics show that in the metropolitan area permits alone last month were issued for 695,000 homes. The largest number for any 1 month since the boom month of April 1956.

In the city of Chicago, home and apartment construction during the past month showed gains of 97 percent over levels of 1 year ago. Apartment building permits alone in the city of Chicago last month were up 119 percent over a year ago.

The seasonally adjusted annual rate of Chicago area residential buildings last month climbed to a 1959 high of 62,285 units. Last year's actual production was 40,587 units and in the suburban area of Chicago apartment building has risen to an alltime high, while suburban home building soared sharply, too.

The April statistics show that suburban apartment building for the first 4 months of this year nearly doubled the number of the corresponding 1958 period.

In the face of these figures which I suspect are quite parallel to those of other metropolitan areas, we bring forward the most extravagant housing bill in the history of this country.

I received a letter today from the Greater Chicago Property Owners Council presenting some of the figures I have cited and containing a warning of the squeeze in which property owners whose taxes support the necessary Government revenues face.

It just seems to me we have embarked on a binge to create surpluses of every nature and description from the farm to the cities and most everywhere in between and with each ambitious program we create greater fiscal deficits in the Federal Treasury. Now, if one of these days we dedicate our legislative activities to creating a little surplus in the Federal Treasury and applied it against the astronomical national debt, I am sure that many good folks in this country would enjoy a feeling of gratitude and security and, particularly, the folks on pensions and fixed incomes whom we stroke gently on one side of the face while firmly bashing them firmly on the other.

The Red Stripes in Our Flag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.
OF
HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1959

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure to place in the RECORD the Armed Forces Day address given by Maj. Gen. H. J. Vander Heide, the commanding general at the Indiantown Gap Military Reservation, Annville, Pa., at York, Pa., on Saturday, May 16, 1959:

ARMED FORCES DAY ADDRESS, YORK, PA., MAY 16, 1959, BY MAJ. GEN. H. J. VANDER HEIDE

Mayor Schilding, Congressman QUIGLEY, other distinguished guests, members of the Armed Forces Week Committee, ladies and gentlemen, Armed Forces Week offers our American people an annual opportunity to evaluate our Armed Forces, an opportunity to determine for themselves whether our military forces are adequate for the security of our freedom, an opportunity to determine if the tax dollar is sufficient and well used in developing and maintaining our military forces.

During this week military installations hold open houses so that the public may learn about the effectiveness of our personnel and equipment. The status of our forces, and the threats to our freedom, are highlighted in news media and in talks throughout the Nation.

It is well that this is done, because under the form of government that we desire, our military forces are only as good as our people as a whole are willing to make them.

Today we maintain a military force—land, sea, and air—of 2½ million people. This is the largest force our country has ever maintained during a so-called period of peace.

Is this size force necessary? Is its cost justified? I believe the answers lie in a brief review of historical facts since World War II. You will recall that at the beginning of World War II the only Communist power on earth was Russia herself. At that time she controlled a population of 170 million people. A population about equal to that of the United States today.

Let us review very briefly what happened since that time. Remember how, in 1940, Russia took over Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania. Remember how after World War II we collapsed our military forces. Remember how, while we were militarily weak, communism took over country after country which had been weakened by the war. Remember, in 1945, it was Poland, East Germany, Albania, and Yugoslavia. In 1946 it was Bulgaria and Rumania. In 1947 Hungary, and in 1948 Czechoslovakia. By the end of 1948 nearly half of the formerly independent countries in Europe had fallen to communism.

Remember what happened in the Far East. In 1945 Russia took over North Korea, South Sakhalin, and the Kurile Islands. In 1946 it was Mongolia. In 1949 all of the great land mass of the Chinese mainland fell to communism. In 1950 Tibet and North Vietnam fell.

By that time communism had expanded to such an extent that Russia controlled a population of nearly 1 billion people—that is about half the population of the earth. What was left of the free world realized that it would have to band together if it was not to fall piecemeal to communism.

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) had been developed and was starting to strengthen. The Southeast Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO) was being molded. Other mutual-assistance agreements, whereby each member nation agrees to support each other if attacked, were being developed. Under these agreements the United States also provides assistance in the form of materiels and technical advice. The free world was developing unified strength.

But in June of 1950 efforts were made to communize South Korea. We immediately entered the war, and under the United Nations, saved South Korea from communism. We had lost our fear of the Communist surge. Our country had acted with positive decision regardless of the possible danger of igniting a general war.

Since that time our country has taken a firm attitude in dealing with forced Communist expansion. We have made it clear that we will use our own forces if necessary, any place on a moment's notice, to prevent communism from denying the rights of any member of the free world. Our determination on this point was clearly displayed to the world through our use of military forces in Taiwan and in Lebanon.

The firmness of our country's policy was clearly stated by our President last fall. He was talking before all members of the United Nations. He was dealing with the problems in the Middle East which had caused us to send troops to Lebanon, and the British to send troops to Jordan. In substance President Eisenhower said: "This world of individual nations is not going to be controlled by any single power or group of powers. This world of individual nations is not going to be commited to any single ideology. Please believe me when I say, the dream of world domination by a single power is an impossible dream." That was a strong statement. Our President made it clear that we would do all in our power to insure that Russia's dream of world domination is in fact, an impossible dream.

We must not weaken from that position. It is important that we realize that since adopting a firm policy in 1950, Communist expansion has been slowed to a walk. However, communism keeps nibbling at the periphery of the free world and continues its ultimate objective of devouring all of the world.

Today we are facing another crisis in Berlin. Our country has taken a firm stand. We have indicated a lack of fear of even a general war if necessary for the preservation of the rights of the Western allies and the freedom of the West Berlin people.

To back up our position we must maintain strong ready military forces. Such forces, if sufficiently strong act as a deterrent to war. We feel that Russia will not seek her own destruction if she feels we have the power to destroy her.

I know more about the Army than I do about the Navy and the Air Force. So, let me say a little about the responsibilities, strength and deployments of our Army forces. The Army has four primary responsibilities:

First, as our Nation's forward line of defense, the Army has forces near the Iron and Bamboo Curtains. If an aggressor should strike, these forces would offer resistance until reinforcements could arrive. In Europe, we maintain the fire-division 7th Army. In Korea we have the 8th Army with its 2 divisions backed up by 18 South Korean divisions. Sizable forces are stationed in strategic locations in Hawaii and in the Caribbean area. About 40 percent of our overall strength is deployed overseas.

Providing reinforcements for our oversea units, is the second job of the Army. For this purpose, it has a combat-ready Reserve in the United States. Its hard-hitting spearhead is known as the Strategic Army Corps or STRAC. The slogan of STRAC—"skilled, tough, ready around the clock"—describes its mission. Backing up the STRAC spearhead are other active Army forces to provide additional combat reinforcements for either limited or general war.

The third major job of the Army is a substantial share in the air defense of the continental United States. This is the responsibiltiy of the Army Air Defense Command. It maintains some 200 guided missile battalions on alert 24 hours each day. They defend, with their Nike surface-to-air missiles, 20 strategic industrial and highly populated areas.

The fourth primary responsibility of the Army is one of vital and personal interest to many of us here. It is to maintain strength to reinforce our Active Army units. This strength comes from the 27 Army National Guard and 10 Army Reserve divisions and other nondivisional Reserve units. They are organized and trained for either limited or general war. The divisions have the same pentomic organization as the Active Army divisions. They can mesh speedily and efficiently with other Army forces engaged in combat.

The Army Reserves, which of course include all Army elements of the National Guard, provide a vital part of our national defense. In time of war, their role is indentical with that of the Active Army. In combat there can be no distinction between Active and Reserve forces. It is essential that our citizen soldiers have the same organization, the same type of leadership, the same training and the same equipment as the Active Army. If war does come, they must equal the professionl soldier in combat readiness and in quality. Our reservists, in addition to pursuing their civilian careers, devote much time to military training in order to keep qualified for their military jobs. The shrinkage of time and space no longer permits the United States to mobilize and train forces over a period of time while our allies face the enemy. Because of this, the degree of combat readiness and efficiency of our Army Reserves comprise the determining factor in any emergency situation which is beyond the scope of our Active Forces.

Another essential Army activity is conducted in the military assistance advisory groups. The United States maintains these in some 75 countries. They contribute to the strength of the free world through the help they give our allies in developing the effectiveness of approximately 200 divisions in the collective security system.

An additional important activity of the Army is in the missile field. The Navy and Air Force, of course, also have vital interests and accomplishments in this field. However, the Army fostered the earliest steps and I would like to mention a few of its achievements. In 1944, the Army fired our country's first modern military ballistic test vehicle. In 1949, an Army missile established the record-breaking speed of 5,150 miles per hour, and reached an altidure of more than 250 miles. That flight marked several important "firsts." For the first time in history, communication was achieved by radio with an object more than 250 miles above the earth; for the first time, a two-stage rocket was separated in flight; for the first time, rocket motors were ignited at high altitudes, and the existence and nature of the thermal barrier were determined.

An outstanding example of the achievement of the Army's great missile team is the 1,500-mile intermediate range ballistic missile, Jupiter. It is now in production. It is taking its place in the line of America's defense as an operational missile in the Air Force. The Army's Jupiter–C rocket lifted the United States into the space age. It hurled the first American satellite, Explorer I, into orbit on January 31 of last year. On March 26, the Army Jupiter–C put Explorer III into orbit, and on July 26, Explorer IV.

The latest Army achievements came about as part of its participation in the Nation's efforts to probe outer space. Of five shots authorized, two were allotted to the Army. The Army's first try on December 6, 1958, did not develop quite enough velocity, and the missile, Pioneer III, penetrated only 66,654 miles into space. Pioneer IV, the Army's second probe, was fired early on the morning of March 3, 1959. By the afternoon of that day, all America knew that, for the first time, it had a missile loaded with valuable scientific instruments that had traveled well past the area of the earth's gravitation. The missile was on its way into orbit around the sun.

The Army's arsenal contains more than 10 types of missiles and rockets. Tactical surface-to-surface missiles range in size from the mighty Redstone, which can deliver a nuclear warhead 200 miles, to the antitank missile, capable of destroying the heaviest tank.

In connection with missiles, I would like to extend a word of caution. In view of the great range and destructive power of some missiles, some people are prone to believe that a war of tomorrow may be won by missiles alone. I assure you that against a determined foe that is not true. Balanced forces will be needed—forces to move over the ground, through the seas and through the air. Some people would like to believe that ground forces are becoming obsolete. The task of the infantryman is a muddy, bloody one, and I wish they would not be needed, but that just is not true. Against a determined enemy, there is only one way to ultimate decision. That is by overrunning the ground from which the enemy fights. General Bradley expressed it this way: "No victory has been insured until the man on the ground takes possession by his physical presence on the enemy's soil." General Lemnitzer, our Army's newly appointed Chief of Staff, expressed it this way. He said: "To protect people on this earth you need to hold the land with forces on the ground." I assure you gentlemen that as far as I go, and I believe our American people go, our country will never submit to conquest by remote control. Nor, I believe will Russia.

Overall, I feel our Army and our other services are doing exceptionally well with what we have. I am especially proud of the accomplishments of our Army Reserves. They have come a long way in the past few years. Every unit we now have would be useful if needed tomorrow.

Today we are facing a great challenge. That challenge, as expressed by our President in his state of the Union message to the 85th Congress, was: "Can government, based upon liberty and God-given rights of man, permanently endure, when ceaselessly challenged by a dictatorship hostile to our mode of life, and controlling an economic and military strength of great and growing power?" The President answered his own question in these words: "For us the answer has always been found, and still is found, in the devotion, the vision, the courage and fortitude of our own people. Moreover, we face this challenge, not as a single powerful nation, but as one that has in recent decades reached a position of recognized leadership in the free world."

So far, since the Korean war, the overall military strength of our country, Army, Navy, Marines, Air, including our Reserves, plus the assistance given to other countries has proven sufficient as a deterrent to war and as an effective restraint on the forced expansion of communism.

I feel certain that the value of freedom means enough to all of us to warrant the sacrifices necessary to maintain our country's present effectiveness in preserving a free world. If we hesitate to make sacrifices, if we develop into a Nation of individuals, each interested in only his personal gains, then we, like the Roman Empire, and each great power that has since risen and then fallen, may expect conquest and oblivion.

The opportunity in a free country for developing selfish interests, and the dangers thereof, have been recognized for many years. In 1917 Teddy (Theodore) Roosevelt said: "The things that will destroy America are: Peace at any price, prosperity at any price, safety first instead of duty first, a love

of soft living, and a get rich quick theory of life."

Somehow, I feel, that theory of life will never become damagingly effective, if we consider the meaning of the red stripes in the flag of our country. Those red stripes, when our flag was designed, symbolized the blood that had been shed to make possible the birth of our free Nation.

Today as we look at those stripes, we cannot help but think about the lives that have been given, and the other sacrifices that have been made so that you and I could walk on this earth as free men. It took a million lives to do that. Yes, we have a great obligation to those who have gone ahead of us, and for those who follow us. I feel that our generation will meet the challenge facing us. We will not lead our country, through selfishness, into oblivion. We will sacrifice the meaningless dollar, and our blood, and lives if necessary, in order to preserve a free world for our children and for their children.

True Champions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM T. CAHILL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 21, 1959

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to announce to the House that today members of the 1929 championship basketball team of Camden Catholic High School, Camden, N.J., are attending a reunion in Washington in celebration of their 30th anniversary.

These men have been fast friends throughout the years—all reside in the same general area of New Jersey where they lived during their high schools days and all are contributing to the general well-being of their community, State, and Nation by taking a real interest in community, State, and national affairs.

This group has maintained throughout the years a vital interest in their alma mater and played a dominant role in the reestablishment of the athletic program at their high school in 1946 which has brought not only credit to the school but inestimable benefits to the students and the community at large.

The members are accompanied by three men who helped guide them in their youth and have been their warm personal friends during manhood. These men are Rev. Paul N. Fairbrother, formerly athletic director at Camden Catholic and presently pastor of St. Patrick's Church, Woodbury, N.J.; Elmer "Al" Hertzler, former basketball coach and now associated with the Army Engineers here in Washington and Thomas Ryan, former baseball coach and now sports editor of the Camden Courier of Camden, N.J.

The members of the 1929 team, most of whom have joined in this reunion, are William "Pat" O'Brien, Wallace "Bud" Sheehan, Rev. Peter N. Budniak, Matthew Slapkowski, John Flood, Lawrence Crevey, John Bach, Joseph Lloyd, Joseph Sascovitz, J. Edward McGowan, Charles Woods, and William "Reds" O'Brien. The team managers were James Campbell and Harry Kelleher.

All of these men have, by their accomplishments in their respective fields of endeavor, been a credit to their school and community and have by their friendship and loyalty to each other through the years, demonstrated the great spirit and teamplay that carried them to championship heights in 1929.

Of such stuff is America built.

Michigan: A Land Rich in Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN LESINSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 20, 1959

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, three major ingredients for industrial growth are resources, power, and transportation, all of which abound in Michigan, and are well described in the following articles by Culver Bailey, staff writer for the Michigan Education Journal:

MICHIGAN: A LAND RICH IN RESOURCES
(By Culver Bailey)

Michigan is a land of multiple riches—a second timber growth, wildlife, minerals, and 11,000 lakes—all basic to the needs of a present modern age.

Today these riches are ingredients of the newspaper you read daily, the boat you may fish from, the automobile which carries you from home to job, or the chair you now sit in. Each of these products has a part of Michigan's natural resources in it.

Nature piled up Michigan's resources during more than two billion years of geological time. Man spared a few resources, but some he bludgeoned without mercy.

A century ago big men, with rough muscular arms and hands, stripped much of Michigan's forest land. Some 34 million acres of the 36.5 million acres of Michigan land were forests. Today 19 million acres are classified as forest land. In 1880 Michigan lumbermen led the Nation in the production of lumber—five and one-half billion boardfeet.

Lumberjacks swung single and double-bladed axes time and again. Hardened steel cut the cambium and other living tissues of pines and hardwoods. They first cleared trees close to the rivers and worked their way from the western and eastern edges of the State diagonally north toward the center of Michigan, approaching the State's junior continental-divide, the current route of highway M-27.

The lumbermen dumped the trees into rivers flowing toward the Great Lakes, with the logs ending up at lakeshore towns of Muskegon, Grand Haven, and Traverse City on the west, and Alpena, Saginaw and Bay City, along Michigan's eastern coast. Most of Chicago was built with Michigan white pine, and then reconstructed again with it after Chicago's great fire in 1871.

FIRES FOLLOWED CUTTING

Months of drought and parched earth followed ruthless cutting of Michigan lumber. Cast away dry limbs and leveled trunk stubble furnished the fuel for six great Michigan fires between 1871 and 1911. Thousands of people became homeless, and hundreds of others died—some caught trapped hiding in underground vegetable cellers. Flame flicked across the State from Muskegon to Bay City, and south down into the thumb area toward Detroit.

After the fires a new kind of Michigan was born. The price paid for the fire had compensations, however, for today all the wonderful store of living things in the Wolverine State can be traced to this period in our history.

It took the burning to develop the immence deer herd here. The ruffled grouse began to thrive on the scrubby undergrowth that grew after loggers and fires had gone. Much wildlife was destroyed by fires, but in its place came our popular pheasant and rabbit stocks.

Before the fires, deer couldn't reach edible bark and limbs of the 150-foot giant hardwoods abounding in the State. The low-growing bush plants and the tender aspen trees which grew up following the upset of nature's balance offered a rare treat for fast-growing deer herds.

Since that time, Michigan's wildlife has grown to 310 species of birds and 60 native species of mammals. Today in the State's 11,000 lakes and 36,350 miles of streams there are found 28 families of fish, with 125 species of these the best known. Some of the best known are pike, whitefish, greyling, pickerel, cod, bass, and perch.

IRON ORE DISCOVERED IN 1844

In comparison to his rude treatment of the forests a century ago, man paid homage to Michigan's metallic minerals. Yet the minerals too—iron ore and copper—could have been taken from the land more resourcefully. But Michigan was the leader, and it brought up ore from the earth with a vengeance. This State led the Nation in iron ore production from the ore's first discovery near the present town of Negaunee in 1844 until the great Minnesota Mesabi Range became the leader in 1901.

Michigan today ranks second in the Nation in iron ore with an annual production rate of 13 million tons. The ore supply is depleting, however, and without additional high grade ore discoveries, the remaining 140 million tons will be exhausted in 10 years.

However, a discovery in 1948 of 2 billion tons of low grade iron ore 100 feet below the surface in the upper peninsula is expected to give Michigan's iron ore supply a boost. There is enough of the mineral there, geologists say, to supply as much as was mined during the past 110 years. The productive Marquette and Menominee Ranges presently are producing the low grade ore and sending it by train to the Sault, and from there shipping it by lake freighters to Great Lakes' ports.

The skilled Cornish, Scandinavian, Italian, and Irish miners of the Upper Peninsula relentlessly hammer underground, knocking chunks of the low grade ore into smaller pieces. They scoop it up with mechanical machines and send it on its way to the earth's surface.

COPPER INDUSTRY RANKS SIXTH

A story somewhat paralleling Michigan's iron mining is the State's copper industry—only copper mining has declined much more. Michigan, the former ruler of the Nation's copper production, today ranks sixth in the Nation. Arizona, Utah, Montana, Nevada, and New Mexico rank ahead in that order.

Copper and iron ore in Michigan are costly to produce, for these metallic minerals must be brought up from mine shafts as deep as 2 miles. Some years the cost-profit margin for these two minerals is hair-thin. The leading metallic mineral States take iron and

copper from shallow open pit mines—a much less-costly method.

Michigan's pure, malleable copper—a rarity in other parts of America—is mined out of the Keweenaw Peninsula. It has been mined there for thousands of years. Records date back to 5000 B.C. to ancient Indian tribes who heated copper in shallow pits and quickly dashed cold spring water against it to cause the copper to crack, thus affording easy opportunity to pry the copper loose for weaponmaking.

Though Michigan's metallic minerals have slipped from the prominent national positions they once held, the State's nonmetallic minerals are coming to the fore. Gypsum, to make plaster to coat your bedroom walls; sand and gravel, to make concrete for Michigan's vast construction projects—new homes, factory buildings, and metropolitan shopping centers; and salt, to manufacture supplies for the farmer and the chemist, all rank high in America's production of nonmetallic minerals.

Other nonmetallic mineral resources produced in Michigan include marl, cement, clay and shale, lime, peat, bromine, magnesium compounds, calcium-magnesium chlorides, and potash. The bromines, compounds, and chlorides are sold to local chemical industries.

MICHIGAN'S OIL RESERVES

Also from the depths of Michigan's earth comes oil. Since the 1890's some 23,000 wells have been dug in this State. Three new oil wells recently began production—Scipio field in Hillsdale County (January 1957), Albion field near Albion (December 1958), and Pulaski field near Jackson (January 1959). Today most of the producing wells are clustered in central Michigan. Walker field, west of Grand Rapids, is the State's largest oil field (7,200 acres). Porter field, Midland County, leads in cumulative production with 46,833,793 barrels (1957 statistics).

Without Michigan's vast water resources, the automobile industry and other industries would find it difficult to survive here. For every 100 gallons of water a person uses directly, many times that amount is used for him by industry and service facilities. In industry it takes 14,400 gallons of water to produce 1 ton of pig iron; 65,000 gallons to produce 1 ton of finished steel; 18 barrels of water to refine a barrel of oil; and, 15,000 gallons of water to make an automobile.

Each person requires 1,300 gallons of water daily to meet his direct and indirect needs. Underground water is a source of supply for small communities in the State, but the larger cities pump water from the Great Lakes. They also take water from nearby rivers.

Cities, towns, and villages, are expanding steadily. Their boundaries are progressing outward; subdivisions spring up almost overnight. This expansion of urban areas means that Michigan's natural resources are diminishing on a per person basis. There are more people (Michigan is second only to California as the fastest growing State in the nation) now living within this state than ever before. Each year Michigan residents crowd the lakes, parks, forests, and land.

Today there are 1.5 million more people in Michigan than there were 8 years ago. What a far cry this is from the solidly timbered lands of the State 100 years ago and from the days when one of four retreating glaciers left an indelible line from Muskegon across the width of the State to Bay City. The glaciers left a dividing line of fertile clay loam soil in southern Michigan and sandy forest lands in the north.

ESTHETIC RESOURCES, TOO

Michigan abounds in natural resources. Both the utilitarian and esthetic kinds (esthetic includes Michigan's picturesque rivers, lakes, and scenic views) are here practically for the asking. Fortunately, no longer do men of the former lumber baron vintage exist.

Instead, we have profited from the mistakes of a century ago. The establishment of a State conservation department to preserve the balance of nature attests to this. With your help, Michigan's remaining natural resources can be preserved for the appreciative generations to come.

POWER: ATOMIC AGE NEARS REALITY

(By Culver Bailey)

Michigan's power past and present combined together into a knotted bundle of energy, is today swiftly annexing to itself a parcel of the future.

The parcel is the atom, and the present power sources—water, coal, and steam—patiently mark time for the rapidly approaching future. They work and wait, eventually to be swallowed whole by the coming atomic age.

"Twenty-five years from now all new powerplants will furnish atomic energy," predicted Dr. Paul S. Geracht, vice president for atomic energy at the Chase Manhattan Bank in New York City.

Meanwhile, Michigan's present utility power of conventional steam pressure mounts to tornado-like speeds up to 700 miles an hour. The pressure revolves turbines which cause mighty generators in 33 steam plants throughout the State to unleash electrical power.

These stanch generators will hold the line, supplying enough power to light our cities and operate our factories, until the atom can be harnessed to produce electricity.

In 2 years scientists expect to launch their quest to produce peacetime atomic power; the place will be the new 15-acre Enrico Fermi atomic powerplant at Lagoona Beach, near Monroe. In February, scientists will begin conducting experimental tests at the Fermi plant, the largest in the world, under nonnuclear operating conditions. Nuclear fuels will not be used until the entire plant installation has been thoroughly tested.

The scientists will attack their objective with a huge, gleaming, steel walled, fast neutron breeder atomic reactor, as high as a two-story house and nicknamed the "pot." Of the 10 different types of atomic reactors, the last breeder was chosen for the Fermi plant because it likely will prove economically competitive with coal in producing electricity.

One pound of uranium 235, the size of a cube of sugar, produces as much heat as 30 carloads of coal. Heat, the main product of the fast breeder reactor, is transferred from the reactor vessel by liquid sodium through stainless steel tubes to turbines. The turbines, revolved by the heat pressure, turn the electricity producing generator. Plutonium manufactured as a byproduct will be bought by the Federal Government for use in atomic bombs. It can also be used for fuel in other types of reactors.

The 91-ton breeder reactor, housed inside a 77-foot high metal-plated dome, promises to be the key to undreamed expansion of Michigan's electrical facilities.

Enrico Fermi, one of the world's greatest nuclear scientists, in whose memory the atomic plant was named said in 1945 that the country which first develops a breeder reactor will have a great competitive advantage in atomic energy.

The Fermi plant reactor had its beginning in 1951 with the formation of four industry study groups. They sought a new source of abundant, low-cost electric power.

In 1954 Atomic Power Development Associates (APDA) was organized by 31 power companies and 18 engineering and manufacturing firms. Together they shared the expensive research, experimentation, and development work that has gone into the basic design of the $75 million Fermi project. The Power Reactor Development Co. (PRDC), comprised of 18 power companies and 7 manufacturing firms, constructed the huge atomic reactor.

However, at the moment, Michigan's conventional electric and natural gas powers, as we know them today, reign supreme. With the strength of straining horses, electricity flows unnoticed into your home through long, thin, copper wires no longer than your finger.

It turns the machines of our giant manufacturing industries, gives us light to see by, helps heal our bodies, and spreads our ideas from one place to another. It is an awesome power, and it has hewn away barriers to help establish modern civilization.

It brought progress to Michigan via steam and waterpower. In an instant, a particle of coal is shot into the boilers of Michigan's 33 huge electrical steam-generated plants. Less than a second later the energy of that coal, transformed into steam, produces electricity. An instant later electricity is miles away, heating your electric iron, running your refrigerator, or lighting your reading lamp.

Electrical power, too, is produced in 13 Michigan powerplants sponsored by the Rural Electrification Association (REA). These farmer owned and operated cooperatives are aided financially by the Federal Government.

Or, water flowing through 69 power dams in the State likewise cause generators to be turned and electricity to be produced. One of the larger dams, Tippy Dam, is located on Manistee River, just east of Manistee. The Au Sable, Manistee, and Muskegon Rivers supply power for most of Michigan's dams. Smaller dams are located on, among others, the Maple, Grand, and Thornapple Rivers.

This electrical power from the steam-generating plants, the REA farmer-owned cooperatives, and the dams carry out many tasks once requiring backbreaking work.

What a change this is from the old days. Manufacturing plants formerly fed coal into a steam-generating boiler at one end of the factory building, and the generated steam turned long poles stretching from end to end high above. A myriad of leather belts and pulleys were attached to the machines and connected to the long revolving pole above. The pole, while turning, gave the machines power to produce goods.

Today each machine has its own motor. Powered by electricity, machines hum effortlessly, in some instances almost noiselessly, day and night.

TRANSPORTATION: ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY PLAYS IMPORTANT ROLE IN MICHIGAN'S FUTURE

(By Culver Bailey)

Two great arms, Lake Huron and Lake Michigan, in 1962 will link Michigan shipping, truck and railroad industries to a new transportation wonder, the St. Lawrence Seaway.

This Great Lakes-saltwater link will bring to Michigan the cheapest, quickest foreign import-export transportation the State has ever known. It will put the Detroit, Bay City, and Muskegon ports on a direct sea route with the rest of the world.

Within 3 years 10,000-ton cargo capacity oceangoing vessels will steam through the Detroit River seeking Michigan ports. They will want to unload cargoes of Scandinavian

timber, China clay from Great Britain, aged liquors from France, olive oil transported from the Mediterranean, and metallic minerals—copper, lead, zinc, and manganese—from Canada.

However, these ships may be in for a surprise. Michigan ports aren't prepared to wrest great foreign cargoes into their existing facilities. Detroit's port is unable to handle the anticipated foreign shipping. Bay City and Muskegon are improving their ports, but they aren't large enough yet.

Even so, the State's internal transportation systems should be ready to do their part in generating foreign trade. Underway today is a $1¼-billion State highway construction program. Within 5 years new 4-lane, divided expressways will be located within 30 miles of 90 percent of Michigan's industry. Carrier trucks, with loads up to 35,000 pounds of freight, will roll along the new highways to deliver cargo from Great Lakes' ports inland to the automobile, steel, and primary metals industries.

And the 13 Michigan railroads, some with tracks laid evenly next to port docks, wait patiently for the first foreign ships to push their way through Lakes Huron and Michigan. Trains will haul cargoes of heavy machinery, iron ore, gravel, and cement to Michigan's metal industries, and general commodities (including some sugar and coffee) to processing factories.

At present, however, the problem of inadequate ports persists. Detroit's 25-mile-long port is too small. Last November the Greater Detroit citizenry passed up a second chance to construct a $7 million port terminal which would bring the city an estimated $40 million in 1965 from import-export shipments alone. Detroit's failure to provide for increased seaway traffic could mean a loss to the city of $110 million in direct and indirect income in the next 5 years, according to Carlis Stettin, director of the Detroit port commission.

SEAWAY IS A NEW RICH COAST

This 8,300-mile new American north coast will be richer than the Pacific and gulf coasts combined. Challenging the Atlantic coast for the Nation's shipping supremacy, it will connect Chicago, Milwaukee, Duluth, Toledo, Cleveland, Hamilton, Toronto, Montreal, and Buffalo. Midwestern ports will compete with the rich Eastern ports of New York, Boston, and Philadelphia. Via the St. Lawrence Seaway, Hamburg, Germany, will be 199 miles closer to Cleveland than to New York City.

If Detroit doesn't act soon, Bay City and Muskegon—slowly progressing—could divide Detroit's lower Michigan hinterland potential and reap the rewards (a port's hinterland is the inland trade region served by a port).

The Midwest hinterland—extending from the Rocky Mountains to the Ohio River Valley—is in Michigan's backyard. Today the Midwest sends its exports of steel, automobiles, and machinery from its major production centers by railroad to the east coast. From there the exports are reloaded on ships sailing to foreign ports.

The combined cost of sending cargo by rail and then by ship will be practically double the cost of sending the same materials on a direct water route from Detroit, Bay City, or Muskegon to European ports via the seaway. This is why Michigan automobile manufacturers and primary metal industrialists could send cargo to foreign ports cheaper than ever before. Automobile shipments aboard a 500-car capacity oceangoing freighter via the seaway will save manufacturers $45 a car.

Construction of the St. Lawrence Seaway began 4 years ago by Canada and the United States. The actual work consisted of cutting a seven-lock canal around turbulent rapids between the eastern end of Lake Ontario and Montreal.

SEAWAY TO OPEN IN 1962

The seaway will be completed this spring. However, ocean vessels cannot be sent into the Great Lakes until 1962. The lakes' connecting channels will not be deepened to the required 27 feet until that time. America is spending $141 million for its part of the seaway remodeling job. The cost is great; it has to be. Enough earth and rock have been moved to fill a 27,000-mile-long train of 50-ton hopper cars.

The seaway is expected to be worth the cost many times over. Nevertheless, Michigan's ports have a big job ahead of them, and the first task—convincing Michigan's citizens of the seaway's potential worth—is the toughest.

Michigan's highway authority, the railroads, and the truck terminals are aware of the seaway's potential. Within 5 years through expressways for 95 percent of Michigan's residents will be as close as Lansing is to St. Johns—a distance of 80 miles or less. The 5-year billion dollar highway construction program will connect all State cities of 50,000 population or more. Three interstate expressways are included in this program; US-27, extending from southern Ohio to the Straits of Mackinac Bridge and beyond to Sault Ste. Marie; US-16, linking downtown Detroit to Chicago; and US-23, an expressway connecting New York State with Detroit and Muskegon.

Currently 193 road and 134 bridge projects are in various stages of construction. About $142 million was spent last year for highway construction. Total highway costs for 1959 will reach $190 million.

As all motorists know, travel today on the new four-lane, divided expressways is easier and quicker in comparison with the old two- or three-lane highways. Stoplights don't exist, and the slowdown of traffic resulting from cars and trucks moving in and out of roadside drives has disappeared. The through traveler can maintain consistently high speeds—often averaging more than 20 to 30 more miles an hour than on the old roads. The more than 1,000 certified truck lines in the State also appreciate more convenient expressway-driving.

Michigan—with transportation arteries leading to all parts of this mitten-faced State—should welcome the St. Lawrence Seaway. However, if our Michigan ports suffer from hardening of the arteries (that is, insufficient facilities), all that may be seen of foreign ships is a trail of smoke on the Great Lakes' horizon.

Big Labor Union Power a Growing Menace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 21, 1959

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, big labor union bosses are wielding too much political and economic power today. Organized by Samuel Gompers, the "Grand Old Man" of union labor, to combat the power of the industrial barons of 40 years ago, big labor has gotten out of hand and some of its unscrupulous present-day leaders are wrecking our national economy.

Inflation has been speeded up by the exorbitant wage demands of these union leaders. Prices of American-made goods have soared. Imports from cheap-labor countries are pouring into the United States as never before. American exports have been drastically reduced because we have been priced out of world markets. American production machinery has been slowed down, with the result that many American workers have lost their jobs.

Why? Mostly because of the unchecked political and economic power of the leaders of big labor.

The rank and file of labor union members have little or nothing to say about all this. Policies and programs of the big labor unions are determined by the labor bosses—not by the labor union members.

The rank and file of labor union members have no way to protect themselves from the corruption, the misappropriation of union funds, the dictatorial methods of their self-perpetuating leaders—abuses and corruption recently revealed by the McClellan Senate committee.

Samuel Lubell, a noted political and economic writer, interviewed a wide cross-section of steelworkers on the eve of their leaders' negotiations for a new contract. Man after man told him: "We don't want higher wages. And we don't want to strike because a strike means a loss of pay that we'll never make up."

The magazine U.S. News & World Report confirmed Mr. Lubell's findings in its issue of May 25, saying:

> It is being pointed out that the rank and file of steel workers are not in a mood to strike. They are not keen for wage increases that vanish in higher prices and taxes.

Yet the big union leaders continue to insist: Higher wages or we strike.

Mr. Speaker, what will that mean? More inflation. What has it meant in the past? Well, featherbedding and increased wages out of all proportion to increased productivity. These are factors that enable cheap foreign-made goods to undersell American-made goods in world markets and in our own American markets.

For the first time since 1865—almost 100 years—British exports to the United States exceed her imports from the United States. And the same situation is rapidly becoming true in our commerce with Japan, Germany, Belgium, and other nations.

Mr. Speaker, because the cost of production—wages—has been pushed so high by the labor leaders, American goods are in less and less demand in world markets. The downward trend of American sales in foreign countries is becoming increasingly serious. Our prices for goods are entirely out of line with the prices of similar goods produced by exporting nations with which we have to compete. When American prices are too high for American buyers—as they are today—they are far too high for low-wage foreign people to buy.

Summed up, all this means fewer jobs for American workers and more jobs for foreign workers.

Is that good, I ask, for American workers generally?

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Richard Nixon

Aiken, George D., *Vt*——Carroll Arms
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*——Cleveland House
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*——6 Wesley Circle
Bartlett, E. L., *Alaska*——1718 33d Pl. SE.
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md*——
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*——
Bible, Alan, *Nev*——
Bridges, Styles, *N. H*——
Bush, Prescott, *Conn*——
Butler, John Marshall, *Md*——
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va*——The Shoreham
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va*——
Cannon, Howard W., *Nev*——
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind*——The Westchester
Carlson, Frank, *Kans*——Sheraton-Park
Carroll, John A., *Colo*——
Case, Clifford P., *N. J*——
Case, Francis, *S. Dak*——4635 Mass. Ave.
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex*——2525 P St.
Church, Frank, *Idaho*——
Clark, Joseph S., *Pa*——
Cooper, John Sherman, *Ky*——
Cotton, Norris, *N. H*——
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*——
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*——
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn*——
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*——
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho*——
Eastland, James O., *Miss*——5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*——
Engle, Clair, *Calif*——3840 Lorcom Lane, Arlington, Va.
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., *N. C*——
Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del*——
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark*——
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz*——
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*——
Green, Theodore Francis, *R. I.*——University Club
Gruening, Ernest, *Alaska*——
Hart, Philip A., *Mich*——
Hartke, Vance, *Ind*——
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*——
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr., *Mo.*——
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.*——5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*——
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla*——Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*——
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*——
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*——
Javits, Jacob K., *N. Y*——
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex*——
Johnston, Olin D., *S. C*——
Jordan, B. Everett, *N. C*——
Keating, Kenneth B., *N. Y*——3509 M St.
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn*——4929 Hillbrook Lane
Kennedy, John F., *Mass*——
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla*——
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*——
Langer, William, *N. Dak*——2101 Conn. Ave.
Lausche, Frank J., *Ohio*——
Long, Russell B., *La*——
McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn*——2930 Chesapeake St.
McClellan, John L., *Ark*——
McGee, Gale W., *Wyo*——
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*——
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*——The Shoreham
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*——
Martin, Thos. E., *Iowa*——4501 Conn. Ave.
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*——
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg*——4000 Mass. Ave.
Morton, Thruston B., *Ky*——
Moss, Frank E., *Utah*——
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak*——122 Schotts Court NE.
Murray, James E., *Mont*——The Shoreham
Muskie, Edmund S., *Maine*——
Neuberger, Richard L., *Oreg.*——
O'Mahoney, Joseph C., *Wyo.*——Sheraton-Park
Pastore, John O., *R. I*——
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt*——
Proxmire, William, *Wis*——
Randolph, Jennings, *W. Va*——
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*——
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*——
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass*——2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoeppel, Andrew F., *Kans.*——
Scott, Hugh, *Pa*——
Smathers, George A., *Fla*——
Smith, Margaret Chase (Mrs.), *Maine.*——
Sparkman, John, *Ala*——4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss*——
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*——
Talmadge, Herman E., *Ga*——
Thurmond, Strom, *S. C*——
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis*——2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N. J.*——
Williams, John J., *Del*——
Yarborough, Ralph W., *Tex*——
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak*——Quebec House So.
Young, Stephen M., *Ohio*——

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences

Messrs. Johnson of Texas (chairman), Russell, Magnuson, Anderson, Kerr, Symington, Stennis, Young of Ohio, Dodd, Cannon, Bridges, Wiley, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Martin, and Case of New Jersey.

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston of South Carolina, Holland, Eastland, Humphrey, Symington, Talmadge, Proxmire, Jordan, Young of Ohio, Hart, Aiken, Young of North Dakota, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Williams of Delaware, and Schoeppel.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Johnson of Texas, Pastore, Kefauver, Monroney, Bible, Byrd of West Virginia, Dodd, McGee, Bridges, Saltonstall, Young of North Dakota, Mundt, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Dworshak, Kuchel, Hruska, and Allott.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd of Virginia, Johnson of Texas, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Thurmond, Engle, Bartlett, Cannon, Saltonstall, Bridges, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Bush, and Beall.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Robertson (chairman), Fulbright, Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Clark, Proxmire, Byrd of West Virginia, Williams of New Jersey, Muskie, Capehart, Bennett, Bush, Beall, and Javits.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Bible (chairman), Morse, Frear, Hartke, Beall, Case of South Dakota, and Prouty.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd of Virginia (chairman), Kerr, Frear, Long, Smathers, Anderson, Douglas, Gore, Talmadge, McCarthy, Hartke, Williams of Delaware, Carlson, Bennett, Butler, Cotton, and Curtis.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Green, Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Morse, Long, Kennedy, Gore, Lausche, Church, Wiley, Hickenlooper, Langer, Aiken, Capehart, and Carlson.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Ervin, Humphrey, Gruening, Muskie, Mundt, Curtis, and Capehart.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Anderson, Jackson, O'Mahoney, Bible, Neuberger, Carroll, Church, Gruening, Moss, Dworshak, Kuchel, Goldwater, Allott, and Martin.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Thurmond, Lausche, Yarborough, Engle, Bartlett, Hartke, McGee, Schoeppel, Butler, Cotton, Case of New Jersey, Morton, and Scott.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), Kefauver, Johnston of South Carolina, Hennings, McClellan, O'Mahoney, Ervin, Carroll, Dodd, Hart, Wiley, Langer, Dirksen, Hruska, and Keating.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Murray, Kennedy, McNamara, Morse, Yarborough, Clark, Randolph, Williams of New Jersey, Goldwater, Cooper, Dirksen, Case of New Jersey, Javits, and Prouty.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina (chairman), Monroney, Neuberger, Yarborough, Clark, Jordan, Carlson, Langer, and Morton.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, McNamara, Neuberger, Randolph, McCarthy, Young, Muskie, Gruening, Moss, Case of South Dakota, Martin, Cooper, Scott, and Prouty.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Hennings (chairman), Hayden, Green, Mansfield, Jordan, Cannon, Curtis, Morton, and Keating.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D. C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 4852 Hutchins Pl.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.
Mr. Justice Brennan, of New Jersey, 3037 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Whittaker, of Missouri, 5000 Van Ness St.
Mr. Justice Stewart, of Ohio, Fairfax Hotel.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—James R. Browning, 454 New Jersey Ave. SE.
Deputy Clerk—Edmund P. Cullinan, 4823 Reservoir Rd.
Deputy Clerk—Richard J. Blanchard, 427 St. Lawrence Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Rd.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS JUSTICES ASSIGNED TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Connecticut, New York, Vermont.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Brennan. Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Alabama, Canal Zone, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Stewart. Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Whittaker. Arkansas, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Alaska, Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, Guam, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Whittaker. Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Utah, Wyoming.

Appendix

Tribute to Dean Francis Bowes Sayre, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 22, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very interesting and stimulating story which appeared in the New York Times of today about Dean Francis Bowes Sayre, Jr. There are few men who have made more contributions toward making this a better world than Dean Sayre.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SCION OF WHITE HOUSE—FRANCIS BOWES SAYRE, JR.

WASHINGTON, May 21.—Francis Bowes Sayre, Jr. went back today to his birthplace, the White House. At his birth it was occupied by his grandfather, President Woodrow Wilson. From then until now, no other child has been born there.

Now 44, and dean of the Washington Cathedral (Protestant Episcopal) the Very Reverend Mr. Sayre went back to the White House offices as Chairman of the U.S. Committee on Refugees. The purpose was a 2-day meeting with President Eisenhower to discuss this country's participation in World Refugee Year, a program to liquidate as far as possible the problem of the homeless across the globe.

Dean Sayre's leadership in this effort was typical of his wide range of interests—humanitarian, social, and political—outside the pulpit that have marked his career since he was ordained in 1940.

These activities have made him a somewhat controversial figure in the religious community, but he never has allowed the probability of controversy to stay him. He spoke out against the late Senator Joseph R. McCarthy of Wisconsin when the Republican Senator was at the peak of his power. He called the Senator's followers "The frightened and credulous collaborators of a servile brand of patriotism."

Though some of his wealthier parishoners remain stubbornly opposed to self-government for the voteless District of Columbia, the dean is a steadfast champion of home rule. He said some of its opponents now posessed back alleys to power but with home rule they would need to find new pipelines to power.

The cleric, 6 feet 2 inches tall, leads a busy, energtic life. Up early, he conducts the early service of holy communion at 7:30 a.m. in the cathedral, then crosses Woodley Road to breakfast with his family.

His wife is the former Harriet Taft Hart, daughter of Thomas C. Hart, a retired admiral who commanded the Asiatic fleet at the outset of World War II and later was briefly Senator from Connecticut.

DEAN IS FATHER OF THREE

They have three children, Jessie, 10; Thomas, 8, and Harrie, 3. A Thai boy, Tridhos Davakul, 17, has been living with them for 7 years while he attends the cathedral school.

The Dean and Davakul's father grew up together, and whimsically the Dean refers to his young charge as "my private point 4 program."

By 9 a.m. Dean Sayre is in his office for a series of appointments, informal meetings with his staff, dictation and telephone conversations.

Part of his job is to raise funds to finish the cathedral, started in 1907. When time permits, the Dean loves to clamber up ladders and on platforms high in the unfinished cathedral. He talks with the carpenters, stonemasons, and stone carvers while his secretary tells telephone callers that the Dean is in construction conference.

YOUNG SAYRE STUDIED ABROAD

From his White House birthplace young Sayre moved with his parents, Francis B. Sayre and the late Jessie Woodrow Wilson Sayre, to Cambridge, Mass. His father was then a professor of law.

Young Sayre spent his early years at Belmont Hill School near Cambridge. When his father became adviser to the King of Siam, he went to Bangkok for a year. He attended schools in Paris and in Switzerland before entering Williams College, from which he was graduated cum laude in 1937.

His theological training was obtained at the Union Theological Seminary in New York and at the Episcopal Theological School in Cambridge. His first assignment was as assistant minister at Christ Church, Cambridge.

He entered the Navy in 1942, and served nearly 4 years, including duty as chaplain on the heavy cruiser San Francisco in the Pacific.

"We were bombed, hit, strafed, kamikazied," the dean recalled. "It was the finest ministry I ever had in my life.

"You really get to know people when you eat, sleep, get bored, get afraid with them."

After the war, he served churches in Cleveland until he was installed in May, 1951, as the fifth dean of the cathedral in which his grandfather is buried.

New Maritime Developments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 22, 1959

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, many promising new developments in ship design, navigation, and expediting cargo shipments were discussed at length in the address my colleague, Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, of Massachusetts, delivered last night May 21, 1959, before the Propeller Club of Washington, D.C.

Because of the new light cast upon this vitally important subject, I ask unanimous consent that Senator SALTONSTALL's address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, OF MASSACHUSETTS, BEFORE THE PROPELLER CLUB OF THE UNITED STATES, WASHINGTON, D.C., MAY 21, 1959

Control of the sea—a watchword of the past—is still today synonymous with world leadership. Ocean commerce is the very lifeblood of the world. Nations aspiring to world leadership always sought to promote their own trade through ocean commerce, and it is more than coincidence that through the ages world leaders have been strong maritime nations.

Today commerce consists not only of trade upon the sea, but above it in the modern jet airplanes now just going into trans-Atlantic service. One jet passenger liner makes the round trip from New York to Paris in the course of a day.

Can we draw a historical parallel from those nations which preceded us in leadership of the world's activities upon the sea? Each of these nations conquered a new frontier of commercial enterprise. The Phoenicians explored the Mediterranean from end to end, passing the Pillars of Hercules and reporting back what they found beyond. The Romans carried this further, exploring down the coast of Africa and up the coast of Europe. The Vikings and Venetians further expanded the realm of man's knowledge of the world around him.

Henry the Navigator of Portugal sent men around the Cape of Good Hope. Isabella of Spain financed Columbus. Following these acts, Spain and Portugal became the leading centers of western commerce, until leadership was wrested away from them by the sea-dogs of England.

A century ago the United States was making a bid for maritime leadership with packets and clipper ships. Much of the ship development was done in East Boston by our own Donald MacKay, who took large risks by building ships on speculation. The courage of the captains was legendary. However, our western expansion halted this growth, and British steamers soon took over the sea.

Again, later, in the last throes of sail, the most unusual schooner ever built, the *Thomas W. Lawson*, was launched in Quincy. She was an effort to create a minimum cost collier. She suffered two collisions in her career with steamers whose captains did not realize she was moving faster than they were.

The First World War wiped the sailing ship from the sea for good. During it, we built up a large merchant fleet of Hog Islanders and other ships. Our great trouble was that we let our sea leadership go back to Europe after the war. Until the Maritime Commission programs of the 1930's little was done to expand U.S. activities on the sea.

During World War II the United States again inherited the responsibility of leadership in the defense of freedom. With it came leadership in world commerce. Whether we like it or not, we must face up to the challenge and shoulder the responsibility it imposes. We have begun to do that already, with our ship replacement program, but more must be done. Today we must seek out the new frontiers and conquer them.

Time is our new frontier—not geography. Today time is money more than ever before.

Magellan's crew took 3 years to circumnavigate the world. Now a satellite does it in 90 minutes or less. The cargoes of today need to be carried at greater speeds. The turnaround of the vessels carrying them must be cut. Now the battle is not to the discoverer, but to those who take the risks of new investment, of new research and development, and make those risks pay off. Our American forefathers on the sea risked all they had on their voyages of discovery of new markets in the spice islands and the Near East.

In recent years man has broken the sound barrier and speed has become a vital and precious commodity in exploiting the medium of the air. But man has yet to break the sea barrier to any like degree. Through the years there has been no dramatic improvement in the speed of surface vessels from the days of square riggers to our most modern nuclear-powered vessels. If ocean commerce is to remain vital and strong, competition demands that ocean vessels achieve faster, improved speeds. For speed is the key to both economical operation and the quick service which today's world demands.

Here in the United States we are testing the nuclear possibilities of a general cargo ship, the NS *Savannah*, shortly to be launched at Camden. Her namesake predecessor taught the world many of the advantages of steam. While the first *Savannah* had difficulties with her fuel supply, this *Savannah* will have none.

But nuclear propulsion raises another difficulty of its own—great weight. The shielding required to surround a nuclear powerplant takes up much valuable cargo space, so it is probable that for the present it will only be feasible for larger vessels.

Partly to solve the problem of getting more productive space, our research people have under test a gas turbine engine which, though it requires fuel, is relatively economical in the use of that fuel. It can be built cheaply of standard parts, so that the entire powerplant is relatively light in weight for the power it delivers.

I am told that our gas turbine Liberty ship, the *John Sargent*, has made 20 knots—light, of course. What would this have accomplished had it happened during World War II? It could well have shortened the war, for these gas turbine engines can be mass produced. I am told that they are very similar to a Pratt and Whitney J-57 but with another turbine wheel attached; put together they cost about $225,000 to produce 16,000 horsepower and only weigh about 6,000 pounds. With intercooling, I understand it can equal a diesel in fuel economy and is actually more efficient on cold days at sea level than it is at high altitudes, because of the greater density of the air.

Speed is the way to today's fast-moving world. What are we doing to increase the speed of our vessels?—not by just a few knots—but by double or triple the present possibilities? No displacement vessel has yet, to my knowledge, exceeded 45 knots, not even submarines which do not meet surface resistance.

But there are possibilities—for example, of hydrofoil craft which go far beyond 45 knots. Hydrofoils, in principle, are nothing more than miniature airplane wings, terribly strong, operating just below the surface of the water in a medium 800 times as dense as that supporting an airplane. The foils actually lift the hull out of the water, thus enabling the vessel to achieve greatly increased speeds. It derives obvious advantages from the density of water. Anyone who has ridden on an aquaplane or water skiis knows how this principle works. Last year I had the opportunity to manipulate one of the Navy's experimental hydrofoil vessels, and what a thrill it gave me.

The Maritime Administration is experimenting and private research is investing in hydrofoil craft to learn their possibilities and their limitations. They may hold the key to increased speed for ocean travel and commerce. A few years ago the Congress appropriated $1 million for hydrofoil research. Yet the money was never spent. Fortunately, farsighted officials of the Maritime Administration embarked last year upon a thorough research project designed to investigate the possibilities of hydrofoil application to maritime vessels. I quote from Clarence Morse, Maritime Administrator, when he made this announcement a year ago last January:

"We intend to take a closer look at the possibilities of hydrofoils for larger ships. In the air, aeronautical scientists have broken the sound barrier. Why shouldn't we break the sound barrier on the surface? Why should we continue to think in terms of 30–35 knots? Why shouldn't we think in terms of Mach II, or better, at sea?"

He also said:

"We will still have a merchant marine when the rocket boys are landing on the moon—and we will have a merchant marine which is far more efficient than our existing fleet."

Again, let us look at our competition. In the western world, a few hydrofoil passenger craft are now operating—in Italy, Switzerland, Puerto Rico, and elsewhere. But, Russia, our chief competitor, has them in regular use on inland canals. I have been shown photographs of Russian hydrofoil vessels which operate at high speed on her inland canals in less than a meter depth of water.

Other hydrofoils are being tested on the ocean, where it has been found that they can maintain high speed in spite of rough seas. By lifting the hull of the ship 14 feet or more above the water, which is entirely practical in the open ocean, seas of up to 20 feet in height—or over 90 percent of those encountered in the North Atlantic—can be passed over without difficulty.

Airplanes may carry the most expensive types of cargo, but here may be a vessel which carries the intermediate merchandise—not ore or oil—but general cargo. Time is money, and the investment in a cargo delivered in 3 days is far less than the investment in a cargo delivered in 2 weeks.

Delivery, however, involves more than just moving things from place to place across the oceans—it involves cargo handling with its high manpower costs. What new advances are contemplated here? We all know of the roll-on, rolloff ships, which though not yet perfected may still have great potential. We know that conveyer belts and forklift systems are now standard on docks and piers. Tomorrow new systems may make these standard in ship's holds. Ships have been ordered that use cranes rather than masts and booms for cargo hoists. Expanded use of specially designed vessels to transport solids in a liquefied state offer great possibilities (sugar and sulfur are present examples). Container ships, which though expensive, have obvious advantages, are being studied. New equipment purchases for the piers of our ports must be encouraged, and ships fitted to make best use of them. Many well known efficiencies in time and laborsaving devices are well known, but have not been put into practice to any extent.

Nowadays a ship spends from 35 to 50 percent of her time in port. Since she earns only while moving, any speedup of the turnaround in port can generate new profit.

Much can be done in the way of voyage planning with the new data processing equipment. Cargo stowage plans can be worked out and optimum voyages and schedules predicted far in advance, making better use of our investment in ships. An idle or empty ship is an expense, not an earner.

So much for the present. Research is the key to the future. Research is now going forward on those advances which I have discussed tonight and many more with which you are better acquainted than I.

But research is worthless unless the idea is tried. Some ideas can be tried inexpensively, such as the new layout of the navigation bridge which has been suggested. Others are tried by the Government which has already made the major investment in some navigation systems for the benefits of our armed services. These new developments in navigation will provide greater safety and thereby greater opportunity to operate at greater speed.

Take, for example, space research now underway.

Navigational satellites may soon be circling our earth which will enable a mariner to determine his position within a small fraction of a mile on any place on the earth. This will eliminate the need for Loran and other equipment which requires stations closely spaced around the globe. Once in orbit, these satellites may make the investment for the shipowners mush less costly in time saved and accidents avoided. One collision or one wreck costs the whole industry money, for it comes out of insurance premiums. We taxpayers can assist in many ways, but eventually the burden of the responsibility to maintain our Nation's supremacy on the sea will fall on you people.

Just as the railroads have lost much of their more valuable cargo to the trucklines which provide greater flexibility of service, you are endangered by the airplane with its greater speed and opportunity to land closer to the point of destination. The railroads have not been replaced in the carrying of iron ore and coal, but they have lost much of their miscellaneous tonnage.

Flexibility, efficiency, greater speed, lower cost, and less weight. These are all goals toward which we must strive. There is no reason why you and I should not consider looking forward to turbine or nuclear powered hydofoil craft crossing the Atlantic at speeds in excess of 100 knots, carrying medium-size general cargoes, turning around in less than a day. This will accomplish in sea transportation many of the gains which have been accomplished in the last 30 years by the trucking industry on land. Ships will no longer be economically restricted to hauling large cargoes along relatively fixed routes due to the need for large terminal facilities and deep harbors. Smaller craft will be operating at greater speeds, with more frequent service to many more ports, including those on our Great Lakes which have opened a new market to the salt water shipper. Other new markets in Africa, in South America, in southeast Asia, and in India are only just now being developed.

If we are willing to take the risks of developing new ideas, many of which are already known and well established, we can look forward to closer contact by our own ships with our neighbors across the sea and within our own Nation.

I believe we are prepared to take these risks. Already our Maritime Administration is doing much research, our Navy is looking at new ideas, and, best of all, our shipping companies are building new ships.

This work needs more effort and more coordination. The National Academy of Sciences is presently making oceanographic studies, a subject closely related to shipping. This study should be expanded or a parallel one instituted to coordinate and expedite research on commercial ships, setting up a fund to which private companies and Government bodies could contribute men, ships, and material.

Private cooperation with Government is the key to this work. An example in which I take some pride is the way in which work has been carried out under the Saltonstall-

Kennedy fisheries research program, where privately owned ships have experimented with new types of nets and equipment supplied by the Government.

Under a similarly coordinated program, I can visualize private lines operating their own ships with experimental engines, paid for by the Government, or a small hydrofoil cargo ship being built by the Government and privately operated between the United States and Hawaii. These are merely examples of what an amateur can conceive.

Research must be carried on and development must follow. The burden of carrying forward America's present world leadership will fall largely upon you. I am sure that in a few years we will see the American flag in many new ports to pick up cargoes that are hardly known today, in ships that stay only a few hours, and ships that bear small resemblance inside and out to those that now ply the seas.

But they must be American-flag ships, or our children will inherit far less from us than we inherited from our forefathers.

Metric System of Weights and Measures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 22, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the Oregonian, of Portland, of May 9, 1959, published an excellent editorial entitled "Sensible Measure." The editorial advocates a conversion to the metric system of weights and measures. Already our scientific community uses the metric system, so why should it not be used by the American public as a whole? I think the editorial in the Oregonian, Mr. President, should be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD for the information and enlightenment of my colleagues, and I ask unanimous consent for that purpose.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENSIBLE MEASURE

When a nurse gives you a shot in the arm, she measures the dose in cubic centimeters. When you buy film for your camera, chances are it will be designated as 35 millimeters in width. In the growing field of physics, American scientists, as well as those of nearly every other civilized nation, use the metric system exclusively.

This was pointed out in an announcement by the American Geophysical Union the other day that returns on a questionnaire published in leading scientific and engineering journals are running 93 percent in favor of America's changing from its table of weights and measures to the metric system used in most non-English-speaking nations. The scientists and others returning the questionnaire do not favor a sudden switch, but one of gradual evolution over 20 to 25 years.

Despite the Iron Curtain and other barriers, the world is becoming more closely related. One can cable or telephone an order from almost any part of the world today and day after tomorrow a plane can deliver it from an American factory. But if the American product is measured in inches or pounds, the foreign buyer will have to be a sharp mathematician to be sure that it is just what he wants.

It was only 4 months ago that the United States and Britain got together on just what an inch is. It is now 25.4 millimeters. But until January of this year, the American inch was 25.4000508 millimeters and the British 25.3999722 millimeters. The discrepancy could make a lot of difference to a buyer and the failure to use the common language of measurement—the metric system—could cost American industry a pretty penny. The penny, incidentally, is sensibly part of a decimal system, just like the millimeter.

Ounces and pounds, inches and feet, quarts and gallons don't make sense. Some day we'll have to go farther than the nurse's shot in the arm, the camera film and scientists' computation to get in step with the larger part of the world. It will cost a lot of money to change our dies and rulers but it will be worth it in the long run.

Address by Rev. John E. Colman, C.M.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 22, 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an excellent address on the subject of education by the Reverend John E. Colman, C.M., of Niagara University in New York, at the Vincentian-day Academic Convocation on April 20, 1959, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NIAGARA UNIVERSITY AND THE PURSUIT OF EXCELLENCE

(Address by Rev. John E. Colman, C.M., Vincentian-day academic convocation, Niagara University Student Center, April 20, 1959)

As a token of esteem, Niagara University has just bestowed upon three Christian gentlemen honorary degrees impressed with the seal of the university. Part of that seal includes Niagara's motto, "Ut omnes te cognoscant"—That all may know Thee. This is not only our motto, this is our constant aim—that all men may know Jesus Christ, and, knowing Him, may strive to be with Him forever.

This, however, is only one task of a university, and, for a few minutes, I would like to speak to you about other tasks in American education and Niagara University's role in the pursuit of excellence.

There is little doubt that modern conditions require the substantial lifting of the entire Nation's educational level. Furthermore, our American belief, based on a very Christian tradition, in the overriding importance of human dignity, demands that each individual be helped toward a full realization of his particular potential. Many obstacles, however, appear to thwart the achievement of these seemingly divergent goals. Contrary to what some people may believe, the ideal of excellence and the ideal of equality of opportunity are compatible. The very recent Rockefeller brothers report, compiled by some of the finest minds in America today and entitled "Education and the Future of America," stresses this compatibility in the following terms, "Our society will have passed an important milestone of maturity when those who are the most enthusiastic proponents of a democratic way of life are also the most vigorous proponents of excellence."

Today, thoughtful American educators appreciate that equality does not mean that the same amount of talent is found in each individual but rather that God has endowed each person with the same basic nature. At Niagara University we have long understood this truth.

One criticism leveled against the American educational system today by thoughtful American critics is that there is too much emphasis on quantity. But let us not be too harsh. In all fairness we must give credit to the American people who have exercised heroic achievements in creating a system of universal education. Still, we would be less than honest if we did not admit that we are certainly failing in many ways to meet the unparalleled opportunities and the stern demands of our times. Too many of our schools are overcrowded, understaffed, and ill-equipped, and the forecast is that the pressures will become more severe in the years ahead. But, we repeat, let us not be too harsh; we are still a relatively young country, and now is our golden opportunity to improve our quality. The intelligent leaders in our Nation are alert to this problem.

In July 1957 the second report of President Eisenhower's Committee on Education Beyond the High School noted: "If an unwelcome choice were required between preserving quality and expanding enrollments, then quality should be preferred, because it would do neither individuals nor the Nation any good to masquerade mass production of mediocrity under the guise of higher education. But the choice between quality and quantity is not mandatory. The Nation needs more of both, and it can have more of both if it decides to do so."

And in December 1958 the New York Board of Regents complained that progress in the educational system of this State is impeded "because we continue to make compromises with quality and with excellence."

Finally, to illustrate this point about the Nation's rising to meet the pressures that face it, let me quote just once more from the Rockefeller Bros. Report already mentioned. "If we are to meet these pressures, our schools will need greatly increased public support and attention, and much more money. But they also need something besides money; an unsparing reexamination of current practices, patterns of organization and objectives."

This, then, is the general condition of American education and what the country's best brains think should be done about it. It represents great quantitative strides up to the present with a great qualitative challenge for the future provided we are alert to seize the opportunity. Now what about Niagara University's role in this overall picture? It is no revelation to you good people that Niagara University stands in need of funds. This is true of every university in the country, even including Harvard with its current endowment of several million dollars. But there is something besides money that we must talk about tonight.

It is difficult to show concretely the influence of Niagara University upon the Nation since our alumni are scattered at such a distance. But let me present to you a brief sketch of some of the contributions which Niagara University is currently making to this immediate area. Do you realize that two out of every five dentists in Niagara Falls attended Niagara University? Do you know that 2 of every 10 of the physicians and surgeons, and 2 of every 5 lawyers of Niagara Falls attended Niagara University? Did you ever hear before that one out of every three of the certified public accountants and one of every two of the accountants of Niagara Falls are alumni of Niagara University? Did you know that besides school principals, guidance directors, supervisors, and psychologists, almost one of every two of the secondary public school-

teachers of the school district of Niagara Falls have attended Niagara University?

These are the facts of the current contribution of Niagara University to the Niagara Falls area. Let no one say, therefore, that Niagara University has been asleep. This university, side by side with its sister universities, has lived through the era of quantitative expansion and it is obvious that Niagara University has exerted a tremendous influence, educationwise, especially in the immediate area.

Now it should also be obvious to any astute observer that Niagara University is also alert to greater quantitative demands in the future. This very day is especially significant for us because ground has been broken for the first building construction of our second century of operation. The plans for today's groundbreaking had to be considered months and years ago. Furthermore, justly authorities have cited weaknesses in the caliber of instruction and the quality of students and Niagara University, like every other good university, has recognized these shortcomings and plans to do something about it. Even now, Niagara University is making an unsparing reexamination of current practices, patterns of organization and objectives such as the Rockefeller Brothers report suggested. There are faculty committees which are currently engaged in formulating these unsparing reexaminations; they are presenting them for action in the near future.

But my dear friends, we cannot rest upon our oars. The task of bringing our ship to port seems an unending one but we must constantly stirive to do our best to help its progress. If I may continue the nautical metaphor, we cannot rock the boat by negativism but must strive to give the cooperation that is essential to the harmony of a well-regulated ship. We must endeavor to raise the sights of good students to help them to be truly excellent in a world searching for competent leaders.

Before concluding, may I remind you that the things which we have cited thus far only refer to an excellence in the natural order. In addition to the contribution in the pursuit of natural excellence for which we must be grateful to Niagara University, there is another contribution in a higher order of excellence which it is well nigh impossible to evaluate. Nevertheless, we must appreciate its existence. Besides encouraging numbers of students to develop their natural capacities and to serve as loyal citizens, Niagara University endeavors to shape their wills to conform to the moral order and to motivate them to a love of God. This contribution, while difficult to measure, is an incalculable gain for the Niagara Falls area, for the State, and for the Nation.

Yet our motto remains for us a challenge. We are aware of our shortcomings and the extent of the field that is ripe for the harvest. The pursuit of excellence is never easy and the path is filled with many roadblocks. Nevertheless, we face this challenge today with renewed vigor as we pledge our confidence in Niagara University and in its very own motto repeat—"Ut Omnes Te Cognoscant"—That All May Know Thee.

Equal Time Nonsense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PRESCOTT BUSH

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 22, 1959

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, the radio and television industries face an impossible situation as a result of a recent FCC interpretation of section 315 of the Communications Act of 1934. Section 315 provides that any radio or television station which permits a legally qualified candidate for public office to use its facilities must afford equal opportunities to all the other candidates for that office.

This so-called equal time section was intended to prevent television and radio from discriminating among candidates in their strictly partisan appearances. It appears obvious that the intent certainly was not to interfere with the ordinary newscasting activities of the radio and television industries.

Recently, however, in the Lar Daly case in Chicago, section 315 was interpreted by the FCC as applying to newscasting as well as other types of programing. If this ruling goes unchallenged, it can seriously diminish the public service role of the radio and television industries as well as complicate their editorial and newscasting functions.

The junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE] has introduced a bill which offers a clarification of the intent of section 315. I am happy to be a cosponsor of this bill, S. 1858, and I urge that the Members of the Senate support this legislation when it comes up for a vote.

A number of periodicals and newspapers throughout the country have devoted editorial space to this important matter. I ask unanimous consent that three of these editorials—from the Saturday Review, of April 11, 1959; the South Bend Tribune, of March 21, 1959; and the Cincinnati Post and Times-Star, of March 20, 1959—be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Saturday Review, Apr. 11, 1959]

Neither the press nor the public seems likely to give the attention it deserves to an issue that CBS has courageously forced into the open. The NBC-Chet Huntley affair concerned the NAACP, segregation, and delicate questions of judgment—it had more human and headline values. The CBS case involves a local primary in Chicago and rises from an action by a man who puts "America First" between his first and last names. But it also involves the powers of the Federal Communications Commission and, particularly, section 315A of the act under which the FCC operates—the section that requires a broadcaster, if he puts his facilities at the disposition of one candidate for office, to do the same for others.

At the time of the prinfaries in the mayoralty campaign in Chicago, news broadcasts on various stations showed film clips of the mayor greeting the President of Argentina and starting the March of Dimes campaign. I am not sure whether other stations as well as CBS's WBBM–TV also showed the mayor and his Republican opponent filing nomination papers. Lars "America First" Daly demanded equal time, on the ground that he also was a candidate. That is, he demanded equal time for the two official acts of the mayor as well as for the third, purely political, event. The FCC ordered the stations to grant the demand. WBBM–TV refused to comply, pending an appeal to the FCC—an appeal to which that body made no reply, so that the campaign ended with the station disobeying an order of the FCC and Lars Daly without his equal time. CBS has now asked the FCC for a statutory decree, reversing its order.

The intent of section 315A is parallel to the intent of the reversed Mayflower decision, which allows a broadcaster to editorialize provided he searches out and presents a contrary opinion. It is to prevent broadcasters from using the air-channels they enjoy by franchise from the Government for their own ends, to prevent unfairness. The section, dealing specifically with political campaigns, would seem to apply to the appearance of a candidate, in his own behalf, or a spokesman for him, in a political capacity.

The effect of 315A is something the framers of the law did not intend. It is, briefly, to diminish the amount of time allotted to political discussion. Referring to the Chicago case, Frank Stanton, president of CBS, said that the grant of equal time to the 20 or so minority candidates in an eletcion would have taken "approximately 20 percent more time than all the time spent by all our TV network newscasts on all the news." The only protection is not to give time to anyone at all.

Mr. Stanton also noted that newspapers and magazines enjoy special mailing privileges; thus they are partially subsidized by the Government, and that the application of the FCC decision to them would require equal space to be given to all candidates—an open infringement, probably, of the first amendment.

It is easy to see how a broadcaster, relieved of any obligation to give equal presentation in newscasts could favor one candidate—he could even give equal time and present one candidate in a more favorable light than another. Yet the traditions and the economics of broadcasting make such an outcome improbable and until the danger is clear and present, our national tradition is in favor of preserving the first amendment. It is good to know that one network has had the courage to challenge the Commission which, with its power to refuse renewal of license, has a virtual life-and-death power over the network's constituents.

A further point is that Mr. Stanton proposes, if the FCC does not reverse itself, to "appeal to the courts, appeal to the Congress, appeal to the people." In that order, I presume, and I should have preferred an appeal to the people first. Not that section 315A doesn't pose a dilemma requiring intricate thinking and decisions beyond the simplicities of broadcast argument. It does—and considering how much research into the trivilities of broadcasting is being done, it is a pity that the essential question—the relation of television to the first amendment—has not been profoundly discussed. But the people are the prime factor—or should be—in the protection of their freedom—and it will hardly be worth preserving it for them if they do not themselves care to fight for it when it is endangered.—Gilbert Seldes.

[From the South Bend Tribune, Mar. 21, 1959]

SILLY RULE SHOULD BE CHANGED

The equal rights for political candidates on radio and television is a hangover that is accurately described by President Eisenhower as "ridiculous."

With the best intention, this rule was propounded in the early days of radio. In long practical experience it has proved embarrassing, unreasonable, and unjustified.

If it ever was justified, it has become outmoded. There was some intelligent objection when it was first applied, but the general sentiment was that it should be given a fair trial. It could have been rescinded long ago without any threat to the public welfare.

The basic implication in this rule, that all candidates for public offices are equally

important, is merely theoretical. All are not equally important from the general public viewpoint.

In a primary, for example, anybody can become a candidate by meeting a few simple requirements. Not all candidates for nominations are serious contenders for public offices. Some merely use the primaries for self-advertising purposes.

But the rule of equal rights for all candidates on radio and television applies in periods of primary as well as general elections. This is the fact pointed up by the Federal Communications Commission in a Chicago case.

During the recent primary campaign in that city the Democratic mayor appeared on some televised news shows. As mayor he had much more news importance than his Democratic opponent in the primary who, as it turned out to nobody's surprise, was an extremely ineffective opponent.

The latter demanded equal time on TV. It was refused. He appealed to the FCC and was upheld, by a 4-3 vote, even though the mayor had appeared on the news programs as the chief executive of Chicago instead of a campaigning politician. The televised news films merely showed him welcoming the president of Argentina and giving a boost to the March of Dimes campaign.

The equal rights rule was made transparently absurd from the public welfare viewpoint. Congress should act in this session to amend it in the interests of justice and commonsense.

[From the Cincinnati Post and Times-Star, Mar. 20, 1959]

EQUAL TIME NONSENSE

Frank Stanton, president of the Columbia Broadcasting System, has asked the Federal Communications Commission to reconsider a ridiculous ruling it made last month.

The ruling compelled Chicago TV stations to give equal time to a rival candidate for mayor because Mayor Richard J. Daley, also a candidate, had been shown briefly on newscasts.

There was a flash shot of the mayor filing his nomination papers, a 22-second glimpse of him greeting President Frondizi of Argentina, and a 1-minute shot of him opening the March of Dimes campaign.

The mayor didn't ask for the time; he didn't buy it. The mayor got in the show only because he was part of the news show.

But Lar Daly, a perennial candidate, demanded equal time and the FCC, by a 4-to-3 vote, said he was entitled to it. This is the same Daly who once announced he was a candidate for President, then sued the TV networks for equal time with Ike. A judge threw out the case.

The law, in what the trade calls the "ulcer" section, requires TV stations to give equal time, if asked, to political candidates who use the facilities. That is, if a candidate buys or is given time, his rivals may have a like time under like conditions.

The FCC frivolity in the Daly case goes way beyond that—it tampers with the news. If the Government bureaucrats get to telling the news media what they must broadcast or print, it won't be long before they are dictating what they cannot broadcast or print.

Sober Facts About the Farm Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 22, 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, at the same time that the slick paper magazines are attempting to destroy the farm programs through irresponsible reporting, many farm magazines are presenting reasonable and thoughtful articles on ways to improve these programs which are of vital importance to farmers and consumers alike.

The Prairie Farmer is an old and respected magazine with a very large circulation among real farmers in the Middle Western and Southwestern States, and it is often characterized as a conservative publication. In recent issues it has published two thoughtful and challenging articles on the subject of compensatory payments for livestock, written by L. W. Cook, of Macon County, Ill., as well as an illuminating introductory editorial titled "Sober Facts About Farm Situation."

At this particular time, when so much nonsense and misinformation is being spoken and written about agriculture and Government programs, it would be well for all of us to read these timely articles.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these two articles and the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Prairie Farmer, Feb. 21, 1959]

SOBER FACTS ABOUT FARM SITUATION

President Eisenhower's message to Congress on the farm situation is a sobering document in several respects. One is the growing realization that the cost of the program has become intolerable. It may be that America can well afford to spend this kind of money to keep agriculture in a healthy state. The trouble is, our present crazy quilt of farm programing is getting us nowhere, and our farm economy is not improving in health. The taxpayer should not be saddled with a costly system that makes little or no progress toward the solution of the ills it is intended to cure.

It's clear enough now that if lower supports are to put agriculture in a healthy state, we haven't been lowering them fast enough. Supports have not gone down enough to head off the accumulation of surpluses, either because such a course is politically inexpedient or economically dangerous. You can take your pick.

The other sobering aspect of the President's message is that he has very little to offer in the way of a better program. He suggests more of the same. This means supports should be lowered further in the hope that sometime soon we will reach the point where production will become so unprofitable that it will fall off and permit supply and demand to come into equilibrium. Will this happen with corn at 95 cents or 60 cents? Will it happen with milk at $3.25 a hundred or $2 a hundred? No one knows.

Who would get hurt most in this period of prolonged belt tightening? Recently a group of economists, considering the possibility of going on a free-market basis, estimated that if we could completely insulate our present Government holdings, prices would drop another 30 percent and there would be 3 years of austerity for farmers before prices would begin to recover. They estimated that the greatest strain would fall on the medium-sized farmers, not the large operators with good reserves to ride out the adjustment period, nor the small and part-time farmers who have severely restricted standards of living.

The 3 years of austerity might range anywhere from severe depression to the kind of recession we experienced in the years just before 1958.

So, let's not kid ourselves. The state of the farm economy does present a serious problem. It is politically inexpedient or economically dangerous, or both, to pull all props out from under farm prices.

Prairie Farmer believes we should make our agriculture as efficient as feasible and that we should keep decisions as far as possible in the hands of the farmer himself. However, we may as well face the fact that compromise and partial monopoly will play an important part in agricultural economy as well as our general economy in the foreseeable future.

That means we should take another look at the commodity programs to see if we can work out less expensive methods that we can live with in the future. We should also take another look at the compensatory payments which, frankly, have had a disagreeable taste to many people, including the editors of Prairie Farmer.

There is talk in Washington of compensatory payments on grain and feed crops. This, in our opinion, would be sheer foolishness. One way out of the present puzzle is to feed our grains, including wheat, to livestock, and increase the use by our population of the high-nutrition foods. If compensatory payments must be resorted to, then they should be on livestock, as is pointed out by L. W. Cook on page 10.

So it's back to the grindstone to sharpen our ideas of how we can reconcile the warring factions in our agricultural leadership and the contradictions in our farm economy. And we had better get at it right away because the patience of the American people is wearing thin.

BELIEVES LIVESTOCK PROGRAM IS ONLY SENSIBLE APPROACH—MAKES URGENT PLEA FOR FARM PROGRAM TO INCREASE USE OF ANIMAL PRODUCTS

(By L. W. Cook)

Since I am an old and loyal reader of Prairie Farmer, perhaps you will let me comment on your editorial "What Price Should Soybeans Bring?" And to use this comment to talk about our farm policy in general.

The soybean problem, in fact our whole farm problem, is much more complicated than we farmers and our city cousins have been realizing. The price of soybeans must be set with regard to the support price on corn. If the price of beans is low with respect to corn, fewer beans will be planted. If the soybean price is high with respect to corn, more soybeans will be planted. A farmer is no different than any other businessman; he tries to do the work that will make him the most money.

WON'T RAISE MANY BEANS

Today we have a support price on corn of about $1.12, and all planting restrictions have been removed. So, if we cut the support price on beans by 46 cents, as is being recommended, we won't raise many beans. What farmer would plant beans at $1.70 when he is guaranteed $1.12 for corn? At these figures corn would bring in about twice as much money as beans.

Now the stated purpose of those who advocate a lower farm price for soybeans is that our soybean oil can compete effectively in European markets with South American sunflower seed, African and Asian peanuts, and Filipino and Indonesian copra. I suppose the term, "compete effectively" means, "run them out of the market." But the trouble is, of course, we hope the South Americans, the Filipinos, and the Indonesions will be on our side in our war against communism. Can we afford to make their farmers mad at us? Most of their people are farmers.

I don't know how many soybeans we ought to try to produce in the United States, nor what the soybean price to the farmer should be. I do know that Government farm policy is directing the production of farm products in the United States—and doing a miserable job of it.

Take milk for example. Last year we produced less milk than we did in 1957. Yet during 1958 about 4 million new babies were born. Why less milk for more babies? Because of our farm policy.

According to figures furnished by the University of Illinois, the average Midwest dairy farmer works 3,100 hours per year. This is more than 8 hours per day, every day in the year. This includes every Sunday, and Christmas, and the 4th of July. For this he is paid an average wage of $1.05 per hour. This is about half as much as the lowest "organized" wage in industry. But if $1.05 is the "average" wage, then many farmers have been milking cows for 50 cents per hour. No wonder those dairy farmers who can are getting out as fast as they can. But this won't help the Nation. It is predicted we will soon be having 5 million new babies a year.

I cannot see on what basis it can be argued that we have ever produced a surplus of milk. Our nutritionists tell us we have been producing only a little more than half as much milk as we need. Despite all the billions of dollars we have spent to "help" the farmer, the United States ranks eighth among the major nations of the world in the consumption of fluid milk.

But under our present farm laws no solution to our milk problem is in sight. Since the end of the Korean war, milk prices in the 24 major cities in the United States have gone down 21 percent to the dairy farmers, but up 8½ percent to the city consumers. We are legislating ourselves out of milk.

MISGUIDED ENCOURAGEMENT

So you see, what we have been doing under our present farm policy is encouraging production of the wrong kind of agricultural products. We have made it more profitable for a farmer to produce row crops for the Government than to raise food for the people. There is no surplus of milk, bacon and eggs, or beefsteak. We cannot produce more animal protein than is needed for the health of the people of the United States, and the world. That is utterly impossible with our present knowledge of agriculture.

Let us see what would happen if our farm policy were reversed. Let's say we made it more profitable for our farmers to raise milk, meat, and poultry, rather than as now subsidizing them to raise corn, cotton and wheat.

To begin with, if it were more profitable for a farmer to milk cows than to raise corn and soybeans, many farmers would do just that. This applies to meat and poultry versus wheat and cotton too. Then, as we raised more livestock, we would be creating a demand for corn, and soybeans, and feed wheat. Eventually there would be an answer to the row crop farmer's problem, because eventually he would be raising a useful product, not one for Government storage.

CONSUMER DESERVES BREAK

And as to the city consumer? He'd just eat better for less money. And he certainly deserves a break. He has been very patient. As it is now, he is being taxed to help the farmer, when the only result of successful help would be to raise the city taxpayer's grocery bill. Under a livestock farm plan, he would be getting lower prices, better health, and a higher standard of living for his tax money.

The Government would be relieved of the absolutely impossible job it now has. Today the Government is attempting to direct the production of farm products for which no markets exist. But if the Government, through the medium of price floors, had the opportunity to indicate to the farmer, "We need more milk, and less wheat," it would be possible for the Government to do a worthwhile job in the allocation of our agriculture resources.

Nobody, including me, is ready to suggest the Government get out of farming. It won't do the city workers any good to have all the farmers broke, nor all the country banks in trouble, nor all the country school bonds in default, and farmers unable to buy machinery, or shoes, or unable to keep from turning their mortgaged farms over to insurance companies. It won't help toward world peace, or help us in our war with Russia and China, if we suddenly dump our agricultural surpluses on the world markets. It is unthinkable that our Government can get out of farming.

END OF ROPE

But we must have a change in our farm policy. One is coming. Every farmer knows that. Every man who works in a city knows that. Every Congressman in Washington knows that we cannot continue to spend over $1 billion a year just for the storage of the surplus farm products the Government now owns. Something is going to happen. We have reached the end of the rope with our present farm policy.

These are critical times for farmers. Almost any kind of new farm legislation is apt to be passed. I suggest there would be betterment if we would define a farmer as a man who works in the country and raises food for the man who works in the city.

[From the Prairie Farmer, Mar. 21, 1959]

BASE FARM PLAN ON LIVESTOCK IS PLEA OF PRAIRIE FARMER READER TO U.S. CONGRESSMEN

(By L. W. Cook)

In my first article I attempted to show that all farmers, as well as all city workers, would be better off if we changed our farm policy from one of subsidizing a farmer to produce crops for Government storage to one of subsidizing the farmer to produce products the people could use.

I attempted to show that this change could be brought about if we made it more profitable for a farmer to produce milk, poultry, and meat rather than corn, cotton, and wheat.

GIVE WRONG SIGNALS

I contended that Government farm policy is directing the production of farm products in the United States and giving the farmer the wrong economic signal as to what our country needs. I contended that any farm program that can cost a billion dollars a year just to store surplus products people can't use, must be changed.

I presume you are asking me now, "How would you go about making this change?"

The problems facing the farmers who produce milk, bacon and eggs, and beefsteak, are not exactly the same. With hogs, for example, the question is, How do we solve the problem of boom and bust? The cycle goes like this: (1) Farmers find it more profitable to feed their corn to hogs than sell it to the Government, so they raise more pork; (2) about a year and a half later so many hogs are on the market that the price to the farmer falls below his cost of production, so many farmers quit raising hogs and go back to selling their corn to the Government; (3) then the cycle repeats.

NONE WENT TO WASTE

The reverse of this, of course, is true for the housewife. At times she goes to her butcher and finds hams cheap. Later they become expensive. But it is interesting to note that a few years ago when hams were very cheap (when farmers were losing their shirts raising pork), all of the hogs raised were consumed. This could mean, I think, that our lower income groups will eat more pork when they can offord it.

The situation with respect to milk is different. The outstanding characteristic of the milk business is unregulated monopoly. It can hardly be argued we have very much free enterprize in the milk business, when we consider that from the end of the Korean war in the 24 major cities of the United States milk prices have gone down 21 percent to the farmer, but up 8½ percent to the consumers.

But monopolies need not be bad. Under proper Federal regulation monopolies can be very useful business tools indeed. REA is a monopoly. So is the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. All electric power and light companies are regulated monopolies.

The basic trouble in milk at the present time, I think, is that while milk is currently handled in a wide area of monopoly still, the public does not know this. My first suggestion, then, is that the whole problem of milk be opened up for public inspection.

Congress could do this by creating some sort of permanent regulatory commission to study and regulate the production and distribution of milk. Here again, there is nothing new in this suggestion, except in its application to agriculture. The production and distribution of stocks and bonds is regulated by the Securities and Exchange Commission. The airlines are regulated by a commission. Tune in your radio or television and you have operated an instrument regulated by a Federal commission.

In my opinion Congress must, at this session, at least set up a commission to handle milk. We produced less milk last year (1958) than we did the year before. Yet during 1958 about 4 million new babies were born.

In my previous article I gave figures to show why so many farmers have had to quit the business of milking cows. Many farmers simply must be paid more money for their milk, if we are to have enough milk. But I try to be a realist. In my opinion, under present circumstances, the farmer isn't going to be paid more money for his milk unless Congress passes a direct compensatory payment plan. Unless Congress does this, in my opinion, we will simply have a continuation of the present trend. Milk prices will go up to the consumer and milk production, and hence milk consumption, will continue to decline.

SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS

With this background then (including the previous article) I will try to make some specific recommendations:

1. Congress should, as soon as possible, set up a commission or study group, to advise Congress, as soon as practicable, on the best way to change our farm policy from one of subsidizing the farmer for raising crops for the Government to one of subsidizing the farmer for raising livestock products for people. In setting up this study group Congress should appropriate sufficient funds so that the best economists and sociologists in the country can be put to work on the problem. Congress should also advise this group that direct compensatory payments to livestock farmers should be considered, in addition to any other alternatives that might be suggested.

2. Congress should, at this session, pass at least a token direct compensatory plan for the dairy farmer, and take the first steps toward creation of a permanent milk commission to regulate the production and distribution of milk. This commission should not be under the jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture.

I would suggest the immediate granting of at least a 50-cent-per-hundred direct compensatory payment to the dairy farmer for both cheese and grade A milk. This would not be enough for most farmers, but it would express the determination of Congress to help in the milk situation, and should encourage many dairy farmers to hang on a little longer.

My concern here is that our dairy herds are being dispersed. It takes years to build up a good dairy herd again. This bill, in my opinion, should also stop the Government purchase of such things as cheese, powdered milk, and butter.

Let the open market distribute these products in this country at whatever price they will bring, and get the Government immediately out of the business of storing dairy products. We can better keep the dairy farmers in business with direct compensatory payments.

I have heard it suggested that direct compensatory payments might be made to producers of the six so-called basic crops—wheat, cotton, corn, tobacco, rice, and peanuts. This, in my opinion, would be a very bad mistake. It would contribute nothing to the long-range solution of our farm problem. Our policy, I think, should be to encourage many of these farmers to turn to livestock production. And the livestock farmer, generally speaking, is the farmer on the family sized farm.

DUMPING HURTS US

Besides, we must quit dumping our Government surpluses in foreign lands. It is hurting us in the war with Russia. Christian exporting is fine. Dumping is dangerous. There isn't really any strong demand any place in the world for the Government's holdings of wheat, cotton, corn, tobacco, rice, or peanuts.

Barring wars, in most areas of the world the people can raise for themselves the carbohydrates and cereals they need. There is relatively little need for more foods of plant origin any place in the world. But the world need for the better protein of animal origin is quite insatiable.

Uncle Sam Collects Taxes and Returns Them to the People—Corpus Christi Tells How

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 22, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, paying taxes to support our Government is a duty which all of us realize is worthwhile and necessary—yet, particularly around April 15 of each year, we wish we could keep our money.

An article by Jim Greenwood in the Corpus Christi (Tex.) Caller-Times recently pointed out how this tax money is returned to the people in the form of services rendered. For example, more than $75 million has been returned to taxpayers in the Corpus Christi area in the form of work on bettering the city's seaport facilities, improvement of public housing, help in the field of public welfare and health, assistance to schools, and many other projects.

Mr. Greenwoods' article, I feel, points out a side of the picture which is not often stressed: while taxes take away they also give in return.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD Mr. Greenwoods' article from the Corpus Christi Caller-Times for Sunday, May 17, 1959, entitled "What Do You Get for Your Taxes?—Federal Government Has Big Stake in You—Uncle Sam Does More Than Collect, He Sinks Millions Into the City's Economy."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT DO YOU GET FOR YOUR TAXES?—FEDERAL GOVERNMENT HAS A BIG STAKE IN YOU—UNCLE SAM DOES MORE THAN COLLECT, HE SINKS MILLIONS INTO THE CITY'S ECONOMY

(By Jim Greenwood)

Uncle Sam taketh away at income tax time, but he returneth a lot, too, to Corpus Christi area.

Corpus Christians immediately recognize a healthy return on their Federal Taxes in the form of the naval air station and other military installations which keep millions of dollars circulating through the local economy's bloodstream.

Too, there are the many Federal offices—post office, immigration and customs, Federal Bureau of Investigation, the various agricultural offices and others—on the local scene that add both to population and payroll.

But what are the other ways in which Federal funds find their way into the local community? Some are not nearly so obvious or widely known.

A group of such instances where Federal funds have been, or currently are involved, represent a staggering Federal contribution of more than $75 million.

The port of Corpus Christi, city utilities, local highway projects, including the new high bridge and the Tule Lake lift bridge, the local school systems, the Corpus Christi Housing Authority, the new city airport, Spohn Hospital, local welfare and health programs have benefited or are benefiting from the gift of Federal money.

There are others who benefit directly from Federal assistance—the farmers who participate in the agricultural conservation program; the aged, who receive old-age and survivor's insurance benefits; war veterans and widows, who receive veterans benefits, dependent children, needy blind, to mention a few.

The Federal programs are almost beyond enumeration.

Looking at that phase of Federal assistance which applies to local public improvement, school, housing, and hospital projects, you get an impressive picture of local tax dollars finding their way back home.

The most spectacular program currently underway involves Federal financial aid to the interlocked port redevelopment and expressway building that is changing the face of the city.

The Federal Government is deeply involved in this area, along with State, city, and county governments, and the local navigation district.

In construction of the high bridge, the Federal Government under the Public Roads Act is paying about $5,740,000 of the $11,480,000 total cost of construction of the bridge and the north and south expressway approaches to it. The State government is paying the remaining half of construction costs, with the city, county, and navigation district providing the $6,600,000 right-of-way costs.

An integral part of the port redevelopment program is the construction of the Tule Lake lift bridge, now nearing completion. The Federal Government, under the Truman-Hobbs Aid to Navigation Act, is paying about $4,866,514 of the total estimated cost of $6,726,514. The city, county, and navigation district are paying the balance.

When this bridge is completed, and railroads now using the old bascule bridge to cross the port can be routed over it, the bascule span at the entrance to the port can come out and the port entrance channel widened.

The Federal Government's share of this program, under Rivers and Harbors Act appropriations will total about $575,000.

This will add to the $20,480,611 already put into development and maintenance of the port of Corpus Christi by the Federal Government since the port was opened in 1926. Total investment in the port since it was opened so far amounts to about $35,775,507, with local taxes and operations revenues accounting for about $15,294,896 of that sum, according to Port Director Byrd Harris.

The Federal Government pays half the construction costs of primary highway projects in the city—including such expressways as the proposed Lexington freeway, the proposed crosstown expressway as well as the high bridge and its expressway connections. The State pays the balance and splits right-of-way costs with city and county governments on most of these projects.

Federal contributions to the Lexington freeway will total an estimated $6,653,000 toward total estimated cost of $15,147,000.

Preliminary estimates indicate the Federal Government will pay about $2,650,000 on the crosstown expressway.

Interstate Highway 37, from Waco Street connections with the high bridge approach system to the city limits, may involve as much as $20 million in Federal funds. In this particular project, the Federal Government will be paying 90 percent of all costs with the State picking up the balance.

The State expressway office here, planning the interstate and other freeways, estimates total cost of Interstate 37 in Corpus Christi between $20 and $25 million.

The Federal Government, through its aid to aviation program, is participating with the city on construction of the new municipal airport near Clarkwood. Bernard Schrader, city coordinator for this project, estimates the Federal Aviation Agency may allocate as much as $2,986,000 toward a total cost of about $6,415,000. The full extent of Federal participation has not yet been determined.

The Federal Government put about two-thirds of the more than $1 million invested in the city's present municipal airport, Cliff Maus Field.

A Federal loan of $400,000 and an outright grant of the same amount were obtained by the city in 1935 to develop its first modern-day sewage treatment plant on Broadway.

The coming of the Naval Air Station to Corpus Christi triggered a number of federally financed or assisted improvements including construction of Alameda and Lexington Boulevard as military highways.

The Federal Works Agency financed Oso sewage treatment plant construction and built a main trunk and some laterals up and off Santa Fe in 1943 because of the impact the air station was to have on Corpus Christi. After operating the facilities for a few years, the city paid the Bureau of Public Facilities $100,000 for the $425,000 worth of improvements.

The need for more water for the Navy brought about $1,465,721 worth of Federal improvements to the municipal supply system. The city later paid the Government $600,000 for the facilities.

La Armada housing project was built to house the influx of naval personnel, and turned over to the Corpus Christi Housing Authority to operate. In subsequent years the authority developed Wiggins Homes and the Leathers Center and has operated its $6,800,000 worth of public-built housing as low-rent housing for several years. The housing authority is repaying the Govern-

ment out of rentals for most of the cost of this federally-financed construction, but has received grants totaling $523,672 to supplement its operations over the years.

War Impact Act aid has been available to local schools for several years—pouring $2,231,364 into the Corpus Christi school district, $300,000 into the neighboring Flour Bluff District to help with construction of new plants and to offset operation expenses. The assistance is based on the number of students whose parents are employed in military activities in the area.

The Hill-Burton Hospital Act has provided $1 million for Spohn Hospital's current $3 million expansion project. Memorial Hospital hopes to get similar assistance in an expansion now being planned.

Federal civil defense legislation enables the city to get reimbursement for half the funds it puts into police, public utilities, and public works mobile radio equipment and the local air raid warning system.

If the local urban renewal program becomes a reality, the Federal Urban Renewal Administration will contribute about $4,579,439 in loans and grants to the $6,618,479 slum clearance project.

Debtor Nation?—The United States Must Put Solvency Ahead of Charity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 22, 1959

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the May 18, 1959, issue of Barron's weekly which points out the shift of the United States from a creditor position toward a debtor position in world trade and the effect of this change on our gold reserves.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEBTOR NATION?—THE UNITED STATES MUST PUT SOLVENCY AHEAD OF CHARITY

In and around Washington these days, as the annual debate over foreign aid proceeds apace, politicians of varying persuasion have engaged in a strange kind of competitive bidding. Thus W. Averell Harriman has branded the administration as niggardly for seeking only $700 million for the Development Loan Fund. Chairman J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has urged that the Fund be given a kitty of $7.5 billion, to spend at its whim over the next 5 years. Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, bemoaning the massive failure of our national leadership, has demanded that the United States counter the growing Soviet challenge with a 7-year, $14 billion plan of its own. Finally, that curiously hostile good neighbor, Premier Fidel Castro of Cuba, has exhorted Washington to pour out $30 billion in the next decade to make Latin America safe for democracy.

Whatever their differences, all these proposals apparently take one thing for granted: that U.S. resources are inexhaustible. The facts, however, suggest otherwise. Since early last year, the United States has been losing gold in amounts great enough to evoke torrents of comment, here and abroad. That outflow, moreover, is only one symptom of a more far-reaching economic malaise—the mounting deficit in U.S. international accounts. The balance of payments, in short, has begun to shift adversely; this country, for so long a creditor to the rest of the world, overnight has become a debtor. Washington may try to cling to its ruinously high standard of living. Sooner or later, however, it will have to cut its coat to fit its cloth.

For nearly a decade, Congress has chosen to ignore this simple truth. Through military and economic aid, under the so-called mutual security program, as well as through farm surplus disposal, the United States recently has been expending a massive $5 billion a year all over the world. Moreover, since 1957, the Development Loan Fund has been extending credit to backward countries at low interest rates, mostly on terms providing for repayment in local, fiat currencies. To add to the burden, President Eisenhower has asked the lawmakers to authorize a contribution of $250 million, plus a guarantee of $200 million, for a new Inter-American Bank. Finally, the administration is seeking to double the capital which it originally put up for the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank. The free-spenders on Capitol Hill, as noted, would do much more.

This burst of postwar philanthropy had its start at a time when the United States was an oasis of prosperity in a war-ravaged world. In those days, the economic wise men of many lands were knitting their brows over the implications of the celebrated dollar gap, and the impregnable liquidity of the United States. Since then, however, economic resurgence in Europe and elsewhere drastically has altered the international scene. The most dramatic evidence of the shift is the rate at which gold, figuratively speaking, has been leaving these shores. Since the start of 1958, this country has lost more than $2.6 billion of the precious metal. From an all-time high of $24.6 billion a decade ago, the U.S. gold stock now has fallen to $20.2 billion, the lowest level since World War II. A year ago, many observers, on first noting this trend, chose to view it as temporary. Recent statistics, however, suggest that the outflow may become chronic.

The persistent loss of gold, moreover, is only part of the story. For the United States today, on a number of accounts, is losing dollars as well. One is the upsurge of private American investment abroad, which happens to be an adverse entry in the balance of payments. Another is overseas travel by Americans, who are seeing the world in an ever-swelling tide. The most significant factor of all is the recent shift in foreign trade. Throughout 1958, U.S. imports held up conspicuously well, rising from an annual rate of $12.3 billion in the first quarter to one of nearly $14 billion in the fourth. So far this year, they have been scaling new highs. Exports, by contrast, shrank last year by nearly one-sixth—and their decline has persisted to date.

As a result, this country's export surplus (in merchandise) steadily has dwindled. From nearly $1 billion in the first quarter of 1958, it declined to less than $600 million in the fourth, and to a meager $271 million in the first 3 months of 1959. Furthermore, since it lumps in farm surplus disposal and economic aid, even this figure is overly optimistic. Counting only paid-for merchandise, the balance of trade in the first quarter of this year ran against the U.S. by nearly half a billion dollars. Altogether, these unfavorable tides of commerce have caused short-term dollar claims against this country to pile up—to an aggregate, at last report, of $16.6 billion.

The eagerness of Americans to travel and invest abroad obviously has contributed to this sorry state of affairs. But the real villian is the Nation's growing inability to hold its own in world markets. U.S. agriculture, for example, conditioned as it is to massive subsidies, scarcely can sell any of its produce overseas without Federal help. Similarly, many industries, saddled with ever-rising costs, are less and less able to compete with foreign producers, either at home or abroad. The mounting plight of American industry is highlighted by some World Bank figures, which pinpoint where its loan proceeds are spent. In the 8 years through June 1955, the Bank's borrowers spent more than 63 percent of such funds in this country. In fiscal 1956, the U.S. share dropped to 50 percent, and the next year to 44 percent. Last year, it plummeted to less than 39 percent, and in the final 6 months, to a new low of 34 percent. In global competition, in short, the United States steadily has been losing ground.

To halt this ominous drift will not be easy. Neither the administration nor Congress—nor many a would-be beneficiary, for that matter—appears to recognize the vast shift which has taken place in the U.S. balance of payments. Yet, as all the foregoing suggests, an era in international finance has come to an end, and a new one has dawned. This country no longer can be creditor or philanthropist to the rest of the world. Henceforth solvency, like charity should begin at home.

Address by M. C. Chagla, Ambassador of India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 22, 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a very thoughtful address by the Ambassador of India, M. C. Chagla, before the Committee for International Economic Growth in Washington on May 4, 1959, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY HIS EXCELLENCY M. C. CHAGLA, AMBASSADOR OF INDIA, CONFERENCE ON INDIA AND THE UNITED STATES, 1959, SPONSORED BY THE COMMITTEE FOR INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC GROWTH, WASHINGTON, D.C., MAY 4 AND 5, 1959

The subject I have been asked to speak on emphasizes not the importance of Indo-American relations generally but in today's world and, therefore, I must take a look at the world as it is today and at the picture as it presents itself.

Now, I wish to undertake a task which is both difficult and not very pleasant. I wish to draw attention to certain ideas which are current and which are accepted as axiomatic and almost sacrosanct, and my purpose will be to try and establish that these ideas are based on erroneous assumptions and have been responsible for policies which have resulted in a great deal of harm.

The first idea which is accepted by every politician in Europe and the United States is that there is tension and conflict between East and West—"East" representing the Communist countries and "West" the countries that are arraigned against the former. We are given to understand through radio, television, and the columns of the newspaper every hour of the day and night that there is a cold war on and the temperature of this war varies, sometimes it becomes quite hot, so hot as almost to reach the boiling point.

We are solemnly warned with a sang-froid which takes one's breath away that we are all the time walking on the brink of a precipice and that any miscalculation or error might hurl humanity into the abyss yawning below. It is suggested that the differences existing between Soviet Russia on the one side and the United States, England, and France on the other constitute the only grave crisis that the world is facing today.

To my mind, there is a much greater crisis which confronts the world and that is the division of this world into developed and underdeveloped countries, into countries which have plenty and countries which are on the verge of starvation. That able and astute statesman, Disraeli, once said that England was divided into two nations—the rich and the poor—and England could never become prosperous so long as that division existed. If we look at the world as consisting of a world community and not separate states, Disraeli's remark applies with all its force to the present situation. The world community is divided into two nations, the rich and the poor, and the real malaise from which the world suffers is this—the highly industrialized nations of the world have achieved a standard of production which would never have been considered as possible a few years ago but the distributive agency has failed to keep pace with the growing production. It is a strange and sad commentary on the present situation that while there should be superfluity and undreamt of luxury and material comfort in some parts of the world, there should be want and starvation in other parts.

MENACE OF POVERTY

The one major premise on which all sections of opinion in this country are agreed is that the greatest danger to the world is international communism. It is looked upon as a monster casting its shadow everywhere threatening the democratic faith and the democratic way of life and seeking to embrace in its terrible grasp every part of the world. I am myself passionately devoted to democracy and I know that the stature of man can only grow and he can only attain the dignity which is his right under a system of government in which he can function as a free agent. But what frightens me today is not the inroad of totalitarian or dictatorial ideas but the growing threat and menace of poverty.

Many countries in Asia and Africa have attained freedom in the last 15 years. This led to the exuberance and uplift of the human spirit. Freedom has led men to think, to compare, and to complain and also to ask the crucial question, "What is the content of freedom?" What has freedom meant to the common man? Has it improved his lot? Has it raised his standard of living? Has it given him education and employment? If freedom has only resulted in the trappings of democracy, the vote, parliamentary institutions and responsible government, then freedom has failed to give to the people what freedom is essentially intended for—social and economic justice.

We are often told that the most pressing problem today is the defense of the free world and for that it is said every sacrifice should be made. I entirely agree with the proposition that freedom is in peril and must be vigilantly safeguarded. In the long evolution of the human race, the most precious object it has achieved is the concept of freedom. But there is a serious error in equating the free world with the world that is opposed to communism. I understand by free world that part of the world where freedom prevails, where the mind of man is untrammeled and where he can give expression to his thoughts and ideas and is free to associate with whomsoever he likes. But I find in the so-called free world the worst type of reactionarism, dictatorship, antiliberal forces entrenched. Are we to support these forces merely because they wear the badge of anticommunism when the very support given to them may ironically result in the true forces of freedom being suppressed?

Another grave fallacy which has currency is that nations which are not in alliance with democratic countries which are opposed to the Communist states are neutrals. My country is one of those against whom this charge is often leveled. This charge is based on a total misapprehension of the policy and principles for which India stands. We are uncommitted to the cold war. We are opposed to military alliances because we feel that they only add to tensions and conflicts. It is our profound belief that by keeping out of the cold war we are serving the cause of peace. If peace is ever to prevail in this troubled world, it can only come by there being good will and understanding between nations. To increase the area of cold war is surely not conducive to peace. The more countries keep away from it the larger is the climate of peace. It is the uncommitted nations that can use their good offices to bring about better relations between countries which are at present facing each other in battle array. But to be uncommitted to the cold war does not mean that we are uncommitted to cause which we hold sacred. We are deeply and irretrievably committed to the cause of democracy and to the cause of freedom.

INDO-AMERICAN COOPERATION

Coming now to the specific question of cooperation between India and the United States, I think the greatest basis of our cooperation is our common belief in certain basic principles. We believe in the freedom of the individual, in the dignity of man and in the rule of law. We believe that democracy is the only form of government devised by human ingenuity which can create a true welfare state without sacrificing the freedom of the citizens that live in it. To me this bond appears to be stronger and more enduring than an artificial bond created by military pact or military alliances. Pacts are euphemeral in their very nature. They are opportunistic, intended to serve a specific purpose or object. The bond between our two countries has a spiritual basis to it. It is created out of a common sharing of values and ideals. Therefore, there can be a true cooperation between us in the defense of the free world, free world in the sense in which I have defined it, in defense of true freedom and democracy.

There can also be cooperation between us in the noble and vital task of fighting poverty in a part of the world where 400 million people live. I beg of my American friends not to look upon their programs of economic aid as part of their mutual security. In doing so, I think people of this country are underestimating the important role they are playing in the world today. In giving economic aid to underdeveloped countries, this country should not look upon it as merely a part and parcel of its security program, putting it on the same level as the money it spends on its defense program. The true aspect of economic aid will only be realized when there is a reorientation of the policy underlying economic aid. I want this country to look upon it as a crusade against poverty. This country has been noted for the many noble causes it has espoused. There is no nobler cause than this crusade I am speaking about. It is only when this is realized in this country that the true image of America will appear in underdeveloped countries. It is a false and unjust image when people in underdeveloped countries look upon American aid as actuated by American self-interest or when it is more insultingly looked upon as an extension of dollar imperialism. If it is once realized in this country that prosperity, like peace, is indivisible and that you cannot have real prosperity in one part of the world if there is poverty in another, and that economic and industrial development is part of a world problem to be tackled on a world basis in the interest of a world community, that the moral consciousness of the people will be aroused and economic aid will assume its true aspect of a war that has to be waged against the forces of evil.

LONG ARDUOUS WAR

I advisedly use the word "war" because this is not a short sharp struggle with regard to which one can lay down short-term plans. It is a long, arduous war, a long-term affair which has to be planned on a long-term basis. Your country was engaged in two wars in recent times. You did not lay down any specific period during which the war had to end. It was a war which had to be waged to victory. I want you to look upon this war from the same point of view. Determination, heroism, sacrifice, expenditure of men and money were the contributions you made for your success. The war I am speaking of does not recall for the shedding of blood or the use of bombs and other weapons of destruction. It is a humanitarian war, the success in which will bring forth results a thousandfold more enduring and more beneficial than the results of the two last wars.

Incidentally and inevitably this war will also be a war against totalitarianism. What is happening in China and Russia must have a certain amount of glamor for underdeveloped countries. Both were poor countries. Russia in the course of two decades has become one of the most industrialized and powerful countries of the world and China is forging ahead. These two countries have registered resplendent successes which have seemed to many underdeveloped countries as indicating a new way of life which must of necessity produce prosperity and a higher standard of life. It may be that these successes have been achieved at the sacrifice of personal freedom, dignity of man, and an element of violence and coercion had gone into the producing of these results. It is in the light of what is happening in Russia and China that what is happening in India today assumes such vital importance.

MEANS AND ENDS

India is a poor country and she is as anxious to bring prosperity to her people as Russia and China are but the whole philosophy of our people requires that we should attach the same importance to means as we do to the ends to be achieved. We have been taught, and that is a lesson we have taken to heart, that ignoble means tarnish the ends or objects which they ultimately attain and that is why, anxious as we are to make our progress rapid, we have set our face against all ideas of violence and coercion. Our economic policy is based on consent and we propose, God willing, to achieve our economic objectives by democratic processes. People here sometimes do not realize that a great and decisive battle is being waged in the world between dictatorial and democratic methods of solving the problem of poverty. India is the battleground and the victory or defeat of democracy will be registered in that country. If democracy fails in India, freedom will be the casualty over the whole of Asia and Africa. In cooperating economically with India in this decisive struggle, you will be fighting communism more effectively than if you were to give India hundreds of bombers and nuclear rockets and were to enter with India into the closest of military pacts.

May I say this in conclusion: We do not so much want help or aid from the United

States as we want cooperation and partnership. On a governmental level, we want loans to help us to tide over this very critical period in our economic history. Don't forget your own country was in need of these loans when you started on your own exciting adventure of industrializing this great country. The loans you received were long-term loans, loans which did not operate as millstones round your necks, loans which you could repay when you had turned the corner. These are the kind of loans we require. Loans which will testify to the faith that the American Government has in the future of our country. Even more important, to my mind, is investment of private American capital in Indian industries. There is a wide and expanding scope for this investment. Your trade delegation which recently went to India has pointed out that there are at least a hundred industries in which American capital could safely and profitably invest. I attach more importance to this because it would lead to economic cooperation between the peoples of the two countries and cooperation between peoples is much more important than cooperation between governments. In the short time that I have been here, I have realized how warm and cordial the feelings of the people of this country are toward the people of my country and how anxious they are to help India in the great experiment by which she is trying to achieve social and economic justice democratically. What is needed most, to my mind, is a proper direction and guidance to these people as to how to give practical effect to the large fund of good will toward us which exists here and I hope and trust that this conference will be able to give the necessary guidance and direction.

Celebration of June, Dairy Month

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 22, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, as we know, next month is June, Dairy Month.

Across the Nation, the dairy industry, along with the United States and State departments of agriculture, is cooperating in an all-out effort to increase the consumption of dairy products, not only during June, Dairy Month, but throughout the year.

The big challenge, of course, is to get across the dairy food message to consumers.

Among other things, it is important to stress, first, that dairy products are a best buy for the family budget, providing more than one-third of our total food needs for less than one-fourth of the total food budget; second, that milk is good for folks of all ages—including adults and folks in their "golden years," as well as babies and teenagers; third, that we further educate the American family, particularly the housewife, not only as to the health-giving quality of our dairy foods, but also as to the variety of ways in which dairy products, including milk, butter, cheese, ice cream, and other items, can add zest, color, and a variety of flavors to the daily diet.

The accomplishment of these goals will not only provide better health for the American people, but will also help to resolve some of the economic problems confronting the dairy industry.

The May 20 edition of Dairy Record outlined the scope of the national program being planned for June, Dairy Month.

Mr. George S. Buckley, of Los Angeles, will head the staff of some 50 State June Dairy Month chairmen to carry out this splendid program.

In addition, the article includes a list of dairy leaders who will direct the activities.

To pay tribute to these leaders in the dairy industry for their fine work in this outstanding program, as well as to encourage the development of better programs for consumption of dairy products, I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNE DAIRY MONTH TO BE LAUNCHED WITH HEAVY NATIONWIDE PROMOTION—MANY AMBITIOUS PROJECTS FEATURE ANNUAL DRIVE TO SPUR DAIRY CONSUMPTION

CHICAGO.—Ten days from now, June Dairy Month will be launched from coast to coast and from the Dominion to the gulf, with more publicity than has ever been accorded that event.

Already scores of States have had pre-June month kickoff events, and invariably they have attracted larger and more enthusiastic audiences than at any time in their long history.

One of the most ambitious events will be the coronation festival luncheon at the Olympic Hotel in Seattle on June 5, where the new Washington dairy princess will be introduced to an audience of 850 people, followed that night by a dairy princess ball in the armory for some 6,000 people, with proceeds going to the Seattle milk fund, a local charity.

BULKLEY, NATIONAL CHAIRMAN

George S. Bulkley, of the Carnation Co., Los Angeles, will head a staff of some 50 State June Dairy Month chairmen, who will have general supervision over the State programs, although the American Dairy Association will do most of the routine work.

In most of the States, dairymen will continue to serve as State chairmen, but this year there will be some exceptions, notably in Minnesota, where Ron Kennedy, of F. H. Peavey & Co., Minneapolis, large grain dealers, and Mrs. Orville Freeman, wife of the Governor, will jointly serve in that role.

STATE MANAGERS

Listed as State managers are the following:

Alabama: Robert E. Lee, Sr., Gadsen.

Arizona: W. W. Cole, office of dairy commissioner, Phoenix.

Arkansas: Jimmie Ligon, Central Arkansas PCA, Conway.

California: John Watson, Petaluma.

Colorado: Stuart Benshoof, Safeway Stores, Denver.

Florida: Jack Dew, Southern Dairies, Jacksonville.

Idaho: Glen Thomas, Upper Snake River Valley Dairymen's Association, Idaho Falls.

Illinois: L. J. Cork, Joliet.

Indiana: Branch McCracken, coach, Indiana University, Bloomington.

Iowa: Prof. Verner Nielsen, Iowa State College, Ames.

Kansas: Ivan Van Nortwick, Kansas Ice Cream & Milk Institute, Inc., Lawrence.

Kentucky: Ben Butler, commissioner of agriculture, Frankfort.

Louisiana: Paul Gantt, Rosedale.

Maine: Herbert Waterman, New Gloucester.

Michigan: Ward C. Hodge, Farm Bureau, Snover.

Minnesota: Ron Kennedy, F. H. Peavey & Co., Minneapolis; Mrs. Orville Freeman, Minneapolis.

Mississippi: W. C. Brookshire, Brookshire Ice Cream Co., Meridian.

Missouri: Harvey Johnston, department of agriculture, Jefferson City.

Montana: Howard Dissly, Fergus County Creamery, Lewistown.

Nebraska: Willard D. Heyne, Hillside Dairy, Uehling.

Nevada: Ray Yoder, Crescent Creamery, Reno.

New Hampshire: George A. Clement, New Hampshire Grange, Lisbon.

New Jersey: W. M. Nulton, Jr., N.J. Guernsey Breeders Association, New Brunswick.

New Mexico: Mrs. Edith Schulmeister, Albuquerque.

New York: E. J. Rowell, National Dairy Council, New York City; John King, Borden Co., Troy.

North Carolina: Voight Gilmore, Travel Council of North Carolina, Southern Pines.

North Dakota: Glenn Olson, American Dairy Association of North Dakota, Jamestown.

Ohio: Robert Webner, Cottage Creamery Co., Orrville.

Oklahoma: Emmett N. Carter, American Dairy Association of Oklahoma, Purcell.

Oregon: Jerry Aakhus, Carnation Co., Portland.

Pennsylvania: Robert C. McKinley, Dairy Council, Inc., Philadelphia.

Rhode Island: Francis Perry, Buttonwood Dairy, Warren.

South Carolina: C. G. Cushman, Clemson College, Clemson.

South Dakota: John B. Richards, Brown Swiss Dairy Products, Rapid City.

Tennessee: Leonard Rogers, Tennesse Valley A. & I. Fair, Knoxville.

Texas: J. O. Woodman, North Texas Producers Association, Arlington.

Utah: Richard Stevens, Rosehill Dairy, Salt Lake City.

Vermont: Derick V. Webb, Shelburne Farms, Shelburne.

Virginia: Grady G. Wolfe, Virginia State Chamber of Commerce, Richmond.

Washington: Cliff Henning, Cliffhaven Jersey Farm, East Stanwood.

West Virginia: Robert L. Steele, associate extension dairyman, Morgantown.

Wisconsin: Truman Torgerson, Lake to Lake Dairy Co-op., Manitowoc.

Wyoming: Royal H. Jenson, Afton.

Betrayal of a Public Trust

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 22, 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, Time magazine is continuing its barrage of misinformation about everything that has to do with farm programs and farm policy. In the May 11 issue the magazine deals in its usual fashion with the legislative action on S. 144, the bill to restore full loan-making authority to the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration.

Personally, I shall make no attempt to answer such a bad example of news reporting. I have no need to since the

Rural Electric Minuteman, published by the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, has responded to the Time article with an editorial which I believe all of us would like to read. It is most aptly titled "Betrayal of a Public Trust."

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BETRAYAL OF A PUBLIC TRUST

The May 11 issue of Time magazine carries, on page 21, a story headed "Veto Upheld." It purports to be a news story about Ike's veto of the Humphrey-Price bill and the fight in both Houses of Congress to override the veto.

It's just about as ridiculous a piece of writing as you'll ever come across. It is factually innacurate, and we think the editors knew it was inaccurate when they wrote it. The style, a creamy blend of prejudice and propaganda, would shame the editor of a power-company house organ.

Time says, for example, that the bill would "transfer power to approve or reject REA loans from Agriculture Secretary Ezra Benson to power-hungry Clyde Ellis, director of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association."

In an answering letter which Time has promised to print, NRECA Legislative Director Dick Dell said:

"This statement (the one quoted above) is patently false and is deliberately contrived to discredit Mr. Ellis and NRECA, as is the rest of your story. Under S. 144, loanmaking authority would have been restored to the REA Administrator. The present Administrator is David Hamil, an Eisenhower appointee.

"Your story, of course, completely ignores the issue with which S. 144 was concerned. The REA Administrator is appointed by the President for a 10-year term, and is confirmed by the Senate. His job is to make loans for rural electrification facilities. In 1957, Secretary Benson ordered a political appointee in the Department of Agriculture—who has no term of office and is not confirmed by the Senate—to review loan applications before the loans were made by the Administrator. We do not believe this is a principle of good administration or good government."

Time had a lot of other things to say in a similar vein. For example, it says the bill, "As drafted by Benson-hating Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY * * *, was a direct slap at the bedeviled Agriculture Secretary and, indirectly, at the President himself."

If we cared to use Time's style, it might be more accurate to say: "As drafted by the REA-hating editors of Time, this story was a direct slap at HUMPHREY and Ellis, and, indirectly, at the 5 million Americans who are rural electric system members."

This is not the first time the magazine has shot its poisoned barbs at rural electrification. In a report on the NRECA annual meeting in February, Time called the 7,000 rural people who attended "a cold, hostile, subsidy-loving audience" in describing the reaction to Ike's speech.

This was an ugly, untrue thing to say about a lot of nice people who are every bit as patriotic and a lot more responsible than the gray-flanneled editors and publishers of Time. The subsidy-loving company that puts out Time, Life, and Fortune gets millions of dollars in mail subsidies every year. In a congressional report last year, the Post Office Department estimated the subsidy for Life alone, for 1 year, at $9,494,000.

Time claims a circulation of 2,300,000. Each issue is probably read by about 10 million people. Most of those people, having no other source of information on the subject, will presumably believe what they read. When the editors betray their public trust, the result is brainwashing at its worst.

The Washington reporters for Time say they did not send in the story the way it finally appeared. The inaccuracies, the slant, the bias, were inserted by the New York editors. We hope they're proud of themselves.

Domestic Donations of Department of Agriculture—Surplus Foods Up 42 Percent in First 9 Months of Fiscal Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH SCOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 22, 1959

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I hold in my hand some data with regard to donations of surplus foods which I think are of considerable interest, and I ask unanimous consent that a statement I have prepared in regard to this subject be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DOMESTIC DONATIONS OF USDA SURPLUS FOODS UP 42 PERCENT IN FIRST 9 MONTHS OF FISCAL YEAR

More than 2¼ billion pounds of surplus foods have been donated by the U.S. Department of Agriculture during the first three-fourths of the current fiscal year, for use in school lunch programs and by charitable institutions in this country and by needy persons in this country and abroad.

Total distribution of 2,252,500,000 pounds represented an increase of 42 percent in donations to recipients in this country over the same period a year ago, and a decline of 15.9 percent in the volume of donations to foreign recipients.

The donated foods were acquired by the Department in the operation of price support and surplus removal programs, and were donated through the direct distribution program of USDA's Agricultural Marketing Service. Not included in these figures are foods which the Department has purchased specifically for schools participating in the national school lunch program.

Surplus foods donated through the program were used during this period by more than 14 million schoolchildren taking part in school lunch programs, and by about 1.4 million persons in charitable institutions. In addition, they were being distributed in March to 5,741,298 needy persons in this country.

Distribution of surplus foods to schools and institutions is made in all the States, the District of Columbia, and in five Territories. Forty-four States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Inlands are currently taking part in distribution of surplus foods to needy persons. Not all areas in all participating States take part, however; in March, 1,214 counties and 164 separate cities took part—a slight increase over December participation.

The following table shows the number of needy persons in family units receiving donated foods in March 1959:

Alabama	13,210
Arizona	60,956
Arkansas	295,378
California	52,445
Colorado	26,370
Connecticut	1,025
District of Columbia	34,185
Georgia	38,488
Illinois	85,687
Indiana	103,654
Iowa	91,094
Kansas	12,107
Kentucky	294,874
Louisiana	178,925
Maine	60,541
Maryland	45,827
Massachusetts	4,198
Michigan	514,851
Minnesota	51,252
Mississippi	400,920
Missouri	122,466
Montana	13,012
Nebraska	2,010
Nevada	1,247
New Hampshire	8,992
New Jersey	17,695
New Mexico	42,057
New York	405,013
North Carolina	739
North Dakota	12,820
Ohio	67,804
Oklahoma	257,368
Pennsylvania	858,791
Puerto Rico	605,666
Rhode Island	12,312
South Carolina	1,886
South Dakota	38,531
Tennessee	171,041
Texas	143,051
Utah	25,778
Vermont	15,157
Virginia	41,580
Washington	7,151
West Virginia	301,264
Wisconsin	65,142
Wyoming	9,628
Trust Territory	4,050
Total United States	5,741,298

With the increase in the number of recipients, the donation of foods to needy persons increased by 80.2 percent over the same period a year ago. Distribution to charitable institutions was up 15.8 percent, and distribution to schools for lunch programs was increased 1.3 percent.

After all requests for donations of foods in this country have been met, remaining foods are made available to voluntary U.S. relief agencies for distribution to needy persons abroad. During the past quarter-year, 19 of these agencies distributed USDA surplus foods to needy persons in 78 foreign countries.

Most of the foods donated during the past quarter-year again were cereal products, including flour, cornmeal, and rice; remaining foods distributed were principally dairy products.

The following tables show the surplus foods donated, the quantities of each, and their costs. Figures cover the 9 months of July 1958 through March 1959, with comparisons to the entire 12 months of the preceding fiscal year (July 1957 through June 1958):

Quantities of surplus foods donated for domestic and foreign use, fiscal year 1958 and estimated July–March fiscal year 1959

[Million pounds]

Commodity	Domestic								Foreign distribution		Total distribution	
	Schools		Institutions		Needy persons		Total					
	Fiscal year 1958	July–March 1959	Fiscal year 1958	July–March 1959	Fiscal year 1958	July–March 1959	Fiscal year 1958	July–March 1959	Fiscal year 1958	July–March 1959	Fiscal year 1958	July–March 1959
Beans, dry	17.9	4.1	0.3	[1]	1.0		19.2	4.1			19.2	4.1
Butter	68.9	55.6	29.0	20.0	12.9	41.8	110.8	117.4			110.8	117.4
Cabbage		3.4		.9				4.3				4.3
Cheese	32.9	31.1	14.4	8.2	68.9	50.8	116.2	90.1	193.4	[2] 38.5	309.6	128.6
Corn									62.5	31.5	62.5	31.5
Cornmeal	16.6	14.0	8.6	6.0	96.1	107.8	121.3	127.8	298.2	182.8	419.5	310.6
Eggs, dried	4.6						4.6				4.6	
Flour	58.6	64.2	72.6	60.7	149.0	187.3	280.2	312.2	769.7	667.0	1,049.9	979.2
Grapefruit, canned	6.5						6.5				6.5	
Milk, nonfat dry	21.1	23.0	14.7	12.6	87.3	97.0	123.1	132.6	549.7	376.6	672.8	509.2
Peanut butter	4.9	6.8					4.9	6.8			4.9	6.8
Rice	19.8	18.7	8.7	9.4	56.3	59.8	84.8	87.9	59.6	46.3	144.4	134.2
Wheat									39.9	26.6	39.9	26.6
Total	251.8	220.9	148.3	117.8	471.5	544.5	871.6	883.2	1,973.0	1,369.3	2,844.6	2,252.5

[1] Less than 50,000 pounds.

[2] Includes requests approved prior to July 1, 1958.

Cost of surplus foods donated for domestic and foreign use, fiscal year 1958 and estimated July–March fiscal year 1959 [1]

[Million dollars]

Commodity	Domestic								Foreign distribution		Total distribution	
	Schools		Institutions		Needy persons		Total					
	Fiscal year 1958	July–March 1959	Fiscal year 1958	July–March 1959	Fiscal year 1958	July–March 1959	Fiscal year 1958	July–March 1959	Fiscal year 1958	July–March 1959	Fiscal year 1958	July–March 1959
Beans, dry	1.6	0.4	[2]	[2]	0.1		1.7	0.4			1.7	0.4
Butter	42.6	34.3	17.9	12.4	8.0	25.8	68.5	72.5			68.5	72.5
Cabbage		.1		[2]				.1				.1
Cheese	13.1	12.8	5.7	3.4	27.5	21.0	46.3	37.2	80.6	[3] 15.9	126.9	53.1
Corn									3.0	1.7	3.0	1.7
Cornmeal	1.1	.7	.6	.3	6.5	5.5	8.2	6.5	21.6	11.1	29.8	17.6
Eggs, dried	5.2						5.2				5.2	
Flour	4.6	4.2	5.6	3.9	11.6	12.2	21.8	20.3	60.0	47.9	81.8	68.2
Grapefruit, canned	.9						.9				.9	
Milk, nonfat dry	3.8	3.8	2.7	2.1	15.8	16.0	22.3	21.9	101.6	65.0	123.9	86.9
Peanut butter	.8	1.2					.8	1.2			.8	1.2
Rice	2.3	2.1	1.0	1.1	6.4	6.9	9.7	10.1	3.5	3.0	13.2	13.1
Wheat									2.2	1.7	2.2	1.7
Total	76.0	59.6	33.5	23.2	75.9	87.4	185.4	170.2	272.5	146.3	457.9	316.5

[1] Represents total cost to the Federal Government. Includes commodity cost, warehousing, transportation, processing, repackaging, and miscellaneous handling charges.

[2] Less than $50,000.

[3] Includes requests approved prior to July 1, 1958.

Address Delivered by Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

Hon. EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 22, 1959

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, the text of the address delivered by Secretary Benson last night at Cedar Rapids, Iowa, at the annual farmer-businessmen dinner at Cedar Rapids, Iowa. The address was alluded to on the floor of the Senate earlier today. It is possible that the full text of the address was not available at the time to show exactly how the Secretary actually treated the REA matter. Therefore I submit the entire text for inclusion in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE EZRA TAFT BENSON, ANNUAL FARMER-BUSINESSMAN DINNER, CHAMBER OF COMMERCE AGRICULTURAL BUREAU AND LINN COUNTY FARM BUREAU, CEDAR RAPIDS, IOWA, MAY 21, 1959

I am delighted to have this opportunity to visit with you in your beautiful city. I am grateful to the Chamber of Commerce Agricultural Bureau, the Linn County Farm Bureau, and to all of you for making this visit possible.

Coming here has aroused a flood of happy memories. I love the State of Iowa. It seems only yesterday—although my grandchildren and the calendar make me realize it was actually 32 years ago—that Mrs. Benson and I first came to Iowa in an old Ford pickup. We had been married only a few days when I enrolled as a graduate student at Iowa State Agricultural College.

My modest scholarship of $70 a month seemed adequate for a young couple who had heard somewhere that two could live as cheaply as one.

During my first year at Iowa State I rode on a special 4–H Club train en route to the International Show in Chicago. On that train trip we sang the proud Iowa song, "That's Where the Tall Corn Grows."

The cornstalks with which we kept time to the music, as I recall, were tall enough and husky enough to discourage any who might have doubted our claims.

Today the cornstalks in Iowa may not be as tall as those we remember, but they produce more bushels to the acre. And the farmers have the same vision and the same quiet faith which gave strength to their ancestors who pioneered these rich fields.

So it is good to be back with you. And it is inspiring to see city people and country people sitting at table together. If this gathering results in just a little better appreciation of American agriculture by our people in the cities, and a little better appreciation of American business, industry, and the professions by our farmers, it will have accomplished much.

Tonight I want to set the record straight on some important points concerning our American agriculture. These are the points I have particularly in mind:

First, the so-called farm problem is not just a farm problem—it is a national problem, an American problem.

Second, farmers are not to be blamed for this problem. On the contrary, we should be unstinting in our praise of the American farmer's productive ability. Never in history have so many been fed so well by so few.

Third, this problem cannot be solved by continuing the old outmoded price support, acreage control program—to do so will only make the problem worse.

Fourth, to achieve and maintain a prosperous, expanding, and free agriculture, we must solve the farm problem.

We all know the major elements of this problem.

Vast surpluses of a few commodities exert a depressing influence in the market.

Farm people are caught in a cost-price squeeze.

Half our farms have gross incomes of under $2,500 a year.

Some producers are struggling with acreage allotments which are too small to permit them to farm efficiently.

The costs of maintaining Government farm programs are at an alltime high, and rising.

These are the major elements.

Now, I say to you that this is not just a farm problem. It is an American problem—it is our problem. Whether you live on a farm or in the city, whether you operate a thousand acres or grow a few plants in a windowbox, whether you run a tractor or a machine in a mill, whether you have your money invested in a corn-hog operation or in a business on First, Second, or Third Avenue, whether you are an agricultural producer in one of Iowa's 99 counties or a professional men in one of Iowa's thriving cities and towns—this is our problem, yours and mine.

We taxpayers—and let's all remember that farmers are heavy taxpayers, too—have $9 billion tied up in surplus farm products—most of it corn, wheat, and cotton. We are paying $1 billion a year in storage, interest, and handling charges on these surpluses. Though these costs are assessed against agricultural appropriations, very little of this money goes to our farmers.

But it is not only because all of us are taxpayers that the farm problem is our problem. It is our problem—yours and mine—because past efforts to deal with it have carried us far along the road to Government regimentation and control over agriculture. Many farmers are no longer free to plant, to compete, to market, and to make their own decisions.

Proposals are now being made which, if adopted, would go far to socialize agriculture—to make farmers depend for much of their income on direct payments from the U.S. Treasury. This threatens not only the freedom of agriculture—it threatens the free American economic system in general.

Each one of us, moreover, depends upon agriculture for sustenance. I have heard it said that the economic life of this Nation fluctuates with the ups and downs of the automobile industry. Well, I recall that practically everybody in this country got along from 1942 to 1946 without a new car. But I'd hate to see this Nation try to go without food for 5 days much less 5 years.

The farm problem is our problem because it has a bearing not only on our taxes—not only on our freedom—but on the very food of life itself.

My second point is that the farm problem was not caused by farmers. It is the outgrowth principally of two factors:

The technological revolution in agriculture; and

The continuance of an outmoded price support, acreage control program long after this program had ceased to serve a useful purpose.

Here is what I mean by the technological revolution. For the Nation as a whole, an average acre that produced 28 bushels of corn in 1940 produced 52 bushels last year—nearly double.

An average acre that produced about 15 bushels of wheat in 1940 produced 27 last year—nearly double.

An average acre that produced about 250 pounds of cotton lint in 1940 produced 469 pounds last year—nearly double.

The old price support program was built on the false premise that production can be effectively controlled through acreage allotments and marketing quotas. The experience of the past 25 years has demonstrated that this is not true.

Congress will not legislate, farmers will not accept, and no Secretary of Agriculture could enforce acreage allotments so low as to achieve market balance at 90 percent of parity based on a formula which goes back 45 years.

Under the formula in the old law do you know what the national acreage allotment for wheat would have been this year? Zero—no wheat production whatsoever.

Do farmers want this kind of a program? No. The big majority of farmers do not want Government handouts and Government regimentation.

A recent nationwide poll by the Farm Journal showed that 8 out of 10 farmers responding want greater freedom and less Government in agriculture.

In the referendum of December 1956, 61 percent of the corn farmers voted for lower support and increased acreage.

Last November corn farmers voted by almost 3 to 1 to eliminate corn acreage allotments and lower the level of price supports.

Obviously the farm problem is not the fault of our farmers.

My third point is: We cannot solve the farm problem by continuing the outmoded programs. This is obvious from the current situation.

Producers of cattle, hogs, poultry, fruits, vegetables, and various other products which are not price supported or controlled have had growing markets. We do have temporary gluts in the market. We are having trouble with eggs now, and we are using sound means to relieve the situation. But we are not going to repeat the fiasco of 1950 by putting Government into the egg business.

The so-called basic crops—corn, cotton, wheat, rice, peanuts, and tobacco—the one-fifth of our agriculture that is not free—the crops that have depended the most on supports and controls—these are in the most trouble.

And they will continue to be in trouble, barring some emergency, until they are priced and promoted to sell. History reveals that these crops were baled out of trouble by two wars. None of us wants war as a solution.

The last Congress enacted some badly needed legislation for corn, cotton, and rice. It was a limited move in the direction of common sense. But it came too late to avoid serious surplus troubles and loss of markets. And nothing was done about wheat, tobacco, and peanuts.

That is why corrective farm legislation is doubly important now.

We are facing a very grave crisis in wheat and a serious situation in tobacco and peanuts.

By July 1960 our wheat carryover will be about 1½ billion bushels. Converted into bread, that would provide 515 loaves for every man, woman, and child in this country. We will have $3½ billion of taxpayers' money tied up in wheat alone.

But that is not all. If we continue the present program, it will mean a further buildup of the surplus by 200 million bushels or more a year. I say to you in all sincerity that this could end in disaster of a magnitude such as we have not seen before in our American agriculture.

A ground swell of antifarm program sentiment is developing that endangers the whole price support idea. An editorial in Life magazine urges wiping out the whole program. "The whole farm support program," it says, "is a colossal failure. The only sensible thing to do about it is to get rid of it, stop it. Why go on pouring good money after bad?"

Not for a moment do I believe this is a sound approach. I cite it simply to show the danger that exists—the resentment that is steadily growing against paying tremendous costs for a program that makes the problem worse.

My fourth point is: To have a prosperous, expanding, and free agriculture, we must solve the farm problem.

The huge surpluses have cost farmers billions of dollars in lost income—up to $2 billion a year. This is not the path to prosperity.

Our commodities have been forced out of some of their traditional markets. This is not the road of expansion.

Too many farmers have lost the right to make their own decisions. This is not the highway to freedom.

If we want a prosperous, expanding, and free agriculture, the first necessity is to face the facts—these facts:

The old price support, acreage control program has failed.

The failure is due to the program itself—the program required by old legislation.

Therefore, the remedy lies in changing the legislation—which means changing the program itself.

President Eisenhower has sent four special agricultural messages to the Congress. The latest was in January of this year. Officials of the Department have spent many hours testifying before committees of the House and Senate on the details of our recommendations. I testified in February before the House Agriculture Committee and the Senate Committee. We submitted legislative language for needed changes in the wheat law the forepart of March. The President made two more appeals for action on wheat last week. The date for announcing the 1960 wheat acreage allotment and marketing quota has been extended from May 15 to June 1.

We have recommended that price supports should be based not on the old outmoded parity of half a century ago, but on a percentage of the average market prices for the immediate preceding years. So far as wheat is concerned we have urged that all acreage allotments and marketing quotas should be eliminated as soon as price supports are adjusted to realistic levels. This is the kind of program that corn farmers voted for overwhelmingly in the corn referendum last November.

In this competitive world farmers must be free to make adjustments and commodities must be priced to sell—otherwise surpluses pile up in Government warehouses—and a Government warehouse is not a market. When we do price to sell, markets increase. Here, for example, are some very interesting figures on feed grain consumption for the 6 months ending March 31.

Compared with the same months a year earlier, corn consumption was up 244 million bushels—or 12 percent.

Consumption of grain sorghum was up 93 million bushels—or 42 percent.

Consumption of oats was up 97 million bushels—or 17 percent.

This is a sound development.

We must always remember, however, that balance in agriculture involves good judgment. There is now underway a strong trend toward building up cattle herds. The reduced rate of slaughter indicates an increase in the cattle inventory this year of possibly 4 to 5 million head. I urge cattlemen to make production plans that will

avoid overexpansion with undersirable results later on.

Hog producers are increasing production, and returns this year will reflect the larger supplies. Here again, I strongly urge farmers to make wise production decisions.

Our approach is sound. The overwhelming majority of agricultural economists, like the majority of farmers, endorse what we are trying to do as sound and best for agriculture.

A recent survey of agricultural economists of our 49 land-grant colleges has just been been published. Of the 37 economists replying, 4 out of 5 say that, "any laws further hamstringing the free market will hurt the farmer, the consumer, and the Nation."

We cannot price abundant farm products as if they were scarce without piling up surpluses.

The evidence of 25 years says that we cannot balance supply and demand by means of present acreage controls. The economics of the farm problem are simple—we need less government in farming. We must quit trying to fix prices unrealistically. This is the source of the twin evils of production for Government warehouses and Government control over farmers. We must emphasize markets, increased efficiency, and competitive selling. We must eliminate Government's stranglehold on agriculture.

Until this is done, agriculture will be burdened with too much Government, too much politics, and too little commonsense.

The longer this situation continues, the more we all have to lose—for this is our problem. But the biggest losers are farmers themselves.

Now I want to say something about another aspect of the farm situation.

In recent months we have been in the middle of a debate about rural electrification.

When I was a youngster on a farm in Idaho many years ago I milked cows by hand, fetched water by the bucket, and studied my lessons by the light of a kerosene lamp. We had no radio or television, no refrigerator or freezer, no milking machine or water pump, no electric lights or telephone.

Later, electric power brought light, a telephone, and running water to the farm. We hailed it enthusiastically, as an emancipator—it freed us from drudgery.

I know what it meant to my mother to have electric power at her fingertip. I know what it means to farm boys and girls to have enough light to read or study by at night. I have seen the worn and tired faces of farm men and women glow with new life at the mere prospect that electric power would soon be available.

Nobody has to sell me on the great work of the Rural Electrification Administration.

I am gravely concerned, however, about a growing national attitude of dependence on government. The tendency seems to be to look to Washington for the solution to every problem. There is no surer way to lose our American heritage of freedom than to let this tendency grow unchecked.

Few of our people realize how far we have already gone on this path. Here is an instance—a contrast—that may help to open our eyes. Back before the turn of the century the Congress passed a bill providing for free gifts of seed to farmers. It involved only a small amount of money—about $10,000 I believe. But the bill was vetoed by President Grover Cleveland—a Democrat—because it also involved a big principle. He expressed the principle thus: "Though the people support the Government, the Government should not support the people."

We are in danger of forgetting those words today. Powerful forces are pushing us toward a planned and subsidized economy which weakens initiative, discourages industry, destroys character, and demoralizes the people.

Now, how does this bear on the debate over rural electrification?

It comes down to this. I believe, and so does President Eisenhower, that REA and the rural electric cooperatives have now come of age. They are strong enough and mature enough to begin to stand more on their own feet. Because I have plainly said so, many ridiculous charges have been made against me.

It has been suggested, for example, that I am against cooperatives. Nothing could be more untrue.

I grew up with cooperatives. I have had the privilege of working for and with hundreds of them, and I have never for a moment lost my faith in cooperative organizations. I am a co-op booster—always have been—and I am proud of it. Sound co-ops have proven their place in the free enterprise system.

Now here is what raised the tempo of the debate in recent months. President Eisenhower in his 1960 budget message proposed a change in REA financing. Since 1944 REA has had an interest rate of 2 percent. This does not cover the costs of the money to the Government. The President suggested that this 2 percent interest rate be replaced by a rate which will cover the current cost to the Treasury of equivalent term borrowing and other reasonable costs. This would apply to new loans only. Further, he suggested that legislation be enacted to broaden the sources of capital for the REA programs. This would assist borrowers in obtaining from private sources funds to finance needed expansion.

I find these proposals just and reasonable. So do most Americans who have the facts.

I want you to know the facts. Decisions about the future of the rural electrification and telephone programs need to be made. These are important programs, far too important for their future to be decided in terms of political expediency.

I have a proposal for a permanent financing plan for the REA electric and telephone systems. Here it is:

1. Authorize these rural systems to have their own bank—their own lending institution—which they may operate and ultimately own entirely.

2. Let them have their own national policy board to direct the affairs of their bank. Members of this board would be nominated by the rural electric and telephone borrowers. Plans for organizing and operating the REA bank should be carefully developed to meet the particular capital requirements of the electric and telephone borrowers.

This system is operating successfully in the Farm Credit Administration with its banks and local lending institutions which are farmer-owned and operated.

When these Farm Credit institutions were first organized, skeptics said that they'd never succeed. Well, the record has been outstanding. The farmer-members and their cooperative service organizations now borrow nearly $3½ billion annually from their own Farm Credit institutions—that's almost as much every year as the whole 24-year total of REA loans.

Farmers have invested more than $287 million capital in their credit institutions. Through careful and prudent management, they have accumulated net earnings of more than $361 million. They have an orderly retirement plan in effect to return their remaining Government capital to the Treasury.

These long-range plans for the Farm Credit System were worked out over a period of time through consultation with representatives of the local and district Farm Credit institutions. That is the way a permanent financing system for the rural electric and telephone borrowers should be developed.

I am very proud of the accomplishments of the rural electric and telephone systems. They are strong and healthy. They should now start formulating plans which would enable the users of these systems ultimately to own and operate their own national financing institution.

The REA programs are among the best investments ever made by the American people.

Let's keep REA and all farm programs sound and fair—fair to farmers and fair to all our citizens.

Our farm people are the salt of the earth. They have always come first with me. As a farmer, the son of a farmer, yes, the grandson of a farmer, and as a former county agent, it is natural that I should feel this way. And I shall continue to speak out for what is right for farmers, and right for America, as long as God gives me life and a voice to do so.

Now, let me return briefly to some of the wild charges that have been made.

It has been said that I have interfered with the administration of REA. This is utterly false.

The Secretary of Agriculture has been responsible for the general direction and supervision of REA since 1939. When I became Secretary in 1953, I made no change in REA's internal policies or procedures.

In 1953, President Eisenhower transmitted to the Congress, a reorganization plan. This plan as it affected REA, was substantially the same as one sought unsuccessfully by the Truman administration. It transferred to the Secretary all functions of REA. It authorized the Secretary to delegate the performance of transferred functions to any other agency of the Department.

After the reorganization plan took effect, I delegated the REA functions to the Administrator of REA to be exercised under the general direction and supervision of the Secretary. To assist me in carrying out this and other responsibilities in connection with our credit programs in agriculture, I designated a Director of Agricultural Credit Services.

In June 1957, I asked the REA Administrator to submit certain loan applications to the Director of Agricultural Credit Services of the Department for his information and possible discussion—for his counsel. I'm just old-fashioned enough to believe that there is safety in counsel. This arrangement did not affect the loan-making authority of the REA Administrator in the slightest degree. He has continued to make all loans.

It has been suggested that I interfered with the approval of a particular loan application—a $42 million generation and transmission loan application submitted to REA in 1957 by Hoosier Cooperative Energy of Indiana.

This, too, is false. I have never interfered with any REA loan application, including the Hoosier application. The so-called $42 million Hoosier loan application has never been disapproved. The fact is that REA has no proper application from Hoosier Cooperative Energy on which it can take action. If and when REA gets such an application, you can be sure it will be processed like any other.

Some people would like the country to believe that I am engineering a weird master plan to wreck REA. Here is a sample of their language.

"That crowd (I assume that includes me) is hell-bent on handing us over to the Wall Street bankers—the Wall Street control power companies, and they are not going to rest until they do it."

Well, let's look at the record—the record of REA progress during the past 6 years.

The REA has been in existence for about 24 years. Almost one-third of all its electric loans have been made in the past 6 years.

The telephone program has been in existence about 10 years. Four-fifths of all telephone loans have been made in the past 6 years.

On January 1, 1953, 45 REA borrowers were delinquent in payments; in April 1959, just one was delinquent.

The net worth of REA electric borrowers has more than doubled in the past 6 years.

The authority of REA to make generation and transmission loans is a vital part of the rural electrification program. Since January 1, 1953, these loans have accounted for almost 31 percent of the total loaned for rural electrification, compared with 19 percent before that date.

If I had plotted a conspiracy to harm REA, you can see that I have failed miserably.

The core of the debate is that I consider it politically, economically, and morally wrong for successful organizations like REA borrowers, with sizable reserves and increasing revenues, to keep dipping into the Federal Treasury at the taxpayers' expense to the tune of millions of dollars per year for interest payments alone.

Surely that makes sense.

But, no matter how many facts are presented, a vocal and organized minority continue to dredge up phony issues. They pursue one of their favorite pastimes—taking potshots at me. They continue to play politics with REA.

When you cut away all the rhetoric, all the noise and fury, here is what they are asking:

"Why single us out to pay our own way? We were doing all right as we were."

The answer is simple. This is not 1935, when only 11 percent of our farms were electrified. This is not 1944, when fewer than half were receiving central-station service. This is 1959, and over 95 percent of our farms are electrified. The backbone electric system to serve nearly all of rural America has been completed; one of the principal objectives of the rural electrification program has been achieved.

REA borrowers will continue to need large amounts of capital funds to meet their increasing load demands. A large part of this continuing need for capital is coming from the increasing loads of nonfarm consumers. Over one-half of the power sales of REA borrowers is now to nonfarm consumers. That trend will continue. The ratio of new nonfarm consumers to farm consumers is now 3 to 1.

We want to see that these borrowers obtain the additional capital funds they need and continue to prosper as independent community service organizations, paying their own way.

REA borrowers have demonstrated their ability to pay their own way.

I am certain that the majority of the directors, managers, and members of rural electric cooperatives want to pay their own way. They do not want to rely on Government support. This is in keeping with the best of American traditions.

I have full confidence in the judgment of an informed American people. That is why I consider it such a privilege—and such a grave responsibility—to meet with you tonight.

We must build solidly for the future of our agriculture. To do this, I repeat, is not just a farm problem. It is an American problem—our problem.

I pledge to you and through you to all the farm and city people of America that I will continue to do all in my power to develop and maintain a prosperous, expanding, and free agriculture. And I also pledge to you that I will never support any policy or program which I believe is not in the best interest of our farmers and fair to all of our people, regardless of political pressure.

Our goal, I repeat, is a prosperous, expanding, and free agriculture.

We need such an agriculture to help our Nation confront at full strength those on the international scene who are eagerly scanning our economy for a sign of weakness. We need such an agriculture to meet the inevitably expanding demands of our rapidly growing population.

Let us seek the solutions we so sorely need. There is no room for blind partisanship, for prejudice, for bitter bias. Agriculture is neither Republican nor Democrat. It is American.

As Americans all, let us get on with the job. God willing, the progress, prosperity, and strength of our American agriculture are now only in their beginnings.

The Farm Problem—GTA Daily Radio Roundups

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 22, 1959

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two GTA Daily Radio Roundups, dated May 15 and May 18, 1959, prepared by the public relations division of the Grain Terminal Association, of St. Paul, Minn., relating to the farm problem.

There being no objection, the roundups were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GTA DAILY RADIO ROUNDUP, MAY 15, 1959

Our favorite Washington reporter tells us he is in a gloomy mood this week from watching how the President, the Secretary of Agriculture, and Congress are chasing each other around and around on the serious, crucial farm issue without getting anywhere.

He says, "It's startling, sometimes, to notice how negative the whole current Washington mood and situation are. The White House is hypnotized by the budget."

"Congress had a liberal surge in November but the southern leadership took care of that," he adds, "and some of the Dixiecrats are as harmful to farmers as Benson-Republicans." And the President has been of no help either. Back in January he sent a farm message to Congress. "Get rid of all the farm surpluses, farm costs, and all of the Government farms regulations," is in substance what the President told Congress.

Now, after 4 months of silence, the President tells Congress it must do something in a hurry about the wheat referendum. He tells Congress it is stalling. He said that on May 13. It happened that on the same day the House Farm Committee said, "All right, Mr. President, if you are in such a hurry, here is a wheat referendum bill. It ought to do the job, if you don't veto it." That bill okayed by the House Farm Committee is basically a sound one.

It is a fair and reasonable effort to do two things: To reduce wheat production and protect farm family income at a reasonable level, and cut back on the biggest operators—the ones who get all the bad newspaper headlines about $100,000 price-support loans from the Government.

Most wheat farmers will buy that kind of a proposal. We know because GTA had some of its fieldworkers interview farmers. We, pass this along to the President and the Secretary of Agriculture for what it is worth, because both say farmers do not want any Government support or regulation. No wonder there is doubt as to whether either the Secretary of Agriculture or the President know what to do about agriculture. That's understandable.

Even the Saturday Evening Post, which has never championed anything even remotely related to the New Deal, and which has never been known to be sympathetic to Government regulation or the farm problem, had this to say in an editorial this week. It asks three questions about farming:

First: How can agriculture become even more productive, as it will, without repeatedly putting farm people through an economic wringer?

Second: Is the family type farm going to be able to maintain its traditional key place in the new kind of agriculture that is rapidly evolving? If so, how?

Third: Must national farm policies continue to be negative in concept, designed only to fight rear-guard action against advancing technology?

If the President and the Secretary of Agriculture cannot find one good idea out of more than 200 farm bills submitted by this Congress, they ought to at least have the courage to submit one constructive idea.

Congress has come up with a sensible answer in a sensible bill. Will the President or his Secretary of Agriculture accept it? That is the big and difficult question confronting Congress and the farmers.

But if enough Democrats stay hitched to the promise their party made to farmers last fall, and just a handful of farm-State Republicans in Congress have enough courage to stand up for farmers instead of holding up the Secreary of Agriculture's hand, farmers can hope for some measure of improvement.

GTA DAILY RADIO ROUNDUP, MAY 18, 1959

There is a severe farm crisis in Washington. It revolves around wheat. Congress and the White House are deadlocked. Farmers know that the Secretary of Agriculture and the White House seem determined to have no wheat legislation that will protect the farmer's income.

M. W. Thatcher, the general manager of GTA, has filed a statement with Members of Congress from the wheat States. It gives the point of view of many thousands of farmers who are the owners of GTA. This is what Mr. Thatcher told the Congressmen:

"Last week the House Agricultural Committee gave the President what he asked for, a bill to meet an impending disaster in wheat. The bill recommended that wheat acreage be cut 30 percent next year and the price support be boosted as much as 20 percent. While this would reduce the wheat surplus there is some question as to whether the price increase is enough to protect family-farmer income."

"But since then there has been too much jockeying around, too much backing and filling, and too much evidence of retreat in Congress. The House Agriculture Committee has recalled its bill. The Senate Agriculture Committee has reported out a bill that is unsatisfactory to farmers and could well play into the hands of the Secretary of Agriculture."

"Congress ought to know how farmers feel. No wheat farmer can willingly accept a big cut in acreage unless he is sure of a substantial increase in the support price to protect his income. Every farmer knows the Senate Agriculture Committee bill will not reduce production by a single acre of a single bushel. It only cuts the farmer's

pay. This kind of a bill is doing just what the Secretary of Agriculutre wants. It is the kind of a bill that will help kill all price supports."

"Farmers in our spring wheat States expect their Congressmen to stand up and be counted. They expect something more from the agriculture committee members than committee-room politics. To say that this bill or that bill will not pass Congress or get by the President's veto, will not satisfy the farmers."

"Farmers expect the House and Senate Agriculture Committees to agree on a sound and reasonable wheat bill that will protect the income of producers and reduce wheat production. Anything less is unsatisfactory. At the moment farmers are wondering whether many of the committee members do not know what they want or are pliable to pressure from the Department of Agriculture."

"To argue that a good farm bill is not politically acceptable is no argument at all. Let the farm committee members do the best job they can and then let Congress decide whether their bill will give farmers a fair break. Then it is up to the President to decide whether or not he will veto a fair break for farmers." "Then the record is there for everyone to see."

This statement by M. W. Thatcher of GTA has been wired to wheat-State members of Congress. Action now in the wheat crisis is urgently demanded by the farmers who own GTA—the co-op way.

Snide Remarks About Wisconsin's "Cow Juice"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 6, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Walt Brovald, who edits the Cadott Sentinel in my home district, observed in his weekly column that the opponents of my national milk sanitation legislation are hindering their cause by making snide remarks about Wisconsin's prize product, milk. He goes on to tell how milk is now being shipped from Wisconsin to Texas with no deterioration in quality. Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include Mr. Brovald's comments in the RECORD:

EVIDENCE REFUTES "TIRED MILK" CHARGE

Opponents to Representative LESTER JOHNSON'S bill which would allow unrestricted movement of milk meeting U.S. Public Health standards to any part of the country are hurting their cause more than helping it, according to reports, by making snide remarks about Wisconsin's "cow juice."

Most vocal of them all is the Maryland-Virginia Milk Producers Association, which said the East didn't want Wisconsin's "tired old milk," and wondered about Wisconsin milk moving to market on bobsleds during winter snowfalls.

JOHNSON had no trouble refuting the tired old milk charge, and cited the Babbitt trucking firm, of Chippewa Falls, as an example of modern transportation methods. Babbitt, who sends seven truckloads of milk to Philadelphia every day, has had only one interruption because of snow in the last 2 years.

You may be as interested as I was to learn, too, that milk trucked from Chippewa County to Texas, even on the hottest of summer days, gains only 3 or 4 degrees temperature during the trip.

Even when, as once the driver had to stop and buy some bags of chipped ice to cover the floor boards of the truck cab to cool the soles of his shoes. Sounds like a whopper, but Dale Babbitt, public relations man for the truck firm, keeps a straight face when he tells the story.

Federal Lunch Programs Can Save Money for School Districts; Recommended for Houston

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 22, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, even though the Federal aid program to help provide better lunches to schoolchildren has been going on for some time, there are still some districts which do not participate in the program.

The arguments the leaders of these districts use against the Federal school lunch program have been proved wrong in actual practice, but still they persist. Adults talk their opposition, while children go hungry.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Ron Moskowitz which appeared in the Houston (Tex.) Post for Wednesday, May 6, 1959, under the heading "Houston Use of Federal Lunch Program Backed." Accountant Edwin Bruhl is asking for the exercise of reason by the Houston School Board.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Houston Post, May 6, 1959.]

HOUSTON USE OF FEDERAL LUNCH PROGRAM BACKED

(By Ron Moskowitz)

Accountant Edwin Bruhl said Tuesday he will ask the school lunch committee of the Community Council to recommend to the Houston School Board that it participate in three Federal lunchroom programs.

Bruhl, a member of the committee, will make his opinion known when the group meets at 3 p.m. Thursday in the board room of the National Bank of Commerce.

"This is not anything new," he said. "My opinion has been well known for 12 years and I don't intend to change it.

"I have studied this situattion for 12 years and I have never been convinced that it is not the reasonable thing to do—to get back some of the money we pay out.

"The Houston School Board has consistently refused this aid. Their refusal has not decreased or stopped our Federal taxes, or the programs. Instead, the programs have expanded throughout the Nation—except in Houston.

"It is only sensible for the district to accept it and get the benefits from it. After all, we are paying for it.

"I don't believe in anybody, elected or otherwise, setting themselves up in such a way as to take away from the people something that is given to the people. And that's what the board has done."

The committee has been studying the lunchroom program in Houston and the other 20 school districts in Harris County for months—ever since complaints were received that some children were going without lunch.

For the past 20 years the district has been paying for free lunches for the needy with Community Chest and United Fund allocations. Almost every other district in the county—and almost every large district in the State—pays for its free lunches out of its own lunchroom department funds.

These districts are able to do this because they participate in one or more of the Federal programs designed to better nourish the youth of America, spokesmen say.

Because the Houston district has refused to participate, plate lunches in Houston's secondary schools cost more than almost any other district in the county—and they contain less, recent surveys by the Houston Post have shown.

When the committee meets Thursday, it will be equipped with answers to questionnaires sent out to every district in the county and every large district in the State.

The report shows that only a fraction of these participating districts have had trouble with storage, transportattion or bookkeeping because of participation.

The committee may or may not make a recommendation at this meeting. It may decide to study the program longer.

West Virginia's Industrial Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT C. BYRD
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 22, 1959

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I am sure that every Member of this body is aware of the tremendous industrialization that is taking place in the great Ohio Valley. West Virginia is playing a vital role in that industrialization, and I would like to call to your attention the huge $250 million plant just completed in my State by Kaiser Aluminum & Chemical Corp.

This farsighted organization brought 2,400 jobs to the people of my State and surrounding areas. The firm's decision to move into the Ohio Valley was motivated by proximity to markets, adequate fuel supply, adequate transportation facilities, and available, capable labor.

Kaiser Aluminum has stated that the adaptability of our labor force met the company's most optimistic expectations. This is a tribute to the efficiency and ability of the laboring people of West Virginia.

Many of West Virginia's skilled laborers who, in recent years, have gone to such industrial centers as Akron and Detroit are now returning. Their roots are still in West Virginia, and the continued industrial expansion of our State, aided by such outstanding companies as Kaiser Aluminum, is providing the job opportunities that permit these people to return to their home State.

A more comprehensive picture of what Kaiser Aluminum is doing in West Virginia is contained in an address made

recently by H. B. Benedict, works public relations manager of Kaiser Aluminum, Ravenswood, W. Va., before the Kiwanis Club of Charleston, W. Va. I ask unanimous consent to have the address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WEST VIRGINIA'S INDUSTRIAL FUTURE

(Address before the Charleston, W. Va., Kiwanis Club, March 10, 1959, by H. B. Benedict, works public relations manager, Kaiser Aluminum & Chemical Corp., Ravenswood, W. Va.)

Faced with employment, education, financing, and other problems common in varying degrees to all the States, it is understandably easy—in the urgency of the present—to misinterpret these signs in terms of West Virginia's future—and to overlook the tremendous progress of the past.

Almost unnoticed is the fact that West Virginia is a dynamic part of an area which has enjoyed one of the Nation's greatest industrial expansions in this decade.

As a reference point let us examine how much industrialization has actually taken place in this general area in recent years and let's pinpoint this industrialization to a specific area—the Ohio Valley, an area stretching 1,000 miles from Pittsburgh to the Mississippi and say 50 miles on either side. The actual figures are startling and probably unprecedented in the industrial growth of any area in the economic history of the United States.

Since 1950 10 billion—yes, $10 billion—has been spent in industrial expansion including new plants and enlarged existing plants throughout this area. Ten billion dollars of private capital in the 1000-mile-long valley. In no other valley in the world, possibly in no other time in history has so much money—money is energy, materials, and people—been involved in so large a growth.

During the same period industrial investment in West Virginia has been more than $800 million. Eight hundred million has been expended by industry on new jobs in our State.

This probably brings several questions to your mind. Why has it happened? Will it continue?

Let me cite a few factors that are involved * * * the same factors that made Kaiser Aluminum decide to settle in West Virginia * * * then you may draw your own conclusions as to whether or not this growth and expansion will continue—whether or not in the next decades a comparable or even greater growth will occur.

The factors that we shall examine are those that dictate the location of virtually all industries:

Proximity of the largest market.

Advantageous geographical relations in product flow from sources of raw materials through finished goods.

Availability of inexpensive power in proximity to fuel sources.

Availability of labor on both a qualitative and quantitative basis.

Diversified types of transportation.

Availability of easily developed sites.

In all these respects, we will find that West Virginia is singularly blessed.

Let us consider first the factor of proximity to market. Within a 500-mile radius of where we are tonight exists the largest consumer market, the heaviest purchasing power, of any place in the world. The population concentrations of the eastern United States buy more goods of all kinds, consume more goods than any other area of comparable size in the world regardless of population.

Our own case is an excellent example. Within 500 miles—a few days delivery time—lies 70 percent of the total aluminum consuming market in the United States. Of the three basic products we fabricate in Ravenswood—aluminum plate, sheet, and foil—85 percent of the Nation's aluminum sheet market lies within that same magic circle.

Although the figures may differ, the same relative thing is true for almost all goods manufactured and consumed in the United States.

Now look at the geographical considerations in material flow. The elements making up this factor vary from industry to industry, but the same general rules apply to most industries because it is unusual to find the sources of raw materials located near markets.

In the case of aluminum, our source of ore, bauxite, is in Jamaica in the British West Indies. It takes more than four pounds of the ore to deliver one pound of finished product to the consumer—quite an exercise in logistics when you realize that in Ravenswood alone we hope to sell some 340-million pounds of our finished products each year.

But look how advantageous geographically, the material flow is from our standpoint. We ship the bauxite by deepwater vessel to Louisiana where on the banks of the Mississippi River at two locations we have facilities for extracting aluminum oxide from the bauxite, reducing the bulk in half in the process.

This semiprocessed material, aluminum oxide, or as we refer to it "alumina," is the raw material used in the electrolytic cells to produce the metallic aluminum at Ravenswood.

At present we are moving alumina to Ravenswood at the rate of 290 million pounds per year, and soon will double that rate. Ravenswood is linked to our Louisiana operations directly by both excellent mainline rail and navigable river, thus giving us a choice of economical means of transportation.

In our industry we not only pay the cost of raw material shipment but also the cost of the finished product to the customer. It is absolutely imperative then that we have the shortest possible routes to our markets.

West Virginia's portion of the Ohio Valley not only has a navigable river providing access to the north and south, but also is connected with crisscrossing rail and highway systems reaching every point in the magic market circle.

And now with the advent of the St. Lawrence Seaway and West Virginia's tie-in with the Federal Interstate System to the Great Lakes, a port of embarkation closer to Europe than the eastern seaboard is but a relatively few hours distant.

But equally important with the factors of market proximity and transporation is that of power—one of the most important raw materials not only in the aluminum industry but all of the electrometallurgical and electrochemical industries.

Tremendous amounts of power are required to produce aluminum. For example, to operate the reduction plant at Ravenswood our power contract with Ohio Power Co., a subsidiary of American Electric Power Co. calls for 450,000 kilowatts—the largest single private power contract ever negotiated—enough power to provide the needs of a city of more than 1 million population.

What is more important to West Virginia is that the power is all steam generated using coal as fuel. Each pound of product fabricated at Ravenswood represents approximately 10 pounds of coal.

Kaiser Aluminum's decision to lead the aluminum industry in the return to coal generated power is a most important clue to the future of West Virginia. Therefore, let us review the background in some detail.

Electrical power to produce aluminum prior to this decision primarily came from two sources—hydroelectric generation and natural gas.

Until 1948 all aluminum in this country was produced with hydroelectric power, except for some World War II emergency production and one plant in Arkansas.

Before 1940 there was no aluminum production west of the Mississippi River, but the Northwest had huge resources of surplus hydro from such dams as Bonneville and Grand Coulee, plus many favorable undeveloped sites on the Columbia River and its many tributaries.

The first aluminum plant in the Northwest was built at Vancouver, Wash., in 1940. The following year another was built in Longview. In rapid succession three more were built, utilizing the available power to supply critically needed metal for the arms of war. By 1944 the Northwest was producing nearly 50 percent of the total production in the United States.

Expansion of the aluminum industry in the Northwest continued until 1950 when gradually unexpected increases in power demand for home and commercial use, water shortages and slowing of the Columbia River development prevented allocation of further blocks of energy to the industry.

Rising construction costs and difficult financing added to the problems of hydroelectrical development—the industry turned to natural gas in the Southern Gulf States. In 5 years more than one-third of the electrical power used in aluminum production was derived from natural gas.

While gas helped fill the gap between 1950 and 1955, it could not be depended upon for long-range plans of the industry. Its increasing rates indicated it would not be able to remain competitive with coal. The widespread extension of transmission lines also required commitments of large gas reserves for long periods of time.

To gird itself for the almost unlimited horizons in the market for aluminum the industry has been forced to conclude that if there is to be expansion there is only one way to turn—to coal.

Fortunately, coal-based electrical power was ready for the challenge. The advance in the art in design of steamplants has shown such remarkable improvement that it is now possible in the most modern plants to generate 1 kilowatt-hour of electricity from as little as six-tenths of a pound of coal. Through outdoor-type construction, larger generating units, improved combustion, and through the very force of load growth itself the cost of electrical power production in steam-generating plants is following a constantly downward trend.

Reserves of coal have also been reappraised. According to the U.S. Geological Survey of 1950 more than 95 percent of the Nation's recoverable coal still lies in reserve. On the basis of the average annual rate of production in the past 10 years there is enough recoverable coal (50 percent of the total know reserves) to last this Nation for at least another 1,600 years.

In addition to these advantages from the standpoint of fuel costs, remember that the raw material—aluminum oxide—is shipped 3,000 miles from Louisiana, and the finished products shipped east more than 2,000 miles to compete in the magic market circle—all at the producer's expense.

Of course the Ohio Valley's steam power is approximately twice the cost per kilowatt-hour of hydroelectric power, but the reductions in material shipping costs effectively compensate for the difference.

Turn for a moment now to the factor of labor. The picture is equally promising. Again using Ravenswood as an example, we have had more than 80,000 applications for employment. At present we employ some

2,400 persons and we are in an expanding situation.

Our prelocation studies indicated that West Virginia was a surplus labor area, and talks with existing industry in the State at the same time indicated the adaptability of this labor force. We therefore decided to relocate only supervisors and train our own labor force. As you know the aluminum industry is a new one to the area.

There are two interesting points in this connection:

1. Adaptability of the labor force met our most optimistic expectations. We have been highly delighted with the efficiency, and ability of our 90 percent West Virginian work force to learn the relatively complex skills of our operations.

After more than 2 years of operations of portions of our plant, production superintendents report the recently trained mill and equipment operators—most of whom had never seen the inside of an aluminum fabricating facility—within months ran the costly equipment with the skill of 10-year men.

2. We found that many of those West Virginians who had left the State over a period of years to become substantial portions of the labor forces of such great industrial centers as Detroit, Akron, etc., still had their roots in West Virginia and were anxious to return.

In other words, this provides not only a labor pool in the State, but permits drawing on a very vast pool of industrially oriented workers from a wide area. This out-of-State pool consists of not transients but persons wanting to come home. Testimonial to the stability of the work force is the extremely low rate of turnover and absenteeism we have experienced.

One last factor, then, is the availability of sites. Our own site, for example, consists of some 3,000 acres of what was formerly farmland. Better than 2,000 acres is above flood and ideal for future industrial development. Within a few miles of our location lie a score of ideal industrial sites ranging in size from a few hundred to several thousand acres.

There is a trend today in industry to purchase larger and larger sites. Along the Ohio River, the Kanawha, and other tributaries there are literally hundreds of these fine industrial locations—locations in the center of the world's largest market, the center of a vast network of power systems extending from the Great Lakes to the Carolinas, the center of a lacelike network of all the major forms of transportation—the center of a large labor pool. If one believes in the continued economic growth of our Nation, there can be no doubt as to West Virginia's role in that future growth.

Twenty-fifth Anniversary of Federal Housing Agency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1959

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the 25th anniversary of the founding of the Federal Housing Agency was recently celebrated in my home city of Springfield, Mass.

The notable event was sponsored jointly by the Greater Springfield Home Builders Association, the Springfield Board of Realtors, and the Western Massachusetts Society of Residential Appraisers.

General Counsel Graham W. McGowan of the Federal Housing Administration was the principal speaker at the May 11 banquets.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include Mr. McGowan's remarks, as follows:

FHA ROLE IN HOUSING IN 1959

(Remarks by Graham W. McGowan, General Counsel, Federal Housing Administration, before the Home Builders of Springfield, Mass., May 11, 1959)

Twenty-five years is not a long time, as history goes. But a lot of history was written in the last 25 years. America ran the gamuts of war and peace, of depression and prosperity, of uncertainty and security.

In short, America crowded what ordinarily might have been the experience of centuries into a short 25 years.

Yet, despite the many events that intervened, many of us still remember 1934 very clearly.

It was a year that was filled with events which were to change many of our lives and our ways of thinking.

The world was inalterably following a path that was to lead to the greatest conflict ever experienced by man.

The Nazis killed Chancellor Dollfus of Austria that year as Hitler began to move in Europe.

Mussolini was preparing to invade Ethiopia.

The Japanese already were in Manchuria.

These were the early warnings of World War II.

In 1934 the depression was at its depth. Drough had hit the Middle West hard and farmers were abandoning their land to the elements.

The Nation's big dust bowl was born and billowing clouds of dust were blotting out the sun for days at a time in many parts of the country.

Those were the days, too, when billowing clouds of foreclosures were blotting out the mortgage market and home ownership throughout the Nation.

Foreclosures reached an all-time high of 252,000 during 1933, and housing starts had dropped to a mere 93,000 annually.

Mortgage money was frozen. The housing industry was flat on its face.

Properties were falling apart for lack of money to pay for repairs.

Millions of construction workers were unemployed because there was nothing to build. Total unemployment stood at 11 million persons.

This was 1934. Most of you can well recall the times. This was when, 25 years ago, Congress passed the National Housing Act, which created the Federal Housing Administration. It was signed into law on June 27 of that year.

FHA was established to insure the loans that private lenders would make to prospective homeowners, and further, to insure loans for repairs and modernization of our then rapidly deteriorating housing inventory.

Today, the concepts embodied in the National Housing Act of 1934, namely making it possible for Americans to purchase homes with a minimum downpayment and low monthly payments, are established practices in home financing.

This Government program of mortgage insurance sparked a revolution in American housing. This new concept led the way to large volume homebuilding and a healthy housing industry. It has brought opportunities for homeownership to over 50 percent of our American families so far, and the percentage continues to increase. It has brought about better construction methods and property standards, sounder financing, scientific appraisal and credit rating methods, more accurate analyses of housing markets and increased reserch in building techniques.

I think most of us will agree that FHA's program of mortgage insurance has been the cornerstone of this revitalized industry. That it succeeded is attested by history—by the fact that time and again the housing industry has shown itself to be one of the most dynamic and stable segments of our country's economy. Last year when recession was the news of the day, our housing industry continued strong. Today, with our economy again showing a noticeable trend upward, our housing industry is leading the way.

This is what FHA and the housing industry, working together, have accomplished.

In summing up these accomplishments, I should like to emphasize that the FHA is entirely self-supporting. Not 1 cent of Government money goes into any part of FHA's operation. In the early days of operation, the Treasury Department advanced a total of $65½ million to pay expenses and to establish FHA insurance funds. These advances were repaid to the Treasury in the fiscal year of 1954, together with interest amounting to $20.4 million.

I might suggest that there is much to be learned from the benefits which have accrued from this type of partnership between Government and private industry.

These accomplishments are of the past. What will we able to say about FHA 25 years from now? How can this partnership create still more home ownership and still better housing for all Americans?

This is a great challenge to the Federal Housing Administration.

Well, I know how not to accomplish it. One way would be for FHA to become a bureaucracy so entangled in redtape that our customers would give up in disgust. Another way would be for private industry to think it could rest on its laurels—or look to the Government to solve every passing problem with which you may be confronted from time to time.

But so much for the negative. To find the positive, I like to look back to 1934, and appreciate the fresh imaginative thinking which was being done in FHA at that time. Nothing was borrowed or borrowable from the past. This was a new program, carved out of new ideas and new concepts.

I like to look back to 1934 because I have found the same feeling among FHA's present 7,000 employees. Even after 25 years, during which time our programs have become well established and enthusiastically accepted by industry and the public, FHA is still staffed with employees who have that same fresh, imaginative approach; employees dedicated to better housing for all Americans

A good example of this imaginative approach, I think, is the administration's proposed trade-in housing program.

This legislation, if enacted, will make it easier for a prospective home buyer to trade in his present home on another which better suits his needs. This program is important to the housing industry because it provides greater flexibility in dealing with trade-ins.

To state the case more simply, FHA hopes to be in a position to make long-term financing available to a realtor or builder on the same liberal terms that are now available to an owner-occupant. It will permit the homeowner to use his equity as an immediate downpayment on another home without having to wait until the trade-in house is actually sold. I hope Congress enacts this legislation for it will benefit all concerned.

It will benefit:

1. The homeowner who needs the cash out of his present home for the downpayment on another home.

2. The real estate broker and the builder who cannot afford to have their money tied

up for long periods of time on trade-ins, and

3. It will benefit the lender because he will now have a Government-insured loan on the most favorable terms during this interim period.

In fact, I hope to see the day when Americans can trade in a house just as easily as we now trade in automobiles. And the closer we come to this goal, the closer we'll come to meeting America's changing and growing housing needs.

FHA knows it has contributed much toward meeting America's housing needs, in 25 years. Today, three out of every five American families own their own homes, due largely to FHA's 203 program which insures mortgages on one- to four-family homes. This program has worked well during those 25 years and could be expected to continue to work well without anyone worrying very much about it. But we in FHA know that this is not enough.

For instance, we have found that there are sections of the country where the benefits of the 203 program are not readily available. Something needed to be done, and we're doing it. We recently launched the certified agency program.

The certified agency program works very simply. FHA certifies qualified lending institutions as its authorized agents in smaller communities that are some distance from FHA insuring offices. These agents act as FHA representatives and have full authority to issue FHA commitments to insure 203 mortgages. Industry people are used as fee appraisers and fee inspectors.

The certified agency program is an excellent example of how FHA constantly reexamines and reappraises its programs—always seeking to extend the benefits of its programs to more and more American families.

Now I want to get into something that I know is very much in the minds of many of you in the housing industry. That is FHA's program for urban renewal and relocation housing—our 220 and 221 programs.

At the outset, I think I should point out to you that the concepts embodied in these two programs are not much different than those in FHA programs that have been proven over the past 25 years. There is no Government money involved in FHA's urban renewal and relocation programs.

Just as in our 203 home ownership and 207 rental housing programs, we provide mortgage insurance for 220 and 221 projects. Private industry does the rest. Private builders do the work, private capital finances the projects.

There has been, I think, considerable misunderstanding on this point. These are not public housing programs. FHA is not in the public housing business.

FHA sections 220 and 221 are specifically intended to provide financing assistance for existing as well as new properties through insurance of mortgages on a range of housing that includes multifamily rental and single-family sales housing.

Rehabilitation of existing dwelling units, when practicable and economically feasible, is receiving special attention.

Another example of the fresh, imaginative approach that has been typical of FHA during its first 25 years, is our master commitment program.

This is a plan that enables homebuilders to use a single FHA commitment for a variety of houses based on a basic design. Under this program, builders will learn in advance how FHA valuations will be affected by additions or deletions in the basic house design.

This will mean more flexibility for the builder and for real estate brokers handling new homes because you will now be able to tell prospective buyers exactly how much each addition to the basic house will cost.

This, I think, is real evidence that FHA continually reexamines its programs and procedures to keep them up to date.

FHA is always sensitive to the changing conditions in the housing field and through continuous reexamination of our programs we find new ways of doing things and new things to be done.

For instance, FHA is now pioneering in housing for the elderly. This is an urgent market.

The population of people over 60 has increased greatly since FHA was first established. So have the needs of these people. Most of them do not want, nor do they think they should be required, to live with their children, as families have done in the past. Many millions of them want to enjoy the dignity of living independently in housing accommodations they can afford and which meet their needs.

FHA is offering a sound mortgage insurance program which is available in both large and small communities.

Most of you are now quite familiar, I am sure, with FHA's new minimum property standards. They became effective last month throughout the Nation on an optional basis, and will become mandatory July 1.

These new standards are the result of 3 years of hard work by the FHA staff and you people in the industry. They represent a recodification of 23 sets of the old minimum property requirements that previously had been used.

FHA's minimum property standards are America's first nationwide building code, aimed at providing better homes through uniform standards. They are a real protection to the American home buyer and provide uniform guidelines for homebuilders.

I would like to discuss with you for a minute or two still another FHA program which some people, I think, have misunderstood. That is armed services housing. We call it "Capehart housing." A good many of these units have been constructed at military bases in Massachusetts and others are being planned.

In this program, FHA cooperates with the Department of Defense in providing the type of housing at our military installations that will make our career officers and enlisted men want to stay in the armed services. This is an extremely important part of our national defense, and is of even more importance when we consider that the training of some of these highly skilled men costs this country about $300,000 per person.

The military, and for that matter the entire country, simply cannot afford to lose these people.

The Assistant Secretary of the Army remarked recently:

"Despite all the wonderful advances that have been made in weapon development and better organization and cooperation throughout our Armed Forces, in my opinion, there has been no progress of more long-range value to the overall strength of this country than the long overdue provision of attractive housing for our enlisted men and officers."

It has been estimated that the drop in turnover among the military services as a direct result of better housing has saved the American taxpayers something over $1 billion.

FHA is proud of the part it has played and is playing in this vital field of housing on behalf of the national defense and honestly believes that this program has been so carefully administered as to have had no appreciable effect on the private market.

And now, my friends, by way of concluding this talk—and it is out of consideration for you rather than myself that I don't make it longer—let me stress these points in closing:

1. As I have already told you, FHA is entirely self-supporting. Those people who use FHA pay for its operation through their insurance premiums.

2. FHA has written about $55 billion in mortgage and loan insurance since it was established in 1934 and now has $26 billion of mortgage insurance outstanding.

3. FHA now has $700 million in reserves which in our judgment is adequate to withstand the most serious economic reversal which can reasonably be expected.

4. While accomplishing all of this remember: FHA has helped make the housing industry one of the strongest and most stable pillar in our country's economy; and more Americans own their homes today than ever before in history.

This is FHA—FHA 25 years ago; FHA today. This is FHA's role in housing in 1959.

A partnership—Government and industry—working together toward the mutual goal of "Better housing for all America."

H.R. 3

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMER H. BUDGE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1959

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert the following letter which was received from Charles B. Shuman, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, and which, I believe, appropriately calls attention to the need for legislation such as H.R. 3:

AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
Washington, D.C., May 19, 1959.

Hon. HAMER H. BUDGE,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BUDGE: The American Farm Bureau Federation respectfully recommends your favorable consideration of H.R. 3.

The major argument against the bill is that an element of uncertainty would be created with respect to the interpretation of certain Federal statutes where experience has indicated or may indicate that concurrent jurisdiction of State and Federal law is not desirable.

This, however, is something that can be readily and quickly remedied by Congress by the amendment of substantive legislation to define more specifically the relative scope of State and Federal law. (For example, by the time the Congress completes consideration of labor reform legislation, the dividing line between State and Federal au-

thority in this field may have been established with reasonable certainty.)

On the other hand, if H.R. 3 is not enacted, there seems to be no way to clear up the existing uncertainty with respect to literally hundreds of State laws. In view of the extent to which the doctrine of Federal preemption has been applied, the validity of such laws is jeopardized.

The principle that State laws not in conflict with Federal laws remain valid is a traditional and historical concept of our Federal system, which has been subordinated in recent years to the doctrine of Federal preemption.

This bill has been referred to as a "bill to curb the courts." We do not believe it is or should be so considered. It is no more than a rule of construction to be applied by the courts to indicate they should not infer an intent that a Federal law is preclusive unless the Congress says so.

It is our view that if State governments are to continue to have significant authority to enact laws to serve or protect their citizens, if State law is to continue to be a fundamental part of our Federal system, if State sovereignty is not to be swamped by Federal sovereignty—then H.R. 3 should be approved.

May we express our appreciation for your consideration of these views.

Very sincerely,

CHARLES B. SHUMAN,
President.

Berlin—Reunification of Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JEFFERY COHELAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 18, 1959

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, in our continuing discussion of the situation in Berlin and in Germany we must constantly return to the long-range view and the question of ultimate reunification of this divided country. Our current efforts to lessen existing tensions cannot be taken out of that perspective. In his most recent article, C. L. Sulzberger of the New York Times points out that there is at least room for confusion about the long-range goal of the Allies. I wish to submit Mr. Sulzberger's article for the RECORD and may I call attention, in doing so, to his comment that there are economic reasons for the Soviets to oppose reunification because East Germany has become an industrial satellite important to the Soviet 7-year plan.

The article follows:

BERLIN—THE FLOWER IN THE CRANNIED WALL

(By C. L. Sulzberger)

GENEVA, May 19.—Khrushchev may hope to discover at this Geneva conference how far the United States is prepared to go on any deal dividing the world into political spheres of influence. Indeed, diplomats presume he might suggest this kind of deal to Eisenhower when he finally meets the President at the summit.

No doubt the Russians are confused about our attitude on such cynical if practical arrangements. When the Berlin blockade was ended by the Jessup-Malik agreement 10 years ago, Moscow understood that accord as implicitly accepting Europe's partition into Soviet and American zones. The Kremlin interpreted our passivity during the East German, Polish, and Hungarian uprisings as confirmation of its view.

For this reason Russia has never been firmly convinced of our desire to reunify Germany, especially when we refuse even to discuss that country's neutrality as a purchase price. Obviously, the removal of the East Germans from the Communist bloc would be a repudiation of what the Kremlin sees as a tacit pact of 1949.

Khrushchev considers German unification impossible for a long time to come. He needs his East German satellite's industrial contribution to the Soviet 7-year plan and he still fears installation of a non-Communist state on the borders of Poland and Czechoslovakia.

THE FRENCH AND BRITISH VIEWS

Furthermore, even if he has doubts about our own desires to reunite Germany, he has fewer doubts about France and Britain. The French talk about German unity but they imply willingness to divide Europe by accepting the Oder-Neisse line as a legal border between Germany and Poland. And the British are not only prepared to accept that frontier; they have given rich hints they are not opposed to a partition arrangement ratifying the Continent's existing ideological division.

Thus Khrushchev can detect lack of harmony in the allied approach. He does not realize that American diplomatic habits and internal political realities make it impossible for us to carve up the map. Not quite sure of our views and suspecting differences between ourselves and our partners, he clearly wishes to probe at this Geneva meeting for the basis of this kind of understanding.

If he cannot get a formula juridically recognizing Europe's division, he would at least like to ascertain what we might be prepared to give for sacrifices on his part. He knows that even Dulles once argued that German unification should be given a higher priority than West German rearmament. Gromyko will surely inquire whether we might agree to a reunited Germany's military neutralization.

But we cannot even toy with this idea. We support a Bonn Government which has maintained electoral strength by distinctly non-neutral support of NATO. We feel if we deserted Adenauer he would eventually be replaced by a coalition ready to make terms with Moscow at our expense.

A NEUTRALIST CHAIN REACTION

Furthermore, if the idea of German neutralization spread through Europe, we would not only weaken our military position at its most vital sector but might find other countries seeking a similar escape: Norway, Denmark, Italy and even France. A neutralist chain reaction, once begun in Germany, could spread to the English Channel.

We must insist on German reunification as a policy. And we cannot afford to pay for such unification in terms of German neutrality. Khrushchev will therefore discover that the United States is committed to its present European policy. This continues to demand German unity even if it remains no more possible than Korean unity.

For Moscow, German unity on any other terms than German neutrality is inadmissible. For Washington, any formal recognition of Soviet control in Eastern Europe, including East Germany, is equally inadmissible. And to end such control by risking the vigor of our principal alliance is even more inadmissible.

One can compare the current negotiation, started over Berlin, to Tennyson's famous poem, "Flower in the Crannied Wall." Berlin is the flower through which the poet, or diplomat, can envision the world. "I hold you here, root and all, in my hand," said Tennyson of the flower, and say the ministers of Berlin, "but if I could understand what you are, root and all, and all in all, I should know what God and man is."

The Realities of Cotton Economics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLAN HAGEN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 20, 1959

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I submit for the consideration of the Members the following article on Mexican cotton planting which appeared in the May 17 issue of the Fresno Bee:

DRASTIC CUT IS REPORTED IN MEXICAN COTTON PLANTING

(By Alva Senzek)

MEXICO CITY.—California cottongrowers will face substantially reduced competition from Mexico on the international market when the crops are harvested next fall, if the current trend toward reduced acreage continues here.

Preliminary figures which started coming in to Mexican agricultural officials here 2 weeks ago indicate that planting is off by as much as 66 percent in some areas, and that it is down nearly 20 percent to date for the country as a whole.

MAY BE HIGHER

Experts predict that by the time the spring planning season ends, the drop may be as high as 35 percent.

In the Mexicali area, a southerly continuation of the Imperial Valley, acreage is down 26 percent so far, from 475,000 to 350,000 acres. Near La Paz, Lower California, the drop has been 60.9 percent, or from 27,500 acres of 10,750.

The hardest hit area has been the Yaqui Valley, Mexico's second largest producing center in the states of Sinaloa and Sonora. There bad weather and a bad crop last year have made it impossible for farmers to pay off last year's loans and, as a result, to obtain new ones. Acreage for the area was down from 582,000 to 335,000.

SHORTAGE OF CREDIT

The down turn has been attributed both to a shortage of bank credit and to apprehension over the possibility of higher subsidies for American growers, which would enable the latter group to undercut Mexican prices on the world market.

Mexican growers are particularly sensitive to fluctuations in the international market since all but a small portion of their crop is grown for export. They sold only 14,000 bales of specialty fibers in the United States for domestic consumption last year, but marketed a large portion of their crop on U.S. exchanges or through U.S. buyers for overseas use.

Mexico was the third largest cotton producing country in the free world last year, producing a record 2,300,000 bales. Buyers expect this year's crop to be a third smaller, or 1,500,000 bales. Acreage is expected to drop from 2,450,000 to 1,975,000.

OFFICIALS DISMAYED

Government officials here have expressed unanimous dismay at the downward trend and have called attention to possible foreign trade complications which the country may face during the coming months. Cotton is Mexico's most important export commodity, making up 40 percent of its foreign trade balance.

Some industry and Government leaders here are blaming the slump on U.S. price support policies which, they say, are taking away the profit incentive from Mexican growers. An equally large group, however, holds the view that Mexico is caught between its own hand-to-mouth tradition of financing its cotton industry and an international

picture in which production is up and demand down everywhere.

Mexican growers do not make a policy of limiting their acreage to what they themselves can finance and, as a result, annually require 1,600 million pesos ($128 million) in credit.

FUNDS NOT AVAILABLE

About 80 percent of this money comes from foreign cotton buying firms which have officials in Mexico, and from private banks. Both types of business naturally are more reluctant than the Government to underwrite marginal farming operations in the face of a possible bad year, with the result that many farmers are currently unable to get funds for seed.

Conservatism is more the policy than ever with the financing firms this year, since there are more than 500,000 bales of cotton as yet unsold within the country. Most of this surplus—in ordinary times no problem for the Mexicans to dispose of—is in the hands of the underwriting firms, not the growers.

The Mexican Government has made an effort to help in the current situation by, 1. Extending extra bank credits to some areas; 2. Lowering the export tax on cotton slightly, and 3. Buying up some surplus cotton on a price support basis. However, most industry leaders agree the help was too little and too late.

IRON CURTAIN PRODUCTION

Mexico's cotton industry also has been affected of late by the entry of the Iron Curtain countries into the ranks of major cotton-producing countries.

Until very recently Japan, for example, bought up 25 percent of the Mexican production each year. Now Japan is cutting back on Mexican orders and reportedly is planning purchases from Communist China. Russian trade missions also have been active in European and South American countries which previously had been good customers of the Mexicans.

A breakdown of the acreage estimates, showing the change in each major producing area, follows:

Matamoros, 800,000 acres in 1958, 700,000 in 1959; Nuevo Leon, 50,000 and 32,575; La-Laguna (Torreon), 225,000 and 300,000; Delicias, 175,000 and 128,250; Juarez, 60,000 and 69,375; Sinaloa, 192,500 and 110,000; Navajoa, 75,000 and 25,000; Ciudad Obregon, 185,000 and 125,000; Hermosillo, 80,000 and 50,000; Caborca, 50,000 and 25,000; Mexicali, 475,000 and 350,000; La Paz, 27,500 and 10,750; others 55,000 and 50,000.

Mr. Speaker, the foregoing article makes several significant points with respect to the direction our cotton program should take. The first significant point is that Mexican cotton production will be radically smaller—and competition for American cotton, therefore, substantially less—because, among other reasons, American cotton is being sold abroad for a lower price, albeit a Government-subsidized lower price. This information would seem to prove the proposition that a lowering of the price of American cotton will permanently increase its market.

A further reason given for the slump in Mexican production is the unavailability of crop financing. This reason is not really a second reason but rather an aspect of our lower pricing policy. Heretofore our high pricing policies have held an umbrella over foreign cotton and synthetic production which justified the utmost flow of finance capital into that production with little or no risk of loss. The removal of that umbrella makes such capital cautious.

I next invite the attention of my colleagues to a second article appearing in the Fresno Bee on date of May 17, 1959:

ACALA 4–42 WINS PRAISE OF OFFICIAL

BAKERSFIELD, KERN COUNTY.—John Turner, the director of the U.S. Department of Agriculture Cotton Experiment Station at Shafter, says Acala 4–42 cotton is a cotton seed developed by and for the California cotton industry.

"The seed bred by the USDA for the California cottongrower and increased and distributed by the California Planting Cotton Seed Distributors, has developed more special features for production on California farms and ranches than any other variety of cotton."

Turner said Acala 4–42 is bred at Shafter, without thought of profit to any seed breeder, individual, or organization. "The only function," he declared, "is to breed the best cotton for this valley and its growers so that they may obtain a cotton which is high yielding, of uniform fiber and strength, and one which has better spinning qualities than any other cotton.

"Acala 4–42 is wilt resistant and is bred for 1 1/16-inch to 1 3/32-inch staple, which has a wider and more general use than cottons of longer or shorter staple."

Turner conducted several tests last year with competing cotton varieties and found Acala 4–42 produced more pounds of lint cotton an acre than three other specially bred cottons. Acala 4–42 produced 1,307.3 pounds lint cotton per acre; Arizona A–44 produced 1,201.1 pounds; New Mexico A–1517 produced 1,112.6 pounds, and Mississippi Delta Pine variety produced 1,170.1 pounds.

Mr. Speaker, this article reflects the fact that by private endeavor and State law California cottongrowers universally produce a wilt-resistant cotton, the fiber of which measures from 1 1/16 inches to 1 3/32 inches, a staple which has a wider and more general use than cottons of longer or shorter staple.

The import of these facts is that without the help of ridiculously high price supports an intelligent group of cottongrowers can improve the quality of their product, its salability, and their net economic return.

Unhallowed Ground at Gettysburg?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 21, 1959

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, once more the Washington Post has spoken out in defense of Gettysburg Battlefield as a national historical shrine and its preservation in a fitting manner. I can only hope that the Senate, and ultimately the House, will become as interested in our heritage as the editorial writers of the Nation's press. I can only wish that the Senators will read all of the editorials on the matter and see the mail that is coming to Capitol Hill on the subject. May I commend this morning's editorial from the Washington Post to the Senators. It follows:

UNHALLOWED GROUND?

Unless the Senate acts quickly, the site of the most important battle of the Civil War may be irrevocably opened to commercial spoliation. As it is, the slopes of Gettysburg are already partly defaced by a clutter of souvenir stands, gas stations, auto junkyards and motels. Only 100 yards from the cemetery where Lincoln gave his matchless address an industrial plant may rise on land owned by a steel corporation. A way exists to halt further encroachments. The Senate Appropriations Subcommittee can restore $750,000 pared by the House from the National Park Service budget. This is the sum needed to purchase about 425 acres at the battlefield now in private hands, land which otherwise may soon be encrusted with split-level ramblers and outdoor barbecues. Of course it is beyond mortal powers to consecrate and to hallow Gettysburg's ground. But surely the country has a right to expect that Congress will protect these honored dead from the indignity of this kind of mortal invasion.

So, Batista Has a Hart After All

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 18, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following column, "Notes From Washington," by Ron W. May, Washington correspondent for the Capital Times, of Madison, Wis., for Monday, May 18, 1959—certain references to Members of Congress have been deleted and supplied material is indicated by the use of brackets:

WASHINGTON.—The powerful influence of ousted Cuban Dictator Batista was felt last week in the U.S. Congress.

A special showing of a film denouncing Rebel Leader Fidel Castro was held in the chambers of the House Foreign Affairs Committee. Castro, of course, is the bearded ex-law student who forced Batista to flee to the Dominican Republic last New Year's Eve.

[Seven] Congressmen, with office aids, attended the showing.

How was the program arranged? [One of the Congressmen] said that he understood it was arranged by a Columbia Broadcasting System official named Ed Hart. He had met Hart a number of times recently, he said.

[He] was right that Hart had done the arranging, but not that Hart is a CBS official. He is, in fact, a paid agent of the Batista family trying to put the exile back into the presidential palace in Havana, or, failing that, to obtain for him a visa to live in the United States, where his wife and family now reside.

Last week Hart filed a report with the Foreign Agents Registration Office of the Department of Justice. He said he had received $5,000 from Batista for the following mission:

"To seek the right of asylum for Senor Batista and to correct misstatements of facts and misinformation concerning him; to reunite the Batista family in Daytona Beach, Fla."

In pursuit of these aims he had held "informal conversations with members of the press, radio, and television, Congressmen, Senators, and political figures," and had

written a series of "questions unanswered by Castro" that had been inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, although he didn't say by whom.

This column received a call from Hart shortly after the film was shown suggesting that [several Congressmen] would have statements to make about the show.

But Hart refused to identify himself other than to claim he had met this writer about 5 years ago at a Washington gathering. * * * The film shown to the Congressmen was televised nationally by CBS 2 weeks ago, and immediately aroused strong criticism. It was answered on the network last Sunday by Representative CHARLES PORTER, Democrat, of Oregon, and others.

The film, titled "Is Cuba Going Red?" was produced by Stuart Novins. It stated that "What is emerging (in Cuba), in the opinion of Western diplomatic sources, is the best organized Communist apparatus in the Caribbean." It also said that "This Cuban island is today a totalitarian dictatorship."

There was only one mention of the Batista regime, which, top U.S. newsmen have written, murdered [20,000] opponents. This mention merely termed the Batista government "corrupt."

Communists are active in Cuba, according to informed persons, who also say they gained their foothold under the brutal Batista regime. But few objective experts believe the Communists have the upper hand, although they do say that unfair criticism of Castro and his administration by U.S. television and newspapers may help the Reds. * * *

Ever since Milton Eisenhower condemned the friendliness to Latin dictators shown by the administration of his brother, Dwight, this column has been interested.

This interest was boosted by the strong praise of Dictator Rafael Trujillo, of the Dominican Republic, voiced by Representative GARDNER WITHROW (Republican, La Crosse). WITHROW even told the Dominican Congress that if Trujillo had been born in the United States he would be President instead of Ike.

Last year it was discovered that the President's brother-in-law, Gordon Moore, had risen from modest circumstances to riches since 1953, partly through the help of Trujillo. Among other things, Trujillo made Moore an officer of a Dominican shipyard.

Last week an equally startling development was discovered by this column. President Eisenhower's new special legal adviser, David Kendall, was a paid agent for Trujillo when he accepted the White House post.

Furthermore, information has reached the Capital Times that Trujillo, through U.S. agents, has bought a number of Midwestern canning factories, including, possibly, one in southern Wisconsin. The information comes from a Nebraska politician who turned down an offer to scout out good buys in such plants in the Midwest.

Foreign Aid Waste

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 22, 1959

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Foreign Aid Waste Calls for Closer Look by United States," published in the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette of May 13, 1959.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOREIGN AID WASTE CALLS FOR CLOSER LOOK BY UNITED STATES

Our foreign economic and military aid to both neutral and anti-Communist nations has been an indispensable tool to implement our foreign policy in checking the tide of international communism.

It has done many sensible things, and it deserves continued support in the years ahead with more emphasis on economic programs.

In fact, former President Truman urges that we should set up a bigger program on a longer basis, instead of cutting it.

On the other hand, our aid program in the absence of realistic planning, wise spending and vigilant supervision has done many foolish things.

As we continue to spend $4 billion every year in 70 countries, needs to police this giant worldwide program are becoming increasingly evident.

Only several months ago, a congressional probe exposed incredible waste in our foreign aid project in a more or less improbable country called Laos which we are committed to build up as a bulwark against communism.

Investigation brought up:

More than five-sixths of the $135 million we have spent there had gone to support an army which couldn't fight.

To beef up this private army we have flooded this primitive country with money and goods it couldn't possibly absorb.

As a result of this stupid policy, corruption and fraudulent currency exchanges openly flourished, thus helping the Communists win a national election with their anticorruption slogans.

Now comes another sample from Laos' sister republic, South Vietnam, which compels us to wonder if Vietnamese bureaucrats are catching up fast with a familiar American practice called "boondoggling"—at the expense of American taxpayers.

The other day we received, among a usual pile of handouts, a bundle of slick magazines—four printed in English and four duplicates in French—from Saigon, Vietnam.

These expensive propaganda publications inevitably draw a rosy picture of military and economic programs in that country with an annual gift of almost $200 million from Uncle Sam.

But then we can't help giving out an exasperated cry: Do these Vietnamese officials want us to read the French version?

Is this an apparent oversight on the part of American-dollar-loaded native bureaucrats too zealous in their anxious efforts to persuade American opinion makers for "more and more dollars"?

Or is this just a sheer Asiatic imitation of our inept policy in Washington?

In either instance, it would be the American taxpayers who have to foot the bills.

Chances are that handouts of this nature are reaching thousands of newspaper offices in this country in an ever-increasing flow only to be thrown into the wastebasket.

When you add up all the expenses for this nonsensical waste, it would certainly amount to a fortune—big enough to feed thousands of hungry Vietnam refugees for a year.

It would be bad enough if the money were merely being wasted, but when it comes to "smothering" us with this sort of exasperation, things are getting downright ridiculous.

We believe it's time for Congress to step up policing, so American taxpayers are kept informed of how their money is spent for what.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer, plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Raymond F. Noyes is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

White House Conference on the World Refugee Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 25, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include an address made by my able and distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] on May 21, 1959, at the White House Conference on the World Refugee Year:

WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON THE WORLD REFUGEE YEAR

Ladies and gentlemen, you will forgive me, I hope, for dispensing with niceties and generalities which the occasion and the setting of this meeting may call for. Instead, I shall take the liberty of submitting to you frankly a few thoughts and a few facts.

My legislative experience in the field of immigration, displaced persons and refugees extends now over a period of some 14 years beginning immediately after World War II. This experience, as well as my modest participation in some international activities related to that field, has taught me that there are several ways of approaching the refugee problem.

First, there is the emotional approach. It usually generates more compassion than action.

Next, there is the oratorical approach producing, by definition, words rather than deeds.

Then, there is the combination of the two aproaches, resulting in the game of numbers and developing into a sort of auction reflected in some recently introduced legislation. Yes, amateurish surveys coupled with the desire to attract public attention, have resulted in the appearance of legislative proposals replete with unrealistic numbers of refugees allegedly desiring to enter this country, numbers bearing little, if any, relation to facts and figures assembled by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees and the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration. In my opinion, it is the emotional approach to the refugee problem, combined with oratorical efforts, which is responsible for the appearance of those unrealistic figures. Having presided over two recent international meetings devoted to the discussion of the refugee problem, I found myself on the receiving end—so to speak—of overzealousness and it is, probably, that experience which makes me a cold realist.

As I look around this hall, I see many people with whom I have cooperated both in this country and abroad in finding ways and means to alleviate the plight of refugees. Thus, addressing this particular gathering, I feel that I may be permitted to urge you not to use either the emotional nor the oratorical concept in your deliberations, as well as to avoid the pitfalls and the futility of the numbers' auction. I know that most of you assembled in this room are able, qualified, and equipped with sufficient experience to approach the problem realistically.

What I have in mind in the first place, is to invite you not to think and plan in terms of what some like to call a definite and a final solution of the refugee problem.

No such solution is possible as long as we live in a world divided between the free and the enslaved.

No such solution is possible as long as freedom and economic opportunities beckon from the free lands to human beings oppressed by tyrannical regimes regardless of the name under which they function.

No "crash programs," no "speed-ups," no "mop-up operations" will wipe out the refugee problem as long as conditions generating that problem continue to exist.

I do not say these things for home consumption only. A few weeks ago, when I had the honor of presiding over a special session of the Council of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration in Geneva, I indicated to the representatives of the many nations gathered around the table that the World Refugee Year should should not be misconstrued to be a "mop-up" operation.

In my opinion, no such "one shot" operation is conceivable. Realistic thinking and realistic planning require the awareness that, as long as there is tyranny, misery, slavery and oppression, there will always be human beings who will decide to pull out their stakes and leave their homelands, seeking freedom and economic opportunities abroad.

Sometimes the influx of refugees into the free world is but a trickle. Sometimes it is a mass exodus like the one we witnessed during and after the Hungarian revolution of 1956. But certainly, not even an armistice in the cold war, an armistice based on the fallacy of coexistence of the incompatible—a fallacy of coexistence of slavery and freedom—not even such an armistice will stop the drive of people out from the lands where Orwell's nightmare has become a reality.

With that in mind, I have endeavored to equip the United States with a long-range legal instrumentality which—if wisely used—could contribute to the resettlement of refugees and become an important factor in the widening of international cooperation and partnership of the free nations.

Earlier this morning I introduced in the House of Representatives a resolution, the enactment of which will, in my opinion, give the United States such an instrumentality.

My resolution is based on the experience gained in 1956 and in 1957, when, under one of the provisions of the Walter-McCarran Act, the United States was able to lead the other free nations in providing a safe haven and resettlement for the Hungarian refugees.

In line with this experience, my resolution amplifies the authority vested in the Attorney General of the United States under section 212(d)(5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act to parole into the United States certain aliens, if he deems such action to be in the public interest.

It could be—as it seems to me—that the existing statute is sufficient to permit continuous U.S. participation in providing resettlement for refugees in this country. However, inasmuch as the parole authority now contained in the law is discretionary in nature, and the Attorney General of the United States may not feel that the Congress desired him to use that authority in the absence of reasons which could be deemed to be emergent, the resolution which I introduced this morning states specifically the intent of the Congress by reiterating the discretionary authority already available, and amplifying it through the use of defined criteria of eligibility of refugees for parole entry.

The criteria are patterned upon a well tested definition of the refugee-escapee contained now in section 15 of the act of September 15, 1957, known as Public Law 85-316.

My resolution does not contain any numerical ceilings, nor does it prescribe any termination dates. Its purpose is to give the Attorney General of the United States, acting upon the recommendation of the Secretary of State, a long-range legal weapon with which to operate in coordination with the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees and the U.S. escapee program under continuous supervision of the Congress.

I am aware of the fact that under my resolution the Congress is actually called upon to express its full confidence that the Attorney General of the United States will use the power vested in him with foresight and care, with the best interests of the United States remaining the governing factor of his decisions. I am hopeful that the resolution, if enacted, will permit the United States to induce our allies and friends to share with us the responsibility for the resettlement of refugees and to recognize that task to be a joint and not a one-sided undertaking.

The Congress will maintain continuous close scrutiny of the parole operation conducted under the terms of my resolution by reviewing reports which the Attorney General of the United States will be directed to submit to the Senate and the House of Representatives. Should the Congress, at any time, decide that the parole operations affecting refugees should be terminated, a simple resolution passed by either the Senate or the House of Representatives will have the statutory effect of terminating the Attorney General's special authority.

Further, and again in line with our experience with Hungarian refugees, my resolution provides for the granting of permanent resident status to refugees admitted under parole after they have been in the United States for at least 2 years. After the adjustment of their status, they will be granted the benefit of the original date of entry for naturalization purposes.

I believe that in drafting my resolution I have succeeded in steering clear of the numbers game, as well as of crash programs originating from the feeling that a deadline must be met.

I believe that I have also given the Department of State the opportunity to negotiate with other governments a correlated and parallel international effort to secure a fair and equitable distribution of the refugees among more nations than those who have so far made the most sizable contribution in this field.

I would feel that I am being remiss in my duty if I would conclude my remarks at this point without leaving one additional thought with you.

Since the end of World War II, the United States admitted 3 million immigrants. Since Hitler's advent to power this country has admitted 3.5 million immigrants. At least 1.5 million of these immigrants could be classified as refugee-escapees as we now define this term in our laws.

What happened to this mass of humanity? We know, of course, that the majority of immigrants who entered our country in the

last two decades, are of a character very much different from the type of immigrants who arrived at our shores around the turn of the century. What is the nature and the extent of the new immigrants' contribution to our economy, to our scientific achievements, to our arts and literature, to our politics, and to our rate of crime? What is the immigrants' contribution to the increase of the population of our prisons? What is the immigrants' contribution to our Armed Forces, our universities, our insane asylums, our orphanages? There is no answer to these questions.

In leafing over old congressional documents, I found that no study of the immigrant in the United States, no study worthy of this name, that is, has been made in the last 50 years. A Commission appointed in 1907 produced reports the size of a good library. That was in 1911 and nothing was done in that field since, except politically inspired reports, unworthy of that name, and propaganda booklets produced and peddled by people with strong self-serving motives of one kind or another.

The 1911 report had a most profound influence on our immigration policy and our immigration legislation. After half a century had passed, it is certainly time to assemble a group of impartial specialists in the various fields fo human endeavor for the purpose of giving this country the benefit of a study answering some of the questions which many Americans are asking before they decide whether our long-range immigration policy should be changed.

There are 100 million more people in this country than there were when the Commission of 1907 was constituted. More than 50 million children have been born in the United States since World War II. By 1970 there will be 210 million Americans, 20 million of whom will be people over 65 years of age.

What is the capacity of the United States to absorb people? Whom and how many immigrants should we admit? Who should they be? What should be the basis for their selection?

I know full well that I could pyramid questions of this sort without anywhere finding the answers.

It seems to me that the initiative for scientific study of immigration's impact upon all facets of life in the United States should most appropriately emanate from you, ladies and gentlemen. In my opinion, it should not be a study undertaken by a governmental agency and it should not be a congressional venture. This is a field where citizens' initiative should take over so that institutions of learning, qualified foundations, and individual experts could work together.

In launching such a study this meeting will leave a lasting, most valuable imprint on the history books of this Nation.

International Educational Exchange Programs With Africa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 25, 1959

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, upon returning from my 3-month special study mission to Africa in the fall of 1955, I noted in my report to the Congress that one of our greatest needs, both in Government and out, was information about Africa. Accordingly, one of my recommendations was that educational exchange programs should be stepped up with the facilities of higher educational institutions in this country made available in much larger measure to students from all over Africa. The purpose of this recommendation was twofold—to expand our knowledge of that long neglected continent and to promote mutual understanding and friendship between our peoples.

It is, therefore, particularly heartening to me that the proposed exchange program with Africa for fiscal year 1960 represents a substantial increase over that of previous years. Since the inception of the international educational exchange program in 1949, 111 Americans and 271 persons from 17 African countries had been exchanged through the 1957 to 1958 academic year. In the coming year alone, however, a total of 230 exchanges are proposed. This accelerated program is in keeping with the rapid emergence of much of Africa into freedom and responsibility.

The beneficial results of these exchange activities are numerous, with advantages accruing to both the United States and Africa. For us, the program has resulted in an increasing number of American specialists on Africa, an increase in knowledge on Africa available to the American people, and an increase in interest and study in the United States on Africa.

One has only to review the teaching staffs of area training programs in colleges and universities in the United States and the membership of steering committees for important programs and agencies to realize the great importance of study and research provided by the U.S. Government and private agencies in developing a corps of American specialists on Africa. Competence has been acquired in some of the many African languages, and valuable research conducted among certain African tribes.

Publications resulting from such specialized study and research are increasingly making knowledge about various African countries available to the American people. During the last few years a growing number of magazine articles and even entire issues have been devoted to Africa.

The number of area training programs and courses on Africa in colleges and universities has been greatly expanded. Currently, some 31 institutions of higher education offer area training, research, or course work on Africa at the undergraduate or graduate level.

Discussion groups and seminars on Africa have been sponsored by various groups. An African Studies Association with a membership including 183 scholars and specialists has been established to stimulate research on Africa. Our own Library of Congress is planning to set up an African studies unit, which will compile a monthly list of publications on Africa acquired by American libraries.

For Africa, the international educational exchange program has been profoundly important. It has demonstrated a genuine interest by Americans in their future, and thus contributed enormously to the existing good will between our peoples. Moreover, it has meant needed asistance in health, education, and economic development, together with the training of Africans to assume leadership.

Africa's urgent need for trained teachers is an important consideration in the exchange program. Under the program from 1949 through the 1957 to 1958 academic year, 25 American teachers and 18 from African countries had been exchanged. These activities were supplemented by programs independently carried on by the African-American Institute, the International Cooperation Administration, and by private agencies. In the coming fiscal year an additional 20 teachers are proposed to be exchanged under the program.

Perhaps the greatest value derived from this program is the very real contribution to the development of African leadership. Many of those who come to the United States for study will return to their own countries to enter key positions in government and other areas of national importance.

Certainly these exchange programs have contributed to mutual understanding between the United States and Africa beyond any precise calculation. Close and lasting bonds of confidence and good will have developed between hundreds of Americans and persons from Africa, between anthropologists, athletes, educators, library and museum directors, political leaders, and leaders of women's affairs and organizations. In these programs we have demonstrated to the African people that Americans desire to learn about them, their history, their culture, and their languages. In turn, they have given opportunity to learn about American democracy and institutions at firsthand.

The following chart indicates the proposed exchange program for African countries south of the Sahara during fiscal year 1960:

Country	Grants to Americans	Grants to foreign nationals	Total
Angola		1	1
Belgian Congo	1	2	3
Cameroun		6	6
Central African Federation	2	11	13
Ethiopia		7	7
French Equatorial Africa		4	4
French West Africa	6	6	12
Ghana	3	18	21
Guinea		3	3
Kenya		10	10
Liberia	1	3	4
Madagascar		2	2
Mozambique		1	1
Nigeria	1	24	25
Sierra Leone		3	3
Union of South Africa	4	16	20
Tanganyika		3	3
French Togoland		3	3
Uganda		5	5
Zanzibar		3	3
African United Kingdom program	24	22	46
African Trust Territory program		2	2
African students in Europe and UAR		18	18
Regional	15		15
Total	57	173	230

Armed Forces Day, Altoona, Pa., May 16, 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 25, 1959

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, my hometown of Altoona, Pa., joined with thousands of other communities in the Nation in paying a well-deserved tribute to our Armed Forces on May 16.

At an Armed Forces Day luncheon prior to a colorful parade, Brig. Gen. William W. Stickney, USMCR, Deputy Director Marine Corps Reserve, delivered the following address:

ADDRESS DELIVERED IN ALTOONA, PA., MAY 16, 1959, ARMED FORCES DAY OBSERVANCE, BY BRIG. GEN. WILLIAM W. STICKNEY, USMCR, DEPUTY DIRECTOR, MARINE CORPS RESERVE

Salutation: I have been looking forward with distinct pleasure to meeting with you good people of Altoona.

It is, of course, most gratifying to me that you are interested in hearing about the overall Reserve picture, and I am most happy to have this opportunity to talk with you about a subject which is not only vital to our country's defense but also strongly connected with our commerce, industry, and economy.

You have requested that I speak in reference to the big picture in Reserve matters, the mission of the Armed Forces Reserve, or the overall policy concept. This, you must realize, is a very large order and would require many hours to properly cover the subject. However, I will try to limit my remarks to a few basic concepts which can be confined to the time allotted for this occasion.

Let us consider for the moment your Reserve and mine. This is not the Marine Corps Reserve, the Army, Navy, Air Force Reserve, or the National Guard. This is our Reserve, the whole ball of wax. We too often think in terms of our own service alone. We sometimes feel that our own particular service is the best, or the only service to be considered. We sometimes speak of our particular service to the detriment of other services. This may be all well and good for competitive purposes or loyalty to one's particular service, but we must all remember that the hand is no stronger than the strength of all its fingers. Likewise, our Reserve is no stronger than the strength of each service. Insofar as we do harm to any finger of the strong hand of the Reserve, we destroy its strength to that extent. It is vital to the future of this Nation that we have a strong and virile Reserve in all components, a well-balanced force in readiness.

As you well know, many hours, days, weeks, and months of devoted effort have been expended during the past few years by many outstanding citizens, military and otherwise, in a concerted effort to find ways and means of improving our Reserve components so that they in turn may better serve the Nation. In this effort many committees, boards, surveys, and reevaluation symposia have been convened, dissolved, and reconvened. What has been the cumulative result of all this monumental effort?

To be sure, gains have been made. Some improvements have been notable. Some rights have been established, and, many privileges have been sought. Frustration has been rampant.

In my opinion, never have so many eminent citizens and outstanding military leaders worked so diligently to obtain so little. Why?

Today, I would like to discuss with you a few basic concepts. A lawyer would call it "horn book law"; a military man would call it "an estimate of the situation"; a Navy man would call it "rocks and shoals"; a marine would call it "customs and traditions of the service."

Generally speaking, the resultant of all of our efforts has been the 1955 amendments to the Reserve Forces Act of 1952. Whether you agree with those amendments is irrelevant. The fate of that act may be academic, at least it is debatable.

Regardless of that, and whatever the results may be, we do know that in a democracy such as ours, the Regular forces can only be a shield, can only man the outer ramparts, can only ward off the initial thrust. By this, I mean no offense to our Regular forces—within them we have many great leaders and thousands of valiant hearts. Nevertheless it is the very nature of our form of government and economic structure to maintain a relatively small protective shield and to create and build a large Reserve to fight and win our wars. This is, and always will be, our tradition.

I believe it to be manifest that this Nation cannot survive without a strong, virile and flexible Reserve. I also believe that it is the duty, not only of the Reserves themselves, but, of every citizen as well, in and out of uniform, to build that Reserve and give it every nourishment necessary to its health. There are those who have said we have failed, but they say not why. If this be so, idle criticism is not what we need—nor are bodies and weapons our only requirements. What we need first and foremost is good old American pride and patriotism. And, what is more, we know that pride and patriotism cannot be subsidized, it cannot be bought and paid for in the marketplace. Dollars will help, but we cannot build a Reserve on drill pay alone nor lipservice at a bargain. Let us look at the record of events during the past decade and see where we find ourselves today. Let us face our problems, good or bad, fairly and forthrightly.

First, let us look at our needs and requirements.

Never has the need for real preparedness, real thinking and self-analysis been so urgent. Now, as never before real and rapid preparedness is of the first priority. This Nation must organize its manpower and its production so that it can transfer easily and quickly from a peacetime economy to a war production effort, take any emergency in its stride and ride out the storm. If this is done, and done now, it will gain for us the initial advantage of any struggle that may be in the offing.

In addition, we must make a very serious study of what future wars will mean and how we will fight them. It is of little use to superimpose new weapons on World War II organizations, and then try to work out the tactical changes involved—we have tried this before and know it will not work.

Any suggestion that the introduction of atomic and thermonuclear weapons is not going to affect the organization of our forces and the tactics of warfare is nonsense. We must examine our organizations and reevaluate our equipment, in order to keep pace with constant changes required in this atomic age.

This reevaluation is also required in our reserve components and our present system of procuring and training our Reserve Forces. The old method has proven itself to be out-of-date.

To successfully fight any war, we need the following essential requirements:

First, we must have outstanding regular peacetime forces, up to strength and ready at all times to act as our shield without any mobilization procedure.

These forces must be trained and equipped in the highest degree. They must be mobile, hard-hitting, offensive troops with an esprit de corps and very highly disciplined. I say "very highly disciplined" advisedly. Somehow in our effort to be equitable we have lost track of the highly important subject of discipline. We just cannot wage a successful war without instinctively disciplined troops. These are the troops and the commanders who must stand firm in the face of the horrors and the terrors of the opening clashes of an atomic war. They will stand firm only if they are highly trained and highly disciplined.

Secondly, we need Reserve Forces, well organized, capable of being mobilized in echelons in depth, each echelon receiving sufficient training in time of peace to ensure that it is ready in fact, and fit to fight offensively or defensively as and when needed.

Thirdly, these forces, Regular and Reserve, must be backed by a sound logistic and movement organization which must exist in peacetime to the degree necessary to ensure success in the opening days of war; and

Lastly, we must have a sound civil defense organization in each State, territory, and large metropolitan area.

For these reasons, I strongly contend that it is our solmen duty to do everything humanly possible to help affirmatively in the building of a strong, flexible, and sturdy Reserve with the will to fight anywhere, and everywhere that need may arise.

These things being true, how do we best obtain the desired results? First, it is my considered opinion that what we need most is a strong and forthright educational program for our citizens, as to the present position of this great Nation; that it is the greatest and strongest Nation in the world and that as such it is incumbent upon us to lead the free Nations in our struggle for peace and the preservation of all freedom loving peoples. This preservation of freedom will largely depend upon our efforts in this direction. In our success may well depend the success of the world, and government as we understand it. In our failure may well depend the failure of world democracy. These are not idle words but fundamental truths for which our forefathers have fought and given their life blood to preserve. So let it be known that these ideals and our very existence are in peril. To maintain them, we need the full loyalty and wholehearted support of every American citizen. If America is worth living for, it's worth fighting, if not dying for as well. I cannot express too strongly the great need of new and powerful concepts in the thinking of the American people if this Nation is to survive. The concept is plain and the need is great.

There is rampant in the world today a sinister force of unbelievers—a gigantic force backed and sponsored by a nation whose rules live in constant fear of the truth—in constant fear that the Russian people will learn the truth about the world without or that foreigners will learn the truth about their world within. A nation whose rulers constantly seek security only in patient but deadly struggle for the total destruction of rival power—never in compacts and compromises with it. With this constant fear of the truth, with this clinging dogma that the outside world is evil and that their inside world shall never be exposed to the clarifying rays of truth and justice, the implications are self-evident. With such a government, whose rulers dare not be guided by the everlasting truth, we will have an uneasy Russian nationalism in which the conceptions of offense and defense are inextricably confused, and armed and equipped with the apparatus of international communism they become more

dangerous and more insidious than could ever be imagined by the ordinary man.

We have here before us a political force which appears to be committed to the belief that with the United States there can be no permanent modus vivendi—that it is desirable and necessary that the internal harmony of our society be disrupted, our traditional way of life be destroyed, and, that the international authority of our state be broken, if Soviet power is to be secure. This political force has complete power of disposition over the energies of one of the world's greatest peoples and the resources of the world's richest national territory. Finally, it is seemingly inaccessible to considerations of reality and truth in its basic reactions. For it, the vast fund of objective fact and truth about human society and history is not, as with us, the measure against which outlook is constantly being tested and reformed, but a great grabbag from which individual items are selected arbitrarily and tendentiously to bolster an outlook already preconceived. The problem of how to cope with this force is undoubtedly the greatest task our diplomacy has ever faced and probably the greatest it will ever have to face. But cope with it we must. And to do this, I sincerely believe that we must see to it that our people are educated to the realities and truths of the Russian situation. I cannot overemphasize the importance of this great truth. I am convinced that there would be far less hysterical anti-sovietism in our country today if the realties of this situation were better understood by our people. There is nothing as dangerous or as terrifying as the unknown. We must instill in all our people the truth, courage, and self-confidence necessary for the greatest possible improvement in the health and vigor of our own society, and, we must put before the peoples of the world a much more positive and constructive picture of the sort of world we would like to see than we have put forward in the past.

Ancient Carthage, with its luxury standard of living, refused to make minimum sacrifices to support Hannibal and did not survive. Cato's relentless chant "Carthage must be destroyed" did not awaken the indolent Africans from their preoccupation of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. They did not believe that Cato, like Khrushchev meant what he threatened. Similarly, Rome itself, entertained with bread, wine, and circuses—and, arrogant in its splendor, did not survive the onslaught of the vandals and visigoths. The technical skill that built her roads and aqueducts, the know-how of her administrators, the glory of her law—none of these assets saved an effete and overcivilized Rome.

The gross national product of Rome did not protect her. The visigoths had no gross national product—only weapons and the will for power. These dismal comments on Carthage and Rome could be repeated for other proud civilizations. Many times in the past, nations with high standards of living have been pushed to the grave by nations with low standards of dying. There is no reason to suppose that history, or providence, will accord any special dispensation to America.

We must admit, as a government and as a people, that we are locked in a struggle with a conspiratorial elite who seem to have perverted every form of human activity to the cause of conflict. This struggle continues today just as surely as it did on the afternoon of December 6, 1941. Even though we didn't know it, the carriers of the Imperial Japanese Navy were converging on Hawaii. The bombs had been loaded, the pilots briefed, the mission assigned, the die cast for our people by war lords on the far side of the earth. We learned then that war starts—not at the moment of the surprise attack—but when the enemy completes his final plans and commits his resources to conflict.

Permit me to read to you a small portion of a paper read before the American Geographical and Statistical Society by Admiral Perry in the year 1856, 103 years ago. I quote: "It seems to me that the people of America will, in some form or other, extend their dominion and their power, until they shall have * * * placed the Saxon race upon the eastern shores of Asia. And I think, too, that eastward and southward will her great rival in future aggrandizement (Russia) stretch forth her powers to the coasts of China and Siam: And thus the Saxon and the Cossack will meet. * * * Will it be in friendship? I fear not. The antagonistic exponents of freedom and absolutism must thus meet at last, and then will be fought the mighty battle on which the world will look with breathless interest; for on its issue will depend the freedom or the slavery of the world. * * * I think I see in the distance the giants that are growing up for that fierce and final encounter; in the progress of events that battle must sooner or later be fought."

As sure as this prophecy has proven itself to date, there now stands on our frontier an Asiatic conqueror. Owing to science, the Atlantic Ocean is no wider than the Delaware. Owing to technology, the Pacific is no broader than Lake Michigan, and the wastelands of the north can be bridged in a few hours flight. And don't think for one moment that we will have time to organize the militia as we did at Lexington and Concord or the Federal Reserve as we did in World War I and World War II. We will be lucky if we have time to get our loved ones into air raid shelters.

Now, with this in mind, let us look squarely at the facts, particularly at the facts of our weakness—from them we may gain strength.

Never have we, as a people, talked so much about equity and privileges and so little about responsibilities, obligations, and duties. In fact, we words "equity" and "privilege" have to many become synonymous. Let us remember that the building up in peacetime of a strong national character is of supreme importance.

This Nation has never accustomed itself to a professional military force. Indeed, we boast of the fact as if it were a cornerstone of democracy.

We still like to think about arousing a military force after the danger is upon us, and about sending the boys back home even before the danger is over—as we did in World War II.

Our fetish for springing to arms in an emergency has prevented us from clearly thinking out our national defense problem, and if the springing has each time proved costly, in life and treasure, we have been thus far willing to pay the price. It has seemed preferable to a large standing force.

Now the new weapons of war have eliminated our choice in the matter. We will barely have time to spring to our air raid shelters in this age of atomic destruction.

Whether we like it or not, security under arms is the order of the day, and as our leaders have told us, may continue for decades or even a century.

It is high time we became more mature about the needs and requirements of our Military Establishment. It is also high time that we started to think about our Reserve as a quasi-professional force instead of a quasi-amateur force. A force which must have the full support of business and industry if it is to succeed.

An adequate and flexible Reserve cannot spring up over night. It requires professional attitude, aptitude, organization, equipment, and training—much training. The history of German military success against the French in World War II clearly reveals the overwhelming superiority of the quasi-professional force when arrived against the quasi-amateur force. Germany did not conquer France with superiority of manpower, in numbers. Germany conquered by virtue of the superior capability of its military force, even when outnumbered.

We Americans take pride in having the best of everything, but we have not demonstrated our pride in achieving and maintaining the world's best Military Establishment or, the world's best trained Reserve.

The test is not in wartime, when patriotism runs high, when our people actually shake with patriotism. The real test is before us today, when we are called upon to support a large professional military force and, an even larger quasi-professional military Reserve, all within our peacetime social structure.

Our support has been shabby, at best; as a nation we have not let our military people feel, Reserve or otherwise, that their efforts are appreciated. We go through the motions, but true respect is lacking. We look down upon the military service as a career, and upon the military reservist as a quasi-professional military man.

We cannot expect men of the necessary caliber to enter the military or its Reserve on a voluntary basis until their neighbors, all of us, look upon the bearing of arms as an honorable occupation, with the prestige which it deserves. We cannot expect to retain men of the required caliber in the military services unless the bearing of arms becomes, in fact, an honorable profession.

We must get away from the trend of thinking that Reserve units are quasi-amateur and insist that they are, and must be quasi-professional units. We must depart from the public conception of weekend warriors, Thursday night soldiers and citizen marines. We must go forward and prove, beyond doubt, that these men are expending their time, energy, and devotion to become quasi-professional men in an honorable and respected profession.

It must be made crystal clear, as it is in fact, that all major wars and struggles are Reserve wars and struggles and that the Reserves have done their part to quell past wars, contained the flame in Korea, and will do so elsewhere. The public must know that they train at home and in the field and are ever ready for immediate employment should the flame of greed or hate touch off a general conflagration.

If this be done, then, the community will see the error of its ways and will be compelled to honor and respect such efforts.

If this be done, then, it is merely basic economics to realize that the best military capability can be procured for the least money by a Reserve Military Establishment which, at least, has a backbone of professional character. It can be shown that the best way and the cheapest way to defend our country is with a professional force and a quasi-professional military reserve. This, of course, goes against the present public concept. It runs headlong into the old theory that each must do his bit and, in the end, must do it whether he likes it or not, and, whether or not he can be made into a capable military man. If the Armed Forces Reserve were actually attractive, if there were some competition to get into it, this situation would not prevail.

A respectable military force, be it Regular or Reserve, can be obtained only if it is believed that the military worker is worthy of his hire.

The one way to get men without regard for their market worth is to draft them, and they will leave military employment at the first opportunity. The one way to keep them in military service is to give them a package which adds up to reasonable incentive and reasonable security. The package may not

parallel civilian life in monetary gain, but the total should compare with civilian experience. The package may consist of direct pay, fringe benefits, and security for the long pull. It must include the respect, honor, and prestige of the civilian community.

As a nation, we will be in the military business for a long time to come. In the tradition of America, we deserve the best military force in the world, with the complexity of new weapons, we can no longer get the best with a quasi-amateur force, especially short-term enlistees nor with a quasi amateur Reserve attitude. And in the long run, a highly professional force with a quasi professional military Reserve is the most economical of all security forces, and an asset to business and industry ratner than a deficit. Business and industry must realiz that it has a great equity in our Reserve structure. It must also be remembered that the members of our Reserve are of, and from, business and industry and that their very membership is for the purpose of protecting that equity and all that it represents.

Civilian understanding and support of the military man is an essential ingredient of our military posture. Such support is, in the last analysis, our finest military asset—part and parcel of our national security.

Credit Unions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD G. WOLF
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 25, 1959

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks I would like to insert in the RECORD a copy of my testimony before the Banking and Currency Subcommittee No. 3, regarding credit unions:

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE LEONARD G. WOLF, DEMOCRAT, OF IOWA, BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 3 OF THE BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, MAY 15, 1959

Mr. Chairman, I take this opportunity to express my support of H.R. 5777 and related bills, to amend the Federal Credit Union Act, now being considered by this subcommittee.

In my home State there are more than 300 credit unions presently in operation, serving more than 100,000 members. However, only a few of these Iowa credit unions are chartered under Federal law. One of the primary reasons the credit unions in my area prefer to be chartered and operate under the laws of the State of Iowa is that these statutes are far less restrictive than the Federal credit union law, and allow State-chartered credit unions to operate in my area with more flexibility. For instance, the State law imposes no signature loan limitation on credit unions chartered under the Iowa laws. Such limitation is left to the discretion of the board of directors of each credit union. Also, the laws of the State do not specify any limitation on loan maturities, except in the case of real estate loans, in which case the loan maturity limit is 10 years. These State-chartered credit unions are providing invaluable services to the people of my district. Certainly the Federal act should be amended to increase the signature loan limitation from $400 to $1,000 and to increase the loan maturity limit from 3 to 5 years.

To my way of thinking this legislation is long overdue. We are all aware of the numerous changes which have been taking place throughout the economy during the past several years—interest rates have been rising, the purchasing power of the dollar has been decreasing, consumer credit has been on an upward trend as more and more consumer goods become available and more and more American families seek to improve their standard of living. There has been a steady growth in the number of American families who can afford at least some of the comforts once associated with the highest positions in society. The credit unions have contributed their fair share toward this increased number. This cooperative movement is truly a "grassroots" program. People in all walks of life—in schools, churches, manufacturing, and in many occupations—have had their needs and desires met through credit union loans and savings.

We are today faced with the necessity for formulating some sound methods for guiding the continued growth of our economy at a rate which will assure an adequate supply of goods and services at reasonable prices while at the same time preventing inflation. The accomplishment of this goal of economic stability depends upon the assistance of all segments of the economy—the lenders, the industrial producer, the farmer, the distributors, the small businesses and the large. The modernization of Federal credit union legislation can do much to assist in this endeavor, by facilitating the efficient operation of the individual credit unions. At the same time, an increased supply of loan funds would be made available for the provident and productive purposes of low and middle income families and individuals. The self-help quality of these institutions is a refreshing and welcome part of the economic and social scene.

During the 25 years of Federal credit unions, and the even longer period in which some of the State credit unions have operated, these financial institutions have performed a much-needed service. It is because of the real need for the services of these institutions that they have achieved such an enviable record of growth, both in membership and assets. Perhaps the most important factor accounting for this tremendous growth is the credit union's willingness to make loans to individuals for purposes which would not be acceptable to most other lenders—and at interest rates which are usually much lower than the interest charges required by commercial or mutual banks. In summary, these groups have fostered and encouraged thrift through regulated savings and prudent economic management of individual credit and financial resources. Such purposes must be served if we are to maintain a healthy economy which meets the needs of all levels of our population.

In view of the rapid changes which have been occurring in our economy, it is expedient that revisions be made in the structure of credit union operations, such as those contained in H.R. 5777. The losses suffered on unsecured loans made by credit unions have not been out of line with those of other financial institutions. Therefore, an increase in the unsecured loan maximum from $500 to $1,000 is unwarranted, and not unduly risky. Likewise, I believe that investment in shares of central credit unions does not carry with it any undue risk. Rather, it will provide additional dividend income and will make funds available where they are most in demand, following the natural economic course of resources flowing into areas where they can be the most productive.

Still another important proposal made by H.R. 5777 is the extension of loan maturities from 3 to 5 years. This lengthening of the period of time within which loans may be repaid is in keeping with extended periods for home mortgage repayments and other consumer installment purchases.

All of these provisions upon which I have touched, and others contained in the proposed legislation, will facilitate more adequate servicing of the credit needs of millions of individuals. We would be remiss in our duty if we did not furnish these credit cooperatives with all the assistance which can be made available through the revision of the Federal statute to bring its provisions in line with the changing times. There is no question with regard to the Federal expenditures for these cooperatives—they are self-supporting entities, under the general supervision of the likewise self-sustaining Bureau of the Federal Credit Unions. There is no question, either, with regard to the essentiality of the services rendered by these financial institutions. Approval of this proposed legislation will underscore our belief in the basic principls upon which our whole economic and social structure has been built—the perpetuation of the ideals of equality of man, freedom of opportunity and unselfish cooperation.

Facilities and Progress of the Library of Congress in Science

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 18, 1959

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following testimony of the Librarian of Congress, L. Quincy Mumford, before the Science and Astronautics Committee:

FACILITIES AND PROGRESS OF THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS IN SCIENCE

The purpose of my presentation is to describe briefly the resources and services of the Library of Congress in science and technology.

Without going into historical reasons, the Library of Congress has come to be recognized widely both in this country and abroad as performing for the United States many of the functions of a national library. The Library, as the Government's oldest and largest library, has had from its beginning the special function of serving the Nation through service to the Congress, and its resources and facilities have been extended broadly to other Government agencies and to scholarly and research groups. The Library has been able to discharge its multiple responsibilities because in developing its collections and in providing the tools by which its collections can be used it has taken a comprehensive view of the role it was to play and responded comprehensively to the demands which the Congress, the scholarly community, and the public placed upon it.

The great segment of human knowledge represented by science and technology is an area in which heavy demands have been made on the Library for many years and in which the results in terms of collections and services have been correspondingly great. The Library of Congress has been preeminent in science since 1866 when, by act of Congress, the Smithsonian Institution's complete collection of the memoirs and transactions of learned societies throughout the world and an entire series of the most important scientific and literary periodicals were transferred to it in order that such literature might be more adequately housed and serviced. Since that time the growth of the scientific collections has continued stead-

ily and with ever-increasing pace until, as of June 30, 1958, there were more than 1,486,000 volumes, comprising monographs and serials in the classified collection of science and technology.

This great expansion has resulted from a variety of efforts. The Library continued and extended the foreign exchange program which had been begun by the Smithsonian. Today it draws materials from a worldwide network of more than 17,000 exchange agreements with governments and with private research centers, laboratories, universities, observatories, and other scientific and technical institutions. The annual yield from these sources is nearly half a million books, pamphlets, journals, and other materials in printed, near print, and photocopy form. In the Soviet Union, 151 scientific and technical institutions exchange publications with the Library. When we consider in addition the Communist satellite countries, including East Germany, this figure is increased to 305. The use of the facilities of many U.S. agencies abroad serves greatly to enhance the receipts of the literature of other lands. Through the operation of the copyright law, the Library of Congress is assured that all American publications and many of the foreign ones in the scientific field that are registered for copyright find their way into the national collections. Still other materials in great quantity are constantly received as a result of domestic exchange arrangements, and by transfer, gift, and purchase. Some 750 bookdealers throughout the world, with many of whom the Library has standing orders, provide publications of importance, regardless of language or country of origin. The magnitude of these operations may be seen from the fact that in the last fiscal year the Soviet Union provided through orders placed by the Library of Congress nearly 57,000 pieces and on exchange another 31,000 pieces in all fields of knowledge. The grand total of pieces received from the Soviet Union in that year, on order and through exchange, was 88,256. Exchanges with East European countries, including East Germany, produced 39,808 additional items.

The scope of the receipts of scientific material by the Library of Congress may be judged from the volume of periodical literature coming in from Soviet Russia. The literature of Soviet science and technology and its availability in the United States has received much attention in the press in recent months, but the situation is apparently not very clearly understood.

Contrary to the general impression that little is known of the output of science literature in the Soviet Union, there is a Soviet national bibliography of their book and periodical publications which I belive to be a fair representation of their total output. This bibliography is voluminous and detailed, and itss issues are diligently scanned by members of the Library of Congress staff for use in our acquisitions as well as our bibliographical work.

The most recent volume of the Soviet periodical list that cumulates the output of the 5-year period 1950–54 gives a total number of 1,480 titles in science and technology, including medicine and agriculture. The latest volume of the Monthly Index of Russian Accessions, a publication which the Library of Congress, with support from other agencies, compiles of its own Russian receipts and those of other American libraries cooperating with us, lists more than 900 titles in science, technology, medicine, and agriculture. These represent about 66 percent of all the Soviet journals received by the Library.

In monographic publications we are more selective in our acquistions, since a considerable portion of the total literature published in any country must necessarily be of minor or no importancec. The problem is one of evaluation; and we are constantly striving to improve the quality of our accessions in the broader aspects of Soviet publication. A recent analysis of a limited number of issues of the Soviet national list of books and monographic series indicated that, of more than 5,000 monographic series in the natural sciences and mathematics and in technology, about 2,000—or better than 38 percent—were found among the Library's collections. In the natural sciences and mathematics, we were 49.5 percent complete, while in all other fields of technology our figure was 36.6 percent.

One of the major services to the Nation which the Library of Congress performs, then, is the acquisition of the ever-increasing worldwide output of scientific and technical materials. On this great reservoir the Congress, the executive departments and agencies, industry, the scientific community, and the public draw for their informational needs. That they are able to do so with facility and reasonable speed is due to the second great service performed by the Library—the cataloging and indexing of the materials received. This is a traditional library operation which is at once a highly technical and time-consuming process. For most materials, the Library of Congress printed catalog card serves very well, not merely for the Library's own collections but for the collections of the major reesarch libraries throughout the country, many of which buy or otherwise utilize the cards which we prepare and print. The broad validity of the Library of Congress system of subject classification and the indispensability of the printed card is evidenced by the fact that the service has nearly 10,000 subscribers. The Library also maintains the National Union Catalog, containing cards locating research materials in 700 cooperating libraries in North America; and it publishes this and other catalogs in book form.

To make more quickly and completely available for use certain kinds of material, including acquisitions in science and technology, the Library publishes the following monthly lists: New Serial Titles, listing the periodicals which the Library and some 200 other libraries receive; the Monthly Index of Russian Accessions, the East European Accessions Index, and the Southern Asia Accessions List. The method is much the same for all of these publications. Special indexing is given to each article and, where necessary, the author's name and the article title are translated. Articles on science and technology are listed in a separate section with many subject subdivisions. An extensive subject index is added at the end of the volume. The volume of the Monthly Index of Russian Accessions for the year ending March 1958 covered periodical issues (not titles) totaling 8,929, of which 5,202, or 58 percent, dealt with science and technology. We have already noted that the number of Soviet titles in science, technology, medicine, and agriculture was 905, or 66 percent of a total of 1,368 titles received. During the same year, 5,632 monographs classed in these fields were also received. In the volume of the East European Accessions Index for the year ending December 1958, the number of journal titles listed was 3,856, of which 1,497 were classed as science and technology. The number of issues in all fields was 28,067, while those in science and technology numbered 8,444. The number of monographs received in all subjects was 7,735, while those in science and technology amounted to 2,275.

These specialized bibliographic productions make a formidable contribution to the national scientific effort but they by no means exhaust the contribution of the Library of Congress in this area. Within the limits of budget, space, and its primary commitment of service to the Congress, the Library has assumed responsibility for administering a number of large-scale projects which, on funds transferred primarily from the Department of Defense, provide analyses, abstracts, and other bibliographic services on certain types of literature, including scientific and technical material. Under this bibliographic program, the Library is making available to American scientific and industrial users, through the facilities of the Office of Technical Services of the Department of Commerce, a large volume of Soviet and other East European literature. In the past 12 months, 43,520 abstracts of periodical articles have been prepared, including 8,406 translations of foreign-language abstracts. Since August 1, 1958, a total of 29,947 abstracts has been made available to the Office of Technical Services. This abstracting service at the present time regularly covers 165 foreign journals, 141 of which originate in the Soviet Union. In addition to abstracts, 1,292 reviews in English of foreign-language monographs have also been prepared. Since the subject is often misunderstood, it should be pointed out that, though a considerable amount of translation work is a necessary part of the abstracting service just described, the Library of Congress does not as a normal function prepare or distribute translations of foreign scientific and technical materials as such and at the present time has no plans to do so.

The third great area of service by the Library of Congress in the field of science and technology is its work in reference and bibliography. The focal point of subject competence in this field is the Library's Science and Technology Division, which maintains, on a 7-day-a-week basis, a special science reading room. Established in 1949, the division, with a relatively small staff of subject and language specialists, has an active bibliographic and reference program, and its services are steadily increasing. The total reference services provided to the Congress, to other Government agencies, to other offices of the Library, and to the public, numbered 10,873 in fiscal 1958. From present trends, it appears that the total in the present fiscal year will reach approximately 14,000, or an increase of about 30 percent.

The reference services performed for the Congress in the form of special studies and other assistance numbered 143 in fiscal 1958. Present trends indicate that the number in the current fiscal year will reach 275, an increase of more than 90 percent over the preceding year. Nor is the mere number of these requests truly indicative of the increase either of the service to the Congress or the workload imposed on the staff. In 1 month—March 1959—the scope and length of the studies completed reached a point where they required the equivalent of 4½ man-months of professional staff time. The range of these inquiries and their difficulty is shown by the following examples of the subject covered: "The Effects of Atomic Radiation on Human Beings"; "Jet and Rocket Fuels and Oxidizers"; "Atomic-Powered Airplanes and Rockets"; "Underground Disposal of Radioactive Wastes"; "National Science Policy"; "Alcohol-Blend Motor Fuels"; "Cold-Weather Agriculture"; "The Future of Science"; and, "Toxicology and Uses of Thiocarbonyl Tetrachloride."

The division also has under preparation some 25 major surveys of the literature in various fields of science and technology. Several are being done on contract for the Department of Defense; others are supported by the National Science Foundation. Although most of these bibliographies are produced for and paid for by other agencies with a special need to know, those dealing with unclassified literature are in nearly all cases made available to the scientific community at large. The range of coverage of these bibliographies can be seen from their subjects, which include: "The International Geophysical Year," "Thermal Properties of Metals," "Aviation Medicine," "Industrial Ap-

plications of Radioactive Isotopes," and "Snow, Ice, and Frozen Ground."

The division serves as a collecting and reference center for unclassified technical report literature of the United States and foreign countries. The output of a number of Government agencies and their contractors, including the Atomic Energy Commission, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and agencies within the Department of Defense, forms a good part of this literature. In addition to its other activities, the division has a research program in documentation techniques, the objectives of which is to make the Library's science collections more responsive to current trends and needs.

One other service of a very special and significant character may come into being this year. I refer to Public Law 85-931 amending Public Law 480 (1954) authorizing the Librarian of Congress, in consultation with the National Science Foundation and other interested agencies, to acquire with U.S. foreign-owned currencies, publications (including materials in science and technology) from foreign countries; to catalog, abstract, index, translate and reproduce such materials; and to deposit these publications "* * * in libraries and research centers in the United States specializing in the areas to which they relate." This program awaits an appropriation to enable the Library to put it into effect.

The dissemination of scientific and technological information throughout the Nation under this program could have a very significant impact on the availability of research information. That scholars should be able to acquire a knowledge of the existence of articles and books through indexes and catalogs is readily apparent; of equal or greater significance is the ability to gain ready access to publications which appear to relate to a piece of research. Although libraries endeavor to acquire publications from abroad, limitations on funds and the tremendous amount of material available make reasonably complete coverage of foreign research publications an unattainable goal for most libraries. The Public Law 480 program would be a long step toward overcoming this shortcoming.

This brief survey of the resources and services of the Library of Congress in the broad fields of science and technology should serve to demonstrate that, by the breadth of its base, its wide acceptance as an authority in bibliographical know-how, the rich competence and variety of its staff, and its relationships with other institutions and organizations within and outside the Government, the Library of Congress serves as the national library of science. This role of the Library is supplemented and enhanced, rather than detracted from or weakened, by the two other great national library collections, those in agriculture and medicine held by the Library of the Department of Agriculture and by the National Library of Medicine. It has sometimes been suggested, and indeed it has been proposed in legislation, that by transfers of functions from existing libraries and by the accumulation of separate collections an independent national library of science and technology should be created, possibly within the framework of the proposed National Department of Science and Technology. In view of the existence of the three great collections mentioned and their long record of service to the Nation and cooperation in undisturbed harmony with each other, I have gone on record as opposing the creation of another national library of science as not only duplicative and wasteful but impossible to bring into being without many years of concentrated efforts.

In this presentation today I have attempted to point out that the Library of Congress and, by that token, the Nation already have a vast investment—perhaps the largest in the world—in the literature of science, and I believe that science, which in great measure relies for its stimulation and growth on that literature, has an equally great stake in the Library of Congress.

U.S. Technical Cooperation Activities in Public Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 25, 1959

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, one of the major needs of the newly independent countries lies in the area of improved public administration. The serious lack of managerial skills and government experience in these countries is a critical barrier to economic development, and a potential threat to political stability. Until inefficiencies are reduced or eliminated much will continue to be wasted in terms of manpower and other resources.

Quite often the organization of government agencies is outmoded and cumbersome, with considerable overlapping between agencies charged with related functions. In most underdeveloped countries the governmental employees are poorly paid and inadequately trained in their duties. This condition encourages personal irresponsibility, and occasionally leads to graft and unscrupulous conduct.

Modern concepts of good budgeting have been adopted by only a few of these countries, and governmental administration is uniformly over-centralized. Inadequate facilities exist for training people in the principles and techniques of good management, with the few technological institutes occupying a position similar to our vocational schools. As those persons desiring to be trained in the technical and scientific fields must generally go abroad to study, comparatively few have received proper training in management.

In our technical cooperation program we have recognized these inadequacies and have carried on an extensive program in the area of public administration, always at the invitation of the host country. At the present stage of the program, most of the projects are centered upon problems at the national government level. It is anticipated, however, that appreciation and concern for problems of local governments will increase, and the technical assistance emphasis may correspondingly shift from national to local levels.

One of the most effective techniques for improving public administration abroad has been found to be the participant program. In this program carefully selected officials and technicians are brought to the United States for observation and study of public administration methods. During calendar year 1958 nearly 900 participants, ranging from the highest officials to young persons of ability and promise, came to this country under the program. Some 300 more were sent to other countries for training, many to the Institute of Public Administration at the University of the Philippines, and the American University in Beirut. Many of these persons are expected to assume key positions in their respective governments upon returning home, where their decisions can determine the future course of efforts to improve public administration.

Contracts have been made with some 15 outstanding American universities to assist in some 20 projects in public administration. Most of these are for professional advice and staffing of about 15 business and public administration institutes abroad, established with the help of American universities under ICA-financed contracts.

A partial listing of accomplishments in the public administration program may serve to illustrate the type of projects carried on under the program.

In the Philippines an ICA financed contractor concluded a government reorganization project which produced some 41 reorganization plans, and well-trained Filipino staff in a newly established management service division of the budget commission to put the plans into operation. The commission, assisted by another ICA contractor, completed the installation of performance budgeting for the entire government.

Through a contract with the University of Michigan, an Institute of Public Administration has been firmly established. Instrumental in founding the Eastern Regional Organization for Public Administration, the institute is conducting third country training for many government employees from neighboring countries.

In Pakistan an executive development scheme for members of the superior civil service will bring 2 groups of from 15 to 20 of these top Pakistani officials to the United States for management seminars and workshops at the University of Southern California and on-the-job associations with local, State, and Federal officials each year for 3 years. This training of the top layer of civil servants will prepare the ground for further efforts by the United States to introduce modern management concepts in Pakistan.

The Eastern Regional Organization for Public Administration formed by 10 Asian countries in Manila last summer, is clear evidence of greater understanding of the values and role of modern public administration among countries of the Far East. EROPA will have its secretariat in Manila—supported by a small ICA grant from Far East regional funds—a research, documentation and dissemination center at Saigon—assisted by Michigan State University contract personnel—and a training center at New Delhi.

The Wharton School of the University of Pennsylvania is helping the University of Karachi create an institute of business and public administration. The institute now has a student body of approximately 650 students, including evening school and special students, and has generated great interest in the business community.

The Iranian Government, with the help of ICA advisers, has completed a plan for classification and standard compensation of all governmental employees, and legislation was drafted for the creation of a central personnel agency. More recently, the Government has released a considerable number of excess superannuated employees.

An Iranian Municipal Association has been formed to assist in development of improved municipal administration—one of a number of steps to strengthen government at the grassroots.

Toward the close of calendar year 1958, with the collaboration of ICA advisors, the Iranian Government began a program of decentralization, including the delegation of increased authority and responsibility to provincial and district authorities. The plan is being fully supported by the Iranian Ministry of the Interior. While it is too early to evaluate results, it is significant that the decentralization of what has been a highly centralized government is now seriously being pressed.

Mr. Speaker, these selected programs suffice to demonstrate the valuable work carried on by our technical cooperation program in the field of public administration. While the immediate results of this program may not be so readily apparent as in certain other programs, the long-range benefits will be highly significant.

Replies to 17 Important and Vital Issues by the People of the 15th District of California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 18, 1959

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I recently requested the people of the 15th Congressional District of California which I represent to give me their opinion on 17 issues of vital importance to the United States and all its citizens.

The range of these questions was great, covering both domestic affairs and our foreign relations—matters which will affect the future security of this Nation as well as the individual welfare of every citizen.

The response to my questionnaire was immediate and tremendous reaching a total of 51,000 replies in record time, and clearly establishing the keen interest of the people of the 15th District in the vital issues upon which this Congress must act.

In summarizing the replies I received from people in every precinct of the 15th District, it is significant to note that question No. 4—"Should we have strong legislation to curb labor racketeering?"—received the largest "yes" vote with 96.7 percent.

The next question with the highest "yes" vote was No. 3—"Should the House Un-American Activities Committee be retained?"—with 84 percent.

One of the most vital questions was No. 8—"Do you think we should keep American forces in Berlin along with British and French forces—even at the risk of war?"—which received the third highest "yes" vote, with 79.9 percent.

It is a great satisfaction to know that the thousands of people who participated in this questionnaire are so well informed on the current and important issues before Congress as their replies indicate, and it is a pleasure to represent such an intelligent and well-informed constituency.

The following are the results of my questionnaire, which I am sure will be of interest to all Members of this Congress:

[In percent]

	Yes	No	No opinion
1. Do you favor the admission of Hawaii as a State?	78.5	13.1	8.4
2. Do you think the United States should stop making tests with nuclear weapons and the H-bomb?	20.0	68.5	11.5
3. In your opinion, should the House Un-American Activities Committee be retained?	84.0	9.7	6.3
4. In your opinion, should we have strong legislation to curb labor racketeering?	96.7	1.7	1.6
5. Should health and medical benefits be added to social security on a voluntary basis at an increased cost to you?	35.4	50.5	14.1
6. Should postal rates be increased to further decrease the Post Office deficit?	45.1	47.3	7.6
7. In your opinion, should the Federal Government provide financial aid for education?	27.8	63.1	9.1
8. Do you think we should keep American forces in Berlin along with British and French forces, even at the risk of war?	79.9	11.5	8.6
9. In your opinion, does foreign aid strengthen the position of the United States in world affairs?	36.9	49.0	14.1
10. Do you believe foreign aid, other than military, should be reduced?	71.0	20.8	8.2
11. Should our immigration laws be revised to permit a greater number of immigrants to enter the United States for permanent residence?	20.3	71.0	8.7
12. In your opinion, are the present Federal benefits for our veterans adequate?	64.8	14.6	20.6
13. Should educational benefits be extended to veterans who are drafted for peacetime service?	41.3	47.7	11.0
14. In your opinion, should an all-out effort be made to excel Russia in the exploration and control of outer space?	45.1	34.6	20.3
15. Do you favor legislation to curb the authority of the Supreme Court?	57.2	34.6	8.2
16. In your opinion, is Government support for farm prices necessary to maintain a healthy farm economy?	14.9	71.0	14.1
17. Should the expanded use of atomic energy for civilian use be developed and promoted by private industry rather than under U.S. Government control?	68.5	20.3	11.2

Nathaniel Barber Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BASIL L. WHITENER
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 25, 1959

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I have long felt that our people in North Carolina have enjoyed the finest race relations to be found anywhere in our country. This was further emphasized to me on Friday, May 22, 1959, at a public gathering honoring one of our outstanding Negro citizens.

With the thought that the story of this occasion would be of interest to my colleagues, I am, under unanimous consent, inserting the newspaper account carried by the Gastonia Gazette of May 23, 1959, in the Appendix of today's RECORD:

EX-COUNCILMAN IS HONORED; BARBER PRAISED AS UPRIGHT MAN

Gastonia was a showcase of good race relations last night.

Gathered at Highland High School on the Dallas Highway were 300 people—Negro and white—to pay honor to the first Negro man ever to sit on the Gastonia city council.

And Catholic, Christian and Jew, white and Negro stood up to give verbal praise to the man—Nathaniel Barber.

It was a testimonial dinner in his behalf—for the good he has done for his community.

OLD FRIENDS

His old friends by the hundreds were there, and many of them stood up to say a few words.

Leon Schneider, a Jew and former mayor of Gastonia, said that when he used to look down the council table and see Nat Barber sitting on the left side on the end, "I never saw a Negro. I saw a man."

He pointed out that Gastonia has a lot to be proud of.

"It has had a Jewish mayor (Schneider), a Jewish conciliman (Marshall Rauch), and a Negro who served both as councilman and treasurer. Now, white and Negro Catholic and Christian and Jew meet here tonight. What other city in the South can say as much?"

As others got up to laud Barber, the man who runs the Excelsior Credit Union, largest such Negro organization in the United States, sat in apparent meekness with eyes on the floor.

SPEAKER

BASIL WHITENER, Representative to Congress from this district, was the principal speaker.

He pointed out that for 49 years, Barber has walked uprightly among the people of our county and has carved a mark "all out of proportion to that which could have been expected of him from his humble beginnings. As one of 12 children born to his parents, he has known the life of deprivation and limited opportunity which so often is the crucible which produces leadership in the finer areas of personal and community life."

WHITENER pointed out that even though Barber's economic situation prevented his receiving a high school diploma, he kept this goal before him and after reaching manhood he attended night school until he received the instrument.

Among other things, WHITENER mentioned that Barber is chairman of the Erwin Memorial Park Commission which manages and operates the publicly owned recreation facilities for the Negroes of Gastonia, that he was chosen as Man of the Year for community service by the Omega Psi Phi fraternity in 1953, that he is chairman of the board of stewards of St. Peter's A.M.E. Zion Church, that he served for 6 years on the council of the city of Gastonia.

"In politics," continued WHITENER, "Barber has conducted himself in a manner benefiting the high confidence expressed in him. He has put into practive the fundamental principle which should guide the life of all of us who seek the suffrage of our people."

James W. Atkins, publisher of the Gazette, said that historians—those who dig deep in research back to the dawn of recorded events—have made the statement that no race in history has made such marvelous progress in all lines of human endeavor as the Negro, within a period of less than 100 years since they gained their freedom.

He spoke of the splendid relations between the races here and paid compliment to the honoree, Barber, as city councilman, as business executive, and as civic and religious leader.

OTHERS LAUD BARBER

Others who rose to laud Barber included Mayor Bob Ferguson, E. F. Gallagher, W. Harrelson Yancey, the Reverend A. C. Hunnicutt, Elsie Saunders, and J. Q. Falls.

All of them pointed to the understanding that Nathaniel Barber had helped to establish between races here, to the service he has Jeffers, principal of Highland High.

A plaque in honor of Barber was presented to him. The presentation was made by T. Jeffers, principal of Highland High.

The plaque reads: "Presented to Nathaniel Barber, Gastonia councilman, 1953–59, for outstanding civic service, May 22, 1959."

Toward the end of the dinner, Nat Barber rose to say a few words.

"I have been greatly moved and touched by your expressions of good will and friendship," he began. "The one thing I have learned, and it has been brought home to me most vividly here this evening, is that the true sense of service can best be evaluated by a man's close friends and close associates. This I believe sincerely."

The meeting was presided over by Donald Ramseur, attorney, who headed the committee in charge of arranging the program.

House Underrated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 25, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include an interesting letter which correctly states the Constitution written by Eugene Kelly, of 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C., and appearing in the Washington Evening Star of May 20, 1959. Mr. Kelly is to be congratulated in exposing the lack of knowledge on the part of some of the columnists and editorial writers in failing to recognize that both branches of the Congress are coequal and neither branch is the upper or lower branch:

HOUSE UNDERRATED

I am weary of constant references to the House of Representatives as the lower Chamber, the implication being, of course, that the House is legislatively inferior to the Senate. Just the opposite is true. The House has more powers than the Senate.

Only the House can impeach a public official. All revenue bills must originate in the House, and the same holds true for appropriation bills.

Similarly, the House is the sole judge of the elections, returns, and qualifications of its own Members (art. I, sec. 5, of the Constitution). The Senate also has the same authority, so that in this respect the Senate and House have coequal powers. But nowhere in the Constitution is there any mention of upper and lower Chamber.

EUGENE KELLY.

The Tragic Drama of Fort Polk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 25, 1959

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, our people in Louisiana are greatly disturbed over the loss of Fort Polk located in Sabine and Vernon Parishes. This great Army installation was established as a permanent fort a number of years ago and at the time it was established the State of Louisiana was asked to furnish to the Army for maneuver purposes without charge 7 million maneuver acres of land located in the western part of the State.

When the request was made for 7 million maneuver acres, the State agencies went to work to obtain these extremely large areas of ground for maneuver rights and without charge on the part of our citizens. It is to the external credit of the State agencies cooperating with the parochial and municipal authorities that land was made available by your people. With a loyalty and enthusiasm rarely equaled at any time our people gave unstintingly the 7 million acres of land to the U.S. Government with the invitation that without charge they could use this land for maneuver purposes.

Only a few short years have gone by since this occurred. During that time the fort has been built into the permanent establishment which it was intended to be. A contract for $32 million in Capehart housing was let and work to the extent of millions of dollars placed in this 2,000 unit housing construction project.

Mr. Speaker, tragedy struck with lightning effect. In some cloistered portion of the Polk Building, shielded from outside light and public scrutiny, an order went out to close down this great mechanized base, sorely needed by us in our Defense Establishment. The order took the eagles, so to speak, from the 1st Armored Division, stripping it of course of its laurels and its history and its tradition and ordered the closing of this base.

Local people had spent millions of dollars in construction, had built houses, places to rent, business establishments, places of amusements, and great highways, all because of the prosperity of Fort Polk. The people had voted school taxes and the school boards had let bond issues for the purpose of building schools. The State had put in four-lane highways to the base. The whole community seethed with activity in support of a permanent fort at Leesville, La.

The order of the Department of the Army closing Fort Polk out struck with sickening effect. The economy of this area was paralyzed. Our people were perplexed and dismayed that the U.S. Government would breach its faith to local people who so vigorously offered and gave 7 million maneuver acres to the U.S. Government. The dismay of our people has now turned to anger. Does any government have the right to breach faith with its citizens who loyally support that government by supplying defense needs?

The legislature is now meeting at Baton Rouge, La. It has passed a Resolution No. 6 answering this question, and Mr. Speaker, the copy of this resolution has been sent to me by air mail. I present it to the House that it may be copied verbatim into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD together with the names of those in Louisiana who voted for this measure.

A solid Louisiana approaches this crisis. No votes were recorded against presenting Resolution No. 6. I hope this administration will act in time to prevent a permanent wrong being visited upon so many people of a great State. I hope that the Department of the Army will still act to reinstate Fort Polk and designate it again to the position of a permanent installation which designation was made at an earlier date. The resolution just passed the House of Representatives, with no opposing votes. The resolution and vote are as follows:

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 6

By Mr. Cole and Representative Adams:

Be it resolved by the Senate of the State of Louisiana (the House of Representatives concurring), That,

Whereas the U.S. Army has ordered the closing of Fort Polk, located in the parish of Vernon, La., effective on or about June 30, 1959; and

Whereas the people of Louisiana were assured by the U.S. Army when Fort Polk was established that it would be a permanent installation of the Army; and

Whereas the people of Louisiana, relying on these promises, gave maneuver rights free of charge to the U.S. Army and the State of Louisiana cooperated through all of its various official agencies, particularly the Office of the Attorney General, in obtaining the balance of the maneuver rights for the requirements of the Army free of cost to the said Army, which rights and areas were areas which the United States designated as required for their needs, and which totaled approximately 7 million acres; and

Whereas the scheduled closing of Fort Polk now violates the honor and integrity of the promises and assurances made to the people of the State of Louisiana; and

Whereas based upon the commitments of the United States, the State of Louisiana through its proper officials at an enormous expense to the State and its people set in motion the necessary legal procedure looking

toward the acquisition of the above referred to maneuver areas, which efforts resulted favorably and enured to the benefit of the United States; and

Whereas based on the above referred to commitments and the reasonable assurance of the people of the area involved, enormous debts were incurred, schools were built, sewerage and other public utility facilities were supplied, highways were constructed and improved, bonds were issued, special taxes were voted, and improvements of a substantial nature at an enormous cost were placed on the properties, which would not otherwise have been done, except for the commitment of the United States to the people of Louisiana to make Fort Polk a permanent installation; and

Whereas the peremptory closing of the said fort at the time above set out does violence to the contractual obligations, or quasi-contractual obligations, to the effect that the permanency of the establishment of the fort would be for a period of at least 15 years, and the closing of the fort violates the said obligations and operates to the extreme disadvantage and monetary loss to all of the people of the State of Louisiana: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the Legislature of Louisiana, That the U.S. Government and the Department of Defense be urged to rescind immediately the said order closing Fort Polk and that it continue to be operated as a permanent installation of the U.S. Army in keeping with the commitments of the United States of America, and that a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the Members of the U.S. Congress, the Secretary of Defense of the United States, and the Secretary of the Army of the United States, and that the said President and Members of the Congress and the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Army be urged to take appropriate action to have said order rescinded; and be it further

Resolved, That the Attorney General of the State of Louisiana is hereby urged by the legislature to take whatever appropriate legal action he may deem proper and necessary in the premises to carry out the mandates of this resolution.

Read in full.

Mr. Adams moved that the resolution be concurred in.

A record vote was asked for and ordered by the house.

ROLLCALL

The roll was called with the following result:

Yeas: Messrs. Angelle, Speaker; Adams, Albro, Alford, Allen, Altmyer, Aycock, Babineaux, Becnel, Belisle, Bernard, Bertrand, Brennan, Brignac, Brown, A. D. (Caddo), Campagna, Cashio, Cefalu, Cerise, Cheves, Clark F. (Vermilion), Clark, W. P. (Orleans), Collier, Daigre, Deshotel, Diesi, Donaldson, C. F. (Orleans), Downes, Dupont, Dyson, Faulk, Fields, Fremaux, Garrett, Gaudin, Gibbs, Gleason, Gouaux, Gravolet, Gregson, Grizzaffi, Hankins, Haynes, Holt, Jewell, Jones, Kirkpatrick, Lancaster, Leake, Lehmann, Lewis, Matassa, McGittigan, McLain, Munson, Murtes, Myrick, Napper, Peck, Rambo, Rau, Regan, Roberts, Sanders, Seaman, Shows, Smith, J. K. (Caddo), Steen, Sutton, Sylvester, Teekell, Tessier, Triche, Tyndall, Vetter, Vivien, Womack. Total, 77.

Nays: None.

Absent: Messrs. Barranger, Beeson, Broussard, Brown, J. M. (Orleans), Crane, Delony, de Nux, Donaldson, H. E. (Allen), Dugas, Fontenot, Fulco, Gaharan, Jack, Lapara, LeBreton, Martin, Nelson, Percy, Roussel, Smith, B. (Avoyelles), Stinson, Sullivan, Vesich, Wilson. Total, 24.

And the resolution was concurred in.

Prize Short Story Entitled "Isaac" Written by Robert W. Nolte, of Silver Spring, Md.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. FOLEY
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 25, 1959

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, from time to time we have the opportunity to recognize achievements by young people in our country. Today I should like to recognize the achievement of a young man who lives in my district, Robert W. Nolte, who has won first prize in the short story category of the national scholastic writing awards. This fine young man, a student at Montgomery Blair High School, Silver Spring, Md., has written a prize-winning short story entitled "Isaac," which I ask to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD as a tribute to his outstanding accomplishment. I think Mr. Nolte's short story is indicative of a fine literary and intellectual future for him.

The short story is reprinted here from the Record, one of our fine Montgomery County, Md., newspapers, in the May 14 issue. I commend the story to all my colleagues, and wish to commend and congratulate Robert Nolte on the winning of this fine award:

HERE IS A NATIONALLY AWARDED SHORT STORY BY A BLAIR SENIOR

(By Robert W. Nolte)

The sun beat viciously on his back and drew out his sweat, staining his denims a deep indigo. The baked prairie rustled with heat. He leaned on the wooden crosspiece between the handles of the plow and moved his parched tongue as if wetting his lips. The dry air stung his lungs and its dust clung to his throat. He coughed softly between rapid breaths.

The man was known as Isaac. This tired piece of land and its little worn buildings were nearly all he owned and had been the family heritage from a time he couldn't remember. These things were sacred to him in a way. They were his life and he was their master; they provided all he needed and all he wanted.

Although his land was not great, it was more than Isaac alone could sow in the spring. He plowed the best then and worked on through the summer with the worst, plowing to keep the soil open to rain and air and silently hoping that his earth would somehow become rich. He would watch the rows turned up in the sun like long lines of hands in prayer, watch them when the heat bleached them to a sandy fragility, when the too infrequent rains soaked them to a suggestion of life, and when the storms came in the heat and leveled them and carried them off. Then he would begin again and silently hope again.

Often he would say to himself when the water was low and the crops were meager, "I am strong. I will not run." And this way he lived through drought and through storm and through fire.

The others had left or were leaving. They sought the great cities and the lands where the sun would be pleasing. They sought the lands that grew grass. Isaac would scorn them year after year as the sand piled higher and the crops grew less. But often at night when he tossed sleeplessly and the air hung like a heavy blanket, stuffy and motionless, he would think of leaving. The clutching hands of his sheets held him, grasped him by the sweat of his body, and made him afraid to stay any longer. He stayed and struggled on, however, for daylight would make him believe again, believe in the land, believe in the hope that the earth would be fruitful. The fear of the unknown was strongest of all fears. He would think, "To live here and die here is right. The storms and the sun and Ruth can't change that."

Ruth was getting worse this year and Isaac wasn't sure why. She had known the droughts and the storms for she had lived with them. But now that the dry days had come again, she seemed to be breaking.

"The trouble is, she doesn't know how rough I've got it. She doesn't care. All she ever talks about now is leaving. The fight about adopting that kid really made her mind up. If it was our own we could manage, but there's no sense in taking on more than we can afford. She ought to see that."

The guide reins slapped the mule into motion and on they trudged down the dusty furrows.

Isaac fell again to thought. "She shouldn't be like this. All we do is fight. Every day, more and more. Maybe it's my fault. But maybe it's the sun. No, she can't make me go. I couldn't do anything for work if we did."

The sun at its height and the dusty air forced him out of the field for the noon meal. Unhitching the mule, he led him slowly across the field through the sand-piled gate to the meager shade of the lean-to. The mule eagerly lapped at the water Isaac poured from the precious pitcher into the trough. He licked the rough boards when it all was gone, as his master walked around him patting his side.

Isaac stood in the sun again, staring absently, once more lost in thought. "If she's washed those curtains again * * * I just can't take much more of this." He blinked his eyes and the thought was forgotten. Sweat ran down his face to the point of his chin and he drew his sleeve across his mouth.

The boards of the single step from the ground to the house shuddered under his weight, the quivering planks sending the tops of the sand drifts piled against them tumbling down and down like small avalanches. The doorway opened directly to the kitchen where Ruth stood at the sinkboard.

"Got something to eat, Ruth?"

"Mm-hmm. I was just getting ready to bring it out. Too hot to stay outside?"

Isaac was wiping his hands.

"Huh? Oh, yeah, too hot."

"Too hot for most anything, isn't it?" Her words were clipped, the muscles of her neck beginning to tighten.

"Now Ruth, just a minute. Let's not start already."

"Start what, Isaac?"

"You know what I mean. I'm too tired to fight right now. You always have to start first thing I get in the door."

"You're too tired? You're too tired? Don't I ever get tired? No, it's always you. Well, I'm tired, too! I'm good and sick and tired! I'm sick of your stubbornness and your soft talk and your silly dreams about making something out of that desert out there."

"Now just a minute here." His voice became stronger.

"That seems to be all you can say. It's been just a minute, just a minute, just a week, wait another month for years. Eleven years we've been married, Isaac. Eleven years and look what's happening to me. Look at my hands."

"Ruth."

"Eleven years, Isaac, and we've got nothing, no children."

"That's not my fault."

There was silence.

"Oh, Isaac! Oh, Isaac, how could you?" She talked slowly now, biting off her words. "How could you? Eleven years and no children, no joy, nothing pretty, and it's not your fault? Look at me, Isaac. Look close. I'm becoming an old woman. Just 11 years and I'm an old woman."

"Stop it, Ruth. Stop it right now!"

"No. No, I won't. I ask you to leave, I beg you to leave, and you still hang on. It's killing me, Isaac, it's killing me. I can't take it any longer. I'd rather die."

The momentary fury ebbed as she turned with her back to him. She stared with glazed eyes across the shimmering land past the white window curtains to the blue-gray distant hills. The faraway look was there when her anger had drained away. "Oh, Isaac, I wish we could go, just throw everything in the Ford and go. We could go off down the road to town and honk the horn all the way through and then just go on." She ran her finger across the window ledge and laughed softly, almost to herself, "I can just see them now, Old Man Haplin and the Thomas Sisters and Tommy Spotts at the gas station and * * *." Her continuing laugh died in a painful sigh and she whirled around, her cheeks growing flushed again, her eyes anxious.

"Isaac, give me one reason why not!"

He came awkwardly to her and placed his clumsy hands on her rigid shoulders, quietly looking into her eyes which burned with frustration. When he spoke, his tone was as gentle as he could make it, the same he had used so many times before.

"Ruth, this land was my father's and his father's before that and his father's before that. You know I'd die without it."

"You don't know that I'll die with it."

She gave up and fell sobbing into his arms. Encircling her, he softly rested his chin on the top of her head and his eyes fell on the clean white curtains hanging soft and fresh in the still air.

"Ruth. You've been washing those curtains again. How many times I gotta * * *."

She wrenched herself from him and began beating her fists on the worn drain board.

"Isaac, Isaac, Isaac. Must you kill the only thing left? You will not even allow me to be a woman. You take away everything."

She fled from the room. Arms hanging loosely, a frown on his forehead, plainly confused, Isaac carried his food to the table and sat down to eat. There were a number of things that made no sense to him. She would wash the curtains and wash the curtains and wash them again, no matter how low the water was, and in the evening sometimes she would go to the bedroom to sit and look at herself in the mirror and he would be puzzled. When she got this angry, he really couldn't think straight. So he just closed his ears to her and tried to calm her down until it was all over.

All that the fights did was to convince him more and more that it was right to stay. It was right that he plow the ragged, dusty furrows, sow when the time was right, reap what he could when he could, milk the earth as his father and his father's father had done. It made no difference to each succeeding generation which fought the dust that the land grew poorer with every passing year. It was right to stay.

Isaac rose from the table and walked slowly across the cracked linoleum floor to the open doorway, where he propped himself by his elbow against the frame and leaned there squinting in the glare of the boiling sun on the baked waste land. Somewhere off through the waves of heat he could see the dull-colored hills.

"Those hills," he remembered. "Something like they're a life to her with everything she wants." He could remember her exact words:

"Someday, Isaac, if you will not see my way, I will find what I want in someone else * * * or something else. Then it will be too late, but you will know me." He could remember because she had spoken coldly, not in anger, and looked out to the hills when she said it. Whenever he saw the hills, he remembered.

Although he felt suddenly tired, Isaac forced himself to go out of the door and back to the fields. He led the aging mule past the worn gate, tortured by weather, and down the barren furrow the plow he had left.

"Maybe we could adopt the boy. If he was big enough, I sure could use him here. No, we couldn't afford it."

He hooked up the traces and went back to the plow handles.

"I'm not making her get old. A woman's got to grow old. I don't know why she's the way she is."

Isaac shook his head and then called to the mule and put his weight to the plowstaff, grinding the blade in the harsh soil, turning up an arid, dusty wake. Later on he stopped to rest, panting from the effort. Leaning on the plow and inspecting the creases in his tanned hands, his eyes widened in random thought.

"I guess she's really right. We'll go see about the boy next Saturday." He dismissed the matter from his mind and pushed on, intent on the ground before him, consumed by his exertion.

Late in the afternoon, he felt the moisture on the back of his neck cooled by a faint suggestion of a breeze and he stopped to rest once more.

"Yes, we'll do it. We need some life, something young. Yes, we'll do it."

The breeze was stronger now and the man drove forward with renewed vigor, refreshed by the motion of the warm, breathy wind and the release of the tension inside him. Tiny puffs of dust were lifted in irregular swirls by gusts of wind. Looking out to the familiar hills, Isaac notice a warm, yellow hue he couldn't remember having noticed before. He fought his way down the long stretch to the end of the plot with his eyes fastened on the ground.

When he had straightened up and turned the mule and reset the plow, he happened to glance at the sky. He took a step backward and his eyes suddenly widened.

The orange clouds which enveloped the horizon might have been reflecting the glow of the sun beginning to set on the hills behind him, but his years on the farm belied this to Isaac. The wind in his face and the fighting, turbulent clouds told the story. For all the times he had seen it, the spectacle still frightened him.

Bent and weary, the mule awoke to a danger he sensed in the wind whipping up his ragged mane. His feet shifted uneasily and he backed up, wavering from side to side. Isaac unfastened the mule's traces and took his muzzle ties to lead him back toward the barn. The terrible clouds made the mule shy back, snorting excitedly, pawing the ground.

"Easy there, easy, Jerry, whoa boy! Whoa now!" Isaac fought to calm the excitement and fear in his voice as he urged the animal to follow him. The wind whistling in his wild hair nearly caused the man to panic.

"Steady now. Come on, Jerry. Come on, boy."

The strength of the storm was growing, heightening.

"Come on. Come on, now. Come to me, boy."

The frantic urge to run, run anywhere now that the wind was so great, made the mule jump forward, nearly upsetting Isaac. On they hurried for the broken gate, man and mule, in a desperate lunge, stumbling, tripping, running.

When he saw his wife standing before the little farmhouse, Isaac stopped short. She was wearing her best clothes and was facing the hills, swaying slightly in the wind.

"Ruth? What are you doing?"

He panted from his flight.

"Ruth?"

He came closer, bewildered.

"Get back in the house. There's a sandstorm coming. Will you get back in the house, there?"

She turned her face to him. The wind played with wisps of her hair.

"No. I'm leaving you."

"You're what?"

"I'm leaving. I've had enough."

"That's a sandstorm, I said."

"I'm going."

"Where? What do you mean?"

"It doesn't matter."

They had to yell to overcome the noise of the wind.

"You'll die."

"Yes."

"What?"

"Yes."

"For God's sake, Ruth, get back in the house."

"Goodbye, Isaac."

"Listen to me. We'll adopt the boy. Go back to the house."

"What?"

She said nothing. He had not heard her.

"What?"

She would not answer. Isaac turned and broke into a run. The frantic race ended when the mule was safe in a stall, lathered and panting. Isaac couldn't hear the soft stacatto of the sand on the barn walls because of the wind. He ran to the huge doorway.

The wind tore the heavy door from his hands with a broadside gust and slammed it closed against the frame. When he had fitted the great bar on the hooks to keep it shut, he shielded his eyes and nose and started for the house.

The force of the stinging blast pushed him sideways, but he reached the shelter of a leeward side of the house and slipped around to the front door. The door was wide open, banging madly against the wall. Sand was blowing into the kitchen as the man burst through the doorway, still covering his eyes. He rushed in and fell across the table, too spent to close the door. His lunch dishes, unwashed, flew off with the collision and shattered into fragments which scattered over the floor. Isaac's red rimmed eyes closed and he breathed in deep, groaning sighs. The wind outside thundered in his eardrums.

Realization forced him erect.

"Ruth. Ruth. Where are you?"

From room to room he ran, tearing open the doors. Emptiness greeted him.

"Ruth."

His hands shaking he groped his way to the open door.

"No, oh no."

Isaac's voice fell to a whimper, for he could faintly see the swirl of the dark skirts of a figure stumbling off in the direction of the now indiscernable hills. He started after her but fell forward to the ground with the power of the storm. He clutched after her distant feet and his fingers drew up into sand-filled fists. He threw his head back.

"Ruth Ruth. Ruth." he screamed.

The wild noise of the door smashing against the wall and the titantic roar of the wind overpowered his frenzied cry. The figure was now almost completely engulfed in the howling, swirling sand.

"Ruth."

Public Opinion and the Farm Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 25, 1959

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, there has been a recent upsurge in anti-farm-price-support publicity from those who have a history of such opposition.

For example, in April the farm Journal published the results of a poll among its readers. This poll purported to show that farmers generally are opposed to price supports.

The Secretary of Agriculture and Newsweek, to name two, have cited this poll as evidence that a large percentage of farmers want lower price supports or none at all. Every Congressman has been made aware of this poll.

Life magazine in its April 16 issue ran a lengthly article appealing to its readers to notify their Congressmen to put an end to farm subsidies, as a means of obtaining a tax cut.

The May 1959 issue of the Reader's Digest contains a diatribe against farm programs.

We all have been exposed to periodic and sustained publicity to the effect that taxpayers are unhappy about farm subsidies. It is important to note, however, that such publicity has always emanated from sources most antagonistic to Government-sponsored farm programs.

I should like to insert in the RECORD the results of a poll conducted under the supervision of Dr. George Gallup, director of the American Institute of Public Opinion at Princeton. These results were widely syndicated and appeared in the May 1 issue of the Washington Post and Times Herald.

One of the questions asked of a cross-section of voters was: "Do you think there is anything for which the Government should be spending less money than it is at present?"

Only 4 percent of the voters answered that farm subsidies were an item for which the Government should spend less money.

Stated another way, 96 percent of the voters do not disapprove of the farm program, but support it and recognize its value to the population as a whole.

There are some significant features about Dr. Gallup's poll as compared to the one conducted by the Farm Journal.

First. Dr. Gallup is a qualified expert in the field of measuring current public opinion, but the Farm Journal is not.

Second. The American Institute of Public Opinion at Princeton is principally engaged in measuring public opinion, while the Farm Journal attempts to mold it. For the past several years the Farm Journal has been chief salesman of the Benson program.

Third. The techniques and methods used by Dr. Gallup are scientifically valid, whereas those of the Farm Journal are questionable at best.

It would be more representative of high-caliber leadership if our public officials, particularly those of cabinet rank, would exercise caution in publicly citing the results of polls and surveys which do not reflect sufficient expertise in the field of measuring public opinion, or which are obviously biased.

A Resolution for Progress in the Missouri Valley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 25, 1959

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, recently the Missouri River States Committee met at Council Bluffs, Iowa, to discuss vital matters relating to our Missouri River development program.

This committee passed an important resolution concerning the need for continuing construction on the Missouri River.

Under unanimous consent I include the text of this resolution in the RECORD:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED APRIL 15, 1959, BY MISSOURI RIVER STATES COMMITTEE AT COUNCIL BLUFFS, IOWA

We, the Missouri River States Committee, consisting of the Governors of the States of Iowa, Colorado, Kansas, Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, and Wyoming, comprising one-sixth of the area of the United States of America, in meeting assembled, do hereby adopt the following resolution:

"Whereas the Missouri River States Committee, created in December of 1941, was organized for the express purpose of securing flood control, irrigation, navigation, power development, and related improvements of the entire Missouri River Basin; and

"Whereas through the efforts of the Missouri River States Committee and other groups, the Missouri Basin project was authorized by Congress in the year 1944; and

"Whereas during the 15 years since that time substantial progress has been made in meeting the objectives of flood control, navigation, water supply, and power development and, to a lesser degree, irrigation, and other improvements; and

"Whereas the orderly development of natural and human resources of the Missouri River Basin is impeded and severely handicapped by the 'no new starts' policy; and

"Whereas said 'no new starts' policy impairs the economic strength of the entire country by preventing the development of natural resources in the basin as an investment in the future welfare and security of the United States as a whole; and

Whereas the construction of planned projects would strengthen the economic base of this region and of our whole country at a time when full development and use of our national resources are urgently needed in the struggle between the free world and the areas of the earth dominated by Communists: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That this committee urges the Congress of the United States to implement its authorizations of reclamation and flood control and other projects by appropriating the necessary money for the initiation of said projects; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That this resolution be forwarded by the chairman of the Missouri River States Committee to the Honorable CLARENCE CANNON, chairman of the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives of the United States, and the Honorable CARL HAYDEN, chairman of Appropriations Committee of the Senate of the United States.

Special Subcommittee on Oceanography of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 25, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the Special Subcommittee on Oceanography of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, under the able leadership of our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER], is making an outstanding reputation. This is clearly evidenced by the wide and favorable publicity on the work that Congressman GEORGE P. MILLER's special subcommittee is doing and the importance of the subcommittee's work, and the serious and constructive manner which the subcommittee has approached consideration of this important field.

In my extension of remarks I include a fine editorial of the work of the Special Subcommittee on Oceanography appearing in the Boston Traveler of May 16, 1959, and also an informative news item appearing in the Boston Sunday Herald of May 17, 1959. Congressman GEORGE P. MILLER and the members of his special subcommittee are to be congratulated in the constructive manner in which they are approaching in the performance of their duties:

[From the Boston Traveler, May 16, 1959]

SUMMING UP AND LOOKING AHEAD

Most of the money and energy the U.S. Government has spent on science in the past few years has been for the lofty purpose of hitching our wagon to a star.

While all this looking upward has brought great progress in rocketry, satellites, moon shooting and outer space research in general, there's one group in Congress that wonders if more of us shouldn't have kept our eyes on the mud.

The mud at the bottom of the ocean and all the salt water around it, they suspect, hold as much—if not more—promise for mankind than the conquest of the universe.

A Special Subcommittee on Oceanography of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee is concerned lest our national policy leaders may have missed the boat in neglecting the sea to concentrate on space.

In this connection, there are fears that Russia may be outstripping us in oceanic studies.

There is no proof of this, but there is sober counsel from the National Academy of Sciences, whose job it is to advise the Federal Government on scientific matters.

"On the practical side, the problems to be solved concerning the oceans are at least as

urgent as those of space," said the Academy in a report issued in January.

"From the point of view of military operations, there is no comparison between the urgencies of the problems of the oceans and those of outer space.

"The submarine armed with long-range missiles is probably the most potent weapon system threatening our security today. It seems clear that the pressures of establishing effective bases, and of protecting ourselves from attack, are relentlessly driving us into the oceans."

The Academy said that we know less about many areas of the ocean than we do about the moon.

Capt. Henry G. Munson, commander of the Navy's Hydrographic Office, made it somewhat stronger. He said:

"We know little more about the ocean than where it is."

It was against this background that the House subcommittee, under Chairman GEORGE P. MILLER, Democrat of California, began hearings in March.

As witnesses, they are calling as many as possible of the relatively few experts on oceanography in the United States.

While it is a highly technical field in many ways, it is filled with the kind of adventurous speculation that produced Jules Verne's "Twenty Thousand Leagues Under the Sea."

And the tales of gold that have fascinated committee members make the richest pirate's treasure sound like so much pin money.

In every cubic mile of ocean, the salt water scientists say, the volume of gold suspended is worth $93 million.

And that's only one of the many valuable minerals in the water or under it. We haven't an inkling of the extent of oil deposits.

But knowledge of their existence and recollection of the bitter Federal-State battles over offshore oil rights have been enough to raise some knotty legal questions in the subcommittee.

For instance, what do we do if Russia starts drilling for underwater oil just outside our coastal limits?

If, as it seems, present international law offers us no protection against such a possibility, then inner space—or underwater—boundaries are surely as essential as those for outer space.

Pressures for food from rapidly expanding populations may force the issue long before exploitation of oil or mineral resources.

The subcommittee is hearing about methods of fencing off parts of the seas for fish farms. There's little doubt that in the decades to come both animal and vegetable life from the ocean will be more important to human survival than they are today.

And there's no doubt that deeper and broader knowledge of the ocean will be increasingly vital to our defense, weather forecasting and, possibly, even climate control.

While the Congressmen are learning all they can about the scientific channels to be studied they have before them a financial program suggested by the National Academy.

It recommended that Uncle Sam spend $650 million during the next 10 years on basic research—the sort of exploration carried on by oceanographers of several nations during International Geophysical Year in 1958.

Presumably, the Woods Hole Oceanographic Institute and its neighbor on Cape Cod, the Marine Biological Laboratory of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, would benefit under such a program.

The biggest chunk of money, some $275 millions, would go for specially designed ocean research ships. Another $100 million would buy icebreaking submarines and anchor platforms in midocean for scientists.

New shore laboratories to evaluate the findings of basic research ships would cost $90 million and some $56 million would go for surveying and mapping the oceans.

Another $87 million would be used to study the ocean's resources—fish, oil, etc.

And the problems of dumping atomic waste at sea would be studied in projects costing $32 million.

Some studies on radioactive waste will be conducted off Boston and Martha's Vineyard this summer for the Atomic Energy Commission.

One of the House subcommittee's big jobs before recommending any appropriation will be to discover what various Government agencies are already doing in the field of oceanography and to what extent their activities could be coordinated.

Possibility that sea studies, space studies—in fact most Federal research—may be lumped together in a U.S. Department of Science is seen by Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY.

He has filed a controversial bill to consider putting frogmen and spacemen on the same team.

[From the Boston Sunday Herald, May 17, 1959]

OCEANS SEEN AS NEGLECTED BATTLEGROUND—HOUSE COMMITTEE TAKES HARD LOOK AT FIELD OF IGNORANCE

(By Congressional Quarterly)

WASHINGTON.—Congress is taking its first broad look at what many scientists see as a neglected battleground—the oceans.

A Special Oceanography Subcommittee of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee is doing the looking.

"The first thing we have to do," says Subcommittee Chairman GEORGE P. MILLER, Democrat, of California, "is to find out what is being done now in this field. Only then will we be in a position to make recommendations to Congress."

PICKING OF BRAINS

What the subcommittee has been doing for the past 2 months—and will continue doing throughout the 1959 session of Congress—is picking the brains of the relatively few experts in the oceanography field.

This brain picking gives the committee hearing room the atmosphere of an advanced seminar course. Beribboned Navy officers spread out century-old whaling charts before the student Congressmen to show how marine life can be mapped; earnest scientists talk about how part of the ocean could be fenced off into fish farms; others tell of the untapped wealth in the oceans.

The Congressmen sit entranced as witnesses tell of $93 million worth of gold suspended in each cubic mile of sea water; of rivers 1,000 times mightier than the Mississippi surging in the ocean depths; of mountains and broad plains equal to those on land. The subcommittee recently listened to an eerie tape of the language of the sea—snapping of shrimp, barking of porpoises, and grunting of drum fish.

Visionaries see the oceans, the mother of all life, as the last frontier. They say it is about to be rushed. Yet there are no laws controlling the homesteading of the sea. Are we, lawyers ask, about to enter another era of pirating where fast ships hijack the treasures other ships have dug out of the sea? And what can we do legally if Russia, for example, starts digging for oil just outside our coastal limits?

RUSSIA BIG WORRY

As in the space race, Russia's progress in oceanography worries our experts. The National Academy of Sciences in a recent report said:

"From the point of view of military operations, there is no comparison between the urgencies of the problems of the oceans and those of outer space. The submarine, armed with long-range missiles, is probably the most potent weapon system threatening our security today. It seems clear that the pressures of establishing effective bases, and of protecting ourselves from attack, are relentlessly driving us into the oceans."

Ignorance about the oceans is widespread, Capt. Henry G. Munson, commander of the Navy's Hydrographic Office, told the subcommittee: "We know little more about the ocean than where it is."

What should be done? The Government asked the National Academy of Sciences to make recommendations. The Academy recently summarized its recommendation in the first of 12 reports on oceanography.

It said "the key to the growth of oceanography in the United States lies in basic research—research which is done for its own sake without thought of specific practical applications."

It then urged that the Federal Government spend $651 million over the next 10 years to double the rate of basic research. The money would go for new ships especially designed to explore the seas; fellowships for students of oceanography and financial aid to institutions that teach them; new shore laboratories to sift data gathered at sea, new research tools such as icebreaking submarines and midocean ploaforms, and a program to find out if radioactive materials can safely be dumped into the seas.

RESPONSIBILITY SPLIT

Right now, the work of studying the ocean is spread among several Federal agencies. The subcommittee is trying to decide whether a coordinating committee should be established. But its recommendations to Congress on these and other oceanography problems are not expected to come until late this year.

On the Senate side, Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat of Minnesota, introduced a bill with broad bipartisan backing to set up a Hoover-type commission to determine if a special Department of Science was advisable. Although the Senate has scheduled no oceanography hearings on its own. HUMPHREY said the Senate should consider establishing a special group to act in concert with the House subcommittee.

He said Congress must not wear blinders in looking into space, but should also concern itself with the inner-space of the surrounding oceans.

Fortieth Reunion of the Billings High School Class of 1919

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LeROY H. ANDERSON

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 25, 1959

Mr. ANDERSON of Montana. Mr. Speaker, on June 20, 1959, the Billings High School class of 1919 will hold its 40th reunion. This date will also culminate celebration of Western Days in Billings, Mont.

I take this opportunity to extend congratulations and all good wishes to members of the class of 1919.

Lucile Miller Wright, a member of the class, now a consultant in public relations and aviation facilities, who works in New York, will go to Montana to attend the reunion. She has written a poem about our great State which I am including in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Each member of her class will receive a copy as a momento of the reunion:

MONTANA

(By Lucile Miller Wright)

Lazy, fleecy clouds floating through sapphire skies;
Golden mountains necklaced in diamonds and pearls;
Copper sunsets inviting stately pine trees, sentinels of the forest;
To cast amethyst shadows on canyon wall and valley floor.

Hungry trout make silvery ripples on emerald pools
Where deer, bear, fox, and hare come to quench their thirst.
This is Montana, the treasure State,
Land of shining mountains, symbol of peace, my home.

The "Hot Cargo" Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 25, 1959

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include, at the request of the writer, the following letter which I received from a constituent of mine:

SAGINAW, MICH., *May 22, 1959.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BENTLEY: You are my voice in Congress. I want you to speak. I want you to stand up in Congress and read this letter for the consideration of your fellow Congressmen.

Concerning the "hot cargo" contracts, are you aware that my husband could be forced, at the threat of losing his job, to go into a plant where a strike was in progress and risk his personal safety to deliver his load? Do you realize that his company would be forced to send him through picket lines and forced to discharge him if he refused? Do you realize that my husband is 44 years old come Sunday and we have four dependent children? Have any of you men stopped to think in terms of the individual in drafting this labor bill? Have you carefully considered the effect each and every phase of this legislation will have on each individual driver?

Please do not aim this bill at Jimmy Hoffa. Lower your sites and aim your labor legislation at the truckdrivers. They are the people who will have to live with it day by day.

In Senator MCCLELLAN'S zealous effect to fix Jimmy Hoffa's wagon, do not be carried away to the point where you will lose consideration for the individual and the unworkable conditions you will create for Mr. Average Man.

Do you imagine that factory workers will stand idly by and allow a plant to receive delivery as usual while a strike is in progress? If they can get raw material delivered, and finished products hauled away, they can run their plants on scab labor and we would all be right back where we were before labor even got organized.

Factory workers realize what is at stake. They will have no alternative but to use violence to stop delivery from being made. They must enforce their demands on their employers or their employers will enforce their demands on them. A hungry man will fight and this legislation must not come to pass. I warn you this "hot cargo" issue is a Pandora's box.

Consider long and consider well, for the entire Nation will feel the effects of this legislation.

Sincerely,

Mrs. TONY GRILL.

People-to-People Plan Working

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD G. WOLF
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 25, 1959

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, many times what politicians and diplomats cannot do, artists can do. This is because art knows no narrow boundary or selfish motive. The artist knows the truth of the heart which is a universal truth. Last week the Bolshoi Ballet was in Washington. Those lucky enough to see the art of Ulanova, the great Russian dancer, knew the beauty of art and forgot about a cold war and hydrogen bombs and the Berlin crisis. For at least a few hours those who attended the performance felt a universal kinship and brotherhood toward all men through the wonders of art.

Under leave to revise and extend my remarks I wish to insert into the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Drew Pearson on art as a bridge to better world understanding:

[From the Washington Post and Times-Herald, May 20, 1959]

PEOPLE-TO-PEOPLE PLAN WORKING

(By Drew Pearson)

In the center of the Capitol Theater stage, the fragile form of Galina Ulanova fluttered to the floor in the climax of "The Dying Swan." Out in the body of the theater, 3,426 spectators—the most ever squeezed into the Capitol—paid uproarious tribute.

Scene after scene, dance after dance of the Bolshoi Ballet had brought from staid, conservative, culture-satiated Washingtonians unabashed, uninhibited, tumultuous approval.

Beyond that approval, beyond the record-breaking $37,000 box-office receipts which topped the Metropolitan Opera's $29,000, beyond the ballerinas' quick tour of the Lincoln Memorial and Congress was something more important than art and the appreciation of art.

It was the fact that art can form a bridge between people.

So far diplomats have not been able to bridge the gap between the political animosities of the United States and the Soviet Union; nor have the scientists sitting in Geneva; nor even the heads of states meeting at the summit in 1955. But the lithe beauty of Ulanova's body and face; the suppleness of Susanna Zvyagina in the saber dance; and the rugged, expressive hands of Yuri Faier as he led 70 American musicians and 100 Russian dancers in perfect rhythm—they did what trained diplomats and skilled politicians have not been able to do.

They helped the Russian and American people understand each other.

CULTURE AND COMMUNISM

For the Americans, who applauded the grace and symmetry of the Bolshoi Ballet, began to understand that a determined cultured people had produced it, that a ballet so beautiful could not have come from a nation of state policemen and Communist criminals.

Like wise the Russian ballerinas who toured Washington by bus before their performance knew they were not visiting a nation of hate mongers and wicked capitalists. They wanted to stop rush-hour traffic near the 14th Street Bridge to take pictures of the Jefferson Memorial because it was so beautiful.

And when they were so facinated with the radio sets that described the portraits at the Mellon Art Gallery, they did not appreciate the fact that the founder of the gallery had been an oil-and-aluminum millionaire, Andrew Mellon, architect of the Coolidge-Hoover policy that we must have no contacts with the Communist world.

This did not interest the ballerinas. What they said was: "This is a wonderful art gallery. This is beautiful. It has real art."

Even the relentless anti-Russian heart of old Andy Mellon might have melted had he heard the ecstasy of these modern-day Russians over his gallery.

BOLSHOI BALLET PIONEER

Another man who should have been present to watch the Bolshoi Ballet take Washington is Eddie Dowling, the Irish actor with more gold in his heart than in his pockets.

It was Eddie Dowling who first urged that the Bolshoi Ballet be brought to Washington shortly after Franklin Roosevelt resumed relations with the Soviet Union. Dowling had helped elect Roosevelt in 1932 as head of his stage, screen, and radio committee, and the only thing he asked in return was to be permitted to talk with Soviet Foreign Minister Maxim Litvinov regarding the Bolshoi Ballet.

Late one night at the White House Roosevelt arranged the meeting. Dowling urged Litvinov to improve American-Russian friendship by bringing the ballet to the United States. Litvinov was noncommittal, later sent word the ballet was too busy.

Twenty-five years have passed since then. The Iron Curtain has been lifted. American tourists can now go to Russia.

So, slowly, but irresistibly and effectively, people-to-people friendship is working.

Edward D. Stone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 25, 1959

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, Edward D. Stone is one of the outstanding architects of our country. The fact is, he has a worldwide reputation as a leader in that profession. Among the buildings he has designed are the U.S. pavilion at the Brussels World's Fair, the U.S. Chancellery in New Delhi, and the Museum of Modern Art in New York.

He is a native of Fayetteville, Ark., and is a credit not only to his State but to the Nation as well. We are indeed proud of him.

Yesterday he was the speaker at the Arkansas State Society meeting. His subject was "The American Way of Life," and I thought his address was very interesting and very challenging, even though we may not all agree with every

detail of his address. I want to share it with my colleagues and am inserting it in the RECORD as a part of my remarks:

THE AMERICAN WAY OF LIFE

(By Edward D. Stone)

I thought I would speak on the American way of life. Since by now I have lived quite a bit of it up, and I am among friends who might enjoy some personal biography.

I was born around the turn of the century in a small town in the Ozark Mountains. The Baptists would say a community of 5,000 souls. Although its name is Fayetteville, the country people always call it the Athens of the Ozarks as the State university is located there.

My grandfather had settled that corner of the State and was an acquisitive old gent and soon owned the land as far as the eye could see. He had five sons whom he educated and it was his wish to educate them and leave them in a position where they would never have to worry about money. They never did.

My Uncle Will studied medicine at Johns Hopkins, came home and operated on a patient who unfortunately died. He, too, became a philosopher and a learned authority on medicine.

My uncle Albert, for instance, went to Yale to study law. He returned but found that he was much more interested in the affairs of the Roman Empire than he was was in the more mundane practice of law. He was given to drinking with the local philosophers and had a saddle horse named Hobson, after the Spanish-American War hero.

Hobson would take him to the philosophical rendezvous, and uncle Albert would be assisted onto Hobson at the conclusion of the evening; the horse knew the way home. I cite this as an example of the simplicity of the American way of life 50 years ago. You can imagine the legal complications if he had to come home in a Chevrolet.

My father was sent to the University of Virginia and he devoted his life to objective meditation and became, in effect, the local encyclopedia.

So that I was raised in a relaxed life among lotus-eaters, and someone has described my environment as "a hotbed of tranquillity." They did not have to catch me to put shoes on me when I went to school—I simply went to school barefooted.

I very often encountered the work of Senator FULBRIGHT'S biographers and profile writers, but I note that they have overlooked a bit of the Senator's pioneering.

His father owned a Chalmers automobile and BILL'S sisters took the car out and allowed the motor to freeze, cracking the cylinders. Mr. Fulbright told BILL he could have the car if he could make it run. So, after tinkering with it for some months and removing the body, BILL was scooting around town on the chassis. I think I can safely say that he was, therefore, Arkansas's first hot rodder.

The first automobile in town was kept in our barn and looked exactly like the buggy even to the whipsocket. This was my first introduction to the mechanical, scientific 20th century.

So I have been through the horse and buggy, the automobile, the air, the jet, and the atomic age, and if the insurance tables are accurate, there is life left in me yet.

Now to cope with the marvels of our age from Lenin to lanolin and golden oak to chrome tubing, and from Hobson to jets, I've had to work out certain rules for myself that enable me to be carefree and barefoot in the atomic age. I will gladly share these rules with you. You may think of them as Stone's don'ts.

1. Don't work too hard. If you find that you do not have enough ideas in an 8-hour day, the chances are your soul needs therapy. You are in need of inspiration, and for that you should look into the eyes of the woman you love, or go to Chartres Cathedral and see the sunrise through the beautiful stained glass windows or sit among the flowers in your garden.

2. Beware of progress. Progress invariably means that you sacrifice something good for something less attractive. A simple example: Twenty years ago we had living rooms 20 by 30; now you can only tell a room from a closet by the hook-strip on the wall. On a Sunday afternoon when you are trying to get back to New York in your car and you are in a traffic jam, this is a good time to reflect on whether progress is really paying off.

3. Don't be modern. Being modern simply consists of closing your mind to 2,500 years of Western culture and proving yourself content to copy the next-door neighbor's glass building, house, chair, drapery and poodle clip. I have two tests by which you can readily determine whether you are modern or not. If you prefer a bent chrome chair to a rocker, or a Cadillac to a horse-drawn carriage, you need therapy. If you are a pulp writer, it doesn't hurt if you know Shakespeare. Remember too, that Chippendale was handy with wood.

4. Go to bat for beauty. If we don't, we're going to find flashing neon signs on the pearly gates when we get there. If a few militant dames can sell this country prohibition, we certainly should be able to do away with neon signs, billboards, roadside honky tonks and used car lots.

5. Don't fall in love with just your idea. If you are jealous of your ideas it is a sign you have too few. Keep an open mind, the janitor's suggestion is probably the best.

6. Don't get in trouble. This fortunately is the easiest of all and simply involves avoiding certain people: the landlord, the doctor, the dentist, the psychiatrist, intellectuals, moriticans, and beatniks.

7. Don't be a moneychanger in the temple. If you're an artist you've earned the right to starve with dignity.

8. Don't talk back to your wife—because she is smarter than you are. H. L. Mencken said in the twenties that no man would make any decision without first talking it over with his wife, because she was a creature of super intelligence. If I had listened to him I would have saved myself some 25 years of exhausting research.

9. Don't be too worthwhile. Always keep a few character defects handy. People love to talk about your frailties. If you must be noble, keep it to yourself.

To elaborate on the idea that we should go to bat for beauty, I am told that man is the result of his heredity, his education and his environment. The sputnik shook us out of our complacency regarding education and I think this is the ideal group to launch a sputnik regarding our environment.

I suggest that you start with the highways and countryside. Long ago the Government made the farmer realize that it was unprofitable to plow the land down the hill and let it wash away, and our forests have been protected by legislation. But I know of no laws which prevent us from despoiling our beautiful, physical heritage. We do everything rapidly in this country and I think that in 30 or 40 years, we have converted it from the most beautiful country into one of the ugliest.

An English observer visiting this country stated that he noticed a firm determination on our part to pave our countryside with car lots, beer cans, billboards, and honky-tonks in order that we might whiz by in a lemon-yellow Cadillac and contemplate the ruins.

Someone else has said that in this era of prosperity and over-abundance, we seem to be able to afford everything but beauty.

When I was in Harvard in the 20's, Cape Cod was a fabulously beautiful remnant of colonial life with charming village greens, stately elms, and picturesque fishing villages. This is long since gone. It is a forest of billboards and no longer an exquisite reminder of the past.

When I came to New York in 1929, which, by the way, was not an auspicious time to start a career, Long Island was a park. Now, with the square miles of little boxes, it is also gone, so that the motorist goes 50 miles before reaching the open countryside.

All highways should, first of all, be free of billboards and hamburger joints and all tree-lined. Recently a high official of the automobile industry recommended that all trees be cut out along the highways as a menace to motorists. Assassination is not the solution. Perhaps the car manufacturer could eliminate 4 feet of vulgarity from the length of his car and spend the money creating destinations for the motorists.

The Democrats always say that if a Republican is elected to office, grass will grow on Main Street. Of course, this is exactly what should happen. It is wrong that when a man purchases a full-length chinchilla coat for his wife on one side of Main Street, he should risk his life in crossing to get her an emerald necklace on the other.

France, which was a comparatively uninteresting country physically, has, through man's effort, become one of the most beautiful countries in the world, largely due to its tree-lined roads, its compact, charming villages. It is very comparable, in the balance of agriculture and industry to our Middlewestern States, but can you imagine anybody voluntarily going to Iowa, Indiana, or Ohio, such a long distance, to view the shambles.

It seems to me that we need the phenomena of Presidents like Washington and Jefferson. Maybe their roots were so recently and so deeply in the British Empire, maybe that explains their conduct. But they were truly well-rounded individuals. Their response to their environment makes them special heroes to me. Men like Washington, for instance, could have a vision of a city like Washington. He actually implemented the plans, and here it is today, a living city, a monument to his wishes. Jefferson too, aspired to find ways of enhancing his environment. The University of Virginia is his contribution. But I haven't seen any thread of great interest in any of our succeeding Presidents, with the exception of Theodore Roosevelt, who was interested in everything.

In conclusion, what we need are guardians of the physical destiny of our country. First of all, we should have a Cabinet official, in a foreign country he would be called Minister of Culture, here this might be suspect, so I suggest we call him Secretary of Environment. In the lower echelon, a counterpart should exist in each State capital and in each principal city.

We have spent some 300 years pioneering and developing our country and in perfecting a democratic system of government. We now should be ready to embark on a great cultural period in our lives.

If it be true that all great periods of history were only great because of the art they produced, I hope that it can be said by future generations that our time was the period of a great cultural renaissance in the 20th century.

Wartburg College Choir To Tour Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 25, 1959

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, May 29, the Wartburg College Choir will leave Waverly, Iowa, for a 5-week tour of

Europe. I am proud to say that this fine liberal arts college, owned and operated by the American Lutheran Church, is located in my district.

The Wartburg Choir is recognized as one of the very finest singing groups in America, and I have every confidence that these young people will prove to be excellent good will ambassadors for the State of Iowa and the Nation. Director of the choir is Dr. Edwin Liemohn. One of the foremost college choir directors, he also has won eminence as a composer and arranger of a cappella music.

Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks I desire to include the choir's itinerary for its European tour:

May 31: Departure from New York International Airport.
June 1: Arrival in Amsterdam, Holland.
June 2: Amsterdam, Holland.
June 3: Utrecht, Holland.
June 4: Heerlen, Holland.
June 5: Muenster, Germany.
June 6: Wuppertal-Barmen, Germany.
June 7: Sightseeing at Cologne and Bonn, Rhine River Valley.
June 8: Neuwied, Germany.
June 9: Heidelberg, Germany (auspices of American military).
June 10: Stuttgart, Germany.
June 11: Munich.
June 12: Fuerth, Germany.
June 13: Coburg, Germany.
June 14: Fulda, Germany.
June 15: Kassel, Germany.
June 16: Bremen (tentative).
June 17: Schneverdingen, Germany.
June 18: Lueneberg, Germany.
June 19: Hanover, Germany.
June 20: Preetz, Germany.
June 22: Soerup (tentative).
June 23: Travel to Copenhagen, Denmark.
June 24: Roskilde Cathedral, Roskilde, Denmark.
June 25: Haderslev Cathedral, Haderslev, Denmark.
June 26: Hamburg, Germany.
June 27, 28: Travel to Oostende, Belgium.
June 29: Cross channel to Dover, England. Arrive at Hothorpe Hall, Theddingworth/Nr. Rugby, England.
June 30: Corby, England.
July 1: Leicester, England.
July 2: Bradford, England.
July 3: Market Harborough, England.
July 4: London.
July 5: London.
July 5: Departure for New York.
July 6: Arrival in New York.
July 7: Arrival in Waverly.

Meat Imports Skyrocket

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 25, 1959

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the Livestock Producers' Association of South Carolina last year adopted a resolution opposing the extension of the so-called Reciprocal Trade Act. The cattlemen of my State were farsighted. They were looking to the future.

Now, Mr. Speaker, here is an article which appeared in the Lancaster, Pa., Livestock Reporter of May 18, 1959:

MEAT IMPORTS SKYROCKET TO ALMOST TRIPLE TOTAL RECEIVED 2 YEARS AGO

Importation of meats from foreign countries into the United States during March were almost triple those received during March 1957, according to tonnage figures complied by the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

During March 1957, red meat tonnage received amounted to 24,842,551 pounds and during March 1958, the amount rose to 50,263,854 pounds. During March of this year a total of 71,489,148 pounds were received.

New Zealand imports have almost doubled since last year. Top exporters of meat to the United States were Argentina and Australia with New Zealand in third place.

Fresh and cured beef and veal accounted for most of the increase in meat importations. In 1957, the United States imported more than 3 million pounds of fresh beef and veal and last year about 18 million pounds were imported. During 1959, the tonnage amounted to 32,370,345 pounds or almost half of the entire March importation.

Two years ago the importation of fresh beef and veal amounted to about one-seventh of the monthly total as compared to almost 50 percent of the volume during March.

The legislative committee of the American National Cattlemen's Association is working in Washington, D.C., to curb rising imports of beef through tariff laws and labeling of imported beef.

Cooperstown Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 25, 1959

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, the Nation has been saddened by the death yesterday of our distinguished former Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles. Mr. Dulles' passing brings home again with renewed emphasis the urgency of increasing our endeavors, both at the private and the public level, in our battle against cancer, the dread disease which now has taken from our midst one of the great architects of the present diplomatic structure of the free world.

Because of the importance of every step taken in the fight against cancer, Mr. Speaker, I am proud that a great new step forward has been taken by one of the leading cancer research institutions in the Nation, located in my district, the Mary Imogene Bassett Hospital in Cooperstown. The work which the Bassett Hospital has been doing in my district has been recognized throughout the Nation and the world.

In view of the new cobalt 60 radiation unit which has now been added to the facilities of the hospital and is being put into operation to continue the fight against cancer, I am happy to include the following editorial comment which appeared in one of the leading newspapers in my district, the Otsego Farmer, of Cooperstown, N.Y.:

COOPERSTOWN AGAIN

Cooperstown has become unique for so many things that we have a tendency to become somewhat blase about anything new.

We cannot but wonder what the impact of an announcement such as was made this week by the Mary Imogene Bassett Hospital would have been if, for instance, the community had nothing to brag about.

"The new cobalt-60 radiation unit will be open for inspection May 16," says the announcement in part, "* * * there will be a brief description of current radiation studies and an address by Dr. Charles G. Zubrod, clinical director of the National Cancer Institute of Bethesda, Md."

This could be equivalent to the shot heard round the world, for those who can foretell the possible practical results of this device, and this intensive medical study at Cooperstown, which has already attracted worldwide attention.

That Cooperstown, represented by the keen medical staff at the hospital, should have such an important part in the fight against one of nature's worst scourges, should not go unnoticed. While admittedly experimental, the use of this unit has already demonstrated that it holds promise for alleviating ills that afflict untold numbers of people around the globe.

We certainly are not competent to predict the possible results of what will be unveiled at the Mary Imogene Bassett Hospital on Saturday, but we cannot fail to recognize that it is important, and that Cooperstown is very much in the vanguard in this as, it has been in many other programs which have attracted national and international attention.

Pennsylvania Is a Farm State to the Tune of $3 Billion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 25, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Sunday Independent, Wilkes-Barre, Pa., May 24, 1959:

THIS IS A FARM STATE TO TUNE OF $3 BILLION

HARRISBURG.—Pennsylvania is a great agricultural Commonwealth although it usually is regarded as an industrial State.

Its 119,000 farms and their buildings, equipment, machinery, livestock, and crops in 1958 were valued at more than $3 billion, representing a larger capital investment than either mining or the manufacturing of primary metals.

Although Pennsylvania ranks 32d in total area and 32d in acres in farms, it ranks 14th among all the States in cash receipts from farm products, placing value of production per acre on Pennsylvania farms above the national average.

Cash income from marketings from Pennsyvania farms amounted to $788,647,000 in 1958 or 5 percent more than the $752,439,000 in 1957. Cash income from all livestock and livestock products in 1958 amounted to $607,831,000, including poultry and eggs; income from crops totaled $180,816,000.

GOOD CLIMATE

Climate and rainfall are favorable to grassland farming in Pennsylvania. The farmland of the State is so situated as to permit the cultivation of a great variety of crops, since the elevation ranges from practically sea level to 3,000 feet and the crop-growing season from 80 to 207 days. This range makes possible the general cultiva-

tion of fruits, vegetables, cereals, and grasses. Pennsylvania is a State of family size farms, the average being 102 acres, about 40 under cultivation; the remainder is mostly pasture and woodland. Of approximately 13 million acres in farms, 6 million acres are improved or cropland.

Pennsylvania farms produce, on the average, more wheat per acre than Kansas, Oklahoma, or any other Midwest Wheat Belt State. Pennsylvania leads all other States in the production of ice cream, murshrooms, cigar leaf tobacco, sausage products, scrapple, pretzels, nursery-grown Christmas trees, apples, stategraded for processing, spring and fall fall spinach, and in the value of crops grown under glass. The State leads in the number of farmers' retail markets, bakeries, carbonated beverage and still drink plants.

In addition, Pennsylvania has the largest apple processing plant in the world, the largest grape juice plant in the world, the largest package ice cream plant in the world, and the largest farm show building in the world under one roof. Pennsylvania was the first State to pass meat inspection laws and first to establish livestock sanitary service.

One Pennsylvania county (Lancaster) ranks first among the Nation's 3,000 counties in value of farm products grown without aid of irrigation, first in the value of farm crops used by farm households, and first in tonnage of cigar leaf tobacco produced.

LEADING DAIRY STATE

Pennsylvania is an outstanding dairy State. Over 6,500 million pounds of milk are produced annually. Dairy products bring in approximately 41 percent of all farm cash income, totaling $320 million in 1958. Pennsylvania ranks fourth in number of milk cows and fifth in volume of milk produced (1958), fourth in income from dairy products and fourth in value of milk cows. Since World War I the average milk production per cow has increased more than 50 percent and is now over 7,000 pounds per year.

Pennsylvania is a leader among the States in poultry and eggs. In 1958 the total farm cash income from this source was $175,306,000. The State then ranked first in farm cash income from chickens, except broilers, second in income from eggs, third in total farm cash income from poultry and eggs, third in value of chickens on farms, fourth in number of farm chickens raised and in number of eggs produced, fourth in number of chickens on farms and ninth in turkeys on January 1, 1959. Nine Pennsylvania countries are among the 100 highest in poultry sales in the United States and 14 are listed among the first 100 in number of chickens on farms.

Pennsylvania in 1958 ranked 5th in the United States in the production of maple sugar and sirup, 4th in sour cherries, 4th in peaches, 5th in grapes, 3d in clover and timothy hay, 11th in potatoes, 6th in commercial apples and all cherries, and 7th in all tobacco.

HAY A LEADING CROP

Hay was the leading crop in Pennsylvania in 1958, the 3,828,000 tons produced being valued at $101,442,000. Corn was second in value with $82,996,000, followed in order by wheat, oats, commercial truck crops, potatoes, tobacco, barley, commercial apples, and peaches.

Cattle and calves on farms January 1, 1959, led Pennsylvania livestock values at $399,801,000; the 1,039,000 milk cows and heifers 2 years old and over being valued at $294,037,000. The State's 21,735,000 chickens were second at $33,689,000 followed by hogs, horses and mules (work stock), sheep and lambs, and turkeys, in that order.

The importance of the State's livestock and poultry industry is emphasized in the fact that 77 percent of all gross farm income is derived from the sale of livestock and poultry, and their products, including milk and eggs.

INVENTED IRON PLOW

Farming in Pennsylvania dates back more than 250 years. Until the early 1800's it was largely subsistence farming, little more than supporting the farm families that tilled the soil. Up to the time of the Civil War (1861–65) the increasing demand for farm products from rapidly growing cities and towns required farmers to produce more food in larger quantities. Mechanization started with invention of the iron plow by Joseph Smith, Bucks County blacksmith, in 1800. In the next half century came mowing machines (1822), the first reaper (1831), threshing machines 1832), the steel-toothed hayrake (1850), and the first steam tractors (1855–58).

As the State's agriculture expanded the Pennsylvania State Agricultural Society was formed in 1851; it obtained a charter and an appropriation of $10,000 from the General Assembly in 1855 for establishment of the Farmers High School (now the Pennsylvania State University); the recording of crop production statistics started in 1866; the Pennsylvania Agricultural Experiment Station was established in 1887; the State department of agriculture was set up in 1895; the Agriculture and Home Economics Extension Service began in 1914; the first Pennsylvania farm show was held in 1917 and organization of countywide soil conservation districts was authorized by legislation approved in 1945.

Baltimore's Educator: Dr. John H. Fischer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 25, 1959

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, none of us would deny that the future of our great Nation lies with its young people. It is an equally well-recognized fact that those who educate our children and prepare them for adult manhood and womanhood are bound to have as great an impact upon them as do their parents and spiritual leaders.

The city of Baltimore, the sixth largest city in the land, is, indeed, very fortunate to have had as its superintendent of schools a native son who is a product of the city's educational institutions. These include the Maryland State Teachers College and the world-famous Johns Hopkins University. I say Baltimore is fortunate because this man has, during his tenure in various capacities with our city's excellent educational system, clearly demonstrated outstanding ability, a broad tolerance, and profound wisdom in dealing with Baltimore's primary and secondary school population. At the same time he has constantly increased the levels of the standard of teaching and of the city's schools.

This truly outstanding man I refer to is our own Dr. John H. Fischer, whose efforts and achievements have attracted such national attention that Columbia University's teachers college has named him as dean.

As a result of this honor, the city of Baltimore will lose Dr. Fischer's invaluable services, but the Nation as a whole will gain. To say that we most reluctantly release him and that we shall miss him very much is to state the obvious. However, Baltimore cannot be selfish since Dr. Fischer's special qualifications will enable him to guide the destinies of many of the country's future educators in his new and wider field of endeavor.

In recognition of Dr. Fischer's achievements, Mr. John L. McClay, general manager of the Westinghouse Broadcasting Co.'s television station WJZ–TV in Baltimore, paid him the following well-earned tribute:

Hello, I'm John McClay, general manager of WJZ–TV. Within a few months the people of Baltimore will lose a good friend. Dr. John H. Fischer, our superintendent of schools, has resigned so that he may become dean of the world-famous Teachers College of Columbia University. While regretting his departure, most Baltimoreans will feel a sense of pride in knowing that a man born, educated and trained in Baltimore, has been elevated into a position of national prominence.

We at WJZ agree with Columbia University's obvious conclusion that John Fischer is one of the country's best school superin- rather talk about what Dr. Fischer has done tendents. We could support this conclusion by citing the honors bestowed upon him by his fellow educators. However, we would rather talk about what Dr. Fischer has done right here in Baltimore, where he steered our school system though 6 years of crisis.

During these years, Dr. Fischer never lost sight of the goal of quality, even while quantity—a floodtide of new students—was the pressing problem. His administration more than tripled the number of secondary schools offering accelerated courses for bright students. This was achieved without compromising Dr. Fischer's basic belief that all children, the slow as well as the bright, must be offered the maximum in educational opportunity.

Yet Dr. Fischer has not gone along with the extremists who believe that the public schools should solve every problem that faces a child. To quote his own sensible words: "The school is a prominent and powerful institution, but it is not the home, the church, the social agency, the youth group or the police department."

Public education has always been subject to unreasonable pressures, often from people who are stirred up by the latest newspaper headlines. A few years ago, when the fear of internal communism was rampant, there were many who insisted that in a school there should be no mention of the word "communism," except with a sneer. Dr. Fischer rejected this viewpoint. He said: "If we persist in teaching that communism is to democracy as black is to white, the student will find it difficult, if not impossible, to understand the gains of communism in the last two decades." These remarks, we believe, scored a point for those who hold that communism must be fought with knowledge, not ignorance.

After the first Russian sputnik was shot into orbit, there was another public outcry; this time for more scientists. In the excitement of the moment, a proposal was made to the Baltimore school board that science teachers be given extra pay for supervising science clubs after school hours. Dr. Fischer, again, cool is a crisis, opposed the suggestion, unless the same extra pay was offered to teachers of language, literature, or history clubs. His decision not only salvaged the morale of the nonscience teachers, but reminded everyone that all the components of a liberal education are essential to a free society.

When the school board made the momentous decision to desegregate all the schools without delay, Dr. Fischer immediately made it plain by his deeds as well as his words that he believed the board's decision was the right one. Although he is, by nature, a gentle person, he quickly got tough with the adult rabble rousers and the small minority of pupils who attempted to block the peaceful integration of the races. Because he acted decisively, the spread of bigotry was nipped in the bud.

We at WJZ think there is a basic reason why Dr. Fischer has been an outstanding leader. In the midst of the public hue and cry for better schools, almost everyone is pushing a pet idea. Dr. Fischer has the ability to look at each of these ideas calmly and thoroughly before making a decision to accept or reject it. Even more important, he can stand back and take an impartial look at his own pet ideas. This, we believe, is real wisdom.

There is only one John Fischer, but we know that the school board, in its search for a successor, has a model in our departing superintendent. He leaves Baltimore with the best wishes of all of us at WJZ and, we feel sure, with the warm gratitude of the city he served so well.

Editorial Tributes to the Late New York State Assembly Speaker, Oswald D. Heck

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 25, 1959

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, last week in my home district there passed from the scene suddenly and well before his time one of the most important leaders in government in New York State, Oswald D. Heck, speaker of the New York State Assembly. Speaker Heck, who had served in this important position longer than any other man in history, for a period of 23 years, had long occupied a position of great leadership in the State government. He had identified himself frequently with forward and progressive legislation, and during his years of service to the State he came to be respected and admired not only by those in his home city of Schnectady who knew him well, but also by men and women throughout the State, regardless of party.

Speaker Heck's passing will leave a great void in our State which will take many years to fill. I know that the sympathy of all of us is extended to his wife and family in their heavy loss.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to include three editorials from newspapers in my district, one from the Schnectady Union-Star, one of the newspapers in Mr. Heck's hometown; one from the Amsterdam Evening Recorder; and one from the Gloversville Leader-Herald:

[From the Schenectady Union-Star, May 21, 1959]

"MR. SPEAKER" OUTSIDE; ONE OF US AT HOME

Although he never realized his ambition to be Governor, Oswald D. Heck probably knew more about State government than anyone else. More than 20 years as speaker of the assembly, the post next to the governorship in importance and influence, gave him knowledge of and insight into how the State operates that could be acquired only by long exeprience and participation in it at high level. Because the speaker is a behind-the-scenes operator and not an executive, Mr. Heck's contribution and his influence over the past quarter century cannot be measured. Much that was credited to someone else he initiated or approved. Much that rightly was not approved resulted from his veto. His colleagues respected his fairness and conscientiousness, and officials in the executive branch of State government—Republicans and Democrats—knew he was on the level. While politics made up much of his life, he was never lacking in convictions and several times took the floor of the assembly to voice them strongly. His career in Albany reflected credit on the community that term after term sent him back, to establish a record for tenure as speaker.

To Schenectady County he was more "Ozzie Heck" than "Mr. Speaker." Here he grew up, here he went to school, here he practiced law, here he lived. His honors and position in public life never affected his relations with lifelong friends and those he made in later years. Inherently modest, he never let what came to him outside give him a big head. For one thing his sense of humor wouldn't permit that to happen.

Schenectady County has lost, at altogether too young an age, a citizen of distinction. The State of New York has lost a public official of experience, judgment, wisdom, and courage.

[From the Amsterdam Evening Record, May 23, 1959]

LIFE OF SERVICE

As speaker of the assembly, a position next to the governorship in importance and influence, Oswald D. Heck managed to enjoy the respect and affection of members on both sides of the party aisles. Jolly and companionable by nature, he was deeply serious about matters which involved the welfare of his State, and in the art of politics he had few, if any, peers.

Like so many men in public life, Ozzie Heck did not live to fulfill his fondest ambition to be Governor of New York State. But as he watched over Governors come and go, he compiled a record of achievement and friendship rare in these days of power politics.

Hic contribution as a public servant cannot be measured by usual standards, for speaker of the assembly is a behind-the-scenes sort of position. But the fact that on innumerable occasions others received credit for his accomplishments never bothered Ozzie. He accepted this as part of the political game.

We regret that Ozzie Heck never became Governor, for he would have made a fine one. But we can be grateful that for 23 years we had the benefit of his devoted service to our State.

With his passing at the untimely age of 57, we have lost a public official of experience, wisdom and courage. The pair of shoes he leaves on the hill in Albany will be hard to fill.

[From the Gloversville Leader-Herald, May 22, 1595]

OSWALD D. HECK

The cause of good government suffered as acute a blow as did the Republican Party in the untimely death yesterday morning of Oswald D. Heck, speaker of the State assembly for a record 23 years.

"Ozzie" wielded great power in State government and managed to push a number of worthwhile programs through the assembly in the face of strong opposition. His greatest influence, of course, was among upstate Republicans. Had his ability and his knowledge of State government been more widely publicized in New York City, he might have realized a dream of becoming Governor of the State.

Filling the vacancy left by Assemblyman Heck's death will not be an easy chore. The sepaker knew how to get things done. His power of persuasion was something to behold. His political acumen was outstanding. And he was a grand fellow on top of everything else. He will be missed.

Spry Lame Duck

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 18, 1959

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Roscoe Drummond:

ADMINISTRATION RETAINS ITS VIGOR

(By Roscoe Drummond)

For what was supposed to be a "lame-duck" second term, the Eisenhower administration is continuing to show itself, at least at two important points, to be remarkably spry—hardly lame at all.

The theory of the critics of the 22d amendment—and I think that on longer experience they will probably be proved right—is that a President who is prevented by law from even the possibility of running again will inevitably limp through his second 4 years, losing influence and prestige and hard-pressed to get top-grade people to take top-grade appointments.

Perhaps Mr. Eisenhower retains his second-term political influence because he was not elected as a political person.

What is increasingly visible today is: (1) That the President's popularity with the voters continues to mount, and (2) that the Eisenhower Cabinet, as the administration moves toward the end of its second term, is younger, more vigorous, and at several points abler, than the Cabinet which first came together.

A series of Gallup polls since November shows that Mr. Eisenhower's national prestige has recovered steadily from the 1958 Republican congressional defeat. Today 61 percent of the voters say they approve the way the President is doing his job—and this majority approval is distributed across every major section of the country.

As to the Eisenhower Cabinet, two developments this past week add to its strength and resilience.

One is the appointment of Thomas S. Gates, Jr., the absolutely topdrawer Secretary of the Navy who was about to retire, as Deputy Secretary of Defense to fill the yawning hole in the Pentagon created by the passing of Deputy Secretary Donald Quarles. Gates has been on the job since 1953 and to keep him in the administration in this new post is an achievement and an asset.

The other development, similarly heartening, is the announcement by Secretary of Defense Neil McElroy that he is "adjourning" all plans to resign this fall. This means that his departure is put off until at least next January and he might very well stay on the job to the end. This would be most desirable.

How desirable? Well, what do you think would be the effect if a mammoth cor-

porate enterprise, at least as large as General Motors, Ford, and General Electric combined, had new management every 2 or 3 years and that every new president was without any previous experience? It would be disrupting, productive of delay, and confusing. The Department of Defense is a vaster enterprise than these three corporations combined and it has had six different men at the top over a 12-year period—Forrestal, Johnson, Marshall, Lovett, Wilson, and McElroy. And hundreds of changes at the second and third levels. The McElroy-Gates team is a good one and it is devoutly to be hoped that nothing breaks it up before there is a change of administration.

On balance it seems to me that the Eisenhower Cabinet is stronger today than when the President took office in 1953. Without making any person-by-person comparison, the major changes brought either equal or greater ability to the departments: McElroy for Wilson at Defense, Mitchell for Durkin at Labor, Seaton for McKay at Interior, Rogers for Brownell at Justice, Anderson for Humphrey at the Treasury, etc. It remains for Herter fully to prove himself.

But this is certainly not a lame-duck Cabinet.

There is still no evidence that the Republican Party is inheriting any of Mr. Eisenhower's popularity. While the President has been gaining 9 percent since November, the Republican Party has lost 2½ percent since its low point of 43.5 in the last election.

This leaves one conclusion at least: The popularity of the Democratic Party does not insure the election of a Democratic President and the unpopularity of the Republican Party does not prevent the election of a Republican President.

Tobacco Imports Mushroom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 25, 1959

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, imported tobacco leaf reached the highest point in 1958 in approximately 30 years. So far this year, imports from two of the largest foreign suppliers, Turkey and Greece, are up 20 percent and 28 percent, respectively. From all indications, tobacco imports this year will be the highest in the history of our country.

I warned the House time and time and time again during consideration of extension of so-called reciprocal trade this very thing would happen. Of course, as night follows the day, the American tobacco farmer will be forced to plant less and less and it will cost the American taxpayer more and more in price supports.

Mr. Speaker, the following is taken from a statement I placed in the RECORD last year when extension of the reciprocal trade bill was being considered:

Eric Johnston's committee is out over the country trying to drum up support for his completely bogus foreign-trade program. The American farmer is a particular target for false slogans, innuendoes, and fear psychology. They do not dare tell the American people that foreign exports are falling off except where we are paying the other country to buy our goods. They do not dare tell the American people about the hundreds of thousands of jobs that could be added to those presently engaged in foreign commerce through a truly mutually advantageous reciprocal trade program.

A desperate attempt is being made by Eric Johnston, Charlie Taft, and company to mislead, bamboozle, and hornswoggle the American tobacco farmer. This present attempt smacks of sheer chicanery and fraud in that in a few years they will do the same thing to the tobacco farmer and the tobacco industry that they have already done to the cotton farmer and the textile industry.

While trying to fool and temporarily brainwash the tobacco farmer, the ICA, under the table and behind the tobacco farmer's back in the secret recesses of distant lands, are teaching the people the art of American agriculture with the American taxpayer's dollars. I might remind the American tobacco farmers that this same Mr. Taft is listed as an official in the International Cooperation Administration. Their policy is to play one industry against the other, to play one segment of agriculture against the other until their nefarious scheme of growing our crops takes roots all over the world in foreign lands.

We are exporting less tobacco under Johnston and Taft's policy of "trade for the benefit of foreign countries" than we did in the year 1920.

I might remind our tobacco farmers that the millions of employees of the coal, oil, lead, zinc, plywood, and textile industries could purchase millions of pounds of tobacco and smoke the cigarettes if they could be placed on full time with time and a half for overtime which they formerly enjoyed before Johnston, Taft, and company started all their one-world treatment.

Inefficiency in the National Labor Relations Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 25, 1959

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention of the House today to a penetrating report regarding the National Labor Relations Board, which has been written by Mr. Carleton Kent, chief of the Chicago Sun-Times Washington bureau, and which appeared in the Sun-Times on Friday, May 22.

Mr. Kent has written a comprehensive analysis of a report prepared by one of the Nation's top management consultant firms, McKinsey & Co., regarding present operations of the National Labor Relations Board. It should be pointed out that McKinsey & Co. were hired by the NLRB to make this management survey.

It is my firm belief that Mr. Kent and the Chicago Sun-Times have performed a great service in bringing to public attention the deplorable conditions which apparently exist within the National Labor Relations Board. I hope that every Member of Congress will read this excellent analysis by Mr. Kent because I am confident that we can better understand the cause for much labor-management unrest which can be traced directly to the National Labor Relations Board, the agency which was supposed to minimize upheavals in labor-management relations.

I read the Sun-Times account of the McKinsey & Co. findings with particular interest and gratification because this devastating report merely confirms what I have been saying before my own committee, the House Committee on Education and Labor, ever since our hearings began on labor-management reform legislation.

I have stated repeatedly that many of the problems and abuses related by the McClellan committee and by other sources could have been to a great extent eliminated or alleviated if the NLRB was doing the job it was intended to do. And I submit that the breakdown in relations between employers and decent labor unions can in many instances be traced directly to the total inefficiency of the National Labor Relations Board.

I might add that I have personally read the McKinsey & Co. report, and I think that Mr. Kent did an outstanding job of analyzing this very complicated document.

I hope that after the Members of this Congress have had an opportunity to read this highly critical analysis of the NLRB, they will join me in demanding a full-scale investigation of that agency's conduct and procedures. It appears to me that we can find the answer to many problems confronting this Congress in respect to proposed labor-management reform legislation by first compelling the National Labor Relations Board to carry out its responsibility to the highest level of efficiency.

The National Labor Relations Board affects the lives of millions of American working people and the very survival of thousands of American business institutions. We can all safely conclude from this report that because of the dissension and seemingly aimless drifting of the NLRB as it is now constituted, both legitimate labor and decent industry have suffered untold hardships.

I hope, also, that any investigation of the National Labor Relations Board by an appropriate committee of Congress would go into the substantive matters of the Board and attempt to ascertain how some of the decisions, which have created havoc and misunderstanding in labor-management relations, have been arrived at.

Mr. Speaker, the Sun-Times account of the McKinsey & Co. report as prepared by its Washington bureau chief, Mr. Carleton Kent, follows. I hope that my colleagues will read it carefully. I hope further that they will agree that Mr. Kent's analysis can well serve as the basis for a demand of a full-scale investigation of the National Labor Relations Board and its present operations:

[From Chicago Sun-Times, May 22, 1959]

NLRB RIFTS, INEFFICIENCY, BACKLOG BARED IN REPORT

(By Carleton Kent)

WASHINGTON.—A devastating report made for the National Labor Relations Board pictures it as torn with dissension and drifting rather aimlessly in a swelling tide of labor-management controversies it is supposed to settle.

The report was made early this year by a management consultants firm, McKinsey

& Co., which the NLRB hired to help improve its production after a Supreme Court decision made it clear the Board's cases were going to increase by about one-fifth.

FALLING BEHIND

The Sun-Times has been able to obtain exclusively a copy of the 198-page report, which the board charged with policing the Taft-Hartley Act received in January, and which for obvious reasons it has closely held.

In general, the McKinsey report says that the agency was steadily falling behind what was required of it even before the prospect of an additional 20 percent of cases involving labor disputes was added to its workload by the Supreme Court's decision in the Guss case.

The report said the agency has no firmly established personnel policies governing hiring and firing, promotion and transfer, the keeping of record or of tabs on its employees to promote consistent production, and great gaps of any clear lines as to who has responsibility.

The Court ruled that Congress had preempted for the NLRB all jurisdiction of labor disputes in interstate commerce, which meant the Federal agency had to take over responsibility and many cases State labor boards theretofore had processed.

In fiscal 1958 the agency received 16,748 cases. About 15 percent of these finally came up through narrowing channels for the Board's attention and a final decision.

This is a statistic from the NLRB itself.

TELL TIME LAG

The McKinsey report emphasizes that the average elapsed time for the Board to reach a decision on C cases, which are the more complex cases involving complaints of unfair labor practices, was 444 days in the same period—and 555 days for the more involved ones.

In other words, unless the contesting parties abide by the decision of an NLRB regional office, they must figure that it will take at least 18 months to settle their case.

On this point, the report cites testimony last year by Board Chairman Boyd Leedom that: "It is doubtful if a decision given after such a lapse of time [in this instance it was 2 years] and after expenditure of considerable money in legal costs, was anything approaching a real remedy for the unfair practices involved."

In fiscal 1958 the Board got 9,200 C or complaint cases, and 7,400 so-called R cases, which are much simpler ones involving essentially only the question of whether a union is entitled to be recognized as a plant's collective bargaining agent.

Yet the McKinsey report shows that in the same period, the 16 to 18 legal assistants in the office of each of the 5 NLRB members who do the groundwork for final decisions, spent 65 percent of their time on the easier R cases.

The result is inevitable: That the backlog of the more involved C cases keeps growing, the report makes clear—and the time required to decide them keeps on mounting.

The report remorselessly lays the blame for delays, which affect millions of American workers, clear across the NLRB's haphazard structure and set of practices.

It begins with the basic split built into the Taft-Harley Act of 1947, which sought to separate the powers of the General Counsel and the five Board members.

COUNSEL FINAL AUTHORITY

The Counsel was to have final authority, on behalf of the Board, to investigate charges, issue complaints of unfair labor practices, and to prosecute them before the Board.

He also was to have general supervision over all attorneys except Trial Examiners and the Board's own legal assistants, and over the officers and employees in the regional offices.

The Board's role was thought of as similar to a court's in most respects, since it had to rule on the cases brought before it, and to seek compliance with its decisions.

But it also had some administrative operations—establishing recruitment, transfer, promotion, and firing policies, developing programs and budgetary requirements for its quasi-judicial activities, and determining the agency's organizational structure.

ACT ISN'T SPECIFIC

However, the act wasn't specific about who had control of housekeeping operations involving personnel, overall budgeting, and the development and analysis of its program "established the groundwork for duplications or conflicts," said the McKinsey report.

Washington long has been familiar with the feuding between the General Counsel and the Board over who has power to do what. The new report gives a classic instance of it.

It sets forth that last year the agency's first request to the Budget Bureau for its fiscal 1959 funds was prepared without the participation of the General Counsel or his representatives, although they are responsible for spending the bulk of NLRB funds.

This meant the Budget Bureau had to call for a thorough review of the agency's workload. And the McKinsey report adds: "This in turn adversely affected operations because it rekindled disagreements over responsibilities within the agency for reviewing and approving administrative actions. * * *"

ASKS SINGLE EXECUTIVE

For what it is worth to Stuart Rothman, confirmed by the Senate last week to succeed Jerome D. Fenton as NLRB General Counsel, the McKinsey report proposes the General Counsel be made the single executive officer.

He would develop and execute the agency's administrative program, subject only to final policy review by the Board.

McKinsey contends this would be a foundation on which to build an efficient organization and wipe out all its current deficiencies.

But it recognizes this will take an act of Congress, mentions that similar efforts to solve the NLRB bickering by legislation have come to nothing, and contends that even without this the agency can still do a great deal to improve its performance.

NLRB UNFAIR TOO?

In one of its criticisms, McKinsey & Co. comes very close to accusing the NLRB itself of an unfair labor practice.

It notes that since its study was made, "some progress has been shown"—and lists as one evidence of this the establishing last fall of hurry-up time targets for processing cases.

To comply, field employees put in more than 14,000 unpaid overtime hours, with the result that the average age of cases in their field offices was reduced from 60 to 50 days.

But it adds, drily: "The agency cannot plan on such contributions indefinitely."

MEMBERS BLAMED

Much of the blame for inefficiencies was laid directly at the door of the five Board members.

For instance, it charges:

"Nearly as much time is now required to circulate a proposed decision to the other four Board members as is required for the original preparation of the decision by the legal assistant originally assigned to the case."

But most of the legal assistants who prepare the cases catch it too.

The report says the Board members agree that "most staffs include a substantial portion of legal assistants who are not proficient."

The McKinsey report recognizes many of these assistants were inherited, and says no significant effort is being made to develop better supervisors, and no organized effort for systematically developing legal assistants or removing those who are consistently poor performers is apparent.

MEDIOCRE PERFORMANCES

And, driving home its point, it concludes: "The Board cannot afford poor or mediocre performance from legal assistants. It risks the chance of issuing ill-prepared decisions and adds excessive time to the processing of cases."

Putting up with poor performance in the Board office is spread throughout the agency's operations, the McKinsey report says, because there is no definite standard of what is acceptable performance, and from failure to demand results.

Depletion Allowance for Perlite

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. MORRIS

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 25, 1959

Mr. MORRIS of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, if it were possible for everyone to study all of the aspects of our Revenue Code I am sure that the phrase "depletion allowance" would not connote something undesirable. We have all read of late the term "tax giveaway" or "outright subsidy," so perhaps it is well to recall that we have had a depletion allowance in one form or another for nearly 50 years, and if such an allowance were not in the best interests of the land the Congress would have voted it out of existence long ago. This section of the revenue code has been periodically changed or modified until today the allowances are pegged equitable to known values of material and limited so that they cannot become excessive. A majority of the areas of controversy have been settled in the courts and we have a good workable law. Perhaps one of its best features is that it leaves in the hands of the Congress the periodic determination of just compensation in any particular area and rectification where considered appropriate without disturbing the body of the law or affecting other materials. Adjustments can be accomplished by changing the percentage depletion allowance for a group of materials, or by moving a particular material from one group to another.

A case in point is perlite, a relative newcomer to the field of expandable aggregates which have become of such commercial importance. Their uses now range from building construction, throughout industry, and into farming. When the benefits of depletion were extended to perlite in 1951 it was a new mineral whose real commercial use extended only over 5 years. At that time there was not sufficient data at hand, or operating experience to show exactly where perlite would fit into the field of expandable aggregates. The depletion

allowance was therefore quite properly established at a conservative 10 percent and then maintained at that level in the Revenue Act of 1954. Since that time the uses of perlite in its original and newer fields have come to closely parallel those of vermiculite, diatomaceous earth, fuller's earth, bentonite and gilsonite, each with a 15 percent depletion allowance. It is in no way intended to convey the impression that these materials enjoy an inordinate allowance as it is realized they may well be operating under difficulties themselves. Nonetheless, this difference in percentage allowance coupled with certain operational problems peculiar to perlite, has made competition on an equal basis impossible.

To one of our industrial States a small change in the depletion allowance of a material is of minor importance. In all probability it will result only in an eventual small variation in the cost of some finished product. To a mining State, however, a small change in percentage depletion compensation for one of its mining industries can be of great and continuing importance. It can spell the difference between success or failure of a relatively new enterprise. It can determine the rate of growth of a well-established one with its effects on local employment and wealth of the State. In fact it can determine whether or not a material will continue to be mined year after year or will eventually be abandoned for lack of new sources. Therefore, today I have introduced a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide a percentage depletion allowance of 15 percent for perlite.

Hoffa Must Be Stopped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEO E. ALLEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 25, 1959

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Rockford, Ill., Register-Republic of May 22, 1959, entitled "Hoffa Must Be Stopped":

HOFFA MUST BE STOPPED

Senator JOHN MCCLELLAN, chairman of the racket-investigating committee which exposed the abuses of responsibility of James R. Hoffa, Teamster president, should get solid backing for his request that Congress meet Hoffa's threat to call a nationwide general strike. MCCLELLAN said he will soon introduce a bill to apply the antitrust laws to unions which have the capacity to strangle the Nation's commerce and transportation.

Hoffa made his threat in defiance of the American public. He would not merely be straightening out employers for once and all, as he told a Longshoremen's Union meeting in Brownsville, Tex. Instead, Hoffa wants to throttle the entire American economy just to prove his power.

The Teamster leader is on record for proposing actions which defy Government. He is working for a nationwide transportation federation of teamsters, longshoremen, maritime workers, and airfreight handlers. He tried to organize New York City policemen—but had to back down. Now he has defied Congress, which has a legitimate right to adopt legislation to curb the monopoly power of labor.

The AFL–CIO expelled the Teamsters' Union in 1957 on charges of corruption, after the McClellan committee had brought out numerous violations of trust by Hoffa and some of his lieutenants. Even George Meany, president of the federation, lost no time in serving notice that Hoffa could not count on the AFL–CIO's support for a nationwide strike.

Laws putting organized labor under the antitrust statutes which apply to business and industry are needed to prevent men like Hoffa from trying to carry out their threats. Hoffa must be shown that he is not bigger than the U.S. Congress or the public. He can be cut down to size if laws are passed to prevent him from carrying out his defiance.

Textile Men Get Strauss "Payoff"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD G. WOLF
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 25, 1959

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, the nomination of Lewis Strauss is about to be confirmed or denied by the Senate. This matter is not one which should be considered as an ordinary confirmation nor is the Senate likely to consider it in this way.

Mr. Strauss is a man of strong conservative conviction. But this is no reason to vote against Mr. Strauss. On the other hand, it is clear that Mr. Strauss is not a man of high principle as has been suggested by his public-relations-minded supporters. He has dealt in falsehood, smear, and chicanery. He has alienated the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy with his high-handed actions when he served as head of the Atomic Energy Commission. He has alienated and maligned many of the leading members of the scientific community. His relations with the Congress are at a new low because of the half truths he told before the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and because of his smear of the great chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, CLARENCE CANNON.

These are reasons enough to reject Mr. Strauss' nomination, and it is my personal hope that a majority of the Senate will also feel that these are reasons enough to reject his nomination. The tortuous twists and turns that the Strauss affair has taken are pointed up in today's article in the Washington Post by the distinguished columnist, Drew Pearson. Under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I wish to have this article inserted into the Appendix of the RECORD:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald, May 25, 1959]

TEXTILE MEN GET STRAUSS "PAYOFF"

(By Drew Pearson)

The day before the Senate Commerce Committee voted on his confirmation, Secretary of Commerce Lewis Strauss made a political payoff to three Senators—PASTORE, of Rhode Island, THURMOND, of South Carolina, and COTTON, of New Hampshire—who helped salvage his one-vote victory. The payoff had to do with stricter controls on foreign textiles, especially Japanese.

However, one payoff backfired so badly that it made JOHN PASTORE, the bounding little Democrat from Rhode Island, hit the ceiling and almost change his mind about voting for Strauss. What made PASTORE mad was that Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL of Massachusetts, Republican, not PASTORE, Democrat, was permitted to announce the creation of a new governmental textile agency.

The whole inside story illustrates the ruthlessness with which Senate votes are sometimes bartered in a tough confirmation battle, and how such a battle can undermine an administration's foreign policy.

Here are the unrevealed highlights:

Because U.S. military bases in Japan are so important, the Eisenhower administration has refused to put mandatory controls on Japanese textile. Instead, Japan itself has imposed voluntary controls.

Because Admiral Strauss' confirmation as Secretary of Commerce is personally important to Strauss and politically important to Eisenhower, the White House agreed to a special agency to investigate textile imports, with expected stricter controls on Japanese products later.

Ex-Governor Tom Dewey, of New York, former candidate for Persident, accepted a fee of $100,000 a year to push Japanese textiles in the United States. Dewey is the man primarily responsible for nominating Eisenhower in 1952, and still has great influence at the White House. Dewey, incidentally, accepted the fee 1 day after the White House announced formation of the special agency on textiles.

Therefore, two prominent Republicans, Dewey and Strauss, will be battling on opposite sides of the textile fence.

Admiral Strauss' backstage buttonholing among textile Senators began some time ago. It was aided by certain big textile firms, notably Burlington Industries, of North Carolina. In the middle of the Senate hearings over his confirmation, Strauss took a quick trip to Greensboro, N.C., to address a textile meeting where Spencer Love, chairman of Burlington Industries, called the Senate hearing an unwarranted "political vendetta."

Prior to that, Strauss dropped in on Senator THURMOND to talk textiles, told how he began his business career as a salesman in the Carolinas, how he had used his influence to set mandatory controls on oil imports into the United States. The implication was that he would do the same for the textile industry.

At about the same time Strauss had promised the three textile Senators on the Commerce Committee that he would do his best to establish their proposed Interagency Board to consider the problem of textiles.

When a group of New England Governors called on Ike to urge such a Board, the President turned thumbs down. Such a Board, he told Gov. Christopher del Sestro, of Rhode Island, would establish a wrong precedent.

However, as the time approached for the Commerce Committee vote on Strauss' nomination the President began to shift.

The committee vote was due May 19. On May 18, Under Secretary of Commerce Fred Mueller, righthand man to Strauss, went to the White House. The votes of two textile Senators, PASTORE, of Rhode Island, and THURMOND, of South Carolina, next day were essential. COTTON, of New Hampshire, a Republican, would vote for Strauss anyway. But the two Democratic textile votes meant the difference between total defeat or partial victory.

Next morning, just before the Senate committee voted, Senator PASTORE read in the newspapers that the special textile committee was to be formed. This was what he had been working on for a long time. But PASTORE was not pleased. Quite the opposite.

For who should make the announcement but a Republican—Senator SALTONSTALL, of Massachusetts.

PASTORE finally curbed his resentment and went into committee to vote for Strauss.

The Barn Still Leaks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 25, 1959

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks I am inserting in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Barn Still Leaks" which appeared in the Washington, D.C., Post last Saturday.

As the editorial points out, the United States desperately needs a realistic farm program. We have needed it for many years.

The reason we have not been able to solve the farm problem, even make a realistic approach to a solution, is that it has been made a political football. Until all political considerations are set aside and economic realities be our sole guide, we shall never find a solution.

Where is the farm program which the Democrat Party, who control this Congress by a substantial majority, has so vigorously talked about? We need less talk about what should be done. We need action.

The editorial follows:

[From the Washington Post, May 23, 1959]

THE BARN STILL LEAKS

Whatever happened to all the Democratic plans to deliver farmers from the clutches of Ezra Taft Benson? Here it is corn-planting time and there is still no sign of the Humphrey-Talmadge farm bill which was supposed to have been ready by last February. The best that the Democrats have been able to do so far is to come up with differing House and Senate versions of wheat legislation. Neither bill would do more than put still another patch on the roof of a hopelessly antiquated barn. As the Democrats kept reminding farmers both before and after the elections last fall, the United States desperately needs a realistic farm program.

Under either the bill approved late last night by the Senate or the bill awaiting approval by the House, farmers would be given an opportunity to choose between higher support prices accompanied by further reductions in acreage allotments and lower support levels with fewer or no restrictions on planting. In the past farmers have usually decided to take high support prices even though they mean acreage restrictions. Up to now it has been possible to grow more on fewer acres by pouring on the fertilizer, and there is every reason to believe that this will be the outcome down on the farm of the wheat proposals now before Congress.

The tardiness of the wheat legislation, which must be enacted by June 1 to be effective in the 1960 crop year, is yet another indication of the difficulties that the Democrats are having with their farm recommendations. It certainly is much easier to stick a political pitchfork in Secretary Benson's back than it is to draft an alternative program. Indeed, the wheat bills would not even be before Congress of the wheat surplus were not getting so far out of hand. Even before the 1959 harvest has got underway the United States has enough wheat in storage to take care of all domestic needs for 2 years.

The amendments to farm legislation in both the Senate and the House to limit the amount of Government payments that any person may receive also are questionable expedients. The root of the farm problem is the encouragement of surplus production through Government subsidies, not the size of payments to individual farmers. Likewise, the attempt in the House to force the sale of more surplus commodities in the open world market is a largely meaningless gesture.

Nor do the farm program ideas of Democrats outside of Congress seem much more fertile than the withering seedlings on Capitol Hill. The rhetoric of a pamphlet on the farm problem published recently by the Democratic Advisory Council is cloyingly self-righteous, but the council's conclusion that production payments may be the answer—and such payments seem to offer some advantages over the present program—is disappointingly vague. Perhaps the council ran out of forthright words after it described Secretary Benson's personality as peculiarly perverse.

The essentials of a workable program, it seems to us, must include some markedly different approach to price or income support so as to discourage production for Government storage bins and at the same time to furnish incentives to farmers to increase the Nation's supply of meat and other commodities which consumers want. Production payments may prove to be part of the answer. If Democrats would expended as much energy in trying to work out a sensible alternative farm program as they have used in taking potshots at Secretary Benson, however, the undeniably staggering farm program might be closer to a solution than it is today.

Distinguished Educator Retiring as President of Central Michigan College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 25, 1959

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, one of Michigan's best known and distinguished educators is retiring from the presidency of a college, the affairs of which he administered for 20 years.

Central Michigan College at Mount Pleasant, Mich., and in the 10th Congressional District, will lose the services of a devoted man when the resignation of Dr. Charles L. Anspach becomes effective on July 1. However, deeply imbedded on the campus will be the inspiration woven into the school's fabric by the character of Dr. Anspach and by his devotion to everything that contributed to the advancement of the college.

Under the direction of President Anspach, Central Michigan College rose in stature to the point where the Legislature of the State of Michigan has just enacted legislation granting the school university status, effective June 1.

Not only has Dr. Anspach given unstintingly of his time and effort to foster the growth of Central Michigan College and strengthen the character of its students, but he has found time to participate in the civic affairs of the community and of the State.

Dr. Anspach's sterling qualities of mind and heart coupled with his warm, outgoing personality and sparkling sense of humor have caused him to be very much in demand as a speaker.

In Dr. Anspach's 20 years at Central Michigan College the school grew from an enrollment of 2,284 to 7,247; its faculty more than doubled to nearly 300; and its physical plant value multiplied from $4 million to $28 million. The campus itself increased from 50 to 235 acres.

Research and special studies have been emphasized with the college receiving well over $400,000 from a number of sources including the Fund for Advancement of Education, Atomic Energy Commission, and Dow Chemical Co.'s National Science Foundation.

Dr. Anspach could have continued as president of the new university, since he is several years from the mandatory retirement age, but true to his makeup he expressed his feeling that the new university should have a younger man at its helm as the school moves into a new status.

Although we in Michigan are sorry to be losing the active services of Dr. Anspach, we are pleased that he has agreed to remain as president emeritus. I am also glad that he has indicated his intention of remaining one of my constituents in the 10th district because I value his counsel and enjoy his companionship during the occasions when our travels bring us together.

I join Dr. Anspach's friends—and they are legion—in wishing him and his charming wife, Mary, many happy years of retirement.

The Effort To Destroy Williams Is Backfiring

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 25, 1959

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I place an article by Gould Lincoln as it appeared in the Washington Sunday Star under date of May 24, 1959. The article follows:

THE EFFORT TO DESTROY WILLIAMS

(By Gould Lincoln)

The fight in Michigan to obliterate politically the State's 6-term Governor—G. Mennen Williams, Democrat—by his Republican opponents and certain large corporations is not panning out. Recent developments, however, have shown the politi-

cal venom at the bottom of Michigan's financial plight, which has been widely advertised by Governor Williams' enemies. For example, a telegram sent by officers of the Michigan Manufacturers Association to all 22 Republican members of the State senate, congratulating them on their opposition to Governor Williams and his attempts to obtain new tax money to pay the State's bills, salaries, and wages. This extraordinary message, which seems as politically unwise as it could be, went to the homes of the State senators; it was explained, so that it would not be lost in the welter of mail received at their offices. It read: "This goes to every Senate Republican as an expression of appreciation for the Michigan Manufacturers Association for the united stand you have taken in the people's struggle with the Governor over taxes.

"You have him over the barrel for the first time in 10 years. Keep him there until he screams 'Uncle.' God bless each of you." The telegram was signed by the State manager of the Michigan Manufacturers Association, John C. McCreary, and the association's Lansing (State capital) representative, Joseph H. Creighton. Republican State senators admitted they had received the telegram, but said they regretted it had been sent. Nevertheless, it points up Governor Williams' contention that the action of the Republican-controlled State senate—and indeed, the legislature—has been directed by partisan politics rather than by the best interests of the State.

LEGISLATURE HAD WARNING

Governor Williams insists the legislature has had full warning for a long time that the State would be in grave financial difficulties if something was not done to bring in more tax revenues. He has recommended new tax legislation, and continues to do so. The Republicans have stalled, and they have come up with their brand of tax-producing legislation—which, in a few words, consists of raising the 3-cent sales tax to a 4-cent tax, although the increased penny tax is called a "use tax." This is to get around a State constitution provision that sales taxes shall not exceed 3 cents. But even this proposed increase in the sales tax would not bring in more than $108 million, which is short some $92 million of what is needed to put the State on a solvent, long-range basis financially.

Governor Williams has proposed a graduated State income tax and a State corporate profits tax. He contends the people in the low income brackets are now paying about 20 percent of their incomes for the sales and other State taxes, while those in upper brackets get off with as little as 6 percent. He believes, he says, in placing the needed tax increases on those better able to pay.

The State legislature has so far been deadlocked over tax legislation. The Senate put through the Republican bill (there are 22 Republican Senators to 12 Democratic). The House, which is split politically with 55 Republicans and 55 Democrats, has rejected the bill. And there the matter stands. The Republican Senate also will not agree to legislation to permit the Governor to use any part of the $50 million trust fund for veterans—which is available for cash needed now to meet payrolls, although the money is practically lying idle. And a payday June 1 is rapidly approaching. Available funds have been almost exhausted.

EFFORT TO BLAME GOVERNOR

The Michigan financial situation has been widely exploited, with an effort made to saddle all the blame on Governor Williams. The State has been called a welfare state. It has even been charged that it is a bad place for industries to settle. Many of the criticisms come from outside the State. All of which has finally roused the ire of Michiganders.

The upshot of the tax situation may result in a compromise, with the Governor getting much of what he has demanded. And when steps have been taken, his friends insist he will come out of the ruckus as a determined and successful leader.

The opposition to Governor Williams has stemmed from a desire to weaken him and his party inside the State. It seems to be failing. There appears also to be a determined effort by certain big interests to ruin the Governor as a national figure and kill off whatever chance he may have for a Democratic presidential nomination next year.

If and when the financial situation has been cleaned up, and Governor Williams has won his point that more revenues are essential to operate an efficient State government and its necessary services, this effort, too, will have failed. Fortunately for the Governor, this showdown has come as early in the year as it has.

The charge that Michigan is a welfare State is met by figures showing that in the matter of spending for so-called welfare services Michigan stands 34th among all the States. It is spending $16.30 per capita for these welfare services, whereas, for example, California is spending $29.09, and Oklahoma $47.73. These figures are, the Williams supporters say, taken from the U.S. Census reports. Also, the charge that Governor Williams has taken Michigan into the welfare State class is answered by the fact that all the legislation, all the laws, for social services have been passed by a Republican legislature during his six terms in the State House.

In early 1933, after Franklin D. Roosevelt had been elected President and Republican President Hoover was still in the White House and trying to get a Democrat-controlled Congress to do something to save the United States from ruin, certain Democratic leaders told him they had Mr. Hoover over the barrel and where they wanted him. They declined to do anything.

This was politics of the worst kind for the sake of the country, although it helped the Democrats to retain power for 20 years. The only difference in what the Republicans are attempting in Michigan today is that it may boomerang.

The Lesson of the Lake

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 25, 1959

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, the whole meaning of Memorial Day has experienced a long process of growth. It no longer refers to one period of strife or to one region. It is less narrow in scope than in times past and therefore has become more meaningful. As we honor our war dead, we should at the same moment devoutly raise our supplication that such sacrifices will not again be necessary.

Mr. Speaker, an awareness of the problems of our age prompts me to ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from the May issue of the Trailways magazine:

THE LESSON OF THE LAKE

It was a bright, sunny afternoon in late May.

The two small boys sat close together on the shore of the lake. Held tight in each boy's hand was a long string, and attached to the end of each string was a model sailboat.

From time to time, one of the boys would yank hard on his string and pull his model sailboat quickly toward him. Then he would let the string out again and the little craft would move slowly toward the middle of the lake.

After an hour or so, the second boy became restless. He seemed no longer interested in the bobbings of his sailboat; his grip on the string grew weaker.

Just then, a violent gust of wind came up. Rippling across the lake, it snapped the string right out of the boy's grip. Helplessly, he watched as his model sailboat sped out of control toward the other side of the lake.

The first boy had held tight to his string. When the gust of wind came up, his sailboat moved also, but he was able to keep it under control.

One boy kept his boat; the other lost it.

The 30th of May is Memorial Day. Taps will sound once again in Arlington National Cemetery just across the Potomac River from the Nation's Capital. Americans the world over will pause to honor those, who in the hour of darkest danger, held tight to their string of beliefs and saved their ship of state.

The lesson of the lake is obvious.

Our Nation is at peace today; our guns have been long silent. But all this could change, for looming dark on the horizon is an ever-increasing threat to our liberties. That threat is world communism, and like the violent gust of wind on the lake, it can rise up without warning to challenge our strength.

As we await this Memorial Day, let us remember to hold ever tighter the strings of our liberty. Let us be ready for that violent wind—now and always.

Tobacco and Lung Cancer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. RILEY
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 25, 1959

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Speaker, by permission of the House, I herewith quote an article by Dr. G. Wilse Robinson, Jr., appearing in the Bulletin of the Jackson County Medical Society and subsequently carried in the Kansas City Star.

The terrible scourge, cancer, has frightened us all, but in the search for truth as to the cause of cancer—particularly lung cancer—let us keep our feet on the ground:

ANOTHER VIEW: LUNG CANCER WILL KILL YOU IF SOMETHING ELSE DOESN'T

(By Dr. G. Wilse Robinson, Jr.)

Dr. Alton Ochsner is quoted in the March edition of Reader's Digest as condensed from Today's Health March issue as follows: "I am convinced that every heavy smoker will develop lung cancer unless heart disease or some other sickness claims him first."

I hope Dr. Ochsner has been misquoted, but I am sorry to say I am afraid he has not. Dr. Ochsner, a great surgeon and a great scientist, has been riding his scientific hobbyhorse for several years now and I am sure that he is very sincere in his belief that heavy smoking does cause carcinoma of the lung. Dr. Ochsner is entitled to his belief as is any physician in any matter involving etiology and treatment of any disease. Anybody who has been around as long as I have has heard

a lot of ideas. Some lived and some died very quickly because they did not work out. But no one denied anyone the right to express himself. I sincerely hope that this will always remain true. This is the only way we can advance.

But such a statement as quoted above is ridiculous. I will make it correctly. Everybody, smokers and nonsmokers, will die of lung cancer if they live long enough. Or in a field I know a little more about, I am very sure that everybody will die of a cerebrovascular accident of the brain if they don't die of something else first. And any cardiologist knows that everybody will die of heart disease if they don't die of some other disease. There is no limit to the list and naturally the laws of chance from fire, traffic, and falls will eventually catch up with everybody.

The purpose of this discussion is not to enter into the cigarette controversy, although there are many eminent scientists who do not agree with Dr. Ochsner in his opinions about cigarettes and lung cancer.

I just deplore hearing that a great physician has permitted himself to so engage in a purely scientific discussion in such a way as to exceed all the bounds of scientific restraint that he should leave the laboratory and enter into the public press with a purely scare statement that if analyzed is medically ridiculous.

Lung cancer is a major medical problem, as is all cancer and so many other serious illnesses, and as far as the person who dies from them, minor medical problems are also serious I know of not a single one that has ever been solved except in the laboratory or in the clinic.

Medical history is full of statements made in the public press about this disease and that illness. Never have these statements advanced the health of our people or medical science.

People, especially American people, don't scare easily—only the neurotic and the borderline psychotics. These are already stirred up about all kinds of sickness. One more won't hurt them.

But there are a lot of intelligent people in this country and some are pretty important. These people are going to read this statement and they will react to it as I did. What a silly thing to say. And does it prove anything? Of course not.

So we take it on the chin again. The practice of medicine has once more been presented to the thinking public in the light of sensationalism, not as a matter of scientific judgment.

We physicians base our request for respect from the public on our ability to be objective scientists within the limitations of our knowledge. We are scientists, not purveyors of rash statements.

I sure wish Dr. Ochsner hadn't said it.

Address on Memorial Sunday of Mayor John B. Hynes, of Boston, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAURENCE CURTIS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 25, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, Hon. John B. Hynes, mayor of Boston, in his Memorial Sunday address on May 24, gave emphatic and timely warning of the danger to our country of the Soviet threat, and of the need for great efforts and sacrifice by an aroused public to meet the challenge.

He urged the need of American leadership, and warned against propaganda decrying the aid we give to the free nations of the world "who must be helped if they are to resist the economic pressures and military posturings of the Soviets."

Mayor Hynes spoke at the annual memorial services at the Veterans Memorial, Mount Hope Cemetery, Boston, sponsored by the mayor and by the Suffolk County Council, American Legion.

In extension of my remarks, I include his forthright and eloquent address, as follows:

ADDRESS ON MEMORIAL SUNDAY

On this day, in these peaceful surroundings, our thoughts and our memories hearken back to those who have departed this world, and who enjoy, we pray, the blissful rewards of the world without end.

More particularly do we, on this day, think of those who answered our Nation's call in time of crisis, and left home and fireside and loved ones, to give battle in the cause of justice and freedom. To those, the brave and the true, we—our country—will always be in debt.

From time immemorial men have marched off to war convinced that the outcome of that war would be the beginning of uninterrupted peace in the world. Many a man in this last resting place and in other cemeteries throughout the world went to his Maker, while life was still young and sweet, firm in the belief that his sacrifice and the sacrifices of his comrades, would bring men and nations to their senses, and forever outlaw conflict and war.

What must be their feelings, these gallant men of yesteryear, as they look down upon a world which is today an armed camp, and which could, overnight, become a raging inferno laying waste most of the world and most of the peoples of the world.

What kind of madness can it be, they must wonder, when nations are furiously at work devising, designing, constructing weapons of war of terrifying power and potency almost beyond the mind of man to comprehend.

What can the world be thinking, they say, when it makes feverish preparations to destroy itself, and draw the curtain of darkness and oblivion over that which God has created and only God has a right to destroy.

Our answer must be that our country today—even as in all the days since our birth as a nation—seeks not to conquer or destroy, but seeks, as it always has, to preserve peace, to preserve man's God-given rights, to preserve the world.

It is for these reasons that our country must spend much of its substance, call many of its young men to service, and be able to counteract, implement for implement, weapon for weapon, bomb for bomb, the potential might of that mighty force in the world which denies that man has a right to be free; which denies that man has an imperishable soul; which denies that man has any God-given rights, and which scoffs at and denies that there is a Creator, a God of all the universe.

This ungodly tide which has overrun so much of the world, is not to be taken lightly. In the air, on land, on sea, and beneath the sea, it has developed an arsenal of devastating destructive power which—unless matched by the forces of freemen—will result in the complete domination of the world by the Soviets, and the critical maiming of present day civilization.

While we complain about high prices for the things which make for luxurious living, while we embrace the godess of materialism and look for more for doing less; while we cry out against, and even try to evade, the payment of taxes, the Soviet Union holds the noses of its people to the grindstone; allows little or no luxuries; provides only the bare necessities for its workers, and controls the hours of labor and the scale of wages, and all in the cold, deliberate, devilish purpose of out-arming and conquering the world.

World domination has been the aim of the Soviets since the days of Lenin. It is the basic doctrine of communism. It was no different under Stalin. It is no different under Khrushchev, who only a few weeks ago, in a spirit of bravado, told the people of West Germany, free Germany, that he could wipe their part of Germany off the face of the world with no more than eight bombs.

Let us not deceive ourselves, the awesome power of the Soviets is not a figment of their imagination. It is terrifically real. It must not be underestimated. It must be checked.

Who will check it? Who will make the stand for all that is right? Who will prevent a world of desolation? Who will prevent this world from becoming a citadel of paganism and atheism?

Unless we, our Nation, take leadership in the fight against evil, we, too, shall find ourselves in the web of the monster who will devour us.

The time may be shortly here when we must get along with less of the niceties of life: work harder and produce more: and give more to the national effort if we are to keep faith with those who have gone before us and those who will come after us.

If our city burned to the ground because we did not want to pay the cost of an efficient fire department—if epidemic took the lives of countless people because we would not pay the price of a good health department or maintain the facilities of a good hospital—we would moan and beat our breasts in regret.

How then would we feel if—because of an insatiable desire for more of the world's goods, we should wake up some morning—if we could wake up at all—to find that the world we know is no more.

Let us not be mollified or deceived by propaganda decrying the aid we give to the free nations of the world, who must be helped if they are to resist the economic pressures and military posturings of the Soviets.

If we won't help them, who will? How long can they stand their ground without our aid? Let us not be lulled into a false sense of security by those who would have us believe that all is right with the world, and there is really nothing to be concerned about.

Before the last world war the people of Great Britain were persuaded to believe that the antidote to hitlerism was some sort of detached pacifism. What a fearful price the British people paid for that fallacious reasoning. And what fallacious reasoning it is for us to think that modern sovietism is less cunning, less brutal, and less an enemy of freedom than was hitlerism.

We must not let ourselves believe that distance gives us protection. No longer is that so. It is far better that we know the stark truth and face up to it even if it means a period of grimness and self-denial. Is that not better than being on our knees begging for the mercy that would not be shown us?

These are serious thoughts. These are serious times. The free world is on the threshold of serious decisions. Let us on this day—give serious contemplation—to the grave possibility of what could happen when madmen, godless men, hold the trigger to the head of humanity.

America must give less thought to luxurious living—and more thought to actual survival.

May God help us and direct us—and save us from ourselves—and inspire us to keep faith with the heritage of the past as we journey into the future.

The Dangers of Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 25, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, recently I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter written by a citizen of St. Louis on the subject of inflation.

I now wish to call to the attention of my colleagues the keynote address of William A. McDonnell, president of the chamber of commerce, given Monday, April 27, before the chamber's 47th annual meeting in Washington, D.C.:

ADDRESS BY WILLIAM A. MCDONNELL, PRESIDENT, CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE UNITED STATES, AND CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD, FIRST NATIONAL BANK IN ST. LOUIS, ST. LOUIS, MO.

This particular annual meeting is one we are all going to remember no matter how many others we attend in the future.

Since we last met, two new States have joined our Union of Republics, and have added two more stars to our flag.

Alaskans and Hawaiians have been knocking on the door of statehood for many years, and this year, when the time was ripe, the American people opened the door and welcomed them into the family federation.

The substantial majorities by which the Congress approved the admission of Alaska and Hawaii undoubtedly reflected a popular will to welcome them with open arms.

Let us hope that the significance of these momentous events simmers down to those peoples of the world who waver in their thinking in the present global struggle for the minds of men. It might give them pause to remember that no people ever clamored for admission to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

The past 12 months as president of the national chamber have been for me a challenging and stimulating experience. I wish each one of you could have shared it with me. It would have renewed your faith, just as it has renewed mine, in the high purpose of American businessmen and women.

My duties have taken me to every section of this country and also to Canada, Mexico, and Hawaii. I have talked with and to many thousands of business and professional men and women. Furthermore, my duties have brought me close to the Washington scene, where I have had the opportunity to observe at short range the workings of our Federal Government, especially the legislative and executive branches.

As a result of these observations and experiences I have arrived at two firm convictions concerning the domestic, or internal, problems which confront this Nation. One has to do with economics and the other with politics.

One is an old belief of mine which has merely been confirmed. The other is a new conviction, and it constitutes for me a change of opinion.

You will note I am speaking of domestic, or internal, problems. Our international problems are great and we all recognize their magnitude. Paramount as those problems are, however, I think we can take pride and comfort in the fact that there is little disagreement among us concerning our approach to them. I think there are two reasons for this:

The first is that we have confidence in those we have placed in authority.

We are fortunate to have, at this particular moment in our history, the right man at the right time in the White House.

I believe that the overwhelming majority of all men of good will in this Nation—regardless of political affiliation—will agree that this is true.

The second reason that we as a Nation are united in our approach to our foreign problems is that we have learned to live with international crises. Anyone who doubts this has but to read the record of recent years: 1948, Berlin Airlift; 1949, Chinese Nationalists overthrown; 1950, South Korea invaded; 1951, Oil crisis in Iran and Tibet invaded; 1952, Iran crisis continued, and Farouk of Egypt overthrown; 1953 and 1954, Indochinese crisis; 1955, Formosa; 1956, Suez, Cyprus, Algiers, Jordan; 1957, Middle East crisis; 1958, Iraq, Lebanon, Quemoy; 1959, Berlin crisis.

And we may be sure that when the present crisis is past there will be others. Yes, we have learned to live with crises. We have acquired the wisdom, the courage, and the maturity to look danger squarely and calmly in the eye without flinching or backing away. I am confident that as we continue to seek peaceful solutions of international problems, we will not compromise principles. For us, the days of appeasement are over; we have learned how to call a bluff.

So much for that. And now I want to get back to our domestic problems about which I feel better qualified by training and experience to speak.

The old belief of mine which has been confirmed as a result of my experiences during the past year, is that the number one long-range domestic problem in this country is inflation. I thought that was true a year ago when we were at the bottom of recession. I am more convinced than ever that is true at this time when the recession is virtually over.

We also have other domestic problems, some of a serious nature. The problem of unemployment, for instance. The unemployment figure stood at 4,362,000 as of mid-March.

Of course, in a democratic society such as ours, where people have freedom of choice as to if and when and where they will work, full or 100 percent employment of the labor force is impossible, if not actually undesirable.

A condition where everyone is working, whether he wants to do so or not is found only in totalitarian states.

In a democracy there will always be a certain amount of what economists call frictional unemployment—people who are unemployed through choice or through illness or else are in between one job and another. But even allowing for that rather substantial group, there are probably about 1½ million people today who are ready, willing, and able to work who can't find jobs.

This is not good. That's a problem that must be solved. Personally, I think it will be pretty largely solved by the end of this year, as the recovery proceeds. At the moment, however, it is unsolved, and it is a problem worthy of our deep concern.

Then, too, we have problems of housing, of education, of urban redevelopment, of depressed areas, and of racial integration. We have the farm problem, and that's a honey. Our Government has $9 billion invested in agricultural commodities which it acquired from farmers under our price-support program.

Where are these commodities? Why, we have them in storage. Storage costs alone are over a million dollars a day. Those costs, plus insurance and interest upon the amount invested, amount to over a billion dollars a year.

We have these commodities in storage because we don't know what to do with them. If we sell or give them away in this country, we simply multiply the percentage of the next crop we must buy to support the prices. If we sell or give them away in foreign markets, we damage the economies of friendly neighbors and allies in the cold war.

It is true that some of these surpluses are being disposed of in the foreign market under constructive programs, but this has not resulted in a solution of the overall problem, and our friends who have agricultural commodities to export are not at all happy over what we are doing.

If we should burn these farm products or dump them in the ocean, we would make ourselves the laughing stock of the whole world. The Soviet Government would want nothing better for propaganda purposes.

Yes, we have problems but among our domestic problems, inflation ranks first. Why? Because without a stable currency a capitalistic system of free enterprise cannot endure. It can last for a while but ultimately it will go down. Inflation and democracy are not congenial bedfellows. The pages of history are replete with the records of free peoples who lost their freedom because of inflation. Time and time again freedom has been won by blood and lost by handouts of the people's own money—handouts usually financed by depreciation of the currency. In the days of old Rome, these handouts were called bread and circuses. In modern times they go by the more euphemistic term of social welfare.

In our time we have seen inflation pave the way for Hitler, Mussolini, and Mao Tse-tung. Whenever these examples are cited, however, there are always those who say: "Well, of course, those situations in Germany and Italy and China were very bad but they were cases of runaway inflation. Nothing like that can happen here. The most that can happen to us is a creeping inflation and that's not such a bad thing. In fact, a little inflation is good for the economy." It is even being said that a rise of 2 to 2½ percent a year in the price structure would constitute a wholesome stimulant to the economy.

Well, all right, let's take a look at a case of creeping inflation. Let's take a look at France. France has not suffered from a runaway inflation but it has had a steady and presistent depreciation of its currency over a long period of years.

I hold in my hand a 1,000-franc note. When I was a soldier in France in 1918, I held a commisison as captain of field artillery. My pay was $200 a month and I was paid in francs. The rate of exchange was 5 for the dollar and I received 1,000 francs every payday. If I were being paid $200 a month today in France, I would receive 98,741 francs. The franc today is worth just a fraction over 1 percent of what it was worth in 1918.

In other words, this piece of French money which was once worth $200 in our money, is today worth a few cents over $2.

In one corner of this French banknote, which bears a beautiful colored picture of Cardinal Richelieu, is the warning that anyone who counterfeits one of these notes will be sentenced to hard labor.

But the 1,000 francs which were once worth $200 are worth so little today that a counterfeiter would starve to death making these bills.

If the same fate should befall the dollar—if it should become worth only 1 percent of what it is worth today—a suit of clothes which now sells for $100 would cost you $10,000.

Any one of the so-called low-priced American cars with minimum trimmings would cost you $300,000.

A social security check for $100 would buy 2 pounds of hamburger, and $100,000 in life insurance would purchase room and board for a widow for approximately 1 year.

I do not need to tell you what would happen to our democratic institutions under the impact of such a depreciation of our currency. We are all familiar with what has happened in France. The Government has changed 27 times since the end of World War II, and this last time they had to rewrite the constitution, and give the Premier virtually dictatorial powers.

There is an example of creeping inflation. There is an example of what a 2 to 2½ percent a year increase in the price structure can do to your money. It is true that the costs of two World Wars, plus the military campaigns in Indochina and North Africa were the main cause of inflation in France. But the depreciation of the franc was greatly aggravated by the additional load of social charges and price-supporting subsidies in which the French people indulged. And I am sure that down through the years the leaders of French minority groups advanced the same arguments to condone inflation and to justify deficit financing as we are hearing today in this country, viz:

"A little inflation won't hurt us.

"Price stability is a false demigod.

"Bookkeeping must not come ahead of human needs.

"Let's not make a fetish out of a balanced budget or become obsessed with the value of the franc.

"We must think first of social security and the welfare of the people."

The French have finally learned the hard way that social welfare and old-age security purchased at the cost of inflation are neither the welfare of the people."

And yet with that example staring us in the face, there are powerful groups in this country advocating increased Federal spending of every conceivable kind, most of it for nondefense projects. It is being said that a program of a balanced budget—of living within our income—is reactionary and unimaginative; that the bold and dynamic approach to our problems is to spend and spend regardless of fiscal consequences.

It is even being said that the cure for inflation is more inflation—that the only way to bring about full production and full employment is by a massive infusion of Federal money into the economic bloodstream—a quack economic remedy we tried in this country from 1932 to 1940, and which resulted in a miserable and costly failure.

Our Federal Government has operated in the red for 23 of the last 28 years. The deficit in the present fiscal year, which ends June 30, will be almost $13 billion, with increased expenditures of a nondefense nature mostly to blame.

Largely as a result of these fiscal procedures the dollar has lost 52 percent of its purchasing power in the last 20 years. In other words, we have a 48-cent dollar today compared with what we had in 1939. And if we keep on going as we have been, we will have a 35-cent dollar 10 years from now and a 25-cent dollar in another 10 years, and a 10-cent dollar a little further down the line. What we need in this country today is the assurance that if you buy a life insurance policy or a Government bond or any other kind of fixed investment today you will get back in the future the same 48-cent dollar you put in.

We hear on every hand the so-called liberal spenders that it is the duty of the Government to provide for the welfare of the people. That is true, but you do not achieve welfare by fiscal irresponsibility. The greatest benefit any nation can provide for its people is a stable currency.

In other words, the greatest "Federal aid" measure Congress could give the people of this country would be a stable dollar.

That would prevent further inflationary theft from those with fixed or lagging income.

It would benefit those who depend on social security.

It would protect the value of our savings accounts and insurance policies.

It would encourage thrift and the formation of investment capital which is the foundation of a free enterprise system.

It would enable business to expand more boldly and so provide more jobs.

In a word, a stable dollar would protect the little people—the very ones who are hurt the most by inflation—and—ironically—the very ones who are supposed to be helped the most by the so-called Federal aid programs.

Now—if you stay around Washington and Capitol Hill very long, as I have during the past year, the thing about inflation that impresses you most is that everybody is against it—at least professedly so. Everyone is for economy in government provided it doesn't affect his particular hobby, subsidy or advantage.

Last fall I appeared on a program with a U.S. Senator whose political hobbyhorse is Federal housing. I spoke on the subject of inflation. The Senator followed me, speaking on housing. He said: "I couldn't agree with the preceding speaker more. We must put an end to all this profligate spending which is depreciating the purchasing power of the American dollar. We must reduce our spending to bring it in balance with our income, but why take it out on housing?"

Indeed, Senator, why take it out on housing? Why take it out on farmers, or veterans, or depressed areas, or schools, or community facilities.

Everybody is in favor of economy in Government so long as it doesn't affect them. As the Choctaw Indians say: "Everybody smoke peace pipe—nobody inhale."

I have referred to inflation as a domestic problem. In fact, it is more than that. It has international overtones, becauses if we do not control inflation we may lose the cold war by pricing ourselves out of world markets. Every nation in the free world is watching us to see how we face up to this problem—to see whether we have the commonsense, the courage, and the self-restraint to meet it resolutely and squarely. And on more than one occasion in recent months our friends abroad have politely hinted that any nation incapable of fiscal self-discipline is incapable of free-world leadership.

Well, if inflation is our No. 1 domestic problem, is there anything we can do about it? Yes, I think so. Inflation is not inevitable. Inflation is not a natural economic phenomenon, and it can be controlled. But how? The answer to that question leads me to the second conviction at which I have arrived as a result of my experience as president of the U.S. chamber.

This conviction is a new one for me; it represents a change of opinion on my part. It has to do with businessmen and politics. For most of my business life—in fact, all of it up to a year or so ago—I believed very strongly that a businessman should have nothing to do with politics other than giving financial support to the party of his choice and voting on election days. I believed that politics was for the politicians, and that if a businessman allowed himself to get mixed up in politics his business would be hurt.

I have changed my mind. I was wrong. I have concluded that businessmen must get into politics if we are to preserve our free market system. I have concluded that, if we do not become politically active, we as a nation are going to legislate and spend our way into state socialism, and businessmen won't have any business left that they can call their own.

Politics is not something apart from business. It is part and parcel of business. Politics is the art of government, and government affects everything we do in business. Under our present system of taxation, which was arrived at through political action, Government is a senior partner in every business endeavor. The thousand and one statutory rules and regulations under which we do business are the result of political processes. Furthermore, all of these rules and regulations are administered by the political party in power.

The United States is a republic, but we function on the basis of a highly democratic process. Our society is composed of many groups—many interests—economic, geographic, racial, and social.

It was obviously presumed by the authors of our Constitution that a distillation of decisions by these many forces would result in wise programs—programs designed in the best interests of the Nation as a whole. It was also assumed that each group would exert a positive and effective influence in the formation of political decisions.

Well, it has not been working out that way, at least not in recent years, because members of many groups, and our group in particular—the business management group—have not fulfilled their political responsibilities as citizens. We have been leaving it to George.

If businessmen are to have the kind of government which is fair to the business community—a government of limited powers—a government which preserves the integrity of the dollar and the free market system—if we are to have that kind of government, businessmen must do two things:

First of all, we must do our best to mold public opinion in favor of that kind of government by the dissemination of economic intelligence through every avenue available to us.

Secondly, and what is equally, if not more important, businessmen must participate more actively in the realm of practical politics.

Too many businessmen are overcome by political timidity. And when we do get up enough courage to make a political effort, we spend our entire time at the place where laws are being made rather than at the more important point where lawmakers are being made.

Too often our sole political objective is to resist legislative proposals made by others, rather than to help elect men who will support the kind of legislation which we would like to see adopted. We spend so much time trying to put out fires, that we have no time left to prevent them.

We must roll up our sleeves and get to work at the precinct and county levels where the candidates are being chosen. We must quit thinking of politics as a dirty word. Politics is not a dirty business; it is the very essence of democracy.

Any businessman who insists that he is not interested in politics is like a drowning man who says he's not interested in water. We are in it up to our necks and we had better learn how to swim and to swim effectively. The price we pay for the rewards of living in a democratic republic is participation.

I am not suggesting that all businessmen and all of management personnel go into politics as candidates, or take up politics as an avocation to the exclusion of other outside interests.

The important thing is that as a group, the management community should provide its share of political leaders.

Well, where do we start? The place to start is at the local level—that's where elections are won.

How do we start? By learning something about the workings of politics—the political process—a subject about which most of us are woefully ignorant.

To help businessmen acquire that knowledge, the Chamber of Commerce of the

United States—as you know—has developed an action course in practical politics. It is nonpartisan. In its development we had the assistance of leaders in both parties. It is not antilabor—in fact, it has been praised by some labor leaders.

The program was launched on February 5 of this year. Since then in less than 90 days 852 business firms, chambers of commerce, and trade associations have ordered a total of 3,653 sets of the booklets to be used in the course, and 901 copies of the "Discussion Leader's Manuals."

While we are off to a very auspicious and encouraging start in this program, it will not succeed unless it has the enthusiastic blessing of top management. We must encourage our junior officers and supervisors to participate just as we encourage them to take part in community chest drives and other civic activities. Turning it over to our public relations department and then forgetting it won't do the job. This is a job for all management personnel. And, of course, after we have acquired the basic knowledge of politics, we must put that knowledge to work. Knowledge without action is of little practical value.

It is a long-range program. We expect no sudden miracles, but I am convinced that if the businessmen of this country adopt and use this program of political participation as a continuing policy of business management, and by precept and example encourage other groups to do so, we will have better Government in this country, and the free market system will be preserved.

Raymond Moley, a distinguished observer of the American scene, capsuled the idea not long ago when he said that "our generation has achieved a miracle of productivity, of efficiency and inventive genius. Its abundance is far beyond our needs and almost beyond our wants.

"But all this may pass * * * if we neglect our basic political institutions. Busy with the material things we are creating, we forget the preservation of those values which give meaning and purpose to life and which in the long run determine material progress. The political institutions we have inherited seem to us so excellent that we foolishly assume that they need no attention and support. In enjoying the excellence of the fruit, we are blind to the care of the tree."

And Mr. Moley might have added that if we neglect too long the care of the tree, the fruit will become bitter.

Our business is business—but our business is also public affairs—politics, legislation, and government—and there is no escape from that responsibility if we are to preserve our system of free enterprise.

It is said that as Benjamin Franklin walked out of Convention Hall in Philadelphia, after signing the new Constitution of the United States, someone asked him, "What have you given us?" and he replied, "A republic, sir, if you can keep it."

That was in 1787. We have kept it thus far. Can we continue to keep it Yes; if we pay the price. That price is eternal vigilance and active participation in public affairs. Will we pay the price? I think we will.

Carriers Vital to U.S. Strength

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 25, 1959

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the San Diego (Calf.) Union of May 21, 1959:

CARRIERS VITAL TO U.S. STRENGTH

The resumption of bombardment in the Formosa area points anew to the need of a strengthened carrier force. There is only one quick way in which the United States can apply force, or the threat of force, at trouble spots in Far Eastern areas and that is with big carriers and their long-ranging aircraft.

Without the Seventh Fleet and its carriers, how long could the Chinese be restrained in the Formosa Strait?

The Seventh Fleet must support U.S. policies throughout vast areas of the far Pacific—along a 3,5000-mile front from Vladivostok to Indonesia and on into the Indian Ocean area.

The Navy at present has only 14 attack carriers. Five are deployed overseas, five are held in readiness, and four are in overhaul and training. Two generally are deployed with each fleet but three are needed on duty at all times with the Seventh Fleet because of the ever-present threat of the Chinese Communist Air Force. And it takes 14 days for a carrier to get from the west coast to the Far East.

The 14 carriers are a mixed lot. Only four are of the modern *Forrestal* class. Two are converted *Midway* class carriers of World War II design, and the remainder are converted *Essex* class ships of World War II construction.

The *Forrestal* carriers now are the only ones on which heavy modern jet aircraft are fully operational. And such big ships aren't built overnight. A new carrier, which a House subcommittee threatens to force out of this year's budget, could not, even if finally approved, join the fleet until 1964.

When all the carriers for which money has been appropriated are built, the Navy still will have only 10 modern carriers, and believes it needs a minimum of 14.

The Navy has been an aging one, as so many admirals have warned. As each new *Forrestal* class carrier joins the fleet she replaces an obsolescent World War II carrier. The replaced ship joins the antisubmarine force and a still older CVS is decommissioned.

The main striking force of 14 carriers, remains constant, as does the antisubmarine force. Yet the enemies' capabilities at sea and in the air increase. The Russians have more than 450 submarines and today they are the second greatest seapower.

There is only one lesson to learn from the Chinese excursions in the Far East, and the Russian threats to Berlin and in the Middle East—the Communists will continue to probe for all weaknesses.

As Adm. Arleigh Burke, Chief of Naval Operations, remarked, "If they find a weakness, they'll try to cash in on it."

How To Do—Rural or Area Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 25, 1959

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I desire to call the attention of my colleagues to what is being done in the field of a national rural development program.

Some days ago, a national conference, with representatives from 34 States, was held at the Jackson's Mill 4–H camp at Weston, W. Va., in the nature of a workshop aimed at correlating the activities of the several States in this field of endeavor to improve our natural resources, with special attention being given to the development of our rural areas.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I desire to include in the RECORD an address delivered at this conference by True D. Morse, Under Secretary of Agriculture, who is in charge of this program now being carried out by the Department of Agriculture. Mr. Morse's remarks follow:

HOW TO DO—RURAL OR AREA DEVELOPMENT

(Address by True D. Morse)

The success of the rural, resource, or area development approach has been gratifying. A foundation has been established on which to go forward with widespread activities of increasing effectiveness.

Work is moving ahead in over 30 States and in Puerto Rico. Development action has spread, in less than 3 years, far beyond the original 60 pilot or demonstration counties and areas. We have been told of work underway in some 200 counties.

This does not include the pioneering community and area development activities which have helped point the way for the present enlarged program. Recognition needs to be given to all such development work. It is all part of the total effort which is being made to enlarge the opportunities for low-income families and entire rural areas.

There are over 1,000 counties, about one-third of all counties in the United States, where there are serious underemployment, low incomes, and unsatisfactory levels of living.

There are about 2 million farms producing 90 percent of the farm products marketed. They include the larger more prosperous farms.

The billions of dollars of Government expenditures for price supports and stabilization are primarily for the products of these farms. By comparison, there is a bare trickle down of aid to the farm families—on small low-income farms—who are most in need.

There are some 2.7 million small-scale part-time and residential farms. They produce a mere 10 percent of the farm products marketed.

Price-support outlays for these farm families are comparatively small, meager millions compared with the billions of dollars being spent by law on the production of the larger more prosperous farms.

Most of the 2.7 million farm families have low or inadequate incomes. Levels of living are below average. There is widespread and acute underemployment.

Price supports have not—and cannot—solve the economic problems of the small farmers. In fact, such price-support laws have increased the problems and burdens of thousands of small farmers already hard pressed for income and an adequate level of living.

Living within the same areas of low-income farms—and assocociated with the farm families as neighbors in the country and in the towns—are even larger numbers of rural nonfarm families, which likewise have low incomes, underemployment, and often low levels of living.

As a whole, this is a major weakness in the total resources and economy of the United States.

Human resources are being neglected, wasted, and underemployed.

Natural resources are not being developed and employed adequately.

President Eisenhower has pointed out such facts repeatedly in his 1954 farm message and later statements.

The Joint Congressional Committee on the Economic Report said in January 1956: "The existence of areas of low economic activity seriously retards the rate of national growth, and is in itself a significant cause of self-perpetuation of low-income, underemployed groups. The goal of achieving full utilization of our national resources—land, labor, and capital—will never be attained as long as these geographic pockets of continuing economic depression persist."

The way to largely overcome this serious and widespread national problem is through development programs. That is what brings us together in this school or "How-to-do-it Workshop." That is our challenge.

You as State leaders—and workers at the grassroots with this age-old and tough problem—will be going back to the 32 States and Puerto Rico represented here—to help in training other leaders and workers. The success of this conference will depend largely upon the extent to which you go back to your various States and areas and assist in conveying how-to-do-it-ideas and methods to other leadership.

How to do rural, resource, community, or area development has been shown by—

1. Numerous studies, including congressional studies and investigations of the family farm; and

2. Hundreds of community activities and pilot or demonstration county and area programs.

Now the emphasis is on action. We must push ahead.

More income is the top goal. Top because more dollars will help families buy more education, health and other needs.

More income can and is being achieved to a major extent by increased off-farm and nonfarm income. The Congressional Joint Economic Committee said in February 1958 there is "need to develop local nonfarm resources and otherwise assist farm-reared people who have poor opportunities in agriculture to earn income in other ways."

Farm families, on their own, have reached out for such off-farm and nonfarm income. It is the largest single source of income—bringing in more than $1 out of each $3 which they receive.

How to do it. Just look at the results where people team up for county area development programs.

New and expanded industries, factories, businesses and service enterprises—each new job generates the equivalent of another—so the payroll and income buildup accelerates.

Tourist, hunting, fishing, and recreational activities are big business in America. They are an important cash crop which rural areas are cultivating. Forests, hills, mountains, parks, streams, and lakes are being developed to attract and hold this rapidly expanding business.

Another cash crop or new payroll being attracted is retired people and others seeking country homes. They have money to spend and help create more prosperous areas.

Farms are made more productive. Forests are improved. Processing and marketing are developed. More local demand for farm products results as the economy is built up and people in an area have more income with which to buy.

The new rural America that is emerging is good for America. It is good for people to live on the land—out in the country. Certainly it is good for low income farm families to be able to continue to enjoy their farm homes and yet have adequate incomes for health, education, and general welfare, such as most American enjoy.

More and more farm people who have their homes on farms, especially small, low-income farms, are commuting to factories, offices, and other employment in the towns or cities. They have taken lessons from their city cousins and discovered that roads and highways can be traveled in both directions to more income and higher levels of living.

The most extensive highway building program in history is under way—and will speed this development.

Mixed-income communities are replacing what were once only farming areas. Some are calling them diversified income areas.

Businessmen, farmers, and other leaders know how important it is to have diversified income. When drought disaster or low yields strike farming, incomes from off-farm employment continues to bring in cash. When factories close down—or workweeks are shortened—it is good to have continuing farm income and produce for the family.

More broadly based and diversified area economies are good for the future stability of America.

Education—and total "development of agriculture's human resources"—rank at the very top. Every area can go into action on this—and increasing numbers are.

Vocational education is urgently needed to serve effectively the new rural America—the diversified income areas. Vocational instruction is being adjusted and broadened. Instructors in trades and skills are in demand.

The Family Farm Subcommittee, House of Representatives, 84th Congress, said: "Since two or three out of four rural youngsters are destined to settle into urban and industrial employment, the vocational education of rural schools definitely should embrace elementary training in urban pursuits. This applies especially to areas of small farms, since these are the sources of the largest youth migrations to urban employment."

The Joint Congressional Committee on the Economic Report (Senate and House) 84th Congress, said: "It is apparent that a threefold approach is required to meet other aspects of the problem of chronic labor underemployment in low-income farm areas:

"(1) Encouragement of off-farm employment by development of new industrial locations within the area;

"(2) assistance of farm families willing to migrate to other areas and who possess definite job opportunities in the new location;

"(3) provision for greater opportunity for rural people to obtain training for nonfarm occupations * * * to improve the education of farm people, to make training in industrial skills available to them, and to overcome obstacles faced by people who wish to make the transition from farm to nonfarm work.

"Success in this effort would have most direct impact on noncommercial farm families."

Does your county or area or State offer "horse and buggy" vocational education, or is it modernized for the new rural America already upon us?

Education beyond the high school is being pushed by development committees. President Eisenhower's Commission pointed up the urgent need. Estimates indicate that the work force of 1975 will be composed of 75 percent more professional and technical workers, 45 percent more craftsmen, and 25 percent fewer laborers than in 1956.

Low income rural areas are rich in human resources. These fine boys and grils primarily need encouragement and kindly guidance to get them started into colleges and universities. There are unused scholarships, grants and loan funds—and people and organizations are ready to help.

Action. Let's push ahead to help get the boys and girls to stay in school—and then go on to education beyond the high school. We will be helping to fill the shortage of scientists, engineers, teachers, doctors and nurses—and helping bright young people escape what may be a lifetime of low incomes and limited usefulness. It is a major way to help build a stronger America.

Better health has been among the first and most vigorous action programs. No county or area need wait to push ahead.

Report after report shows stepped up inoculations against disease. The reports show more X-rays. Health clinics and hospital facilities have been installed—improved diets, water supplies, sewage disposal and sanitation have come through local people actively working with available medical and health associations and State and Federal agencies and departments.

How to do it. Let's look again at what the congressional committees have had to say.

The Family Farm Subcommittee said: "Democracy finds its meaning in the community. Programs for economic improvement can be put into effect far more quickly and beneficially in organized rural communities. Local initiative and cooperation are imperative in programs directed at improving the economic position of the family farm."

The joint congressional committee said: "The Federal Government must assume a positive role, but we do not believe that responsibility for further constructive action lies with the Federal Government alone. To meet the problems effectively will require the concerted efforts of all segments of our national life—all levels of government working with labor and management and private community groups and organizations."

The President, in sending the report to Congress that resulted in the rural development program approach, said (April 1955): "The essential cooperative nature of the undertaking is clear. The recommended program is cooperative as regards individual and group action, as regards private and public agencies, and as regards agencies at local, State and Federal levels * * *.

"A many-sided attack is essential.

"We must open wider the doors of opportunity to our * * * farm families with extremely low incomes * * * for their own well-being and for the good of our country and all our people."

How to do it.

1. States have formed rural, resource, or area development committees—with broad representation.

2. Counties or areas have development committees—with project or subcommittees as needed.

3. There is a national committee at the Under Secretary or Subcabinet level. This committee for rural development program represents Department of the Interior; Department of Agriculture; Department of Commerce; Department of Labor; Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; Small Business Administration; and Council of Economic Advisers.

Dr. Harry J. Reed, former dean of agriculture at Purdue University, is the coordinator.

4. A wealth of people and organizations stand ready to help any area that wants to make more rapid progress.

In June 1958, prominent representatives of more than 150 private organizations met in Memphis, Tenn., to discuss the program with officials of 31 land-grant colleges and universities and State and Federal personnel representing 44 agencies.

5. All organizations, groups and agencies need to be brought together in a coordinated working relationship to get maximum county or area development.

(a) There needs to be a study and inventory of the resources of the county or area.

The favorable along with the limiting factors need to be determined.

(b) The next step is to draft a development program. It should show specifically the activities and enterprises adapted to the area—those with most potentials, such as crop and livestock enterprises; businesses and industries; tourist, recreation, or residential potentials; health, education, religious, and character building needs, etc.

(c) Get general agreement among the area leadership, organizations and agencies on the development program to be undertaken. Specific goals may be desirable.

(d) Establish committees for each project or activity—with definite responsibility fixed on the logical agencies and leadership. For example:

Dairying: Dairy industry representatives, farm organizations, extension service, banks, etc.

Forestry: Private and public foresters, forest service, soil conservation service, etc.

Industry: Chamber of commerce, power and transportation companies, Department of Commerce, Small Business Administration, etc.

Tourist and recreation: Chamber of commerce, service clubs, park administrators, foresters, travel bureaus, game and recreational organizations, etc.

Health: Doctors and health officials, medical and health organizations and agencies, including those working on dietary problems youth clubs, etc.

Education: School officials and education leaders, labor, and education department and agency representatives, extension service, etc.

Other development projects and activities.

(e) Hold regular meetings of the county or area development committees to review progress of the various projects and activities, assure coordination of work, and to project plans and goals ahead.

6. Get action on all fronts where the leadership has agreed that progress is possible on a sound basis for the future. This action could include for example:

(a) Better farming situations for those who should continue in farming.

(b) Additional employment opportunities for underemployed farm people.

(c) More tourist, and recreational income.

(d) Additional sources of incomes for farm families and other rural people needing higher incomes.

(e) Adjusted and expanded educational opportunities.

(f) Better health facilities and services and more use of dietary and health measures.

(g) More adequate religious and character-building activities.

(h) Financial management programs, including retirement plans.

There will be increasing assistance for rural area development work. For example:

Congress, in 1955, changed the law so the Farm Credit Administration could make land bank loans to farmers located where they have opportunity to obtain supplemental employment.

Congress, in 1956, changed the law so the Farmers Home Administration could serve more effectively low-income farm families by loaning to farmers with off-farm employment. Additional loan funds were made available.

Congress, in 1956, in amending the Defense Production Act, inserted in the law "it is the policy of the Congress to encourage the geographical dispersal of the industrial facilities of the United States."

Congress, in 1958, in the National Defense Education Act, provided for guidance, testing, and counseling in both rural and urban schools; and area programs of vocational training for highly skilled technicians.

Congress, in 1958, made the Small Business Administration permanent, and gave it greatly enlarged lending and management assistance authority. In a recent 6 months the Administration made 394 loans totaling some $27 million to small businesses in rural areas.

The Department of Labor is carrying forward four experimental programs in Arkansas, Kentucky, Tennessee, and Wisconsin to determine how to serve more effectively farm families and others in rural areas with aptitude testing and guidance and employment services.

The President has established a Cabinet-level Federal Council on Aging. The Congress has authorized a White House Conference on Aging to be held in January 1961. There are many elderly people on small farms.

Area assistance bills are pending in Congress. The President has recommended such legislation on a limited basis.

Concern for farm families and people—not just cotton, corn, cattle, or hogs—that is the challenge that is before us.

The Nation is deeply indebted to you and those working with you in charting the way to more widespread prosperity for farm and rural people.

Some say these low-income farm families and areas are a social problem—not a farm problem. It is, however, a problem of families. All can agree that it is a deep-seated and chronic economic problem—with human values at stake.

At stake are the social stability and the spiritual and cultural values of rural areas that have helped make our Nation great.

At stake are future opportunities for fine boys and girls.

At stake is the future strength of America.

Of such is the challenge of rural or area development programs.

California Eagles Vocational Training Center at Catania, Sicily

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 25, 1959

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, members of the Fraternal Order of Eagles in California, under the dynamic leadership of Past Worthy State President Charles J. Fracisco, have come up with another first.

In the true spirit of Eagledom, they are extending the hand of brotherly love to the unfortunate youth of strickened, war-damaged Italy.

One of the outstanding agencies in Italy is its Boys Town. Quite recently Princess Pacelli, niece of the late Pope Pius, visited the United States in its interest. This gracious lady was an excellent ambassadoress in leading the cause of underprivileged youth who need vocational training and guidance.

The California Fraternal Order of Eagles in keeping with the high traditions of that great fraternal organization, has undertaken the sponsorship of a school at Catania, Sicily, to train young men as machinists and radio and television specialists.

Worthy State President Harry Wetherald and Emeline Michler, president of the State Auxiliary, are giving their full support to Chairman Charles Fracisco, of Livermore, who is sparkplugging the drive.

The following is taken from the official publication of FOE, the Eagle, for July 1959:

CALIFORNIA EAGLES START THEIR OWN EUROPEAN SCHOOL, YOUTH VOCATIONAL TRAINING CENTER AT CATANIA, SICILY

Inspired by the sensational success of Eagle-sponsored youth training centers in West Berlin and Naples, California aeries and auxiliaries have set out to establish another vocational and trade school in Catania, Sicily—strictly a California only project.

California is the only State which has adopted such a program as a purely State Eagle effort to bring direly needed trade education to underprivileged youngsters in a foreign land, thereby helping to bring about sorely necessary person-to-person good will among the peoples of the world.

The California-Catania project is being handled in cooperation with CARE, American-sponsored international relief organization, as are the other two Eagle-sponsored schools, one at Eagle Haus in Berlin, the other at Casa Materna in Naples.

Strongly urged by State President Harry Wetherald and Emeline Michler, president of the State auxiliary, sufficient commitments have already been made by California Eagle units and individuals to practically insure that the Catania project will be a whopping success. Wetherald is honorary chairman of the campaign. Directors of the campaign include Charles J. Fracisco, chairman, Judge John J. Molinari, C. C. DeYoung, Victor Lamanuzzi, Gus Sorci, Joseph Baudino, Victor Corsiglia and California State Secretary William J. Fitzgerald.

Directors have circularized their friends, Eagle units and other organizations, and report an amazingly enthusiastic response.

This will be the first school in Sicility training machinists. Other firsts are courses in the field of radio and television assembling and repairing. The children who will be enrolled in the California Eagle-sponsored school will be orphans, abandoned youngsters and children from the squalid slums who would otherwise be without an opportunity to learn a trade and thereby bring opportunity of the dignity which comes with being self-supporting. By establishing this school, California Eagles are helping these youngsters to help themselves.

All contributions are tax-deductible. Checks should be made out to CARE and sent to one of the various directors of the project, to the local Aerie or to California Eagle House Committee, Eagles Club, Livermore, Calif.

The Villaggio del Fanciullo "Exelsior" in the city of Catania is Italy's Boys Town, patterned much after the famed institution founded and guided by the late, great Eagle, Father Flanagan. It is located in one of the most picturesque seaside resorts in the city, with a superb view. There are 135 boys already enrolled in the Italian Boys Town and in addition, 80 boys will come to the Eagle-sponsored school as day students.

The school will be located in a newly constructed wing of the school proper. It is emphasized that the instruction will be offered to those who need it most—youngsters who would otherwise not be able to learn a trade and become self-supporting. They are poor children without other opportunity to obtain a technical and vocational education. Other expansion is planned at the school, much of it through the generosity of humanitarian-minded citizens of Italy.

Grand Worthy President Andrew Halloran has expressed the hope that other States will follow the lead of California. "I think all of us in the Eagles may well be proud of the training centers we have already established as a national organization work-

ing on a national basis," he said. "California Eagles may be particularly proud for having successfully gone out on their own in this magnificent program which will do so much good for the youth of Italy. I only hope that more State aeries will do the same. It is impossible to overemphasize the good we are doing through these so very worthwhile projects. We are doing much in this way to cement international friendships, now and in the future."

Says California State President Harry Wetherald, "We are proud of the fine cooperation of the aeries in this State and their members. Their excellent response to the appeal for an Eagle house in Catania has made it possible for California to pioneer in this sort of activity as an official State aerie project."

Social Security Coverage for Self-Employed Physicians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. WALLHAUSER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 25, 1959

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday of last week, I introduced a bill, H.R. 7295, designed to provide coverage under the Social Security Act for self-employed physicians.

The bill, which is designed to break through a long-existing bottleneck that has stymied such legislation in past Congresses, would—

First. Grant the right of election of coverage to present self-employed physicians.

Second. Automatically cover all persons who enter the field of medicine as self-employed physicians after enactment of the bill into law.

As we all are aware, self-employed physicians now are one of the few groups in the Nation not covered under the Social Security Act, and it is my belief that acceptance of the proposals contained in my bill could overcome the difficulties that have prevented extension of coverage to the medical profession.

Two major reasons are attributed for the failure to bring self-employed physicians under the Social Security Act. One is the opposition of some in the medical profession to compulsory coverage. The other is the opposition of the legislative and executive branches of Government to elective coverage because of long-established social security policy.

My proposals call for a slight shift in the two positions so that a compromise can be reached.

Under my bill a presently self-employed physician would have to choose whether or not he or she wanted to participate in the social security program by the due date of his or her second income tax year after enactment of the bill. A signed declaration of noncoverage, which would be necessary under terms of the bill, would be irrevocable.

Thus, those presently self-employed physicians desiring social security coverage for themselves, their wives, and their children could obtain it, while those opposing it would not be forced to accept it. This could answer, at least in part, the objections of those sternly opposed to compulsory coverage.

In the case of those who are to become self-employed physicians, they would be automatically covered by social security from the start of their practices. In most instances, this would mean a continuation of coverage they have had while employed in hospitals or other types of public and private employment.

Because this proposal would mean that all self-employed physicians eventually would be covered by social security, just as are members of other professions and other working men and women, it might well provide a means of compromise for those opposed to elective coverage.

Unless there is a complete change of attitude by the opposite parties in this matter, an insistence upon complete elective or complete compulsory coverage can mean automatic defeat for any effort to give social security protection to the many in the medical profession who desire it. I do not believe we should shut the door in the faces of those physicians and their families.

Possibly because my late father and my late brother were members of the medical profession, many physicians have contacted me since my election to the Congress last year and asked that I take what I consider the necessary steps to give them the social security coverage now enjoyed by a vast, vast majority of working Americans.

I believe my bill will accomplish that purpose in the shortest possible time.

In closing, I would like to cite a recent poll of the Essex County Medical Society in New Jersey to indicate the number of physicians who want social security coverage. In that poll, the members of the society, many of whom live in my congressional district, were asked: "Are you in favor of compulsory social security for physicians?" A total of 1,209 replies were received and the tabulation was: Yes, 822; no, 377; and undecided, 10.

New York Democratic Delegation Urges Nuclear Powered Carrier To Be Built at Brooklyn New Yard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 25, 1959

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement from the New York Democratic delegation in the House of Representatives:

The New York State Democratic delegation expressed keen desire to have built at the Brooklyn Navy Yard a nuclear super arcraft carrier. The Brooklyn Navy Yard has the expertise, skilled labor, and facilities to build this nuclear-powered supercarrier.

Carriers have proven their worth many times since World War II. Whenever the United States and its allies were faced with threats to their mutual security on foreign soil, our aircraft carriers were alerted and prepared to cope with the crisis. They were used successfully in local conflicts in Quemoy, and Matsu, Korea, Lebanon, Jordan, etc. The old conventional type of aircraft carriers have become obsolete becaues of their shorter runways. Longer runways are required to accommodate the latest jet aircraft.

Billions of dollars are being poured into outer space research and development. Aircraft carriers should be a matter of deep concern for our defense and offense. They are a lost closer to us and of more immediate need. A supercarrier would be used as a missile launcher. It would have a decided advantage over missile bases, which are stationary. The aircraft carrier would be a mobile base and could easily elude the enemy's lethal weapons. Its own array of jets would be a protective curtain.

It is estimated that a nuclear carrier will cost between $370 and $390 million, but its cost could be amortized over the years. There would be a great saving of fuel space and fuel costs.

As Vice Adm. John T. Hayward stated in a recent telecast, not only are jet bombers here to stay, but in time they will be equipped with the latest missiles. Our mobile aircraft fleet will be needed to bring them within range of the vital targets within the enemy's home borders.

We believe that we must not only plan ahead but must make firm all facets of our lines of defense. Aircraft carriers today are in the forefront of that main line of defense. A delay of a year or two means a delay of 5 or 6 years in obtaining a carrier prepared to defend us.

VICTOR L. ANFUSO, CHARLES A. BUCKLEY, EMANUEL CELLER, JAMES J. DELANEY, ISIDORE DOLLINGER, THADDEUS J. DULSKI, LEONARD FARBSTEIN, JAMES C. HEALEY, LESTER HOLTZMAN, EDNA F. KELLEY, EUGENE J. KEOGH, ABRAHAM J. MULTER, LEO W. O'BRIEN, ADAM C. POWELL, JOHN J. ROONEY, ALFRED E. SANTANGELO, SAMUEL S. STRATTON, LUDWIG TELLER, and HERBERT ZELENKO.

Westmoreland, Kans., Welcomes Oregon Centennial Wagon Train

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, the Oregon centennial wagon train is rolling across country. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include an editorial which first appeared in the Westmoreland, Kans., Recorder and was reprinted in the Drain, Oreg., Enterprise. Westmoreland residents, who are represented in Congress by my friend and colleague, the Honorable WILLIAM H. AVERY, were wonderful hosts to the wagon train members. An editorial describing this event was written by Doc Maskil:

WAGON TRAIN CAPTURES IMAGINATION OF NATION

(By Doc Maskil)

If you weren't one of the three or four thousand folks who crowded into Westmoreland Tuesday afternoon and evennig to see the wagon train bound for Oregon, you missed something.

Maybe there were those who couldn't see much to it. Maybe there were those who looked at the wagons and the teams and the fellows who were letting their whiskers grow and the women in calico and wondered why everyone was making such a fuss over a bunch of grownups playacting like that, but we feel sorry for them, if they did. They missed what the rest of us saw—the pages of history turning back a hundred years, when the unbroken prairie stretched as far as the eye could see, and the white tops of the prairie schooners moved across the plains into the unknown, led by the hope of a better life.

You missed something if you didn't see them. You missed something if you didn't half close your eyes and multiply the seven wagons by tenfold, until the entire slope from Rock Creek to the top of the rise was covered with wagons bedded down for the night, as oldtimers contend they have seen it.

It's easy to pick holes in a balloon, but then it isn't pretty and bright any more, but just a mess of soggy rubber. But just for a moment, let's do it.

The 2,020 miles isn't much of a trip, even with a team of mules hitched to a wagon. We used to ride that far every year taking the cows to pasture. These folks are availing themselves of some modern conveniences, and they're not having to scrounge around for food and water.

But that's not because, as one of the fellows put it when talking to the crowd at the high school, they wouldn't like to do the old-fashioned way. But where could you find a buffalo chip? And how can you take a bath in a nearby stream with folks along the way watching your every move?

Maybe it isn't so much, after all. Maybe the folks, back in Oregon, who didn't see how much could come of it were right after all. But the folks who said that were the practical heads, they weren't the dreamers that the rest of us are. They didn't know that we would close our eyes and see, not this wagon train, but the hundreds of rolling wheels that cut the deep ruts in our prairies a century ago.

Be that it may, we don't know of any publicity stunt, pure and simple, that has caught the imagination of a Nation such as this wagon train has done. Even the most ardent supporters of the idea admit it has attracted attention beyond their wildest dreams.

The Oregon Legislature put up $1,700,000 to see that their centennial goes over, and somehow, an item allowing $25,000—about enough to buy a pretty decent house—was slipped in for wagon train retracing the Oregon Trail.

That $25,000 is the bargain of the century. The publicity we've given in this paper alone would have cost them a good many dollars, but, in turn, they've done a lot for Westmoreland.

Even with the $25,000, they had trouble. Any town could put up $1,650, and get its name put on a wagon—that would be enough to buy the wagon, the team, and the food for the trip out. But only seven towns in all Oregon could see how it would do them any good. "Who's going to notice a few wagons going across the country?" the promoters were asked. "No one is going to pay any attention."

It was even worse with the daily newspapers. The publicity men working on the idea had to beg for a few lines in the paper, and then were often refused.

"Just you wait," the unbelievers were told. "Just you wait until we're 2 months out. Then you'll be sorry."

It didn't take long. When they hit Westmoreland, only a little more than a week on the road, every daily newspaper in this territory was making daily reports on their progress, and when they reached here, a reporter from an Omaha newspaper made the long trip to tell of their stop here. Radio and television stations in Oregon were giving news of the train three times daily, and the daily newspapers were frantically wiring for news.

But as far as the folks in the wagons are concerned, while they appreciate the publicity they are getting, they figure it would be well worth the time they are donating if they didn't get a line in the papers.

"The original pioneers were killed off by Indians, by cholera, by the dangers along the route," exclaimed one of the party, "but we're being killed off by kindness."

If kindness is killing them off, Pottawatomie County did its share. "We didn't know there were folks such as you have in the county," one of the travelers said. "If I ever move from Oregon, I'm coming here to live."

Westmoreland, as we said in our opening sentence, greeted the group with between 3,000 and 4,000 people in the half day and evening they were here, climaxed with a program, the annual Farmers' Night, sponsored by the Westmoreland Community Service Club, and by a square dance following, sponsored by the Westy Saddle Club.

It was a big day. When we first talked with the publicity man, he assured us the wagons would lay over a day at St. Marys in order to delay long enough to fit in with Westmoreland's plans, and then, when he learned the size of the town (400) his jaw dropped a little. "When we first rode into town," one of the drivers said, "I said to myself, 'Well, here's for a quiet day. I never was so wrong in my life.'"

Cars from Nebraska, Oklahoma, Missouri, and many counties in Kansas fought for parking positions along the streets, with everyone wanting a look at the wagons.

If you missed it, you shouldn't have. It was a wonderful experience, a big day.

Section 318 Amendment Is Not Necessary for VHF Translators

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DON MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 21, 1959

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, on April 13 the Federal Communications Commission announced that it would proceed with the licensing of VHF television translator facilities, to enable many isolated communities throughout the country to receive satisfactory television at a reasonable cost, provided the Congress enacts two amendments to the Communications Act of 1934.

I wish to commend the Commission for taking, at long last, what appears generally to be a sensible approach to this problem.

By requesting amendments to the Communications Act, the Commission has tossed the ball to Congress, and I hope that Congress speedily will enact such statutory amendments as are necessary to permit the Commission to proceed.

The first amendment requested by the Commission would amend section 319 of the Communications Act of 1934. That section now prohibits the Commission from granting licenses to any facility which was constructed without first receiving a construction permit from the Commission. Without such an amendment, the Commisison could not license the many hundred VHF translator facilities now in operation in most of the western States.

The proposed amendment to section 319 is embodied in section 2 of H.R. 6471, a bill introduced by the Chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I fully support this amendment and hope that it is enacted well before the adjournment of the first session of the 86th Congress.

The second amendment requested by the Federal Communications Commission applies to section 318 of the Communications Act. The language of the proposed amendment, as drafted by the Commission, is embodied in section 1 of H.R. 6471. I do not feel that this proposed amendment is necessary or desirable; in the proposed form it clearly is irrelevant to the VHF translator problem and goes far beyond it.

My views on the proposed amendment to section 318 are supported, I feel, by a recent exchange of correspondence I have had with the Federal Communications Commission. So that my colleagues in the House may be more fully informed on this issue I have set forth below my letter to the Commission of April 27 and the Commisson's reply of May 6:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., April 27, 1959.

Mr. JOHN C. DOERFER,
Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, New Post Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DOERFER: I wish to take this opportunity to commend you and the other members of the Federal Communications Commission for your decision of April 13 to proceed with the licensing of VHF television translator stations upon the enactment by Congress of technical changes in the Communications Act of 1934.

From my reading of the public notice issued on April 14, I feel the Commission has taken a generally sensible approach to this somewhat difficult problem.

You certainly may count on my support in the House of Representatives for enactment of the requested amendment to section 319 of the Communications Act. As a matter of fact, a similar proposal was included as section 2 of my bill, H.R. 3737, which I introduced on January 29, 1959.

I am somewhat puzzled, however, by your request for an amendment to section 318 of the Communications Act. In that connection, I have two specific questions which I should appreciate having your answers to.

First, I should like to know why you feel that any amendment to section 318 is necessary. From what I can learn from reading your public notice and from talking with members of the staff, it is my understanding that you contemplate requirements for the operation of VHF translator stations which are essentially similar to your requirements for operation of UHF translators. The UHF translator rules were issued almost 3 years ago and under those regulations, I believe some 200 licenses have now been granted. If an amendment to section 318 was not necessary in the case of the UHF translators, it is difficult for me to understand why an amendment is necessary before VHF translator rules can be issued.

Second, assuming that some logical justification exists for amending section 318 at all, I should like to ask if it is not true that the amendment you have proposed to Con-

gress is considerably broader than is necessary to accommodate the proposed VHF translator operations. I have examined H.R. 6471 and S. 1741 which embody your proposed amendment. These bills, if enacted, would empower the Commission at is discretion to waive the statutory operator requirements for all broadcast stations. By waiving the existing statutory requirements for all broadcast stations, the proposed language goes far beyond the announced intention of achieving a technical amendment supposedly necessary to accommodate just the tiny VHF translators. In view of this, I should like to know if the Commisison would have any objection to confining the proposed amendment solely to the operation of VHF translator stations.

Sincerely yours,

DON MAGNUSON,
Master of Ceremonies.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., May 6, 1959.

Hon. DON MAGNUSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MAGNUSON: Your letter of April 27, 1959, addressed to our Chairman, John C. Doerfer, arrived during his absence from the city on official business.

We appreciate your commendation and support for the proposed amendments to sections 318 and 319 of our act in connection with extending VHF television service (47 U.S.C. 318, 319).

The Commission felt that it could appropriately authorize translator stations and probably also the booster stations without having an operator on duty, but that it would be advisable to remove any possible doubt on this point by appropriately amending section 318. Present section 318 was enacted in 1934 and has not been amended since. However, in the meantime there have been wide technicological improvements improvements in broadcast operations. In the Commission's judgment it is appropriate to amend section 318 to dispense with the statutory requirement of an operator in the broadcast services, letting rules and regulations provide for the varying requirements necessary to protect the public interest. Specifically we would prefer to have the amendment to section 318 broad and not confined solely to the operation of VHF translator stations, although we initiated it primarily for them.

We appreciate your interest in our efforts to solve these problems and hope if there is any further assistance we can render you will not hesitate to call on us.

Sincerely yours,

ROSEL H. HYDE,
Acting Chairman.

The Dominican What?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 14, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Sam Romer, Minneapolis Tribune staff writer, which appeared in a compilation of Mr. Romer's articles in the Minneapolis Morning Tribune from April 6 through April 18, 1959:

WILL THE COMMUNISTS TAKE CUBA?—TRUJILLO RULES LAND OF BIG LIE

(By Sam Romer)

The Dominican Republic is the country of the big lie—and Rafael Trujillo is its spokesman.

The biggest lie, of course, is the very title of the country. Despite its formal trappings, it is no more of a republic than was Mussolini's Italy or Hitler's Germany.

In common fashion with other Latin American governments, the Dominican Republic boasts of a written constitution which provides for individual liberties and guarantees of freedom.

In truth, the constitution is a paper document, ignored by the men who are sworn to enforce it and the people it is pledged to protect.

Capital punishment was abolished by constitution in 1924—but a 1947 book named 134 victims of Trujillo's terror and Jesus de Galindez, the Spanish author of "The Era of Trujillo," pronounced this number too little.

Trujillo's victims died by unexplained accidents, by police shooting while trying to flee, by suicides accompanied by farewell notes written by semi-illiterates.

There are few signs of open terror now within the country itself but Trujillo's power to exact revenge extends far beyond the borders of his nation.

Galindez, who wrote his scathing indictment of Trujillo as a doctorate thesis for Columbia University, disappeared from his New York apartment before the book was published; he has not been heard from since.

Gerald Murphy, the North Dakota-born pilot who was accused of flying the kidnaped Galindez to Trujillo's ranch, vanished in Ciudad Trujillo when the investigation of Galindez' disappearance got too warm.

A month later, the Dominican authorities announced that a fellow-pilot had been arrested for Murphy's murder and had committed suicide in remorse.

Andres Requena, a Dominican author, was killed in New York after he published a novel which described Trujillo's paradise as a cemetery without crosses.

HISTORY A LA CARTE

The big lie of the Dominican Republic rewrites history and ignores the present.

Trujillo's most recent biography, distributed to visiting newspapermen, records without a blush that "the police are gentle, quiet and simple and carry no weapons."

Every street corner in downtown Cuidad Trujillo is witness to this lie—it is commmanded by a policeman, armed with revolver and trucheon.

And army officers, even when off duty and at social affairs, are never without the holstered revolver.

The rewriting of history goes on continually.

Trujillo's biography now refers to his early military training with the U.S. marines (during the 8-year period of American occupation of the country before 1924) as the first step of a complete plan by which the young visionary prepared to save his country from the domineering Yankees.

It recites as if it were fact how Trujillo as a lieutenant defied marine orders and hoisted the Dominican flag as a symbol of the nation's dignity; it adds an account how the young lieutenant exchanged shots with a Marine detachment which attacked a post he commanded.

These are good stories and certainly will interest future historians. Although they occurred almost 40 years ago, it is the first time they have come to light.

FACT VERSUS AUTOBIOGRAPHICAL FACT

Unfortunately, the Dominicans published in 1956 the official military biography of Trujillo—a detailed account which even includes photostats of such documents as a scribbled memorandum ordering his first physical exam.

The military biography doesn't even hint that Trujillo defied court-martial by disobeying orders and fighting off a Marine attack in order to preserve the patriotism of an occupied people.

The Dominican Republic is a police state in which the individual comes under continual surveillance by the authorities.

The average tourist reportedly has his photograph taken, full-face, as he enters the country—some persons explain this as an X-ray search for hidden weapons.

The tourist also will find that his American news magazine is taken from him at customs, then returned—but any page referring to the Dominican Republican is neatly sliced away.

A newspaperman seeking an interview with a prominent Government official tells the soldier guarding the palace that he will return for an answer that afternoon; 2 hours later, a presidential inspector visits him at his hotel, although he did not leave word where he was staying.

In driving through the countryside, the motorist slows to a complete halt every few miles—there is a foot-high bump in the road. At some of them, a policeman steps forth from nowhere, records the motorist's name and license number.

Dominicans call these bumps policemen lying down.

THE PEOPLE'S CHOICE

They have regular elections in the Dominican Republic—conventions, endorsements, and campaigns.

The last election was in 1957 when Hector Trujillo, the generalissimo's brother, ran for reelection. A national convention of Dominican journalists met during the campaign and unanimously voted endoresment of the ticket.

The newspapers reported the action as indicating a landslide for Hector's reelection.

It was. Some 1,265,959 votes were cast and every single one of them was for Hector.

This is a far better record than the Russians have ever been able to roll up.

Of course, Rafael Trujillo always has done well in elections. In his first campaign in 1930, he was elected by an outpouring of 223,851 votes. An American diplomat then noted sourly that this "greatly exceeds the total number of voters in the country."

A MAJORITY PARTY

Although the constitution provides for the widest freedom for political action, there is only one political part in the country—the Dominican party. No one apparently wants to start another.

It is a party which should excite the envy of any normal machine politician worried about primary challenges and ward club dissents.

Trujillo is named in the party's constitution as its chief; the constitution then gives him the power to name the party chairman, authorize all expenditures, veto all committee decisions, object to candidates and punish disloyalty.

"The authority of the chief," it adds, "is undiminishable and untransferrable."

As if this were not enough, it provides that all elected officials must submit signed but undated letters of resignation before taking office; when the letter is put into effect (often without the official's knowledge), the congress fills the vacancy by choosing another nominee named by the party leadership.

RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

Galindez notes that the only individual liberty guaranteed by the constitution which has practical application is that promising religious liberty.

Although, a Roman Catholic country, there apparently is full religious freedom for both Protestants and Jews.

But even this has its drawbacks. A Jewish civil engineer from New York, in the Dominican Republic to help build one of Trujillo's proud public works, complained to a friend that he felt compelled to attend synagogue services for the first time since he was a child.

"After all, Trujillo built the synagogue," he explained. "And they tell me it's healthy to attend."

H.R. 3460: The TVA Bonding Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 20, 1959

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, although it is too late for the House to take further action on the matter of H.R. 3460, the TVA bonding bill, yet I hope that our colleagues in the Senate will take note of an editorial from the Detroit Free Press and on article from the Detroit News on this very important subject. The indirect use of Michigan tax dollars to lure industry out of our State is very much resented, and rightly so. It is my opinion that many other States are faced with the same problem, and that tax-free TVA competition is preventing these States from realizing the full potential growth to which they are entitled.

[From the Detroit Free Press, May 9, 1959]

ITS FULL FACTS CARRY A SHOCK

Diligently steered by its Democratic majority, the House has passed a bill which would enable the Tennessee Valley Authority to expand its public power facilities by issuing bonds.

Unless the Senate greatly alters the measure, or declines to pass it, President Eisenhower almost certainly will veto it. If he does, it is about equally sure that not enough votes can be mustered to override him.

Backers of the measure aren't much dismayed at this prospect. In fact they're reported to rather like it. The veto, they think, might be made into a public power versus private power issue for 1960—something to demonstrate that Republicans are on the side of avaricious utilities while Democrats are strong for social legislation.

The administration, any administration, better be against public power—with the exception of providing it as a public service where electricity can't be had except under a subsidy arrangement.

For the more of it there is, the less is your chance of ever seeing a tax cut. And here in Michigan the less your chance is of holding a job.

The job aspect comes from the fact that industries naturally favor areas where power is cheap. It is cheapest where a great part of the bill is spread on the whole public, instead of it all coming as an individual bill against the actual user of electricity.

Really, it's a double belting of the tax payer—for not only does he subsidize the users of public-power electricity by covering much of the cost, but unlike the private utility the public power operation makes no tax contribution of its own to the public Treasury. The other taxpayers have to make up for that, too.

In the case of TVA, with which power was originally to have been incidental to a commendable waterway and reclamation program, the Nation's taxpayers have contributed $1,967 million, much of it in order that communities within reach of its lines may advertise lower electricity rates.

Michigan's share of this subsidy has been about $100 million.

And it has cost Michigan jobs as well as dollars. Take the specific case of a Ford Motor Co. glass plant. According to an analysis of public power's record for taking jobs out of Michigan, TVA's cheaper power was among factors which caused Ford to choose Nashville, Tenn., as the plant site.

Detroit Edison campaigned strenuously to have it here, but had an almost impossible row to hoe. It would have had to charge Ford $1,250,000 for the glass plant's electricity. According to the study, it could be had in Nashville for $700,000.

And, according to a clipping from the Ford Rouge News, the Nashville plant would provide 2,500 jobs—jobs that might have been available to this area's workers.

The study names Holley Carburetor and American Metal Products as other Detroit area industries that have put facilities in range of TVA's bargain power.

Nor does it do to say that the solution is to have public power everywhere. If it costs so many scores of millions to subsidize just the power sold at less than cost by TVA, what would the burden be if the taxpayers had to make up the difference all over the Nation?

So this is the background, the real operation of social legislation congressional Democrats hope to make use of as a campaign issue, even if they can't put it across this year. It will, of course, be labeled as enlightened.

Michigan's people ought to demand that all Michigan Representatives and Senators clearly state their stands on a measure that can take still more jobs away from Michigan workers, and further reduce the chance that those who do continue to have employment will ever see their tax burden lightened.

So, too, should the groups named by Governor Williams to keep Michigan industrially dynamic.

[From the Detroit News]
(By Jay G. Hayden)

WASHINGTON, May 11.—An issue that is sure to be exploited by Republicans in northern industrial areas was emphasized when the House of Representatives voted, 245–170, to bolster electric power production and marketing by the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Specifically the measure would authorize TVA to sell up to $750 millions of bonds for expansion of its powerplant, without reference to the President, Congress or any other Federal authority.

President Eisenhower certainly will veto the measure if it passes the Senate in present form. But it may be that the astute majority leader of the Senate, LYNDON B. JOHNSON, of Texas, will head it off to avert a certain bitter split in his party looking to next year's presidential and congressional elections.

The issue at stake was clearly indicated when 31 Democrats, nearly all from northern industrial regions, joined with 139 Republicans in voting against the bill. Debate centered largely around the claim that cheap TVA power, heavily subsidized by the Government, was being used to entice northern industries to move southward.

New England led the Democratic opposition with seven out of eight representatives of that party from Massachusetts, Connecticut an even split 3–3, and Rhode Island two votes solid against the TVA expansion. Five Democrats from Pennsylvania joined all Republicans in that State in voting "no."

Only one Democrat from New York joined the opposition, but nine Republicans from in and around New York City issued a statement declaring "it is almost unbelievable that the Democratic Congressmen from New York State voted with their leadership to allow the TVA, with its cheap utility rates, an undue advantage over the business concerns of the city and State of New York."

JOHN LESINSKI, the one Michigan Democrat who voted against the bill, said be opposed it because Tennessee propagandists had come to Detroit in attempt to lure Michigan industry to their State with promises of cheap electric power.

Representative THADDEUS MACHROWICZ, who surprisingly refused to vote either way although he was present, explained that he believed direct bonding power for the TVA was a good approach but he was disturbed that people in the TVA are soliciting Michigan industry.

Representative WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD, Royal Oak Republican, declared:

"We in Michigan certainly are having our trouble with TVA. We, who have paid taxes to create TVA, are now in the rather embarrassing position of having this agency come in and take away jobs from our workers."

Southern Democrats lined up almost unanimously in favor of TVA expansion, but there was just a suggestion of conflict even in that quarter when of the two Southern States developing most swiftly, Florida cast three votes and Texas two against the measure.

Industrial progress in Florida and Texas has been wholly without benefit of Federal bounties, but those States increasingly are paying the Federal taxes which have gone to subsidize TVA.

It is most important to note that Democrats from the Far West, which enjoys many similar public utility preferences, voted solidly for the TVA bonding power, and that the scant seven Republicans supporting the bill came mainly from that section.

SEEK HIGHER INTEREST

A companion piece of the fight over bonding power for TVA is President Eisenhower's recommendation in his budget message that the 2 percent interest rate on U.S. Treasury loans to the Rural Electric Cooperative Administration, be raised to match what the Government pays on its borrowing.

It was brought out in that connection that well over 90 percent of American farms have been electrified, with results that RECA borrowing now goes largely into providing services to city and small town folks in competition with private utility companies.

Just last week the Senate voted to sustain, but the House narrowly overrode, veto by President Eisenhower of a bill which would have taken from Secretary of Agriculture Benson authority to pass on loans by the Government to rural electric locals.

The bill now passed by the House is the same idea, applied to the capitalization of TVA expansion.

The Housing Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 25, 1959

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, this past weekend I read with interest editorials on the housing bill just passed in the House of Representatives. I have

asked leave to extend my remarks in order to include editorials from the Newark Evening News, the New York Times, and the New York Herald Tribune, all dated May 23, 1959.

I would like to particularly call the attention of the House to the New York Times editorial, as I feel that in its views concerning the conference, it clearly recognizes the overall picture and the sincere views on both sides that must be compromised to enact an omnibus housing bill. In both the New York Times and New York Tribune editorials there was full recognition of the need for fiscal responsibility, as expressed by President Eisenhower and the administration. It is my hope that the bill as finally written will give concrete evidence of fiscal responsibility on the part of the Congress.

As the New York Herald Tribune editorial states:

It can be said that unless the Government's economic behavior rests on some kind of balance between revenues and spending, the new houses that are built, if any, will be built on sand.

The editorials follow:

[From the New York Times, May 23, 1959]

THE HOUSING BILL

The liberals in the House have scored a notable victory on the big and complicated housing bill. For the most part, the product of their labors is in the public interest—urgently needed authority for such important domestic programs as slum clearance and low-rent housing for families displaced from slums. But the victory may be short-lived if the President, as he has strongly indicated, feels he must veto the bill on the ground of excessive cost.

The President's position is based on a fully justified sense of concern about the condition of the Federal budget, present and future. Nearly every week that passes in the money markets in New York illustrates the problem created for the Treasury by the present level of spending and receipts.

The problem will soon be less severe, as revenues rise with the vigorous recovery in the economy. But the President understandably fears that built-in upward pressures in the budget, augmented by the sort of future commitments that are contained in the housing bill, will postpone indefinitely the debt reduction and tax revision he feels are urgently necessary.

Here is a clash of priorities even more than of objectives. The Democrats in Congress quite rightly feel that the mandate of last year's election was not for retrenchment in such programs as are contained in the housing bill. Indeed, the Nation, and particularly the Nation's cities, need the programs.

The President is not against the program as such and most Democrats are not against fiscal prudence in the economic conditions of the present. But the two sides' sense of what is needed first and most produces a divergence of major proportions.

Is there no possibility of reconciliation? There may not be. And yet the housing bill still must pass through a final, and crucial stage, in which some approach may be made toward accommodation. The peculiar circumstances of the House and Senate bills produce the possibility of a final bill containing substantially smaller spending authority than the total in either individual bill.

Thus the conferees could eliminate the new programs of direct Federal loans for housing the elderly in the House bill and of loans for college classrooms in the Senate bill. They could accept the lower Senate totals for college housing loans and direct housing loans to veterans in rural areas. Without cutting the near-term authorization of 35,000 units of public housing the conferees could cutback on the 4-year duration of the program which is in the House bill.

If the conferees make a genuine effort to meet the President halfway they could legitimately ask the same of him. An impasse would not be in anybody's interest. The final chapters in the housing story still contain the possibility of an ending that, if not entirely happy for anyone, at least leaves the couple getting along with each other.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, May 23, 1959]

HOUSING NEEDS FIRM FOUNDATIONS

This country has never been richer or its people more prosperous. Yet richness has brought its own problem, and one of these is the failure to provide proper housing for an expanding population. In some cases, slums are more widespread than they ever have been. And with each rise in the number of citizens, there must be more and more new houses.

The problem can be simply stated but not the remedy. The House of Representatives has just passed a huge liberal housing bill calling for the expenditure of at least $2.1 billion, a sum far larger than what the administration believes can be squared with a balanced budget. The bill would provide $1.5 billion for slum clearance, or urban renewal in the official phrase, to be spent over 3 years. The administration has recommended a similar sum to be spent over 6 years. Another feature of the House bill, not covered by the $2.1 billion figure, is the erection of 145,000 public housing units over the next 40 years, at a cost of $3.7 billion. The administration opposes this provision on the logical ground that 110,000 of the public housing units authorized 10 years ago have not yet been built.

It is difficult, of course, to decide what housing is necessary and what is not. Ideally, everyone should have the dwelling he is content with, if such a thing were possible. But it can be said that unless the Government's economic behavior rests on some kind of balance between revenues and spending, the new houses that are built, if any, will be built on sand.

[From the Newark Evening News, May 23, 1959]

THE HOUSING BILL

Congress is set upon a budget-busting housing bill that President Eisenhower most certainly will find unacceptable. Acting on the proposition that economy does not begin at home, Democrats and urban Republicans in the House overwhelmingly put through a comprehensive measure that exceeds administration requests for slum clearance and public housing.

The Democrats say the bill will cost $2.1 billion. The administration, which futilely offered its own moderate $1.6 billion measure the previous day, figures that the prevailing measure will take $5.8 billion over the next several years. The House bill now goes to conference with the Senate which earlier voted to spend $2.6 billion on the housing program.

Major differences between the House and administration proposals are in the spending for urban renewal and public housing. The White House contended that new public housing was unnecessary. Of the 810,000 units authorized 10 years ago, 110,000 are still unbuilt. But the House bill adds 140,000 units.

Urban renewal is of special interest to Newark, which is short of funds for its redevelopment projects. The House has provided $1½ billion for nationwide slum clearance for the next 3 years. But the administration recommended spending $1,450 million over 6 years.

While Democrats in the House have scored a clear-cut victory, the 261–160 vote for the housing bill indicates that they may lack the required two-thirds majority to override a Presidential veto. On a relatively minor measure, the Rural Electrification Administration bill, the House last month sustained Mr. Eisenhower's rejection.

It must have been a time for a bit of soul-searching for economy-minded Representatives before going along with the housing bill. They had to weigh a balanced Federal budget against the demands from back home. The determining factor may have been the knowledge that back home is where the votes are.

Cross Country With the on to Oregon Cavalcade—III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 20, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, the daily account of the on to Oregon calvalcade by Rudy Roudebaugh, of Drain, is published by the Drain (Oreg.) Enterprise. The third installment appeared in the newspaper on May 14. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include it herewith:

WAGON PIONEERS REWARDED FOR HARDSHIPS OF TRAIL

The weather has been anything but ideal for an outdoor camping trip using a horse-drawn covered wagon for transportation, according to Drain representative on the Oregon wagon train, Robert "Rudy" Roudebaugh. More than ample compensation for the discomforts of pioneering on the 2,020-mile Oregon centennial sponsored trip are the gifts, dinners, friendly reception, and enthusiastic cooperation given the seven wagons and 23 Oregonians retracing the historic Oregon Trail.

Rudy was pictured in a three-column photo on the front page of Marshall County News of Marysville, Kans., April 30, with Tex Serpa, wagonmaster, and Mrs. Ernest Mutschler, 96-year-old Leonardsville, Kans., pioneer. Her father once rode a covered wagon across the country to settle in Leonardsville. This is typical of the wide coverage given the wagon caravan by news media.

A day-by-day report on what's happening at the wagon train from the viewpoint of the driver of the Drain covered wagon, Rudy Roudebaugh, follows:

"May 5: Been up since 4:30 a.m. It rained 3 inches last night and still raining this morning. Dan sure has a cough and doesn't eat very good. 8:31 and haven't got started yet. Janell is still asleep. We are in Hebron. A man is trying to trade horses.

Mine seems to be going downhill. 8:46 here we go. The delay was a wagon that had to be greased. They should be greased at night. I grease mine every night as soon as we make camp. Looks like Janell is going to sleep all day. 9:32 Little Blue Springs Creek water is running down the bank. 10:53 at Deshler (population 1,200). The highway goes within half mile of the Oregon Trail here. The children are all out to see us, and look through the wagons. Janell is still asleep. The horses

seem to handle pretty good this morning. 11:08 and we are on our way again. The Deshlers Brownie Broom Co. gave each one of the wagons a whisk broom and large broom for the whole camp. 11:20 Janell is finally getting up. 12:12 we are pulling out to feed horses and have lunch.

"12:48: We are ready to roll again. Dan ate only half of his grain, Daze ate all of hers. It has stopped raining but still cloudy. 1:06: I see a schoolbus ahead so we will have more company. Ruskin is about half mile off the highway (population 220). Here come two more buses. Janell is driving now and I'm going to try and get some sleep as I have to stand watch tonight. 2:40: We have arrived at camp. Daze is going to have new shoes put on this evening (front feet). Well, I have my wagon greased and ready to go in the morning. Black clouds are coming in from the southwest. We made 21½ miles today. I guess we must have brought the rain to Nebraska."

BRIGHT, COLD, AND WET

"May 6: The sun is out bright today and the cold wind is out of the northwest. It rained 3 inches last night. We have 21 miles to go today. 8:30: We are underway. We are second in line this morning. Someone seems to be having trouble with their mules. We are heading west on highway. Only got the left front shoe on Daze last night. 9:25: Now we are going north. Nelson is 4 miles away. We are heading right into a north wind and it's chilly. Janell walked at least 5 miles today. 10:13: At Nelson (population 810). Here come some saddle club riders to meet us. They sure have lively horses. They have a big welcome sign for us. They also have the streets roped off for us.

"Here comes the school band and also all the other students are out. The band played about 10 songs for us. We also had television people out here for us. 11:15: We are going to leave now with the band leading us out of town. Janell is doing the driving through Nelson. 12:06: Stopped for lunch and fed the horses at a little old country school, Bethel. Oh yes, the chamber of commerce fed us our lunch today. 1:08: We have 5 miles before camp. That will make 21 miles for today. The wind has gone down some. 2:32: We are at camp 8 miles north of Nelson on the James ranch. The chamber of commerce is coming to take us to town for dinner and showers.

"May 7: The sun is out bright this morning. Gwen James, age 6, is riding in our wagon with Janell. She is the daughter of the farmer we stayed at last night. 8:59: We are on our way. We just seen the longest freight train I've seen in a long time, 131 cars with 3 baggage cars and coach. 10:45 and we are in Fairfield in front of the grade and high school. Dan and Daze each got one shoe on their right front foot last night. It's clouding up and it looks like it's going to rain again. We started out with a little girl and ended up with two more. They were freshmen schoolgirls from the same farm. 11:25: We are on our way to Minden where we will spend the weekend. And then only 50 miles to my hometown of Lexington. We have been on good roads today. 11:48: We have stopped for lunch at the Jake Lindeman farm. Both Dan and Daze have eaten their grain today. 1:00: It looks like rain, hot and cloudy. 3:07: Camped at Heye Bukr farm at Glenvil, right on the county line between Clay and Adams Counties. My horses have lost so much weight I had to buy new collars again. 7:55: We just had dinner here at camp and talk about people, they are all over the place. You can look down the road for a mile and see cars parked."

ON THE OLD OREGON TRAIL

"May 8, 8:02 and ready to roll. Believe it or not Janell is up this morning. Boy, Daze is raring to go. The weather is cloudy and an east wind. 9:09: Crossing the Little Bule River. 10:10: Minden is 31 miles away. We were on the old Oregon Trail for about 6 miles today. The rest has been rock and gravel. Janell went back to bed. 11:55: We have stopped for lunch. Dan and Daze ate all their feed and drank their water. 12:05: Three school buses from Bladen to see us. 1:23: Roseland (160 population). Same reception as all the other places, glad to see us and wished us luck. I'm really enjoying this trip and that goes for Janell. Tell everyone hello from us both. When I pass out the letters from Drain to the schoolchildren I'll have their teacher look Drain up on the map and plan on coming out here and see us. Janell has gone into Hastings to see the municipal museum. I'm here alone in my wagon catching up on my writing.

"May 9: Two men from Gothenburg came to see me last night and we had a real visit. I guess I better say they were old school friends. We were all given a gift of a lap desk last night. It rained all night and looks like rain all day today. We will camp at Helen Babels farm tonight. We will be in Minden about 2:30 at the fairgrounds. It's 7:55 and we are ready to roll. Janell is rereading the Drain newspapers and your letters. 8:25 and we are 17 miles from Minden. It has stopped raining. 9:39 Kearney County. 10:32 at Norman (population 70). 10:56 Going to have myself a cup of coffee. I carry some right with me.

"Boy, Daze is really on the ball and wants to get going. 11:58 Five miles from Minden. We are going right on in as its raining and cold. 12:12 We are about to Minden and I see some saddle horses coming to meet us. 1:14 Arrived at Minden (population 2,120). We had dinner last night at Kearney. The chamber put it on. My mother was there and took Janell home with her for a few days in Lexington, Nebr."

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 20, 1959

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of May 23, 1959, and statement on the farm program:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

MAY 23, 1959.

A bill, H.R. 7007, to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) for salaries and expenses, research and development, construction and equipment, and for other purposes, came before the House for the first time by the new Committee on Science and Astronautics. Controversy immediately developed by precedent, procedure, and economy-minded Members, because of the suspension of rules procedure which permits only 20 minutes' debate on each side, pro and con. For these reasons: (1) A new committee's first authorization bill; (2) no printed hearings; (3) $580 million involved; (4) space, a new, complicated and interesting subject matter; (5) section 4 placing space appropriation separate from the independent offices of Government—the opposition developed (including myself). It passed 294 to 128. There are many unanswered questions the committee could have answered if regular debate had been permitted.

The agriculture appropriation bill of $3,939 million brought on the usual heated debate. Activities (some necessary) are—research, disease and pest control, meat inspection, soil conservation, marketing services, school lunch, soil bank, commodity stabilization, REA, crop support loans (loans farmers need not repay)—and special activities, including international wheat agreement, emergency famine relief, Public Law 480 ($968 million) and bartered material for stockpile. The usual recriminatory charges were hurled respectively by those blaming the farm situation on not enough or too much Federal aid and control. The principal amendment demanded by Republicans placed a top limit of $50,000 on crop loans. Some support loans run into five and six figure amounts, even over a million. Actually, most beneficiaries of the program will not be affected. In 1958 on all crops there were more than 700,000 loans, but only 1,229 in excess of $25,000. The amendment passed 262 to 165 (ALGER for) despite heavy Democrat and House leadership opposition. Someone should ask who is for the small farmer?

To me, the American legislative something-for-nothing tragedy is embodied in this bankrupt farm program, which no amendments, no matter how brilliant can change. The farm subsidy program should be repealed. Although the economic dislocation of such sudden termination has prompted the administration's endeavor to gradually eliminate these supports, despite political opposition, we need to get back to first principles (see attached farm program views).

The housing bill, S. 57, brought on the year's biggest and most controversial debate. The Rules Committee's 6-6 tie blocking the costly Democrat housing bill from House consideration was broken when the leadership agreed that a much less costly Democrat substitute bill could be presented by HERLONG, of Florida. This bypassed even considering the administration bill. All three, the Democrat leadership bill ($5,800 million) the Herlong substitute ($1,300 million), and the administration bill ($1,600 million), agreed on extending the FHA loan insurance authority by $10 billion. The Democrat leadership bill included also: (1) 140,000 new public housing units; (2) $400 million for college housing loans; (3) $100 million for elderly housing loans; (4) $1,500 million for urban renewal for 3 years; (5) raise FHA mortgage amounts and duration and lower downpayment; (6) continue and expand Federal national mortgage insurance secondary (FNMA) loan market. The substitute bill differed in three ways: (1) striking out public housing; (2) cutting down urban renewal to $600 million for 2 years; (3) placing the spending under the Appropriation Committee's control instead of direct Treasury payout. One hundred twenty-nine Republicans and sixty Democrats joined to support the substitute, but were beaten 233 (including 19 Republicans) to 169. Then the Democrats successfully beat Republican efforts to reduce the amounts and to eliminate public housing. Joint efforts resulted in keeping the spending under Appropriations Committee control 220 to 201. Other amendments approved included one to permit hotels to be part of urban renewal.

Amendments defeated included: (1) To cut out public housing (a coalition of Republicans and some beaten Democrats); (2) to make public housing bonds taxable; (3) no discrimination in public housing because of race, color or creed. My efforts were directed to (1) replacing the costly bill by the substitute; (2) eliminating public housing;

(3) cutting down urban renewal amount and challenging eminent domain's constitutionality; (4) challenging the validity of the premises justifying Federal subsidies; (5) eliminating tax-exempt status of public housing bonds.

The bill passed 261 to 160 (ALGER against) and now faces a veto. If vetoed, the big spenders will have killed a housing bill for the second time.

THE FARM PROGRAM

(Statement by Hon. BRUCE ALGER, of Texas)

The farm problem is your problem. Think not? Consider for a moment:

Do you pay taxes? If you're the head of that average family we keep hearing about, you shelled out over $75 in taxes last year just to support farm prices or to funnel money directly to farmers.

Do you eat? One of the things your own tax money bought you was the privilege of paying higher prices for your family's groceries than you should have.

Are farmers your customers? No matter how you make your living, all business suffers when the sizable farming segment of our population faces lost markets and lower income. Indeed, the farm problem is everybody's problem.

Before dreaming up any answers, let's consider some fundamental questions—like what is a farm? About 2 million farms (and that's only 44 percent of them) account for about 90 percent of all U.S. farm products sold. These farmers get most of the Government aid too, but how much they've been aided by it is open to question. On the other hand, 2.7 million farmers (56 percent of the total number) raise less than 10 percent of our farm produce. Price supports have meant less than $100 extra per farm to them, and these are the fellows who are up against it. They need new income—not Government handouts.

Why the huge surpluses? Because of World War II. Facing record needs for food and fiber, Congress guaranteed farmers high price supports as a production incentive, and in this hour of need farmers came through with the greatest output per man in history. This was good for them and good for the country. But after the war, Congress continued these price support incentives, for reasons too obvious to dwell upon, and farmers continued to produce at record levels. Who wouldn't?

With crops far greater than could be marketed at these prices, Government-owned surpluses mounted. Tighter acreage controls were more than offset by technological advances in farming, and surpluses continued to pour in. 1958 saw huge overproduction again despite lowest acreage allotments in 40 years and reduced price supports. Since 1953, Mr. Benson has striven mightily to move these price-depressing Government-owned stocks—he has disposed of over $16 billion worth—but he might as well be trying to empty White Rock Lake with a bucket during a steady rain. Today, the Government has about $9 billion invested in surplus farm products—far more than we had in 1953. It's costing the taxpayer about $3 million a day in just storage and interest charges.

Where are we now? Today the efficient American farmer is like the fellow who said he could handle his enemies but who prayed for deliverance from his friends. After 25 years of politically motivated aid programs, here's what we've got:

1. Farm income down $2 billion. These huge surpluses, created by the very laws aimed at propping up farm income, hang over the market and have actually depressed farm income.

2. We have spent $18 billion tax dollars to support prices and no end in sight. Terrific cost of farm program is building resentment against farmers, and it's not their fault.

3. Automatic surpluses inevitable under present law. We spend billions to sell and give away surpluses, but, by law, price supports must be maintained at levels too high to move the crop, encouraging surplus production again.

4. Government controls shackle farm progress—abolish efficiency, 40 percent of cotton acreage allotments amount to less than 5 acres—three-fourths of burley tobacco growers each permitted 1 acre or less. Efficient farming on this basis impossible. A ceiling (and a low one) is thus set on farmer's opportunity to progress.

Cure-alls by the bushel: Another surplus we have created is in programs and schemes to save the farmer. Each day's mail here brings its quota of plans. Some call for more and higher price supports, some for a two-price plan (high at home—cheap abroad) and some for direct handouts to farmers. All that I have seen, it seems, would create as many problems as they might solve, and contain the seeds of self-defeat.

Some simple facts: (1) All political attempts to solve this essentially economic problem have failed; (2) the small farmer, who really needs help, has benefited but little from price support programs; (3) Government's legitimate role should be to help farmers help themselves through research, educational, and marketing programs; (4) nothing has ever worked so well as freedom.

Does freedom work on the farm? With price supports and controls, U.S. cotton acreage today is about one-third of what we planted in 1930, while world acreage is up. We have lost our markets at home and abroad to foreign competition and synthetics. Meanwhile, back at the ranch unsupported and uncontrolled beef producers are thriving and beef consumption (56 pounds per person in 1951) had soared to over 85 pounds per person by 1956. The only commonsense farm program is one based on freedom for the farmer—freedom from quotas, freedom from controls, yes and freedom from stultifying high price supports.

The administration and Secretary Benson have tried manfully to free the farmer from Government controls, to return to him free choice in managing his own farm and to return his produce to a free marketplace. At best, the transition would take time, for the present situation isn't the farmers' fault, and sudden economic dislocation wouldn't benefit anybody. However, Benson keeps plugging away at getting started in this direction, bitterly opposed at every step.

The issue will eventually be resolved by you, the voters. As I said, the farm problem is your problem too.

What Strange Ideas Reds Have on Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 20, 1959

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, a very thought-provoking and a brief, clear, and realistic analysis of what the Communists mean by peace appeared in an editorial in the Cleveland News on May 20.

The Cleveland News, as always, presents sound, objective views in its editorials. I recommend the reading of this editorial.

Under leave granted, the editorial is inserted herewith:

WHAT STRANGE IDEAS REDS HAVE ON PEACE

The Communist committee that annually picks the winner of the Lenin Peace Prize must have known which side its bread is buttered on when it chose Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev for the 1958 award. Tass reported that Khrushchev was honored because as an "outstanding public leader and statesman," he worked "for the benefit of peace" and "embodied in a most full and striking manner the peaceable policy" of the Soviet Union and the Communist Party.

This is the same Khrushchev who liquidated tens of thousands in the Ukraine like vermin, according to his own testimony; who ordered the butchery that broke up the Hungarian revolt; who directed the doublecross and murder of the two Hungarian rebel leaders; who supports and condones Red China's policy in Tibet and the shelling of the offshore islands; who recently told American visitors that "we Russians will exterminate you."

Is this what wins peace prizes in the Soviet Union? Then Joe Stalin, Adolf Hitler, and Al Capone deserve some medals.

Agricultural Dependence on Oil May Lead to Famine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 25, 1959

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, in the break-neck race to arm this country, we are inclined to lose sight of the fact that we are rapidly depleting a very important resource that has become indispensible in our present economy.

America is rapidly becoming a nation that lives on wheels and it takes gasoline to make those wheels go round.

Many facets of our economy are presently dependent on petroleum, not the least of which is agriculture.

In the University of California clip sheet for release on May 9, is an article by Dr. Raymond B. Cowles, professor of biology, which I include in these remarks. Dr. Cowles' article is timely and thought provoking:

AGRICULTURAL DEPENDENCE ON OIL MAY LEAD TO FAMINE

LOS ANGELES, May 9.—America's highly organized and efficient food production system paradoxically may be helping to lead us to famine.

So points out Dr. Raymond B. Cowles, professor of biology at the University of California, Los Angeles.

Petroleum is the life's blood of agriculture, he notes. It flows through the tractor that pulls the plow, the harvesting machine, the jeep that herds the cattle, the truck that delivers food to the market, and the plane that dusts the crops. In short, the internal combustion engine is the factor that enables 15 percent of the Nation's population to feed the entire United States and parts of the rest of the world.

Unless some unsuspected new energy source is discovered, the rapid depletion of our petroleum resources is a quick way to famine, the UCLA biologist says. Our agricultural system would not be able to do this job even with limited petroleum. It would take several decades to breed necessary draft animals to replace farm vehicles. Their food consumption would also be a problem.

Atomic power is not practical for relatively small farm vehicles because of the heavy shielding necessary. Battery-powered electric vehicles involve scarce metals.

The only answer to the problem in sight is to limit the population to such a degree that food resources could be converted to alcohol for engine fuel.

Colonization of other planets has been suggested as a solution to the world's overpopulation problem, Dr. Cowles notes. "In time it would take all the known iron resources to provide spacecraft to convey India's annual surplus population to the nearest possibly inhabitable planet," he points out.

Classics of Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1959

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks to include an article from the Denver Post of May 18, 1959, by the eminent columnist, Roscoe Fleming, as follows:

MASS PUBLISHING OF CLASSICS A MUST

(By Roscoe Fleming)

Five years ago Congressman BARRETT O'HARA, of Chicago, found that there were no copies anywhere available in the world on a grassroots level of the books in which our forefathers found their inspiration.

Not even the Constitution nor the Declaration of Independence had been translated into languages that could be read and understood by the people in awakening lands and as hungry for democratic inspiration as were our forefathers.

He said not even "The Federalist" has been translated into more than two or three languages, and that this had been only in limited editions now out of print.

"We * * * had been building up the military strength and the economic stability of the nations joined with us in the cause of democracy. But we had not been reaching into the minds and hearts of the people.

"We were losing that fight while * * * in every bookstall in every language at prices within reach of everyone, were the words of the architects of the ideology of communism."

So O'HARA asked hundreds of people for suggestions as to what should go into a list of all-American books to be sold cheaply to the peoples of the world in their own tongue.

He got encouragement both from private and public sources—from the Book Publisher's Council and the U.S. Information Agency.

By now at least a few of the classics that explain what America is all about and the nature and inspiration of our liberties, have been translated into foreign languages of which you may never have heard but are spoken by millions of people, such as Gujerati and Telugu. Books are on sale in many countries in the language of the country.

The list includes "The Federalist," several collections of Ralph Emerson; one book by John Dewey; Learned Hand's "The Spirit of Liberty"; several by and about Thomas Jefferson; several by and about Abraham Lincoln; De Tocqueville's "Democracy in America"; Henry Thoreau's "Walden"; Mill's "Essay on Liberty," and two about Woodrow Wilson.

(I still think that some modern works should be included such as Gerald W. Johnson's "Incredible Tale," or one of the late great liberal Elmer Davis, but maybe those can come later).

The books have been translated and published under all sorts of auspices, and at an extraordinary range of prices. For example the "Federalist" in French costs $9.60 and in German, $7.41. Most, however, sell for less than $1 in our currency, although considering the economic level of most of the countries, that still represents a considerable sacrifice for most people.

O'HARA makes his report proudly and he has every right to. This is a needed enterprise that would never perhaps have been undertaken without him.

But he points out that Congress has never appropriated for this program specifically, and that without subsidy the voice of democracy will remain too still and too small to match the ideological roar of our opponents.

Their state presses and state stores pour out the books that argue for communism, by the millions and in scores of languages. And if they can't sell them, they give them away. We are still trying to match a calliope with a penny whistle.

More power to O'HARA. And may Congress decide that men's minds are worth battling for, too, along with their stomachs, and their ambitions to be somebody.

P.S.—By the way, how long has it been since you read one of these?

Senator Kennedy's Remarks at United States-India Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER BOWLES
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 20, 1959

Mr. BOWLES. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month on May 4 and 5, the Committee for International Economic Growth sponsored a highly significant conference here in Washington on the subject of "India and the United States, 1959."

References have been made previously here in the Congress to the contributions made at the conference by a wide cross-section of outstanding commentators on Indian-American relations.

Among the most eloquent and effective of the speeches delivered at the conference was one entitled "The Bases of U.S. Interest in India—Its New Dimensions" by the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts, the Honorable JOHN F. KENNEDY.

Senator KENNEDY's interest and concern for the future of free India has been enormously heartening to all of us who feel as he does, that India's success or failure will determine the future of freedom in Asia.

In his conference speech, Senator KENNEDY demonstrated again, as he has on many occasions in recent years, a succinct and imaginative grasp of the economic, political, and strategic role of India in Asia. I think that speech admirably reflects the kind of leadership which Senator KENNEDY is devoting to this subject, both in his legislative capacity in the U.S. Senate, and in his outside contribution to public awareness of this vital question.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include the text of his speech as follows:

THE BASIS OF U.S. INTEREST IN INDIA—ITS NEW DIMENSIONS

(Remarks by U.S. Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY, Democrat, Massachusetts, Conference on India and the United States, 1959, sponsored by the Committee for International Economic Growth, Washington, D.C., May 4 and 5, 1959)

No struggle in the world today deserves more of our time and attention than that which now grips the attention of all Asia. I am not referring to the unhappy tide of events in Tibet, where the world is being shown once again that man's eternal desire to be free can never be suppressed. Nor am I referring to the intermittent hostilities that endanger the Formosan Strait, or the truce lines in Korea and Indochina. I am referring to another struggle equally fierce but less obvious—less in the headlines but far more significant in the long run.

And that is the struggle between India and China for leadership of the East, for the respect of all Asia, for the opportunity to demonstrate whose way of life is the better.

The battle may be more subtle than loud—it may not even be admitted by either side—but it is a very real battle nonetheless. For it is these two countries that have the greatest magnetic attraction to the uncommitted and underdeveloped world. It is these two countries which offer a potential route of transition from economic stagnation to economic growth. India follows a route in keeping with human dignity and individual freedom, with only haphazard assistance from this country. Red China represents the route of regimented controls and ruthless denial of human rights, with considerable aid from the U.S.S.R.

It should be obvious that the outcome of this competition will vitally affect the security and standing of this nation. But do we fully realize how it is coming out? Both China and India began their development efforts at about the same time—1950. They started with similar economic structures, similar standards of living and similar problems of skilled labor and natural resources. Actually India had some advantages—in transportation and trained personnel, for example.

But the harsh facts of the matter are that in the last decade China has surged ahead of India in most sectors of its economy. Its gross national output has expanded about three times as fast. In terms of industrial capacity, investment, education and even household consumption China has slowly pulled up and now moved ahead. Its food production has nearly doubled, while India's has increased by less than 50 percent. By the most authoritative estimates, at present levels of agricultural growth, India will have by 1965 a food production deficit of over 25 million tons, a gap which cannot be filled by any foreign aid or domestic rationing program.

In steel production, China has moved from a position of inferiority to marked superiority. In 1950 China produced as much steel as Great Britain did in 1880. By 1958 China has moved to a point of productive superiority in steel to modern Great Britain today—and is making equal growth in coal and other major ingredients of national

strength. Chou En-lai declared at the party Congress this past month: "It took us only 6 years to achieve in steel production what took Britain more than 50 years."

Since 1952 China has tripled the number of engineers and technicians in its industries and added 4 million workers to its skilled labor force.

Last year, China's rate of economic growth was at least three times as high as India's. Perhaps her official figures which claim to have doubled both agricultural and steel production may be discounted—but the fact remains that they are based on a hard record of fact compared to the sagging performance in India—and this is the record which has great appeal to those nations uncertain of which route they should follow.

Within the last year the Chinese have produced their first automobile. Within the next year they may have launched their first earth satellite. Even more seriously, they may well begin to take their place among the select company of nuclear powers. And perhaps equally significant for the future is the fact that China has become a major trading nation, not only in southeast Asia, where she is gradually supplanting Japan, but also in the growing trade movements to Europe and Africa. Indian primary products such as manganese ore and oil seed, for example, now suffer heavily as a result of China's price competition. Red China is now able to repay its loans from the Communist bloc, while India is not only in need of considerable further assistance, but has been forced to drastically reduce its foreign exchange reserves to meet its investment gap.

For the first time in modern history a government appears to have found a way—however brutal its human defects—which appears to solve the problems of large peasant underemployment and labor surplus. The mobilization of the unemployed mass of Chinese rural workers through economic communes, cottage industry, small pig-iron schemes and all the rest is an achievement whose political and intellectual impact is less developed areas is bound to be immense.

For the ambitious goals and growth of both the Russians and the Chinese are major political influences throughout the newly awakened world. The sturdy confidence of the Red Chinese is measured against the uncertainties of the Indian Government. The Chinese leader, moreover, boasts that within the next year China will make still further leaps into the future. He promises that the total value of agricultural and industrial output will rise by as much as 40 percent in 1 year. He hopes, for example, to raise coal output by 110 million tons in 1959 alone.

Even if these hopes cannot be fulfilled, in India—by contrast—targets are wavering. Hopes are set upon maintaining a real rate of growth of only 2 to 3 percent. This year the Indian population will rise. Increased agricultural output may not even feed the nearly 8 million new mouths of India's exploding population this year. It is in this setting that we consider this challenge, not by playing down and depreciating the very real physical achievements of China, but rather by determining to match these achievements in India by a real record of performance consistent with our ideals and democratic methods.

For the struggle is not over, and the potentialities for gain in India are still great. In the Chinese language, the word "crisis" is composed of two characters, one representing danger, and one representing opportunity. The danger now is clear. But let us also make the most of our opportunities. For if they are lost now, they may never come again.

India's population represents 40 percent of the uncommitted world. It is larger than the total populations of the continents of Africa and South America combined. Unless India is able to demonstrate an ability at least equal to that of China to make the transition from economic stagnation to growth, so that it can get ahead of its exploding population, the entire free world will suffer a serious reverse. India herself will be gripped by frustration and political instability, its role as a counter to the Red Chinese will be lost, and communism would have won its greatest bloodless victory.

So let there be no mistake about the nature of the crisis—both the danger and the opportunity. And let there be no mistake about the urgency of our participation in this struggle. It is not enough that we participate on a crash basis, for temporary relief. We must be willing to join with other Western nations in a serious long-range program of long-term loans, backed up by technical and agricultural assistance, designed to enable India to overtake the challenge of Communist China. The tool for this program can well be the Development Loan Fund.

I have joined with Senator FULBRIGHT in proposing that the operations of the Development Loan Fund be stabilized and its scale increased by placing it on a 5-year basis with authority to loan up to $1.5 billion a year. If by next year we can build up the resources of the Development Loan Fund to this level with assurance of continuity, then the United States will be in a position to exercise real leverage on the economic growth of the less developed countries and to give international leadership in the common efforts of the free world. We should embark on these reforms not at some indeterminate date in the future, but this year when there are real opportunities to seize.

Our assistance thus far has been limited to emergency aid to meet immediate crises and existing shortages. We have not met the requirements essential for long-range economic growth—nor have we alleviated the harsh realities which India faced a year ago. Her population continues nearly to outplace her economic development, her shortage of foreign exchange continues to increase, and a general loss of hope and morale continues to spread.

This is the critical year for India. This is the year when the second 5-year plan will prove to be either fruitful or futile. This is also the year when the third plan beginning in 1961 will be designed. This is the year, in short, when India must appraise her future and her relations with the rest of the world.

I do not say that India could not tread water for a few more years before going under. But this is the year the Indians need confidence that they can plan major efforts for long-range progress with some assurance of substantial, long-term assistance from the Western World.

Our aid should, of course, be based upon sound criteria and productive investment. But let us remember economies need time to mature. Our own Nation, in the days of its youth, sold railroad bonds to the British and other Europeans—and these were long-term—40- or 50-year—debentures. With the growth of our productive capacity, we gradually became a creditor nation with the ability to repay these foreign investments. There is no question that the Indians, given proper assurance and assistance, could do the same.

Many of the other governments in Asia and the Middle East are now balanced precariously on the wall of indecision between the East and West. Of course, an adequate program of aid to India is no magic persuader—nor is it a panacea for all of India's difficulties. There is no such solution for these tough problems. The barriers are great. The political and ideological dilemmas are many.

But I am confident that we can recover the initiative, that we can give a doubting world the realization that we—and not Russia and China—can help them achieve real stability and growth.

In short, it is our job to prove that we can devote as much energy, intelligence, idealism, and sacrifice to the survival and triumph of the open society as the Russian despots can extort by compulsion in defense of their closed system of tyranny. We can give a convincing demonstration that we have not a propaganda or crisis interest but an enduring long-term interest in the productive economic growth of the less developed nations.

This year, all over the Western World—and practicularly in an impressive Washington ceremony last month—we commemorate a notable anniversary, the founding of NATO. Whatever its handicaps may be today, this unique and historic association of free nations in a community of effort demonstrated that alliances can prosper on positive, as well as negative, goals.

Let us bear that decision in mind today. For, just as in 1949 the historic front was in West Europe, so in 1959 the gateway to fresh achievement lies in Asia. As Russia cast her ominous shadow across the horizon of our hopes during the last decade, so in the next decade we must take measure of a new power—China, whose mounting strength is the cardinal political development of this area.

How will we meet the challenge of the next 10 years, between now and 1969? Will we be reminded of a lost journey which ended with the fall of Prague in the spring of 1939, or the new vitality of the democratic alliance which was formed in the spring of 1949?

The answer lies in part in congressional action, along the lines I have indicated, on the Development Loan Fund, our best tool for aiding long-range capital development. But the job should not and cannot be done by the United States alone. We need—as we needed 10 years ago—another historic effort in international collaboration—among the capital exporting nations in the world and India herself.

That is why Senator COOPER and I have recommended the creation of an international joint mission to India to work out with the Indians an accurate appraisal of their needs over the life of the third plan, to weave together the various aid programs of the Western nations, and to give both assuarnce and incentive not only to the Indians but to democratic leaders throughout the underdeveloped world, to demonstrate to them, and to enable them to demonstrate to their political followers, that there is a democratic way of achieving economic development as an alternative to the forced mobilization of men and materials. Once again, the free world can unite on a positive program with positive goals—instead of hanging together only out of fear of evils which we all oppose.

Coalitions of free states impose strains and sometimes handicaps, particularly in a period of peace and apathy. The allies of the U.S.S.R. and China, on the other hand, are rarely critical or uncooperative. They are at the very least silently, if grudgingly, submissive. But in a time of crisis, a free alliance finds unity and strength, even in the free exchange of ideas—while the Red satellites in a time of crisis are sources of anxiety, uncertainty, and trouble.

The situation in India is today a crisis, and it is an opportunity to demonstrate Western unity and strength. The moment is ripe for giving new meaning to the Atlantic community and relating its peaceful enterprises to the aspirations of the uncommitted world. If the President and Congress give new momentum to our foreign assistance program, then we can expect with reason that the nations of the Common Market and the Commonwealth will also give realization to a larger effort of their own. Both the Sec-

retary-General of NATO, Mr. Spaak, and the world spokesman of the Common Market, Mr. Monnet, have underscored in recent months that the great issues facing the member nations lie outside Europe and preeminently in the underdeveloped areas.

The creditor states of Europe are deeply involved in India's future, as are Japan and other potential members of this common enterprise. Our task now is to harness all of the resources of these nations more effectively, and to work out with the Indian Government the most effective method in participating in their developmental plans.

If the aid which India has received from all sources should remain at its current level, the increase in national income would barely outstrip population growth, bring no significant decreases in unemployment, increase the alarming deficit of food grains, and require sharp curbs on private enterprise in that economy.

If, however, foreign investment in India from all sources can rise to a figure of about $1 billion a year, then we can foresee with some confidence a growth in Indian income in the range of 25 to 30 percent as against a 10 to 12 percent growth in population. Unemployment might be reduced. Provided India takes vigorous measures of agricultural reform, food supply might finally outpace the increase of population, and the private sector of the economy would again reflect the dynamism which it exhibited at the end of the first plan.

But it is not enough merely to provide sufficient money. Equally important is our attitude and our understanding. For if we undertake this effort in the wrong spirit, or for the wrong reasons, or in the wrong way, then any and all financial measures will be in vain.

I have spoken here today about India's race with Red China. We want India to win that race. We want India to be a free and thriving leader of a free and thriving Asia. But if our interest appears to be purely selfish, anti-Communist and part of the cold war, if it appears to the Indian people that our motives are purely political, then we shall play into the hands of Communist and neutralist propagandists, cruelly distort America's image abroad, and undo much of the psychological effect that we expect from our generosity.

We ought to return to the generous spirit in which the original point 4 program was conceived; stress our positive interest in, and moral responsibility for, relieving misery and poverty; and acknowledge to ourselves and the world that, communism or no communism, we cannot be an island unto ourselves. That alone would do justice to the innately decent motives from which most Americans do support foreign aid.

There is considerable talk these days in Washington about distinguishing between military and economic assistance, and emphasizing the latter. I join in that endeavor, and consider it of major importance to the success of this program. But there are other distinctions which must be made—distinctions which are important to public understanding of the issues—and important to the self-respect and sensitivity of recipient nations.

Let us distinguish between lending a helping hand to countries—such as India—which are carrying forward their own development and, on the other hand, underwriting the entire economies of such vital but shaky areas as South Korea, Formosa, and south Vietnam. In one case, we are providing the all-important missing link in a total development effort, but in the other, capital development is only an incidental part of overall budget support.

Secondly, let us distinguish between aid shipments that are geared to the needs of the recipient countries, and those which are more geared to our domestic needs to dispose of agricultural surpluses. Certainly food shipments for famined relief in India and Pakistan are worth while, but where foreign needs and domestic embarrassments do not happen to coincide so nicely, we should not subordinate needs of the recipient country to our domestic political conveniences.

Finally, let us distinguish between foreign aid needed to prop up a faltering friend and aid which is part of a comprehensive, long-range foreign economic policy.

Foreign aid is important to most underdeveloped countries; but for some of them the real life-and-death question is markets for their export commodities; compared to that foreign aid receipts are often desirable incidentals. Many underdeveloped countries, if they had to choose between foreign aid and stable markets, would choose the latter.

The one commodity nations, such as Bolivia and Ghana, are particularly affected by our business conditions and market policies, but even nations such as India are concerned about the economic cycle in this Nation, about our plans for commodity stabilization, and about our hopes for reciprocal trade agreements with more predictable tariff procedures.

All of this, by way of attitude and action, can be done, and must be done.

The free world cannot shame Russia and China into freedom, but it can inspire democracy to enrich its own freedoms. Freedom's banner will be vindicated or lost not by the test of military strength alone, but by the purity and passion of our commitment to democracy, by our dedication to the advancing hopes of new nations, and by our determination to provide that freedom can lift the haggard burden of poverty from desolate lands. We have not yet conquered the frontiers of fear. But neither have we yet fully explored the horizons of hope.

Poison In Your Water—No. 81

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 25, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the Santa Barbara (Calif.) News-Press of September 30, 1958, entitled "Montecito Sewage Problem Growing":

MONTECITO SEWAGE PROBLEM GROWING—ONE HUNDRED PERCENT GAIN IN SEPTIC TANK FAILURES SINCE 1954 REPORTED

Faced with a 100-percent increase in septic tank failures in Montecito since 1954, the area's only solution is a community sewer system, Dr. Joseph T. Nardo, county health officer, said in a report released today.

The report was release by Montecito Citizens for Sanitation, which is campaigning for passage of the $1,765,000 sewer bond issue in the October 7 election.

INSPECTIONS

"Records indicated," the report states, "that during the first 6 months of 1954 approximately 100 inspections were made by the sanitation staff in the Montecito area as the result of complaints that individual sawage installations were overflowing. During the first 6 months of 1958 over 200 such inspections were made."

Dr. Nardo, commenting today on these figures, pointed out that there are many instances of overflowing septic tanks that are not reported to the health department because either the owners pump them out immediately or the neighbors have septic tank problems of their own and don't want to report on their neighbors.

"Soils of poor porosity and underground seepage from springs are primarily responsible for the malfunctioning of septic tank systems in the Montecito area," the report continues. "Along with poor soil conditions, the increase in population density and subsequent increase in the amount of sewage discharged into the ground may be responsible for the increased amounts of water encountered underground at shallow depths."

ALARMING INCREASE

"During the past year there has been an alarming increase in underground spring action and in the amount of static water encountered when test holes were drilled in septic tank systems.

"It is our opinion that the only solution to the problem is a sewer system. We therefore urge and recommend that immediate plans be undertaken for the sewering of the area with an adequate community system, thereby eliminating an existing health hazard."

Spain and NATO

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 21, 1959

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, after my tour of U.S. military installations in Europe during the latter part of 1957, I stated in my report to the Armed Services Committee that Spain should be invited to join in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

Objections to her entry into NATO are, in my way of thinking, based on feeble reasoning. Those quarters from whence objections come might well indulge in some introspection for the purpose of determining whether their national effort and sacrifice might be increased in compensation for the military potential of Spain which is not now fully available to the NATO partnership.

In the final recommendations in my report, I stated: "The United States make stronger representations for the admittance of Spain into the North Atlantic Treaty Organization."

I wish to insert in the RECORD an editorial I noted in the Friday, May 22 issue of the Washington Evening Star in support of Spain's entry into NATO:

SPAIN AND NATO

For various reasons, none of them persuasive, a few members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization still oppose Spain's entry into the alliance. But President Charles de Gaulle has announced that France—which used to be bitterly against the idea—now favors such a move, and this may lead, at long last, to favorable action.

In any event, as a matter of political and military commonsense, there can be no doubt that Spain belongs in NATO. Already a member of the United Nations, and of a number of economic and other organizations designed to strengthen Western Europe, it

has all the qualifications for full participation in the alliance. Not the least of these, of course, is the fact that the American air and naval bases on its territory are of vital importance to the defense of freedom. Further than that, regardless of the extravagant and often stupid criticism that has been leveled by outsiders against Generalissimo Franco, his country and its fine people continue to be one of the world's strongest bulwarks against the menace of Red aggression.

Back in 1949, a U.N. majority acted, in keeping with all this, by rescinding the General Assembly's sorry and essentially fraudulent 1946 decision (a decision supported at the time by our own country), aimed at isolating the Franco Government by ending diplomatic contact with it. That egregious error should now be rectified completely by a unanimous NATO vote to admit Spain into membership.

Resolution by the State of Texas Commending Dr. Henry A. Holle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER THORNBERRY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 6, 1959

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Henry A. Holle, a distinguished Texan who is a native of Brenham, Tex., which is in the 10th Congressional District, which I have the privilege to serve, enjoys an outstanding record in the public health program of our Nation and our State.

After having received his degree of doctor of medicine from the University of Texas Medical School, he served in the U.S. Public Health Service for many years, and was granted a leave of absence to serve as commissioner of health of Texas, where he rendered outstanding service.

I take pride in the fact that the Senate of Texas, on April 23, 1959, adopted Senate Resolution 435 as an expression of high regard and esteem for Dr. Holle, and commending him for his valuable service to the State of Texas.

Under previous consent I insert the resolution in the RECORD:

SENATE RESOLUTION 435

Whereas the Texas State Commissioner of Health, Dr. Henry A. Holle, recently tendered his resignation in the midst of derogatory statements about him which appeared prominently in public news media; and

Whereas this distinguished doctor of medicine received his education in the Brenham public schools, Texas A. & M. College, and the University of Texas Medical School; and

Whereas Dr. Holle has risen to international eminence in his chosen profession, having served with the U.S. Public Health Service in responsible positions for many years in this country and abroad; and

Whereas Dr. Holle requested a leave of absence from the U.S. Public Health Service in order to accept the post of commissioner of health in his native State of Texas some 5 years ago, through a sense of obligation to his fellow Texans; and

Whereas during Dr. Holle's period of service in Texas, the State health department has broadened its services to the people and has greatly increased its professional and administrative efficiency, largely through this capable doctor's ability and devotion to duty; and

Whereas the new headquarters buildings of the State department of health reflect the planning and vision of Dr. Holle as well as the confidence reposed in him by succeeding members of the Texas Legislature and other officials of the State; and

Whereas much of the criticism voiced against Dr. Holle has decried his association with an agency of the Government of the United States of America, an honorable circumstance more deserving of praise than censure by his fellow Texans and fellow Americans; and

Whereas additional criticism has concerned alleged technical violations on minor points about which Dr. Holle had previously, with great conscientiousness, obtained competent legal advice and counsel; and

Whereas no charges of malfeasance in office have been directed against Dr. Holle, but many unkind and unsubstantiated remarks have been made about him: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Texas, That this honorable body hereby desires to place on the public records its high regard and esteem for Dr. Henry A. Holle; and be it further

Resolved, That the Senate of Texas hereby officially commend Dr. Holle for his valuable services to the State of Texas; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to Dr. Holle as a token of the esteem in which he is held in this historic legislative chamber.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer, plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Raymond F. Noyes is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

Death of C. R. Hallmark, of San Angelo, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 26, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "C. R. Hallmark, Prominent Banker, Civic Leader, Dies," published in the San Angelo (Tex.) Standard Times of April 27, 1959; and also an editorial entitled "Recognition," relating to Mr. Hallmark's untimely death, and published in the San Angelo Standard Times of April 28, 1959.

Mr. President, this good citizen was a grand gentleman, a true Texan, and a real American, who devoted a lifetime to the best interests to his community, State, and Nation.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the San Angelo Standard Times, Apr. 27, 1959]

C. R. HALLMARK, PROMINENT BANKER, CIVIC LEADER DIES

C. R. Hallmark, a vice chairman of the board of the First National Bank and a civic leader here, died at 5:45 a.m. Sunday in St. John's Hospital after a brief illness. He was 78 years old.

A former president of the bank, Mr. Hallmark entered the hospital Friday for medical treatment after becoming ill at the bank on Wednesday. His death was attributed to double pneumonia.

Funeral services are to be held at 4 p.m. Tuesday at the First Baptist Church with the Reverend James B. Leavell, pastor, officiating. Burial is to be in Fairmount Cemetery under the direction of Johnson's Funeral Home.

BORN IN BELTON

Mr. Hallmark, born November 25, 1880, near Belton in Bell County had been associated with the First National Bank, oldest financial institution in San Angelo, since March 25, 1907. His parents were George Washington Hallmark and Rebecca Clements Hallmark, both native Texans.

Educated in Bell and Coryell County public schools, Mr. Hallmark later completed a combined course in bookkeeping and banking and in 1904 was employed by the L. Miller General Merchandise Store at Orange.

His work with the Miller store was that of general office worker, a job calling for the handling of payrolls of several lumber and paper mills.

While in Orange he became proficient in handling large sums of money and 3 years later he came to the First National Bank as a bookkeeper.

FIFTY-TWO-YEAR SERVICE

A banker here for 52 years—longer in the business than any banker here now—Mr. Hallmark became cashier of the bank in 1923 and 10 years later, he was named a vice president.

The First National Bank, established July 29, 1882, has had only six presidents and Mr. Hallmark was the fifth. He succeeded the late George E. Webb as president after Mr. Webb's death in September 1936.

Other presidents of the bank were: Leasel B. Harris, who helped organize the bank, which was originally the Concho National; Philip C. Lee, W. H. Godair, whom the late Mr. Webb succeded in 1896, and William J. Reed, president at tihs time.

Mr. Hallmark retired as president of the First National Bank March 6, 1959, after Michel T. Halbouty, Houston banker and oilman, purchased 70 percent of the bank's stock for $1,025,000.

REED IS PRESIDENT

Succeeding Mr. Hallmark as president was William J. Reed, former executive vice president and cashier of the Continental Bank & Trust Co., at Houston. Halbouty became chairman of the board and Mr. Hallmark and Clarence R. Webb, who had been exectuive vice president and chairman of the board, were named vice chairmen.

Once Mr. Hallmark had established himself in the banking business he turned his attention to civic work and other enterprises.

As president of the First National Bank, Mr. Hallmark was one of three trustees of the Fairmount Cemetery Trust, a nonprofit organization set up for perpetual care of the cemetery. Presidents of the other two national banks here, Weldon Jones of the San Angelo National, and Claude Gibbs of the Central National, are the other two trustees. At Mr. Hallmark's death the trust held more than $300,000, the money being invested in bonds and first mortgage real estate loans for the benefit of the cemetery.

Mr. Hallmark was appointed a member of the board of the San Angelo Independent School District in 1923 and served as secretary of the board for 13 years.

ORGANIZER

He was one of the organizers and served as treasurer of the Western Reserve Life Insurance Co., which was established here. The firm later moved headquarters to Austin and later was purchased by the Great National Life Insurance Co. of Dallas.

At the time Mr. Hallmark became an employee of the First National, deposits totaled around $1 million. Deposits at the close of business March 12, 1959, the last call from the National Comptroller of the Currency, totaled $17,033,862.54. Loans last March 12 totaled $4,896,268.49. In 1907 the bank personnel numbered only 6; today there are around 55 employees.

The First National grew steadily under Mr. Hallmark's direction. The present building, which has housed the bank since 1905, underwent several remodeling jobs, each one providing for an expansion of facilities.

It was also under Mr. Hallmark's regime that the bank purchased the home and lot of the late Mr. and Mrs. N. M. March, 138 West Beauregard Avenue, as a prospective building site. The property was purchased in December 1956 for $150,000.

BIRD HOME BOUGHT

Halbouty, shortly after purchasing the First National last month, exercised an option on the George J. Bird home, just east of the West Beauregard site, purchasing it for $96,500, thus giving the bank a quarter block.

Mr. Hallmark also served as a member of the San Angelo Parks Board for 14 years and was a member of the Knights of Pythias and the Masonic Lodge.

Mr. Hallmark and Miss Bessie M. Day were married October 9, 1907, and have made their home here since. In the 1936 flood their home, at 532 West Beauregard Avenue, was lost to the raging waters of the North Concho River. The Ranch House has since been built on the property. The Hallmarks resided at 404 South Washington Street.

Mr. Hallmark is survived by his wife, a daughter, Mrs. Brown Shield, of San Angelo, and one brother, Q. M. Hallmark of Killeen.

[From the San Angelo Standard Times, Apr. 28, 1959]

RECOGNITION

To spend 52 years at one job is something of a rarity in a changing world. To spend 26 years as the head of a bank, one of the cornerstones of a community's economy, commends additional recognition.

The late C. R. Hallmark not only wrought these records with the First National Bank here, but he found time to take his place on the school and parks boards and to enjoy the fellowship of the Kiwanis Club. There his mates say he frequently came up with surprising humorous and pithy comment on varied projects of the organization.

That he devoted himself to the affairs of the bank in a way to beget the confidence of the community is in itself a worthy recognition. To be the president of a bank makes one at once something of a community adviser and a steward of the funds of other people. In such a job a man assumes the responsibility of leadership, and banks, by nature of their services, are under heavy pressure to provide it.

Racing Change

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 26, 1959

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, we Marylanders are justly proud of the way in which horse racing has flourished in our State and of the men and women who have been responsible for the exemplary way in which the sport has been conducted. One of the persons to whom is due a major portion of the credit for the health of Maryland racing during recent years is Mr. D. Eldred Rinehart, of Smithsburg, Md., whom I feel privileged to number among my closest friends. As chairman of the Maryland State Racing Commission, Eldred Rinehart utilized the same qualities of leadership, understanding, and perseverance which made him a personal success, to add immeasurably to the stature of racing in our great Free State. Re-

cently, as his term expired and a new State administration named a replacement, the Evening Sun newspaper, of Baltimore, commented editorially on Eldred Rinehart's service, and I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Evening Sun, of Baltimore, Md.]

RACING CHANGE

No convincing reason was offered at the last session of the legislature for abolition of the present three-man Racing Commission and its replacement with a five-man group. Now that Governor Tawes has made his five choices to fit out the new arrangement its underlying motive becomes even more obscure.

Two of the present commissioners, Mr. Shuger and Mr. Chewning, are retained for extra terms. Three new members—Mr. Jackson and Mr. Cuccia, with Mr. Livie to serve as chairman—are being added. The net of it all is loss of Mr. D. Eldred Rinehart, the present chairman, who has proved himself a most effective force for the good of Maryland racing.

None of the Tawes additions shows much promise of making up for the Rinehart loss. To be sure, it might be too much to ask of a practical Democrat like the Governor to keep Mr. Rinehart, who happens to be the Republican State chairman, at the head of this important agency. Still, it is leadership on the commission which counts and only its chairman has the opportunity to lead. Mr. Livie, though a man of good standing, has not hitherto shown high qualities on this score.

The Government's Exchange Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 26, 1959

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a summary of a talk given before representatives of the New York Department of Education on April 21 by John W. Harrold, of Ellenburg Depot, N.Y.

This is, I believe, an unusually lucid description of one aspect of our governmental exchange program.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A REPORT ON THE 1959 SEMINAR IN COMPARATIVE EDUCATION HELD IN FRANCE, BELGIUM, AND THE NETHERLANDS

(By John W. Harrold, Ellenburg Depot, N.Y.)

(A summary of a talk given before representatives of the New York Education Department in Albany, N.Y. on April 21, 1959)

During the past decade many thousands of students, teachers, university professors and research scholars have participated in and contributed to the International Exchange Service program of the U.S. Department of State. This year, for the first time, school administrators in the United States were given an opportunity to share in this program. With funds provided under the Fulbright Act, selected supervisors and administrators of elementary and secondary schools participated in the Seminar in Comparative Education held in France, Belgium, and the Netherlands during the months of February and March 1959. It was my privilege to have been a member of this group of American educators.

The basic purpose of the program of the International Exchange Service is to increase good will and understanding between the people of the United States and the people of other countries. The Seminar in Comparative Education contributed to this objective by sending 20 school administrators from various parts of the United States to live for 2 months in Europe and to study and discuss problems in the field of education with many people in the countries visited. The seminar included lectures on elementary, secondary, and university education; discussions on the teaching of foreign languages, science and mathematics; conferences with national and local educational officials; visits to schools of different types; and, contacts with the social and cultural life in the countries visited.

In each of the countries visited we were warmly welcomed and treated with the highest degree of kindness and respect. We worked with many persons and made many friends. Since returning home I have written some 130 personal letters expressing my appreciation to various individuals in Europe who helped to make our trip a most educational and valuable experience. Most of us were invited into homes of different people, to eat with them, to observe their way of living and to discuss life in our respective countries. Reports I have received from other members of the group indicate that all 20 of us have been asked many times to tell our friends and public groups about our experiences and our observations. I am convinced that the seminar in comparative education has contributed much to increasing goodwill and understanding between the people of the United States and the people of the countries visited.

During our all too brief 2 months in Europe we saw, we heard, and we did many things. In spite of our numerous and varied experiences, I am sure that no one of us would qualify as an expert on any phase of European life or problems. However, being steeped in the American way of life, all of us soon came to recognize that in Europe the social status of the family is a dominant factor in determining the educational opportunity of the children. This caused us to inquire about the occupations of the fathers of the 20 Americans who were in positions of more or less importance and who had been selected from over 500 candidates to represent the United States in this new program. Here is what we found: Our fathers were a barber, a blacksmith, a carpenter, six farmers, a grocer, a day laborer, a librarian, a mechanic, a merchant, a minister, a pharmacist, a postmaster, a shipping clerk, a shoemaker, and a teacher. It was our conclusion that few, if any, of us would ever have had an opportunity to be in the positions we are in today if we had been born in and lived in the countries we visited.

As a result of our experience each of us returned with varied impressions and perhaps many of us have new and greater understandings. These are some of the general observations I would make:

1. Our educational horizons were broadened. Never again will we see our own schools, and education in general, through the same eyes as before.

2. We observed the close relationship between the history, the culture, and the social values of a country and its educational system—something that, because we were so much a part of it, we had not seen so clearly in America before.

3. We marveled at the high priority given to education both by the people in general and by the actions of their governments.

4. We recognized the importance and the value to the people of Europe of the classical and cultural subjects taught in their schools.

5. We observed the demanding of high standards of achievement from the primary grades through the university and noted the many who fell by the wayside.

6. We have a greater appreciation of the contributions of the European peoples to our own heritage.

7. Many of us returned with ideas for some shift in emphasis, for some experimentation, for some subject or program innovations.

8. We agreed that it is impossible to transport a system of schools from one country to another country.

9. We have a greater appreciation of the efforts of our own schools to develop in students self-reliance, critical thinking, ability to reach conclusions, to make judgments and a capability of working together rather than acquiring knowledge just for knowledge sake.

10. We have a deeper conviction of the many accomplishments of the schools of America—a revitalized faith in America education and a renewed awareness that it is a fundemental source of strength of our Nation.

11. We are more fully aware of the vast work being done by the United States in the various countries of the world to create goodwill and understanding among the peoples of the world.

12. We came away with a deeper understanding of the countries we visited, with an appreciation of different types of school systems that had many points of excellence, and with a feeling of personal admiration and friendliness toward a people who have courageously rebuilt from the destruction of war and its aftereffects and at the same time have coped with problems of growth, economics, education, and the preservation of freedom that confronts all nations.

The Responsibility of Business in Public Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 26, 1959

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a speech delivered on May 20, 1959, by William C. Stolk, president of the American Can Co., before a manufacturers association meeting in Chicago, be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

In this excellent speech, Mr. Stolk has done an outstanding job of highlighting the vital need for American businessmen to take an active and interested part in public affairs. I am greatly encouraged by this presentation, for I have long urged businessmen, both small and large, to devote a portion of their energies to the area of public affairs.

American business contains a vast storehouse of administrative know-how; American business is the foun-

tainhead of American ingenuity; American business is the best schooled group in the world as to the practical advantages of a free enterprise economy to all citizens in a representative republic. This know-how and experience should be, indeed, must be, utilized in the intelligent selection of public representatives and in the formulation and development of sound public programs and policies which are in harmony with the fundamental and formative concepts of this Nation.

I commend Mr. Stolk and the American Can Co. for taking the lead in encouraging business personnel to participate in public affairs and practical politics, and I earnestly hope, for the well-being of this Nation, that this speech will receive the thoughtful attention of a great many American citizens.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE RESPONSIBILITY OF BUSINESS IN PUBLIC AFFAIRS

(Address by William C. Stolk, president, American Can Co., at the 45th midyear meeting of the Chemical Specialties Manufacturers Association, Chicago, May 20, 1959)

Having been in the sales end of business most of my life, your invitation to be here today is not only an honor but a real treat. There could be no greater pleasure for a salesman than an invitation to sell his bill of goods before several hundred fine customers and equally fine prospective customers—without interruption.

Despite your generosity, I will avoid talking about insecticides, disinfectants, waxes and polishes—and, of course—cans, though the temptation to do so is strong. It would be wonderful to discuss with you new developments, new products, and new markets, and to paint a picture of a great and glorious new future we might share together.

This I would do if it were not that I have become so deeply concerned—as have many other businessmen—with the ominous outlook facing our country. If things continue to go the way they have, there is real reason for serious doubt that we, as a nation, have a glorious future in store for us.

I came here to sell—but not containers. If any businessman has not already been sold, he needs to be sold on the absolute need and urgency to participate in public affairs. My goal today is to convince you of the need for your participation in this vital area and for your help in encouraging, stimulating, and helping your managers, your business associates, and your friends to do likewise.

We, as businessmen, have been working vigorously and conscientiously to increase productivity, cut costs and provide a firm basis for a constantly improving standard of living. But people in increasing numbers are discovering that while we have been busy developing, financing, producing, and marketing new products and services, powerful forces have been working at least as diligently to develop, finance, produce, and market ideas that are seriously undermining our political and economic system.

Standards are being lowered, ideals are being downgraded, character is being weakened, and our Constitution is—in effect—being rewritten. The freedoms now becoming popular are: Freedom from care; freedom from effort; freedom from responsibility; and freedom to get without having to give.

The public is being hoaxed into believing that the Nation can consume more than it produces, that our standards of living can be increased by restricting output and reducing hours of work, and that the good life is a life of irresponsibility.

Efforts are being made to convince the public that the way to have booming prosperity in this country, improve living standards, and withstand the threat of annihilation by Russia—is to forget the balancing of the budget, maintain existing tax rates, increase government expenditures, hamstring business incentive and initiative, build a larger and more powerful Central Government, and move further and further along the road toward socialism.

Some politicians in government, in labor unions, in our two great political parties, and—sad to say—even in our educational institutions have been promoting concepts, ideas, and legislative actions which will surely rob the public of a substantial part—if not ultimately all—of its bank savings, series E bond savings, life insurance protection, pension rights, and other property values.

These same politicians are promoting the idea that business is suspect, that big business is particularly bad, that anything which is good for an employer could not be good for an employee. They are coldly contriving to break down public confidence in and respect for business, particularly big business. This despite the fact that business, and business alone, makes possible the goods and services used by consumers, the income used by tens of millions of people to support their families, and—both directly and indirectly—the great bulk of Government income.

To my mind, we businessmen, individually and collectively, have become much too refined for this day and age. We have striven too hard to seek universal acceptability for ourselves, as well as for our products.

We have devoted too much effort toward attempting to find areas where we can agree with other business managers, with labor leaders, and with Government. We have made too little effort to think about, and speak out on areas of disagreement with labor leaders, with Government, and even among ourselves. We must not, of course, confine ourselves to the purely negative exercise of saying "we are against what you are for." But in order to make clear to everyone what we stand for, and why, we cannot avoid taking an open position against schemes that are designed to overturn the things we seek to advance. For example, as we speak out to support and promote the continuance of a free competitive market for goods and services, we have to oppose the ideas of those who want to see all business management directed by some combination of Federal bureaucracy and union "trusteeship."

Business managers have assumed that, in the area of public affairs, their responsibilities to society are adequately discharged by making a financial contribution, once every 2 years, to the party of their choice and by contributing to the support of business organizations which take stands on legislative issues. This may have been adequate in the dim past—but certainly not in the recent past, and assuredly not now.

You and I and other businessmen, as corporate executives, must give more personal attention to our unique opportunity to exercise the art of leadership—to fulfill our unique responsibility as managers of human resources. As corporate executives we have great opportunity to demonstrate and promote sensible ideas and constructive actions for the common good. Let me be specific: I believe that the economic realities, and the social and political principles, that have operated to achieve success for the American Can Co. as a corporation, are the same realities and principles that have operated to achieve success and prosperity for every employee—in our business, in your business, and for every citizen.

As corporate executives, you and I stand at the head of groups of employees who can and will judge, firsthand, whether our management ideas make sense and deserve their agreement and support. When our own people learn firsthand from us what we stand for—and when they decide for themselves that they agree with us—we will have accomplished our principal duty of leadership as corporate executives.

This, however, is not the end of our task. You and I, and other businessmen—as individuals—must, in order to be good leaders and good citizens, become politically sophisticated. We must, as individuals, personally participate in the job of helping to select, nominate, and elect able people to public office.

If we fail to do so, we can look forward with certainty to the day when the corporation will become obsolete and the Government will become absolute.

Because we—in the American Can Co. management—are so strongly convinced of this, we decided some months ago to do something about it.

We decided we were not going to be passive and thus be a party to permitting our country to be lead, unobstructed, into intellectual, moral and financial bankruptcy by a relatively few, highly vocal people—people who are either selfish, shiftless, power-hungry, well-intentioned but misguided, or are proponents of another kind of political and economic system.

Here, briefly, is what our company is doing in an effort to help preserve and strengthen our economic and political institutions.

We at American Can Co. have laid out a four-part program. Some of the parts are already in action, others are in the make-ready stage. Let me emphasize that no part of our program is a one-shot project or a temporary campaign. All four parts are designed for long-term action, from now on. We wish we had started them years ago.

Part 1 is to inform, equip, and encourage everyone in our management organization to lead out and speak out on the business facts that have a direct bearing on the economic and social well-being of our own company, our own people, and of the Nation. And by "everyone in our management organization" I mean our people at every management and supervisory level from the front office to the shipping dock.

Part 2 of our program is to make sure that every employee, and his family and his neighbors, gets from us, both face-to-face and in writing, a continuous flow of facts and viewpoints to round out his understanding and make it possible for him to reach judgments based on all of the truth rather than only part of it. We are constantly on guard not to underestimate our people's intelligence, or overestimate the amount of information they already have.

The third part is to give our managers the opportunity to study political processes and learn the art of practical politics. Our purpose here is to give our managers, and through them all employees, genuine encouragement to participate actively in personal politics—on their own time and at their own expense, in their own precincts and wards, through the party of their individual and personal choice.

The fourth part of our program is to give elected officials, through our management organization, our mangement views on important national issues as they come up for consideration in pending legislation.

The first two parts of this program do not require anything different in the way of organization structure or operating techniques. This is not to say, however, that these parts will operate by themselves without careful planning and constant attention, from the chief executive on down. Several months ago I tried to summarize this area of our

current program to our entire management organization, in the following three sentences:

1. Let us extend our principles of sound and successful management to provide an increasing initiative to lead out and speak out, in our plants and offices and in our communties, on the affairs that control the welfare of our business and the economic, social, and political climate in which we live.

2. Let us take constant stock of our management decisions and actions, to be sure that our practices and actions are always consistent with our principles.

3. The task remaining, then, is to exercise both personal and corporate leadership, in talking and writing to people to get them to think straight—to make the right choice under sometimes difficult circumstances.

The third and fourth parts of our current program—encouraging personal political action, and putting our management viewpoint on national issues on record with Congressmen—are brand new activities in our company. I want to take a few moments to describe how we are going about serving our apprenticeship in these new ventures.

Our decision to participate much more actively and aggressively in public issues and personal politics was made some months in advance of the 1958 elections, although not in time to make an effective contribution to a better understanding of the major issues involved. We did, however—through a personal letter sent to the home of each one—urge our 50,000 employees to register and vote.

During the second half of 1958, we also sent a series of letters to all of our top management people explaining the purposes of the program and soliciting their support. We asked 153 of these men—managers in plants and offices across the country—to act as official spokesmen for our company and establish direct relationships with the 153 Congressmen and 52 Senators representing the areas in which our facilities are located.

This group was asked to make themselves known to their legislators, to invite them to their plants and offices, and to discuss subjects of mutual interest. In addition, we wrote to the Senators and Congressmen telling them of our new policy of taking a much more active interest in public affairs, of our desire to be of service to them, of our plan to provide our employees with an increasing body of economic facts, and of our intent to speak out on important issues and to study legislative results.

It would be heartwarming to you and even inspiring, to read the substantial number of replies received from Members of Congress which expressed warm approval and enthusiastic endorsement of our purpose. These letters were about evenly divided among Republicans, Democrats, liberals and conservatives.

We are not yet well enough equipped or experienced to be articulate on all important national issues before this session of Congress. So as a practical matter we are limiting ourselves this year to such critical matters as a balanced budget and sound fiscal policy, the encroachment of Government controls over business, and an effective labor law. On each of these, we have considered the problem and have taken a company stand on what we believe is right and what we think Congress should do.

These positions are documented in detail based on our analysis of the need to favor or to oppose proposed legislative actions. They are being given to every one of our top management people. Our positions are also being made known to middle management and all other employees through our normal communication channels.

The 153 managers selected as spokesmen for the company are asked to study these carefully formulated views, and then to make their conclusions known to their legislators. We, of course, expect that all of the others in top management, acting as responsible managers and public-minded citizens, are also studying our views and communicating their analyses to their Congressmen—on an individual and personal basis. We hope that eventually all 50,000 employees, their families and their friends, will join us in articulate support of the same objectives.

Needless to say we appreciate that, to the extent corporate managers confine their communication of ideas to legislators, their influence is limited. We want and expect our managers also to express themselves, on important issues to their management associates, to other employees, and in public. We want and expect them to help others to understand the fundamentals of sound business, sound government and to enlist their support in working toward the common good.

We expect to be successful in helping our employees to gain an understanding of the kinds of legislation which will further the interests of themselves and their company, as well as the welfare of the country. But we know that we, as managers, cannot stop there. Management must also offer employees an opportunity to learn how to translate knowledge into forceful and constructive action.

For this reason we are currently testing out, at several of our facilities, a course designed to provide citizens with a basic understanding of the art of practical politics. This is a course prepared by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce which brings together 12 to 20 people for a 2-hour discussion, once a week, for 9 consecutive weeks. It is expected that those taking the course will be sufficiently well informed to exert a healthy and beneficial influence on politics in their precincts and wards.

How fast and how far we can go in offering this opportunity to an ever-increasing number of our employees will be determined on the basis of the results of our tests.

Nevertheless, we are firmly convinced that if our political and economic system is to survive—perhaps, even if our Nation is to survive—a very much larger number of citizens must actively work to aid in the selection of good candidates for public office, to nominate them, and to elect them. This being so, management has a definite responsibility to help provide its employees with opportunities for political education. We, in the American Can Co., are fully committed to bearing our fair share of this responsibility.

The payoff from all this educational effort will come only if and when knowledgeable people actually support the cause of good government with their own personal effort—using their own time and money. Thus a vastly increased number of people must be encouraged, stimulated, and urged to work in their own precincts and wards for good government, through the party of their individual and personal choice. We intend to provide this incentive.

This is really all we should do. Because the decision to work or not work to promote the cause of good government must, of course, be left to the individual's personal conscience.

In conclusion I want to quote Thomas Jefferson. He said, "I know of no safe depository for the ultimate powers of society but the people themselves; and if we think them not enlightened enough to exercise their control with a wholesome direction, the remedy is not to take it from them, but to inform their discretion through education."

If and when your management, our management, and other business managements are well on the way toward discharging these important responsibilities to our employees, our companies, and our country, in the field of public affairs, the people will, we can be sure, become enlightened, and—as Thomas Jefferson phrased it—exercise their control with a wholesome direction.

Permissible Radiation Level May Be Too High

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 26, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, Lauriston S. Taylor, the head of the National Committee on Radiation Protection, which sets permissible radiation-exposure levels, has said that if the entire population is involved, the current levels might be too high.

I respectfully wish to call this statement to the attention of my distinguished colleagues in the Congress and to all those interested in the problem of radioactivity. When those who set the permissible limits say that they have set them too high, resulting in 200,000 cases—the first generation of tangible, inherited defects—it is time that somebody set safe limits.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Edward Gamarekian which was printed in the Washington Post and Times Herald for Sunday, May 24, 1959, entitled "'Permissible' Radiation Level May Be Too High, Expert Says."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"PERMISSIBLE" RADIATION LEVEL MAY BE TOO HIGH, EXPERT SAYS

(By Edward Gamarekian)

The head of the national committee which sets "permissible" radiation-exposure levels stated yesterday that these levels "might be too high" if the entire population were affected.

Although the National Committee on Radiation Protection has not officially announced what its recently revised "permissible" doses are, its chairman, Lauriston S. Taylor, quoted figures during a WTOP-TV "City Side" program which indicate that the 30-year dose of 15 rems to the reproductive organs now includes the radiation from fallout and atomic wastes as well as the radiation from medical X-rays and radioactive substances normally present in the earth, air and drinking water.

As previously defined, the dose was understood to include only the effects of fallout and atomic wastes dumped into the air, water and ground from atomic power reactors and other sources.

A rem is a unit of radiation exposure. A dose of 3 to 4 rems is acquired by the individual in a generation—30 years on the average—from the radioactive thorium and radium present in nature. The average dose from X-rays is about 5 rems per generation.

GENERATION DOSE DEFINED

Taylor said his committee may come up with a recommended dose for the overall population instead of the average individual. He gave a figure of 14 million rems per million people as a generation dose. This would average out to 14 rems per person but

would permit part of the population to receive more than the average if others received less.

Taylor recently collaborated in the writing of a chapter in a book published by the Atomic Energy Commission which states that a radiation dose to the reproductive organs of 15 to 60 rems per generation would double the rate of genetic damage now suffered by the American population.

In numbers this would mean that "perhaps 200,000 cases of tangible inherited defects would occur in the United States in the first generation, rising slowly to some 2 million cases per generation at equilibrium."

The chief author of the chapter is Walter D. Claus of the Biology and Medicine Division of the Atomic Energy Commission. Copies of the book "Radiation, Biology, and Medicine" (Addison-Wesley)—were given to delegates from all nations attending the Atoms-for-Peace Conference in Geneva last September.

SEES NO REASON FOR ALARM

Taylor, who is chief of the Atomic and Radiation Physics Division of the National Bureau of Standards, said during the broadcast yesterday, "I personally would like to see the causes of fallout removed."

But, he added, "it is with us, and we'll have to do the best we can to live with it. I don't think the fallout problem has reached the point where we should worry to the point of becoming neurotic about it."

The interview by a panel of newsmen covered the effects of radiation on the living as well as the effects on future generations.

Racial Segregation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP A. HART
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 26, 1959

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Time for Individual to Set Own Covenant in Racial Struggle," published in the Saginaw (Mich.) News of April 26, 1959.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TIME FOR INDIVIDUAL TO SET OWN COVENANT IN RACIAL STRUGGLE

Call it conscience. Call it guilt. Call it, yes, fear—fear for the social future of this community. The day has arrived when to postpone longer an open stand on the issue of a racially segregated Saginaw is no longer tolerable.

This is one of the most crucial issues to be faced in the history of this community—because it calls for individual decision, personal courage and a moral fortitude capable of standing against hostile reaction which must be anticipated at the outset as inevitable.

For pushing this decision off dead center, the Saginaw News commends the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, U.S.A., which adopted what it terms "The Covenant of Open Occupancy."

Its broad terms encompass the full scope of segregation as practiced in residential, on-the-job, and educational discrimination. It is a challenge to Christian conscience and an admonishment to the church sessions of this denomination to endorse the covenant and to urge active support of the membership.

Saginaw Valley Presbyterians pledged themselves to promote the aims of the covenant, with special emphasis on its provisions opposing racial discrimination in housing. The following day, the Saginaw County Council of Churches acknowledged the dynamic challenge of the covenant and added its own endorsement with recommendation that the principles be studied by all member churches and other groups.

The News no longer can stand on the comforting and comfortable appraisal by our friends among Negro leaders here that "the News is not a crusading newspaper but its sympathies are well understood." Segregation continues. Problems grow more acute. Pressures on restricted housing in restricted areas deny to almost all of our finest Negro citizens the social opportunities and surroundings to which their economic and intellectual attainments entitle them.

To hang back longer on the premise that we are part of a nationwide pattern and cannot help the Negro citizen to break out of his congested ghetto until greater numbers of Americans demonstrate their readiness to put aside the prejudices of race and color is no premise at all. There is no such thing as a "national movement" except as it is implemented locally by successions of local citizens.

By now, some readers will be registering horrified amazement at the implications of what all this suggests. Let us say here, that we have never written with more sober awareness of a position taken in these columns.

It is intended, quite frankly, to stimulate thinking and to unsettle consciences about this problem to the point that, within this community, some enlightened citizens will "make their covenant" and stand with the churches and this newspaper in support of a rational program of constructive action.

The Saginaw area is far from being in the posture of a pioneer in racially integrated living. Pennsylvania and New Jersey, to name two States, have enjoyed marked success in the development of integrated suburban projects. At last 50 other privately built interracial housing projects are on record in the Nation.

And for an insight into the action procedures of white residents to stem a hysterical tide of distress selling which had been encouraged by the blockbusting tactics of opportunistic real estate firms—read "When Negro Moves Next Door" in the April 4 issue of Saturday Evening Post. It is an inspiring and hopeful report of enlightened neighborhood conduct in the suburbs of Baltimore, Md.

Saginaw's Negro citizens have made few ventures toward locating in the city's solidly all-white neighborhoods, or in its modern suburbs. Obviously this reflects, at least in part, a rather ironclad policy of prohibition effectively enforced by our real estate businesses and lending institutions.

The practice is not to be condemned—unless each of us is prepared to condemn himself. What has gone before and still prevails is in keeping with the tradition of prejudice and fear. During early unsuccessful efforts to gain financial backing for an interracial housing development in Bucks County, Pa., a mortgage company officer turned down the developer with these words: "Fellowship isn't our business. Making money is."

Fortunately, much ice has been broken elsewhere among lending institutions since the soundness of mortgage loans both for new developments and for gradual mixing of all-white neighborhoods has gone forward.

An excellent opportunity for concerted community effort in this direction is presented in the urban renewal area of northeast Saginaw. This 470 acres can become a model of gracious living if properties are offered to potential home buyers in a normal market. We believe that two restrictions should be imposed to insure such a development. First, a minimum price floor barring to the area construction of mass crackerbox houses. Secondly, insistence on an agreed ratio of Negro and white owner occupants.

This project can do little to alleviate the segregated status of the Negro community if it is thrown open only to Negro families. As one of their thoughtful members has said, "If the present pattern of racial segregation is used to relocate the displaced families—on this urban renewal site—it can only mean that a new ghetto will be established."

Discussion and decision should be arrived at on these points well in advance of any property sales, so that everybody understands what conditions must apply. The issue is important enough that, if necessary, Federal authority will be invoked to insure that Federal funds are not permitted to help perpetuate patterns of segregation and discrimination in homebuilding.

This new area represents the first hope for development of homes which would appeal to the higher social-economic groups. It must not be exploited in any way to undermine the best chance this town has to crack its self-made segregation wall.

In taking its stand, the News warns that it will be as militant in its opposition to "pressure group" tactics of minority peoples as it is prepared to be in support of the churches and other groups who pledge their preparedness to work for an end to segregation and the crushing burden it imposes on those who cannot escape it.

The ugly fact is that discrimination in housing is one of the most undemocratic practices in American life today. It is time that we here in Saginaw spoke openly of our feelings. It is time that we began meeting in small groups of mixed races to express the practical problems to be met and to search for practical solutions. Trustworthy examples of local communities more courageous than ours can be drawn on freely.

Once the shock of actual undertaking has been experienced and conquered we will be on the way toward quieting fears for Saginaw's future as a city of "old people, Negroes, and Mexicans." And in reversing an undesirable trend we will surely stand taller in the eyes of our fellowmen and in the private estimate, each of himself.

Education for the Age of Science

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 26, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we recall that recently President Eisenhower's Science Advisory Committee issued an 18,000-word report entitled "Education for the Age of Science."

The report, I believe, contains a great many thought-provoking views on our progress in science and education that should indeed be required reading, not only by Congress, but by the American people.

Among other things, the Advisory Committee recommended:

First. Americans should attach greater value to intellectual excellence;

Second. Every school and college should reexamine its curriculum to make sure that it is giving adequate challenge to the intellectual capacities of its students;

Third. The Nation should do far more to enhance the prestige of the teacher and provide him with more effective support;

Fourth. The country should move further toward adapting educational programs to the widely varying competence of students and seek especially to meet the need sof the most gifted students;

Fifth. We should improve our scientific education at all levels, attempting to give greater understanding of science to the nonscientist, as well as to discover and stimulate more individuals who have the talents to become scientists and engineers.

The report by the Science Advisory Committee has made an outstanding contribution to American thinking on the problems and challenges of educating enough scientists and engineers to meet the needs of the Nation now, and for the future.

The report, I believe, should stimulate a new look at our overall educational program.

We recognize, of course, that the Nation must maintain a balanced system of educating individuals, not only in the field of science, but also in economics, sociology, the arts, the humanities, and other fields.

In addition to specific recommendations for meeting the challenge in science and engineering, the report contains thought-provoking philosophical ideas on training in these fields.

I ask unanimous consent to have excerpts of these ideas published in the Sunday Star, as well as a list of the outstanding individuals who served as members or consultants on the panel of the Advisory Committee, printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PHILOSOPHICAL IDEAS ON SCIENCE TRAINING

Americans do not really think that educated people are dangerous or silly—yet the terms "egghead" and "intellectual" are not always terms of approbation.

A successful, democratic society * * * must have millions of well-educated citizens who can comprehend what the specialists and leaders are proposing.

Women * * * constitute an enormous potential resource for research, scholarship, and teaching which we have not even begun to tap.

To be able to think beyond the press releases and publicity statements, to understand the background of national debate requires a greater comprehension of space problems than that provided by science fiction or the comic strip.

Though the star athlete may remain a hero, it is now evident that an even deeper recognition ought to be given to the scholar.

In school or college, learning to think must take precedence over learning to run or swim or drive a car.

There is much more to learn than there was 100 years ago, and, hence, the learning process must be made more efficient at every level. Time is precious.

Teachers' salaries should be increased to the point where the teacher does not have to work on other jobs to eke out a living.

Democracy does not require that everyone go to college. By accepting such a shibboleth we can only debase the significance of a college degree.

Under no conditions should able young people be forced to discontinue their education at any level for economic reasons.

It serves no purpose for the professional man to be critical of high school or any other teaching, unless he himself is prepared to take steps to help improve it. Indeed, it is irresponsible.

Television, a teaching medium of great potential power, has never been adequately studied by those persons who might learn how it could most wisely be used.

Whatever medium is used, science must * * * be made as interesting to the bystander as it is exciting and inspiring to the scientist. Citizens will not submit themselves to adult education in science simply as a response to bugle calls to duty.

The liberal arts faculties must insist that in these days the general baccalaureate degree should not be granted with less than 2 years of science.

Draftsmen, designers * * * and technicians of many kinds are essential to industry and to the engineering profession. These occupations deserve greater dignity and prestige.

For this Nation to graduate less than 650 Ph. D.'s per year in engineering, as was the case in 1958, is to imperil it.

SCIENCE PANEL MEMBERS

PANEL MEMBERSHIP

Dr. John E. Burchard, dean, School of Humanities and Social Studies, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Dr. Henry Chauncey, president, Educational Testing Service.

Dr. Caryl P. Haskins, president, Carnegie Institution of Washington.

Dr. Frederick C. Lindvall, chairman, Division of Engineering, California Institute of Technology.

Dr. James A. Perkins, vice president, Carnegie Corp.

Dr. Alan T. Waterman, director, National Science Foundation.

Dr. Dael Wolfle, executive officer, American Association for the Advancement of Science.

Dr. Jerrold R. Zacharias, professor of physics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Dr. Lee A. Dubridge, president, California Institute of Technology (chairman).

PANEL CONSULTANTS

Dr. Harold B. Gores, president, Educational Facilities Laboratories, Inc.

Dr. S. C. Hollister, dean, College of Engineering, Cornell University.

Dr. Frederick L. Hovde, president, Purdue University.

Stephen White, director of the film division, Educational Services, Inc.

Robert M. Briber, technical assistant to the panel.

COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

Dr. Robert F. Bacher, professor of physics, California Institute of Technology.

Dr. William O. Baker, vice president (research), Bell Telephone Laboratories.

Dr. John Bardeen, professor of electrical engineering and physics, University of Illinois.

Dr. Hans Bethe, professor of physics, Cornell University.

Dr. Detlev W. Bronk, president, the Rockefeller Institute.

Dr. Britton Chance, director, Johnson Foundation (biophysics), University of Pennsylvania School of Medicine.

Dr. James B. Fisk, president, Bell Telephone Laboratories.

Dr. George B. Kistiakowsky, professor of chemistry, Harvard University.

Dr. Edwin H. Land, president, Polaroid Corp.

Dr. Emanuel R. Piore, director of research, International Business Machines Corp.

Dr. Edward M. Purcell, professor of physics, Harvard University.

Dr. Isidor I. Rabi, professor of physics, Columbia University.

Dr. H. P. Robertson, professor of physics, California Institute of Technology.

Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg, chancellor, University of California.

Dr. Cyril S. Smith, Institute for the Study of Metals, the University of Chicago.

Dr. Paul A. Weiss, member and professor, the Rockefeller Institute.

Dr. Jerome B. Wiesner, director, Research Laboratory of Electronics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Dr. James R. Killian, Jr., Special Assistant to the President for Science and Technology (chairman).

Michigan—Her Heritage and Destiny

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAT McNAMARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 26, 1959

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, this past week, we celebrated Michigan Week in my State.

Sunday, May 17, opening Michigan Week, was designated as Spiritual Foundations Day. It was marked by a sermon on "Michigan — Her Heritage and Destiny" delivered by Rev. Allan Zaun, of the Jefferson Avenue Presbyterian Church, in the Old Mariners' Church in Detroit.

His sermon was so much to the point on a number of subjects that I ask unanimous consent that the text be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

I also ask unanimous consent that preliminary greetings by Gov. G. Mennen Williams on that occasion be printed along with the sermon.

There being no objection, the sermon and greetings were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MICHIGAN—HER HERITAGE AND DESTINY

(Sermon given by Rev. Allan Zaun, Jefferson Avenue Presbyterian Church, Spiritual Foundations Day Opening of Michigan Week, Old Mariners' Church, Detroit, Sunday, May 17, 1959.)

This is a day of gratitude and of challenge—of gratitude for the truly wonderful heritage which has been bequeathed to us as citizens of this great State of Michigan, and of challenge because of the exciting opportunities and tasks which lie before us if

we are willing, under God, to possess that heritage, and to fulfill our destiny.

I. HERITAGE

Every great fact, movement, or person has behind it some adequate cause or causes. To contemplate the history of our great State is to recognize immediately that many dedicated persons have given their lives for it—not only in battle, but in the forests and fields, the mines and the factories; the classroom, pulpit, and courts of law.

Indeed, wherever human endeavor has been significant, there a real contribution has been made to Michigan's wealth, both material and spiritual.

Vast and opulent though our material resources may be, the real wealth of this States lies in the abilities and love of its people offered in glad allegiance to the furtherance of our common interests.

The vitality of a people depends in great measure on their faith in realities that are deeper than the concerns of making a living or of finding distraction in pleasure. Men are strong and honest and unselfish as they have faith in Almighty God.

The Scriptures speak very clearly of the need of spiritual foundations for any important enterprise:

"Except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it; except the Lord keepeth the city, the watchman waketh but in vain" (Psalms 127: 1).

What is said of the city and the Nation in God's word is equally true of a State, as we understand it today:

"Blessed is the nation whose God is the Lord" (Psalms 33: 12).

"When it goeth well with the righteous, the city rejoices" (Proverbs 11: 10).

"Open ye the gates, that the righteous nation which keepeth the truth may enter in" (Isaiah 26: 3).

"Where there is no vision the people perish" (Proverbs 29: 18).

Our religious inheritance here in Michigan is rich and deep, made more valuable because of the variety of streams which have flowed into the river of faith. The French traders and their devoted priests, coming with Cadillac in 1701; the beloved Father Gabriel Richard, in the early years of the 19th Century; and the Reverend John Monteith, the vigorous, and valiant Presbyterian, representing a strong Protestant ministry during the same years; and then our Jewish brethren, coming with the ancient splendors of the religion of Israel—all these as well as other traditions, have brought us a heritage that is worthy, indeed.

John Monteith preached his first sermon in Detroit in the Council House on Sunday afternoon, June 30, 1816, taking the text, "Behold, I bring you tidings of great joy which shall be to all the people." This was an appropriate text, for the congregation resembled that of the day of Pentecost (which day, incidentally, we celebrate today), for in that early Detroit congregation that day, there were Methodists, Presbyterians, Congregationalists, Baptists, Episcopalians, and probably many without any denominational affiliation.

A happy condition of involvement in the total life of the community and of religious cooperation characterized these early days—John Monteith was close to Governor Cass, General Macomb, and other men of influence, and likewise he and Father Gabriel Richard were on hospitable terms. They often called on one another, dined, and consulted together.

No one group has a monopoly on the effective contribution it made. To the Methodists goes the credit of establishing the first Protestant Church in the Territory, and to the Presbyterians for founding the first in Detroit.

If the first need of a great and magnificent structure is that it have deep foundations, then surely we gladly acknowledge that our fathers in the faith thrust their foundations down to the fundamental bedrock of trust in God and dedication to His truth.

II. DESTINY

1. Our prime task as Christians is to be concerned about the vitality of our religious witness.

Our duty and joy are to proclaim that God is Sovereign Lord. He holds the destinies of mankind in His strong, wise, and loving hands. The prophets of Israel proclaimed the righteous judgment of God, evil in ecclesiastical and political life was rebuked, and the gracious offer of forgiveness and reform was held forth.

There was never any hesitancy to relate the high ethical demands of religion with the problems of everyday life in government, economics, the home, and other areas of individual and social activity.

The luxury of careless criticism is one we cannot afford. The faults are not in organizations or institutions, but in us as individuals who comprise them. It is our honesty, neighborliness, diligence, and vision—based upon an abiding faith in God and the revelation of His Son Jesus Christ—that determines the kind of contribution we are going to make to responsible citizenship in this great State.

In our religious witness we shall be as broad and understanding as possible, without compromising particular aspects of truth which seem valuable to us. We shall compete only in goodness, and even in good works it is sometimes better to cooperate rather than to be inefficiently competitive.

2. Another task confronting us is that of maintaining private and public education at the highest possible level.

The church, historically, has been interested in education, not only of the mind, but of the spirit. "The fear of the Lord is the beginning of knowledge." While the churches have fostered their own schools in order to inculcate more adequately the principles of the Gospel, religion has always had a high stake in public education.

We have spoken of the Reverend John Monteith. It should be remembered that in addition to his religious endeavors he was also the first President of the University of Michigan, founded by Judge Woodward. Later moved to Ann Arbor and reorganized, the great university began to prosper under the wise management of Isaac Crary and the Reverend John D. Pierce.

It is significant to note that the University of Michigan was the first successful State university in America. Other States quickly adopted the plan, and now it is virtually universal in this country.

In State-supported schools the majority of our young people receive their education. Along with academic competence in the various disciplines of science and the arts there can be, without any involvement in sectarian religion, the presentation by precept and example of the basic elements of character and responsible citizenship.

We shall determine to use our best efforts for the support of the public schools at all levels, by adequate financing, by our participation in parent-teacher groups, and by informing ourselves of the goals and progress of our schools.

3. Another concern of Christians should be that of the conservation of the natural resources of our State. Because "the earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof," the gifts of nature are to be used for the benefit of all the people. The treasures of field and forest, the lakes and streams, are to be developed rather than exploited, in the service of our people. We have a stewardship responsibility, a trusteeship, so that all may benefit—and this always in a spirit of gratitude to God who created these treasures.

They were here when we came upon the scene; we did not create them; they were given to us by God. Therefore let us use them wisely and transmit them improved and augumented to those who shall follow us. May they bless us because of our forethought and unselfishness.

4. A fourth concern of Christians is to encourage the cooperative efforts of capital, management, and labor in our industrial economy.

There is no point in our taking sides, for basically we are all on the same team. We ought not to confront each other as enemies but as partners in a significant enterprise. Michigan is justly famed for its large place in the industrial heartland of America. Here are available in abundance the skills of men and machines.

To capital and management the gospel says that "the laborer is worthy of his hire." To labor the divide word is "a workman that needs not to be ashamed," "not slothful"—and to all of us to seek to serve the Lord in our vocations.

The church must no claim to have the solutions to our economic problems, but it does proclaim, on the authority of her Lord, that persons are prime, that work has dignity, that covetousness and greed are wrong, wherever they are found.

Let capital, management, and labor look upon each other with mutual respect, and work together for equitable solutions—so that every person able and willing to work shall find employment. This is the scandal of our time, that for too many there is no place for their skills of body and mind. Let us never become complacent about this, for it is a sin against humanity.

5. Finally, we face in this great State of ours the challenge of racial brotherhood, so that the skills of all our people may wisely be utilized.

Intelligent, sensitive people have been agonizing about this for a long time. Recently, however, under the responsible conviction that time is running out, we are facing with new urgency our problems and opportunities in this area. I think that we here in Michigan can be justly proud of our record in the fight against racial and religious discrimination in the field of employment. The approach, in the Fair Employment Practices Commission, of which I am privileged to be a member, is that of persuasion and conciliation, rather than of legal coercion. Laws and penalties affect our actions but something deeper is needed to affect our attitudes—education and a spirit of brotherly love are needed. Let it be said to the shame of the church that she has not always practiced racial brotherhood. She has made noble pronouncements and large protestations of understanding, but in practice the prejudices of Christians are too often narrow, cruel, and un-Christian. We are failing to follow our Lord and the life of the early church.

Confessing our sin, determining to do better, let us open our minds to information, and our hearts to understanding and Christian love.

CONCLUSION

John Foster Dulles, our esteemed former Secretary of State, who has literally given his life in the service of his country, gave an impressive address in October 1953, at the 150th anniversary of the First Presbyterian Church of Watertown, N.Y., where his father had been pastor for 16 years. His words on that occasion bear repeating here, in part:

"The churches today provide the principal means of drawing together the men, women, and children of our land and of bringing to them knowledge of the faith of those who have gone before, so that today's faith is a contagious and vital force.

"As our churches, synagogues, and other places of worship thus carry an even greater share of vital responsibility, they should be strongly supported by all our citizens, for they all profit from the institutions which faith inspires.

"Sometimes we feel that we are indeed compassed about by a great cloud of witnesses. Each of us knows that, in terms of loved ones who have gone before. We know it as we have read the great Book of Faith and as we are taught the lessons drawn from the story of the great prophets and disciples from the past.

"Let us maintain spiritual communion with them. Let us draw faith and inspiration from their lives. Let us act as we know they would want us to act. Then we, in our turn, will run with steadfastness the course that is set before us. Then we will play worthily our part in keeping alight the flame of freedom."

The conclusion of the matter is that in the light of our noble heritage we stand on the threshold of an even greater destiny. Our State of Michigan is one of the richest among our 50 States in total industrial and agricultural output—ranking seventh, as a matter of fact. How wonderfully we have been blessed.

Shall we rise to the challenge in the light of our equally great spiritual heritage? Varied and wonderful has been the inheritance bequeathed to us by those noble souls of many faiths who have given their lifeblood that we might be the benefactors of what we now have.

The answer is simple, embarrassingly direct and simple—as individuals we must rededicate ourselves to Almighty God, and resolve that in every aspect of our lives—in government, the shop, the school, the home, the church, the factory—we shall make our personal influence count for righteousness. We shall, and do, band together in groups for the furtherance of our common objectives, but ultimately it is up to us as individuals.

The Psalmist cried out in a moment of hesitancy and fearfulness, "If the foundations be removed, what shall the righteous do?" The answer is, "Dig deeper." Human foundations may shift, but the Divine one is still there. "No other foundation can any man lay than that which is already laid in Christ Jesus."

"I am but one in the vast multitude of the world, but I am one. I can't do everything, but I can do something.

"What I can do, I ought to do, and what I ought to do, by the grace of God, I will do."

May God bless our beloved State of Michigan and may we love it and live for it, that here where we are may be the nearest place we know to the Kingdom of God on earth. "Thy will be done on earth—in Michigan—as it is in Heaven." Is that an impossible dream? Jesus didn't think so.

Let us pray.

Dear Heavenly Father—In a spirit of gratitude for all which Thou hast bestowed upon our beloved State and us, we would face the exciting possibility of our destiny. Grant that we do not miss that destiny, which is to become Thy sons in Christ. Through the same Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

SPIRITUAL FOUNDATIONS SUNDAY REMARKS AND GREETINGS BY GOV. G. MENNEN WILLIAMS, OLD MARINERS' CHURCH, DETROIT, MICH., MAY 17, 1959

Representing the people of Michigan in their governmental capacity, I am happy to participate in this Spiritual Foundations Sunday program and bear witness to the people's deep and abiding faith in God the Father of us all, in whom "we live, and move, and have our being" (Acts 17:28).

In our American system of government we believe in the separation of church and State; but this does not mean we believe in the separation of the State from God and morality. Quite the contrary.

As we said in our very first constitution, as well as in our present one, "religion, morality, and learning being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind," it now seems eminently fitting and proper that we begin our Michigan Week celebration with a tribute to our spiritual foundations.

Now only is it fitting and proper that our ideological foundations be spiritual but it is historically true that Michigan's very beginnings were consecrated by the work of missionaries of God of all faiths who had the courage to come to a raw and forbidding country beset with savages to preach the word of God and help develop the blessings of church and civilization.

We have recognized our dependence upon the Almighty for his bounty to us in our constitution's preamble, which says: "The people of the State of Michigan, grateful to Almighty God for the blessings of freedom, and earnestly desiring to keep these blessings undiminished to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this constitution."

Indeed, the good Lord has been kind to us with spiritual and material blessings. We have been a State of churches and synagogues. We have been a State of homes and family fellowship. We have been a State that has valued morality and civic virtue, and we have recognized that all these things come from God. With Saint Augustine we have recognized—"without him, we cannot; without us, he will not."

The State has been blessed with physical resources and beauty that have helped make us the fastest growing State in this part of the country and one of the three fastest growing big States in the Nation. It is not without ample reason that our State motto is—if you seek a beautiful peninsula look about you. Here man has encouragement to commune with nature and the God of all nature.

The resources that our good lands and waters possess and the contributions of the people called here from every clime and kindred have made our State a good one in which to live to do our business and to bring up our children. Our State is the sixth richest in the land and our schools are among the very best.

We have gone from strength to strength and we will go from strength to strength. Basically it will not be the economic power of our factories, the riches of our lands or waters, or even the many skills of our peoples that will guide up to ever better days. It will be that most important of all strengths and resources, the spiritual foundations of our people that will permit us to find favor before God and our fellow men.

So on this Michigan Week's spiritual foundations Sunday, as Governor of the people of Michigan, I join you humbly and with profound belief in paying tribute to our spiritual foundations and in rededicating ourselves to the God of our fathers who has brought us to the blessings of this day and will bring us to the joys of the world to come.

The Gold Outflow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 26, 1959

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of RECORD an article from the May 22 issue of Newsweek by Henry Hazlitt, discussing the outflow of gold from the United States, a situation of growing concern in the battle against inflation.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GOLD OUTFLOW

(By Henry Hazlitt)

Last year the United States lost the record amount of $2.3 billion of gold. The outflow slowed down in the first 3 months of this year to only $92 million. But in April and the first 2 weeks of May it rose to $197 million for the 6 weeks.

It is sometimes said that any concern about the present outflow of gold is premature. The reasons given are that, even though the U.S. gold stock has declined from its peak of $24.6 billion in 1949 to its present level of $20.2 billion, this is still a tremendous sum and more than half of all the monetary gold in the world. It is also contended that this loss of gold is actually healthy because it makes for a sounder distribution of gold reserves and strengthens the currencies of other countries.

Any complacency about the situation, however, is unwarranted. Though some $20 billion is still held in the United States, it is not, strictly speaking, owned by the United States. The "free" gold supply is comparatively small. The notes and deposits of the Federal Reserve banks are required by law to be backed by 25 percent of gold. As of May 6, this called for a gold cover of $11.7 billion, leaving the Treasury with only $8.5 billion of "free" monetary gold.

(It is also instructive to recall that if Congress had not reduced the reserve requirements to only 25 percent as a "war" measure in 1945, and had kept the previous requirements of 35 percent gold reserve against deposits and 40 percent against notes, the amount of "free" gold today would be only $2.5 billion.)

WHAT THE THREAT IS

As against the Treasury gold holdings, banks in the United States already have short-term liabilities to foreigners totaling $16.6 billion. So if foreigners really elected to withdraw their deposits and short-term assets in gold, and could do so through their central banks, the situation would become very serious.

One of the explanations most frequently offered for the loss of U.S. gold in the last 16 months is a deficit in the balance of payments with the rest of the world. This explanation confuses cause and effect, and suggests the wrong remedies. The chief reason for the outflow of gold is distrust of the future of the American dollar, brought about by our inflationary policies. These policies also cause the deficit in the balance of payments. Unless we have the sense and courage to halt these inflationary policies in time, the withdrawal of gold could become accelerative.

FOUR POSSIBLE STEPS

Discussing this subject in Newsweek of December 22, 1958, I listed a few specific steps we should consider to restore confidence in the dollar. I repeat the substance of them here, with some change in emphasis and detail:

1. The Federal Reserve Board should definitely abandon the effort to make money artificially cheap by open-market purchases, further reduction in reserve requirements, and similar measures. Firm interest rates will not only discourage the withdrawal of foreign balances but stop encouragement to credit expansion.

2. The administration and Congress should take dramatic steps toward slashing the deficit and balancing or even overbalancing the budget. They should do this not by increasing taxes still further (which would

only act as a deterrent to production) but by slashing unjustified expenditures. Swollen veterans' aid and the whole farm subsidy and price-support program are obvious candidates for the ax.

3. It makes no sense to continue and even to expand an enoromous foreign-aid program when our problem is already inflation, excessive Government spending, the loss of gold to foreigners, and a deficit in the balance of payments. Our military-aid program should be much more selective. Our economic-aid program, which rests on dubious socialistic assumptions, should be discontinued. Particularly ill-timed is the pending subscription of some $1.3 billion by our Government to the International Monetary Fund, which operates on questionable monetary assumptions.

4. Revise the Federal legislation and NLRB decisions that enable labor leaders to force excessive wage rates on employers and tend to price our products out of world markets.

Visit the United States, See South Dakota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 26, 1959

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the President of the United States has proclaimed the year 1960 as Visit the United States of America Year. The purpose of this program, of course, is to encourage foreign visitors to come to our shores.

I would go one step further, by not only inviting our friends from overseas to visit the United States of America, but also by encouraging the American people to make 1960 a year in which they will visit areas of the country which they have not visited before.

In calling attention to the visit America program, I want to mention my home State of South Dakota, and, in particular, to cite what one famous American citizen said about our State.

He is the late Frank Lloyd Wright, world famous architect, who described a visit to South Dakota in a letter to his friend, Robert D. Lusk, publisher of the Huron Daily Plainsman. Mr. Lusk published this letter shortly after Mr. Wright passed away.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the article from the Huron Daily Plainsman printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, because I think it portrays most graphically one of the scenic wonders of this country which I am happy to invite Americans from all our States to visit.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AFTER 1935 VISIT FRANK LLOYD WRIGHT LAUDED BEAUTIES OF SOUTH DAKOTA

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Frank Lloyd Wright, noted architect who died recently at the age of 89, was extremely impressed by the beauties of South Dakota in a trip to the State in 1935. He graphically described his impressions in a letter to Robert D. Lusk, publisher of The Daily Plainsman, and the letter later was printed in a book, "Frank Lloyd Wright on Achitecture," published in 1941. The following is a reprint of that letter.)

(In this letter are ideas which should add new layers of meaning to Wright's constant use of the words "nature" and "natural." His imaginative response to nature, as shown here, stands with our best traditional literature of travel and topographic description.)

To ROBERT D. LUSK, *the Evening Huronite, Huron, S. Dak.*

DEAR BOB: Speaking of our trip to the Big Bad Lands, Black Hills, and Spearfish Canyon. I've been about the world a lot and pretty much over our own country; but I was totally unprepared for that revolution called the Dakota Bad Lands. From Mitchell, Paul Bellamy was driving a fair 70 over the brown Dakota prairie to reach the Bad Lands before sunset. About 4, afternoon, something came into view that made me sit up straight and look at Bellamy to see if he saw what I saw. "Oh," said he, "you've seen nothing yet." But I had. What I saw gave me an indestructible sense of mysterious otherwise—a distinct architecture, ethereal, touched, only touched with a sense of Egyptain, Mayan drift and silhouette. As we came closer a templed realm definitely stood ambient in air before my astonished "scene," loving but scene-jaded gaze. The streamline working on a vast plateau of solid cream white clay, something like "calichi," had sculptured this familiar world into one unfamiliar but entrancing.

Endless trabeations surmounted by or rising into pyramid (obelisk) and temple, ethereal in color and exquisitely chiseled in endless detail, they began to reach to infinity spreading into the sky on every side; and endless supernatural world more spiritual than earth but created out of it. As we rode, or seemed to be floating upon a splendid winding road that seemed to understand it all and just where to go, we rose and fell between its delicate parallels of rose and and cream and sublime shapes, chalk white, fretted against a blue sky with high floating clouds; the sky itself seemed only there to cleanse and light the vast harmonious building scheme.

Of course I am an architect and that ride through the land of pure line and evanescent color affected me strangly. Here was the element, architecture, cut of the body of the ground itself, beggaring human imagination, prostrating the simplicities of man before the great cosmic simplicity. Reverence, yes, awe. Deep satisfaction, harmonious like great music drifted over the senses until a new sacred realm was born of light, delicate color and ever-changing but immaculate form wherein not even the senses could touch bottom, top, nor sides of its vast repose.

Here, for once, came complete release from materiality. Communion with what man often calls God is inevitable in this place. It is everywhere around him and when the man emerges to the brown plateau and looks back, as I did, the sun now setting, a pale moon rising in darkening rose and blue sky as rays of last light drifted over, linking drifting water lines of dark rose in pallid creamy walls, gently playing with the sky line, with mingled obelisks, terraces, and temples more beautiful than thought, eternal, who knows, a strange sense of inner experience will come to him of a crisis in his perception of what he has termed beauty. He will leave that place a more humble, seeking soul than when he went in to this pure appeal to his spirit. He will know baptism in its higher than sectarian sense.

Let sculptors come to the Bad Lands. Let painters come. But, first of all, the true architect should come. He who could interpret this vast gift of nature in terms of human habitation so that Americans on their own continent might glimpse a new and higher civilization certainly, and touch it and feel it as they lived in it and deserved to call it their own. Yes, I say the aspects of the Dakota Bad Lands have more spiritual quality to impart to the mind of America than anything else in it made by man's God.

I turned to Bellemy and finally said, "But how is it that I've heard so little of this miracle and we, toward the Atlantic, have heard so much of the Grand Canyon when this is even more miraculous?"

"Oh," said he slyly, "we are not on the through line to the coast."

"Never mind," I said, "all the better eventually." And we drove on to the famous Black Hills which the fame of Borglum's work had already brought to my attention.

Next day, Bellamy again at the wheel, from fine little Rapid City, well set in low hills (what could not that town do for itself if it knew how to live accordingly), several of us drove up another finely laid-out road that seemed to know what the region was all about, through scenery I had often heard of as beautiful. But a more flesh and blood kind of beauty. The beauty that apepals surely to a human being because he is human and brother to the tree and respects individualistic rock formations. Here they are great but not too great. All has the charm of human scale which many great western scenes lack, and invites the wanderer to enter into the spirit of it all and rest. No home for man the Rocky Mountains; no, nor perhaps the Bad Lands, yet; but an ideal home; these Black Hills. Do not think from this that the Hills are unexciting. They are exciting but they stir a different region of the soul; we call it the heart probably. There are stone needles, stone spires, stone piles and stone artificial lakes, tall beautiful pines, wooded gorges, more free standing and sculptured rock masses in nature's own style than one has ever seen before grouped in one area. So it seems fitting that some hand of man should brush aside the realistic veil of stained weathered rock and let the mind of man himself envision his own greatness and his fate alongside the titanic handiwork of nature.

Human nature, let us hope to eventually nature's higher nature, found its hand for this is Gutzon Borglum's masterhand and the face of the great leader of his country. The noble countenance emerges from Rushmore as though the spirit of the mountain had heard as human prayer and itself became a human countenance. The countenance haunts you as you ride * * *; winds and falls with you as freight through depths of pine woods; huge rocks standing about you, themselves statues of a more elemental thought than Gutzon Borglum's: The cosmic urge.

We passed by a quiet land-locked lake (Stockade Lake) that seems to be there with a manmade white sand shore to invite you to get out and stay and rest and drink in the breath of the pines as the breezes print themselves on the surface of the placid water. This Black Hills country has charm, inviting you to get out and go about or stay about. It is a lingering kind of human satisfaction for the soul, hungry of a tired body, the recreation of any jaded mind compelled to live by the abacus, money.

You may think all this the feeling of the moment, a mood, and because I was in good company. But no. I am an old soldier of the spirit, a veteran in time, place, and man. I could not be mistaken. Go and see.

We wound on upward to Sylvan Lake, a gem spot in the hills where South Dakota plans to entertain her guests. It may be that South Dakota sees a body of water so seldom that her citizens overvalue it for the lake is artificial and small, but what a setting. Here a sweeping mountain resort, with the lake as a vignette seen below, could be as masterful a thing of the kind, woven in with the great rich rock and tree foreground, framing the vistas of this spot; another and a higher kind of nature understanding well

and loving the earth from which it springs, loving it too much to imitate it.

Harney Peak loomed to one side. Turning from the little rock-defended, rockbound lake your gaze travels away along blue ridges ornamented by great rock piles to distant blue mountain tops, as far away as the human eye can go beneath the clouds. Round about you, rugged strengths, forest depths, primeval earth at best; well, an architect is speaking.

There was a hotel there once but nature disposed of it in her inscrutable way, for cause. It was ugly.

Notwithstanding the expenditure of riches, so far, there were wonders left for tomorrow. And Spitz, as I felt like calling him by now, came with Ted Lusk's car to drive me to Spearfish Canyon. I felt a little dull toward Spearfish. I had seen two marvels unique in the scenery of the world. I felt headed in for an anticlimax and said so. The boys said, "No." These South Dakota boys by now had me where I believed that they knew their stuff. They couldn't have built those superb roads in the Bad Lands and Black Hills if they didn't know.

So I patiently waited and visited with Spitz as we rode away. We stopped at Homestake, of which everyone has heard, and saw how a primitive gold mining operation has been turned over to the power of the machine and remains primitive just the same. The resources of machinery couldn't change the original steps or even the original way of mining except to cut down the manpower involved.

By afternoon we got in by Spearfish, a mountain torrent beginning a canyon 26 miles long. Not very interesting at first, I had seen so many; the Western States are full of them, as everyone knows. The road here is haphazard as hazard was and is none too good. "Spitz" drove well, fortunately. And the stream itself was something but after a half hour things began to happen. We would be headed straight for gigantic white walls trabeated in ledges from which pines sprouted and grew in precisely the manner of the pictorial dreams of the great Chinese landscape painting of those great periods, and they were mostly landscapes, can see the character of the Spearfish ensemble.

Great horizontal rock walls abruptly rising above torrential streams, their stratified surfaces decorated (it is the word) with red pine stems carving stratified branches in horizontal textures over the cream white wall, multiplied red pine trunks and the black green masses of the pines rhythmically repeating pattern, climbing, climbing until the sky disappeared or was a narrow rift of blue as the clear water poured over the pebbles or pooled under the heavy masses of green at the foot of the grand rock walls.

Well, here was something again different. As different as could be from Bad Lands or Black Hills or anything I had actually seen, a stately exposition of what decorated walls on enormous scale can do and be. These Chinese predicted it and depicted it. This continued for miles and miles without palling or growing in the least stale. We drove out, finally, and turned away from Spearfish town to get back, two architects drunk with primal scene painting, to Gutzon Borglum's little dinner. A third type of earthly marvel was now added to the two. All unique and unparalleled elsewhere in our country.

But now came an unexpected experience. That drive from the Canyon "Spearfish" to Rapid City. Does anyone who knows California and Arizona know that in the softly modeled brown surfaces of South Dakota binding these three wonders together is a terrain greater in charm than any to be found in either? A sweep of modeling and a tender color (it is early September) and a variety of aspect matchless anywhere?

No, I shall be burned for a heretic when I make the statement. But I should be thanked as a prophet and hailed as a discoverer by the jaded public who have seen everything and stick to the through lines. The greatest scenic wonders of the world I know now are touched on grand safe highways but not on railroads. My hat is off to South Dakota's treasures and the men who made them.

We got back in time for Gutzon's little dinner where some Rapid City folk were gathered together to welcome a stranger. He, Gutzon Borglum, of course, is master in more than one medium. The way he handled his dinner, the guests (among them Congressman Harry Gandy), and handled me too, was a masterpiece. Ask anybody there. Gutzon broke down. I like him for it, and anyway, I like those South Dakota folk; I want to see them all again sometime if I can.

Go to South Dakota, but drive there. It is so near to us all and yet I never knew, nor had ever heard much about its southwestern treasure until Gutzon Borglum went out there to work and Senator Norbeck invited me to see it.

I hope the noble inheritance, for that is what it is, won't be exploited too much and spoiled as lesser beauty spots in our country have been spoiled and will not continue to be marred by the nature imitator with his rustic effects, piled boulders, peeled logs, and imitation of camp style primitive gable buildings. Nature seeds from man not imitation but interpretation. It is quite another story, as you may learn.

Lake Michigan Water Diversion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PHILIP A. HART

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 26, 1959

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent article entitled "Ike Believed Ready To Veto Water 'Steal,'" written by James M. Haswell and published in the Detroit Free Press of May 24, 1959.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IKE BELIEVED READY TO VETO WATER "STEAL"—CANADA PROTEST STIFFENS POSITION OF LAKES STATES

(Some wonder why there's so much excitement over Chicago's proposal to take 1,000 cubic feet of water a second from the Great Lakes. A thousand of anything doesn't sound like much.

(But consider this: In a year 1,000 cubic feet per second is enough to cover the entire 920-square-mile Chicago Sanitary District with water more than 6 feet deep. Its about 2½ times the district's yearly rain and snowfall. That's a lot of water.

(In this article, Writer James M. Haswell explains why Lakes States—and particularly Canada—fight the "water steal.")

(By James M. Haswell)

WASHINGTON.—Michigan has gained a powerful ally in the fight against Chicago's water steal.

Senators on both sides of the issue recognize that Canada's protest note this year sets the stage for a rousing Eisenhower veto if a bill permitting additional diversion reaches the White House.

President Eisenhower vetoed bills like this in 1954 and 1956 but this year he has a good new reason:

Canada has a big stake in Great Lakes navigation and power—relatively greater than the United States has.

And this time Canada has chosen to make its views official as well as frank.

"The Government of Canada," it said, in an April 9 note, "is opposed to any action which will have the effect of reducing the volume of water in the Great Lakes Basin."

But persuading Congress and the President to overrule the Supreme Court's 1930 Great Lakes edict isn't the only water diversion issue in Washington.

There are other four issues:

The Supreme Court in 1930 promised Chicago that after 1938 it could take 1,500 cubic feet of Lake Michigan water per second and flush it down the Chicago drainage system into the Illinois-Mississippi Waterway.

Nobody is seeking to change this.

Chicago is asking for 1,000 cubic feet per second more water, however, for a trial year to determine what it should seek permanently.

This bill is now in the Senate Public Works Committee.

In its 1930 ruling the Supreme Court authorized Chicago to take unlimited amounts of Lake Michigan water for domestic use, and dispose of it down the Illinois-Mississippi Waterway.

Chicago's citizens and industries now use 1,800 cubic feet per second, lowering the levels of Lakes Michigan and Huron 2 inches.

Michigan and other Great Lake States are asking the Supreme Court to appoint a special master to review the situation, and recommend changes in the 1930 ruling.

This ruling is not a fixed one—change is possible.

The Michigan view is that Chicago ought to return domestic pumpage to the lakes after proper sewage treatment as other Great Lakes cities do.

U.S. Solicitor General J. Lee Rankin notified the Court April 14 that he now agrees in part with the protesting States.

He would have the Court name a special master to look into new and future diversion questions.

When President Eisenhower turned down the 1956 Chicago water bill he suggested the Army Engineers determine exactly what effect various diversion proposals would have.

This Army report forms the basis for current diversion arguments, both in Congress and in Supreme Court briefs.

The report says that diversion of 1,000 cubic feet per second permanently would mean lowering the average levels of Lakes Michigan and Huron an inch over 15 years. Chicago's diversion since 1938 has lowered the lakes 2.76 inches, it said.

But since 1945 Canada has diverted 5,000 cubic feet per second from the Albany River Basin into Lake Superior and the International Joint Commission has allowed this to spill over into Lakes Michigan and Huron, the Army says.

This has raised the Michigan-Huron level 4.44 inches, and produced a net gain of 1.68 inches.

Thus Canada's diversion into the Great Lakes has more than compensated for Chicago's diverison out of the Great Lakes.

The Army found that lowering the lake levels an inch would mean lake shipping could transport 330,000 fewer tons of cargo a season through the St. Clair-Detroit River channels, the high-water years in with the low-water years.

This would mean a yearly shipping loss of more than $360,000.

It also found the lessened volume of water reaching the St. Lawrence would mean up to $2 million a year hydroelectric power loss to plants in Canada and New York.

In his Supreme Court brief, Michigan Attorney General Paul L. Adams discussed the effect of diversion on harbors and recreation facilities. There are 100 improved harbors in the Great Lakes area, he said, and low water tends to nullify the expensive improvements.

Low water also damages unimproved harbors used by pleasure craft. And it depreciates investments in commercial summer resorts, and private sports areas, private summer cottages, etc.

Low water is a continuing injury, he said, to the welfare and prosperity of people in Michigan, Wisconsin, Ohio, and New York.

Low water does extensive damage to fishing and hunting grounds, spawning beds, and open marshes which are the natural habitat of extensive and valuable wildlife, Adams said.

In the same sense it damages public investments in parks, camping grounds, and fish hatcheries.

State Conservation Director Gerald Eddy is on record as saying that low water will dry up excellent hunting grounds, and that only a few inches of lowering may work damage that will continue for 15 years.

During the House debate several speakers argued that it makes no sense to spend $146 million to dig the navigation channels of the upper lakes deeper, and at the same time permit Chicago to lower the water levels by diverting more water.

The Government's Exchange Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 26, 1959

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, from time to time I receive letters from U.S. and foreign students who have received grants under the Government's exchange program.

These letters are a real testimony to the contributions made by this program to better international understanding.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD several recent letters I have received from recipients of these grants.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHAPEL HILL, N.C.,
May 10, 1959.

Senator WILLIAM FULBRIGHT,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: As a visiting scholar to the United States from the Netherlands, I shall soon return to my home country. I was awarded a travel grant under the act with your name.

This is to express how much I appreciate to have had the opportunity to have been in this country for more than a year and to thank you for the way you have promoted such visits.

Not only for the very valuable sake of science—statistics in my case—but also for that of human relations in general, such an exchange cannot be recommended enough.

I must confess that the one-sided view on the United States which I had acquired in a country that spiritually is much nearer to yours than many others in this divided world, has been changed and that in a more favorable sense.

Although this does not mean that we (I am accompanied by my wife and two children) would approve or prefer everything we have found here, we are impressed by a lot of things.

Besides the material wealth we hold as most striking features; the great freedom (unfortunately sometimes abused, or withheld in practical situations), the spread of real culture, the cordiality and hospitality of the people, the close connection of politicians and officeholders with their electorate, and finally, the opportunity for almost everybody to rise to a level according to his abilities.

We do not pretend that after our stay here we know everything about this country, but we know there are many admirable things, and we hope to tell that to our countrymen.

With best wishes for the continuation of your beautiful task.

Very sincerely yours,

L. C. A. CORSTEN.

UNIVERSITÉ DE BORDEAUX,
FACULTÉ DES LETTRES
ET SCIENCES HUMAINES,
March 12, 2959.

The Honorable J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT,
Senator from Arkansas,
The Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: It seemed to me that you would welcome an informal account of activities concerning my Fulbright grant as visiting professor in social psychology. We spent the first semester at the Université de Rennes, and have just arrived here for the second.

My official duties involve teaching case-discussion, role-playing, and group dynamics techniques. All involve active participation by the students. They explain, discuss, argue, and try out possible solutions. Analysis, diagnosis, and understanding of problems in human relations is stressed. In my opinion, these courses are particularly appropriate to the ideals for which you conceived this program. Process and goal are essentially democratic.

My French students are enthusiastic and responsive. At the Sorbonne, where it was an honor to give a brief series, American psychology was rated highly also. However, teaching is only part of the picture.

At the université, mine is an "open door" policy (no political pun intended). My office door is open most of the time. Students, faculty, and townspeople have found an open ear and an open mind. They borrow my American books, journals, and newspapers.

On and off campus speeches and appearances have been numerous and varied. They have concerned various aspects of psychology, education, science, and counseling. Unfortunately, too many know only the unpleasant side. My contribution, thpugh a drop in the bucket, has exposed the other side. The French have accepted this. They stand for fair play just as we do.

A number of personal contacts with French negro students led me to wangle a talk for the African Students' Association. After a presentation involving history and current events; they peppered me with loaded questions. It was rough going and I didn't know what the score was until the end. Then, they all came up, shook hands, and insisted on walking me home.

We have gained too—a deeper appreciation and understanding of the French people, politics, art, history, and everyday life. As you have guessed by now, this is a most rewarding and challenging year. Undoubtedly, some things were loaded in my favor. For example, my courses and talks are 100 percent in French, which reaches a wider audience. My U.S. Navy service in France during World War II has opened many doors. Then too, my wife has learned French and this has widened social contacts with French people. In addition, the Fulbright Commission, the U.S. Information Service, and the State Department have been very helpful in many ways.

However, the scientist within me raises a note of caution. Undoubtedly, some of these favorable reactions were due to novelty, humor, and color (my own color slides of scenery and university life in the United States of America). However, there remains a genuine conviction that some people have really listened, some have changed, and others have, at least, begun to ask important questions. One thing is certain—anytime a Frenchman who has been Fulbrighting in the United States of America talked to me, he was full of enthusiasm and praise.

If someone were to ask me what is most important conclusion you can draw from this experience, this is what I would say:

There is no substitute for personal, face-to-face contact. Films, newspapers, books, etc., can achieve only limited results. You can only really reach people by listening to them, exchanging points of view, trying to understand each other. In my opinion, we need more personal exchanges with more different peoples of the world, and on every level.

In conclusion, do you have any general or specific question that I might answer? If there is anything I can do, please let me know.

Sincerely,

LEONARD A. OSTLUND,
Fulbright Visiting Professor in Social Psychology on Leave From, Kent State University, Kent, Ohio.

MANILA, PHILIPPINES,
March 27, 1959.

Hon. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT,
Senator, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR FULBRIGHT: Please permit me to express my gratitude to you for having initiated this system of extending financial aid to foreign students. I was one of the Filipino Fulbright travel grantees for the year 1956–57. The travel grant enabled me to accept the Ida H. Hyde fellowship given by the International Federation of University Women through the American Association of University Women.

I came to know the American people, their family life and their honored traditions. Upon my return I was appointed head of the department of nutrition at the Philippine Women's University, Manila.

I hope and pray that Our Lord gives you a long and happy life and that He continues to sustain and bless the American people.

Sincerely yours,

ANGELINA ALCARAZ-BAYAN, M.D.

UNIVERSITY OF DAYTON,
Dayton, May 8, 1959.

Senator WILLIAM FULBRIGHT,
Chairman, Senate Foreign Relations Committee, U.S. Capitol, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FULBRIGHT: Being one of the beneficiaries of your foreign policy, thanks to a travel grant, I want to express to you personally my deepest gratitude, especially in this 14th anniversary of the armistice of 1945.

You gave me, and to many other students, the chance of our life, to appreciate your big country and to help to our level to the world peace and international understanding.

Since I arrived in the United States in September 1958, I have been able to see the considerable influence and prestige you have acquired in the international and national political milieus.

Hoping that some constructive elements to a world peace and coexistence will result from the Geneva talks, I am, dear Mr. FULBRIGHT,

Very respectfully yours,

JEAN REMY.

Bureau of Land Management and U.S. Forest Service Operations in Western Oregon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 26, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, many people in my State have been concerned over recent discussion of the proposal to consolidate Bureau of Land Management timberlands in western Oregon under the U.S. Forest Service. Both of these agencies are outstanding in their field, and they are staffed by able and dedicated men and women.

Mr. Eric W. Allen, managing editor of the Medford (Oreg.) Mail-Tribune, has written a thoughtful and analytical editorial in his paper of May 17, 1959, which discusses in detail the proposed amalgamation. Mr. Allen cites the fact that many county officials in our State would be seriously alarmed if the revenue distribution from Oregon and California lands, of 75 percent to county governments and 25 percent to the Federal Government, were shifted to the Forest Service basis of just the opposite—25 percent locally and 75 percent federally. the Oregon and California distribution, under the Bureau of Land Management, has historical reasons which justify it, because these lands are quite different in origin from those which comprise the bulk of the national forests.

It is my opinion that many of my colleagues will be interested in the informative discussion written by Eric W. Allen, and I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that his editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Mail Tribune, Medford, Oreg., May 17, 1959]

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT AND FOREST SERVICE

(By Eric W. Allen)

The proposal currently in the news, which would place administration of Oregon and California forest lands of the Bureau of Land Management under the administration of the Forest Service, is not a new one. It keeps popping up from time to time.

According to A. Robert Smith, our correspondent in Washington, the proposal probably will have tough sledding, for the reason that Fred Seaton, Secretary of the Interior, is opposed to it.

(The Bureau of Land Management is part of the Interior Department; the Forest Service is part of the Department of Agriculture.)

There are valid arguments on both sides of the proposal.

One of the State's best-informed men on the subject is Charles A. Sprague, who as an editor, as a former Governor of the State, and as a member of the Oregon and California advisory committee, has been closely informed on the problems of the Bureau of Land Management in Oregon for many years. He concludes that:

"* * * The gains from the Bureau of Land Management's intensive management outweigh possible savings in overhead. However, good forestry will prevail whether the merger is made or not, because of the public demand for it."

He is undoubtedly correct in that conclusion. But some heated arguments can be generated about the proposal, just the same.

For instance, the Bureau of Land Management sells timber on a cruise basis—that is, Bureau of Land Management foresters mark the trees to be cut, and set a price for them as they stand. The Forest Service sells on a scale basis—or an actual measurement of the board feet of lumber as the logs come out of the forest by truck.

Some loggers prefer one method; some another. And in any meeting of lumbermen it's possible to stir up a discussion over the merits or demerits of each.

Another factor, probably even more important to the smaller lumber operator, is the fact that most national forest land is in fairly large blocks, while Oregon and California lands are to a large extent scattered in intermingled ownerships, many of them in fairly small plots. As a result the Bureau of Land Management tends to offer a larger percentage of smaller sales than the Forest Service—sales which the small logger can afford to bid on.

Both agencies, as Governor Sprague points out, are dedicated to good forest management and silviculture, and both, as they gain experience and are provided with necessary funds, are doing an increasingly good job.

Because of the patterns of ownership, the Forest Service has worked out its system of ranger districts, with men living in the area where they work, while Bureau of Land Management personnel usually is concentrated in the immediate area of the district office, driving out to the field when necessary.

The Forest Service is dedicated to multiple-purpose use of the forests. The Bureau of Land Management, a more recent comer to the field of forest management, only now is working more and more toward this ideal, but does not have the facilities to do the same job in some fields, such as recreation, that the Forest Service does.

One principal reason why the proposal will meet opposition, particularly in the 18 Oregon and California counties of western Oregon, is the fact that while both agencies turn part of their land revenues over to the counties, they do it under different formulas.

Revenue from Oregon and California lands goes to the counties in which they are located on a basis of 75 percent to the counties, 25 percent to the Federal Government. (In recent years, the counties have allocated one-third of their 75 percent to construction of access roads and reforestation. The remaining portion has no strings to it, as to how counties may use it.)

Revenue from Forest Service lands go 25 percent to the counties and 75 percent to the Federal Government. The counties' portion must be used for school and road purposes.

One can readily see, therefore, why the Oregon and California counties would fight tooth and nail against any proposal which threatened the substantial source of income which the Oregon and California lands represents. In Jackson County, for instance, it is the Oregon and California revenues which have made the levying of a tax for county purposes unnecessary recently.

An administrative reorganization, placing Oregon and California lands under Forest Service administration, would not affect the distribution formula, for that is provided by law. However, it might lead Congress to reconsider the formula—something that gives Oregon and California county officials the shakes just to think about.

In addition, it would create a major disruption in the Bureau of Land Management office here, for the Medford district office devotes a major part of its activities to Oregon and California lands, less to other Bureau of Land Management responsibilities. It would also cause an upheaval in the administration of the Rogue River and Siskiyou National Forests, which would be faced with a tremendously increased job virtually overnight.

As nearly as we can determine, no decision has yet been made, despite rumors published in an upstate newspaper that the proposal has "already gained official sanction and will be instituted as of June 1, 1959." This rumor, almost certainly, is wrong, for such a reorganization plan must be submitted to Congress 60 days before becoming effective. If it wishes, Congress can veto the suggestion within that period of time.

If it is to be done this year, it will have to be done soon, because of the 60-day limitation.

Because of the controversial aspects of the plan, we will be somewhat surprised if it is undertaken, soon, anyway.

Observance of Law Day, May 1, 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 26, 1959

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, in Europe, May first is a political holiday. It is used for demonstrations and parades by certain firmly oriented political groups.

In America, May Day is marked as a happy rededication to our democratic way of life. Seriously, even solemnly, but happily and freely it is observed in America as Children's Day, as Law Day, as Loyalty Day. Various groups and organizations emphasize their own ideals; there's no fixed and firm pattern to tell us how to rejoice or how, indeed, to rededicate ourselves to our American way of life.

Parent-teacher groups and many women's clubs and church groups emphasize our American concern for child welfare. The American Bar Association calls for the observance of Law Day on May 1. Veterans organizations call the day "Loyalty Day" and pledge again their devotion to the flag under which they have served our country.

Some groups combine all these approaches. It is good to know that in our schools throughout the Nation May 1 is happily observed as Law Day, Children's Day, Loyalty Day.

Typical of these programs is one held in Eastern High School in Washington, D.C. Here, a public-spirited principal, Mr. Lynn Woodworth, himself a veteran of two world wars, gave the students a chance to hear Mrs. Milton Dunn, the very able president of the District of Columbia League of Women Voters, an organization which wisely and continuously in daily practice observes Children's Day, Law Day, and Loyalty Day in their splendid study programs—programs supplemented by constructive

community action. And, he gave them something more, he had the police officer who works with the school in its citizenship program speak also. Officer Murray who has won the respect of teachers and students of this school gave them his daily message—but this time from the school's rostrum.

Because these addresses are a fine example of what goes on, of what our schools give our children, by way of example, I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF OFFICER GEORGE MURRAY OF THE METROPOLITAN POLICE FORCE GIVEN ON LAW DAY, MAY 1, 1959, AT THE EASTERN HIGH SCHOOL, WASHINGTON, D.C.

"Fame is vapor; popularity an accident; riches take wings; those who cheer today will curse tomorrow; only one thing endures—character."

This quotation from one of the foremost newspapermen of America, Horace Greeley, captures the spirit of the ideas I wish to present to you this morning, for I believe that good character is the basis of good citizenship. What makes for good character also makes for good citizenship. A person who possesses the traits which are the cornerstones, the foundation, of good character, cannot help but be a worthwhile citizen. Let's examine the parts of good character to see how they relate to citizenship.

First, a person of upright character respects the rights of others. He is always aware of the other fellow—no matter what the situation. He constantly puts himself into the position of his associates, and tries to understand their point of view. Not only does he respect the rights of individuals, but he also respects the property and belongings of others.

Secondly, a person of upright character is honest with himself. If he makes a mistake he doesn't brood over it. He sets his sights on tomorrow, and promises himself that he won't make the same mistake again. He doesn't rationalize, or make excuses for himself. He faces this complex personality, which is himself, truthfully and hopefully. He does not take a detour around problems, nor does he withdraw from them by feigning illness or resorting to escapes, like alcoholism.

No matter who you are, or where you are, you have problems. Everyone does. Life is one problem after another. "Shut the doors and sit in your house, yet trouble will fall from the skies," says a Chinese proverb.

Often we tend to exaggerate our problems. "I cried because I had no shoes, until I met a man with no feet," goes an old saying. Our worry over some minor problem or setback sometimes seems ridiculous in comparison to the courage shown by others with serious problems. It takes strength of character to keep our perspective and maintain the third distinguishing sign of a healthy character—personal courage and integrity.

John Bunyan was arrested in England in 1660 for preaching without a license. During his many years in prison, he had only dry bread to eat and dirty water to drink. He supported his wife and four daughters by making shoe-laces. After many years he was released, only to be put back into prison again. During his second imprisonment, Bunyan wrote "Pilgrim's Progress"—one of the most remarkable books of all time, on scraps of paper in his prison cell.

Strength of character implies self-confidence, and gives us the fourth characteristic of this strength, which is self-respect. Nobody is self-confident at all times. All of us feel frightened, stupid, foolish, self-conscious, embarrassed, or uncomfortable at times. But a person can learn to be self-reliant, most of the time, if he heeds his conscience and becomes his own policeman. One should never be afraid to stand up for what he knows is right, even when others try to persuade him to do otherwise. Self-control, the taming of emotions, helps in this respect.

Sportsmanship and fair play are the fifth attributes of strength and character. A sense of fair play is a time-tested virtue. It dates back to the oldtime ideal of chivalry—loyalty, unselfishness, a sense of honor, and the ability to be a good loser.

There is a need today for a return to this old-fashioned ideal. Too many of us make a motto of the statement "Nice guys finish last."

Sportsmanship is playing hard to win, but losing gracefully if you have to lose. It calls for keen rivalry, but fair play; strict observance of rules, but generosity toward opponents. The pride and self-respect which comes from good sportsmanship are worth much more than any prize—even the Presidency.

Henry Clay knew this. Clay was admired by his friends for his honesty, generosity, and gallantry. During his career, however, Clay, a Kentuckian, spoke out against slavery. The speech ruined his chances for the Presidency. Clay remarked, "I'd rather be right than President." To Clay, as to all persons of character, fair play was more important than winning.

An interest in and understanding of others implies unselfishness. This unselfishness fosters kindness, courtesy, helpfulness, and a greatness which are characteristic of strength.

Tennyson once said, "The greater the man, the greater the courtesy." Ed Sullivan puts it this way, "The bigger they are, the nicer they are." Reflection and inner seeking should assist us in sizing ourselves up. "You should stand still each day and watch yourself go by," a wise Quaker once remarked. Good mental health, a cheerful and healthy personality assist us in our acceptance of fellow humans. It is far easier to get along in this complex world if one possesses self-understanding and an understanding of the next person.

Respect for the rights of others, honesty to one's self, personal courage and integrity, self-respect, sportsmanship and fair play, and an understanding of one's fellow man are the essential attributes of good character.

A person can't alter his fingerprints, or change the color of his eyes, but he can mold and improve his character. "We are the sum total of our actions," said Madame Chiang Kai-Shek. "* * * day by day, we write our own destiny, for we become what we do." Strength of character gives a person the inner glow which everyone admires. High moral character is the keystone of good citizenship.

AN ADDRESS GIVEN ON LAW DAY, MAY 1, 1959, BY MRS. MILTON DUNN, PRESIDENT OF THE LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS, TO THE STUDENTS OF EASTERN HIGH SCHOOL, WASHINGTON, D.C.

I am very happy to have this opportunity to speak to you today. If I were to ask what the word law means to you, I would get a variety of answers. It is possible that in this age of television westerns some of you would immediately think of a tall man carrying a gun and wearing a badge. On the other hand, many of you might agree with me that the meaning of law is not force, but a set of rules to guide our lives and protect us. Calvin Coolidge, our 29th President said, "I wish that people would put a little more emphasis on the observance of the law than they do upon its enforcement." As high school students you sometimes run across laws that seem to be getting in the way of your pleasure. You might wish to drive a car before you are old enough for a license, or stay out of school on a beautiful spring day. Realizing that these laws are for our own good, we obey them, not because we are afraid of the policeman around the corner, but because we know that through them we and our neighbors can have a better life. In a modern society there is no freedom from the law. There is freedom only within the law.

As we grow older we realize that since laws are made by men, and men are not perfect, therefore some laws are not perfect. As our ideals of social justice change, so laws must change to meet our modern needs. Fortunately, as American citizens we can work to change laws which do not carry out the promise of our Constitution. Our country is strong because it is founded on the principle that each person is important, and has equal rights. But we must always remember that with these rights we must accept our responsibilities.

Many years ago when I first started to work for laws which I felt were needed to make our city a better place in which to live, people would say to me, "Why do you bother to waste your time." It hasn't been a waste of time, as I have seen many wonderful things come to pass—things which many citizens worked together to accomplish. One of the situations we have been trying to change is the lack of the vote for District of Columbia residents. We hope that by the time you reach 21 the vote will have been obtained for those of us that live here in the Nation's Capital.

The one idea which I wish to leave with you today is that each one of us has an important part to play in keeping our country great. Don't say, "Not me—I'm just an ordinary fellow, nothing I can do will matter in the whole scheme of things." Let us suppose that each one of you went home today and did some job that needed doing around your home, such as fixing your front steps or cleaning your yard. Can you picture how much better your block would look if everyone did it? Now if this happened in all the blocks in your neighborhood, your neighborhood would take on a new look. With over 137 neighborhoods in the city, before long the whole city would have benefited by the action of many individuals, each one of whom did an important, though small job. To go one step further—many people come to Washington from all over the world. Just think how your action has helped to give these people from other countries a good impression of Americans, because they will judge Americans by what they see here.

I have used the illustration of fixing up our homes because it is a program easy to visualize. We can also use this same method to make our city more law-abiding. As members of this fine student body, you can accept the responsibility not only for your own actions, but you also can help a younger child understand that we obey laws, not because we are afraid we will be caught and punished, but because what we do as individuals makes our country strong or weak. Each of us can thus play an important part in preserving the strength of our country, among the family of nations.

Memorial Day at Cathedral of the Pines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PERKINS BASS
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 26, 1959

Mr. BASS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, this Saturday the Nation pays homage to those countless thousands who

have died in the wartime service of our country. At the Altar of the Nation at the Cathedral of the Pines in Rindge, N.H., a national Memorial Day service will honor all heroic war dead. Under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD the following statement about this service:

At 3 p. m., May 30, all America will honor all its heroic war dead at the Altar of the Nation in the Cathedral of the Pines, Rindge, N.H. This altar is the only national war memorial in the United States recalling the sacrifices of lives of all Americans in war service.

President Eisenhower will, for the seventh year, have his wreath placed at the Altar of the Nation in tribute not only for those of the combat forces but also for those of the Red Cross, the merchant marine, the canteen workers of the Y.M.C.A., the Salvation Army, the Knights of Columbus, the war correspondents, the entertainers, and all whose lives were sacrified in war service. Gov. Wesley Powell, of New Hampshire, will be present to act for President Eisenhower. Governor Powell and the Governors of all the other States and Territories will, for the fifth year, have their tributes placed at the Altar of the Nation in honor of the war dead of their respective domains.

Miss Chloe Clifford, president of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, on behalf of their 5 million members, will have their tribute placed at this altar especially commemorating the sacrifice in war service of the lives of women. Other war memorials commemorate the sacrifices of the men only.

President George Meany, on behalf of 13 million members of AFL–CIO, annually has Hugh Thompson, New England regional director, place a wreath at the Altar of the Nation recalling the sacrifices of life in war service by those providing the sinews of war for those of the combat forces.

At the Altar of the Nation, "One Nation, under God, indivisible," is an actuality. Forty-one different faiths and people of all origins—white, black, red, yellow, and tan; Roman Catholics, Protestants, Jewish, Eastern Orthodox, Christian Scientists, Mormons, and others; those of the North, South, East, and West—have, each in their own way, conducted services before the Altar of the Nation.

The president general of the United Daughters of the Confederacy, Mrs. Murray Forbes Wittichen, is coming from her home in Coral Gables, Fla., to dedicate a plaque to be placed at this altar as a memorial for "the boys in gray." This tribute will be placed next to one commemorating those of the GAR. Miss Inez Farmer, national president of the Daughters of Union Veterans, is coming from Minneapolis, Minn. to dedicate a similar tribute in memory of "the boys in blue."

The president general of the National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution will be present to place a wreath in memory of their forefathers. Stones from all the States and Territories are incorporated into the Altar of the Nation and many of the State stones were contributed by the State societies of the SAR. Other distinguished guests will take part in this observance.

The national commanders of the American Legion, VFW, AMVETS, Sons of Union Veterans, Spanish American War Vets, Marine Reserves, the DAR Society of Mayflower Descendants, and other patriotic organizations, together with the national heads of the American Red Cross, Salvation Army, YMCA, and other national organizations will have their tributes placed at this altar at this time commemorating the sacrifices of lives in war service by members of their organizations.

New Cure for Inflation: Give the Consumer a Break

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. RAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 26, 1959

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Joseph R. Slevin, national economics editor of the New York Herald-Tribune, presents a facet of the problem of inflation to which sufficient attention has not been paid. I think it is worth careful consideration:

NEW CURE FOR INFLATION: GIVE CONSUMER A BREAK

WASHINGTON, April 29.—It's collective bargaining time and so many people are shouting about the rightful shares of labor and the stockholder that they're in danger of overlooking the consumer once again.

Just about everyone in the administration from President Eisenhower on down is bowing in the direction of the consumer by urging that the price line be held to stop inflation, but the question is whether they are bowing deeply enough.

Some Government economists—and they're not odd-balls—think the consumer deserves a better break than that. Their notion is that the consumer ought to get a generous helping of price cuts.

TWO WAYS POSSIBLE

There are two ways to boost living standards. One is by giving people more money to spend and the other is by making it possible for them to buy more things by cutting prices.

The price cut approach isn't the kind of solution that will appeal to labor leaders like United Steelworker President David J. McDonald. He told the Senate Antitrust Subcommittee just last week that the way to increase living standards is to pay higher wages.

United States Steel Corp. yesterday reported first-quarter, after-tax profits of $106,585,303 and its a safe bet that Mr. McDonald will take that as confirmation of his conviction that the steel companies can raise wages substantially without increasing prices.

What some Government economists suspect is that Mr. McDonald's arithmetic is right but his prescription is wrong.

EXPERTS BACK PRICE CUTS

Where Mr. McDonald contends that wages and salaries must be raised to stimulate consumer buying demands, the Government experts reply that the same result can be achieved more quickly—and with greater benefit to more people—by chopping prices.

The notions that many economists have been voicing privately for some time now have been put firmly on the public record in a remarkable speech by one of the country's most respected and influential economists—Woodlief Thomas, economic adviser to the Federal Reserve Board.

Mr. Thomas didn't mention the steel companies by name but there is no mistaking the industry he was singling out when he put his finger on bigger labor costs as the "strongest force" making for higher prices—then followed through with this pointed indictment:

"Rising profits, following maintenance of a surprising level of profits even when operations were sharply reduced would indicate that wage costs are not the sole element of price increase."

Mr. Thomas didn't stop there. He warned that a tendency to limit the division of productivity gains to labor and capital "is perhaps the most important unstabilizing force in our economy today" and the force that is most likely to end the current upturn.

BUYING DIFFICULTY CITED

The Federal Reserve official stressed that consumers will find it difficult to buy an industry's products if all the benefits of greater productivity flow into that industry's profits and into the workers' pay envelopes.

He cited the automobile industry as a horrible example and said that "many consumers will simply decide not to buy the products offered, as they did with automobiles in 1957 and 1958."

Mr. Thomas offered price cuts as the solution. He said the benefits of increased productivity must be shared by the largest possible number of consumers.

"This can be done most effectively—perhaps only—by a lowering of the prices of those products that can be produced at less cost," he declared.

Pertinent Facts on the Aswan Dam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 26, 1959

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, much has been made of the Soviet offer to help finance the building of the Aswan Dam on the Nile River, in Egypt. In this connection, I ask unanimous consent that an article from the Winter-Spring, 1959, issue of "Prevent World War III," published by the Society for the Prevention of World War III, may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PERTINENT FACTS ON THE ASWAN DAM

(By Albert Simard)

The Soviet Union's offer to loan the equivalent of $100 million toward the construction of a high dam at Aswan on the Nile challenges the ability of our diplomacy to develop a farsighted approach in regard to the Middle East. It is probable that the Soviet move will stimulate pressures here to have our Government participate in the financing of this project or other grandiose schemes. Besides the propaganda overtones of the Russian gesture, it is clear that Egypt's aim is to entice the United States to emulate or to outbid the Soviets.

However, if our Government shows prudence and realism, it will avoid the pitfalls which lurk behind the diplomatic maneuvers of the Kremlin and Cairo.

It is in the context of Cairo's imperialistic ambitions and its failure to substantially improve the plight of the Egyptian people, that the Aswan project serves as a gigantic political diversion for a bankrupt leadership.

Contrary to a widespread impression, the efficacy of the Aswan project has been challenged by authoritative sources. For example, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development asserted in detailed analyses that the construction of the project would impose upon the Egyptian people rigid austerity over a period of years and in the end provide them with a standard of living no higher than the one on which they now barely subsist. The Bank asserted that, if the dam were built, the pace of industrial growth will be slower than heretofore, and that "it seems probable that over the next

decade or two the overall expansion of the manufacturing industry will take place at a considerably slower rate than in the past 15 years."

As regards the Aswan project's effect on the Egyptian agriculture, the Bank pointed out that even with an increase in agricultural income over the next two decades, "Egypt will no doubt face continuing problems in keeping pace with the growth of population. In view of the probability that the population by 1975 will be about 60 percent greater than at the present, there is little or no prospect that Egypt will have done much more than maintain the present standard of living. * * *"

Mr. Morris L. Cooke, a consultant engineer of international reputation who has served the U.S. Government in high posts, has also analyzed the soundness of the Aswan project. ("Panacea or Politics?" by Morris L. Cooke, published by the Public Affairs Committee, Washington, D.C., 1957). The following are some of the pertinent conclusions made by Mr. Cooke:

(a) "The $1,350 million high dam project would not, in fact, raise the present abysmal living standards of the Egyptian people."

(b) "The enormous cost of the undertaking would impose upon them a decade of severe austerity, during which urgent needs for social improvement and industrial expansion could not be met."

(c) "Construction of the high dam would invite disastrous inflation unless the Egyptian Government were willing and able to enforce rigid controls over the country's economy."

"(d) This the Nasser regime appears unable and unwilling to do. In the face of the World Bank's advice, the Nasser government has persisted in a capricious 'development' program completely out of line with the realities of its precarious economic position.

"(e) Most striking of all is the fact that Nasser has so crippled the Egyptian economy through his arms-for-cotton deal with the Soviet bloc and his huge internal military budget, that it would now appear impossible for Egypt, with or without Suez Canal revenues, to mobilize the financial resources necessary to complete the project."

Mr. Cooke further observes that the project in its proposed context would discriminate against other states through which the Nile flows, including the Sudan, Ethiopia, and Uganda.

However, the decisive factor which militates against the Aswan project is the underlying character of the present Egyptian regime. In Mr. Cooke's words, the Egyptian economy has been undermined by "militarism, fiscal manipulation, and political adventuring of the Nasser regime."

Thus, by its very nature, the Nasser regime cannot implement a sound constructive economic program to better the living conditions of the Egyptian people, and the construction of the Aswan Dam cannot produce any significant improvement in the economic status of the people.

Practical economic measures for the benefit of all of the people in the Middle East are, of course, a high priority. Experts on this subject have been in general agreement that the nature of the distribution of the resources in that area makes it advisable that economic programs be conceived in terms of treating the Middle East as a unit. The validity of an overall approach was reaffirmed in the President's speech before the United Nations General Assembly in August 1958. On the other hand, it has been proven that the Aswan project is not only of questionable economic advantage to the Egyptian people, but it also discriminates against the rights of other states on the Nile. Therefore, the national interests of the United States and of all friendly countries in the Middle East area would best be served by developing practical programs of aid based on the principles outlined by the President.

It follows from the foregoing that a hasty attempt to outbid the Russians in projects such as the Aswan Dam would, in the last analysis, only serve the political objectives of the Cairo government. These objectives contemplate the subjugation of free countries in the Middle East and the ultimate undermining of the U.S. position in that vital area of the world.

More Money Needed for Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 26, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the President's Science Advisory Committee has recommended this Nation spend twice the $18 billion it is now putting into its educational system. However, like other reports on the vital needs of education, the President has taken no action on this matter.

I suggest to my colleagues that, since the need for educational improvement in this country is not only obvious, but a crying need, and since it is equally obvious that the current administration proposes to do nothing to meet this need, that it falls the duty of the Congress to correct this situation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Washington Post and Times-Herald for Tuesday, May 26, 1959 entitled "Another Bad Report Card."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, May 26, 1959]

ANOTHER BAD REPORT CARD

President Eisenhower's comments on his Science Advisory Committee's education report were as disappointingly vague as the administration's attitude toward the Nation's school needs has been vacillating. The committee, headed by James R. Killian, Jr., the President's science adviser, stated forthrightly that the United States ought at least to double its $18 billion annual outlay for schools, but Mr. Eisenhower merely said that the report is "an excellent statement of educational goals and needs."

The President seems still to place more value on theoretical budget balance than on such vital needs as more adequate education and augmented defense. If the Eisenhower administration had supported a comprehensive Federal aid to education program 5 or 6 years ago the deficit in school facilities and faculties might not be so great as it is today.

This year the administration has even disowned its modest school construction program and has asked Congress to aid only those school systems with truly desperate financial problems by helping them pay off their construction bonds. Yet a broad Federal aid program is necessary if all schools are to be brought up to the desired and attainable levels recommended by the Killian committee and other studies of education. Many cities and States have about exhausted the school tax revenues that are available to them. If Americans are getting weary of reports on the need to improve education it is because of the failure of both the Eisenhower administration and Congress to help solve a problem which has become so distressingly obvious.

Unwise Controls to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 26, 1959

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, an important report has been issued on the likelihood of damage to higher education by the imposition of unwise controls.

The report was prepared by a committee headed by Dr. Milton S. Eisenhower, President of the Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md., the "Committee on Government and Higher Education." The report is published under the apt title, "The Efficiency of Freedom."

Dr. Eisenhower has favored me with a copy of the report.

Neither educators nor State government officials—

The report notes—

would willingly countenance turning over our educational institutions to political control. But when they condone the imposition of intrusive controls of any sort, they open the way to an erosive process which first can weaken and then destroy the essential freedom of the State colleges and universities.

The committee report traces the growth of State controls, pointing to two principal reasons for the tightening of supervisory reins—(a) governors and legislators, faced with rising costs, are forced to promote economy and efficiency in the use of limited State funds, and (b) the present trend in the philosophy of State governments is toward centralization of control.

The possibility of State interference with higher educattion is heightened, the report states, because State finances and the physical and human resources of the universities and colleges are both entering a period of stress.

The report follows a 2-year nationwide study of the relationships between State governments and the State universities. The research study was made by a 15-man group headed by members of the Department of Political Science at Johns Hopkins.

Repeatedly the report emphasizes the committee's conviction that State governments can best assure sound and efficient management of the public colleges and universities by holding a strong, able board of lay trustees responsible and accountable for the program, policies, and operation of the institutions. It argues that colleges and universities can only perform their expected role in a climate of freedom, and that intellectual freedom goes hand in hand with institutional independence.

The consensus of the committee—

The report concludes—

is that this freedom is preserved and strengthened by the granting of independence to the institution and * * * by placing responsibility and authority for the management of the institution in the hands of an able, independent lay board of trustees, who themselves can be held accountable to the people of the State for wise and effective action. Only by insuring the preservation of freedom and independence of our public institutions of higher learning can we make certain that they will continue to exist as creative centers of learning and research, contributing much, as they always have, to human progress.

The report states further:

College officials do not question the right of legislatures to determine the amount and kind of public higher education the State shall have, or the legislature's continuing responsibility for determining what share of the State's income can be allocated to the colleges and universities. They feel strongly, however, that a legislature defeats the purpose of efficient government when it makes detailed judgments on matters of curriculum and research, freezes into statutes admissions policy and other matters requiring flexibility, or, in an effort to insure the honesty and legality of all administrative transactions, sets up a multiplicity of watchdog agencies. Educators know that such all-embracing supervision is a recipe for institutional mediocrity in the field of higher education.

In the concluding passages, the report says:

Some urgency attaches itself to achieving a harmonious and fruitful working partnership between officials of State government and educators, for the heralded tidal wave of students is nearly upon our colleges and universities. There is also a critical and widely acknowledged need for ever-increasing quality in our educational programs and research in all fields. All the talents, energies, and wisdom of professionals in education and officials in State government will be called upon to solve these substantive problems. If we are wise, we shall act soon to establish cooperative relationships, for it would be wasteful to halt educational progress while we spend time settling matters of jurisdiction and procedure.

Mr. President, the committee makes 20 specific recommendations. I ask unanimous consent to have these recommendations printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the recommendations were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RECOMMENDATIONS OF COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT AND HIGHER EDUCATION

1. The committee encourages academic officials, trustees, alumni and all other individuals with an interest in higher education to make a strenuous effort to explain the case for independence of colleges and universities to State officials and the general public.

2. Colleges and universities should be candid and communicative in their dealings with State government.

3. Colleges and universities should make every effort to establish, maintain, and deserve a reputation for efficiency and sound management.

4. Colleges and universities in each State should take the initiative in coordinating the programs effectively through voluntary and cooperative means (to avoid unnecessary duplication of programs or facilities).

5. Colleges and universities should avoid undertaking activities and offering courses that are not properly within the sphere of academic enterprise.

6. Governing boards of colleges and universities should assert their traditional authority to control the policies and operations of their institutions.

7. Legal autonomy should be given to every institution of higher education that carries on a substantial program of teaching and research.

8. Legislatures are encouraged, when allocating funds to higher education, to avoid all attempts to legislate specifics of educational policy.

9. Legislative interim committees and service agencies should continue their valuable function of keeping legislatures informed, but they should never act as instruments of control over educational administration.

10. The committee encourages legislatures to review and revise those statutes pertaining to higher education and fiscal and management controls which have become outmoded or which impede the effective management of the institution by the responsible officers.

11. The committee calls attention (of governors) to the fact that a large measure of success of higher education will depend on the caliber of members serving on governing boards.

12. Governors are encouraged to survey the administrative controls over higher education and to issue administrative orders (where statutory changes are not required) to eliminate those that are unnecessary or harmful.

13. Governors are encouraged to exercise their influence to keep higher education out of any partisan conflict.

14. Regarding higher education, the work of budget officers should be confined to (a) analysis of total budget requests; (b) recommendation to the governor of the total amount needed for higher education, along with the results of the buget analysis.

15. Officers and trustees of the institutions of higher education should have the right to defend their budgets before the governor and the legislature rather than be forced to depend on a third party to present budget justifications on their behalf.

16. Annual allotments or full grants of appropriated funds are preferable to quarterly or monthly allotments for higher education.

17. Colleges and universities should be encouraged, where savings will result, to make voluntary use of State purchasing services, but they should be exempted from compulsory centralized State purchasing.

18. Purchases made by institutions should be in confirmity with modern purchasing procedures, including open and competitive bidding for large items and bulk purchasing.

19. The committee reaffirms the need for a thorough postaudit of the expenditures of institutions of higher education, but believes the preaudit should not be applied to higher education.

20. The committee urges that personnel rules, where applicable to institutions of higher education, should be made as flexible as possible, and argues that if a university is to fulfill its mission, autonomy in the control of both academic and nonacademic staff is by far the preferred arrangement.

The Modern Fallacy and the Ancient Folklore

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 26, 1959

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial by the Wall Street Journal and a reply by the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania, Senator CLARK.

I think this is one of the best replies to a superficial editorial that I have ever seen, and Senator CLARK's concise and lucid comment should be made available to all Americans. The excerpt was published in the New Republic on April 6, 1959.

There being no objection, the editorial and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MODERN FALLACY

For an insight into the modern political philosophy now dominant in Congress, consider some comments made by one of its more articulate spokesmen, Senator JOSEPH CLARK of Pennsylvania.

As quoted in the current issue of the Atlantic magazine, Mr. CLARK expresses annoyance that the word "government" is sometimes equated with "other nouns having an evil connotation—such as 'waste,' 'extravagance,' 'socialism,' 'bureaucracy'." * * * He objects to the "fallacy" that "private spending is inherently good and public spending is inherently bad."

But the real point is the clearly implied one: That Americans should learn to regard growing government and growing government spending as positive and good things; as another of the "moderns" in Congress has expressed it, the danger may be not that we have too much government but too little. * * *

Well, let's see. Some rather marked—and inherent—differences between public and private spending occur at once. Private spending comes from the money individuals are able to accumulate through their own work. Public spending cannot come from anything generated by the Government itself; it comes from what the Government is able to extract from those same individuals either in actual taxes or in the more sinister tax of inflation. * * *

Beyond these elementary differences are others. The vast bulk of public spending is nonproductive; that is true not only of defense but of many other things the Government does. The Government is by and large a consumer of huge hunks of the economy, while private individuals are mostly producer-consumers. The latter combination is what makes the economy grow. Moreover, the bigger the Government becomes the more it competes with the private economy, and in this pressure against the available limit of supplies is a special inflationary force.

And because Government operates without the built-in restraints of the private economy, it is a peculiarly powerful incubator for precisely the evils Senator CLARK thinks should not be associated with Government—waste, extravagance, bureaucracy. The bigger the Government the worse the evils.

Finally, what is the political result of encouraging Government growth and growing Government spending on the theory that, after all, they are not really bad? The end result must be the triumph of the State over the individual. * * *

There is an appalling air of naivete about the expressed views of some of the modern political philosophers. It is impossible that they are unacquainted with the history of man's struggle against the all encompassing State, which is also the very heart of today's conflict with Communist tyranny. Can it be, then, that they are incapable of relating past and present human experience to their own country?

WALL STREET JOURNAL.

THE ANCIENT FOLKLORE

For an insight into the archaic political philosophy still dominant in Wall Street, consider some comments made by one of its

more articulate spokesmen, the editor of the Wall Street Journal.

As quoted in an article in the March 4 issue of the newspaper entitled "The Modern Fallacy," the editor expressed annoyance at those who challenge the assertion that private spending for whatever purpose is necessarily better than public spending for any purpose.

The real point is the clearly implied one: That Americans should complacently regard growing spending for liquor, tobacco, cosmetics, Cadillacs, tranquilizers, yachts, and parties at the Stork Club as positive and good things; as others of the dinosaur descendants on Wall Street have often expressed it, the danger may be not that we have too little public spending for national defense, schools, highways, hospitals, unemployment compensation and flood control, but too much.

Well, let's see. Some rather marked—and inherent—differences betwen public and private spending occur at once. Private spending may come from the money individuals are able to accumulate through their own work; it may also come, as it does in my case, from selecting ancestors who thought they were developing a sugar plantation but turned out to be squatting on top of a salt dome surrounded by a rich oil pool.

Beyond these elementary differences are others. The vast bulk of public spending is for purposes without which life itself would have little meaning: protection against the threat of destruction by, or in the alternative, slavery under a Communist dictatorship; and such mundane but necessary things as police and fire protection, water and sewer facilities, street construction and repair, the postal service, indeed all of that environment without which the editor of the Wall Street Journal could neither publish nor disseminate his strongly-held economic views.

And because our present tax laws are so full of inequitable loopholes, we have today a powerful incubator for what the editor of that newspaper, I am sure, thinks should not be associated with private enterprise—waste, extravagance, plutocracy.

Finally, what is the political result of discouraging all public spending without any consideration of its political, social or economic justification? The end result must be the destruction of Western civilization.

There is an appalling air of naivete about the expressed views of some of the ancient political philosophers. It is impossible that they are unacquainted with the history of man's struggle to conquer nature and subdue the devil within himself—which is also the very heart of today's conflict with atheistic and amoral Communist tyranny. Can it be, then, that they are incapable of relating past and present human experience to their own country?

Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK.

Experience Hard To Replace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 25, 1959

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, the growth of our Nation's cities has made areas of open space more important than ever. The need for city recreational facilities and parks is an ever-pressing problem. We in Baltimore have been fortunate for some years in having two men on the board of recreation and parks, who have not only protected these open areas and facilities from encroachment, but have increased the recreational facilities. They have been fierce defenders of the right of the people to have available spaces within the confines of the city. I am speaking of Mr. James C. Anderson, president of the board, who has served the city for 9 years, and Mr. S. Lawrence Hammerman, vice president of the board, who has served the city for 16 years.

These two positions, president and vice president of the board, are open for appointment by our new mayor. On Sunday, May 24, 1959, the Baltimore American carried an editorial lauding these two outstanding citizens of the city of Baltimore and recommending their reappointment to these offices which they have so excellently filled.

The article is as follows:

EXPERIENCE HARD TO REPLACE

We are hopeful that Mayor Grady plans to make appointments of well qualified people in organizing his administration.

In this connection it is pertinent to suggest that he not deprive the city of the experience and public spirit of James C. Anderson, president of the Board of Recreation and Parks, and of S. Lawrence Hammerman, vice president.

Mr. Anderson has served the city 9 years and Mr. Hammerman 16 years, the latter under both Democratic and Republican mayors.

During their leadership the expansion of desirable facilities for the public has been considered the largest in history and judiciously managed.

Memorial Stadium was built and more recreational space provided in several categories.

The two officials have been fierce defenders of parks acreage against encroachment by unfitting enterprises. An instance was the fight to prevent erection in Druid Hill Park of the Civic Center, which did not belong there but downtown.

When Mr. Anderson took office he was comptroller of the Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey) and spent much of his time in New York. He now has retired from that post and is able to devote much time to the needs of the sprawling parks and playgrounds.

Mr. Hammerman has been zealous and forceful in promoting the welfare of that system.

The names of a couple of men who were active in the background of the Grady campaign, including that of a district "bosslet," have been mentioned as possible appointees to the parks presidency.

They are men of ability, but they would require a long period to gain the intimate knowledge of the city's recreational needs now possessed by Mr. Anderson and Mr. Hammerman.

We think the city would be the loser if this fund of knowledge were tossed overboard.

Columbus Foundation: A Bold New Program To Promote Inter-American Friendship and Good Will

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 26, 1959

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, as guest of a luncheon group which met in the Vandenberg Room of the U.S. Senate on August 13, 1958, I was pleased to hear about a bold new program to promote inter-American friendship and good will. Known as the Columbus Foundation, the new nonprofit, nonpartisan organization proposed to stimulate a continuing program for stronger inter-American bonds of mutual respect and understanding.

The meeting was called by Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, at the request of Congressman PETER W. RODINO, JR., and the executive committee of the National Citizens Committee for Columbus Day. Congressman RODINO, as you know, is the author of H.R. 418 which seeks to declare October 12, Columbus Day, a legal holiday.

The purpose of the meeting was to acquaint Senator MORSE, chairman of the Subcommittee on American Republics of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and other members and interested Congressmen with the work of the National Citizens Committee for Columbus Day and the proposed Columbus Foundation launched on October 12, 1958.

I am pleased at this time to tell you that the Honorable PETER W. RODINO, JR., of the 10th Congressional District of New Jersey, was named in September 1958 as the first national chairman of the Columbus Foundation.

On Friday, September 19, 1958, the distinguished Italian Times of Boston carried the following story about Congressman RODINO's appointment on the front page:

NATIONAL CITIZENS COMMITTEE FOR COLUMBUS DAY NAMES RODINO NATIONAL CHAIRMAN OF COLUMBUS FOUNDATION

The National Citizens Committee for Columbus Day has announced the appointment of the Honorable PETER W. RODINO, JR., Congressman from the 10th District of New Jersey, as the first National Chairman of the Columbus Foundation, a public service organization dedicated to increased inter-American friendship and understanding through educational and cultural exchange. Congressman RODINO is the author of H.R. 418, a bill which seeks to declare October 12 as a legal holiday.

In announcing the appointment, John T. O'Brien, executive vice chairman of the committee, said in part:

"Congressman RODINO has been a pioneer in the movement to make Columbus Day an important symbol of unity in the United States. For the past several years he has been equally enthusiastic in his support of the efforts by the National Citizens Committee for Columbus Day to make its slogan, 'Americans All,' encompass the 21 republics of the New World. This program, first launched in Washington, D.C., in 1955 by Dr. Carlos Davila, then Secretary General of the Organization of American States, has now become nationwide. In 1957, some 40 Governors participated in issuing Columbus Day proclamations and over 500 mayors issued proclamations and sponsored observances of some sort.

"Throughout the United States, Italian-Americans have played an important role in helping to make the traditional Columbus Day observances another occasion for greater understanding and friendship among the peoples of the Americas.

"It was this fact that prompted the Honorable Charles P. Taft, former mayor of Cincinnati, to recommend in his report on the Cincinnati Columbus Day Program in 1957, that the 1958 national chairman of the Columbus Day Foundation be an Italian-American in recognition of the outstanding work done by the people of Italian descent

through the years in making Columbus Day observances an occasion for cultural and spiritual regeneration."

In commenting on his appointment as the Columbus Foundation chairman, Congressman RODINO said:

"I am naturally honored by this recognition for doing something which is close to my heart. I have had the pleasure of working closely with the National Citizens Committee for Columbus Day for the past several years and even before that I had been actively working to have Columbus Day declared a national holiday. The National Citizens Committee for Columbus Day has, in my judgment, performed a constructive public service since 1955 with its emphasis on Columbus Day, October 12, as an occasion for commemorating the richness of the heritage we in the New World have received from the Old World through the diversity of cultures in North and South America."

In the same September 19, 1958, issue of the Italian Times, a very splendid editorial commented on the organization of the Columbus Foundation:

OUR GOOD NEIGHBORS

Occasionally someone in the Nation's Capital becomes cognizant of the fact that we have to our south a large group of countries, known collectively as Latin America, for whom we have mixed paternal and fraternal feelings. We take it for granted that this good feeling is always reciprocal and do nothing to cherish it or to foster more good will until something unpleasant, such as Vice President NIXON'S recent trip, occurs to jolt us out of our complacency.

Then in typical fashion we create a crash program and try to do in a week or month what should have been accomplished slowly and painstakingly over the years.

Therefore, it is refreshing and encouraging to learn that there are forces at work developing such a long-range program, the fruits of which may not seem spectacular at first, but the cumulative effect which will be more beneficial and long-lasting. The campaign to designate Columbus Day as a day on which all the Americas—North, South, and Central—can jointly celebrate the great man and occasion which brought them all into being is very appropriate at this time. For it not only emphasizes the heritage which we all share in common, but underlines the fact that our destinies are more closely entwined through the advancements of modern technology.

To those still residing in the Old World, the designation New World takes in more than just the United States. It may come as a surprise to many Italo-Americans that almost 5 million Brazilians are of Italian ancestry. Millions more live throughout the other Latin American countries.

It seems most fitting, therefore, that President Gronchi of Italy should visit Brazil at this time, for the ties that bind those two countries together are just as strong as those which exist between Italy and the United States.

Just as this country cannot dare to neglect her associations with those lands of the Old World that have demonstrated their friendship for us, can it dare to ignore the reservoir of good will which exists in our good neighbors to the south.

A joint celebration of Columbus Day is a good start in the right direction.

Private Enterprise, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CARLSON
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 26, 1959

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, we are fortunate to have in this Nation individuals who are devoting their time and effort to an international program that is of great value to our Nation internationally.

Private Enterprise, Inc., at Wichita, Kans., has an idea that the best way to meet the challenge of world communism is to have more successful private industries in far places.

This organization started originally through the efforts of one man, Mr. Bill Graham, of Wichita, and has now grown into an organization that is operating in Panama, Colombia, India, Turkey, Australia, Indonesia, Lebanon, and Pakistan, and has just arranged to operate in Ghana and Liberia.

As a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, I am familiar with the great benefits that accrue from these investments. During my visit to New Delhi, India, a year ago, I had the opportunity of visiting with some people who were financed by this organization in what we term in this Nation as very small businesses.

Private Enterprise, Inc., deserves the commendation of our citizens for the fine work it is doing in this field.

I ask unanimous consent that an article on the subject be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Topeka (Kans.) Capital-Journal, May 17, 1959]

RETIRED RICH MEN OFFERED NONPAYING JOBS

WICHITA.—"Wanted: Experienced, successful executive, maybe retired with ample income, who feels the urge for a new challenge. Age 40 to 60, preferably under 50. Money, just now, must be no object."

That is about what the want ad would say, if Private Enterprise, Inc., ran one.

It wants two, three—maybe six—such workers to help carry the load as it expands its program of loans to little people in the United States and abroad, to set them up in businesses of their own.

So says Bill Graham, Wichita oilman who fits that measure of the wanted men as head of the privately financed U.S. group; but who admits he needs dedicated, talented help.

It is Private Enterprise's theme that the best way to meet the challenge of world communism is to have more successful private industries in far places—like India, Indonesia, Africa, South America.

The program is one of investments in new, small business, in partnership with the native enterpriser who has the profit-making idea but is limited in cash.

Bankers, industrialists, salaried workers, even children are putting up the American capital in $10 shares.

It's a 50–50 deal, splitting profits until Private Enterprise, Inc., gets back double its investment, Graham said. Then the native partner can, if he wishes, buy out the loan capital that got him started.

Where native financiers show interest—and in most places they have—Private Enterprise works with them and through them and they furnish part of the capital and supervision.

Such ventures already are operating in Panama, Colombia, India, Turkey, Australia, Indonesia, Lebanon, Pakistan, and—just signed, in Ghana and Liberia.

It's a program that brings in hundreds of letters and telephone calls weekly to be screened; applicants to be interviewed; business decisions to make beyond the capacity of the small staff, including several volunteers, that already has grown up around Graham.

"I'm going to be in Colombia and Peru and Brazil, the next 3 months—and in western and southern Africa—working at this job," Graham said, before taking off on a business trip.

"We need help badly, to keep things going when I'm here. But we need it even more urgently when I'm gone.

"Somewhere, in just about any place of any size, there must be the kind of guys we need—guys who have reached the point where they're no longer worried about making another million, but just itching for a new challenge. Maybe they're not retired, but could get away for 3 or 6 months."

Tight Money Is Back

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 26, 1959

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, under the title "Tight Money Is Back" Sylvia Porter, widely regarded as one of the most competent financial commentators in the business, reported in last night's papers the immensely serious consequences of the Federal Reserve Board's present hard money "kick." She points out that homebuilders and buyers are not going to get the money to go through with their plans; that many loan applications from business borrowers will be cut, others will be refused; that a far greater number of States and cities will find that the legal limits have been reached on what they can pay for money and will bar them from borrowing; that whatever the American people buy on the installment plan will zoom up in cost; that the Federal Treasury—which means the American taxpayer—will pay far more on the huge national debt refunding..

Miss Porter sums up the consequences of the present tight money policies when she reports—

The tight money phase of 1959-to-? is shaping up even now as more restrictive than that of the summer of 1957 just before the recession of 1957–58, and that money pinch was brutal to countless hundreds of thousands.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article by Miss Porter be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TIGHT MONEY IS BACK

(By Sylvia Porter)

We are now reentering a cycle of tight money.

This one will be, according to all reliable signals, the toughest in this Nation since the bank panic of the early 1930's.

Already, the "price" of money—the level of interest rates—is the highest in a quarter-century and its heading higher. Already, many loan applicants are finding it more difficult to get credit, and the clampdown will be rougher in the months ahead. Already, bonds carrying low coupons sold by the Treasury, States, cities, and corporations in the easy money cycles of the past have sunk to record lows and are moving lower.

This is what tight money means: a period in which most borrowers must stand in line to get credit, in which many are turned down flat or granted only a part of the cash they want, and in which all who do get loans must pay heavily for them.

Tight money happens when the demand for credit tops the supply of money available in the Nation's pool for loans.

It happens when the economy goes into an upswing and as a result, businessmen want to borrow more to add goods to their shelves and expand their plants, homebuilders and home buyers want to borrow more to finance houses, millions of consumers want to borrow more to buy cars, appliances, and the like, States and cities want to borrow more for essential public works, etc.

It happens when the Federal Reserve System refuses to add enough money to the credit pool to take care of the increased loan demands because the Central Bank is convinced that if all who want to borrow can do so easily, the prosperity will become an inflationary boom.

The conditions I've described above have been emerging clearly for months, are now unmistakably dominating the money markets.

What will this cycle of tight money mean to you?

To homebuilders and home buyers: Mortgage money is going to be the most expensive in years, and the stated cost of many mortgages is likely to be a lot less than the real cost. Although costs will vary from area to area, there is no doubt the ild will be on mortgage money, and many homebuilders are simply not going to get the financing they need to go through with their plans.

To business borrowers: The highest-rated corporation cannot get a loan for less than 4½ percent today—and hidden extras are raising the effective borrowing rate to well over 5 percent. Less established, desirable borrowers are paying more, of course. Now, the probabilities are many loan applications will be cut, others will be refused.

To States and cities: Lenders are demanding 3½ percent and more even on the tax-exempt securities of the highest-grade municipalities. Increasing numbers of States and cities will find that the legal limits on what they can pay for money will bar them from borrowing.

To buyers on the installment plan: They'll pay more for loans on autos, appliances, etc. Although the real charges will be hidden in the small print and rates will vary violently, costs will be definitely up.

To corporations selling bonds: They'll be placing the fattest coupons in years on new bonds and be glad to get buyers for them.

To holders of outstanding bonds: Prices of bonds they bought in the past will be down because new bonds will be coming out with higher coupons.

To the Treasury: It'll pay more than 4 percent just for short-term loans of a year or less.

To banks: They'll make more on the high loan rates and fat coupons on new bonds, but they'll be in a squeeze too because they won't have sufficient cash to meet loan demands.

To savers: They'll gain because financial institutions will be paying higher rates to attract more and bigger savings accounts.

The tight money phase of 1959 to ? is shaping up even now as more restrictive than that of the summer of 1957, just before the recession of 1957–58. And that money pinch was brutal to countless hundreds of thousands.

Dixie State Park, Utah

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. MOSS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 26, 1959

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, southern Utah is one of the most colorful and unique areas in America. Almost everyone has heard about Bryce and Zion National Parks, about Cedar Breaks National Monument, Navaho Lake, Puffer Lake, and the breathtaking Zion-Mount Carmel Highway.

Few people, however, know about the new Dixie State Park which has recently been opened in the southwest corner of our State. I hasten immediately to qualify that statement—few people have firsthand knowledge of the area now encompassed in the Dixie State Park, but almost everyone in America has seen part of it at one time or another as a background for a western thriller or some other movie requiring a wide sweep of western land and picturesque rocks as its locale.

I commend to the Senate an article which appeared in the travel section of the New York Times on Sunday, May 24, entitled "Head 'Em Off at Dixie State Park." I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HEAD 'EM OFF AT DIXIE STATE PARK—UTAH VISITORS WILL FEEL AT HOME ON LOCATION OF WESTERN MOVIES

ST. GEORGE, UTAH.—Down here, in the southwest corner of this State, first-time visitors to the new Dixie State Park may find its strangely eroded red sandstone cliffs hauntingly familiar. They may easily experience the eerie sensation of having been here before.

The explanation is simply that Hollywood's cowboys and Indians have so frequently roamed the park's 259 scenic acres that all America has seen practically all of them on the screen, and pulsed to every hoofbeat and rifle crack. As recently as last November, Gary Cooper and a sizable corps of his cavalry were galloping across the local sagebrush during the filming of a drama based on the career of Pancho Villa.

Now the Washington County Commission and the U.S. Bureau of Land Management has turned the area over to the Utah Park and Recreation Commission, including a number of picturesque old movie locations. As a result of the earlier histrionic endeavors, forts and haciendas, artfully constructed of adobe, logs and papier mache loom up in the otherwise pristine landscape.

HOLLYWOOD RUSTLERS

Many of the existing parkland trails were worn by the hooves of cattle being run off by rustlers holding cards in the Actors Guild. Virtually every box canyon in the immediate countryside has been utilized by gallant troopers trapping unwary Apaches.

Genuine redskins do reside just outside the new park. Members of a little-known and exceptionally peaceful tribe known as the Shivwits, these Indians live in shabby cabins, till small irrigated plots, or toil unobtrusively in neighboring motels and garages.

While the countryside does support a few dozen genuine cowpunchers, authentic cavalrymen are completely lacking, although a few armed guards are employed at nearby Hurricane Mesa, where the Air Force tests high-speed missiles and jetplane ejection devices in business-like, non-Hollywood fashion.

However, the slice of scenery acquired by Utah's Park Commission is authentically western. While small in acreage, the area is surrounded by additional thousands of acres of undeveloped public domain which include defunct volcanoes, sand dunes, cliffs and juniper-lined canyons of a striking nature. Locally known as Snow Canyon (named for a Mormon ranch family rather than for the flakes which rarely if ever fall here), the park is just 6 miles north of U.S. 91, the major Salt Lake-Las Vegas road.

The latter community, complete with an oddly spired Morman temple, a New England-style tabernacle, and what was once Brigham Young's winter home, has lately become something of a motel center for vacationists wishing to absorb winter sun in a mild desert climate and for those wishing to explore nearby Zion National Park, 45 miles to the east.

In addition to Dixie State Park itself, the Dixie region of Utah offers one of the most highly concentrated geology and history lessons available anywhere in the West. The "pancake rocks" adjacent to the park are striking examples of wind-and-water erosin; the Kolob Plateau in Zion National Park far across the landscape illustrates the manner in which sheer rock walls can be cut by a tiny river; six small, perfectly formed extinct volcanoes in and near the State park area are perhaps as easy to view, study and photograph as any in the Southwest, and the adjacent local sand dunes comprise one of Utah's few true deserts.

The hamlet of Santa Clara, on U.S. 91 near the Dixie State Park entry road, contains the 100-year-old home of Jacob Hamblin, the famous "Buckskin Apostle" of Mormon pioneer times who brought the Bible to the region's Indians, and who served as guide for such explorers as Major John Wesley Powell, who passed through the Grand Canyon by boat while surveying the Colorado River.

MORMON HAMLET

North and east of Dixie State Park, sheltered by the 10,000-foot-high Pine Valley Mountains, another somnolent, century-old Mormon hamlet, Pine Valley, is a haven for

artists and photographers interested in capturing the prim beauty of its clapboard Mormon church, stone houses, and hand-hewn rail fences.

Back in St. George, motel owners, restaurant waitresses or employes at the community's low-pressure tourist information bureau will cheerfully point out the way to such sights as the rock-walled factory where initial residents of Dixie set up the West's first cotton mill at Brigham Young's orders. Hence the name Dixie.

Declaration of Principles Adopted by Federation of American Citizens of German Descent in the U.S.A., Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 26, 1959

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the declaration of principles adopted at the seventh annual German-American Day in North Bergen, N.J., on May 24, 1959.

There being no objection, the declaration was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Declaration of principles adopted at the seventh annual German-American Day held in North Bergen, N.J., May 24, 1959, under the auspices of the Federation of American Citizens of German Descent in the U.S.A., Inc., and cooperating societies throughout the United States, representing the large group of American citizens:

"We reaffirm our previous stand on the reunification of Germany as the prerequisite to its complete restoration and to universal peace. Therefore, we advocate that a peace treaty in conformity with the principle of justice and international law as expounded by the Charter of the United Nations as promised in the Atlantic Charter and as stated as self-evident proof in our Declaration of Independence be concluded as soon as possible in Europe. We appeal for the restoration of Germany in her legal borders, both in the interest of the national security of the United States as well as the entirety of our western family of nations, objecting to any endeavor to deny over 15 million of eastern expellees their right of self-determination, their unalienable right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness in their homes in their ancient homelands. Any endeavor at present to legalize the terrible wrong done to those expellees would create a most dangerous legal problem, and destroy the thin fiber of justice and international law which is barely sufficient to hold mankind together in peace."

We resolve that the above declaration of principles adopted today by the large gathering of Americans of German descent at North Bergen, N.J., be transmitted to the President of the United States, General Eisenhower; the Secretary of State, the Honorable C. Herter; as well as to the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the U.S. Senate.

MAXIMILIAN L. OPOLONY,
Secretary General of the German-American Day Committee of the Federation of American Citizens of German Descent in the U.S.A., Inc.

Orphan Immigration Legislation Urgently Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 26, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, one of the urgent matters now before Congress is the need to extend the provisions of the orphan immigration law which grants nonquota immigrant status to eligible orphans under 14 years of age who have been or will be adopted by American families. The present provisions expire this June 30, and unless a new law is enacted by that time, adopted orphan children will come under the regular immigration quota. They will be unable to enter the United States in substantial numbers and join their families in the United States. This is particularly true for orphan children from the Far East, where immigration quotas are small and from where more than 65 percent of the children admitted under the program have come.

Under the orphan section of Public Law 85–316, which I sponsored, 3,425 orphan visas has been issued since September 11, 1957, through March 1959. Forty percent of all orphan visas issued were issued to Korean children. Since July 1955, some 2,000 Korean orphan children have been admitted to the United States under the old Refugee Relief Act, the emergency parole procedure, and Public Law 85–316. Of this number, my constituent, Harry Holt of Creswell, Oreg., has brought almost 70 percent of the Korean orphan children to the United States. The members of the Holt family have expended freely of their time, money, and energy, and they are to be highly commended for undertaking this great humanitarian endeavor. They are Good Samaritans.

The surest protection for a Korean and oriental orphan child is his speedy placement with a suitable family in the United States. These children, at best, face a difficult and uncertain future in their homelands. The plight of the mixed-blood Korean orphan children, fathered by American military personnel, is still more difficult. It is my opinion that if it had not been for Harry Holt and his efforts, substantial numbers of Korean orphan children would never have been admitted to our country. Prior to July 1955, a total of only 35 Korean orphan children were admitted during 2 years of operation of the Refugee Relief Act.

Mr. President, legislation should be adopted to continue the orphan program on a meaningful basis, so qualified American families will have the opportunity to adopt foreign children. Legislation must not be so restrictive as to substantially halt the program. Abuses, whereby children are placed in unqualified American homes, and which resulted recently in the indictment of a former New York City magistrate for allegedly selling Greek orphan children, must be ended. However, we cannot lose sight of the fact that, despite the abuses that have been shown to exist, thousands of children have found good homes with adoptive parents in the United States. Well over 90 percent of the children admitted under the program are leading happy, fruitful lives in our country. The existing orphan legislation has given these children a new hope and future. Controls which would make difficult, if not impossible, the operation of any future orphan program and would restrict the entry of orphan children to our country must be avoided.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a thoughtful editorial of May 18, 1959, from the Eugene (Oreg.) Register-Guard, entitled "Control Could End Holt's Baby Lift." The Eugene Register-Guard, Oregon's largest daily newspaper outside of Portland, is well qualified to speak of the Holt orphan program, since it serves the area where Mr. Holt resides.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONTROL COULD END HOLT'S BABY LIFT

Hearings will open Wednesday in Washington, D.C., upon a bill which might scuttle Harry Holt's Operation Baby Lift.

A. Robert Smith, correspondent for the Register-Guard in the National Capital, reports that this bill, S. 1468, has been sponsored by JOHN F. KENNEDY, Democrat of Massachusetts, and cosponsored by Oregon Senators WAYNE MORSE and RICHARD L. NEUBERGER. However, since its introduction both MORSE and NEUBERGER have disavowed any intent to stop Holt's internationally famous program of bringing Korean orphans to the United States for adoption.

The threat to the Creswell farmer's program—into which he has put a substantial part of his personal wealth—has roots in a provision of S. 1468 which would halt proxy adoptions. Holt has used the proxy system to get around red tape that would otherwise limit the number of youngsters he might airlift from Korea to this country, and new homes. The proxy ban, Smith reports, was tucked into S. 1468 by Senator KENNEDY because some abuses have been reported in other foreign orphan adoption programs—not Holt's.

Now Senator NEUBERGER has introduced another bill, S. 1532, which would clearly allow proxy adoptions to continue, and MORSE has stated that he certainly is not committed to all the language of the Kennedy bill.

Some legislation covering oversea adoptions must be adopted by June 30 when the present orphan immigration law expires. Otherwise orphans will be subject to regular immigration quota restrictions. It appears that whatever bill is adopted, and there are others in the hopper in addition to those we've mentioned, it will be required that hereafter some authorized agency will need to check the home life of applicant couples before they can qualify to adopt orphans from abroad. However, this is not a major point. Home checks are already required by Oregon law and in most States, and if further safeguards are needed, such as trial adoption periods, these should be enacted by State legislatures to cover all adoptions, not merely those of foreign-born waifs.

Certainly means can be found to control abuses without halting adoptions entirely. If ever it was apt to counsel care against throwing out the babies with their bath water, it is here. Harry Holt has brought some 1,300 Korean foundlings to this country. He has established sound procedures to insure that they will go into homes where they are wanted and will be loved. How senseless, how insensible the Congress would be now to say, in effect, that because a few adoption sharks have been identified elsewhere, Holt must be ensnared in the same net intended to catch them.

Youth March for Integrated Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 26, 1959

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on Saturday, April 18, 1959, a great rally was held in the Capital City of Washington, D.C., attended by thousands of young people of all races from various parts of our country. This meeting, the youth march for integrated schools, expressed the deep feeling of those who actually attend such classes, in favor of education without segregation on account of race.

I ask unanimous consent that the policy statement issued at the time of that rally and excerpts from the keynote speech of A. Philip Randolph, international president of the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement and excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLICY STATEMENT

From its inception, the youth march for integrated schools has maintained a nonpartisan character. In carrying on our activities, we have consistently and publicly made clear that we neither solicit nor accept financial support or participation from any political group as such. Whenever such support or participation was offered, from whatever source, it has been categorically rejected by the committee.

In keeping with this policy, we have on this occasion urged all partisan political groups to refrain from distributing any material along the line of march, at this meeting and in the armory.

Certain groups have not complied with our request. Thus they have made it necessary for us again to respectfully urge all individuals to comply strictly with this request and urge all persons who have responsibility with the march to make it clear that we dissociate the march from all such partisan political activity and literature. We disapprove of the distribution of such literature and regard it as a disservice to the march and a violation of its spirit.

STATEMENT OF A. PHILIP RANDOLPH AT YOUTH MARCH FOR INTEGRATED SCHOOLS, WASHINGTON, D.C., APRIL 18, 1959

In the name of the Youth March Committee for Integrated Schools, I want to welcome you upon the occasion of this historic demonstration for integrated schools and civil rights legislation in the Nation's Capital.

Let me, also, in behalf of our committee, express appreciation for the support of the Negro press, Negro church, NAACP and various student organizations in the colleges and universities throughout the country in making this demonstration the monumental success it is. Let me express gratitude to certain outstanding leaders for the cooperation they have given this great cause, such as Roy Wilkins, executive secretary, NAACP; George Meany, president, AFL–CIO; Walter Reuther, vice president, AFL–CIO; Jackie Robinson, business executive; Harry Bellafonte, great American artist; Judge Hubert Delany, leader at the bar; Norman Thomas, and others.

We have come again to Washington because the job of achieving integrated schools and civil rights legislation is not yet finished, although some progress has been made.

While the massive resistance movement of Virginia has collapsed, morally and legally, resistance in other areas of the South continues unabated. Thus, until the whole sinister structure of segregation in the United States has been torn down and thrown into the ashcan of history, youth, black and white, Jew and Gentile, Protestant and Catholic, and their allies, the church and labor, must make pilgrimage after pilgrimage to Washington to keep the issue of human dignity alive in America in particular and the world in general.

Youth and their allies have come back to Washington because, in this fleeting moment of history, the problem of integrated schools has become the conscience of the Nation. We have returned to our Nation's Capital today with a democratic participation in a great mass demonstration by youth and adults to indicate the uncompromising commitment of American youth to the principle of the God-given right of every child, regardless of race or color, to secure an education in the public schools free from the insult of discrimination or segregation.

We have come again to the Nation's Capital to register our protest against a movement, under the banner of States' rights, to hamstring, undermine, and ultimately destroy the place of the U.S. Supreme Court in our American constitutional system. We resist and condemn every bill which has been introduced in the Congress or which will be introduced in the Congress to curb and restrict the power of the U.S. Supreme Court to interpret the Constitution and the laws of the land.

We have come back to Washington because it is the heart not only of America but of the free world. It is the Capital to which rulers from all nations of the world come to discuss their problems and seek support and cooperation from the President of our country, the most powerful ruler in the world today.

We have come again to Washington because we want to demonstrate that the fight for civil rights and integrated schools is a part of the fight for human rights all over the world.

Because liberty is indivisible, one cannot support colonialism in Africa and racism in the United States without strengthening the hands of communism in its march for world-wide conquest. Thus, the march of youth for integrated schools and civil rights is the march for the preservation of our democratic society and maintenance of our traditions and human values of justice, freedom, and equality.

One of the best ways to halt the progress of communism in Africa and Asia and give reality and integrity to our profession of democracy is for the United States to give Negroes their civil rights today. Tomorrow may be too late.

Thus, in this hour of world crisis, the Youth March to Washington seeks to give hope and faith to the nine Little Rock Negro children who seek to enter Central High School, and to express denunciation of the policy of closing public schools to avoid integration.

In order that the Fascist and Communist enemies of democracy at home and abroad may know where we stand, let me state that the Youth March for Integrated Schools is definitely nonpartisan. It is also definitely anti-Communist, but is definitely not nonpolitical.

Finally, in this time of worldwide tension, youth, together with their allies, express unqualified support of President Eisenhower upon the eve of a conference between Communist Russia and the western democracies to discuss the problem of peace and war, in relation to the Berlin crisis. The cause of democracy must triumph for there can be no civil rights except within the framework of a democratic society. We wish to express appreciation to the Eisenhower administration for the role it has played in advancing the cause of civil rights but urge it to do more.

Let us not be dismayed by the long, hard struggle ahead for we will win if we fight and faint not.

California State Assembly Opposes Partnership Power Program on Trinity River Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 26, 1959

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, the Assembly of the State of California by substantial vote has asked the Congress to provide funds this year for public development of the power plants of the Trinity River project. In doing so the assembly also urged absolute rejection of the exclusive partnership plan that the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. and the Secretary of the Interior have been trying for 5 years to foist upon the people of my State.

Incidentally, I notice that the Secretary is still trying, despite the long legislative history of failure. Last week he sent to the Congress another report endorsing proposed House legislation to authorize the Pacific Gas & Electric partnership scheme which the State assembly has now condemned.

The significance of the assembly action, Mr. President, is not merely the boost it gives the authorized Trinity division of the Central Valley project. This double vote, 43 to 20 on one resolution and 44 to 28 on the other, shows that the Pacific Gas & Electric no longer controls the electric power policy of the California Legislature. The Sacramento Bee commented last week that—

Some capitol observers said they cannot remember when the Pacific Gas & Electric suffered such a setback in the legislature.

The coauthor of the resolutions, Assemblyman Edwin L. Z'Berg, was quoted as stating that—

The Pacific Gas & Electric wanted to defeat these resolutions at all costs.

Another news article from the Sacramento Bee of May 18 tells the story of the assembly vote. I ask unanimous consent that this article, entitled "Assembly Opposes Pacific Gas & Electric Trinity Plan," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ASSEMBLY OPPOSES PACIFIC GAS & ELECTRIC TRINITY PLAN

(By Tom Arden)

The Democratic-controlled State assembly today went on record asking Congress to reject the Pacific Gas & Electric Co.'s proposal to build and operate the power generating facilities at the Trinity River project, now under construction by the Federal Government.

By a vote of 43 to 25, the lower house members approved Assembly Joint Resolution 23, Z'berg, calling for enactment of the Kuchel-Engle legislation to provide for public development of the Trinity's power resources.

ASKS FOR FUNDS

Then the assembly voted 44 to 28 in favor of Assembly Joint Resolution 25, Bruce F. Allen, asked congress to provide funds at this session to begin design and construction of the power facilities by the Federal Government.

The resolutions were sent to the senate for consideration.

Their approval in the lower house marked a reversal of the position of the assembly on the public power issue. Similar proposals were turned down in past sessions when Republicans controlled the assembly.

FOUR GOP'ERS, THIRTY-NINE DEMOS

Four Republicans joined thirty-nine Democrats in voting approval of Assembly Joint Resolution 23. Three Republicans and forty-one Democrats voted favorably on Assembly Joint Resolution 25. The only Democrat voting against the resolutions was Assemblyman Sheridan Hegland of San Diego County.

Assemblyman Edwin L. Z'berg, Democrat, of Sacramento County, chief author of Assembly Joint Resolution 23, said it is very important that the Pacific Gas & Electric partnership plan be turned down.

The Trinity power is necessary, Z'berg told the assembly, to pump Central Valley's project water from the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta into the canal to carry it to the proposed San Luis Reservoir on the San Joaquin Valley west side.

If the Pacific Gas & Electric gets the power at the Government project, Z'berg stated, the Federal Bureau of Reclamation would have to turn right around and buy power from the private company to operate the pumps. It could be used, also by the State in transporting water over the Tehachapi to the south.

"The end result," he pointed out, "would be high priced water down south."

KEEP NOSES OUT

Republican Assemblyman Harold K. Levering, of Los Angeles County, said the issue is one the legislature should ignore.

"We in California should keep our big noses out of this and attend to our own business," Levering said. "This is a hassle in Congress and not a hassle for us on this floor."

Republican Assemblyman Allen, author of Assembly Joint Resolution 25, told the assembly California's U.S. Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL, Republican, and CLAIR ENGLE, Democrat, are opposed to the Pacific Gas & Electric partnership plan.

He said unless funds are granted immediately the Central Valley's project will lose about $5 million a year in power revenue when Trinity River Dam is completed and water is available for hydroelectric generation.

VOTE GIVEN

The vote on the Z'berg resolution was:

Yes: Don A. Allen, Bane, Bee, Biddick, George E. Brown, Burton, Cameron, Crown, Mrs. Davis, DeLotto, Dills, Elliott, Frew, Gaffney, Garrigus, Samuel R. Geddes, Hanna, Hawkins, House, Kennick, Lowrey, Lunardi, MacBride, Masterson, McMillan, Miller, Munnell, Nisbet, O'Connell, Petris, Porter, Rees, Unruh, Waldie, Williamson, George A. Wilson, Winton, Z'berg, and Speaker Brown, all Democrats; Bruce F. Allen, Beaver, Collier, and Thelin, Republicans—43.

No: Backstrand, Bradley, Burke, Busterud, Chapel, Coolidge, Crawford, Cusanovick, Dahl, Ernest R. Geddes, Grant, Holmes, Johnson, Lanterman, Levering, Luckel, Marks, Mulford, Pattee, Reagan, Schrade, Sedgwick, Shell, and Sumner, all Republicans; Hegland, Democrat—25.

Democrats Kilpatrick and Meyers, absent during the vote on Assembly Joint Resolution 23, joined in the yes vote on Assembly Joint Resolution 25.

Republicans Belotti and Britschgi, who did not vote on Assembly Joint Resolution 23, voted against Assembly Joint Resolution 25 and Republican Thelin, who voted for Assembly Joint Resolution 23, voted against Assembly Joint Resolution 25.

How To Make a Movie Out of "The Ugly American"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BYRON L. JOHNSON
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, as one who read "The Ugly American," I view the possibility of its becoming a movie with mixed emotions. I commend to the attention of the Members the views of Thomas W. Wilson, Jr., reported in "The Easy Chair," of the June 1959 issue of Harper's magazine. Mr. Wilson has had 12 years of oversea experience as a newspaperman, businessman, and U.S. official. He now edits Economic World for the Committee on International Economic Growth:

Offhand, "The Ugly American" looks like a natural for the screen. It has at least four big assets.

First of all, the story is presold. It was a Book-of-the-Month-Club selection; it has been on the bestseller lists for months; and it was serialized by the Saturday Evening Post. So almost everyone knows that "The Ugly American" deals mainly with the shenanigans of delinquent Americans who represent the U.S. Government overseas.

Second, there is a carload of colorful characters to work with—good and bad. The principal bad guys include the oaf who is the American Ambassador to Sarkhan; the ignoramus who is Counselor of Embassy; the moron who heads the U.S. Information Service; the numskulls who run the economic-aid missions; the Chinese servants who spy for the Communists; and the ever-so-clever Russians who make fools out of the Americans bumbling about in Asia and elsewhere. The good guys include a Catholic priest who conquers both dysentery and the local Communists; a poultryman who does good work in the hinterlands—at least for a while; an Air Force colonel who plays a mouth organ and works out horoscopes; a hardworking American Ambassador who seriously tries to serve his country; a tough-minded labor negotiator who for some unaccountable reason conducts a conference on atomic weapon installations; and the Ugly American whose uncouth physiognomy and dirty fingernails suggested a title fortuitously reminiscent of Graham Greene's "The Quiet American."

Third, there is plenty of dramatic conflict in the story because everybody who tries to do any good has to beat his brains out against the stupidity, arrogance, trickery, indolence, bureaucracy, rascality, or other flaws of American officials in the field or at home.

And finally, the story is laid in southeast Asia, which offers plenty of exotic background stuff like temple dancers, golden pagodas, jungle scenes, and other grist for technicolor.

The only obvious deficiency in the story is that there isn't much of a sex angle, but it shouldn't be too hard to put some pizzazz into that insipid secretary to the Ambassador.

With all these assets, "The Ugly American" might appear to be a cinch for adaptation to the screen. But it's not that easy.

The screen writers may have trouble developing a story line and picking a hero. The difficulty is that the book is a collection of episodes which are only loosely related to each other and would tend to clutter up the continuity. Besides, most of the good guys don't quite add up as heroes. The Catholic priest is around for only one chapter and then is abandoned by both the authors and the American Embassy; the Air Force colonel never gets to influence policy by reading the King's horoscope because the Counselor of Embassy goofs off; the good Ambassador gives up hope of making sense out of the U.S. Government and throws in the towel; the labor leaders' good work gets him nowhere because a Navy captain on his negotiating team falls for a local Communist girl to the detriment of his daytime reflexes; and the poultryman is bought off by a wily French Ambassador with an expense-free junket through the fleshpots of Asia and Europe.

By a process of elimination scenarists probably will have to settle for the Ugly American himself as the hero, because he is the only character who succeeds in doing any good for the United States of America—and then only by insubordination. The Ugly American, of course, is the earthly engineer who disappears into the sticks of an Asian country with his equally earthy wife and—despite the disapproval of his American superiors—makes a hit with the natives by inventing a bamboo pump operated by a bicycle pedal to raise irrigation water.

Right here I want to make a minor suggestion to the screen writers. It is this: Try to figure out something else for the Ugly American to invent, because the Asians themselves seem to have invented pedal-operated pumps about ten centuries ago, though there is some historical evidence to suggest that they stole the idea from the ancient Egyptians. As for the use of bamboo, a Filipino tried to sell that idea a few years ago to both his own government and to the Indian government, but it was turned down because it doesn't work very well and only works at all on shallow wells. And all the bright engineers—Asians and Americans alike—are trying to help the villagers out there to put down deep wells in place of shallow wells which are unsanitary and have other drawbacks.

As alternative ideas for the Ugly American, you might consider the invention of a coffee roaster made from a gasoline drum; or an improved stove that burns less fuel and doesn't smoke up the hut; or a manual washing machine made out of wood; or a ten-dollar water filter for village wells; or even an inexpensive gasoline pump. All these

things have been cooked up by Americans in the field and they work fine.

STAY AWAY FROM THOSE FACTS

But these are details. The first big suggestion I want to make to the script department is this: Don't do any research on this story. There is plenty of material available and it's easy to come by. But it spoils the whole theme of "The Ugly American."

Take the bit about the poultryman, for example. In the book he quits in disgust because his chief has a fixation about big projects like dams and irrigation works and can't be bothered with unglamorous, picayune stuff like improving barnyard stock. If you made the mistake of poking around into the facts, you would find that there are 58 Americans currently overseas in 43 countries helping farmers to improve their poultry and livestock. In Iran, for example, the U.S.-sponsored poultry program has benefited the farmers of some 30,000 villages and produced some 10 million cross-bred chickens which weigh twice as much as the old Iranian stock and lay 3 times as many eggs. And in Lebanon the poultry program is so well known that large eggs on the market are called "point 4 eggs." This kind of information would spoil the whole story, so it is much better just to go along with the authors of the book and ignore it.

This advice is essential because one of the main points of the book is that our foreign-aid program doesn't do any of the little things that touch the plain people. And if you started messing around with research you would find all kinds of little projects—like the substitution of steel plow tips for wooden plow tips. Or instructions on how to de-worm pigs. Or lessons on the prevention of childhood diseases. Or training schools for rural nurses. Or village programs to teach people how to read and write. Or self-help housing projects which are now underway in Guatemala, Costa Rica, Nicaragua, British Honduras, Surinam, Trinidad, British Guiana, Turkey, Korea, and Taiwan. Or the work-while-learning agricultural school for young farmers in the Philippines. Or the distribution of foods that have eased the twinges of hunger in at least 60 million bellies, mostly Asian. Stuff of that kind. It just doesn't add up to a best-selling story.

Another reason why it's important not to do any research is that a second major point of "The Ugly American" is to show what jerks we are, compared to the Russians. While the United States is represented in Sarkhan by an insensitive political hack, the Russian Ambassador is so dedicated that he not only dieted 40 pounds off his middle in deference to local predilections for slim-waisted diplomats, but he learned to play the native nose flute as well. While American supplies, labeled as gifts from the United States of America, never seem to spark any gratitude, the Russians become heroes by furtively stenciling the hammer and sickle on a few bags of our rice.

But even more important is the evidence presented in the book that the Communists not only beat us hands down but they do it with far less money and never, never make a mistake. The screen writers of "The Ugly American" would do well to take all this on faith. Otherwise, they might find out that the Communist countries have extended credits for some $2.5 billion worth of economic aid and are putting more money and technicians into some countries than we are. What's more, they might stumble across some disturbing stories of booboos by the Communist masterminds—like how they offended the Burmese by buying their rice and then selling it in competition to Burma's own customers; or how they overcharged the Indonesians for inferior jeeps; or how they sent a beet-sugar mill to Java instead of the cane-sugar mill that was ordered; or how a team of technicians from Indonesia spent 9 months in Czechoslovakia without learning anything because their Communist instructors couldn't speak the language.

How would the audience get the word that the Russians are taking the shirts off the Americans if you show the Russians making mistakes like that? So this is my first line of advice to the screenwriters: Stick with the episodes in the book and leave the facts alone. They muck up the story.

PUNCHERS AND QUITTERS

The second helpful hint is this: Don't be confused by a lot of little contradictions in the book. For example, the book says that Americans working overseas should get out and live and work in the villages where the people are; but it also says that Americans should cuddle up to students, intellectuals, labor leaders, opinionmakers, and the kind of folks who obstinately prefer to live in the cities. Then the book keeps preaching about how we should concentrate on the simple, inexpensive things that the people understand; but it also says that we should do things that will have a big dramatic impact, like the Russian offers to build a hospital and a sports stadium. The book says that we should send out only Americans who are steeped in knowledge of the language, history, religion, politics, economics, culture, and folkways of the country to which they are assigned; but it also suggests that our envoys should be down-to-earth folks ready to work with their hands in the fields and repair shops. The book suggests that our representatives should be disciplined professionals in the service of our cause; but the authors' sympathies run to insubordinate and peevish types who quit when they can't have their way, give the old heave-ho to visiting American Senators, and punch other Americans on the nose—the kind of colorful individualist with a very low survival value in any organization, public or private.

But, as I say, don't be confused by such minor contradictions. Chances are the movie audiences will never notice a thing.

The third—and most important—bit of advice to the screenwriters is this: Don't go trying to make any sense out of the big message of the book. The big message is that the United States is consistently losing to communism all over the world and that there is an easy solution to this problem.

The solution is set down as plain as day in the final chapter of the book—rather curiously entitled "A Factual Epilogue." It says this:

"We do not need the horde of 1,500,000 Americans—mostly amateurs—who are now working for the United States overseas. What we need is a small force of well-trained, well-chosen, hard-working and dedicated professionals. They must be willing to risk their comforts and—in some lands—their health. They must go equipped to apply a positive policy promulgated by a clear-thinking Government. They must speak the language of the land of their assignment, and they must be more expert in its problems than are the natives."

This is the kind of statement that is impregnable to everything but analysis.

For one thing, the "horde of 1,500,000 Americans—mostly amateurs" includes well over 1 million members of the U.S. armed services. The authors do not recommend any reduction in Armed Forces, so presumably the desired reductions would be made from the professional-level people who man the Embassies and aid missions in the sixty-odd nations in which we are represented. Certainly some of these would have to mind the store in the capitals which remain the political, economic, financial, and cultural centers of the world and where official business between representatives of governments still is conducted. And given the fact that there are somewhere between three and five million villages in the world, one wonders how the remaining Americans would manage to get out and live with the plain people as they are urged to do.

Of course, no reasonable person would quarrel with the authors' edict that the refurbished American teams must "go equipped to apply a positive policy promulgated by a clear-thinking government." But it does imply that oversea representatives—no matter how rigorously trained—cannot be much better than the policies of the government they represent.

Again, none can object to the plea for language qualification, which experts agree is one of the four or five most important assets of representatives serving abroad. In fact it is so unassailable that even the Government had sense enough to expand its language training programs several years ago.

As for the suggestion that Americans should be more expert than native experts in the problems of their own countries, it just wouldn't pay to think about the likelihood of this ever happening.

SOME NATIVE ALLERGIES

But it isn't what is said in the big message that is really troublesome. It's what isn't said.

For example, it isn't pointed out anywhere in the book that Communist parties everywhere are manned—not by Russians or other foreigners—but by bona fide nationals of the country in which they live. Nor is it recognized anywhere in the book that Americans do not and cannot have representatives in the cabinets or parliaments of other nations or even run elections in foreign countries; that Americans do not and cannot publish newspapers or control other means of public persuasion; that Americans cannot have and do not have decisive influence over any of the centers of political power in any society outside of the United States.

Nowhere does the book mention that in almost every nation in Asia, the Middle East, Africa, and Latin America the dominant political force is nationalism rather than communism; and that the trademark of nationalism is a sensitive allergy to the exercise of any influence by any foreigner over any aspect of national life—least of all by foreigners who happen to be white and Western.

Nowhere does the book refer to the fact that our basic concept of relations with friendly nations precludes our representatives from throwing their weight around—even if they could; and prevents them from going behind the backs of host governments to deal directly with the people; and requires them to work out aid programs on the basis of agreed projects and mutual cooperation—with the result that, rightly or wrongly, Americans just don't wander around in the barrios and boondocks cooking up spot projects with the head men of the villages.

Nowhere does the book point up the fact that the major enemies of social and economic reform are not so much the Communists as the conservative and reactionary elements in most societies. Nowhere does the book hint at the responsibility of foreign governments to lead in the conduct of their own affairs—nor at the existence of national leaders capable of doing so.

Speaking more generally, all that is left out of the book is a recognition that societies in the less developed areas of the world are caught up in the whirlwinds of concurrent revolutions—social, economic, ideological, and technological; that old institutions are crumbling right and left without new ones to take their places; that populations in many places are growing faster than resources; that communism—for all its sins—waits alertly to capitalize on turmoil not of its own making; and that there is a desperate lack of capital, of know-how, of management, and of the institutions needed to guide

preindustrial and predemocratic societies through the agonies of violent change—quickly enough to meet aspirations and smoothly enough to avoid political retrogression. And people who worry about such things tend to suspect that this may be just about the toughest, most complicated, subtle, and sophisticated problem that anyone has ever faced.

But the screen writers of the "Ugly American" should not boggle at this kind of thing. Stick with the big message. Stick with that small band of elite Americans—concocted of one part scholar, one part paratrooper, and one part handyman. In the book, the reader is left to imagine just how they would go about making Asia, Africa, and other parts safe for democracy. It would be well to leave it to the imagination of the movie audience as well.

The whole point underlying all my advice is that the big message in "The Ugly American" is absolutely foolproof just the way it is. There are at least three reasons for this.

1. As the authors assure us, the episodes in the book are only fictionalized versions of events that actually took place, and the characters in the book are based on people who actually exist. Thus the stories are essentially true—just as true as the fact that the U.S. Congress includes a handful of rascals and freeloaders, or that American business has its quota of incompetents and fools, or that American youth includes delinquents and beatniks.

2. The authors of "The Ugly American" have the impressive credentials of the man-who-was-there-and-saw-it-with-his-own-eyes. As they put it: "We have shared in the events of southeast Asia." And as the book itself makes clear in the incident involving Senator BROWN, the man-who-was-there is infallible, even when he is wrong.

3. The big message of "The Ugly American" is foolproof because it offers a simple, easy cure-all for violent, complex, intangible problems. Any nostrum is bound to be popular because it offers a substitute for thinking. People love easy answers. So I just suggest that the screenwriters dish up "The Ugly American" the way it was written in the book. You can't miss.

Statement by Hon. James C. Healey, of New York, on H.R. 2337

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. HEALEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 26, 1959

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, I am including in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my statement to the Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee No. 3, in connection with my bill, H. R. 2337:

I want to thank the subcommittee for the opportunity to present my statement in support of my bill, H. R. 2337, which would prohibit certain acts involving the transportation, importation, possession, or use of explosives.

The bill would make it a Federal offense for anyone to possess explosives transported in interestate commerce with the knowledge or intent that such explosives would be used to damage any building used for educational, religious, charitable, or civic purposes. The bill contains a provision, modeled after the Lindbergh Kidnapping Act, which is designed to allow the Federal Bureau of Investigation to intervene as soon as a bombing occurs in any locality. The use of explosives to damage or destroy buildings within the categories mentioned, would create a rebuttable presumption that the explosives had been transported in interstate commerce by the person possessing or using them. Thus, jurisdiction would be provided for Federal intervention upon the happening of the event—to wit, the bombing—without actual proof that the explosives had been carried across State lines. There is, however, a provision that no person could be convicted in the absence of independent evidence that the explosives had actually been illegally transported interstate. This means that the presumption would operate to provide jurisdiction for FBI intervention, but that the presumption alone would be insufficient on which to ground a conviction.

In 1957 and 1958, there were some 70 bombing or attempted bombings of churches, synagogues, schools, and other civic buildings throughout the South and in isolated cases in other parts of the country. With few exceptions, these bombings appeared to be the work of an interstate gang, whose purpose probably was to retaliate against organizations and individuals for, or to intimidate them from, expressing their point of view on the desegregation problem.

At midnight on September 10, 1957, a series of explosives heavily damaged the newly constructed $500,000 Hattie Cotton Grammar School in Nashville, Tenn. One Negro first-grade child had been admitted to the school a few days earlier.

A bomb consisting of 54 sticks of dynamite was placed in a window well of Temple Beth-El in Birmingham, Ala., on April 28, 1958. It failed to explode because of an all-night rain. There was sufficient explosives, however, to demolish the entire structure. On the same day, April 28, 1958, shortly after midnight, a synagogue in Jacksonville, Fla., was bombed. Within an hour, thereafter, a Negro school in that city was damaged by explosives. In all of these cases, an anonymous caller reported that the confederate underground was responsible for the atrocities.

On March 16, 1958, a religious school was bombed at 2:30 a.m., in Miami, Fla., and a Jewish community center was damaged in Nashville, Tenn., at 8:30 p.m. by dynamite. Here again, a purported member of the confederate underground claimed responsibility in an anonymous telephone call. On October 12, 1958, the Temple of Atlanta was seriously damaged by a bomb explosion at 3:30 a.m. Once again, a telephone caller announced that the confederate unground had set off the explosion.

In all the specific cases cited, the local police authorities were convinced that the outrages committed in their cities were symptomatic of an interstate conspiracy directed by a group calling itself the confederate underground or the confederate information center.

Americans are by nature, tradition, and upbringing a lawabiding people. We do not relish subversion of our democratic and sacred institutions. These acts of violence, these dynamitings and explosions have created the exact reverse of the effect that was intended. All respectable citizens and civic groups, in the South as well as in the North, have cried out against these shameful acts of vandalism and terror.

Unfortunately, however, many of the local police officials have neither the ability nor the crime detection facilities necessary to ferret out the perpetrators of these outrages. Furthermore, it is likely that the criminals flee by automobiles across State lines. For these reasons, and because of our experience with the Lindbergh Kidnaping Act, the Mann Act, the Lottery Act, the Anti-Racketeering Act, the National Motor Vehicle Theft Act, and the National Narcotics Act, all of which are Federal criminal statutes involving crimes over which the States have concurrent jurisdiction, it would be completely consistent with States rights and Federal jurisdiction for the National Government to step in and help the local communities to root out this vicious pattern of lawlessness.

My bill, H.R. 2337, would permit the FBI to work in conjunction with local police authorities to curb the interstate conspiracies which have tended to besmirch the good name of the United States all over the world.

I hope this committee will act favorably on my bill.

Beyond the Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WINT SMITH
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 26, 1959

Mr. SMITH of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, the boss of the Teamsters, Jimmy Hoffa, picked up a lot of adverse criticism by reason of his speech at Brownsville, Tex., in which he said he would call a general transportation strike throughout the United States if Congress tried to pass a real tough labor bill.

Harry Bridges, head of the Dock Workers and Maritime Union on the Pacific coast and Hawaii, made a similar gesture on his return from Moscow. He said he would tie up the waterfronts if he deemed it advisable in order to stop shipments of arms to Chiang Kai-shek.

To illustrate how unpopular Hoffa's statement was with the general public, Walter Meany disavowed and deplored this attitude on the part of Hoffa.

The arrogant, domineering, all-powerful Hoffa, friend of gangsters and gangland overlords, now says Walter Reuther is no good and a disgrace to Reuther's own CIO members.

It would appear Boss Jimmy is now going to take on everyone from the general public to Walter Reuther. Boss Hoffa—so far—has said nothing unfavorable against MacDonald, boss of the Steel Workers Union.

I append hereto an editorial which seems to point out what the American public thinks of Jimmy Hoffa. This editorial was written by Dwight Peyton, member of the editorial staff of the Daily Oklahoman, Oklahoma City, Okla. I commend it most highly:

[From the Daily Oklahoman, May 22, 1959]

BEYOND THE LAW

Even the more fanatic union members are getting a bellyfull of James Hoffa and they talk about the time when Jimmy will get his.

Willingly or otherwise the rank and file members of Hoffa's union have gone along with his rotten leadership. Unless a poll were taken it would be hard to know whether this indicated their complete willingness to take a share of the spoils garnered by the Teamsters' strong-arm tactics or whether a majority favored fairness and decency but was too intimidated to speak out.

There has been no call for any sort of reform or legal restriction on unions from

any union source in spite of the record which reads like the Chicago gangland rule in Al Capone's heyday. George Meany, top man of the AFL–CIO, took time out in his efforts to stave off all but the most minor of union controls from Congress to give Hoffa a slap on the wrist. Hoffa threatens to paralyze the economy and Meany says, "We were right in telling Jimmy he couldn't play in our yard any more," or words to that effect.

When and if the day comes that the economy again operates under rules of equal justice it will be because the members of labor unions who were able to think and act beyond intimidation joined hands with the rest of the Nation for a cleanup.

Under present conditions, talk of unions policing themselves is about like talk of turning a Federal prison over to a system of self-rule. Victor Riesel's account of "dead men, wounded women, shattered cars, dynamited homes, burnedout mill property" from southern union strife areas sounds like some report from Russia rather than the United States of America. Surely a great many workers holding union cards must be as disturbed and ashamed of such happening as anyone else.

If so there is hope of reform. Otherwise the Nation is committed to a bitter and destructive period of internecine strife with loss to everyone.

Something for both union members and nonmembers to realize is that Jimmy Hoffa is not the major villain. Eliminate him and a dozen of his stripe will step forward to fight for the power he established. It is the legal indulgence of such dangerous power which must be eliminated if the Nation is to be spared further shame and constant threat of disaster from just any thug who manages to climb on one of the union thrones. Hoffa is asking for a comeuppance but making him instead of the system, the fall guy would be a tragic mistake. Walter Reuther is altogether as offensive and far more dangerous. He does not make his plays out in the open in defiance of public opinion.

Beyond the law license is given union leaders for boycott, blackmail, forced membership, political use of members' dues, featherbedding, and denial of democratic processes such as secret elections under impartial supervision. It is almost unbelievable that Americans of any division or creed would be claiming privilege for such underworld and un-American practices. Yet in fighting against all reform measures designed to restrict unions in any way, labor leaders are doing just that.

In keeping silent and unprotesting union members must carry a share of the blame to the extent that they share in all the gains and benefits won by such tactics.

John Foster Dulles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL B. DAGUE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 26, 1959

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, the Nation stands with bowed heads as we mark the passing of one of the greatest statemen of our time and it is no small thing to have lived through the years when his contributions toward the peace and security of the world come to fullest flower.

To us who stand in sorrow at his bier it seems that his usefulness came to an end at the very time when he is needed most. And yet we are persauded that as a great Christian layman he laid down his life quite content that he had done his best, and with confidence that succeeding generations would set their seal of approval on the dynamic program formulated under his direction which has kept us at peace for the last 6 years.

John Foster Dulles was a great man and his true greatness was revealed in that steadfast refusal to return in kind the vilification that was heaped upon his policies; that these detractors for the most part have reversed themselves and now acclaim him for what he was—the greatest Secretary of State in our time—indicates that in this first instance their opposition was largely political and not of the heart.

My admiration for our late Secretary became firmly established when he refused to retract his contention that the true art of diplomacy lies in the ability to skirt the brink of a world cataclysm without plunging in. In simple language this means that we must always be prepare to call the other's bluff—which under his leadership we did on several notable occasions—and the peace we enjoy today is attributable to that policy.

We stand with our President in salute as this great American is laid at rest in that sacred spot reserved for the Nation's heroes. And to his beloved wife and the members of his family goes our deepest sympathy and the prayerful hope that his service to the world will be the shining light that will guide them along the pathway of sorrow which they now must tread.

To Be Pro-Russia Is To Be Anti-Strauss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 26, 1959

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the following article by George Sokolsky, which appeared in the Long Island Daily Press, on May 20, gives an interesting picture of the viewpoint of Acting Secretary of Commerce Lewis Strauss on doing business with Russia:

CYRUS EATON AND LEWIS STRAUSS
(By George E. Sokolsky)

Cyrus Eaton, the capitalist, also opposes the appointment of Adm. Lewis L. Strauss as Secretary of Commerce.

Eaton is the Cleveland capitalist who conducts a nationwide propaganda in favor of doing business with Soviet Russia. So the pro-Russian capitalist, Cyrus Eaton, wrote a letter to a Democratic Senator instructing him to take "with the utmost seriousness" a recommendation that Adm. Lewis Strauss be retired permanently.

Eaton's letter was on the stationery of the Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Co., a public corporation.

To this letter from Eaton, the Democratic Senator from Connecticut, THOMAS J. DODD, replied:

"MR. CYRUS EATON,
The Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Co.,
Terminal Tower, Cleveland, Ohio

"DEAR MR. EATON: I have your letter of March 24, and a copy of an editorial from the Louisville Courier-Journal of March 16, concerning the appointment of Mr. Lewis Strauss as Secretary of Commerce.

"I note that your letter suggests that the editorial of the Louisville Courier-Journal 'must be taken with the utmost seriousness by the Democratic majority in the Senate.'

"I have read the editorial with great interest, but I take it from your letter that you are opposed to the confirmation of Mr. Strauss, and this in itself will be taken with the utmost seriousness by me in favor of Mr. Strauss.

"Very truly yours,

"THOMAS J. DODD."

The Louisville Courier-Journal editorial is most interesting and may even be of some significance. It tells how Strauss is energetic and cannot remain idle very long. Then it goes on to say:

"But Mr. Strauss's appointment has not yet been confirmed in the Senate.

"Each time the subject is mentioned, deep-throated growls come from Senators who can hardly wait to vote against him, and his confirmation is one of the certainties least likely to encourage bets around Washington.

"Under these circumstances the normal man would be inclined to speak softly, walk on tiptoe and engage in no controversy more unsettling than the possibility of rain or shine. Not so Mr. Strauss. * * *"

Why should a member of the President's Cabinet speak softly and walk on tiptoe when there is business of the Government to be done? Must a man cheapen himself before confirmation by the Senate?

But hark. The Louisville Courier-Journal lets a cat out of a bag. This is the story it tells:

"He promptly rejected an application for the export of some 12,000-odd tons of 28- and 30-inch pipe to the Soviet Union.

"He has this right under the Export Control Act, but it is one that former Secretaries have exercised subject to the advice of other departments, principally the State Department."

Is that not the pipeline that Anastas Mikoyan was holding out as a carrot in front of American businessmen?

Was he not telling of the pipeline to be built from beyond the Urals to the heart of Europe, so that Russian-owned oil could dominate Europe? Does Cyrus Eaton want Lewis Strauss permanently retired because he refused to let that deal go through?

The Louisville Courier-Journal, after much discussion of interdepartmental quarreling on this subject, says:

"It is fatiguing to think that this contentious man is already stirring up his own brand of interdepartmental mischief, before he is even officially installed as Commerce Secretary, and that, if confirmation is given his appointment, he can do so for almost 2 years longer."

Oh, dear. Oh, dear.

Let us not get fatigued. Why should we not all live in quiet peace and gentle conformity and let the Russians get away with what they want to get away with, as long as they are not too noisy about it?

Perhaps it were best always to have sweet and easy persons in public office, so that nobody would be fatigued by the contentiousness which establishes truth and brings the facts of deceit, subversion, and even treason to the surface.

A Good Schoolteacher Is More Than a Talking Textbook

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 26, 1959

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very fine editorial of the Louisville Courier-Journal in its May 20 issue, entitled "A Good Schoolteacher Is More Than a Talking Textbook."

The editorial comments on a report submitted to the Kentucky Council on Public Higher Education by a committee making recommendations for higher standards in teacher-training courses and educators in the school system.

The editorial quotes and pays deserved tribute to Dr. W. J. Moore, dean of Eastern State College at Richmond, Ky.

Dr. Moore is one of the great educators and great citizens of Kentucky.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A GOOD SCHOOLTEACHER IS MORE THAN A TALKING TEXTBOOK

"We simply could not get away from our basic thought that the teacher should be an educated person. Typing and all those hodge-podge courses are all right in their place, but they simply do not contribute to the base of a good, general education."

Those words spoken by Dr. W. J. Moore are the key to a report he submitted to the Kentucky Council on Public Higher Education. Moore is dean of Eastern State College at Richmond. He and a committee he chaired brought in recommendations for higher standards in teacher training courses and also among educators already at work in the school system. Nearly all their points were adopted.

It may seem strange that there could be discussion of whether a teacher should be an educated person. The fact is, however, that teacher training courses in recent years have produced many teachers who are technicians in a narrow sense, rather than people of broad cultural attainment. The vocational type of course has been heavily stressed for those in teacher training. Standards, set up by professional educators for certifying new teachers entering the profession, have demanded more and more of these courses at the sacrifices of training in the humanities and the sciences. The emphasis has fallen on method instead of content.

MILITARY SCIENCE ISN'T SOCIAL

Now the pendulum is swinging back the other way. It still has a good way to go, as some of the discussion at the meeting of the Council on Public Higher Education disclosed. An argument was put forward in favor of substituting 6 hours of military science for an equal amount of social science. This provoked a healthy response from President Adron Doran of Morehead State College: "If military science is social science, then I'm a walrus."

There is still too much willingness to accept such courses as speech and journalism as substitutes for courses in English literature. In some schools, speech and journalism are used as ways of dressing up the old basic training in English grammar and spelling so as to make them more palatable to adolescents. Such subterfuge should surely not be resorted to in the training of adults as teachers. A basic knowledge of English literature and usage should be a minimum foundation for a teaching career in any field, since English is after all the language the teacher uses, and the one the pupil speaks and writes.

Some other States, notably Indiana and Virginia, have recently moved to reduce the proportion of method courses a teacher must show in order to get a certificate. There seems good reason to believe that teachers themselves are ill satisfied with a narrow technical training which leaves them as ignorant in other fields as their young pupils.

Teachers know that society expects them to be people of balanced, trained, and cultivated minds, capable of giving leadership in the realms of thought. The natural superiority of the teaching profession is one of the reasons why men and women have entered it through the ages. Some modern teachers have been so harried by requirements for "education" courses, however, that they have neglected the real purpose of education in their own lives. It is good to see a trend now starting, here and elsewhere, which seems to promise them a a better chance to be the kind of people most of them want to be.

Missiles and Subs: Two Gaps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 26, 1959

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which was broadcast over WDSU-TV and WDSU-Radio on May 19, 1959:

MISSILES AND SUBS: TWO GAPS

Two national magazines in the past 2 weeks have devoted lead articles to serious weaknesses in our national defense.

The current issue of Look has an article on submarines entitled "The War We Are Not Ready To Fight."

The May 16 Saturday Evening Post headlines its lead article on our weakness in missiles "Our Gamble With Destiny."

The Russians now have a fleet of more than 450 submarines. Adm. John Thach, who heads our antisubmarine groups in the Atlantic, says, "A dozen hostile submarines, carrying possibly 20 missiles apiece, could wipe out 70 percent of our economy in one surprise blow."

The Navy is not equipped to cope with this threat. It needs better submarine detection devices, better torpedoes, new antisubmarine cessels, more money for scientific research.

As for U.S. missiles, there has been a lot of publicity about them—Thor, Jupiter, Polaris, Atlas, Titan, Minuteman. But some of these are not yet ready to go and won't be ready for 2 years. And the others have serious defects—they don't have intercontinental range, or they have to be set up on bases that could probably be knocked out by a surprise Russian attack. The outlook is that, 2 years from now, while we're still depending primarily on manned bombers, Russia will have several hundred long-range missiles in place and ready for launching.

These facts need not be cause for hysteria. They deliberately focus attention on the grim side of the ledger. They don't mean Russia will necessarily try to plunge the world into war. They ignore, for instance, Russia's fear of revolution in her satellite countries in case of world disorder. In the long run, the cold war may be won or lost on the basis of economic competition.

But these facts on submarines and missiles do demonstrate that we're skating on thin ice. We're taking terrible risks when we let the Russians pull way ahead in such areas as submarines and missiles. The Russians know too well how to exploit such situations when they think the power balance is on their side.

This station believes there is cause for concern about the adequacy of our defense in the years immediately ahead. We would like to see less complacency on this subject in Washington and more leadership.

Prospects for Industrial Development in the South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUSSELL B. LONG
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 26, 1959

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, the New York Herald Tribune recently carried an article outlining the contribution made by Mr. Henry De Bardeleben of New Orleans to the waterways transportation industry.

I ask unanimous consent that this article, which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of February 22, 1959, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Feb. 22, 1959]

INLAND LINES HEAD TELLS OF SOUTH'S VAST POTENTIAL

(By Walter Hamshar)

NEW ORLEANS, February 21.—Henry De Bardeleben, head of Coyle Lines, the South's oldest and one of its most respected barge and towboat companies, warned today that his industry must prepare now for a period of tremendous industrial growth in this area of the country.

Mr. De Bardeleben is practicing what he is preaching. He has just organized a new company, put the 94-year-old Coyle Lines into it as an affiliate, and also has purchased control of Blue Stack Towing Co., another venerable towing firm of Tampa, Fla.

HINGES ON ICC

If the Interstate Commerce Commission grants his application for a certificate to operate the Blue Stack service—and it is expected to do this—Mr. De Bardeleben's companies will be the largest common carriers in the South, offering service on the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway as well as out in the gulf between the Mississippi River and Florida. Coyle Lines also offers service along the Intracoastal Waterway as far as Brownsville, Tex.

The acquisition of Blue Stack has the entire inland waterways industry talking for it is the first time that an inland common carrier has attempted to operate a similar service on the open sea.

Mr. De Bardeleben's new company, the De Bardeleben Marine Corp., is one of the Inland Waterways Common Carriers Association's members through its Coyle Lines and

an ardent supporter of the association's plans for promoting and expanding the inland waterways industry.

Blue Stack's acquisition is only part of Mr. De Bardeleben's long-range planning. He said that growth of the South industrially makes it imperative for all transportation media to grow. "We're not going to stop here," he emphasized.

"We bought Blue Stack because it has a fine service but it is not financially able to provide new service as fast as the area's needs are developing," he said. "We must go ahead to retain industry."

Further plans are afoot, the veteran barge and towboat man said. "We are on the verge of new construction," he said but declined to discuss details. The Blue Stack purchase includes a shipyard in Tampa, but Mr. De Bardeleben said that it will be operated only as a repair yard. It also involves a stevedore company.

Mr. De Bardeleben, who has spent almost all his 65 years on the waterways, talks enthusiastically about the South's industrial potential and he is looking forward to participating in it. Although many new industries are already there he described it today as "still a wild country to what it will be."

"I don't see how it can be stopped," he said.

LINE TO ADD TUGS

Blue Stack will add five tugs and seven barges to the De Bardeleben fleet which already includes Coyle Lines' 10 towboats, 3 tugs, 39 barges, and 5 big liquid sulfur carriers.

Coyle Lines grew slowly since it was founded in 1865 until it received a big spurt by heavy inland waterway demands during World War II. It first specialized in hauling coal from Alabama to New Orleans for bunkering ships. Today it is still a major coal carrier but most of this commodity is delivered to new paper mills throughout the South.

Poison in Your Water—No. 83

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 26, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, an article appearing in the Appleton (Wis.) Post-Crescent of September 3, 1958, entitled "State Water Too Often Polluted With Sewage."

STATE WATER TOO OFTEN POLLUTED WITH SEWAGE

It is a foul story in more ways than one, and it is happening in our own midst.

The waters of this area, the springs, ponds, rivers, lakes, and streams are God's gift to man. They are his most important resource, pure and sparkling and inviting in their native state. They are the foundation of whole industries, the basis of all our resort attractions, a prime necessity in man's existence.

So commonly beautiful are these assets that man uses them up, wastes them, destroys them unwittingly. Ignorantly he befouls his own nest, ruins the source of his own livelihood and wonders why there isn't more to destroy.

Years ago men violated every law and precept of decency by slaughtering ducks on Lake Koshkonong by the thousands. These were sent in barrels to New York commercial markets.

Today, with easy transportation, a great many prefer to live on or near the lakes and streams. Resorts have prospered there. Cities have grown and spread over hundreds of acres. Few have adequate sewage disposal plants to care for the new development and larger populations.

Meanwhile, the constantly growing demand for water is reducing water levels. Springs have been plugged, marshes drained, and whole water basins dried up by man's insatiable demand for tillable land in a surplus economy. The result is that wildlife searches in vain for cover, for water, and ultimately the farmer will suffer ravages of insect life formerly destroyed by his wildlife friends who have gone elsewhere.

Every year the shores of lakes and streams swarm with more and more people. They build cottages and homes, but often neglect a most vital element in the building—sanitation. Too often sewage is drained directly into the river or lake, or a dry well is made to serve for both cesspool and dry well.

Lt. Col. Charles T. Smythe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL D. ROSTENKOWSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 26, 1959

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have just recently learned of the death of Lt. Col. Charles T. Smythe, the commandant of cadets at St. John's Military Academy in Delafield, Wis. Chick, as he was known to the gentlemen who attended the academy, was revered not only as a gentleman and an officer, but as a great American as well, instilling in those he taught that the American ideals are the most cherished possession we have, and they should be guarded as closely as life itself.

Colonel Smythe symbolized the spirit of a great educational institution, for he worked hard, played hard, and prayed hard. It can best be noted what he meant to the academy by the following resolution adopted by the Dad's Club of St. John's at a meeting on February 3, 1959:

The late Lt. Col. Charles Thomas Smythe was the first child born of the union of Jeannette Strotz Smythe and Sidney Thomas Smythe in Delafield, Wis., on May 13, 1898.

Upon reaching the age of 11 he entered St. John's Military Academy, one of the leading prep schools of the country, which was founded by his father, Sidney Thomas Smythe, in the year of 1884. Those of his friends who were classmates during his 6 school years at his old school will remember him as an alert young senior captain of the class of 1916, the recipient of the Dr. Delafield medal (the school's highest award), and the possessor of the President's medal, given to the most soldierly cadet.

After graduation from St. John's Military Academy he entered Chicago University. Upon graduating from the university in 1920 he returned to his old prep school as an instructor in English and Latin, and in the year of 1923 he became commandant of cadets.

Lieutenant Colonel Smythe served his father's school as commandant of cadets ably and admirably for some 32 years, at the end of which time he successively became secretary of the board of directors, executive officer, and vice president of St. John's Military Academy. In addition to his other duties this capable gentleman was superintendent of St. John's camps, chairman of the athletic counsel, executive secretary of the St. John's Military Academy Dads' Club, as well as a director of the Oconomowoc National Bank. His life was, indeed, a busy one.

The dawn of each new day presented new challenges which had to be met, and he met them squarely in his quiet, fair, straightforward manner. To the very end the colonel's philosophy of life remained unshaken. It was sometime during the last few years, when his illness became more of a burden and trial to him, that he placed on his desk a brief memorandum which read: "God grant me the serenity to accept things I cannot change, courage to change things I can, and wisdom to know the difference."

So with the hush of death come many reflections of this truly great patriot, whom most of his friends, and the corps of cadets fondly called "Chick." His memory is emblazoned on the academic walls of St. John's Military Academy, where the spirit of his father, the "H.M.," still speaks to each cadet who has the good fortune to become a member of the corps. This fine influence is also emblazoned on the hearts and in the character of the many graduates who have gone forth into the armed services of their country in World War I and World War II, or into whatever walk of life they have chosen. And last but not least on the hearts of his host of friends.

So let us salute and stand in silent reflection of this fine person, about whom it can be truly said: "He was a soldier, scholar, and a gentleman," in the true sense of the word.

Public Servants and Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 26, 1959

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I hope all of my colleagues will read and reflect on this editorial, which appeared in the May 25 issue of Life:

PUBLIC SERVANTS AND POLITICS

Donald Quarles, Deputy Secretary of Defense, was one of those quiet, selfless, brainy workhorses without whom the vast Federal bureaucracy could scarcely run at all. His death last fortnight revealed how nearly indispensable he was to the Defense Department, which is short of knowledgeable civilians of his steady, professional type. Its turnover is alarmingly rapid even by the standards of the Eisenhower administration; Secretary McElroy himself has been poised for flight for months.

Quarles was ideally suited both by training and temperament for high public service in the missile age; he brought a solid background in science and administration from Yale, Columbia and Bell labs, and he had an ascetic affinity for a 6-day week of 18-hour days. Since the fate of whole industries depended on some of his budget decisions, he made plenty of enemies. But he was an outstanding example of the kind of man President Eisenhower, as he told the press last week, has been seeking for 6 years: "real public servants" of "competence * * * character

and integrity," and experienced in the strange ways of Washington. Such men are tragically rare.

Then why has the Senate been trying to make them even rarer? Seldom in its history have Senators exercised their power of confirmation with more capricious and vindictive delay than in the last few weeks. Of 40-odd major Presidential appointments still unconfirmed last week, the nastiest case was that of Lewis Strauss, Secretary of Commerce.

Hostile committee witnesses were given a 10-session field day to throw rotten eggs at Strauss before any witness was called in his favor. Senator ANDERSON'S loud charges assayed as much substance as a Hollywood gossip column written by the late Senator McCarthy, yet got even more attention. The victim of all this was a man whom even his foes know to be a real public servant of topflight brains and experience, with a knowledge of Washington dating from the Wilson administration and extending through 10 storm-tossed years on the Atomic Energy Commission. Strauss himself, in a general defense of his own integrity, felt obliged to protest this "defamation of a plain man who has done his best as he sees it for his country over many years," and added, "I had little thought as a young man that I would ever be called upon for such a statement."

As the left-Democratic New York Post remarked, the right way for Democrats to keep a man like Strauss out of office is through a presidential election, not a confirmation hearing. A President is entitled to the best qualified exponents of his policies he can find. So is the country. The more such men are harassed for reasons of political spite, the fewer real public servants will be available for service.

Ironically enough it is Ike's personal and political success that has diverted so much senatorial bile toward his recent appointments. The Democratic strategists have concluded that Ike himself is an unremunerative target of political abuse. The other targets against which they had been storing up ammunition—notably Dulles and unemployment—unexpectedly became taboo or are melting away. Frustrated, the Senators are throwing the ammunition anyway, at any target they think they can see. A little patience might have improved their aim. In their wilderness, they have made real public servants even scarcer than they were before and thereby done harm to the national interest. That's never good politics.

Poison in Your Water—No. 82

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 26, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the Evening Star, Washington, D.C., on May 23, 1959, entitled "New Potomac Approach":

NEW POTOMAC APPROACH

Congress has been listening for many years, mostly with one ear, to increasing demands for a cleanup of the disgraceful Potomac River pollution. In a speech the other day, Secretary Flemming of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare threatened an unusual Federal antipollution action which we hope will focus congressional attention on the problem once again—and with more effective results.

What Mr. Flemming threatened was to invoke the second phase of a legal action which would require the District to end its pollution of the river. The first phase was taken last year when the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, after a conference on Potomac pollution, recommended that the District carry out a $75 million antipollution program by 1966. In the second phase, as authorized by a 1956 law, Secretary Flemming would call a public hearing to determine whether the District was taking the recommended remedial steps. It is this action which Mr. Flemming said he soon may take. After this hearing, if the District still took no corrective steps, the Secretary would be able to ask the Justice Department to seek a court order directing that the pollution be ended. If the District ignored such an order, it presumably would be subject to penalties.

The 1956 law which authorizes this unusual action applies to interstate waterways and is designed to protect one State against the polluting practices of another. To be invoked here, Maryland presumably would file a complaint against the District—an action which would require no urging. The irony of the situation, however, is that the District is in no possible financial position to carry out the recommended cleanup without Congress' help.

It is precisely this situation which three Washington-area Congressmen, Representatives LANKFORD, FOLEY, and BROYHILL, have cited in their identical bills calling on Congress to provide the $75 million over the next 8 years as an expression of the Federal Government's great interest in a clean Potomac. The benefit is direct, not only to Federal installations in Washington but to the increasing number of such installations in the suburbs which must be supplied with Potomac drinking water. Aside from its role as a water source, the Potomac should be the greatest natural asset of the beautiful National Capital area, a delight to thousands of visitors instead of the stinking sewer it too often is today.

Nomination of Adm. Lewis L. Strauss To Be Secretary of Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH SCOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 26, 1959

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Washington Evening Star of May 26, 1959, together with a letter from Mr. William Mitchell, a Washington attorney, formerly General Counsel of the Atomic Energy Commission, both relating to the nomination of Adm. Lewis L. Strauss to be Secretary of Commerce.

There being no objection, the letter and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILLIAM MITCHELL,
ATTORNEY AT LAW,
Washington, D.C., May 23, 1959.

Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MAGNUSON: I am writing as a former General Counsel of the Atomic Energy Commission. I note that, in connection with the nomination of Lewis L. Strauss as Secretary of Commerce, on which your committee has recently concluded hearings, mention has been made of a letter dated May 18, 1956, from the Atomic Energy Commission to the Chairman of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy, stating the Commission's position on S. 2725 (84th Cong., 1st sess.) and H.R. 10805 (84th Cong., 2d sess.). Since I was General Counsel of the Atomic Energy Commission at that time, I feel that it may be helpful to lay before you my knowledge of the circumstances surrounding the preparation and dispatch of that letter.

The letter in question was written in response to a letter dated May 10, 1956, from the Chairman of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy to the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, requesting a statement of the Commission's position on the two bills above-mentioned. Pursuant to the regular practice of the Commission in preparing comments on pending legislation, the letter from the Joint Committee was referred to the Office of the General Counsel for preparation of a reply. The Commission's letter of May 18, 1956, was prepared in my office and I approved the letter before it was forwarded in the regular routine for review by the Commission staff and signature by the Chairman or Acting Chairman. The letter may not have been a perfect exposition of the rather complicated legal problems which it discussed, but I am sure that no one who had any part in the preparation of the letter had any intention to deceive or mislead any Member of the Congress.

Since Chairman Strauss was absent from the city at the time the letter was ready for dispatch, it was signed by Dr. W. F. Libby, as Acting Chairman of the Commission. Mr. Strauss did not see the letter until his return to the city, after it had been sent. In his capacity as Chairman of the Commission, Mr. Strauss did take responsibility for the letter in subsequent hearings before the House Appropriations Committee. If there were any defects in the manner in which the letter was drafted, these should not be attributed to Mr. Strauss.

I respectfully request that this letter be made a part of the printed record in the recent hearings on Mr. Strauss' nomination.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM MITCHELL.

[From the Evening Star, May 26, 1959]

EX-AEC AID BACKS STRAUSS ON 1956 LETTER

(By J. A. O'Leary)

William Mitchell, former General Counsel of the Atomic Energy Commission, has come forward to back up Lewis L. Strauss on a major phase of the controversy which is swirling around confirmation of Mr. Strauss for Secretary of Commerce.

In a letter to the Senate Commerce Committee yesterday, Mr. Mitchell confirmed Mr. Strauss' contention that he did not direct Mr. Mitchell to write a letter back in 1956 which touched off a stormy debate between the AEC and the House Appropriations Committee. The letter related to bills then pending in Congress to authorize Government reactors for power development.

The old House hearings quote Mr. Strauss as having said he "would like to take full responsibility for having asked the general counsel of the commission to prepare the letter."

In the recent Senate hearings Mr. Strauss insisted he did not make that statement.

CANNON MAKES CHARGE

Chairman CANNON of the House Appropriations Committee charged last week that Mr. Strauss impugned the integrity of the committee when he challenged the accuracy of this printed record.

Mr. Strauss, who was chairman of the AEC in 1956, has told the Senate committee that he was out of the country when the letter

in question was written by the general counsel, and signed by Commissioner Willard F. Libby as acting chairman.

Mr. Strauss explained to the Senators that when he returned to Washington in the summer of 1956, he told Mr. CANNON'S committee that, while he did not order the letter prepared, he would take the responsibility for it as chairman.

Mr. Mitchell, who is now in private practice, confirmed this testimony by writing to the Senate committee as follows:

"Mr. Strauss did not see the letter until his return to the city, after it had been sent. In his capacity as chairman of the commission, Mr. Strauss did take responsibility for the letter in subsequent hearings before the House Appropriations Committee. If there were any defects in the manner in which the letter was drafted, these should not be attributed to Mr. Strauss."

DEBATE A WEEK OFF

Meanwhile, all indications are that it will be the middle of next week before the Senate begins debate on the Strauss nomination. Members of the Commerce Committee staff are working on reports which will summarize the conflicting views of the Senators who voted nine to eight to report the Strauss nomination favorably from committee.

One staff member predicted the report would not be ready before next Monday. The printed record of the Senate hearings may be ready Wednesday or Thursday, but Majority Leader JOHNSON has said he wants Senators to have the hearings for several days before they begin the debate.

They Ask Us: "Are You in It to the Finish?"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. CARLTON LOSER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 1959

Mr. LOSER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I herewith present an illuminating report that should be read by every Member of the Congress. It is a report by one of the outstanding newspaper editors of the Nation:

(Coleman A. Harwell, editor of The Nashville Tennessean, returned last week from a world tour. He and Dean Emeritus Kenneth E. Olson of Northwestern University School of Journalism conducted newspaper seminars in five countries under auspices of the State Department exchange program. They visited numerous other countries en route. Harwell views the world scene in the accompanying article.)

THEY ASK US: "ARE YOU IN IT TO THE FINISH?"—MILLIONS LOOK ONLY TO AMERICA AS CONFLICT GROWS ALL OVER WORLD; SUGGESTED COURSE FOR US TO FOLLOW

(By Coleman A. Harwell)

Every place an American sets foot in this world, he finds himself involved in a conflict.

It is the conflict referred to at home as "East versus West."

But, out where we have been recently, the teams are given a more personal billing. They are called the Russians and the Americans.

The people know a good deal about these big opponents but they want to know more. Because you are American, they ask you many questions, and they listen intently to everything you say.

Most of the questions are friendly. Some are not. But all are very much to the point. Put together, this is what they are asking:

"Do you Americans really have your heart in this thing? We know you are strong, we know you are resourceful, but are you determined? And are you in it until the finish?"

These are questions we need to be asking one another here in America. They cannot be answered in Afghanistan or Ceylon or Indonesia. They cannot be answered by the citizens of those countries nor by the Americans we have sent out to represent our country. They can be answered only by the American people.

Our answers, to be valid, must be based on realities.

The big realities are these:

1. This conflict between communism and freedom will go on indefinitely. We will almost certainly win or lose. A draw seems highly unlikely.

2. We have lost much ground and many people, but we have held firm in a number of places and in some we have gained strength.

3. We have wasted money and effort. We will continue to be wasteful unless we adopt a long-range policy under which more effective programs, not necessarily larger ones, can be developed.

4. Being economical, however, does not mean the end of spending. This is big-time competition.

For 12 years we have been putting off making decisions of fundamental policy. We have been swayed by passing events rather than by permanent conditions. We have tried to convince ourselves that if we just won't look, communism and its threat may disappear.

WE ARE STILL REMINDED THREAT IS STILL THERE

Every now and then something happens that reminds us the threat is still there.

There was the envelopment of Czechoslovakia behind the Iron Curtain and the threat that Greece and Turkey might follow. The Marshall plan resulted.

There was the threat to Berlin and the great airlift to rescue it.

There were South Korea, Hungary, Iraq, Tibet, now, perhaps Berlin again.

Each time we rose to the challenge, fought when necessary, voted new appropriations, then subsided into the sense of safety to which we felt these actions entitled us.

These crises have been very real and it has been necessary to deal with them. But our policy should not be determined by whether Khrushchev is threatening war or promising peace. It should be based on the fact that the Communist drive to crush liberty and take over the world goes on relentlessly every day and in every land.

Upon our return to America, we have been asked repeatedly, "How did the people out there feel about Tibet? That showed them what communism is like, didn't it?"

Yes, it did. But it also showed them that Red China will not tolerate disobedience on its borders any more than Russia did in Hungary. It showed them Communist power and determination.

As one man in Indonesia said, "It showed there is only one side to communism and that is slavery."

To which a skeptic rejoined, "So what is the alternative?"

INCOME UNDER $60 YEARLY FOR MORE THAN BILLION

There are more than a billion people living in underdeveloped lands of the world in which the average per capita income is less than $60 per year. Ceylon enjoys one of the highest standards in its part of the world, $122; India's is less than half of this; Indonesia's about the same.

This compares with a per capita average in North America, Western Europe, and Australia of $900. The American average for 1957 was $2,027.

Communism is at work in every one of the lands where people are barely living. It has an effective climate in which to make its appeal. It says to these people "There are better things in life than this. You do not have to live like hungry animals * * * 12 to a room when you are lucky, on the sidewalks when you are not * * * with disease and filth as your daily lot, and nothing better in prospect for your children."

The Russians invite a young engineer from Afghanistan to visit across the border. They show him their accomplishments.

"You should see their charts of production * * * their steel, their power, their coal," he exclaimed.

"No doubt," was the reply, "but look at those in West Germany. And, certainly in America."

RUSSIA SUGGESTS WHAT THEY MIGHT ACCOMPLISH

"Of course," said the young man, "Germany and America have long had big production. But look what Russia has done in 40 years. That shows what we could do, too."

This young man so full of zeal lives in a country whose only oil streets (in the capital of Kabul) were built by Russia, whose major public works—a powerplant, highways, airfields, bakery, and grain silo—were built by Russia. And whose army, incidentally, is equipped by Russia.

You might switch the argument and point out to him that tying up with Russia would mean the end of his freedom. And he might reply, with something close to a smile, "What freedom?"

Russia is at work in many places—Egypt, Syria, Yemen, Iraq, India, Indonesia, even in Argentina, where it has contracted to provide $100 million in credit for oil development. Premier Nikita Khrushchev has boasted that Russia will outstrip American production, will wrest world economic leadership and share its new wealth and skill with others. Its commitments already total billions of dollars.

CHINA'S SLAVE DRIVING MAY BE DECISIVE

While Russia is boasting and displaying its wares, China is getting underway on an economic program that staggers the imagination and is forcing its millions into slavery. If it fails, as many on both sides of the Iron Curtain believe it will, China may be ripe for another bloody revolution. If it succeeds, then the millions of people surrounding China can expect to follow in the footsteps of Tibet, unless, meanwhile, they have gained the strength and the determination to resist.

These people want to be free. The Africans and the Asians who remain uncommitted thus far do not want to take on the Communist yoke. In Indonesia and Ceylon, even in Afghanistan, you encounter a burning desire for freedom, just as you discover it in Greece and Israel, in Egypt and Italy and in many other places. But where do these people get the strength and the determination?

They are convinced the only place to which they can turn is the United States of America. They recognize that Britain and France and our other allies are important, but they look to us. They are convinced that we, with our wealth, our experience and skill, and, they add—with a mixture of hope and doubt—our love of liberty, can provide their only means of resisting communism.

With impatience we often think and perhaps say, "Well, if you expect so much of us, why don't you get on our side?"

NEUTRAL ON COUNTRIES, BUT FOR DEMOCRACY

With this in mind, we asked a forthright newspaper editor in Ceylon how he and his

countrymen viewed the conflict and their position in it.

"In the struggle for power between the United States on the one hand, and Russia and Communist China on the other, we are neutral," he said.

"But in the struggle between democracy and communism, we are on the side of democracy.

"To us the Soviet Union and China are equated to communism, but everything we find in America today we do not consider democratic.

"Please do not think," he added, "that we who are not with you are against you. The only way you can stop communism is in helping thees countries help themselves."

Later, in another country, we sought the views of an American who has been representing his country in the struggle for several years.

"Our overseas program has been sold to the American people on the wrong basis," he said. "They've been persuaded to support it through fear. * * * Hungary, Iraq, Tibet. They fear that Russia and Red China will subjugate more and more people through conquest. Perhaps so but that isn't the point.

MUST SHARE WEALTH TO HELP CREATE MORE

"Our weakness, our Achilles heel, is the fact that we are the world's richest nation. We use 40 to 50 percent of the world's resources. We must share this wealth—the use of this wealth in creating more wealth—with the rest of the world.

"If we do not, Russia and China will create wealth and they will seize the world's markets. They will drive us back to fortress America."

And then, back home, we find people disturbed by heavy taxation, unemployment and other economic woes.

How can we help other nations, it is asked, when we have such problems at home?

Well, it seems rather obvious that we cannot solve our problems here at home by ignoring those that face us abroad. If we should forfeit economic leadership, and permit world trade to be dominated by communism our internal woes would exceed any we've ever known.

UGLY AMERICAN DOES EXIST IN SOME PLACES

There has been a great deal of talk in recent months of "The Ugly American." This is the title of a widely popular book published several months ago which describes the mischief done by some incompetents abroad, chiefly an ambassador in a fictition eastern country who used his job to advance his political career.

You cannot travel far nor meet many people without encountering some ugly Americans. They look down upon the people of the lands to which they are sent; they live to themselves in American compounds; they are satisfied with American food and American customs.

There have been instances of poor judgment, laziness, even of corruption. But most of the people aren't that kind, most of them want to do a job. Their problem often is that the job itself hasn't been made clear to them.

An encouraging thing about this ugly American situation was that not one person we questioned expressed any resentment against the book or reflected on its accuracy. And we found the book on the shelves or desks of nearly a dozen officials. Perhaps that is explained by the recent report that the book has been put on the recommended reading list of the State Department.

"Such things do exist," said one senior ICA (International Cooperation Administration) official. "We weed out people like that; the contract of one such man is expiring soon, I'm glad to say. We'll be glad to see him and his family leave.

SOME OF THE URGENCY OF JOB IS LOST

"The sad fact is," he added, "that some of the urgency of this job has been lost. Instead of a sense of mission, too many people are now finding it to be a bureaucratic exercise. But the worst thing of all is that we don't feel we have the American people behind us.

"They know about our mistakes—sure, we make plenty—but do they know or care about the heat and the dysentery, the loneliness of a woman in a Moslem land where women don't mix, the problems of educating our children, of rearing teenagers?

"We're not asking sympathy; the folks at home have their problems, too. But what we do want, and must have, is the support of the people back home in this job. We believe we'd get it if they knew just how important it is to them."

PERHAPS ALL THE UGLY ONES AREN'T OVERSEAS

He did not suggest it, but the thought follows that perhaps all the ugly Americans are not abroad. Perhaps some are here at home, ignoring our danger, sending other Americans out to do an impossible job.

If we would avoid future catastrophe, it seems inescapable for us to do these things:

1. Shape a bipartisan foreign policy with support both from the White House and the Congress that will endure in principle through changes of administration or dominant party.

2. Redefine our aims with full awareness of the economic threat we face and with minimum emphasis on essential military support.

3. Stress loans on the most liberal terms possible. Use these for projects geared to the needs and economy of the country concerned, so that our people may hand over operation to them as quickly as possible.

4. Stress technical assistance, educational exchange, and agricultural surplus exports. Don't do the job for them, but help them do it.

5. Be clearly factual in publicity on foreign projects, letting such success as they achieve speak for itself.

6. Recruit and train the highest caliber of personnel possible, give them every reasonable iducement and encouragement, require diligent service and give recognition for their accomplishments. For instance, make language study a basic requirement, provide time and instruction, and added compensation fof achievement.

In these 12 years, America has scored some great successes and the Communists have shown their weaknesses many times. These should be borne in mind, too, as we face the discouragements and complexities of the task ahead. But, most important of all, we should set ourselves to it with the knowledge that it is almost certain to continue without interruption into the distant future.

Farm Labor—Address by John M. Seabrook

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 21, 1959

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, in February, a group of very distinguished Americans, who make up the National Advisory Committee on Farm Labor, held 2 days of public hearings here. The committee heard shocking and tragic testimony of exploitation, poverty and child labor on corporations farms, the so-called factories in the field.

One of the most enlightening discussions of ways to improve the working and living conditions of farm workers came from a man who is the president of a huge corporation farm. He is John Seabrook, president of Seabrook Farm in Bridgeton, N.J.

With a display of tremendous intelligence, understanding and wit, Mr. Seabrook urged the enactment of a Federal minimum wage law for farm workers as the best and most workable way of starting them toward a decent standard of living.

Mr. Seabrook is a successful businessman who has long taken a great deal of interest in the conditions of farm workers. The farm he heads covers 54,000 acres in southern New Jersey. The vegetables grown there are processed on the farm. They resulted in $35 million worth of sales in 1958.

He is the author of the New Jersey Migrant Labor Code and has been a member of the New Jersey Migrant Labor Board for 13 years. He is now the board's chairman. The workers on his farm are organized by labor unions. Seabrook Farm is probably the only fully organized farm in the United States.

His relations with the unions has led a vice president of the Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen, AFL–CIO, to write that Seabrook Farm is "a beacon of economic and social hope and justice amid corporate agriculture's poverty and exploitation."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a transcript of Mr. Seabrook's speech before the National Advisory Committee on Farm Labor.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRANSCRIPT OF ADDRESS BY JOHN M. SEABROOK, PRESIDENT, SEABROOK FARMS CO., BRIDGETON, N.J., TO THE PUBLIC HEARINGS ON FARM LABOR, SPONSORED BY THE NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON FARM LABOR, HOTEL MAYFLOWER, WASHINGTON, D.C., FEBRUARY 5, 1959

Dr. Graham has been talking very eloquently about the rights of man; Father Higgins, earlier today, spoke of social justice, moral values. I'm not going to talk about that sort of thing tonight; actually, I don't think it does much good to talk about it.

As I told Father Higgins: All of the people who are interested in social justice already believe in it; and the people who aren't interested already know about these things, and there really isn't much point in repeating them.

Back in New Jersey, in 1945, we did take some action—it might be interesting to some of the people here tonight to know that the Farm Bureau actually supported New Jersey's migrant labor law. Farmers aren't all bad.

The law was a good law, soundly written—actually, some people from Princeton had a lot to do with it. The Governor appointed a 12-man commission; the legislature has been generous with funds; we have lots of inspectors; we have a good, adequate code—not anything great, but it does provide adequate living standards, standards patterned on the U.S. Army.

Now, conditions in New Jersey are still deplorable. Governor Meyner made an in-

spection last summer, and he was really shocked with what he saw; he exploded in the newspapers, which gave him a little trouble with some of his farm constituents.

Now, how does this happen? How could we have a law that is widely respected and well enforced for 13 years, requiring adequate physical facilities, and we still have bad conditions? Well, I think it's because we've approached the problem in New Jersey from the wrong end.

And if I may be so bold as to make some suggestions to the members of the committee here, I hope that they won't approach the problem from the wrong end; I hope they won't work on the effect rather than the cause. We were trying to raise living standards without raising the actual standard of living, without giving the migrants a better wage.

Now, some clues to this problem can be found in a public hearing—a couple of references have been made to it today. The Migrant Labor Board wanted to tighten New Jersey's code.

We made some proposals, we publicized them, and we held the usual public hearing. It was my misfortune to preside at that hearing. I never realized before how badly constructed the State legislative hall is, because the speaker can be hit from anyplace in the room. [Laughter.]

Most of you saw the newspaper headlines; some of the boys got pretty noisy at the hearing. But there were quite a few men who spoke, and spoke sincerely in oppositoin to the tightening of this code.

They said: "I'm required by law to provide certain facilities and I do it—I obey the law—and I go further than obeying the law; I provide a nice camp. Then, the migrant worker moves in and he tears the shower heads off the wall; he breaks the screens; he promptly plugs the toilets.

One man told the story of a fellow who used the automatic washers to wash his shoes in. Now, these farmers were testifying for a reason—they were opposing the increase in standards—but I think they put their finger on the real problem, and that is that we're expecting these people to live by standards that we've set.

But these are standards that these people have never known, and they've never known them because they can't afford them, and they've never afforded them; they're not within their experience. The State legislature has tried to create a split standard of living; they're paid according to one standard, but we require them to live according to another standard.

Now, I've talked to a great many groups of farmers about migrant labor codes. Whenever I talk to them, they always cry: "Discrimination." They say: Why do you want a code for migrant farm housing when there is no code for the housing of industrial workers?

Well, of course, the answer to that is quite simple: The industrial worker has a high enough wage, and a high enough standard of living so that you don't need artificial safeguards to protect him. And I don't think that we would need any artificial safeguards, I don't think we'd need housing standards, if we had adequate farm wages.

Harry Truman once said, "An ounce of competition is worth a ton of regulation." And this is certainly true in the question of farm housing.

If wages went up, farm workers would be worth something, and farmers would want to look after them just as industrialists want to look after their valuable workers, and they would provide adequate housing standards.

Now, we hear a lot of talk about the fact that farm workers aren't skilled. I deny this.

I think, actually, that the average farm laborer requires a great deal more skill and a much wider range of skill than the average industrial laborer does. Conditions on a farm are such that the job content changes constantly.

You can't break a farm job down into a series of repetitive, easily supervised operations, like you can a factory job. I'm an engineer; I've run quite a few factories and I've run quite a few farms. I've never seen an honest job evaluation yet that didn't come to the conclusion that the farm job ought to be paid more than the factory job.

So, if you want to talk about equal pay for equal work, or something of that kind, I don't think there's any question but what the farm job ought to be paid considerably more than the industrial job.

Now, today during the hearing there was some conversation from Mr. Johnson of the Farmers Union (I almost said Mr. Johnson of the Farm Bureau, that would have been a terrible thing) about whether or not prices would go up if farm wages went up. Now certainly, in this room, I've spotted about four workers, and I know there's one farm employer—I doubt that there's more than one—but most everybody alse here is a consumer. And this is a subject of considerable interest I think the question was begged a bit today * * * would prices go up if farm wages went up? Would there be an enormous burden on the consumer?

Well, the first thing I think we want to think about in this regard is that despite the widely publicized opium of price supports, a great amount of farm products—particularly the things that you eat—are still traded in a completely free supply-and-demand market. And there are hundreds of thousands of producers producing for that market and competition really works. Most farmers are theoretically in favor of free enterprise, but they wish competition didn't work quite so well in the marketplace.

Now, I suspect that if farm wages went up substantially, prices would start up. And, as I say, I think most honest consumers, when they think about it, wouldn't complain about this too much; nobody really wants to think that his food bill is based on somebody else's poverty. But I also suspect that prices wouldn't move very much, because as praces started up and competition came into play, more efficient producers would quickly drive prices down again.

In 1938, industry had quite a similar problem: wages were low, a lot of competition, they couldn't seem to do anything about it, and eventually the Fair Labor Standards Act was passed. It's a little startling to look back at the fact now that the minimum wage was 25 cents per hour that was set in October 1938; it doesn't seem like much, does it? But agriculture made its basic mistake at that time. Agriculture didn't want to be a part of it; it was obvious it could never pass the Congress with the opposition of agriculture, so agriculture was exempt. Since then, the problem of the agricultural worker has grown steadily worse, the spread has widened.

As something is done to right this problem of the disparity between agricultural and industrial wages, what would happen to the farmer? Would he get squeezed? I've already said I didn't think prices would go up very much: Now, how do wages go up and prices not go up?

Well, in the first place, of course, wage rates and labor costs are not one and the same thing at all; obviously, there's a connection, but there's a strong link in between called "productivity," and if productivity increases, wages go up and labor cost doesn't go up.

Now, we heard some talk today about what proportion of the cost of farm products wages are—or labor cost is. Dr. Bean gave an estimate. Dr. Bean is an economist and economists deal in averages. I'd like to say to Dr. Bean that I had a very good friend once, who drowned because of an average. [Laughter.] This is serious.

He was a platoon leader and he was in strange country, and he wanted to cross a river with his platoon, and he got out the guide book he'd been given and he saw that this river had an average depth of 24 inches and he started across.

The guide book was right: From its source to the sea the river had an average depth of 2 feet—but where he tried to cross it, it was 15 feet deep—and with a full pack, my friend drowned and three other soldiers drowned with him. So you've got to be careful about using averages.

But I think the sort of thing that would happen is this Dr. Bean and beans—the price of green beans, snap beans—call them what you will, depending where you come from—is about 6 cents a pound—that's a good, average price. It costs 3 cents a pound to pick them, the direct labor cost of picking.

Of course, there are labor costs involved in the planting and the spraying and the preparation and all that, but let's just stick to the picking labor. So suppose we double the agricultural rate and it now costs 6 cents to pick beans, so beans have got to sell for 9 cents.

And as soon as beans sell for 9 cents, a few farmers are going to go to a farm machinery company, actually the Chisolm-Rider Company, who have developed the machine—it costs about $15,000—to pick beans. And it can pick beans—counting amortizing the cost—for about 3¼ cents. So, those fellows are going to start selling beans, then, for 6¼ cents—and pretty soon the price of beans is going to be back down.

Of course, a lot of other things are going to happen, too. There's going to have to be some readjustment to what happened to the people who used to be picking beans, because a mechanic is now going to run this machine. But the consumer hasn't been hurt and the fellow who is working on the farm, instead of averaging 50–60 cents an hour, is now averaging $2.50 an hour, this mechanic. And with some readjustment, society is considerably better off.

Now when I talk about mechanization—obviously you can't use this machine on a small farm. So I've now raised the spectre of corporate farming, and my friends among the push-button liberals are going to respond with hisses and boos.

Corporate farming is synonymous with the exploitation of labor in their minds—just as in Mr. Khrushchev's mind democracy means decadence—decadence means democracy—they're one and the same thing.

Well, it isn't quite that way and it doesn't necessarily need to be that way. Actually, a lot of nonsense gets spouted—it's romantic nonsense—but there is a lot of nonsense spouted about farming as a way of life. I've never known anybody who really worked as a farmer who was much enamoured with farming as a way of life. [Laughter.]

Once in a while I get sort of carried away and I think, you know, this modern society * * * Leon Schacter, the union president, he's banging me; the bankers are banging me about interest rates; the chain stores are always driving prices down. This is too complex, you know?

Why don't I give this up and go back to the delightful pastoral life—there used to be a wonderful poem about "Let the wealthy and great roll in spendor and state, I envy them not * * *." And it goes on about—"I wear my own sheep and eat my own lamb" and so forth.

Well, that's a very fine idea but, you know, pretty soon I get a little more relaxed and I get to thinking about how nice it is to have a bathroom, and I'm rather fond of shoes, so I give up that idea and go back to work. Well, that's the way with a lot of

this romantic talk about farming as a way of life.

Now, a lot of today's so-called family farmers are really no better off than the sharecropper; in fact, in some respects they're worse off than the sharecropper. They pay their rent as interest on the mortgage and that's the same every year, regardless of how good or how bad the crop is; at least the sharecropper pays less rent in the years when his crop is poor.

I don't want to be misunderstood * * * being against the family farm is sort of like being against motherhood and the American flag. Nobody dares be against the family farm. I can't be against motherhood. I'm just the father of a brand new son, right now, so. [Applause.]

And I guess I don't dare be against the American flag either, so I'm stuck. Actually, it's all a question of definition.

Farming requires, as a business, the very closest kind of attention of the proprietor. With the constant changing pattern of weather and soils, you can't delegate decisions on a farm like you can in a continuous flow chemical plant, for instance.

I think that for a long, long time to come the owner-operator farm is going to be the most efficient producer. Now, it's not going to be a family farm according to Mr. Johnsons' definition of this afternoon, in which he said that a family farm is a farm unit, owner operated, which employed no outside labor, or very little outside labor (I guess he said).

I was a bachelor until a couple of years ago, so since I didn't have a wife and a lot of children to oppress by making them work on my family farm, I guess under this defition I would have been restricted to a very small farm. But if I had ten kids I could have a bigger farm.

Actually, if you talk about this * * * Dr. Graham spoke about the industrial revolution * * * all of us, if we had it to do over again, the industrial revolution, would like to protect those little English children from the grinding exploitation in the early textile mills, but I'm sure no one would suggest keeping the spinning wheel in the home—as a solution to this problem. There certainly is a better solution to the problem.

And if the industrial revolution had been stopped and the spinning wheel had been kept in the home, I don't think we'd be very well off today. I'm sure I wouldn't be very well off, I'd be standing before you naked probably; my wife was a newspaper woman, I don't think she'd know how to run a spinning wheel, you know? [Laughter.]

Well, putting a limitation on a farm size and trying to keep the farm on what is the current accepted definition of "family farm" is, to me, exactly like the arguments that tried to keep industrial piecework in the home.

When the professor from North Carolina was talking about these hearings having started in 1936, Dr. Graham, I want to stand up and say that when you were at the University, I hope you researchers did a better job than that, because I read with great interest of a congressional investigation in 1892 on this subject—and they were dealing with farm workers—true, mainly with sweat shops—but they were dealing with farm workers.

And a lot of people had some very good reasoned arguments at that time as to why the garment industry shouldn't move out of the home piecework stage, because all of these poor families would be denied a right to be a family together and to be happy starving together, you know? Well, the unions broke up the garment piecework, they broke up the garment sweatshops, but I don't think that the unions are going to be able to help the farm labor problem very much.

Now, Monsignor Higgins today spoke on this subject and said to the Farm Bureau representative that he thought within 5 years this was inevitable. I don't think so—at least with the kind of unions that are American unions.

The American labor union is—should be—a worker's service organization, service to the workers, and the guys who do this are called business agents; and it's pretty expensive to provide business agent service to a bunch of farm workers who are spread out.

One fellow testified today and said he was an organizer for a union, farm workers; but nobody asked him how many members he had; I don't believe he had very many; and the union isn't a self-supporting union—it doesn't support itself with dues because you can't afford to—you can't afford to give business agent service to farm workers that are constantly moving and are spread out. The union has had—and will have—an effect with the larger units.

Mr. Randolph, who seems to know more about me than I know myself—I don't know where he dug up that my mother was a colonial dame * * * Mr. Randolph mentioned that we've been organized. Since there's no Taft-Hartley Act to protect employers, we have a closed shop; we're oppressed by these unions, you see? [Applause.]

Actually, I've never been able to figure out in practice how a closed shop and a union shop differ—in practice. I understand the theory.

But let me tell you a little what's happened. Being organized—more than 15 years ago—the union collected dues and the union had to give service for the dues, and the direct form of service is to get wages up. Our rates have gone up, since we were first organized, by some 450 percent.

Now, incidentally, I'm a little tired tonight because I've just lived through negotiating a new 2-year contract, so I'm very familiar with that figure, and when I quoted it, of course, the business agent said: "That's because they were so low in the beginning. But that period includes the war * * * let me take a more recent period.

In the last 5 years our farm rates have gone up by more than 35 percent—not counting the most recent increase they got out of my hide on Tuesday night. Now, did the consumer pay for this. No, the consumer didn't pay for it. In the last 5 years our selling prices have gone down by 15 percent.

Incidentally, I'd like to pause parenthetically here and pay for my trip, if I can get a commercial in. These are Bureau of Labor statistics. "Frozen food prices have declined in the last 5 years by 15 percent; other grocery items went up by 18 percent." So let me tell all of your housewives: Buy frozen foods.

Actually, in any period of rising wages management is always prodded to get more efficiency. Secretary Benson, in his letter today, spoke of that. And this is what would happen to agriculture if wages were to rise.

Now, I don't think there's any cure for it; I don't think it can come through unions. I don't think the farmers themselves—and believe me, there are a lot of farmers, who would like to have wages go up—farmers understand, just like the steel companies understand, that their profit in general is a percent—most every business is really a sort of a cost-plus business—and if they paid their workers three or four times as much, the part that stuck to their fingers would be a little fatter, too.

So, a lot of farmers are impressed with this idea, but they don't know how to start. And I think the place to start is with the Federal minimum. [Applause.]

Now, I've kept my eye on the watch here and I'm coming to the end of my time so I don't need to go into why we need Federal minimums, and why State minimums won't work. I don't have a suggestion for what the minimum ought to be. Obviously, it's got to be low enough to satisfy the needs of political expediency, of the Congress that has to enact it.

I'm not poking fun at Congress; Congress in their infinite wisdom will find a point that will work. [Laughter.] And the thing that I have to say about it is that wherever it starts, and I don't think it's really terribly important where it starts, but wherever it starts it ought to go up steadily year by year until it finally comes to a full parity with industrial workers. [Applause.]

Now, if I had my way, actually I think it ought to be higher than industrial workers because I think the work is harder, but this is going to take some time, and there are a couple of things that could be done in the meantime.

Secretary Mitchell is going to speak, and I hope he is going to speak about one of these things. Last year there were between 8 and 9 million placements made by the Federal-State Employment Service. Now, this doesn't mean 9 million people—a lot of them were placed again and again, over and over again.

But I think it's entirely within his province to say that the public facilities shouldn't be used unless there were some very reasonable minimum standards. And in the case of foreign workers, I don't see any point to getting in a quarrel as to whether foreign workers are needed or whether foreign workers aren't needed.

We all know that the farm labor supply is dwindling; in theory, there would be enough farm work if it was well enough paid but we don't know, really, whether there's going to be enough or there isn't going to be enough. You look at the statistics of able-bodied males, etc., and we're coming into a period where they're going to decline.

So, I don't think we really need to worry about that. I think that if foreign workers were also covered immediately by substantial minimums, this problem would solve itself.

I have just one final thing to say, and that is: Would farmers support a Federal minimum? I believe they would support the Federal minimum. I think they have to be approached correctly and I don't think they ought to be approached from the standpoint of social justice.

As I said earlier, those of us who believe in it believe in it; and those of us who don't—don't, and so it doesn't really do any good. I think they should be approached from the standpoint of their own self-interest. If you want to make it a little softer, say "enlightened" self-interest. But approach them from their own self-interest.

And don't spend a lot of time talking to them about the terrible conditions that we see here tonight. They're all very familiar with that fact because, after all, they're out in the field among these people, you know; they know it a lot better than anybody in this room will ever know.

This question of who says what to whom * * * I went, some years ago, to a dinner of "The Friendly Sons of St. Patrick." And I went because Senator Kennedy was to be the principal speaker and I wanted to hear what he could say. He got up on a platform and he was almost entirely surrounded by the upper hierarchy of the Holy Roman Church, and he started off in a very florid, old-fashioned, oratorical style, which surprised me a bit.

He said: "It gives me great honor tonight to speak to you from this platform surrounded by the ranks of our distinguished clergy, who are lean, drawn, and hungry from constant privation, fasting, and prayer * * *"—and then he paused.

And Cardinal Spellman's rather ample stomach began to jump up and down, and soon the good cardinal's jowls were shaking, and pretty soon he was laughing right out loud. Then a couple of bishops started to laugh and pretty soon, you know, everybody was laughing; even the laymen were laughing.

So, when the noise died down, Senator Kennedy said: "You can imagine what would have happened to me if I had been a Protestant and said that!" [Laughter.]

Well, there's a lot in this * * * so, don't send the people whom Dr. Graham referred to as the "do-gooders"—and don't send the do-gooders to convert the farmers. There are plenty of farmers who are smart enough to realize that this is a good thing for them; send some of them to convert the farmers.

Now I think that this committee should devote its efforts to showing that a Federal Fair Labor Standards Act for Agriculture is in the economic best interest of all of society—the worker, the employer, and the consumer alike.

Thank you very, very much.

Short Course in Latin American History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 26, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, the best short course in Latin American history is an article in the May 28, 1959, Reporter magazine by A. A. Berle, former Ambassador to Brazil and outstanding Latin American authority.

It is entitled "Latin America: The Hidden Revolution," and is included hereafter under a previous consent.

Will the southern section of our hemisphere stay with the democratic West? This is a live issue, writes Mr. Berle.

Our real allies are leaders like Pepe Figueres, Romulo Betancourt, Alberto Lleras Camargo and Luis Muñoz-Marín.

He does not think Castro is a Communist but he, along with myself and many others, is disturbed by Communist infiltration into Castro's government and also by Castro's delay in setting a date for elections.

The only flaw I found in this magnificent analysis was an allegation that Castro's military courts murdered "inconvenient editors or political figures." If there were any such executions, I have not previously heard a whisper about them.

The greatly heightened interest in Latin America is a good sign. I do not think it comes too late. The merits, as Pepe Figueres likes to point out, are overwhelmingly on our side in the contest between democracy and communism. We have the weapons and the strength. Once we are informed, as by articles such as this one, we shall quickly acquire the will to act before it is too late.

The article follows:

LATIN AMERICA: THE HIDDEN REVOLUTION

(By A. A. Berle, Jr.)

Latin America is entering a new and possibly crucial phase. At stake is a continent. The issue is whether the southern section of our hemisphere stays with the democratic West. For the first time since the Monroe Doctrine was proclaimed in 1823, the Americas could break in two. This statement is not a rhetorical one. The possibility is, I think, greater than in 1939, when Hitler and his then ally Franco tried to achieve this same end. Fidel Castro's revolution in Cuba, and the swift, and thus far partially successful, attempts of a small but well-organized Communist minority to seize the reins of power in Cuba are the immediate events that have forced the attention of a lethargic United States. They are merely the visible phenomena of a deeper crisis.

From 1952 to January 1, 1959, Latin America (or more accurately Spanish America, because Portuguese Brazil ended its dictatorship in 1945 and in any case goes by its own rhythm) was the scene of a vast democratic revolution, comparable in dimension to the Russian revolution of 1917 and the Chinese revolution that culminated in 1950. Because so many countries were involved, it did not have the great impact on world opinion that occurs when a single empire changes control. Further, since the revolution was liberal and friendly to the United States—and since we are overwhelmingly ignorant of our closest neighbors—little note was taken. So the story has to be summarized here.

It began in tiny Costa Rica, just north of Panama, the best-governed and most stanchly democratic of the Central American Republics. There, in 1948, Costa Ricans held their usual constitutional election, choosing as president Otilio Ulate. But outgoing President Rafael Calderón Guardia, already allied to a small Communist minority, sought and secured support from his neighboring Nicaraguan dictator, Anastasio Somoza (father of the present dictator), and in this he was promptly supported by the Communists. At this point enters a major figure in the current struggle—cultivated and capable José (Pepe) Figueres, an accomplished economist and engineer (he had studied at M.I.T.). With a small group of Costa Ricans, he took the field against Calderón Guardia's combination of Communists and Nicaraguan mercenaries. After a campaign of 6 weeks, he defeated them in a pitched battle behind the city of Cartago, reorganized the government, and restored Ulate to the presidency. When Ulate's term expired in 1953, Figueres ran for president, and was overwhelmingly elected. He undertook the political and social regeneration of Costa Rica. As it turned out, his achievements went far beyond Costa Rica.

At that time most of Latin America was dominated by dictatorships, either of the demagogic or of the military type. Perón ruled Argentina; Rojas Pinilla had taken over Colombia; Pérez Jiménez ruled Venezuela; General Odría governed Peru. The dictatorships of Somoza and Trujillo in Nicaragua and the Dominican Republic were solid, and Fulgencio Batista was holding Cuba. The staunch but militarily impotent liberal governments, led by Costa Rica and Uruguay, seemed in a hopeless position. The dictators, particularly Rojas Pinilla, Pérez Jiménez, and Trujillo, ceaselessly attacked them and their leaders by assassination threats, forged slanders, and intrigues in Washington. Most of the honorable and able leaders in the countries ruled by dictators escaped imprisonment or death only by taking refuge elsewhere. Many found asylum in Costa Rica, while their governments, not always unsuccessfully, tried to have Washington bring pressure on Figueres to throw them out of Costa Rica and out of the hemisphere.

A CONTAGION OF FREEDOM

In 1952 the big change began. In Bolivia a revolution directed by its present President, Hernán Siles Zuazo, one of the great spirits in Spanish America, finally overthrew an ancient, ineffective oligarchy and a social order that had hardly changed since the Spanish conquest. A social revolution followed that is still under way. It is one of the bright spots in American diplomacy that the United States, in this case, speedily moved to support the right side. Argentina in 1955 by the combined efforts of liberals and the military, succeeded in throwing out Perón. A transition government honorably carried on by General Pedro Aramburú held a straightforward free election in 1958, bringing to power the present President, Arturo Frondizi. In 1956, Honduras threw out its dictatorship, and recalled its liberal leader, Ramón Villeda Morales, who had been in exile and under heavy threat in the Costa Rican capital of San José, where Figueres had befriended him. He was elected President of Honduras in 1957.

General Odría, the dictator of Peru, with a wisdom not emulated by many of his contemporaries, voluntarily terminated his dictatorship in 1956. The incoming régime recognized and made peace with the popular Aprista Party, which largely represented the Indian and proletarian workers of Peru. It subsequently elected Manuel Prado as president; his government is a coalition between conservatives and Apristas, and has a clear popular mandate.

On May 10, 1957, under the battering of a liberal opposition, General Rojas Pinilla fled Colombia after successfully emptying the treasury. An outstandingly capable man, Alberto Lleras Camargo (he had been ambassador in Washington and is one of the wisest of South American statesmen), was chosen president a year later. In January 1953, the Venezuelan dictator, Pérez Jiménez, fled the country in the face of a nationwide revolutionary upsurge that engaged the support of students, of the Catholic Church, indeed of practically everyone save a small group of Jiménez hangers-on. Romula Betancourt, leader of the largest democratic party, was elected president 9 months later. He also had been in exile in Costa Rica, had been chivvied out at the behest of Washington, and had been granted asylum in Puerto Rico, where he was kindly received by his old friend, Governor Luis Múñoz Marín. A few months later, the smoldering revolution of Fidel Castro reached Havana, slightly ahead of three or four other movements designed to upset the corrupt dictatorship of Fulgencio Batista. On January 1, 1959, Batista fled. A provisional government of excellent men headed by Manuel Urrutia took office, but it has not yet established its power to govern. The real power lies with Fidel Castro, and with a group around him—and in the streets.

So in the space of about 7 years, most of Spanish America, from Cape Horn to the Florida Strait, changed hands. Of interest is the fact that in their hour of exile and peril many of the men now governing found asylum and comfort through the courage of José Figueres, and the wisdom and broadmindedness of Governor Múñoz Marín of Puerto Rico.

SHADOW OF THE PAST

So far, so much and so good. The old style caudillo-general or his counterpart, the demagog, and their dictatorships had been proved not only hateful but obsolete. The three remaining—Somoza II in Nicaragua, Trujillo in the Dominican Republic, and Stroessner in Paraguay—are on the defensive. In Nicaragua, the only question is whether the transition can be secured peacefully, as in Peru, or must involve bloody drama, as was the case in Cuba.

A few weeks ago, the second phase of this huge struggle began. It revolves, quite simply, around the Communist issue.

In the previous phase, communism had not been a major issue since Pepe Figueres outmaneuvered and outfought it in 1948. True, the dictators, notably Trujillo and

Jimenez, had sedulously spread the impression that everyone opposed to their dictatorships and their corruption was Communist—a not unskillful use of the technique of the late Senator McCarthy. Some of them had resources McCarthy did not have, notably some expert counterfeit-and-forgery shops where documents could be fabricated "proving" their point—until a laboratory as good, say, as the FBI laboratory in Washington got to work on them. There were apparently quarters in this country where such balderdash was taken seriously.

Following Castro's seizure of Cuba, he or his Government invited Figueres, no longer President of Costa Rica, to visit Havana. Figueres went. He had every right to expect friendship. He had helped Castro when Castro had few friends, as he had helped other Cuban exiles. He was worried, for Castro had made a trip uninvited to Venezuela, and had there seen fit to attack Puerto Rico as a "colony" of American imperialism. By implication, he had attacked Gov. Luis Muñoz-Marín, one of Figueres' closest friends. Figueres had been invited to speak at a mass meeting in Havana, but was asked not to discuss Puerto Rico. So, before a vast throng, after congratulating Cubans on becoming free and saluting their revolution, he pointed out that Latin America was part of the Western World and must stand with the West; that having overthrown one dictatorship, the Cuban revolution and its brother revolutions must not permit dictatorship to rise again either through demagogy (as in the case of Perón) or through Communist seizure such as had been attempted against him in Costa Rica in 1948.

"That speech would have been considered neutralist in Chicago," Figueres commented wryly after the event. But Fidel Castro rose, and in a long tirade—repeated the following evening over television—attacked the United States, attacked the West, attacked Figueres, attacked Betancourt, attacked the democratic leaders in Latin America. They were "agents of American imperialism." Latin America could not stay with the West, and certainly not with the imperialist United States, in any conflict. And so forth. It followed the Communist line from beginning to end—and everyone knew it. The speech, like Figueres', echoed from Cape Horn to the Rio Grande. Its effect was to crystallize Latin-American partisanship with breathtaking speed.

It was highly reminiscent of Europe in 1945. All the movements resisting Hitler in each country were then considered as one. But, at a given moment when Stalin so decreed, every resistance movement split. One wing was pro-Communist, blackguarding the United States, Great Britain, and others, following the Moscow line. The other stood with the western allies and for democratic government. Exactly this happened in mid-April of 1959 throughout Latin America. Small but well-organized bands of propagandists entrenched in various quarters unmasked their batteries. Their targets were José Figueres, the recognized continental leader of democratic thinking, and President Rómulo Betancourt in Venezuela, perhaps the ablest politician in South America. Their broader attack was on the entire liberal-democratic movement.

This time they made no bones about it. True, the State Department had treated Figueres and Betancourt with notorious shabbiness, had decorated and flattered their enemies, and had been anything but enthusiastic when they moved into leadership. To accuse them of being "agents of Yankee imperialism" was the most ironic of big lies. But it seemed the hour had struck for the Communist seizure of power, and the battle is joined.

CASTRO AND THE COMMUNISTS

To the United States, the contest is most noticeable in Cuba. Fidel Castro has just visited us, making sweet noises and, incidentally, saying the exact opposite in New York and Washington of what he previously said in Cuba and Venezuela. The reasons may not be far to seek.

Fidel Castro says he is not, and I think he is not, a Communist. He is merely a guerrilla leader who commands the admiration in Latin America properly due to an individual of great courage who fought a winning battle against huge odds. Cuban Communists had consistently supported the Batista dictatorship; only in the last few months of Castro's campaign did they change sides. One Cuban Communist central committeeman then moved into Castro's camp in the Sierra Maestra. He has since spent much of his time with Castro.

The Costa Rican Communist leader, Manuel Mora, who is considered an extremely able propagandist, likewise moved into the picture. It is clear that a number of other Communists are assuming positions in various parts of Castro's amorphous régime. Courtsmartial, set up to execute perpetrators of atrocities under the Batista government, soon became mere people's courts, murdering inconvenient editors or political figures. Castro has recently announced that the death penalty will no longer be applied except in cases of outright counter-revolutionary activity: it will be interesting to see how far this phrase stretches.

The idea that Cuba ought to elect a president with a popular mandate is repudiated by Castro and his clique: some sort of social revolution must first be carried out. It is not specified what this will be, or what it will do, or where it will go. A chief and constant theme is anti-Americanism.

The same tune is sung everywhere by pro-Communist groups in Latin America. The United States is chief target; the liberal democracies presently trying to bring a better economic order to their countries are the secondary targets. The unanimity convincingly suggests that orders were given from the Communists high command in Moscow, presumably through a command post in western Europe. It also suggests that the situation is being used to asist the Soviet Union diplomatically in its current Berlin-Middle Eastern push.

THE UNDERLYING REALITIES

Let us sort out, from the political noise, the underlying realities with which we have to deal. It has been clear to anyone with eyes to see that the dying Latin-American dictatorships would not be able to hold on. They were also the worst possible long-range allies of the United States. Help or cordiality extended in their direction merely meant convincing the oppressed peoples of their countries that the United States was their enemy. Happily, the liberal democratic leaders who now control most of South America are men with education and with experience of the United States. They are quite aware of the difference between the reality of the United States and the ineptitudes of its politics often reflected in the Government of the United States. Most of them have been in close contact with American liberal thinking.

On the other hand, they know that their own countries must go through a social as well as a political reorganization. They are not clear whether the United States understands that fact. The outstanding necessity is to put an end to the division between age-old oligarchic, irresponsible power cliques and a proletariat living out its life in hunger and disease, without hope of improvement. Figueres' first act in Costa Rica was to nationalize the banks, and he was right; no other way would have made credit available to all of Costa Rica.

The Bolivian revolution, like the Mexican revolution against Porfirio Diaz in 1911, marked the end of Spanish feudalism. Social change on a sweeping scale is inevitable in all Latin American countries, except in democracies like Uruguay or Costa Rica, where continuous evolution has been possible. For practical purposes, this means, first, assurance that land is reasonably distributed or available. Second, that credit is available to everyone on reasonable terms and not monopolized by private usurers and moneylenders. In short, a popular banking system. Third, that the governments together, and almost necessarily with the United States, work out a system of economic planning, so that prices of the principal products will be more or less stabilized, the flow of necessary imports will continue, and the industrialization of these countries will go forward rapidly. Fourth, and perhaps most important, that there will be a vast and solid expansion of popular education.

It also means that the United States will have to assist a continuously expanding Latin American economic system. So far as the United States is concerned, it must stand not merely for private enterprise—who in the world wants to die for that?—but should spearhead a battle for personal, political, and economic freedom, by any method, socialist or private, that seems best adapted to meet local conditions.

In fairness to the United States, which has not been getting much of a break in Latin America, it should be said that Washington has made major moves in this direction. The Eisenhower administration, perhaps without realizing it, sharply changed course in the right direction nearly a year ago when it faced up to the fact that the Latin-American economic problem had to be met. It did follow the Brazilian initiative toward continental planning which goes by the name of "Operation Pan-Americana." Governor Meyner, of New Jersey, speaking in Rio de Janeiro and representing the Democratic opposition in the United States, gave powerful support to this view. Washington did give limited approval of the idea of continuous planning, and has taken an active part in the Committee of Twenty-One, established by the Organization of American States, whose report is expected shortly. U.S. Treasury experts supported and have assisted in drawing up a project for an inter-American bank, a measure long overdue. During the Roosevelt administration such a treaty was drawn but it was blocked in the Senate by one of the New York banks through its private influence with the late Senator Carter Glass. Now the project has been restudied and should come before the Senate before too long.

Limited support has also been given to price-stabilization schemes that should remove at least some of the hazards from Latin-American trade. Coordination of public and private investment from the United States in these countries also can and should be attempted. Actually, sustained assistance for 10 years, costing $12 billion—half the size of the Marshall plan—could reorganize the Latin American in a decade.

WHAT WE CAN DO AT ONCE

Most urgently the United States should dramatically reverse its position in respect of the new governments. It should, rather dramatically, indicate its solid support of the liberal democrats who are now running most of Latin America. Especially it should make a clear demonstration of good will toward President Rómulo Betancourt, presently under Communist fire in Venezuela. It can and should give solid evidence of cordiality to Lleras Camargo in Colombia, Frondizi in Argentina, and Villeda Morales

in Honduras (he also needs immediate and direct help: his is a poor country). The United States should establish the principle that it can and will make long-range plans with governments that have held free, honest, and open elections, and must deal with others only on a de facto, day-to-day basis. Incidentally, this means insisting that Cuba hold an honest election, without the terror that stalks there now, before Washington commits itself to long-range plans of economic aid.

Latin America will be setting its direction in the next couple of years—with Washington if it can, without Washington if it must. If it is to be with Washington, we must contribute not only capital but also long-range planning and technical advice, so that the economic development of the southern part of our hemisphere may contribute to the economic and political growth of the free world as a whole. If we let Latin America drift away, it will be to the detriment of the peoples of the hemisphere as a whole. The Marshall plan proved that, with the cooperation of the nations we assist, we can do a lasting job of rehabilitation and improvement abroad. In Latin America, we are facing conditions that cannot be easily compared with those of western Europe. But in Latin America too, we can do the job—and now is the time to do it.

American Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 14, 1959

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, with the passing of former Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, the United States has lost a great statesman who was completely dedicated to and worked unceasingly for the cause of peace.

One of Mr. Dulles' guiding principles, and for which he was criticized in certain quarters, was that there would be no appeasement of the Soviets. Do the citizens of the country approve of this policy? A letter which I received recently from Mr. and Mrs. Lloyd S. Summerhays, residents of the 24th District of California which I represent, sets forth in unmistakable terms their complete support of the U.S. policy to stand up firmly to the Soviets in their insidious campaign for world domination.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am submitting the letter for inclusion in the RECORD for I am certain it catches the feelings of the great majority of Americans throughout the country:

MAY 14, 1959.

The Honorable GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: During recent months, in particular, it would appear that our Government leaders have been heavily burdened with problems and decisions the outcome of which could spell future world peace or, on the other hand, might possibly lead to our eventual destruction. As privileged citizens of our beloved country, we sympathize with our leaders in the enormity of their task, and pray that they will be given the wisdom to make the proper decisions in the day that lie ahead. Their job is made no easier by the fact that they represent many diverse and dogmatic factions, some groups clamoring for a yielding acquiescence to the demands of our sworn enemy, the Communists, and others demand a "stand-firm" attitude at any cost.

Since we realize that our representatives in Washington are eager and anxious to know the will of their constituents in any crisis, we feel that we must write to voice our convictions. We do so humbly, for we know that many important circumstances are possibly unknown to us and that we must have faith in the courage and judgment of our leaders to do what is right. However, we consider this letter to be one of the most important we shall ever write, for it is concerned with one of the gravest problems our country and our world have ever faced. This problem concerns but one consideration, namely, our attitude toward the Communists, and particularly their Russian leaders. There is no doubt in our minds that the Communists will never rest until they have utterly conquered the free world, including our own United States, with all the principles of humanity, freedom, and Christian decency which constitute our heritage.

We are absolutely convinced that Khrushchev's present plans include yet another vital step toward eventual world domination, that of further solidifying the Communist empire by forcing the West out of West Berlin, making it a demilitarized, neutralized city. This disengagement would be a trap, threatening the freedom of the more than 2 million people who live in West Berlin and the security of all Western Europe. Let us never forget that West Germany is the heart of NATO defenses in Western Europe, and that demilitarization of East and West Germany would not only abandon the heroic people of West Berlin, but would leave Soviet troops in a perfect position to deploy in force. They would be within a few hundred miles of Great Britain, France and all the rest of the West with its back to the sea.

We remember all too well the terrible price the world paid for the "lesson of Munich." We have repeatedly, during the years following World War II, seen the Communists gain concession after concession and conquest after conquest, so that now over 100 million European people have been reduced to a state of slavery behind the Iron Curtain, not to mention our friends and former allies in Asia who have suffered a similar fate.

If the West does not stand up to communism, even at the risk of war, what can possibly save us from such a fate? Bit by bit, the communistic empire is growing, not on the principles of decency and human rights, but by the insidious enslavement of whole nations—among them heroic Hungary—whose agonized appeals to the free world have apparently fallen on deaf ears. What, we wonder, has happened to the brave resolution of the United Nations to find out what is going on behind Hungary's Iron Curtain? Isn't Hungary still a member of the U.N.?

We know, before we start, that the Soviets are incapable of sincerity or honesty in any future negotiations. They have proved this again and again. So why make further negotiations and concessions which will only lead further down the road to more human enslavement and the eventual day when we will have to stand alone against impossible odds?

We want to stand up and be counted, now, as citizens who will willingly make any sacrifice to preserve our American heritage from the onslaughts of this terrible enemy. Further, we realize that Khrushchev knows the strength of the United States and the West's military assets and he is not likely to want a war. If, however, the West pursues a role of appeasement or indifference, a really hot war is probably nearer than we would like to think. On the other hand, a shoulder-to-shoulder resistance to Soviet demands just might possibly preserve peace, and eventually bring mankind back to a decent world. In any event, it now appears that our course is clear and that we have no choice in the matter. The enemy is getting entirely too close to our very own front yard.

At this time we want to acknowledge our gratitude and loyalty to our constitutional representatives in Washington for their unstinting efforts and their sacrifices during these trying times. We are especially grateful to President Eisenhower and to Mr. John Foster Dulles, for their diplomatic skill and the inflexible, honorable principles upon which our foreign policy has been conducted. We are deeply appreciative of this. We only hope this letter will serve, in its own small way, to help our leaders to know the will of their people.

Yours very truly,
ANGELA SUMMERHAYS
LLOYD S. SUMMERHAYS.

World Refugee Year Brings Hope for Italian Refugees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD J. IRWIN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 26, 1959

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, on July 1, by proclamation of the United Nations, World Refugee Year will begin.

I have had, on several occasions recently, the opportunity of learning more about the problems of refugees, in particular Italian refugees.

I would like to introduce into the RECORD, therefore, the following article submitted by the American Committee on Italian Migration which, I think, vividly highlights the problem:

HOPE FOR ITALIAN REFUGEES THROUGH WORLD REFUGEE YEAR

(Submitted by American Committee on Italian Migration (National Catholic Resettlement Council), New York, N.Y.)

With World Refugee Year proclaimed by the U.N. and scheduled to begin on July 1, the American Committee on Italian Migration joins in the motives and sentiments behind its program and pledges its efforts to help make it a success both from the standpoint of American national interest and its humane aspects.

The Displaced Persons Act of 1948 and Refugee Relief Act of 1953 reflected the concern of the United States in the plight of the refugee and gave tangible proof of its determination to alleviate it.

ACIM, organized in 1952, played a role in the passage of the Refugee Act and in its implementation insofar as the Italian phase was concerned. Job and housing assurances, as required under its provisions, were obtained for thousands of Italian refugees through the 127 chapters of the organization in every section of the country. The 60,000 Italians eligible for entry under the act have all been resettled here and are faring well.

But, while the scope and purposes of the DP and Refugee Acts are commendable, the problem of the refugee is still a pressing one and in many instances has become even more aggravated. Flight from persecution for political and other reasons is ever-present.

In the case of the Italians, a new situation has cropped up recently.

Local governments in north Africa and in the Near East have projected a policy of expropriation and dispossession which affects thousands of Italians. In Tunisia, there are 60,000 Italians, approximately 30,000 of whom are in Tunis where the problem is extremely acute. They are being systematically dispossessed of their jobs and businesses. Most of them have lived there for generations. Those who can find the means, flee to Italy. It is officially reported that the number of Italians working part time in Tunis is being reduced each day as a result of the government policy to replace Italians with Tunisians as workers. Their plight is extremely serious despite desperate measures of the Italian consulate and of the Catholic charities agencies to give them assistance. Even those who own land are being pressured to leave without their possessions.

In Egypt, nearly 500 Italian families (about 2,000 people) have left for Italy because they have been deprived of their jobs and of other means of support resulting from a situation similar to that of Tunisia. These families are subsisting on welfare funds provided by the Italian Government and the Catholic welfare agencies. Those expropriated Italians who still remain in Egypt, eventually will find their way back to Italy and this additional burden on an already over-populated country will be difficult to sustain. Italy, in addition to its own, has a caseload of over 11,000 refugees of non-Italian ethnic origin, nearly 7,000 of whom seek resettlement.

ACIM, mindful of our Government's generous policy of giving leadership for the solution of the world refugee problem, since the end of World War II, urges that renewed efforts be made in pointing the way to other nations to help erase, or at least attenuate, this unfortunate situation. Legislation to help relieve the world refugee problem would be an example for other nations to follow.

ACIM submits that such legislation should contain provisions for the entry, among others, of some 15,000 Italian, north African and Near East refugees and asks that consideration be given to this proposal by administration and congressional leaders.

It is confident, as President Eisenhower declared to ACIM officials on the matter of reunion of families, that the "common decency of the American people, imbued with the tradition that this country is the sanctuary of the oppressed," will prevail.

National Rivers and Harbors Congress Endorses Water Pollution Abatement Bill (H.R. 3610)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. BUCKLEY,
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 26, 1959

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. Speaker, the bill to further stimulate construction of needed municipal waste-treatment facilities to prevent the discharge of untreated or inadequately treated sewage or other waste into the waters of the Nation (H.R. 3610) will soon be considered in the House. The bill was reported from the Committee on Public Works on April 23, 1959 and a rule was granted for its consideration on May 25, 1959. I invite attention of the Congress to the fact that the bill has the support and endorsement of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress as set forth in a letter I have received from William H. Webb, executive vice president, as follows:

NATIONAL RIVERS AND HARBORS CONGRESS,
Washington, D.C., May 25, 1959.

Hon. CHARLES A. BUCKLEY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BUCKLEY: The following information is submitted for your consideration:

The National Rivers and Harbors Congress, assembled for its 46th Annual Convention in the City of Washington, D.C., on May 15, 1959, has considered the growing urgency of the problem of water pollution abatement.

It appears that with the rising population, rapidly increasing per capita water use and developing industrial and recreational needs for water, current levels of expenditures for pollution abatement facilities are grossly inadequate. Reliable estimates clearly demonstrate the imperative necessity for a level of expenditures for these purposes of approximately $575 million annually.

Evidence submitted to the convention compels the conclusion that only through increased Federal assistance to local communities can this national problem be solved. Accordingly, the National Rivers and Harbors Congress strongly endorses the provisions of the bill, H.R. 3610, and recommends its immediate enactment into law, which it believes to be an essential step in the constructive solution of this growing national problem.

Sincerely yours,
WILLIAM H. WEBB,
Executive Vice President.

"There Is Utterly No Sense for a Superhighway To Destroy a Historic Building or Slash a Historic Battlefield if It Can Swing Around in Some Acceptable Way," Declares the Wilmington, Del., Morning News

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 26, 1959

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I find myself in complete agreement with the position of the Wilmington (Del.) Morning News which said in a recent editorial that—

There is utterly no sense for a superhighway to destroy a historic building or slash a historic battlefield if it can swing around in some acceptable fashion.

There is a deepening concern on the part of our civic and cultural leaders over the heedless destruction of many of our country's most famous historical sites and buildings. In some instances great buildings are being razed and replaced by such things as parking lots. This was the fate proposed for the historic Patent Office Building, in Washington, D.C., and the San Francisco Mint. The Morristown, N.J., National Historical Park with its famed Revolutionary War headquarters of Gen. George Washington was threatened with a highway. I have introduced a bill, H.R. 7215, to save our great sites and buildings which, in fact, are often threatened by federally assisted programs.

Delaware is rich in historic sites and buildings, and our museums and art galleries, such as Winterthur, are world famous. Along with other States interested in preservation of cultural monuments, we have found that our concern with history is richly rewarding both to ourselves and to tourists who visit our State and spend money here with our merchants.

My bill will not halt progress, but it does establish a regular means whereby national organizations interested in historic preservation may advise the Federal Government in these matters. No appropriation of Federal funds is provided or contemplated in my bill. It is not a matter of money, but, rather, of better advice so that the vast bureaucracy of Government gives the same weight to historical factors which they presently give to other factors in making their decisions.

Like the national treasures legislation of European countries, my new bill includes the fine arts as worthy of saving. Among the 30 groups listed in my bill are such outstanding organizations as the American Institute of Architects, the National Trust for Historic Preservation, the American Association for State and Local History, the American Federation of Arts, and the General Federation of Women's Clubs.

I include for the information of my colleagues the editorial from the Wilmington (Del.) Morning News, and the text of my new bill, H.R. 7215, to amend the Historic Sites Act of August 21, 1935, to provide a method for preserving sites, areas, buildings, objects, and antiquities of national, regional, or local historical significance which are threatened with destruction by federally financed programs, and for other purposes.

I invite any of my colleagues who are interested in this matter of historic preservation to join with me in introducing this legislation, and I invite comments and suggestions from all interested individuals and organizations which will assist me in perfecting my measure.

It is my hope that hearings will be held on this legislation at an early date.

[From the Wilmington (Del.) Morning News, May 22, 1959]

NOT A MATTER OF MONEY

In these days of special concern with taxes and revenues the title of this piece could have led you into this note on a measure introduced in the House at Washington this week by Representative HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR., of Delaware. It would set up some commonsense procedures for saving historic sites and buildings apparently in the way of Federal-aid highways and urban renewal programs.

By Mr. McDOWELL's bill the Interior Department could give weight to the advice of outfits such as the American Institute of Architects, the National Trust for Historic Preservation, and the General Federation of Women's Clubs.

There is utterly no sense for a superhighway to destroy a historic building or slash a historic battlefield if it can swing around in some acceptable fashion. Too much good civil engineering has been done in some parts of the Nation, for the roads program,

without enough good regional planning that takes our heritage into consideration.

A straight line is the shortest but not always the best line between two interchanges. We compliment Mr. McDOWELL and urge that this bill get prompt, full attention by all Delaware people who value tradition.

H.R. 7215

A bill to amend the Historic Sites Act of August 21, 1935, to provide a method for preserving sites, areas, buildings, objects, and antiquities of national, regional, or local historical significance which are threatened with destruction by federally financed programs, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first section of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the preservation of historic American sites, buildings, objects, and antiquities of national significance, and for other purposes", approved August 21, 1935 (16 U.S.C. 461), is amended to read as follows:

"That it is hereby declared that it is a national policy to preserve for public use historic sites, areas (including sections of cities), buildings, objects, and antiquities of national, regional, or local significance for the inspiration and benefit of the people of the United States."

SEC. 2. Section 2 of such Act (16 U.S.C. 462) is amended by redesignating paragraph (k) as paragraph (m) and by adding after paragraph (j) the following new paragraphs:

"(k) Carry out (insofar as practicable and appropriate) the same duties and functions with respect to historic areas (including sections of cities) as those which are specified in the preceding paragraphs of this section with respect to historic sites, buildings, and objects.

"(l) Protect and preserve, in the manner provided in section 8 and through the performance of such other functions of the type described in this section as the Secretary may deem appropriate, historic sites, areas (including sections of cities), buildings, and objects of national, regional, or local significance.

"(m) As used in this section the terms 'objects' and 'antiquities' include objects and antiquities of art."

SEC. 3. Such Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 8. (a) Whenever the Secretary receives a petition from any State or political subdivision thereof, or from the American Institute of Architects, the National Trust for Historic Preservation, the Commission of Fine Arts, the National Wildlife Federation, the American Council of Learned Societies, the American Association for State and Local History, the Natural Resources Council, the Wildlife Management Institute, the National Parks Association, the American Institute of Planners, the American Automobile Association, the Society of Architectural Historians, the American Planning and Civic Association, the General Federation of Women's Clubs, the Garden Club of America, the American Society of Landscape Architects, the Urban Land Institute, the American Federation of Arts, the National Academy of Design, the National Council on Arts and Government, the National Art Education Association, the National Council of the Arts in Education, the College Art Association of America, the Artists Equity Association, the American Association of Museums, the Joint Committee on the National Capital, the National Capital Arts Council, or any other organization recognized by the Secretary for purposes of this section as being concerned with historic preservation, alleging that a Federal project or program or a State or local project or program financed in whole or in part with Federal funds will seriously damage or destroy a historical site, area (including a section of a city), building, or object of national, regional, or local significance, or upon his own motion, the Secretary shall conduct an investigation, which shall include (but not be limited to) holding public hearings or affording the opportunity for such hearings, for the purpose of determining whether or not such site, area, building, or object is of national, regional, or local historical significance.

"(b) Whenever the Secretary determines under subsection (a) that a site, area, building, or object is of national, regional, or local historical significance, he shall forthwith determine whether or not the proposed project or program will seriously damage or destroy it.

"(c) Whenever the Secretary determines under this section that a site, area, building, or object of national, regional, or local historical significance will be seriously damaged or destroyed by a Federal project or program (actual or proposed) or by a State or local project or program which is or will be financed in whole or in part with Federal funds, he shall submit such determination to the head of the Federal department, agency, or instrumentality under the jurisdiction of which the project or program is to be carried out; and after the receipt of such determination the head of such department, agency, or instrumentality shall not commence or further proceed with such project or program, or expend or approve the expenditure of any Federal funds (or further Federal funds) for such project or program, unless and until such project or program has been modified and the plans, specifications, and contracts thereunder amended so as to provide to the satisfaction of the Secretary for the preservation of the historic site, area, building, or object involved. Such modification or amendment may be made notwithstanding any provision of law limiting the right of a department, agency, or instrumentality to modify a project or program or amend plans, specifications, or contracts, but shall otherwise be subject to all the provisions of the law under which the project or program is being or will be carried out.

SEC. 4. The Secretary of the Interior, in consultation with the organizations named in subsection (a) of section 8 (as added by this Act) of the Act of August 21, 1935, and other organizations recognized by the Secretary as being concerned with historic preservation, shall make a continuing study of the tax advantages, technical and financial assistance, and other incentives which could be provided (by legislation and otherwise) ot promote and encourage the restoration and preservation of sites, areas, buildings, objects and antiquities (including objects and antiquities of art), in the United States of national, regional, or local historical significance by the Federal Government, and by States, political subdivisions, private organizations, and individuals, giving appropriate consideration to the methods which have been used to encourage such restoration and preservation in other countries and in areas of the United States where intensive programs for historic preservation have been successfully carried out.

The Foremost Manufacturing City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 26, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, many people do not realize that our great city of New York is the largest manufacturing city in the world.

I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following informative article written by Martin W. Wilmington of the New York City Department of Commerce. Mr. Wilmington is well known for his writings in the economics field and is a professor of economics at Pace Institute of New York City. His article appeared in the May 1959 issue of Industrial Bulletin, a publication of the State of New York Department of Labor:

THE FOREMOST MANUFACTURING CITY

(By Martin W. Wilmington)

Andrew Carnegie once called New York City the place where people spend the money they make elsewhere. Like most people, then as now, he had the city all wrong.

In Detroit or Chicago or Pittsburgh or Washington, no one is likely to mistake the nature of the dominant local economic activity. Nobody would hesitate before tagging manufacturing as the vital sinew of Detroit's employment strength. But so few people seem to know that New York City is a far greater center of manufacturing than is Detroit—or Chicago—or Pittsburgh—or any other city in America or the world. It also has more government employees than Washington.

Besides being the country's foremost manufacturing city, New York leads the nation in trade, finance, services, corporate management, communications, transportation, and port facilities. Thirty thousand wholesale firms, 100,000 retail outlets, 150,000 service establishments, 1,200 large corporate headquarters, 380 banks and bank branches, 12 trunk railroads, 13 million airline passengers annually 22 ship movements daily, thousands of truck arrivals daily, 1 billion securities turned over annually—all add up to make New York the undisputed leader.

Its very variety and scope cause most of the confusion that arises about its economic character. The city is both a colossus and a cosmos. Its giant size can swallow new social and economic enterprises without more than a momentary stir.

In almost any other city, the presence of the United Nations and all the subsidiary activities connected with it would continuously excite the awareness and the attention of the public. Not so in New York. Thousands of New Yorkers still have never seen the gleaming structure on the East River.

A world trade fair drawing more than 60 nations, with nearly 3,000 exhibitors and almost a million visitors, would set off a hue-and-cry celebration throughout a lesser city. In New York last year, more than one bus driver, when queried for directions to the first U.S. World Trade Fair, replied haughtily that the fair had been closed in 1940.

The departure of a plant with hundreds of employees, or the compensating opening of a company's new headquarters, would get banner headlines in other towns. In New York it rates back-page treatment by the metropolis' mass-circulation newspapers.

Helping to mask the importance of industry in New York is the unostentatious nature of most of its proliferated manufacturing activities and the rich diversification of the city economy. Amidst the welter of stores, theaters, brokerage houses, cabarets, restaurants, office skyscrapers, jet planes, ocean liners, terminals, exchanges, bank palaces, TV studios, fashion shows, festivals, exhibitions, art auctions, concerts, fairs, congresses, tourists, diplomats, and white-collar commuters, even an industry complex that employs nearly 900,000 production workers can seem inconspicuous.

These hundreds upon hundreds of thousands, far from being concentrated inside a

few giant industries, are spread out through some 40,000 factories that represent more than 300 different industries and make New York a small-business citadel. All told they provide a diversity of production unmatched anywhere—this single city spews forth a greater variety of goods than do most nations of the world.

Yet the average plant in the city, operating in rented quarters and by preference using subcontractors and outside services, employs fewer than 25 workers. The average annual payroll is scarcely $100,000.

Quite clearly the symbol of New York City is not the blast furnace, the towering refinery, the sprawling assembly hangar. The overalled man carrying a lunch pail does not personify the city. Rather, manufacturing in New York speaks through the sewing machine, the clothes rack, the loft building that may look like a tenement. Most of New York's production workers wear white collars or cotton prints on the job.

New York's greatest economic resource is manpower. Many a Gotham manufacturer who feels himself tempted to move elsewhere because of costs finds in the end that the size, the instant availability, and the incomparable variety of skills found in New York's labor force comprise too valuable an asset to sacrifice.

The great waves of transatlantic immigration are no more, but year after year the magic of New York City pulls thousands of opportunity-bound men and women into its orbit, and keeps its labor exchanges filled with eager applicants. Added to this is the pervasive willingness of workers, students, and housewives to take on secondary employment and offhours assignments. Burmese translators, electronics assemblers, what-have-you, are on tap at almost any hour of the day or night.

Diversification and the propensity to modest-scale operation have given the city two other outstanding characteristics: business incubation and business stability.

The place to start a business with modest means is still the big city. Throughout its recent history, New York has been a mass generator of new business. Its labor supply, the availability of low-cost rental space (lofts), diversified credit facilities, the size and depth of the immediate market, and a stimulating environment where top talent meets, demonstrates, competes, and compares every day, have made the city the opportunity-maker it is. While New York is seldom able to report spectacular large-enterprise relocations from other parts of the country, growth goes on. New industry comes to New York via passenger conveyance: people arrive with ideas and turn them into fast-multiplying business operations. The community notices them only when they have grown so much that space has become a problem and relocation a consideration.

Entrepreneurial birth and development are reflected in the 1,500 new incorporations that are recorded for New York City each month—nearly 300 of them in the manufacturing field—and in the construction reports: in 1958 the monthly average of nonresidential construction started in the city reached nearly the $20-million mark.

One-industry cities, like one-crop countries, suffer from extremes of cyclical fluctuation: they ride high with booms, plummet during recessions. New York City, with its wide economic diversification and emphasis on consumer-goods manufacture—which, in general, is relatively insensitive to business-cycle ups and downs—habitually rides out recessions with losses far below the national average. During the first 10 months of 1958, for example, when the recession was at its peak, insured unemployment rose 92 percent in the country as a whole, but less than 55 percent in the city.

Total jobs during the 10-month period declined only 1.2 percent.

While the city may preen itself over the evidence of its economic resilience in a year of national decline, which caused scarcely a ripple in the steady rhythm of its business growth, it must give an ear to the constant prophecies of its doom. The present may be gratifying, but what about the future?

There have been warnings that the process of suburbanization and the developing westward and southward bias of the nation's economic gravitation sound the knell for vigorous life as far as the "old" cities of the Northeast are concerned. Must New York City falter in the momentum of its over-all growth? Are the great days of the Northeastern cities really over?

Free market forces are moving toward a gradual economic attrition of the central cities in most of the nation's metropolitan regions. The lack of reasonably priced industrial and residential space of good quality, the congestion of transportation facilities, the attractions of suburban living, the dispersal of industrial concentration promoted by centrifugal population movement, the heightened commercial mobility afforded by the truck, wage differentials that favor peripheral locations, the outward migration of the middle class, these and other factors adverse to the continued domination of the central city are at work.

Far up to the north, the great St. Lawrence Seaway project nears completion. Port cities, small and large, of the Great Lakes region are licking their chops in expectation of a larger share of the Nation's seaborne trade. The defenses of the port of New York continue to be weakened by railroad freight rates that in effect discriminate in favor of the ports of Philadelphia, Baltimore, and Norfolk on export-import cargo.

Consumer trends are working against the prospects of the city's principal manufacturing industry: apparel. The proportion of the consumer dollar spent on clothing has been shrinking. In addition, the growing preference for casual wear—especially sportswear—has downrated the significance of style, which always has been a prime factor in keeping apparel manufacture to a compact sector of Manhattan.

In terms of employment capacity, manufacturing is on the decline, relatively, all over the United States. For the first time in U.S. history, nonmanufacturing activities give more jobs to workers than do manufacturing, mining, and agriculture combined. With more than 30 percent of its labor force engaged in manufacturing, New York City is highly vulnerable to this trend.

The city, too, is the site of a continuing great industrial treasure hunt. An estimated half-billion dollars are spent annually by States, cities, counties, chambers of commerce, citizens committees, public utilities, banks, newspapers, real estate firms, and railroads to lure enterprises into industry-starved communities. There being a concentration of managerial decision making in New York, the promotional raids are heaviest here; lately, even foreign countries and communities have joined the fray.

Nevertheless, New York has a way of growing in the teeth of all gloomy prophecies. As long ago as 1830, observers complained that middle-income groups were vanishing from the city. At the dawn of the 20th century New Yorkers and their guests were complaining about traffic congestion. A learned professor warned of an impending vehicular strangulation of the city long before World War I.

The traffic problem, for example, is a sign of strength as well as a source of weakness. No prosperous, dynamic city will ever be without congestion. The surest sign of decay would be the disappearance of trucks and delivery cars from the urban arteries. At best, new traffic solutions manage to contain the traffic problems but they never quite abolish them. Build new arterial highways, new bridges, wider streets, and more people start owning and using automobiles. Provide garages, and feeder streets become more congested than ever.

What's more, too many observers forget that New York is a city of five boroughs. Except for the parkways and boulevards feeding into Manhattan, there are no monstrous traffic and parking problems in the other boroughs.

In a different vein, much has been made of the current trend toward spacious 1-story factories. But only recently the business world saw a successful experiment in Newark, where a large company scrapped plans to move its operations to the South and instead completely remodeled the old 5-story structure it had occupied for 70 years. By staying, and expending little more than $2 million for alterations—which are expected to be recouped within 3 years because of greater operating efficiency—the company save more than $5 million, without counting the cost of labor supply and and training difficulties at the once contemplated southern site.

A less dramatic but equally instructive demonstration has taken place on Manhattan's West Side, where a virtually abandoned 6-story building has been turned into a streamlined, ultramodern distribution point for ready to wears. Such officials and engineering experts are predicting that the multistory production plant will stage a comeback and trigger a new era of industrial expansion for cities like New York.

Statements from electronics and missile manufacturers indicate that the one factor that may soon overshadow most others in their site selection is the residential preference of key scientists in their employ. Most of them prefer locations in or near great urban centers with their vast cultural, educational, and recreational facilities.

Even on the subject of the suburban exodus, hasty projections should be accepted with care. Real-estate officers in New York City report a rising reflux of exurbanites to modern apartment buildings in Manhattan. And the city planning commission has detected a perceptible inflow of middle- or high-income families without children into apartments vacated by families with young children.

Probably nowhere in the city has the presence of hidden wellsprings of recuperation been so amply demonstrated as in the downtown financial district. Only a few years ago, the area was written off as moribund in the face of the midtown office construction boom, and many leading institutions, including the Stock Exchange, began expressing the urge to move. Today, Wall Street challenges midtown in the race for construction records; new skyscrapers are changing the Battery skyline; civic improvements crowned by the Manhattan Plaza development at the entrance of Brooklyn Bridge have recast both traffic flow and the downtown panorama; and a group of businessmen and civic leaders has formulated an impressive plan for further revolutions.

While private enterprise is launching its counterattack, government has not been standing still. The highway programs of

the Federal and State Governments have already immeasurably enhanced the locational assets of New York. The impact of the throughway and the third Lincoln Tunnel tube in the recent past, and the Narrows Bridge and projected arterial improvements in Long Island and Staten Island by the near future, forecast dramatic progress during the next decade. The State government, through its industrial-promotion activities, small-business workshops, and various other programs, has shown its determination to maintain a steady pace of progress both in the State and in New York City.

The least-explored factor in most diagnoses of New York's economic future is the role of the city government. It still escapes the attention of many that the relationship between local government and the local economy in America has gone through a historic transformation in the years since World War II.

The traditional American concept of local government vis-a-vis the economic sphere has long resembled that of the role of women in oriental society: passive adjustment to coming inevitabilities. Responsibility for economic growth and employment stability on the local level by and large was left with the market economy and the Federal-State governments.

However, local government in recent years has been taking a far more active role. It is initiating measures of its own to broaden and diversify the economic base, to adjust to shifts in the economic structure without waiting for the more painful corrections of the free market, and to forestall or alleviate unemployment caused by national trends rather than merely to submit to it.

We may expect from New York City's administration sustained efforts to provide more and better services such as pier improvements, better transport facilities, more training institutions, more efficient traffic regulation, more road building and street improvements, and better zoning and building codes. It will seek also to formulate an overall economic policy that will aim at such targets as more jobs, higher incomes, industrial diversification, economic growth, and employment stability.

Three examples illustrate the beginnings of such a policy. During the peak recession months, the city's public works department increased its contract awards to nearly double the corresponding level for 1957, pouring an additional $27 million, in the form of useful public repairs and improvements, into the faltering city economy.

Secondly, New York is now one of the only two cities in America to have a statutory municipal department of commerce. This department's job is to promote industrial expansion and inmigration; to render, and seek improvements in, services by the city to commerce and industry; to disseminate information needed for the planning of business and governmental activity; and to advise the mayor on long-range economic policy.

Thirdly, the city is now laying the groundwork for a great industrial revival which, city officials confidently predict, will confound the experts. A new zoning code hospitable to industry and industrial research institutions will soon replace an amalgam of old regulations bearing an anti-industry stamp in many instances. Industrial parks financed by private capital but dependent on positive municipal encouragement and cooperation are rising in Brooklyn and Staten Island. And the Narrows Bridge linking to the city a broough with 18,000 acres of undeveloped land—much suitable for industry—is nearing reality.

Make no mistake about it, confidence reigns in old Gotham's highest places. The reasons, simply put, are these: the great shockproof diversification of the city's economic activities; the constant locational improvements; the continuous enhancement of the city's advantages as the gravitational pinpoint of American management; the changing concepts in plant construction; the changing requirements for plant location; and, most especially, the continued abundance and high quality of its labor force.

None of these elements is more important than the last. One constantly discovers new points of strength that business in New York derives from the labor supply at its disposal. One of the most telling and simple arguments in favor of locating industry in New York City recently came from a manufacturer who relies heavily on Government contracts. If he moved to a nice rural location somewhere south he might find enough workers to carry his normal load of orders; "But what would I do in case of a national emergency?"

Adding Zest to the Teaching of Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 26, 1959

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article recently prepared for the publication Social Education, written by Elaine Exton, which describes the many and varying opportunities which now exist in Washington for summer training in citizenship and public affairs. Certainly the expansion of these opportunities for young persons of college age has added enormously to the life of this city.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDING ZEST TO THE TEACHING OF CITIZENSHIP

(By Elaine Exton)

How can teachers and school administrators infuse new vitality into educating our country's youth for citizenship, imparting not only understanding of the essential elements of our American form of government and way of life but deep devotion to our heritage of freedom and a sense of personal responsibility for participating fully in helping to make democracy work?

Developing among the youth of the land the understandings, skills, and attitudes which will result in active citizenship is of prime importance in orienting American education to its new obligations in a post-sputnik world. In the period of change and challenge teachers of all subjects and at all levels need to be well informed about the nature of our Government and the policies that are helping to shape our country's destiny.

WASHINGTON WORKSHOPS

Four summer programs in Washington, the Federal city on the Potomac, offer exceptional facilities for strengthening the ability of teachers and school administrators to make citizenship meaningful to American boys and girls; namely, the National Education Association's Washington-United Nations Seminar, Syracuse University's Washingon Seminar, American University's Institute on Current Problems in Education, and its Institute on the United States in World Affairs.

Using Washington's resources as a laboratory for learning about the Federal Government through first-hand experience and observation, their offerings combine classroom lectures and traditional methods of research with briefings by Government officials, group discussions, and visits to scenes of our Nation's history and of today's government in action.

While these programs "major" in different subject fields—the first two stressing government, the third education, and the last-named world affairs—and differ in some procedural matters, they have many attributes in common.

Teachers who have come to the capital city of the United States to participate in one of these summer programs are quick to state that they will be better citizens and teachers as a result of their study.

"I have acquired a store of personal anecdotes which will help to add interesting sidelights to many of the events under question during the semester," a New England classroom teacher states. "With the pictures which I took on the trip I can literally project colorful reminders of our precious heritage on the screen for all to see, thus sharing some of my summer's experiences with a large number of pupils" declares a Michigan social studies teacher. "I will be in a better position to describe the actual mechanics of government," a teacher of the political phases of history relates.

Besides being the home of the U.S. Office of Education, Washington houses the headquarters offices of a number of important national education groups, including the National Education Association, the American Council on Education, and the Association for Childhood Education International. In its environs are located the most extensive library holdings of any U.S. city, including the unusually rich collections of the Library of Congress.

The vast amount of educational information available through these sources makes it a choice place in which to conduct educational research and to obtain background on methods of meeting educational problems. Diversified arts galleries and museums are among the many cultural attractions that help make the capital city of our Nation one of the leading educational centers of the world.

Among the unique resources that Washington offers for keeping abreast of new instructional materials are the Educational Materials Laboratory of the U.S. Office of Education where a representative collection of textbooks in use in the Nation's elementary and secondary schools may be examined, the Current Curriculum Collection in the Library of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare where a large selection of courses of study, curriculum guides in various subject fields, and annual reports issued by State departments of education and some city school systems may be viewed, and the Government Printing Office Bookstore where teachers can browse among the 2,000 Government publications on display to find those which best suit their needs.

Weekends may also be used for sampling some of the historic attractions of the area ranging from attending services in a church where an American President has worshiped to touring battlefields of the Revolutionary War at Valley Forge or Yorktown and such history book spots associated with the Civil War as Harpers Ferry, Bull Run, Gettysburg, and Appomattox.

Popular weekend destinations in Virginia include Jamestown, site of the first permanent English settlement in America, restored Williamsburg, and Fredericksburg, the hometown of George Washington's youth. In nearby Maryland, Frederick, where Barbara Fritchie lived, and Annapolis, where the U.S. Naval Academy is located, are among the favorites.

PROGRAM EMPHASES

Each of the Washington seminars emphasizes a certain aspect of the Washington scene. For this reason, a person interested in studying in the Nation's Capital must first decide whether he desires supplementary training in government, education, or world affairs.

The Government in action

Through a well-planned sequence of activities the Washington Seminar, cosponsored by the National Education Association's travel division and National Council for the Social Studies, takes its members to places of Government in action where they hear talks by Federal officials on the work of their agencies and obtain information on how policies are determined and how a wide range of Government agencies operate. Prior to these appointments, the group meets in the Top-of-the-Park Room at their headquarters hotel for a half-hour briefing session, and returns to the same room for follow-up discussions after the various Government visits.

The NEA seminar begins with a historical review of the plan and founding of our Nation's Capital, and considers seven other significant topics during its 6 weeks' existence; namely, "Making Federal Law," "Promoting the General Welfare," "Educating and Informing Citizens," "Safeguarding Our National Security," "Preserving and Extending Our Heritage," "Participating in World Affairs," and "Pushing Back the Frontiers of Knowledge." The latter topic, for example, reviews the role of the Federal Government in scientific research through visits to such agencies as the Atomic Energy Commission, National Institutes of Health, U.S. Naval Observatory, and National Bureau of Standards. At-the-scene laboratory sessions, lectures, and exhibits help illustrate the variety and scope of Government research.

Students who attend the 3-week Washington seminar operated by Syracuse University's Maxwell Graduate School of Citizenship likewise confer with key officials in the legislative, judicial, and executive branches of the Government. Like the participants in the National Education Association's project they watch Congress in session, visit the Supreme Court, talk with individual Representatives and Senators, sit in on congressional committee hearings, meet with spokesmen of various special interest groups, such as business and labor, and with diplomatic representatives of foreign countries. This year's activities will center on the formulation and execution of American foreign policy. Protection of the consumer will be a second topic for consideration.

Education

Practical applications of American education principles is the focus for American University's Institute on Current Problems in Education, which considers such topics as administrative and supervisory procedures, methods of teaching, curriculum revision, use of audiovisual aids (including radio and television) and school public relations. The day's activities begin on American University's Washington campus at Massachusetts and Nebraska Avenues with an 8 o'clock lecture delivered by guest speakers. The rest of the morning is devoted to study group sessions in such curriculum areas as history, music, chemistry, and mathematics.

Participants may elect to serve on committees which work on reports of a professional nature in such fields as study unit construction, trends in building design, or planning a student trip to Washington. Meetings of these committees and discussion seminars consume two afternoons each week. An Embassy visit is a highlight of the third afternoon, leaving two free afternoons and a free weekend for seeing the places and meeting the people of most interest to individual members.

World affairs

While international relations have a place in all four programs, the Institute on the United States in World Affairs sponsored by American University is the only one which makes this subject its sole preoccupation. Offered since 1945, this seminar now has about 1,000 alumni scattered throughout America and in some foreign countries. Its sessions consider such subjects as world politics and America's role in the international scene, U.S. membership in such organizations as NATO and the Organization of American States, duties of American Ambassadors abroad, and activities of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Two speakers address the group each weekday during the Institute's 5 weeks in Washington. A discussion period follows. Besides foreign ambassadors, guest lecturers include Congressmen, State Department officials, and other international experts. A day spent at the Pentagon and another at the Pan American Union, as well as several afternoons at foreign embassies, help to provide a broad perspective for interpreting world events.

The work in Washington is followed by a final week (July 24-July 31) in New York City (optional) to round out the study of American foreign policy with two days at the United Nations, a day of briefings at the U.S. Mission to the United Nations, and a day of visits to such American organizations supporting the U.N. as the Foreign Policy Association and the American Association for the United Nations.

The National Education Association's Washington Seminar now also sponsors an optional week in New York City (August 15–21) which schedules meetings at the United Nations and at the headquarters offices of some of the American organizations specializing in international activities.

During the preceding week in Washington, the emphasis of the NEA seminar program is on international affairs. In visits to the State Department, for example, officials explain the agency's organization and functions, review global problems, and furnish information on the International Educational Exchange Program. At the U.S. Information Agency Seminar members hear broadcasts by the Voice of America and see typical USIS exhibits and films. Teachers may enroll for just the international portions of the NEA seminar (2 weeks).

New Afro-Asian Ally

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 26, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, although the State of Israel is only 11 years old, it is already rendering valuable assistance to its friendly neighbors.

I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by Roscoe Drummond which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of May 17, 1959:

NEW AFRO-ASIAN ALLY

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—Numerous Asian and African nations are today turning to a newfound ally and benefactor. This is a development of the greatest significance which is just beginning to gather momentum. It is a development which the free world can view with satisfaction.

The new Afro-Asian ally is Western in outlook, Middle Eastern in geography. It is democratic, anti-Communist and, since it is neither a large nor powerful country, it is basically a neutral source of assistance which gives its recipients no appearance of choosing up sides in the cold war.

I am referring to the young but mature State of Israel, which was reborn only 11 years ago and which is now embarking upon a wide-ranging, diverse program of economic aid and technical assistance where it is most needed.

A nation which has been greatly helped by its own friends, Israel is now helping others—to the advantage of everybody.

Israel's expanding investment assistance and technical aid ranges from Ghana to Burma. Its scope is illustrated by the fact that trainees from 17 Afro-Asian countries and territories are now studying Israel agricultural settlements and cooperative enterprises.

The best example of the burgeoning economic relationship between Israel and the Afro-Asian nations is what Israel and Ghana are doing together.

To begin to finance an expanding two-way trade Israel has provided Ghana with a $20 million credit over a 4-year period.

Israel is substantially financing—but taking only 40 percent of the stock—Ghana's newly organized Black Star shipping line and is providing the technical training for Ghanan personnel to man its merchant marine. It is also helping Ghana develop its building industry by providing the necessary beginning capital and by training Ghanans in construction techniques. In other fields of technical skills Israel is providing training in agriculture, city planning, irrigation, water resources and in consumer and producer cooperatives.

A group of Burmese farmers is now living and working on Israeli cooperative farms and it is not to be overlooked that Burmese army contingent is learning how the Israelis defend their frontiers with citizen volunteers who simultaneously till the fields and guard the nation. There is no spirit of pacifism in Israel and Israel is teaching none to its Asian and African friends.

Israeli universities and institutes are taking exchange students from many countries, including some trainees from Thailand, India, and Japan.

Obviously Israel is not doing all this out of sheer goodness of heart.

For Israel it has large political as well as economic advantages. The biggest boon from this growing relationship of trust and good will is that it enables Israel to free itself from the physical and psychological isolation of Arab encirclement. Israel's expanding trade and her enlarged horizon of friends mean that she cannot be surrounded either politically or economically by a Nasser blockade.

Israel's new-found allies are also blunting Egypt's efforts to recruit Afro-Asian support in its own cold war against Israel. At the Accra conference of independent African States a year ago Ghana almost singlehandedly turned back Egypt's effort to aline all Africa against Israel. Egypt could get nothing but a harmless resolution calling for a just settlement of Arab-Israeli disputes. Earlier Burma's Prime Minister, U Nu, rejected an Egyptian demand that he call off a projected visit to Israel. What he called off was a visit to Egypt.

Because Israel is a small, pioneer-spirited, new country, deficient in many physical resources and rich in nearly all human resources, it is in an ideal position to help others. It seems to me that the friends of Israel in the United States might well look for ways to nourish and enlarge what Israel is doing so well in this field.

Legislation Needed To Aid Depressed Areas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LUDWIG TELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 26, 1959

Mr. TELLER. Mr. Speaker, we have all been greatly heartened during the past few months by the Nation's economic recovery and decline in unemployment.

Nevertheless, despite the general economic recovery, we must not lose sight of some basic problems that face the American economy at this stage. Unemployment still remains a major problem.

It has, therefore, been a source of great disappointment to me that the Ways and Means Committee has rejected proposed legislation to strengthen and improve our unemployment insurance system. We need Federal standards for unemployment insurance regardless of the immediate economic conditions that prevail in the country. It is exactly during this time of general economic recovery that we should focus our sights ahead and plan to reduce the tragic impact of any future declines in total economic activity, and provide for persons willing and able to work who lose their jobs due to no fault of their own. I believe that present levels and duration of benefits are inadequate in most States.

Another basic problem about unemployment is the fact that it tends to be concentrated in a number of areas throughout the Nation. Even during the period of general prosperity which the Nation has enjoyed since World War II, areas with high levels of unemployment have persisted during good times and recessions. It is my firm conviction that we must provide Federal aid to help pull these communities out of their economic doldrums and to help broaden their economic base so that the people in these communities can participate in making their contribution to the general economic growth of the country.

The needs of the Nation and a humanitarian philosophy dictate that every American should have the opportunity to engage in gainful employment, to support himself and his family. The fact is that in depressed areas where chronic unemployment and underemployment prevail, such an opportunity is denied to thousands of families in many States throughout the Union.

It would, therefore, be a grave mistake for us to turn our backs now on the problems of these areas because of the general economic recovery. Experience has shown that a general rise in income and employment is not going to solve the problems of chronically depressed areas.

To help these communities we must inaugurate a program which would help the people in the depressed areas to help themselves. Obviously I do not believe that the Federal Government either can or should solve the problems of local communities, but I am firmly convinced that the Federal Government can help them.

To do this job, we must provide a variety of programs to suit the individual needs of the various communities. Appropriate legislation to accomplish this much-needed end has been before Congress for a number of years. Congress passed area redevelopment legislation toward the end of the 85th Congress, which I was happy to support. It was disappointing to me that the President saw fit to veto the area redevelopment bill in 1958.

This year the Senate was quick to seize the initiative to reenact similar legislation to that vetoed last year. I believe that the bill (S. 722) approved by the Senate should be enacted into law without further delay. We should no longer tolerate postponing a job which America needs, and needs immediately.

The bill passed by the Senate is the product of long and thoughtful hearings and debate which has been going on continuously since the 84th Congress. It offers a variety of provisions designed to help the diverse needs of people residing in economically depressed areas.

S. 722 provides for technical assistance to plan the redevelopment of the community, loans to business locating or expanding in these communities, the development of needed public facilities, training and retraining of the labor force in depressed areas, and urban renewal.

Let me briefly summarize each of these provisions. The first step in area redevelopment is the inventory of human and physical resources of the communities. This type of a survey should help the people in the community to appraise their economic potential and to plan the type of industry which can best flourish in the community. We need a central office which can become a reservoir for the various techniques developed to aid area redevelopment and to help individual areas to appraise their economic status. The Federal Government has been doing this type of work for many years. There is now an Office of Area Development in the Department of Commerce which does exactly that. The Bureau of Employment Security in the Department of Labor has conducted a number of surveys of the available manpower pool and skills available in several localities. But the resources of these agencies are entirely too inadequate to perform the needed job. The proposed legislation would, therefore, provide $4.5 million annually to expand technical facilities to help depressed areas to develop a positive program of action for self-development.

Once a community is ready to embark on a program of economic expansion, it is frequently found that chronically depressed communities do not have sufficient resources and facilities to attract new industry. The program, therefore, provides for the establishment of a revolving fund from which the depressed communities could borrow money at a reasonable rate of interest to improve their public facilities. Only in the case of the poorest communities whose economic base is insufficient or has deteriorated to the extent to which the community does not have a sufficient tax base to pay for the interest on loans does the program provide grants.

The third step in community redevelopment is to attract new industry. It is a well-known fact that capital in the declining communities is not as venturesome as that in expanding and growing communities. Consequently, the question of credit becomes more acute in these areas. The proposed legislation would, therefore, establish a revolving fund from which businesses locating or expanding in these communities would be able to obtain loans. The bill provides for two separate revolving funds: one for industrial communities and the other for rural areas where income is commonly low and where underemployment prevails.

A fourth aspect of the proposed program deals with the training of the human resources in the community. In rural areas there is frequently a lack of sufficiently trained personnel available for new plants. In industrially depressed areas the skills of many people have become obsolete because the demand for the products in which they have been engaged has lessened or disappeared because of changes in consumer habits or new technological developments, or because of depletion of resources or change of industrial location.

The program would, therefore, provide for the establishment of training facilities in these areas to equip the labor force to accept new jobs. In many cases it would be unreasonable to expect people who have been exposed to long periods of unemployment to be able to undergo an effective training program without any means of subsistence. The program provides that persons undergoing training for new jobs would receive subsistence payments during the period of training, but not for a period exceeding 13 weeks. It has been realized that this type of program may be very costly. But the proposed program would limit the subsistence payments to $10 million a year. This would allow the administrator of the program to evaluate the need and effectiveness of subsistence payments, but at the same time restrict the budgetary outlays to a bare minimum.

Finally the program would extend the present urban renewal program to blighted commercial areas. At present, urban renewal activity is primarily limited to residential slum areas.

In outlining the program, I failed to mention the sums allocated for the revolving funds in connection with the community facilities and the amount to be expended for grants and loans. The bill as approved by the Senate calls for three revolving funds of $100 million each for loans in industrial areas, loans in rural areas and for public facilities. A $75 million fund was provided for grants. This, it should be noted, was the total extent of the fund and not an annual amount.

Unfortunately, as an over-simplification, the $300 million allocated for revolving funds, the $75 million grants, the $10 million subsistence payments and the $4.5 million for technical assistance have been added up and totaled, giving the im-

pression that the bill provides for an annual expenditure of $379.5 million.

This, of course, is a misrepresentation. The $300 million revolving funds are not really an expenditure or a burden upon the taxpayer. The best experience with this type of loan by the RFC, Small Business Administration and others has shown that these loans are repaid in full. Moreover, the interest that borrowers will have to pay on these loans will be in excess of the interest paid for by the Federal Government. Hence, the loans would not constitute any burden upon the taxpayer.

But the revolving funds for the loans would have to appear as an additional budgetary outlay, and because of the overzealousness to balance the budget from a bookkeeping point of view, proponents of the legislation have feared a repetition of last year's unfortunate veto of similar legislation. The majority of the House Banking and Currency Committee has, therefore, cut down the amount of the proposed loans by one-third. As the bill now provides, there will be two revolving funds—one for $75 million for loans, and $50 million revolving fund for public facilities. In addition, the funds allocated for grants are reduced to $35 million.

I am happy to note, however, that none of the programs proposed by the Senate has been eliminated.

I commend the distinguished Members of the House Banking and Currency Committee for the diligent work that they have done on this bill and the spirit of compromise which they have displayed in order to secure administration appproval of the proposed legislation.

I urge that we enact S. 722 as amended by the House Banking and Currency Committee without further delay.

The country needs this legislation. We must help stamp out the blight of depressed areas from our midst. At this time when we all rejoice in the Nation's economic recovery, we must plan ahead to prevent the reoccurrence of recessions and economic decline. Aid to depressed areas is a most effective tool to prevent, or at least reduce the impact of further recessions. The program should also help millions of Americans in the depressed areas to enjoy a greater measure of prosperity and to partake in our improving standard of living.

A substantial measure of highly valuable research work has been done by an organization known as the Area Employment Expansion Committee to support and point up the need for a Federal area redevelopment program. One of the fact sheets recently issued by the Area Employment Expansion Committee has to do with a situation in the State of New York. The text of this New York fact sheet study, supported by detailed tables which I have omitted in the interest of brevity, is as follows:

AREA REDEVELOPMENT FACT SHEET NO. 61—NEW YORK STATE

The Empire State is among those which would benefit from the proposed area redevelopment legislation. While the total number of areas immediately affected constitutes a somewhat smaller proportion of the total of the State than is prevalent in other States where there are more chronically distressed areas, yet the problems are none the less serious in this State.

In January 1959, there were one major labor market, Utica-Rome, and 11 smaller areas which would become eligible immediately for benefits under the area redevelopment bill. Their total civilian labor force was over one-half million people, which probably represented some 6 percent of the State's working population. The average rate of unemployment in these areas was 11.9 percent. It would take 29,865 new jobs to eliminate the unemployment in excess of 6 percent in these areas.

In addition, there were six major labor markets, four smaller labor markets and three very small labor markets in which there was a substantial labor surplus. Continued high unemployment in these areas would graduate them into the chronically distressed state. It is probable that some of these areas will reach this condition.

There are 23 counties for which no labor market data are currently available.

DISTRESSED AREAS

A. Major labor market

Utica-Rome: This large labor market in central New York State, including both Oenida and Herkimer counties, suffered seriously from the postwar contraction of the textile industry. It has struggled desperately to replace some of the textile jobs with new durable goods plants, but these have also been hard hit by unemployment. While these plants have opened up new jobs for the younger people, they have not provided job opportunities for the older population. As a result the rate of unemployment in the labor market in January 1959 was 11.8 percent.

The unemployment rate reached a high of 11.3 percent in January 1955, but had declined in the subsequent years reaching a low in the fall of 1956. In 1958 this labor market again suffered reverses so that the average unemployment rate for 1958 was 10.4 percent. The community needs considerable assistance to revamp its basic economic structure.

B. Smaller labor markets

Eleven smaller labor markets have had a high rate of unemployment for long enough periods to become eligible for benefits under the area redevelopment bill.

The following are the periods during which these smaller labor market areas have been certified as having had substantial labor surpluses:

Periods of substantial labor surpluses:

Amsterdam: June 1954 through September 1956, March 1958 to date.

Auburn: January 1955 through July 1955, April 1958 to date.

Batavia: March 1958 to date.

Elmira: April 1958 to date.

Glens Falls-Hudson Falls: June 1958 to date.

Gloversville: November 1952 through September 1955, April 1958 to date.

Kingston: September 1958 to date.

Newburgh-Middletown-Beacon: July 1958 to date.

Oneida: June 1958 to date.

Plattsburgh: March 1959 to date.

Watertown: April 1958 to date.

Amsterdam: This textile community has suffered repeated setbacks from the closing of large textile mills. The shift of mills from this area to other States and the contraction of operations are the basic causes for its difficulties. The community has made desperate efforts to attract new plants. It has sponsored local industrial advances though individual improvements have been made.

The labor market includes Montgomery county. It has had annual average rates of unemployment of 9.4 percent in 1955; 9.8 percent in 1956; 8.9 percent in 1957 and 14.1 percent in 1958. In January 1959, the unemployment rate was 13.5 percent.

Auburn: Including as this labor market does Cayuga County, it has been a center of industrial activity except that it has suffered from plant closings and the contraction of some of its basic industries. Among the most significant closings was that of the International Harvester Co. Recently an electrical machinery company moved out of the area. Difficulties are being faced by other textile plants in the area. The annual average rate of unemployment in 1955 was 9.1 percent; in 1956, 7.1 percent; in 1957, 8.4 percent and in 1958, 14.3 percent. Relief from continued high unemployment is not in sight.

Batavia: This labor market includes Genesee County. Its annual average rate of unemployment in 1957 was 8.8 percent and in 1958, 9.4 percent. While it was only recently certified as having substantial labor surpluses, it faces serious problems. Layoffs have occurred in its machinery and primary metal industries and many of its local residents must depend upon jobs in nearby areas for continued employment since the area does not itself support the population.

Elmira: This labor market includes Chemung County. Unemployment began to assume serious proportions in December 1957 and has continued at high levels through 1958 and in 1959. In February 1959 the rate was 11.1 percent. The community has suffered from widespread layoffs in machinery and the electrical equipment plants.

Glens Falls-Hudson Falls: This labor market includes both the counties of Warren and Washington. Unemployment was most marked in 1958 with reductions in the electrical equipment, paper, and textile industries. In 1958 the average rate of unemployment was 9.7 percent.

Gloversville: This is one of the truly chronically distressed labor markets. It encompasses Fulton County. It suffers from the decline of the dress, glove and the woolen knit glove industry. These have been adversely affected by imports. This area has been suffering from continuing high unemployment for a number of years. In 1955, the average rate of unemployment was 13.0 percent; in 1956, 9.3 percent; in 1957, 14.1 percent and in 1958, 19.5 percent. In 1959, the rate was 17.9 percent in February. This is an area needing immediate and continuing attention.

Kingston: This labor market of Ulster County has suffered from the closing of a large machinery manufacturing plant, as well as losses in the aircraft, paper, and chemical industries. Only the seasonal pickups in the summer resort trade help offset these setbacks. The average rate of unemployment in 1958 was 8.1 percent and in January 1959, 10.4 percent.

Newburg-Middletown-Beacon: This labor market includes Orange and Putnam Counties as well as the city of Beacon and the town of Fishkill in Dutchess County. There have been widespread layoffs in the apparel, textiles, leather goods, metals and machinery industries. Many residents working in outside areas have also been adversely affected. The average rate of unemployment in 1958 was 9.7 percent. Much hope has been placed in the economic effects of the New York Thruway, but these have not yet lived up to expectations.

Oneida: The Madison County labor market has also recently been added to the list of the distressed areas. There have been heavy cutbacks in the silverware industry. This is a community which needs long term improvements. Residents have been working in outside areas and commuting and the cutbacks in these outside areas have adversely affected local people. The unem-

ployment rate has been particularly high in 1958, with an annual average rate of 13.1 percent. Long term redevelopment is essential.

Plattsburg: This labor market includes Clinton County and has suffered from the long term drop in construction and losses in mining industries. The average rate of unemployment in 1958 was 12.9 percent and unemployment continued at a high rate of 15 percent in February 1959.

Watertown: The Watertown labor market includes Jefferson County. The difficulties of this community are attributable to the decline in employment in the machinery and paper industries. The high unemployment rates were first noticeable in March 1957 and continued through all of 1958. The average rate of unemployment for 1958 was 11.6 percent.

AREAS OF SUBSTANTIAL LABOR SURPLUS

In addition to the preceding distressed areas there are a number of labor markets with substantial labor surpluses. This condition has not been of sufficient duration to qualify them for the benefits of the act. These areas will become eligible as of the following dates:

Corning-Hornell, June 1959.
Olean-Salamanca, June 1959.
Albany-Schenectady-Troy, July 1959.
Buffalo, July 1959.
New York, July 1959.
Syracuse, July 1959.
Jamestown-Dunkirk, July 1959.
Orleans, September 1959.
Binghamton, October 1959.
Catskill, December 1959.
Waterford-Mechanicsville-Stillwater, January 1960.
Wellsville, January 1960.
Rochester, July 1960.

Time and Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 26, 1959

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of May 26, 1959, entitled "Time and Foreign Aid":

Dr. Vannevar Bush, one of our most eminent scientists, has stated that our program of foreign aid "must continue as long as the Communist threat endures." An arbitrary cut-off date, he says, would be a "calamity of the first order."

Dr. Bush in making such a statement is probably not thinking of the Communist threat in terms of a cold war or of our aid as a weapon in that struggle. What he is doing, rather, is to dramatize the fact that weakness, instability, insecurity and fear provide a ground in which the Communist threat can flourish.

What we need to do is to make persons and societies strong in their own right. This not only offsets this Communist threat but also lays the ground for progress in human betterment.

Dr. Bush does not set any fixed time limit on the endurance of the threat. But he is not pessimistic. He holds that the processes of education and enlightenment, within the very confines of the Communist tyranny, cannot be permanently denied. The spark of true learning will eventually touch off the fire that consumes the enemies of the human mind and the human spirit.

With such an end in view we can well afford to give the help that will make resistance to those enemies stronger. This is the analysis of a skilled scientist with a world-wide outlook. The words of Dr. Bush can well be heeded at this time.

Eloquent Essay for Peace by William Goold

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 26, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent previously granted I am including here an essay by William Goold of Lebanon, Oreg., entitled, "Peace with Honor for America." My friend, Bill Goold, works untiringly for many good causes, including peace in the world. He is a strong supporter of the United Nations. He speaks for many of his friends and neighbors when he asks for greater support for the United Nations.

The essay is as follows:

PEACE WITH HONOR FOR AMERICA
(By William Goold)

"Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall inherit the earth." This historic admonition was given to man at a time when civilization was comparatively young and primitive, even in the most violent conflicts between clans, tribes or nations common to that time. If peacemakers were so honored in this early historic era when man's potential for destruction was utterly insignificant as compared with man's potential for destruction today, the honor and importance of the peacemakers must, as a matter of logic, increase in direct ratio with the destructive forces in man's possession for evil.

The basic philosophy of Christianity and the sheet anchor of democracy has its deepest and strongest roots in the soil of peace and the man or nation whose contribution is the most effective in achieving this noble objective is the most deserving of the love and gratitude of mankind. Peace with honor for America is the prize challenge of current history by which to stimulate and inspire a people to their grandest and most noble deeds. Whether by fate or fortune or by decree of the eternal gods this challenge must be met head-on, confidently, courageously and fearlessly because the very fate of civilization is committed to our keeping, we dare not, we will not, fail this trust.

Never before in all the long march of history has a combination of circumstances and events fraught with the elements of such world-shaking magnitude, been placed in the lap of a single nation with breath-taking possibilities that call forth every resource that moves a nation on toward the goal of greatness. Nations, like men, must be faced with great problems, great decisions—by no other course can greatness be determined.

The challenge provided by the revolutionary war gave us the impassioned words of Patrick Henry that literally set men's hearts on fire; it gave us the leadership of Washington that could inspire and hold the loyalty of his men even as they left their blood-stained footprints in the snows at Valley Forge; it gave us the brilliant pen of Thomas Paine and his "Common Sense," "The Crisis"; it gave us the magnificent Jefferson that who was responsible for the immortal Declaration of Independence that, for breadth of vision and depth of understanding, has not been equaled in the annals of history.

Only by a crisis of the magnitude of the slavery problem and secession that threatened the dissolution of our Nation was the "Man of the Ages," Abraham Lincoln, elevated to the heights to which history has proclaimed him.

"Peace with Honor for America," in its very essence means "Peace with Honor for the World"—the two are synonymous and the time of decision is now. To us is given the choice of whether it will be a world of peace or no world at all. In our hands rests the most momentous decision in the annals of history because, what we do will affect more people over a larger area than any one single decision of recorded history.

How can peace with honor for America be achieved without compromising our democratic ideals and our traditional national honor? The frame-work of such an institution is found in our great United Nations organization. It not only offers our own Nation peace with honor but it offers the entire world peace with honor.

In order to realize this great prize of peace, men of goodwill everywhere must rise to the challenge, that these momentous problems impose upon us. It seems that almost by an act of God the framework of this great institution was founded while partial sanity and goodwill prevailed among nations. The completion of this World Parliament of Man has been temporarily delayed while men and nations jockeyed for advantage. In the meantime, the world's potential for destructiveness becomes positively frightening with unparalleled dangers, so that we dare not tempt the fates with further delay.

People of good will must rise up as with one mighty voice and demand in tones of thunder that the magnificent temple of man's last hopes for survival—the United Nations—must be completed with all possible speed and given the necessary resources and manpower to make its mandates final and effective. With an aroused and enlightened world opinion marshaled on the side of the United Nations, with adequate military force to back up decisions, men of good will could then return to peaceful pursuits and the resources of the earth and skills and ingenuity of man could then be used to build the temples of good will and universal brotherhood, instead of implements of death and destruction.

The unpardonable blunder of the ages has been our neglect and failure to strengthen and expand the one single emblem of man's hope for peace with honor in our day and generation. As a nation, we are blessed with natural and human resources almost beyond calculation. In World War II, we not only maintained aggressive military forces throughout the globe, but also set up a global program of aid through lend-lease to our allies on a scale that is unparalleled in its magnitude and generosity. With millions of our choice young men and women taken out of constructive production and trained specialists for the destructive pursuits of war, we still maintained a standard of living among our civilian population that might, under the circumstances, be considered lavish.

If the 59 nations that constitute the the United Nations were to devote themselves with even half of the fervor and resourcefulness they put into winning the war to working to win the peace, the last potential aggressor in the world would be isolated and condemned by the forces of democracy. Greed and aggression simply could not stand before the mighty forces of

men and nations determined to build and secure an edifice dedicated to world peace and the dignity of man. War can and must be discarded as a means of world policy in the settlement of disputes between nations. War's potential destructiveness can become so frightening with its slaughter of the innocent and helpless as to shock the sensibilities of mankind.

In our final quest for peace, we must develop a world consciousness, a world psychology, a world attitude. We must learn to think big and act big. We must take into account the language barriers, the racial prejudices, religious differences, social customs, political animosities and the wide divergence in environment and heredity with tolerance and understanding.

One of the noblest quests to which man can devote himself is the quest for peace and good will among men, and one of the surest methods to use in the achievement of this worthy goal is to practice what we preach and thus make democracy such a shining example of justice and equality that men will seek it out and adopt it as their own.

In conclusion, my final appeal for your wholehearted support for the United Nations—it can truly be made with the fulfillment of man's most cherished hope—peace wtih honor. In our approach to peace as the most desirable and worthy goal to which man can aspire we will need courage and fortitude to apply the exacting yardstick given to man 2,000 years ago—"Whatsoever ye would that men or nations do unto you, do ye even so unto them." Applying this philosophy to our everyday living will cause us to realize the rightness of an organization such as the United Nations which is the world's last great hope for achieving peace with honor for America and peace with honor for the whole world for full measure.

Page Boy Residences, H.R. 869

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 26, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, my statement before the Committee on House Administration in support of my bill, H.R. 869, follows:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I appreciate the opportunity you are affording me to give you my views with reference to my bill, H.R. 869, a bill to provide a residence for the pages of the Senate and the House of Representatives under the supervision of a Capitol Page Residence Board.

This bill, if enacted, would create a Capitol Page Residence Board composed of 3 Senators and 3 Members of the House of Representatives who would be authorized to establish a home for these young men who serve the Congress as pages.

The naming of page boys comes under the patronage system; hence they may come from the 49 States, far and near. The maximum age limit of a page is 18 years and the minimum age is 14 years. The average age is between 15 and 16 years. A boy at this stage has not reached years of discretion. Under the present setup, these boys have living accommodations scattered throughout the city. Some are paying exorbitant rents and, in many cases, are exposed to the evils of a large city without adult supervision.

Boys of 14 or 15 are neither mentally nor physically matured, and, in my opinion, every Member of this Congress is, to some extent, responsible for their well-being. It is not only our duty but we have an obligation to furnish these boys with the parental care and supervision they left behind when coming to Washington.

The page boys must attend school at the Library of Congress before reporting to work each morning. In some cases, these boys travel alone several miles in the early morning hours. We owe it to the families of these young men to enact legislation of this kind.

My proposal would require these boys to pay reasonable rent, just as they do now. The home should, therefore, be self-sustaining. These teenage boys will be the men of tomorrow. Many are dreaming of taking our places in the years ahead.

Our responsibility to them is to provide adequate quarters, with a superintendent in charge, and a complete housekeeping staff, which would be responsible for their supervision with regard to proper food, sleep, recreation, and sufficient application to their schoolwork.

It is my sincere hope that the Congress will enact this bill to prepare them for the great responsibility which lies ahead. "Let's put first things first."

Business Finally Gets Into Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON H. SCHERER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 26, 1959

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, as most of us know, General Electric is one of the industries in this country which has come to the conclusion that we are only going to get sound and stable government in this country if business and its employees take an active and intelligent interest in the political life of the Nation. General Electric is, of course, to be congratulated on such a forward step. It has gotten beyond the realm of the talking stage insofar as General Electric is concerned. This company has set up a series of lecture and discussion meetings available to all groups of employees after working hours. General Electric says:

This project is designed to give the participant practical experience and understanding of the American two-party system.

General Electric points out that improvements in the climate of the community as a place to live, and work, and raise a family most frequently are the result of political action. Participants in these programs are encouraged to recognize political activity as a dimension of personal responsibility—to be accepted and discharged as a fundamental of good citizenship.

A recent speaker at one of these seminars was one of Cincinnati's leading citizens, William L. McGrath, chairman of the board of directors of the Williamson Co. Mr. McGrath as an industrialist practices what he preaches. All his life he has participated in numerous political and community activities. He devoted many years and gave much of his energy and abilities as the employer delegate to the International Labor Organization at Geneva. Mr. Speaker, every Member of the Congress should have the benefit of Mr. McGrath's speech. I am sure the great majority will realize and appreciate the significance of this activity by men like Mr. McGrath and companies like General Electric. Mr. McGrath's address follows:

We are assembled here to talk about politics. Now that in itself is rather unusual. Up until recently, businessmen thought they had no time to concern themselves with politics. Too many people used to think that politics had to do with things like kissing babies and helping somebody get a job—and even with corruption.

However, let's start from the ground up on this subject. Just what is politics?

The "Century Dictionary" defines politics as "the science and practice of government." Now certainly there can be no higher profession than the science and practice of government. Certainly every citizen, including businessmen, should be strongly interested in the science and the practice of the Government under which we live—because that is what determines in the long run our future opportunities as individuals. What opportunities would individuals have if private enterprise business were destroyed?

Now let's think about the word "politician." When you say "politician" some people think of a man on a soap box waving his arms and promising people that he will get them something for nothing. Well, unfortunately, there are politicians of that sort, as we all know. But there are other kinds, too.

It may be that when history is written several hundred years from now, the historians may say that Abraham Lincoln was the outstanding figure of the 19th century and that Winston Churchill was the outstanding figure of the 20th century. Now these two great men had one thing in common. They were both politicians. They both entered politics at a very early age. As a matter of fact, every President of the United States and every Prime Minister of England has been a politician. So, when we talk about politics, we are talking on a pretty high level.

I want to go back to Abraham Lincoln for a moment. Lincoln talked about the Government of the people, by the people, and for the people. Today I want to ask the question, what people?

Well, the people who make their wishes heard and felt are the ones who get attention. The people who say they don't care anything about politics and don't want to be bothered with it are the ones whose wishes and interests are neglected or ignored.

So what's been happening in recent years? Let's be frank about it. Organized labor has organized for political action. It has used for that purpose the same machinery that is available to all of us. It has become the most powerful single political influence in the United States. The organization known as COPE carries more weight in the Congress of the United States than any other organization in the country. Organized labor is today dictating policies in Columbus, Ohio. Why? Because organized labor has worked in politics while businessmen and other citizens said they were not interested in politics. Most businessmen thought they were interested only in business, and so businessmen have practically abdicated their rights as citizens. They have been sitting on the side lines, while other people with special axes to grind have been getting bills passed favorable to them but in many cases, unfavorable to business. What happens in the long run is determined not so much by what businessmen manufacture, as it is upon how people think.

While we have been busy making products, a lot of other people have been busy saying words that will influence people to think along the lines that the wordmakers want to think. They have influenced politicians and voters.

When you go to work in the morning you are concerned with a special, concrete problem—the design of a product, or the layout of a plant, or the setup of the sales organization, or the purchases of materials, but the world is full of people who actually do nothing but use words.

The head of a union does not have to concern himself with his or his shareholders investment with capital equipment, plant layout, product engineering, packaging, and so forth. He works chiefly just with words. He can spend all day long figuring out what he should say, and what he should get into print to influence people to his way of thinking.

Teachers, ministers, newspaper reporters, editoral writers and columnists, TV and radio commentators, all are putting forward ideas with a particular slant to them. Those ideas influence votes, elections, and legislators and Congressmen. They are the basis for political power—they determine in the main the way the country is going.

Most of these union men, and many educators, ministers, and writers, are not aware that business is the basis of all taxes, and without taxes no government can function. Many of these molders of opinion would destroy business, would destroy the source of jobs and wages, would kill the goose that lays the golden eggs. Businessmen make jobs. But some people do not grasp this truth. They must be told. One of our political jobs, therefore, is that of education.

We are confronted with misrepresentation or twisting of facts to meet special purposes. We see people voting on issues against their own best interests. The reason is because they haven't got the facts straight. In that connection I want to quote briefly from Dr. Claude Robinson, of Opinion Research Corp., who is really an authority on the subject of the molding of public opinion. Dr. Robinson says, and I quote:

"It can be demonstrated that when you take the ideologies of people with different informational levels you always find that the ideologies swing to the right as the facts are clearer in people's minds. That is demonstrable over and over again. It doesn't make any different what income groups or what age groups or what educational groups they are; that basic principle holds. The more people know about the capitalistic system, the more they believe in it."

And then, after we have given people facts so that they can understand them, the other job is to see that they get out and vote on election day.

The minute anybody mentions politics people always start thinking in terms of Republicans or Democrats. Now, that's all right. The science and practice of government in the United States is handled on the two-party system, and to a certain extent on the basis of party responsibility; and our system has proved to be better than that of countries, like France, which had so many political parties that they couldn't get anything done.

As far as the individual is concerned, I think he should concern himself with issues and with trying to get more votes for capable men who have sound views on the political issues involved.

As a matter of fact it is pretty hard to tell today what is meant by Republican and what is meant by Democrat. Both parties are split right down the middle. On many subjects there is great disagreement within the parties.

I think this gives businessmen the biggest opportunity that we have had in years. Political leadership in this country, right now, is very much confused. So let's all go to work at it and see what we can do to get thinking going in the direction which we believe is right.

This isn't going to be easy. I said before, a lot of people are laboring under misconceptions. There are so many things that people just don't understand. For example, I think if you would ask the ordinary man on the street whether he thought Social Security should be increased, he would say yes. Then if you asked him if he thought taxes should be increased, he would say no. A good many people actually don't seem to understand that government can pay out only what the taxpayers pay into it. People seem to think that government somehow possesses billions of dollars of its own.

Now action in politics (that is, vote-getting) has certain established procedures and methods which have been developed by trial and error over the years. Organized labor has commandeered these procedures and methods. A good many of us know little about them. But, on the other hand, businessmen have had considerable experience in promotion. They put on successful sales campaigns for their products. They have put on United Fund, Red Cross and hospital campaigns. We all have been schooled in the techniques of these campaigns. If we apply the same hard work to learning the techniques of political campaigns, we can do a great public service.

We may think we are amateurs, but I am not so sure. For example, let's just take one theme—economy in government. Suppose we started out to sell economy in government the way we sell the United Fund, or the way my company sells furnaces, or the way your company sells electrical equipment, or the way Procter & Gamble sells soap. Why shouldn't we? If we don't get economy in government, sooner or later all of our companies are going to be ruined by confiscatory taxes.

Here's another angle. Everyone of us has sales outlets. Do we know them personally? Of course we do. We give them help and recognition and back them up every way we can. But what do we do with our Congressmen, our Senators, our State legislators and our Governor? We write indignant letters to them when they do something we don't like, but do we praise them for right action and encourage them when they are maligned by their traducers? That's a field that needs attention.

In closing, let me quote two sayings of Abraham Lincoln:

First: "You can fool some of the people all of the time; all of the people some of the time; but you can't fool all the people, all the time."

Second: "Give the people the truth and they will follow with right political action."

New Educational Curriculum, Benjamin Franklin High School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. HEALEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 26, 1959

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement recently issued by the Honorable Charles J. Bensley, member of the New York City Board of Education from the Borough of the Bronx, joined by the Reverend Dr. Gardner Taylor, member of the New York City Board of Education from the Borough of Brooklyn. The statement, which follows, concerns a proposal for a new curriculum and program of instruction for the Benjamin Franklin High School to develop that school into the finest educational facility of its type:

The Honorable Charles J. Bensley and the Reverend Dr. Gardner Taylor, members of the Board of Education of the City of New York, today issued a statement of a proposal of new policy to be submitted to the board of education concerning a plan to develop the Benjamin Franklin High School into the finest educational facility of its type that will gain for the school a world-wide reputation and bring honor to the city of New York. This proposal is an affirmative and constructive approach to enhance the value of the school to the community and city rather than minimize its value by a possible change in organization to an elementary and junior high school, and has taken into account the petitions of many civic and community organizations.

In essence, this plan aims to prepare students to take further work toward careers as social scientists. The curriculum and program of instruction will be designed to develop the type of personnel most critically needed in the field of human relations. It will prepare these students for public service and leadership on municipal, State and national levels. From these leaders in our governmental affairs will emerge the types of persons who could become leaders in world affairs. A result of the plan would be to develop a system similar to the English civil service whereby creative leadership in government would be developed on a career basis.

In explaining the purpose of this proposal, Mr. Bensley said, "In these times of a dynamic and expanding society such as never before witnessed by man, an education for responsible citizenship and leadership must be given proper and special emphasis. We must train our children to think in values that will teach them how to live together. Our problem is how to make human intelligence work for humanity. Man's present solution for peace is through a balance of destruction. We are so concerned with advancing our frontiers of science in tribute to this balance of destruction, that we are continually adding peril upon peril. The values that we evolve must make it axiomatic that science is but a tool of man in his way of life and that this tool should never become the master. The humanities of man must direct the science of man."

Mr. Bensley and Reverend Taylor will introduce at the next meeting of the Board of Education on May 28 a joint resolution to effectuate this plan. The resolution will ask the Superintendent of Schools to prepare such an enriched curriculum of instruction in the following areas: English, economics, human relations, world history and geography, social sciences, foreign languages, and other suitable areas of knowledges and skills that will lead to admission to higher schools and service in municipal, State, National, and international governmental agencies and trade.

Into this school, the resolution proposes, will be gathered from all parts of the city, irrespective of socioeconomic or ethnic background, the young men and women who desire this type of education. Mr. Bensley and Reverend Taylor envisioned, with the assistance of outstanding educators and national leaders, the establishment of admissions criteria. "It is our intention to admit children not alone on the basis of IQ for we recognize that those children who come from socially

and economically deprived environments have not been given an equal opportunity to develop their potentials. We also recognize that a test score solely in terms of IQ is not sufficient to discover the type of children who may possess this special potential and profit most from such instruction. The criteria for admission will have as the goal the selection of those children who will most benefit the community and themselves from this kind of enriched curriculum," they said.

Another feature of the plan will be the establishment of an advisory commission to assist financially those children who will go on to college to pursue these studies. A program of scholarships and fellowships will be sought and the aid of various foundations and international organizations will be enlisted.

The Reverend Taylor said, "We are certain that all men and women of good will and faith will join forces with us in this endeavor to produce leaders of the future for brotherhood and better understanding not alone for the city of New York and throughout the Nation, but among all peoples and nations of the world."

Dr. Taylor and Mr. Bensley pointed out, "It is fitting that the center for world relations, the United Nations, is located in the vicinity of the Benjamin Franklin High School. It is our thought that the Benjamin Franklin High School may well also become the training school for children who will seek their future in activities allied with the United Nations and international affairs."

Limitations on Commodity Credit Corporation Loans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 26, 1959

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, it is unwise, unjust and discriminatory to place limitations by law on Commodity Credit Corporation loans. To do so would defeat the purpose for which the loan program was designed to accomplish. The CCC loan is intended to permit farmers to market their crops in an orderly manner. The larger producers use the CCC loan extensively and this results in stabilizing prices during the time the crops are moving to market. The small farmer will be forced to receive less for his commodities if limitations on the amount any one farmer could place in the load should become effective. The impact on the market due to inability to use the loan at harvesttime would lower the price for all farmers and, at the same, cause the Government, the taxpaying citizen, to stand the loss on reduced prices that would be realized on stocks of farm commodities that are owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The limitation of $50,000 or $35,000 applies on the gross value of the crop placed in the loan; it is not the net profit of the farmer. If it is made applicable for one or both of these amounts as a ceiling they could and would be reduced. That is what has been happening throughout the years in connection with the agricultural conservation program. The limitations have been reduced appreciably on the false assumption that to do so would help the little man. The truth of the matter is that the small farmer and the large farmer alike would suffer if loan limitations are invoked.

To attempt to make loan limitations applicable to the 1959 crop year would abrogate agreements with cotton farmers who have chosen either the A or B program. To limit the loan after farmers had voted controls when no limitation existed would be changing the rules of the game in the fifth inning. It would be unlawful and dishonest.

There should be no limitation placed on cooperative organizations as such. If there is to be a limitation it should be on individual farmers, that is, landowners and renters in their separate capacities. The cooperatives would continue to serve its members as agent in the handling of the CCC loans so long as no one of the members placed more in the loan than permitted under the limitation of $50,000 or $35,000 as the case may be.

The propagandists have been unjust in their campaign against the farmer. Nothing is said about subsidies and tariff benefits to business enterprises. There is no effort to deprive labor of its minimum wage. It is directed at the farmer and farmer alone. It is unjust and discriminatory.

I include some pertinent excerpts from communications received by me on the subject of loan limitations:

Letter of May 23 from Mr. R. A. Pickens, of Pickens, Ark.:

A limit on the amount of CCC loans to any farm or organization for 1959 is a considerable breach of faith on the part of the Congress.

When various crop quotas were voted on, there was no limit. Nor when cotton farmers were given a choice of two individual cotton allotments. The limitation voted by the House last week would, in effect, pull the rug from under us in the very middle of a crop.

A result could well be a complete disruption of what free markets we have left. There would probably be enough dumping of crops on our commodity markets caused by this action to force prices down to the point where a tremendous volume would seek CCC loans, farm in excess of any amounts that might be allocated for CCC purchases. Such could possibly cause the 1959 marketing season to be far worse than that in 1929.

Much has been said about the large corporation farms but Congress should realize that the day of the ox and the bull tongue plow is past. The economy of our rural areas is dependent on the agriculture of these areas, whether marginal producers or efficient modern farms. This sudden limit on CCC loans effects, roughly, each acre of production over 300 acres of cotton and/or rice on each Arkansas farm.

The laborer on the mechanized farm is just as deserving of price protection and a decent standard of living as is the landowner. Possibly more so, as he has very little capital to fall back on.

Excerpts from a letter written by Mr. William Rhea Blake, executive vice president of the National Cotton Council:

Fifty thousand dollars may sound like a large amount, but it represents gross, not net, income. Furthermore, the records of the ACP and other Government programs show that a ceiling once placed in the law is constantly lowered. As the ceiling goes down, the value of the loan as an orderly marketing device is progressively destroyed and the benefits of the program to all farmers are progressively diminished. Cotton forced on the market, instead of being orderly marketed with the aid of the loan, will depress market prices and hurt all farmers, especially the smallest ones who seldom, if ever, use the loan.

The marketing system would be seriously impaired. In fact, it would be hard to devise anything that would do more harm all the way around than the proposed limitation.

Finally, when made applicable to the 1959 crop, limitations would be in direct violation of the Government's contracutal obligations to all farmers who accepted present programs in a commodity referendum and, in the case of cotton, who further made a separate individual agreement with the Government under the choice A and B programs.

Telegram from Mr. Ralph Woodruff, general manager of Delta Products Co., of Wilson, Ark.:

House amendment limiting support loan to $50,000 unfair to grower. No limitations were involved when marketing quotas were approved by referendum. This action also breaks faith with choice B cottongrowers since limitation was not a factor when choice was made. Speaking for member of Delta Products Co., strongly urge elimination of this vicious amendment to agricultural appropriation bill.

Telegram from Mr. Waldo Frasier, executive vice president of the Arkansas Farm Bureau Federation, Little Rock, Ark.:

The passage of the limitation provided in the Senate bill (S. 1968) would be extremely disastrous to the orderly marketing of cotton, rice, and soybeans.

Cotton, rice, and soybeans forced on the market instead of being marketed in an orderly fashion with the aid of the loan will depress market prices and hurt all farmers, especially the smaller ones who seldom, if ever, use the loan. Depressed market prices will in turn force farmers who can use the loan to put their commodities in CCC in greatly accelerated volume; thus Commodity Credit's holdings will be substantially increased and not decreased.

Under the present method of operations under the CCC the rice marketing cooperatives which process and market more than 50 percent of the rice grown in the State, can borrow and have borrowed in the name if the cooperatives. Under the amendment that has passed the Senate this would be impossible. It would mean that the two cooperatives that operate in the State would have to handle rice on which the CCC would have from 5,000 to 6,000 loans to individual farmers who are their members.

If Arkansas' agriculture is forced to operate under limitation of CCC loans the Government's handling of commodities and the cost of that handling would be greatly increased. Farmers benefits would be greatly decreased. A ceiling would be placed on the individual farmer's initiative and efficiency that is contrary to our American system.

Telegram from Mr. Lloyd Godley, of Osceola:

Mississippi County ASC office made 4,386,000 1958 soybean loans. Seventy five percent has been paid. Most of balance will be before dealine. Collected enough fees from farmers to pay clerical and field help 5 years. Farmers averaged $2 for beans. Where storage not available $50. Without storage and loan farmers would have had minimum of $3 million less income this county. Program has not cost Government. Saved farmers big and little from heavy

losses. Despite incidious propaganda, program is good for agriculture and business. Limitation will upset orderly marketing. Will not save money for Government. Will cost economy of Nation.

And from Mr. R. E. L. Wilson III, of Wilson, Ark.:

Congratulations your remarks page 7488, May 18, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. House current legislation regarding limitations will eventually force liquidation of large and proven and efficient operations in favor of its opposite. Discrimination against so-called large farm operators completely unfair in view of the fact that large industry and labor receive the same benefits under our tariff laws as small industry.

Tremendous concern among farmers in this area raising the majority of crops regarding orderly marketing of crops when loan limitation enforced. Commercial banks will have to carry full burden of commodity loans with virtually no price insurance. Entire farm credit structure is threatened. Banks and farm furnishers will be hesitant to advance production loans next spring. Small farmers as well as large farmers threatened by such impending legislation.

Huge Anti-Inflation Campaign Seeks To Cover Up Soaring Profits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LeROY H. ANDERSON
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 26, 1959

Mr. ANDERSON of Montana. Mr. Speaker, we are all receiving a flood of mail inspired by a clever, well-organized, heavily financed master plan to discredit the Congress.

The master plan is to persuade the public that inflation is responsible for all our economic troubles and that Government spending and costs of labor are causing ruinous inflation.

A current article in the Rail Brotherhoods' weekly newspaper Labor points out the real villains, administered prices and exorbitant profits.

It is a refreshing contrast to the expressive propaganda which is constantly coming across our desks, pouring over the air waves, and being published in the slick magazines.

The article from Labor is as follows:

Recent weeks have brought a pair of apparently unrelated developments that actually are closely tied together—but the powers that be would prefer people not to wake up to that fact.

The first development is a big anti-inflation publicity campaign. This campaign has been launched by rightwing daily papers, the steel trust, the big life insurance companies, other big business firms, and rightwing pressure groups like the so-called Committee for Constitutional Government.

Aim of this campaign is to arouse people against inflation—and to channel their resentment against big spenders in Congress and against wage increases for workers, as the supposed culprits causing inflation.

The second parallel development hasn't been noted in any full-page ads, nor in newspaper editorials. The facts are to be found mainly in the financial pages of the daily press, or in the financial journals.

SOARING PROFITS

This second development is the fantastic increase in profits shown by the big corporations in the first quarter of 1959, over the same months last year. The Wall Street Journal, for example, reports: Corporate profits in the first quarter this year leaped to a level 53.9 percent higher than in the recession-hit period a year earlier. And an equally sizable—and perhaps even larger—gain appears likely for the current quarter.

Significantly, the most fabulous first-quarter profit jump of all those reported by the Wall Street paper was shown by 36 major railroads, with an average profit increase of 428.8 percent. Also, the paper said, "railroads expect sharp increases in second-quarter earnings."

Moreover, for 1959 as a whole, alltime record corporate profits are being freely predicted. The Wall Street Journal quoted analysts in Washington as expecting corporate pretax profits of $50 billion this year. U.S. News & World Report forecast a $50 billion annual rate for the first half.

The previous alltime high in corporation profits came in 1956, at $45.5 billion. Last year's total was $36.7 billion, fully $13.3 billion less than this year's predicted total.

EMBARRASSMENT OF RICHES

Already, according to Business Week magazine, "with profits flooding in at this record rate, some corporate treasurers look as though they were faced with an embarrassment of riches. Says the treasurer of one chemical company: 'The biggest problem we have around here is trying to find ways to spend all the money we've got lying around.' "

These soaring corporate profits come ultimately from just one source—the consumer. The consumer will be paying for these $13.3 billion extra profits in the goods he or she buys. But none of this side of the inflation tory percolates into the anti-inflation campaign of the rightwing daily papers and the big interests.

The Chicago Tribune first launched its anti-inflation drive with front-page editorials and articles about a month ago. It coupled this with continuing promotional stories and blank forms for readers to write their Senators and Congressmen urging a balanced budget and less spending.

OTHER PAPERS JOIN DRIVE

The Tribune's sister papers, the New York Daily News and Chicago American, quickly joined in. So also did the big Philadelphia Inquirer and other papers. Big business firms cooperated by ordering scores of thousands of reprints of the Tribune's stories for distribution on their own.

Similarly, a so-called sound dollar committee—promoted by labor foe Edward R. Rumley of the right-wing Committee for Constitutional Government—has been seeking to place full-page ads in 2,000 newspapers. These ads also hammer at Government big spenders. Newspapers have been urged by the committee to drum up local sponsorship of these ads in every city.

The Institute of Life Insurance has launched a big new advertising campaign of the same nature. Meanwhile, the Iron and Steel Institute, speaking for the big steel companies, has placed a deluge of ads in 450 papers trying to blame steel workers' wages for higher steel prices. These ads, geared to the slogan "Inflation robs us all," have been mum about skyrocketing steel profits.

THE REAL TARGET

None of this anti-spender material points out that the real target of economy leaders in Congress is badly needed social welfare programs. Nor do the anti-wage increase ads point out that workers may have some right to share in the soaring big-business profits created by their labor. In fact, all of this anti-inflation campaign is silent about the role of soaring profits in the inflation picture.

In the background lie these further facts: The cost of living has now been roughly stable for about a year. However, Government economists have been predicting for several months that while food prices will go down this year, the prices of other goods bought by consumers will go up.

Thus, when the big manufacturers begin boosting their prices, consumers might be expected to raise some sharp questions about profits. But if, meanwhile, consumers have been educated to put all the blame for inflation on Government spending and on unwarranted wage increases, then the soaring profits may go unchallenged. That's the sort of education many of the current campaigns seem designed to accomplish.

Columbus Day: An Opportunity To Strengthen the Spiritual Bonds of the Americas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 26, 1959

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, as the author of H.R. 418, which seeks to declare October 12—Columbus Day—a legal holiday—I would like at this time to tell you about some of the outstanding 1958 Columbus Day celebrations sponsored by the National Citizens Committee for Columbus Day.

As the first national chairman of the Columbus Foundation which now sponsor the work of the National Citizens Committee for Columbus Day, I was more closely associated with the work of the national committee in 1958 than in the 4 previous years of its existence.

Mr. ZABLOCKI, of Wisconsin, has explained to you why I was chosen to head the Columbus Foundation, an overall organization dedicated to increasing greater cultural and educational exchange and improved understanding among the peoples of the Western Hemisphere.

THE COLUMBUS FOUNDATION

Launched on October 12, 1958, the Columbus Foundation proposes to increase and broaden the traditional observance of Columbus Day in two ways:

First. By stimulating such sister projects as sister cities, sister schools and colleges, and sister organizations.

Second. By encouraging educational and cultural exchanges through scholarships raised by communities, schools, colleges, organizations and business groups.

Now I want to commend the leaders of the National Citizens Committee for Columbus Day for the fine work which is being done to bring to Americans the significance of the discovery of the Western Hemisphere by Christopher Columbus.

AMERICANS ALL-COLUMBUS DAY THEME

The theme of the 1958 celebrations was: Americans All. No continent is so closely knit by religious ties as is the

Western Hemisphere. All people who live on the American Continent are bound together by their belief in the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man—religious principles of Catholics, Protestants, and Jews.

Only through the determined achievement of these spiritual values can we of this hemisphere prove to the world the value and effectiveness of our free western system.

Since the discovery of America over 450 years ago, this continent has been an inspiration to the peoples of the world. From the beginning this new world has offered an opportunity for all peoples to seek and achieve a new and more meaningful life because our country was founded on the belief that spiritual faith, initiative, courage, and energy are traits to be admired.

During the last 50 years, people have come to believe that the destiny of the world was in America's hands—that America was composed of men from the mold of Columbus—men who questioned, dared, and dreamed—men who had the courage to translate their dreams into noble action for the benefit of all mankind.

U.S. CITIZENS NEED TO KNOW MORE ABOUT LATIN AMERICANS

In recent years, we of the United States have been too unmindful of the problems besetting our neighbors in the other 20 American Republics. After World War II, the national yearnings of the peoples of Asia and Africa burst upon us like a bomb. In our struggle to meet these unexpected responsibilities, we perhaps gave the impression to our Latin American neighbors that we no longer were concerned with their problems. At the same time, population growth in Latin America has been exceeding ours. In conjunction with population growth, there is a tremendous desire to push forward on the part of all Latin Americans to obtain some of the more tangible and intangible benefits of life.

The 1958 demonstrations against Vice President and Mrs. NIXON in some of the Latin American countries reveal the urgent necessity for an improved understanding between the citizens of the 20 Latin American Republics.

In 1957, His Excellency Victor Andrade, then Bolivia's Ambassador to the United States and now her Foreign Minister, made this statement in an address before the Cosmopolitan Club of Pennsylvania State College:

> The average citizen in the United States is only vaguely aware of Latin America. He has, on the whole, a kindly feeling toward his southern neighbors and believe they will stand beside the United States in the event of crisis—as, indeed has been true in the past. But he knows comparatively little about Latin America and hears comparatively little. Many Latin Americans feel they are taken for granted by the United States, and, perhaps there is something in that feeling.

Recently, Members of Congress listened to an address by President José Maria Lemus of El Salvador who pointed out that Communist imperialism menaces the entire Western Hemisphere because of "valuable allies" in the hemisphere such as "social injustice, disorder, and political errors, the impoverishment of nations, and the wretchedness of great groups of human beings whom a weakened economy is not able to protect fully, nor offer comforting prospects."

U.S. CITIZENS MAKE COLUMBUS DAY AN OCCASION TO LEARN ABOUT LATIN AMERICANS

It is therefore with great pleasure that I tell you about some of the 1958 activities of the National Citizens Committee to dramatize this great historical date, October 12, as an occasion to learn more about our Latin American neighbors through meaningful exchanges of people and ideas.

Under the leadership of the President of the United States, who made the Columbus Day address at the distinguished New York City celebration, more than 40 State Governors issued 1958 Columbus Day proclamations calling for observances on October 12 to create greater inter-American friendship and understanding under the theme "Americans All." In addition a majority of these Governors appointed State Columbus Day chairmen to stimulate statewide observances and to coordinate the activities of the various communities.

SUPPORT OF STATE GOVERNORS

I would like to call your attention to the statewide Columbus Day observances in some of our States. It is particularly pleasing to report that my own State of New Jersey had a most outstanding series of celebrations under the leadership of Gov. Robert B. Meyner and such distinguished mayors as my own mayor, Honorable Leo P. Carlin, of Newark.

Other examples of outstanding statewide celebrations were: Pennsylvania, Colorado, Ohio, Florida, Tennessee, Wisconsin, Iowa, California, Missouri, Delaware, Utah, Massachusetts, New York, Illinois, and the District of Columbia.

Cooperating Governors were: Hon. James E. Folsom, Alabama; Ernest W. McFarland, Arizona; Goodwin J. Knight, California; Steve McNichols, Colorado; Abraham Ribincoff, Connecticut; J. Caleb Boggs, Delaware; Leroy Collins, Florida; Marvin Griffin, Georgia; William G. Stratton, Illinois; Harold W. Handley, Indiana; Herschel C. Loveless, Iowa; George Docking, Kansas; Albert B. Chandler, Kentucky; Earl K. Long, Louisiana; Edmund S. Muskie, Maine; Theodore R. McKeldin, Maryland; Foster Furcolo, Massachusetts; G. Mennen Williams, Michigan; Orville L. Freeman, Minnesota; James T. Blair, Missouri; Victor E. Anderson, Nebraska; Charles H. Russell, Nevada; Lane Dwinell, New Hampshire; Robert B. Meyner, New Jersey; Averell Harriman, New York; John E. Davis, North Dakota; C. William O'Neill, Ohio; George M. Leader, Pennsylvania; Frank G. Clement, Tennessee; Price Daniel, Texas; Cecil H. Underwood, West Virginia; Vernon W. Thompson, Wisconsin; Milward L. Simpson, Wyoming; Luis Munoz Marin, Puerto Rico; The Board of Commissioners, Hon. Robert E. McLaughlin, President, District of Columbia.

SUPPORT OF MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Through the years, the National Citizens Committee has invited Members of Congress to act as honorary sponsors for Columbus Day. In 1958, many distinguished Senators and Congressmen not only were willing to serve as honorary sponsors, but they helped to set up Columbus Day committees in their States and districts. Others gave major talks on Columbus Day in their own States and elsewhere.

U.S. Senators cooperating: Hon. George D. Aiken, of Vermont; Hon. J. Glenn Beall, of Maryland; Hon. Styles Bridges, of New Hampshire; Hon. Clifford P. Case, of New Jersey; Hon. John A. Carroll, of Colorado; Hon. Dennis Chavez, of New Mexico; Hon. Paul H. Douglas, of Illinois; Hon. John D. Hoblitzell, Jr., of West Virginia; Hon. Hubert H. Humphrey, of Minnesota; Hon. Irving M. Ives, of New York; Hon. Estes Kefauver, of Tennessee; Hon. John F. Kennedy, of Massachusetts; Hon. Thomas E. Martin, of Iowa; Hon. Wayne Morse, of Oregon; Hon. James E. Murray, of Montana; Hon. Richard L. Neuberger, of Oregon; Hon. William Proxmire, of Wisconsin; Hon. A. Willis Robertson, of Virginia; Hon. Leverett Saltonstall, of Massachusetts; Hon. Stuart Symington, of Missouri; Hon. John J. Williams, of Delaware; Hon. Ralph Yarborough, of Texas; Hon. Milton R. Young, of North Dakota.

U.S. House Members cooperating as honorary sponsors: Hon. Hugh J. Addonizio, of New Jersey; Hon. Victor L. Anfuso, of New York; Hon. Wayne Aspinall, of Colorado; Hon. William A. Barrett, of Pennsylvania; Hon. Walter S. Baring, of Nevada; Hon. Hale Boggs, of Louisiana; Hon. Gordon Canfield, of New Jersey; Hon. Emanuel Celler, of New York; Hon. Marguerite Stitt Church, of Illinois; Hon. Harold D. Donohue, of Massachusetts; Hon. Ivor D. Fenton, of Pennsylvania; Hon. James E. Fogarty, of Rhode Island; Hon. James G. Fulton, of Pennsylvania; Hon. Kathryn E. Granahan, of Pennsylvania; Hon. Martha W. Griffiths, of Michigan; Hon. Wayne L. Hays, of Ohio; Hon. Lester Holtzman, of New York; Hon. Walter H. Judd, of Minnesota; Hon. Don Magnuson, of Washington; Hon. Fred Marshall, of Minnesota; Hon. Joseph W. Martin, Jr., of Massachusetts; Hon. Charles E. Merrow, of New Hampshire; Hon. Joseph M. Montoya, of New Mexico; Hon. Albert P. Morano, of Connecticut; Hon. Thomas E. Morgan, of Pennsylvania; Hon. Carl D. Perkins, of Kentucky; Hon. Henry S. Reuss, of Wisconsin; Hon. Peter W. Rodino, Jr., of New Jersey; Hon. Alfred E. Santangelo, of New York; Hon. D. S. Saund, of California; Hon. Hugh Scott, of Pennsylvania; Hon. Henry G. Talle, of Iowa; Hon. Frank Thompson, Jr., of New Jersey; Hon. Stewart L. Udall, of Arizona; Hon. William B. Widnall, of New Jersey; Hon. Clement J. Zablocki, of Wisconsin.

COOPERATION OF MAYORS

In addition to the outstanding leadership given by Senators, Congressmen, and Governors, hundreds of mayors throughout the United States issued

Columbus Day proclamations and appointed local chairmen and local committees to stimulate communitywide observances to advance the goal of increased inter-American understanding under the theme of Americans All.

In this category of accomplishment, the following cities deserve special recognition for their unusual efforts: Kansas City, Mo.; Salt Lake City, Utah; Springfield, Ill.; Wilmington, Del.; York, Pa.; Hoboken, N.J.; Denver, Colo.; Washington, D.C.; Nashville, Tenn.; Galveston, Tex.; San Jose, Calif.; Philadelphia, Pa.; Tampa, Fla.; Miami, Fla.; Fitchburgh, Mass.; Clayton, Mo.; Nashua, N.H.; Des Moines, Iowa; Peoria, Ill.; South Norwalk, Conn.; New Brunswick, N.J.; New London, Conn.; Oakland, Calif.; Sacramento, Calif.; Albuquerque, N. Mex.; Minneopolis, Minn.; and many others. Reports are still coming in. These were the cities and towns giving full reports on their activities. There were countless others who carried out elaborate programs but did not write a full report to the national committee.

COLUMBUS DAY AIDS

As background information for groups and schools, the national committee provided two excellent pamphlets: "The Leaders Guide" and "You and Your Latin American Neighbors"—the latter in collaboration with the Department of Public Information of the Pan American Union.

"You and Your Latin American Neighbors" received great praise from leaders everywhere. I recommend this pamphlet to the attention of every Member of Congress.

In addition, I wish to also commend the following for their excellent Columbus Day materials: Dr. James A. Di Renna, Kansas City, Mo.; Hon. Mary A. Varallo, Philadelphia; Sister Constantius, Clayton, Mo.; Tom Sarcone, Des Moines, Iowa; John Egizzi, Springfield, Ill.; Charles G. Merlini, Utica, N.Y.; Sister Mary Janet, East Lansing, Mich.; Anthony E. Candela, Ashtabula, Ohio; Louis S. Solari, San Jose, Calif.

Also noteworthy is the fact that these spectacular accomplishments were attained by private citizens in States and communities who joined forces to create Columbus Day celebrations across the Nation. There was not one cent expended by the National Citizens Committee for Columbus Day for salaries or paid staff. All of these skills were contributed and donated by the officers and executive committee as their contribution to better inter-American friendship and international understanding.

Furthermore, I was pleased to see the widespread development of interfaith Columbus Day committees in the States and cities. The District of Columbia committee did an exceptional job. I believe such a move represents a tremendous step forward in the extension of our spiritual leadership in North, Central and South America.

THE 1958 NATIONAL CITIZENS COMMITTEE FOR COLUMBUS DAY

The 1958 National Citizens Committee for Columbus Day was composed of fifty-odd people from many organizations in thirty-odd States across the country. Represented were business, labor, education, fraternal, religious, and nationality groups. It was the largest and most representative committee in the national committee's history. Again, I wish to express my appreciation for the fine leadership given by Italian-American organizations to Columbus Day celebrations everywhere, and to the Knights of Columbus who have labored so long to keep Columbus Day alive in this country.

The 1958 Columbus Day Committee members were: Dr. George E. Arnstein, Washington, D.C.; Mrs. Eugene Bacarisse, New York City, N.Y.; James L. Baker, Peoria, Ill.; Peter J. Bertoglio, Pittsburgh, Pa.; James G. Blaine, Clovis, N. Mex.; Barnee Breeskin, Washington, D.C., Dr. Arthur Campa, Denver, Colo.; Anthony E. Candela, Ashtabula, Ohio; Felix N. Cantore, New Brunswick, N.J.; Angelo J. Catucci, Washington, D.C.; Henry G. Catucci, Washington, D.C.; Louis J. Colombo, Detroit, Mich.; Sister Constantius, C.S.J., Clayton, Mo.; Charles De Facio, Jr., Hoboken, N.J.; John R. Di Cello, Kenosha, Wis.; Dr. James A. Di Renna, Kansas City, Mo.; Peter F. Di Stefano, Buffalo, N.Y.; Francis J. Donnelly, Kansas City, Kans.; Dr. William E. Dunn, Washington, D.C.; John Egizii, Springfield, Ill.; Joseph A. L. Errigo, Wilmington, Del.; Angelo Fabrizio, Albuquerque, N. Mex.; Rudolph Faupl, Washington, D.C.; Mrs. Molly Ferrara, Tampa, Fla.; Philip A. Guarino, Washington, D.C.; Joseph M. Garrety, Hork, Pa.; Lawrence P. Girolami, Sacramento, Calif.; M. P. Goebel, Corpus Christi, Tex.; Richard M. Gunn, Tennessee; Frederick G. Hochwalt, Washington, D.C.; Thomas F. Hogan, Norwalk, Conn.; Rev. Alfred F. Horrigan, Louisville, Ky.; Dr. J. Dan Hull, Washington, D.C.

Sister Mary Janet, East Lansing, Mich.; Paul E. Johnson, Indianapolis, Ind.; Richard E. Kellogg, Washington, D.C.; Newell Knight, Salt Lake City, Utah; Milton S. Kronheim, Washington, D.C.; Col. Waldron E. Leonard, Washington, D.C.; Frank Longano, Cincinnati, Ohio; Don P. Luther, Detroit, Mich.; V. P. Mickey McGinn, Phoenix, Ariz.; Rev. Frederick A. McGuire, Washington, D.C.; Justin J. McCarthy, Washington, D.C.; Charles G. Merlini, Utica, N.Y.; Ted Moreno, Eugene, Oreg.; Hon. Judge George D. Neilson, Washington, D.C.; John T. O'Brien, Washington, D.C.; Richard C. O'Connell, Baltimore, Md.; D. Alejandro Orfila, Pan American Union; Andrew A. Ovellette, Nashua, N.H.; Oliver A. Ossanna, Minneapolis, Minn.; Miss Inez Petersen, Sioux City, Iowa; Dr. Thomas G. Pollock, New York City, N.Y.; John S. Prico, Oakland, Calif.; Hon. Peter W. Rodino, Jr., Newark, N.J.; Frank A. Romano, Fitchburg, Mass.; Mrs. Mary E. Romano, New London, Conn.; Saul N. Sanfilippo, San Jose, Calif; Tom Sarcone, Des Moines, Iowa; D. V. Signa, Greenville, Miss.; Paul E. Smith, Washington, D.C.; Louis S. Solani, San Jose, Calif.; James Sottile, Jr., Miami, Fla.; Stanley S. Villavasso, Baton Rouge, La.; Hon. Mary A. Varallo, Philadelphia, Pa.; John W. White, Washington, D.C.

NATIONAL SPONSORS

As I pointed out earlier, the National Citizens Committee is a voluntary citizens organization with no paid staff. There are, however, expenses for secretarial services, duplication of materials and mailings. In 1958, these expenses were underwritten by the following national sponsors:

Sam G. Baggett, vice president, United Fruit Co.

Edgar R. Baker, manager, Time-Life International.

H. W. Balgooyen, vice president, American & Foreign Power Co.

Charles R. Cox, president, Kennecott Copper Corp.

John A. Diemand, president, Insurance Co. of North America.

Fred M. Farwell, executive vice president, American Telephone & Telegraph Co.

W. Latimer Gray, senior vice president, First National Bank of Boston.

Walter Harnischfeger, president, Harnischfeger Corp.

Carl N. Jacobs, president, Hardware Mutual Casualty Co.

John K. Jenney, director, foreign relations department, E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.

Charles A. Meyer, vice president, Sears, Roebuck & Co.

W. M. Miller, vice president, Singer Sewing Machine Co.

Howard M. Packard, president, S. C. Johnson & Son, Inc.

J. P. Spang, Jr., president, the Gillette Co.

Wm. S. Youngman, Jr., director, American International Underwriters Corp.

Ray Schrick Reports on China Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 26, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of Commerce has notified me that he has no information as to the trade potential of Red China. It seems to me that we should get this information. Under a unanimous consent I am including hereafter an article from the Wall Street Journal for Wednesday, April 29, 1959, regarding Canadian trade with Red China:

CANADIANS EAGERLY WOO BIG RED MARKET THOUGH THE PROBLEMS ARE MANY—CHINESE BUREAUCRATS SNAG TRANSACTIONS, PUSH GOODS THE CANADIANS DON'T WANT—UNITED STATES IS AN OBSTACLE, TOO

(By Raymond J. Schrick)

VANCOUVER, CANADA.—The Norwegian freighter *Bougainville* bobs lazily at its moorings here in Canada's western gateway. Tall wharf booms swing lines into the vessel's gray and green hull and unload 153 cases of towels, workshirts, other cotton goods and feathers imported from Red China.

At 446 Homer Street, away from this port city's dock area, there's a tiny shop, owned by the East West Export Import Co., which exhibits such Communist Chinese wares as

tennis shoes, silk shirts and tea. "We expect to sell $1 million worth of technical machinery to China this year if all goes well," says balding Al Grinkus, the firm's secretary-treasurer. "And over there," he says, pointing to wooden crates addressed to the China National Import & Export Corp., 2 West Bund, Canton, "is the first trial shipment of some rubber goods."

Canada's trade with the Red Chinese amounts to just a few million dollars worth of business annually, and in 1958 it totaled less than one-half of 1 percent of Canada's trade with the United States alone. But this country's commerce with the giant behind the Bamboo Curtain is interesting, and its side effects are causing concern in the United States—which refuses to recognize Communist China or do business with it. And Canada's experiences help point up some of the problems peculiar to dealing with Red China.

TRADING WITH RED CHINA

Red China imported $2.4 million worth of goods from Canada in 1956, cut this to $1.4 million in 1957, then boosted its imports nearly sixfold to $8 million last year, with purchases of Canadian wheat accounting for about $7 million of the 1958 total. The Communists' exports to Canada hit a record $5.7 million in 1956, then bumped into this country's 1957–58 recession and averaged a bit above $5 million in each of those 2 years.

The Reds boast that they're ready to export bicycles, medical and surgical instruments, electric light bulbs, sewing machines, tools, chemicals, rubber tires, automobiles, and dozens of other items. The Canadians, however, have been buying such traditional Chinese exports as peanuts, shelled walnuts, hog bristles, sesame seeds, mink furs, and hooked rugs.

Red Chinese wares are frequently disparaged. The nonpartisan Far Eastern Economic Review, published in Hong Kong and backed largely by British capital, reports one case where a Red factory repackaged American antibiotics, slapped a "Made in China" label on them, and proudly exhibited them at eastern European trade fairs. Here in Canada, however, Communist China's exports are earning a good name for themselves.

At Vancouver's Hudson Bay Co. store, for example, the carpet department recently featured 9- by 12-foot hand-made Chinese hooked rugs tagged at $79.50. "We had to lower the price of our Japanese rugs from $99.50 to compete with them," confides a sales clerk, "but the Chinese rug still is better because it's all wool while the Japanese is half cotton."

RED HOOKED RUGS

"We placed our first $25,000 order for Chinese hooked rugs last summer," says wavy-haired Trevor Jordan-Knox, vice president of Jordan's, Ltd., which has six retail carpet stores in western Canada. "Since then," he adds, "we've placed two more orders, and we're completely sold out except for the couple of rugs you see there. We have had nothing but good comments on these Chinese goods."

While Canadian importers are pleased with Red China's wares, they're distinctly unhappy with the Communist bureaucrats they're obliged to deal with in order to get the goods.

One Canadian buyer who recently visited China says, "We accomplished as much by letter as by my actual visit." One stumbling block was the language barrier, plus the fact that the Communists can translate a letter and run it through the proper channels faster than a buyer can locate a Red official with enough authority to okay a transaction.

The representative of a large Canadian manufacturing firm placed a large order for burlap. But when he visited China in an effort to discover why it hadn't been delivered, he found his order had simply been postponed for 3 years. Another Canadian in the paper business says he traveled to Red China where he was graciously permitted to view the great wall of China, the summer palace, the winter palace—all the tourist traps—but no paper mills."

SKEPTICISM ON QUALITY

But Red bureaucracy is only one of several problems involved in trading with Red China. The Chinese aren't content with selling hog bristles, hooked rugs and other traditional items to Canada. They'd like to sell machinery and other industrial products, too. Such additional sales, of course, would boost China's earnings of Canadian currency and might make the Reds better customers for Canadian wares. But the Canadians remain highly skeptical of the quality of Chinese industrial products and thus shy from buying them.

In the Reds' eagerness to boost sales to Canada, they often overestimate the size of the Canadian market. "The Chinese are very stubborn salesmen," says Mr. Jordan-Knox, who not long ago was refused permission to visit the Tientsin factory that makes the hooked rugs he buys because the Reds figured it wasn't necessary. "These Chinese," he continues, "almost insisted our one company buy more hooked rugs than all Canada imported in the biggest boom year in history. They can't seem to understand that there are only 17 million people in our country."

Jean-Louis Junod, president of Pacific Grain Corp., Ltd., of Vancouver, sold some wheat to China last year and hopes to sell some more in the future. "But," he wonders, "will Canada's small population enable us to buy enough from the Chinese to balance our cargoes of wheat?"

There's no question the Chinese are determined to balance accounts with Canada. Harry MacDonald, sales manager for Canadian Forest Products, Ltd., visited Peking last year seeking pulp orders for his firm. "The Chinese," he recalls, "tried to get me to buy their peanuts so they could buy my pulp. The situation was impossible."

A FRUSTRATING BUSINESS

Though trading with Red China is a frustrating business, many Canadians are enthusiastically pushing it for what they consider to be good business reasons.

"The Chinese market is exciting," sums up one Canadian export-importer, "because it contains 25 percent of the world's people." Canada's businessmen are goggle-eyed at the sight of 600 million potential Chinese customers who are, incidentally, reproducing themselves at a yearly rate that exceeds Canada's entire population.

The huge Chinese market bought more than 75 percent of its import needs from the free world before the Korean War, Canadian Government sources claim, compared with only about 25 percent today. Most Canadian businessmen are eager to see a return to the pre-Korean war percentages. But there still are those who fear the sales competition of Communist China, whose greatest economic weapon is cheap labor in endless quantity.

"There is no cost of production in China," says one Canadian importer. "If Mao Tse-tung's regime wants to export a certain product," he adds, "it can undersell anybody." Another importer tells the tale of negotiations with some Red tea merchants. "We asked the Chinese," he says, "to tell us the price of their tea. They told us they had no price, and asked us what we were willing to pay. Sometimes they dicker on our offer, but they can always undersell the competition."

If the Chinese are anxious to earn foreign exchange of a certain country, they can take a loss on a sale to that country, knowing they will be able to absorb the loss in the profits of some other state-owned enterprise.

CHINESE DUMPERS

Red China's critics insist the Communists are not above dumping their goods on the market for any price they will bring. In the past year, for instance, the Reds have been accused of using these tactics in southeast Asia's textile markets at the expense of Japan, India, and other textile exporting countries.

Malaya's minister of commerce and industry recently told of Chinese textiles "known to be sold at prices which did not even cover the cost of raw materials." The same goods, he charged, cost three times as much in China as in Malaya. So the minister slapped a 3-month import ban on the Reds' wares. The ban since then has been lifted.

Charges of Red Chinese dumping are currently in the news right here in Canada.

Red China is the world's major supplier of hog bristles that are hand gathered after the porker has scratched them off his back against a fence. These bristles are hollow, and are used to make paint brushes of high quality. The hog bristle dumping issue was joined recently when Canadian customs appraisers put a value of $7,658.75 on some Chinese hog-bristle paint brushes which the importers had valued at $2,804. This sharply boosted the import duty.

Canadian officials normally rule that dumping has occurred if goods are sold in a foreign land for less than the fair market price in the supplying country. It is often difficult to learn what Communists charge for a product inside their own borders, and not long ago Canada reportedly began appraising hog bristles on the basis of the estimated cost of production plus what Canadian officials regarded as a reasonable profit.

"We think the action taken by the Canadian customs is regrettable, says the China National Animal By-Products Export Corp., the Reds' hog bristle export agency. "We have absolutely made no attempts at disturbing world markets," writes the vice manager of the Chinese agency, which claims its prices were in line with the London open market price, for bristles, plus 50 percent to 70 percent added to cover costs of making the brushes.

Marshal Johnson, president of the East West Export Import Co., says, "We planned to import $100,000 worth of paintbrushes this year, but we will be obliged to pay 180 percent more for them at the expense of the Canadian consumer if the dumping finding stands." Mr. Johnson alleges the government's action in the paintbrush case was based on "misleading information and inadequate consideration of the facts." A paintbrush distributor in Vancouver says, "We bought some Chinese paintbrushes originally but we aren't buying any more right now. With the dumping duty, Chinese brushes cost as much as Canadian-made bristle brushes which are a little higher in quality."

The furor over the antidumping ruling increased recently when George Nowlan, Canada's national revenue minister, told the House of Commons in Ottawa that, because dumping was alleged, a revaluation had been ordered on 2 million yards of Chinese cotton goods that had been imported from Red China in the preceding 2 weeks.

U.S. CHARGED WITH MEDDLING

Canadian news stories in the past year have reported charges of U.S. meddling in Canada's efforts to increase its China trade. The stories generally have contended Canada's economic dealings with the Reds would be a lot more lucrative today if Americans hadn't poked their noses into this country's internal affairs.

A big stir occurred here last spring, for example, when it was charged that Ford Motor Co. of Canada, Ltd., had been refused home office permission to sell 1,000 Canadian-built Ford cars to Red China. Last July,

the Canadian subsidiaries of Ford, Chrysler, and General Motors all indicated a willingness to accept orders from Red China. But so far as can be ascertained here, China hasn't purchased a single Canadian-made car.

One explanation is offered by Al Grinkus of the East West Export Import Co.: "The Chinese couldn't buy our cars when they needed them, so now they are making their own."

When Canada's Prime Minister John Diefenbaker met with President Eisenhower last summer, the United States agreed that in certain cases it would approve permits for subsidiaries of American firms in Canada to talk trade with the Chinese Communists. The only two permits issued so far have gone to Alaska Pine & Cellulose Co., Ltd., that's 95 percent owned by Rayonier, Inc., of New York. Alaska Pine has received two Chinese inquiries on 4,500 tons of Canadian wood pulp, but no orders have followed. "We still hope to get some China orders, but frankly, we aren't too optimistic," says the company's president, W. E. Breitenbach.

"We would welcome some Chinese interest in our flour, but none has come yet," says G. J. O. Degroot, assistant export sales manager of Robin Hood Flour Mills Ltd., a Canadian subsidiary of International Milling Co. of Minneapolis, which has five mills in this country.

While the U.S. Government definitely has relaxed its rules against the Canadian branches of American companies trading with the Communists, it's still attracting barbed criticism from its northern neighbors. "I'm a Canadian," says one. "Why should controls be put on us by Washington?"

This Canadian pique with the United States was heightened recently by an incident involving the giant Aluminum Co. of Canada, Ltd. Alcan has been operating at only 65 percent of its 700,000-tons-a-year capacity, yet it turned down an inquiry from Red China for 2,000 tons of aluminum worth about $1 million. The reason given by sources close to the company: "Unwillingness to hazard relations with steady customers." About 40 percent of Alcan's business, as it happens, is done with American manufacturers.

Some Canadians view the trickle of Red maneuver to sharpen Canadian resentment of the United States. "It's a phony," is the way one Canadian business leader describes the Red aluminum inquiry. There's some solid justification for this executive's stand. The Chinese themselves list aluminum as one of the products they're ready to export. And Red China's best friend—the Soviet Union—apparently has so much aluminum for sale that a year or so ago it was charged with dumping around 20,000 tons of the metal on world markets at less than half the price aluminum commands in Russia itself.

A COINCIDENCE?

It may be coincidence, but the Reds started buying Canadian wheat last year at precisely the time when the U.S. Government's worldwide wheat disposal policies were coming under sharp attack here.

Canada normally exports about 75 percent of its more than 350-million-bushel-a-year wheat crop. But during the period from July 1, 1958, through the beginning of this year, Canada's wheat exports dropped by 6 percent while American exports rose 8 percent, thanks in large part to the U.S. Government's willingness to accept foreign currency in payment for its wheat. Canada insists on payment in dollars. "China has won her point," says a Canadian grain exporter. "She has shown the world she can trade on an equal basis, not the gift basis the United States has cherished in recent years."

Canada's grain fraternity takes pains to shroud its dealings with Red China in secrecy. This apparently stems at least in part from a fear of upsetting trade relations with U.S. businessmen. "Even the name of China was not mentioned in the telegrams that went back and forth before we completed our business," says a Vancouver exporter.

Canadian concern over the U.S. attitude on trade with China goes beyond mere worry over upsetting U.S.-Canadian trade relations. For one thing, of course, there's the U.S. Government's control over trade by Canadian subsidiaries of U.S. firms.

Under the U.S. Trading with the Enemy Act, an embargo on U.S. trade with Red China has been in effect since December, 1950. The top penalty for a U.S. businessman caught dealing with the Reds—either directly or through subsidiaries in foreign countries such as Canada—is 10 years in prison and a $10,000 fine.

The U.S. Government so far has never imposed these penalties. But they still exist as a strong deterrent to any U.S. businessman who might be interested in trading with China. And the U.S. Government has taken some steps to make its position extremely clear.

Just last year, for example, there was a longshoremen's strike in Vancouver and a boatload of Red Chinese sesame seed was diverted to Seattle for unloading. The Canadians planned to put the seed in bond and ship it to Vancouver by rail, but the U.S. Government turned down the request and the Canadians had to pay costly demurrage charges while the boat waited for the strike to end.

Ten Easy Ways To Bootleg Nuclear Tests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1959

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, interest has been expressed in my list of 10 easy ways the Soviets might try to bootleg nuclear weapons tests in violation of a test ban agreement. The Soviet Union's immoral reputation for treaty breaking gives every reason to believe they would use any possible subterfuge to break any test ban agreement they signed. The list is as follows:

1. Hiding: Conceal tests in a location of many naturally occurring earthquake shocks, such as the Kamchatka-Kuriles area.

2. Coinciding: Trigger tests to coincide with naturally occurring earthquakes.

3. Confusing: Firing several tests simultaneously or in rapid succession to create a confused and unreadable seismograph signal.

4. Shaping: Design the nuclear explosion to produce a seismograph signal "shaped" the same as a natural earthquake signal.

5. Absorbing: Fire the illegal test in an icepack, volcanic tuff, or other absorbent formation which fails to transmit the shock.

6. Screening: Trigger a nearby nonnuclear explosion a few seconds prior to bootleg test, erecting a screening signal on seismographs.

7. Minimizing: Keep power of explosion so small it does not register significantly on seismographs.

8. Cushioning: Explode in large, underground cave, air in which cushions shock waves and fails to produce significant seismic signals.

9. Snuffing: Build into the bomb a self-snuffng feature which permits test data to be obtained, but snuffs out explosion before seismologically significant shock is created.

10. Jamming: Jam seismograph stations likely to detect the bootleg test by increasing local background noise. (Even passage of a heavy truck near seismograph may jiggle its recording needle enough to blackout other signals.)

This list is not in any way complete and it is not based on the still secret Berkner Report on test evasion possibilities. I reiterated my earlier demand the Berkner Report be declassified by the State Department so the American people can evaluate pitfalls inherent in the Geneva test ban negotiations.

The foregoing list is based on a ban agreement that would apply to underground as well as atmospheric tests. The only kind of ban offering decent prospects for enforcement is one against atmospheric tests which are the only tests creating fallout, and I have previously expressed my opinion there is a moral responsibility on the United States to seek an atmospheric testing ban and at the same time refuse to consider other type bans pending discussion of the moral, military, and political questions involved.

Nuclear explosion can be detected by acoustic waves, electromagnetic radiation, radioactive debris, and seismic waves. All but seismic waves can be suppressed by underground explosions and my list shows how these, also, could render valueless any detection-inspection system so far discussed at Geneva.

Some other ways the Soviets might consider to violate a test ban include these:

Simply shift testing from Soviet soil to the vast Red Chinese land mass not subject to the proposed agreement.

Test at very high altitudes, using rockets.

Set up secret test at a remote, uninhabited South Atlantic or Pacific Island, using submarines. In this case a few coke bottles and empty American cigarette packages might be left in the test site vicinity to confuse an international inspection team.

At the height of a phony propaganda campaign falsely charging Western violations, or that the detection system is faulty, et cetera, set off a test, and let it get lost in the general hullabaloo.

I hope my remarks may serve the purpose of encouraging public interest in and discussion of this vital test ban question.

Ellis Island as Cancer Research Facility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 26, 1959

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I am inserting a letter from John M. Deegan, chairman of the Hudson County, N.J., chapter of the American Cancer Society, to the President of the United States, in which he proposes that the Government-owned Ellis Island be made available for

the establishment of additional research facilities to continue our fight for the cure for the dread disease of cancer.

While I am confident much has been accomplished in this tremendously important field of research, we have not yet conquered this dread disease. I wholeheartedly endorse and concur in Mr. Deegan's proposal.

The letter follows:

THE AMERICAN CANCER SOCIETY,
NEW JERSEY DIVISION, INC.,
HUDSON COUNTY CHAPTER,
Jersey City, N.J., May 12, 1959.

President DWIGHT EISENHOWER,
White House, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I note in the press that the offer to purchase Ellis Island and convert it into an amusement park has been again wisely rejected by our Government.

It is my belief that at least 75 percent of the present generation of American citizens can trace their ancestry back over the years to someone who was welcomed to a new life in this country on arrival at Ellis Island.

Just why cannot this tradition of humane assistance be carried on to an even further degree by converting Ellis Island into a research center for the cure of the dread disease of cancer?

Ideally located by its proximity to the largest city on our continent and to the many colleges and hospitals where many phases of research are at present being conducted, Ellis Island entirely surrounded by water, offers an advantageous location free from dust, noise, and harmful bacteria.

The need for this type of research center to seek the cure of cancer, I feel, deserve top priority in the domestic phase of our Federal governmental planning and the opportunity to utilize this island for such a humane cause will preserve the intentions of our forefathers that Ellis Island be dedicated to the faith, hope, and tranquility of all Americans.

Our men and women of science can and will conquer cancer eventually and by the creation of this center I am confident that we will greatly shorten the time to the achievement of this God inspired goal.

As the campaign chairman for the Hudson County, N.J., chapter of the American Cancer Society, I have intimate contact with our citizens and I can assure you that the creation of a cancer research center on Ellis Island would, without dissent, be acclaimed as one of the most humane and progressive projects our Government ever initiated.

Respectfully yours,

JOHN M. DUGAN,
County Campaign Chairman.

Pan American Airways: Union Milestone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE HOLT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 12, 1959

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, a unique agreement has been reached between Pan American Airways and the Air Line Pilots Association, the Flight Engineers International Association, and the Air Line Dispatchers Association. MATS made the recommendation to private carriers that to have successful utilization of civil air transport service a labor agreement such as the one below would be of interest to national security. I thoroughly agree with this and want to congratulate Pan American Airways and the unions involved for an outstanding milestone in aviation history.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

SUMMARY OF PAN AMERICAN NATIONAL DEFENSE LABOR AGREEMENTS

Pan American World Airways has signed agreements with three of its operating unions which will assure the Department of Defense that traffic essential to defense purposes will continue to move despite possible labor disputes between the company and the unions, Juan T. Trippe, president, announced today at the annual stockholders meeting in New York. The agreements signed with the Air Line Pilots Association, the Flight Engineers International Association, and the Air Line Dispatchers Association are the first of their kind in the history of transportation. A summary of the contracts follows:

1. Even though the three groups should withdraw from commercial airline service because of labor disputes, they will continue at their respective jobs to insure the airlift of cargo and personnel essential to national defense.

2. A company official will certify in writing that the flight concerned will be exclusively for these purposes.

3. The agreements are consistent with the longstanding policy and performance of the three associations and their members.

4. This agreement will not be altered or terminated without at least 2 years' written notice by either the company or the associations.

5. The agreements with the three associations have been incorporated into their regular collective-bargaining agreements.

Aid to Derthick To Be Promoted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 26, 1959

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, higher education in the United States has received a boon in the appointment of Dr. Homer D. Babbidge as Assistant Commissioner for Higher Education in the Federal Office of Education. Dr. Babbidge is a young man who has made a lasting mark in the world of education.

Secretary Flemming, Dr. Derthick, and Dr. Babbidge are all to be congratulated on this excellent appointment. I am including the report of Dr. Babbidge's appointment which appeared in the New York Times for May 19:

AID TO DERTHICK TO BE PROMOTED—H. D. BABBIDGE WORKED OUT BASIS FOR NEW DEFENSE EDUCATION PROGRAM

WASHINGTON, May 18.—Dr. Homer D. Babbidge is to be named Assistant Commissioner for Higher Education in the Federal Office of Education, it became known today. He will succeed Dr. Lloyd E. Blauch, who is to retire.

The choice of Dr. Babbidge, who was 34 years old today, for a post that is fast increasing in importance is an acknowledgement of his work under the National Defense Education Act.

As Director from the start of the Aid to Institutions Branch of the Office of Education, he has had charge of all programs under the act relating to higher education, such as the student loan program, the fellowship program, and the language and counseling institutes.

PROGRAM VOTED LAST YEAR

The National Defense Education Act was voted last year. The task of Dr. Babbidge was to lay the groundwork for the general program provided by the act. To help in the task he has brought to Washington some of the top educators of leading colleges for limited tours of duty. At present he has about 100 such assistants.

The funds to set the general program rolling were assured only this week when a $75 million deficiency appropriation was voted and sent to the White House for signature. The money is to carry the program through the rest of this fiscal year.

As a result of the preliminary work done under Dr. Babbidge, Arthur S. Flemming, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, was able to announce today that the college loan program was ready to be sent into operation and the fellowships to be granted had been processed.

COMMENT BY DERTHICK

Dr. Lawrence G. Derthick, commissioner of education, said the post Mr. Babbidge is to take had the great potentialities for two main reasons.

1. College enrollments are expected to double in the next 10 years.

2. Higher education is assuming a new posture in national life under the National Defense Education Act, which was enacted as a result of the Soviet scientific challenge in the cold war.

Dr. Babbidge was born in West Newton, Mass., and attended grade schools there. He was graduated from the Amherst Center High School in Buffalo in 1943, winning a fellowship to Yale University. He received at Yale the bachelor of arts degree in political science and in 1953 a Ph. D. in education.

He taught at Yale and was employed in various capacities in its admissions office, on one assignment being in charge of the financial aid program.

He first came to Washington in 1955 to serve for a year as special assistant to the commissioner of education, Samuel M. Brownell. He returned in September 1957 as a special assistant to HEW secretary, Marion B. Folsom, and remained to aid Secretary Flemming.

On December 22, 1956, he was married to Marcia Adkisson, of Seattle, who had come to Washington as secretary to a Congressman from her home State.

Is Fidel Castro a Communist?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD T. FLYNN
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 26, 1959

Mr. FLYNN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I would like to include an article entitled "Is Fidel Castro a Communist?" by Dale Francis. This article was featured in the May 3, 1959, national edition of Our Sunday

Visitor, a religious newspaper with one of the largest circulations of its kind in the world. The piece by Dale Francis is particularly meaningful because this journalist was one of the most ardent supporters of Dr. Fidel Castro until the latter got into power and began the present regime in Cuba. This article is submitted at the request of one of my constituents, and the article reads as follows:

IS FIDEL CASTRO A COMMUNIST?

(By Dale Francis)

Whether Fidel Castro is a Communist or not is of great importance to this country and to the entire western hemisphere. In this article, I do not propose to reach a conclusion. Instead I will offer the evidence both for and against the thesis and let the evidence speak for itself.

First of all, many zealous anti-Communists have made charges against Castro that do not stand investigation. One of the most frequent accusations is the one that charges Castro bragged after the riots of 1948 in Bogotá, Colombia, that he had killed a priest. This has variously been reported as anywhere from one to eight priests killed.

But the fact is that there were no priests at all killed in the Bogotá riots. So if none were killed then obviously Castro did not kill eight, six, or even one.

For another thing, Castro's participation in the riots does not establish him as a Communist. There were many different groups assembled in Bogotá to protest against the Ninth Conference of American Union. Some were Communists, some were not. The riots were sparked by the murder of a non-Communist but liberal leader, Jorge Gaitan, and while the Communists took full advantage of the riots, there were non-Communists among the rioters and the Communists made up only a small minority of the group.

Then in any discussion of Castro there must be recognition of the fact he had almost unanimous backing of the Cuban people in his battle against Batista. Those few commentators who still fail to understand that Batista's government was both corrupt and tyrannical are failing to understand the Cuban situation at all. Batista had to be overthrown. The people's support of Castro was not based on any knowledge of Castro but simply on the fact they hated Batista and Castro was fighting against him.

The evidence that seems most pertinent to me dates back to 1953. Batista was then solidly in power after seizing the government before the elections of 1952. Almost universally, the Cuban people disapproved of the forceful seizure of the government in 1952 and almost all of the people were in some degree opposed to Batista. Because there was some material progress under Batista, this opposition was not always a passionate one but still Batista was by and large always an unpopular man.

But Batista denounced his opponents as Communists, claimed to be the saviour of Cuba. It was in 1953 that the two major political parties in Cuba—the Orthodox and the Authentic—decided to issue a statement of unity in opposition to Fulgencio Batista.

They first planned to meet in Mexico but they decided this was too close to Cuba. They finally decided that the top five members of each party should meet in Montreal to issue a statement of opposition to Batista and make a pact of unity.

A few days before these men were to move out of Cuba secretly, a young member of the Orthodox Party began a campaign for the formation of a popular frent against Batista that would include the Communist Party.

This young man was Fidel Castro.

He was violent in his demand that the Communists be included with the Orthodox and Authentic parties in any statement against Batista. He argued this was necessary for national unity and he argued strongly.

This was a strange argument. Batista could have been given no greater weapon than the inclusion of the Communist Party as an integral part of his opposition. It would have helped him in his efforts to convince the United States he was really a bulwark of strength against Communist encroachments.

Naturally the Orthodox and Authentic party leaders preparing to meet in Montreal knew this and the proposal that Communists be included in the unity pact was so fantastic that they gave it no consideration. Yet young Fidel Castro continued to insist that this had to be done and he threatened that if it was not done that he and his friends would form their own opposition to Batista.

You must understand that at this time Fidel Castro was not well known in Cuba. He had been a leader among the students at Havana, he had participated in an ill-fated venture against the Dominican Republic, he had been a congressional candidate on the Orthodox ticket, he had filed a legal brief against Batista's seizure of power, so he was not completely a political unknown; yet he was in no way a political leader in the nation and so his emotional plea for the inclusion of Communists and his threat to start a movement of his own if the recognized parties did not include the Communists, was not given serious consideration by the more experienced political leaders.

Yet Castro did wield an influence on the men meeting in Montreal. The Authentic Party wanted to include a strong anti-Communist statement in the Montreal pact. Remembering the strong pressure exerted by Castro and his young followers who wanted the Communists included in the pact, the Orthodox members explained they simply could not go along with an anti-Communist statement without causing a split within their own party.

On this issue, the meeting almost broke up. Finally, the Authentic Party members agreed to go along with the Orthodox members and so the anti-Communist statement was dropped out of the pact.

When the delegates returned to Cuba the Orthodox representatives faced an angry young Fidel Castro. He chastised them for failing to include the Communists in the pact. They explained they had at least been able to keep out the anti-Communist statement and they hoped this would satisfy him.

It did not. Fidel Castro, who had threatened to start a movement of his own if the Communists were not given an equal standing with the two major parties, left the Orthodox Party and launched a revolutionary movement of his own.

A few short weeks later Castro and his associates stormed a barracks in Santiago de Cuba. This could have been the start of the overthrow of Batista. Had everything gone as planned, Castro could have taken over Santiago and established a rebel government there.

This is important to understand. Castro and his corevolutionaries had reason to believe that a few hours after their attack they could have been in control of the city and they would have had to establish a government. What sort of a government would have been established then?

We will never know since the attempted revolt was thwarted but one chilling fact about Santiago de Cuba on that July 26, 1953, must be added to give the full evidence on Castro.

On that day every important Communist in Cuba was in Santiago. Blas Roca, Lazro Pena, Bernardo Hernandez, Juan Llosa, Antonio Perez, Rolando Ruiz, Jose Cabrejas, Joaquin Ordoqui—all of the Communist leaders of Cuba were in Santiago, some 600 miles away from their usual haunts in Havana. Why? They say they had assembled for Blas Roca's birthday party.

Is this true? Did it just happen that on the day Fidel Castro launched his revolt and had expected to establish a provisional government that all of the Communist leaders of Cuba were around? Maybe.

But when you remember how a few months before Castro was battling for the Communist Party against what was plainly against the best interests of enemies of Batista's oppression, when you remember his threats to start a movement of his own that would not exclude the Communists, the appearance of the Communist leaders in Santiago appears an ominous thing.

Now Castro says he is not a Communist and there are those who believe him. He says he believes in freedom of the press and this is proof he is not a Communist. I remember newspapermen told me just a few weeks ago that the self-censorship they must exercise to escape the wrath of Castro is a more complete censorship than under Batista. They do not believe there is a free press today in Cuba. Castro's own words tend to convict him.

Law Must Spell It Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 26, 1959

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial from the San Mateo Times, San Mateo, Calif., for Friday, May 22, 1959:

LAW MUST SPELL IT OUT

Congress has a bill before it which would go far toward clearing up future legislative and judicial muddles over Federal versus States' rights. The bill, authored by Representative HOWARD SMITH, of Virginia, would require Congress to spell out in each piece of legislation whether it intends that law to supersede or complement similar enactments in the various States.

There was no need for this legislation until a few years ago. Legal experts took it for granted that the 10th article of the Bill of Rights, which says, "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people," meant what it said.

A liberal Supreme Court, however, began adopting what it called a policy of preemption, which holds that Federal and State laws on the same subject only confuse the picture, and the Court has specifically accepted Federal law as superseding similar ones in the States, although such intention was never voiced by Congress nor written into the law. The tendency has been to avoid Federal-State squabbles by the simple expedient of denying the States jurisdiction in areas covered by national laws.

Among the more famous Supreme Court decisions incorporating the policy of preemption was that which upset the conviction of Pennsylvania's top Communist, Steve Nelson, under a State subversive act. The

Supreme Court, in effect, held that Federal acts preempt the field of subversive control and State laws are invalid.

If the Constitution is not to be flavored by changing political philosophies, Congress must be more specific in its legislative intent. It is no longer sufficient to assume the States have those rights not specifically denied them by the legislative branch of the Federal Government. The judicial branch has decreed otherwise.

Address by Chairman Roger W. Jones, U.S. Civil Service Commission, at the Annual Conference of the Society for Personnel Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. REES
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 25, 1959

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under approval granted by the House, I am including an interesting and timely address delivered by the Honorable Roger W. Jones, Chairman of the U.S. Civil Service Commission, at the annual conference of the Society for Personnel Administration on Thursday, May 21.

The administration is fortunate to have a man of the ability and the understanding of civil service problems as that of Mr. Jones. The reading of his statement will indicate his familiarity with civil service matters:

This is a speech without a title. A number of my associates suggested that I should limit myself this morning to a report of stewardship. Others suggested that I should try to look into the future. Still others suggested that this would be a good opportunity for a new Chairman of the Civil Service Commission to develop his personal philosophy and to set down the goals which he seeks to achieve. I may end up by trying to do all of these things—and not in a very logical order at that.

As a beginning, I am going to quote the Bible, both to give myself a text and to recall to you one of the most graphic verses which has come down to us from the minor prophets. The Second Chapter of the Book of Acts records the reactions of St. Luke when, on the day of Pentecost, the apostles seemed suddenly to be capable of speaking to every man of the multitude in his own language. Some were full of wonder, and the skeptics, of course, were full of derision and mockery. It was at this juncture that Peter lifted up his voice and quoted the poetry of the prophet Joel: "* * * and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, and your young men shall see visions, and your old men shall dream dreams." Here, then, is a text which is applicable to the civil service. Its history is replete with prophecy, and its young men, too often in the past, have seen their visions become dreams when they were old. But now it seems that fulfillment is at hand.

To an extent never before experienced, the civil service system is able to speak to every American in his own language. It can now offer a career in almost any field of useful endeavor. Its supporters understand its message; its detractors know what is being said to them; those who profess indifference can no longer justify hiding in ignorance. Events and developments of the past dozen years have told the civil service story in such a way that no man or woman need have any doubt that a career in Federal service presents opportunity and challenge, and greater awards of satisfaction than some might think. There are, of course, inevitable expressions of derision and mockery. But, perhaps, these voices will be stilled if they, like the multitude to whom Peter quoted Joel, will listen to the voice of democracy. The story of civil service has been one in which it seems to have been destined that the prophecies and visions of young men should come to pass, and that the dreams of old mean should take on reality in the period of our responsibility for administering the civil service system.

The celebration of the diamond anniversary of the Civil Service Act in 1958 was more than a mere recital of the progress of 75 years of slow, but unchecked, advance of the merit system and its ideals. It was also a most effective device for improving public understanding and appreciation of the civil service and its people, the work of the Government agencies, and career opportunities in the Federal service. If we in the Civil Service Commission learned anything from it, it was to pay public homage to some of the dreams of those who had gone before, and to take unto ourselves an obligation to listen to the prophecies of their sons and daughters, and to share with them the vision of a civil service which can be abreast of the Government's changing needs in this rapidly changing world.

As long ago as Theodore Roosevelt's time, Civil Service Commissioners and advocates of the merit system looked to the day when we would foresee Government personnel needs and be prepared to meet them, not always panting to catch up. Strange as it may seem, I believe that the single largest stumbling block to attainment of this dream has been pursuit of a crazy and false will-o'-the-wisp. The belief (whether in 1914, 1933, or 1950) that the dynamic events of the day represented the abnormal, and that tomorrow we would return to the old stability, slowed down the growth and the efficacy of the civil service. We chased an illusion, and in doing so left management in a peculiar position to complain about the application of yesterday's methods to today's problems.

The cumulative effects of two world wars, a depression, the Korean conflict, and the bursting of the nuclear age have finally proved to the American Government that yesterday will never come again. The long drudgery of doing things year after year in the same way has been irrevocably broken. Agencies and the people who man them now perform old tasks by new and different methods. They also do altogether different things, and do not find them inconsistent with either the wishes of the American people or the statutory charters which underline all Federal programs. We have come to accept and to try to prepare for the fact that we now need different skills, different qualifications, and a different, ever-changing population of Federal employees. We no longer wage a nostalgic fight against realization that change is the order of the day, and that the need for change may arrive on short notice, or no notice at all.

None of this, however, is inconsistent with a career civil service. It simply means that in concept and in execution the idea of civil service has outgrown the physical dimensions of a "corps of clerks." The clerks are still here, an honored ,necessary, vital part of the civil service, but they do not make it. Perhaps we could have outgrown the narrow concept long ago if we had paid attention to what were then young men's visions but which the neglect of the years turned into old men's dreams. On digging into the history of civil service I find that we have made at least eight of these dreams come true in recent years. Time and the promise to change this meeting into a question-and-answer period as soon as possible do not permit me to discuss them in any detail, but at least I can give a catalog.

1. We have found the right formula for career recruitment at the college level without forcing everyone through the small end of the funnel of restriction to qualification in a major subject. Slowly but soundly the years since the depression of the early thirties, and the great expansion of Government programs which accompanied it, have given us more and more opportunity to take our pick of college-trained people. We have found means to examine, recruit, and develop them, and to convince them that Government offers a satisfying career. We are rapidly improving our selection of noncollege people, too. It is heartening on both scores to note that in a recent survey of 800 Government executives, some 50 percent of the persons interviewed reported that they had come into the service at grades below GS-9, 22 percent of them at grade 4 or lower. While we still have not done as much as I think we can and should do about career planning with our young people, the old men's dreams of better training facilities, equitable promotion programs, and greater possibility for transfer have come into being as realities regardless of the amount of academic training a person may have had on entry into Federal service.

2. The right of the employee to be considered something other than a cog in a machine also has moved beyond the dream stage. I may have been misled by overoptimistic reports, but I think that there is now a sincere desire and effort on the part of agency management almost universally throughout the Federal establishment to obtain and consider employee comments and suggestions and to support whole heartedly an incentive awards system. How sharply this stands in contrast to attitudes and rules (albeit usually unwritten rules) of not too many years ago.

3. The employee organization is no longer something to be feared or to be treated with contempt as a self-serving, selfish effort to interfere with the prerogatives of officials appointed to make democratic government work. In agency after agency, experience has demonstrated that one of the most effective methods of consultation on personnel matters has been discussion with respresentatives of employee organizations. Furthermore, employee organizations have made many well-thought-out recommendations for management's consideration and have urged members and nonmembers alike to give the kind of active support for suggestion systems and incentive awards which are their lifeblood. Finally, the agencies have generally established and are applying adequate methods for handling grievances and appeals. In fact, the overwhelming majority of employee complaints today are resolved before they reach the formal appeal and grievance stages. These developments have come about gradually, and they have required and received a most commendable degree of restraint from employee organizations. Every one of these developments was prophesied long ago by far-seeing civil servants.

4. The establishment, maintenance, and assignment of major responsibilities to personnel programs in the agencies is now an accepted way of life. In fact, the formal personnel program has moved from an era of mere tolerance and skeptical attention to an era in which analysis and evaluation on an agency-wide basis are important tools for bettering effort across the board. I can only express the hope that the Civil Service Commission in its own work of review and audit will be able to keep up.

5. The Civil Service Commission has opened a concerted attack upon the persisting problems of redtape and paperwork on classification. My late colleague in the Bureau of the Budget, Frederick J. Bailey, was one of the architects of the original "Preliminary Class Specifications of Positions in the Field Service." He once told me that his greatest mistake in a Federal career which spanned more than 40 years was his acceptance of the complicated verbiage of that famous 1930 publication. As closely as I can remember them, his words were: "I dream of the day when a job sheet can be simply written, simply handled, and promptly allocated, without an argument about the degree in which adjectives and adverbs are expressed."

6. The dream of William McReynolds that we would some day have authority to pay premium salaries for high-quality recruits is now a reality, although in somewhat limited form, as is also authority for on-the-spot hiring for regular appointment, which is my seventh point. This was, as some of you recall, often spoken of by William A. Jump.

8. Finally, and this has been dreamed of by many people over the years, we have made at least the first stumbling and imperfect steps in the direction of a merit promotion program. It may well be that for years to come there will have to be almost as many exceptions as there are applications of the rule, but I believe that we will develop the techniques, the skill, the courage, and the fundamental improvements which the concept of a true merit promotion program demands.

We sometimes think that perhaps Government today does not produce Baileys, McReynoldses, and Jumps; that the merit system has grown too complex and too flexible to produce another Stockberger or a Frederick Davenport, with their high regard for fixed principle; that we can never again have even one of those wise and self-effacing "chief clerks" on which so much depended in the old days. I think this is a sentimental comparision, or contrast if you choose. We do not need to judge the present and the future by the yardsticks of the past, even when those yardsticks were towering figures who came to be known as prophets in their own times. I believe that their sons and daughters will prophesy and that we have young men and women today who are quite capable of seeing visions. We will do well to heed them. They come into the Federal Government every year, not by tens, but by hundreds and even thousands. And they come better equipped to be articulate about their visions than their predecessors of an earlier day.

It was the young scientists who saw what the rate of scientific discovery and progress after World War II would do to create a manpower pinch in the Federal Government. It was the young who, by their own examples, demonstrated the value to be obtained from the enactment of a uniformly applicable Government Employees Training Act. Young training officers have done much to nail down the doctrine that responsibility for developing and realizing the potential of this act belongs primarily to the heads of their agencies. With and through the younger staff of the Civil Service Commission the agencies have undertaken broad programs to develop better relationships with college placement officers and faculty members, and a better understanding by them of what the Government needs and what it has to offer. Here is infinite room for the vision of any young person who is dedicated to the democratic ideal and who believes that democracy can outproduce, outgovern, and outlast communism through the strength of its programs rather than the force of its arms.

Better placement, to cite just one more example, must depend upon the vision of the young as much as it depends upon the experience and the judgment of older heads. So, too, must the ever-elusive goal of improving communication from employees to management and back down the line from management to employees.

Most of what I have said up to the present minute has either been accomplished or is on the way to accomplishment. This still leaves the obligation to look a little farther into the future. The suggestions needing attention fall into two broad groups: those for which there is an immediate need, and some prospect of immediate action, say within a year or two; and those which either permit or require consideration over a longer period of time.

In the first group are a number of legislative proposals, of which I shall mention a few. A major gap in the benefit structure for Federal employees is the absence of a suitable health insurance program. The Congress is currently considering legislative proposals for group health insurance with part of the cost contributed by the Government and part by the employee. In its report on Senate bill S. 94 the Civil Service Commission listed a number of standards which we believe any group health insurance plan for Federal employees should meet. S. 94 in its present form fails to meet some of those criteria, and contains some provisions which we consider unwise or unworkable. However, the Senate subcommittee has held hearings and is now actively trying to work out a bill which will offer an acceptable solution for all the parties concerned. The Civil Service Commission and the Bureau of the Budget are collaborating in this effort, and the prospects for success seem better now than they have at any time in the past.

Despite the enactment of new pay legislation last year, the pay problem in its broader aspects is still with us. We still have the hodgepodge of Government pay systems about which so many proposals have been made and so little has actually been done. The President has recommended the establishment of a bipartisan commission to study Federal compensation systems and policy. We all should strongly support this objective, recognizing that a major effort will be involved.

There are several hundred separate statutes on the books pertaining to Federal employee pay. We feel there is a clear need for the development of servicewide compensation policy as a guide for the legislative and executive branches in dealing with pay matters. For example, we have no criteria or systematic methods for adjusting white-collar statutory pay scales on a timely basis. These and other inflexibilities, such as the numerical limitations on the use of supergrades, have put an artificial and unwise ceiling on Classification Act and Postal Field Service grades, and have weakened the ability of the Federal service to attract the most competent persons for Federal jobs in a highly competitive labor market.

Three legislative proposals prepared by the Commission deserve no attention as visions, but they do deserve mention as projected improvements. They have been submitted to the Bureau of the Budget and are now in clearance. One of these would provide more realistic relocation allowances for employees who transfer for the convenience of the Government. Present allowances do not cover the employee's out-of-pocket expenses; they do not take into account increases in rates charged by common carriers, and they fail to cover certain other necessary items such as temporary living expenses for employees and their families. If we can relieve employees of this burden, we will certainly lessen resistance to at least one kind of change. The second proposal is for amendment of the Performance Rating Act of 1950, to enable agencies to adopt systems for evaluating employee performance that are more closely fitted to the agencies' individual needs. The third proposal would authorize the Government to pay for preemployment medical examinations by other than its own facilities, and also to provide fitness-for-duty examinations of employees. Requiring new employees to pay for their own medical examinations is a deterrent to recruitment; it is also unfair, since some applicants are examined free and others are not. Also, fitness-for-duty examinations which may be in the interest of the Government cannot be required if the Government is unable to pay for them. I would also call to your attention a proposal now pending in the Congress to modify and remove the rigidities of the Hatch Act. The Civil Service Commission has endorsed this bill, with a number of amendments.

There are four visions for the longer future which this audience would do well to share as goals deserving of much careful thought and planning. They are: (1) Equalization of appeal rights for veterans and nonveterans; (2) establishment of some system which will insure a regular and substantial annual intake from college graduating classes for Government careers, and with Government agencies authorized to make firm commitments during the competitive recruiting period which falls in the 4 months prior to graduation; (3) establishment (when circumstances, finances, and our state of readiness will permit) of a Federal administrative staff college for the training of the executives we need to discharge Federal program responsibilities; (4) adaptation of the competitive examining system to find ways to fill few-of-a-kind jobs which are scattered in many parts of the country. To this I would also add a corollary, finding means of keeping registers in a constant state of refreshment. It should be possible to add current eligibles to those who have established eligibility earlier without either destroying merit principles or going down the road of specialized recruiting which often misses its mark.

I think that all four of these goals need no further discussion now, but I want to repeat a conviction which I have often expressed: Only an administrative staff college can round out whatever uses we make of the new training act. We need to use the wealth of talent which we have in the Federal Government—the real experts in their fields—to train those who come after them. As Dr. Lillian Gilbreth neatly put it, "We talk a lot about know-how, but it's the know-why that is the key to all good management."

I should like to conclude my remarks this morning with some observations about three significant trends in the general field of personnel management—trends with which I know you are all directly concerned.

The first is the trend toward decentralization and delegation. While these are not identical, they have parallel objectives and results. They respond to the recognition that the man on the firing line, out in our field installations, and down in our lowest level of supervision, is the man responsible for getting the job done. He should have the authority he needs to do his job quickly, economically, and in a manner best suited to the local or specific situation.

Another trend is in the direction of creating more flexibility in the management area. This trend responds to the need for increased freedom to apply basic principles and commonsense rather than restrictive rules and regulations—in recruiting, in classification, in career planning, in training, in incentives.

The third trend is a companion to these—the trend toward the development of tools for positive and better personnel management. Without them, the promotion of decentralization and flexibility would be a

foolish gamble rather than reliance on a relatively sure and predictable outcome.

Progress in these areas cannot be accomplished by fiat, nor by mere acquiescence as to purposes and methods. It involves clear vision, hard work, and courage, because the obstacles are many. The very exacting demands on the Federal establishment for complete and quick reports on stewardship, to the public, to the Congress, and to other levels of Government, make it hard to delegate and decentralize with a free hand. An ability to tolerate uncertainty and ambiguity has been identified as a characteristic of the successful executive, but this is certainly not a characteristic of the American public in expressing their attitudes toward Government. They will tolerate mistakes, honestly made, far longer than they will tolerate inaction and uncertainty.

On the technical side, the task of developing personnel tools based on a realistic appraisal of the problem to be solved, combining the wisdom gained from experience and the knowledge gained from science, is not easy. Productive personnel scientists are rare, and practical managers regard with a healthy cynicism the enthusiastic peddler of the fad or fancy. The problem of identifying the worth while, and selling it to the wary manager, requires intelligence, patience, and wisdom.

Despite these barriers, there are hopeful auguries. The stark necessities of the present situation—the pressing need for economy and efficiency in a Government growing by leaps and bounds to accomplish new functions in a new age—provide an irritating and effective goad against complacency. The constant drive in parts of Government not only to match but to exceed private industry in improved management is encouraging. The increased attention to careers instead of clerks, and the sound development of the career executive bring into prominence the requirement to improve key links in the administrative process. Exploitation of all of the fields of social science through interdisciplinary probings of personnel and management problems creates the hope that our kit of knowledge and tools may be refurnished.

The Civil Service Commission is a service organization. Its purpose is to help the agencies of the Government to recruit and retain the kind of people, and to develop and practice the kind of personnel management, that will enable them to accomplish their several missions most effectively. The Commission is keenly aware of the challenge for bold and imaginative change that is presented by this changing world. We want to meet that challenge, to provide leadership that will keep the whole Federal service in step with the tempo of the times.

But in order to provide such leadership we must know what the agencies need. We have no desire to march off heedlessly in a direction no one cares to follow. We know many of the changes that are needed, but we also need to share more in those needs which are still visions of the young or dreams of the old. Nothing can be accomplished by vague complaints; much can be accomplished by concrete rearrangement of our personnel system—by strengthening those features of merit-system administration that help us, and by getting rid of those that hinder. As I said a couple of weeks ago in discussing scientific manpower, no matter how strongly the urge may come to abandon all the rules, the Government's needs contain no license to scrap the merit system. We can modernize it, and streamline it, and adapt it; we can cut red tape and we can cut corners; but we must maintain the basic merit principles. Then the vision will have substance; the dream will have reality; the prophecy will become history.

Revenue Producing Features of a National Lottery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL A. FINO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 26, 1959

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, while we in Congress persist in refusing to capitalize on the natural gambling spirit of the American people, and while we continue to ignore the tremendous revenue producing features of a national lottery, the American people continue to buy from 75 to 85 percent of all Irish Sweepstake tickets sold.

In view of the fact that another Irish Sweepstakes drawing is scheduled Thursday and Friday of this week, the New York Daily News, a strong supporter of my national lottery bill, wrote the following editorial on May 25 which should be read by each and every Member of Congress.

OH, TO BE IN IRELAND

Come to think of it, though, it isn't necessary to be in Ireland for the purpose we have in mind; namely, to buy Irish Sweepstake tickets.

You can get them in the United States, and an estimated 4 million Americans are at this moment holding tickets for the next drawing, to be staged May 28–29.

How the tickets get to this country is a mystery about which President Sean T. O'Kelly's government isn't saying anything—nor have its predecessors uttered on this question since the lotteries began in 1930. But get here the tickets do; so much so that Americans are believed to buy from 75 to 85 percent of all Irish Sweeps tickets sold.

By the same token, Americans win about 75 percent of all the generous prizes awarded by the Sweeps.

Well, we love the Irish; but we love the Americans a bit more—and lovingly we wish they would have sense enough to set up a national lottery of their own, along the lines suggested by Representative PAUL A. FINO, Republican, of New York, and thereby raise billions in painless revenue per year, with painful taxes cut in proportion.

What a revenue raiser a national lottery would be is indicated by—

THE BINGO TAKE

In New York State, in the first year since charitable bingo games were legalized.

In that period, 1,357,199 persons played in 6,571 bingo contests. They paid $4,310,632, and collected prizes worth $2,861,547. Net profit to the operators—churches, veterans' groups, volunteer fire companies, and the like—was $1,016,527. The State collected $91,120 in license fees.

Most of these figures were racked up, it should be noted, before many of the larger communities—New York City included—had voted last November to have legal bingo under the local-option provision of the bingo law.

What the take will be each year from now on is anybody's guess, but it should be impressive.

And, to repeat, the bingo handle should be peanuts as compared with that of a national lottery.

However, if our national leaders don't want to set up a lottery as a system of painless taxation, they are hereby advised that plenty of—

PAINFUL TAXES

—are available which haven't yet been levied here.

Those we have are bad enough, but the rulers of prerevolutionary France were really geniuses in this field.

They taxed virtually everything in sight, both directly and indirectly, and they had some clever ways of collecting.

For example, there was a tax on salt. Everybody over age 7 had to buy 7 pounds of salt a year, whether he wanted that much or not. France's government was as zealous in enforcing these purchases as ours used to be in trying to enforce Federal prohibition.

You could use your 7 pounds of salt only at the table and in cooking. If you wanted to use salt for non-cooking purposes, you had to buy extra salt.

Further, the government did not collect the salt tax on its own. It farmed out the tax-collecting privilege to a private company, with full powers of enforcement—which naturally inspired the company to squeeze all the tax money it could out of the people.

Shortly before the French Revolution (began 1789), it is estimated that direct taxes were taking about 50 percent of the incomes of the middle class, workingmen and peasants, with indirect taxes grabbing another unknown percentage.

So if our politicos want to get really tough about taxation, they should study the methods and devices of the rulers of prerevolutionary France.

There is this catch, though: that taxes were largely to blame for the French Revolution and all the slaughter of big and little politicos that went with it.

Poison in Your Water—No. 84

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 26, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the Staten Island (N.Y.) Advance, of August 30, 1958, entitled "Creek Probe Finds Proof Of Pollution."

CREEK PROBE FINDS PROOF OF POLLUTION

Definite proof of pollution from sewage has been found in Oakwood Creek and efforts are continuing to track down the source and eliminate it, the health department reported yesterday.

All samples of the water taken in all branches of the creek 3 weeks ago, after laboratory tests, were found to contain human chloroforms, even though the samples were taken in dry weather, the department reported.

Additional samples were taken early this week immediately following a heavy rainfall and tests of these are expected to show an increase in the pollution, according to department.

Just how long it may take to track down the illegal sewage outlets believed responsible for the pollution, the department yesterday could not say.

The investigation, by a team of health department inspectors, was ordered after Public Works Commissioner Frederick H. Zurmuhlen advised the department and

Borough President Maniscalco that samples taken along the beach at Oakwood showed heavy pollution and led him to suspect that illegal discharges into the creek were responsible for this.

Zurmuhlen pointed out that samples of the effluent from the city's new treatment plant near the mouth of Oakwood Creek, showed no pollution, clear evidence that the plant was doing an effective job.

He pointed out that unless something were done to halt illegal discharge of sewage into the creek it could nullify the city's efforts to improve the bathing waters.

The health department said yesterday that results of latest tests of the creek waters should be available next week. If they continue to show heavy pollution, a survey will be made of creek banks in an effort to locate illegal sewage outlets. Owners of the property will then be directed to correct the conditions immediately under penalty of court summonses.

U.S. Expert Warns Defense System Needed Against Biologic Attacks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 14, 1959

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, an article written by Mr. Thomas R. Henry and appearing in the Kingston, Ontario, Whig Standard on April 28, 1959, entitled "U.S. Expert Warns Defense System Needed Against Biologic Attacks," has been called to my attention and I feel it will be of interest to the Congress. I take pleasure in having the article inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

U.S. EXPERT WARNS DEFENSE SYSTEM NEEDED AGAINST BIOLOGIC ATTACKS

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Lord Jeffrey Amherst, an 18th-century British soldier, once had the brilliant idea of taking clothes from victims of smallpox, putting them on Indian prisoners of war—and then releasing them. The idea was that POW's would spread an epidemic among the tribes. Today, biological warfare is more refined and more effective. One of the outstanding scientists in the field explains the latest developments in the following article.)

(By Thomas R. Henry, science editor, North American Newspaper Alliance)

FORT DETRICK, MD.—A top expert in biological warfare says that Canada and the United States must improve and expand their warning system against disease-causing agents if we are to be prepared against attack.

Dr. LeRoy D. Fothergill, scientific adviser to the commanding officer of the U.S. Army's biological warfare laboratories here, said in an exclusive interview:

"It is important to maintain an adequate epidemiological intelligence service and warning network. An unusual occurrence of disease in a particular location may be the first warning of an attack. It also is important to have available an organized network of laboratories having qualifications for recognition and identification of unusual agents, particularly in the virus field."

Dr. Fothergill, who in the past has been director of the laboratories here, outlined the entire field of biological warfare in the course of the interview, which follows:

Question: "Which disease organisms would an enemy be most likely to use should biological warfare be attempted?"

Answer: "Obviously, the enemy would use agents which are believed to be highly infectious. Among these are agents causing 'Q fever' (which causes lung damage), tularemia (rabbit fever), brucellosis (undulant fever), and glanders (which causes hardening of glands in the lower jaw and ulceration of mucous membranes in the nose).

"Recently there have been reported results of exposing human volunteers to aerosols of the causative agent of Q fever. The minimum infective dose with a billionth of a gram of embryonated egg material containing the agent.

"In other words, there are 1 billion effective doses in a gram. But having given this figure one must emphasize that there is no conceivable way of realizing this potential. This would imply that each individual gets an exact dose without any wastage. It would mean that every cubic centimeter of infected air would be inhaled, and then only in an amount required to infect. Nevertheless the potency of such agents is enormous."

Question: "How would clouds of disease agents be delivered?"

Answer: "It would be no more difficult to deliver such devices than an atomic bomb. The same vehicles—airplanes, submarines or guided missiles—would be usable.

"Biological agents, moreover, are very suitable for delivery through enemy sabotage. One can let one's imagination run wild in this regard. Air-conditioning and ventilating systems of large buildings are obvious targets.

"Also, Canada and the United States are rapidly becoming nations that use processed, precooked and even predigested foods. This is an enormous industry that is subject to sabotage.

"One must include the preparation of soft drinks and the processing of milk and milk products. And, finally, huge industries are involved also in the production of biologicals, drugs and cosmetics which are liable to this kind of attack."

Question: "Does biological warfare have further potentialities than those of causing human sickness?"

Answer: "Biological warfare may find its greatest effectiveness when used for anticrop and anti-animal purposes. It could play a decisive role in any war that was not decided with pushbutton speed. This continent is in anticrop warfare. Our crops are very diversified and biological agents are specific only for particular crops. Those countries that are generally dependent on a single crop are the most vulnerable."

Question: "What defenses are possible, or contemplated?"

Answer: "There is a vast amount of medical knowledge in existence which can be useful. We have had long medical and epidemiological experience with infectious disease. Sanitary engineering practices and methods for disease control are at a high level of efficiency.

"But we must not be lulled into thinking that biological warfare would be rendered ineffective by these aids. Military exploitation of massive amounts of high infectious agents through unusual portals of entry creates new problems for which these procedures were not designed.

"Critical in defense is detection or early warning. Biological clouds have no characteristics detectable by the senses. They are invisible, odorless, tasteless.

"One might suggest that any laboratory conducting research to improve and speed up identification of disease-producing organisms will be making a significant contribution to the defense effort.

"One of the most important of all defensive procedures is active immunization. A number of effective immunizing materials already are available for some infectious diseases. But there are some against which there is no known method of immunization.

"The most effective results could be produced by an enemy introducing a highly infective disease into a population, one that could be expected to spread rapidly from person to person. For example, it has been said that a major setback for both allies and German armies in the First World War was the outbreak of the 1918 influenza epidemic. I never have heard the suggestion that this was introduced deliberately by either side, but with present techniques it might have been."

Question. "What progress has been achieved to date in the United States?"

Answer. "Many aerobiological instruments and techniques have been developed to a remarkable state of technical perfection. We are able, for example, to produce regularly an aerosol (cloud of disease agents) such that each liter of air contains one pasteurella tularensis organism (the agent responsible for tularemia or rabbit fever) and to give each of a series of primates a dose of 10 to 25 such organisms.

"The importance of particle size in such aerosols has been thoroughly demonstrated. The natural anatomical and physiological defense features of the upper respiratory tract, such as the turbinates of the nose and the cilia of the trachea and larger bronchi, are capable of impinging out the larger particles to which we are ordinarily exposed in our daily existence.

"Very small particles, however, in a size range of one to four microns (a micron is roughly a thirty-millionth of an inch) are capable of passing these barriers and entering the avealar bed of the lungs. This area is highly susceptible to infection. Entrance and retention of infectious particles amount almost to an intratissue inoculation.

"Extensive studies have been conducted, both at our laboratories and elsewhere, with the spores of anthrax, one of the most deadly of the diseases to which man is subject. These showed that there is a very definite relationship between particle size and infectious dose. When animals were exposed to particles in the one-micron size range and compared to those exposed to those 12 microns in size, it was found that in the latter case the required dose was 17 times as large as in the former. An even more striking relationship between size of infectiousness has been found for the microorganisms responsible for several other diseases."

Guff in the Appendix

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 26, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, on page A4117 in the Appendix of the RECORD my friend and distinguished colleague from Iowa, Mr. WOLF, included an article by William Bohn, editor of the New Leader, who undertook to raise an ironic eyebrow about certain insertions in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

An April 27, 1959, editorial in my hometown paper, the Eugene Register-Guard, went a little further in an editorial entitled "Too Much Guff." Under a previous consent, I am appending the text of this editorial and the text of a letter I

wrote in response which was printed May 21, 1959:

[From the Eugene (Oreg.) Register-Guard, Apr. 27, 1959]

TOO MUCH GUFF

This day, which is not so different from other days, there arrived on the desk four excerpts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—two of them quoting, with apparent approval, from these columns.

We're flattered, of course, to be picked up by any of our contemporaries, including the RECORD. But we'd be more flattered if we felt at the same time that we'd be read. However, a flip through the RECORD indicates that all sorts of people and papers are quoted at great length, less for the historical record or for the edification of Congressmen than for the vanity of the folks at home.

What the daily cost of printing the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is we do not know. But whatever it is, it's too high.

The verbatim account of the proceedings of Congress should be printed, of course. But the extensions of remarks allowed Congressmen, wherein they write into the RECORD all sorts of guff not uttered on the floor, is largely a waste of time. So are the long harangues (including editorials) inserted for the purposes of buttering up constituents.

An opening of the RECORD at a random spot (p. 5284) shows six columns devoted to reprinting a speech made by Senator Mike MANSFIELD in New York. On the next page his colleague, Senator MURRAY, puts in nine columns of speech delivered someplace by Elmo Roper.

On page A3062 Senator JOHN CARROLL, of Colorado, uses nine columns for the reprinting of a speech by his good friend Senator HUMPHREY, which speech was made elsewhere than in Congress. This polemic is followed by seven columns of small type inserted by Senator HUMPHREY. It is a speech delivered by Representative JOHN BRADEMAS, of Indiana, at the University of Indiana.

The polite word for all this is backscratching.

The RECORD for April 15 happens to run from page 5253 to 5438. The pages of the Appendix, where the most flagrant stuffing occurs, is numbered on that day from page A3059 to A3121.

By our horseback guess, the 247 pages of zephyr, chinook, and typhoon contain 395,200 words. A busy Congressman who wants to read the RECORD thus can read it in a 14-hour day (no time out for coffee or lunch) if he reads at a rate of 500 words a minute.

Somehow, it hardly seems worth it.

MAY 13, 1959.

EDITOR, REGISTER GUARD, *Eugene, Oreg.*

DEAR SIR: Let's talk about guff. Certainly editorial writers and politicians can qualify as experts on guff. You write (April 27, 1959) that there is too much guff in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. You say that much appearing there is simply for the vanity of the folks at home, and not for the historical record or for the edification of Congressmen.

You are right.

You say a polite word for a lot of the material is backscratching.

You are right again.

You speak of flagrant stuffing. You figured out that a busy Congressman could read the RECORD for April 15 if he read continuously for 14 hours at the rate of 500 words a minute.

Now, before I defend the guff and backscratching, let's talk about the Eugene Register-Guard, my favorite newspaper. Who reads all of it? Nobody. Who reads most of it? Very few. How much guff and backscratching does it contain? Plenty.

"Extraneous materials" (our parliamentary phrase for what we add to our "remarks" in the RECORD) are not meant to be read by every Member of Congress or by every subscriber to the RECORD, any more than your classified ads or social notes, for example, to more than a fraction of your readers.

Perhaps you will want to argue that the Register-Guard is a business enterprise. It pays its own way—plus part of the taxes which go to pay for the guff in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. My answer to that is that our business here on Capitol Hill is government, which includes not only the promotion of policies to help the general welfare to preserve our freedoms and to defend our country, but to create and maintain confidence by the people in the men and women who make and execute these policies both in and out of government.

Congressional courtesy, or backscratching, may seem sometimes to be overdone but without it we couldn't function as an effective legislative body. As for our concern with the vanity of the folks at home, well, why not? They sent us here. One of the most important jobs of a Member, in my opinion, is to make it clear to his constituents that he is available to help them.

This job has dignity and power. It should have, considering the great responsibilities of the office and the real glory of our system of representative democracy. As the U.S. Representative for some 460,000 people I can do much for economic conditions in the Fourth District of Oregon and the Nation, much for our precious heritage of individual freedoms, and much for peace in the world.

But if I don't make it clear to the men and women who sent me here that I am their readily available representative (small "r") back here in Washington I can't do any of those jobs as I should. I won't have the information I need. I won't be giving them the confidence they need to fell that the Federal Government is in fact responsive to their opinions and needs.

One of the ways we Members of Congress make this clear is through insertions in the RECORD. If we abuse our rights in this or any other respect, the next election is never very far away. One man's backscratching is another man's encouragement. One man's guff is another man's mead.

Sincerely,

CHARLES O. PORTER,
Member of Congress.

You Can Never Tell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD G. WOLF
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 26, 1959

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert a recent column by George E. Sokolsky appearing in the Washington Post of May 25, 1959. The RECORD has previously carried my comments on the so-called mystery of the Soviet lunik or mechta. Following the publication of a story entitled "The Big Red Lie," by Lloyd Mallan, the House Science and Astronautics Committee held hearings on the problems of measuring the rate of Soviet scientific progress. Mr. Mallan was one of a number of witnesses who appeared. His views that the Soviet Union poses no threat in the ICBM field, and has perpetrated a gigantic hoax with their lunar rocket was in sharp contrast to the testimony of better known and official witnesses. Mr. Sokolsky's article, which appears below, discusses some of these contradictory aspects of the Mallan views and the background of the witness. The article is as follows:

YOU NEVER CAN TELL

(By George E. Sokolsky)

It is not unusual for an able newspaperman to get a scoop, as it is called. Sometimes, it is accidental; sometimes it is due to superior ability. What Lloyd Mallan did in Soviet Russia is not altogether a scoop; it is a statement contradicting all authenticized data on Soviet Russia's production of missiles.

In a brochure issued by Mallan's publisher, there are photographs showing the American writer interviewing Soviet scientists with a recording machine on the table. The brochure says:

"This qualified observer, after 14,000 miles behind the Iron Curtain says:

"'1. The Soviet Union's first manmade planet, Lunik, does not exist and never did.

"'2. The Russians do not have any ICBMs, the long-distance terror missile with which Khrushchev has threatened this country.'"

Carl Ruff Associates, a publicity firm, says in a release:

"'The Red air force is said to be a mighty, almost invincible war machine,' Millan states. 'Its striking power is called at least equal to our own Strategic Air Command, if not greater. It is supposed to include countless squadrons of intercontinental, nuclear-armed jet bombers, deadly ground-to-air and air-to-air missiles, supersonic interceptors that form a virtually unbreakable defense wall around the Russian homeland.

"'This is a lie.'"

According to the Associated Press:

"Mallan's stand has been strongly challenged by both U.S. space scientists and military officials. They contend that all available evidence tends to back up Soviet accounts that the Russians succeded in firing Lunik all the way to the sun."

It is startling that Mallan alone, of all reporters, including science writers, intelligence officers, government officials, should have had the opportunity of interviewing the principal Soviet scientists, with a recording machine on the table. It is startling that these scientists were permitted, in a police state, to disclose to him military secrets which completely contradict the published statements of the Russian Government.

To check on these amazing statements, which, if correct, deserve at least a Pulitzer Prize, I made inquiries as to whether Lloyd Mallan is a member of the National Association of Science Writers, which is the journalistic organization of his specialty. I find that, according to the records as of February, 1959, he is not a member of this organization.

The only record of a Lloyd Mallan I could find was one born in Pittsburgh on June 27, 1914. His father, Abraham Mallan, was born in Russia; his mother, Etta Sable Mallan, in Titusville, Pa. In 1937, Lloyd Mallan went to Spain where he was a radio communications officer in the Abraham Lincoln Brigade, the Communist revolutionary force, in which he served from August 1937 to April 1938. He subsequently served in the U.S. State Department in the book and magazine section in 1951. He has been employed by the Toledo Blade and the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette and writes for True magazine.

This is about all there is to Lloyd Mallan's biography and his preparation for contest-

ing the judgment of Dr. William H. Pickering of the Jet-Propulsion Laboratory in Pasadena who, on January 8, 1959, announced that the Lunik was sending signals at short periods at 183 megacycles. The signals were observed to have two tones and that they came from a region west of the moon. On March 3, 1959, Dr. Pickering said definitely that the Russian announcement concerning the Lunik was reliable.

The question then arises as to who was hoaxed, the Government of the United States, the American intelligence officers and newsmen stationed in Soviet Russia, the Jet-Propulsion Laboratory in Pasadena which records space movements, or Lloyd Mallan?

Frankly, I do not know the answer. If Mallan is right and everybody else wrong, why are we spending all our money to beat the Russians to the moon? If Mallan is wrong, what is his reason for saying:

"The Russians claim to have fired a rocket named Lunik past the moon in January. Last month, I stated that Lunik was a hoax. It never existed. Russian space technology simply isn't capable of pulling off any such feat."

No one in authority in the Government of the United States has thus far supported Mallan's statement. Are they all fooled, from President Eisenhower down? Is the CIA fooled? Is the Pentagon fooled? Is every newspaperman in Russia fooled? Or, has Lloyd Mallan been tranquilized?

Basic Cause of Inflation: Excessive Government Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. QUIE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 26, 1959

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, recently Mr. Anton Bertelson of Albert Lea, Minn., called to my attention an admirable statement concerning our economy. It was prepared by Mr. H. G. Frankel, of the Frankel Carbon & Ribbon Co., of Denver, Colo., and at this time, when the health of our economy is one of the great considerations of the Congress, the statement should be required reading:

We feel it is time for individual citizens, whether Democrat or Republican, to take more interest in the serious governmental problems facing us today.

We sincerely believe that certain truths are self-evident—regardless of political affiliations. We also believe in the basic intelligence and foresight of the great American middle class that has been the foundation and strength of our country from the beginning.

We feel that the time has come for all thinking people to consider what ultimately will be the end of the paths we are now following. Toward this end, in all humility we present this article.

The dollar has now plunged more than half way to zero. How long will it take to whittle away the rest of it?

If and when the dollar is whittled to zero, not only will all savings accounts, insurance and bonds, savings and pensions be wiped out, but far more important—we will have lost our American form of government.

We know today • • •

That the basic cause of inflation is excessive government spending—Federal, State, and city. The loss in value of the dollar (and hence the so-called increase in the cost of living) must be in direct proportion to the extent of government deficit financing.

That controls are not the answer and can no more stop the downward plunge of the dollar than they can stop the tides. Controls simply call for more controls and must ultimately end in regimentation and state socialism.

That in order to retain our individual liberties, we must accept individual responsibility.

That a welfare state which guarantees security from the cradle to the grave must necessarily be a regimented state. It must destroy individual liberty and incentive, and it must ultimately result in state tyranny—whether we call it "fascism" or "socialism."

What good are further so-called social reforms—what good are temporary gains by certain favored pressure groups—what good are huge profits in the stock market—if we lose our Government in the process?

When the only solution our leaders offer us to correct a depression is more and more government spending, aren't we buying some temporary prosperity at the cost of future misery?

The danger is real—and the danger is here now. Isn't it time for the great middle class of America—Democrats and Republicans alike—to organize now in order to:

Get back to the basic principles upon which our Government was founded—less and not more government; individual rather than social responsibility.

Resist any further subsidies to pressure groups, and reduce present subsidies as soon as possible.

As defense expenditures increase, insist on more and more economies in nondefense expenditures; and insist that our representatives adopt in toto the economies recommended by the Hoover report.

And unless we exercise our right to vote out of office the squanderers, and unless we can stop now this mania for more and more government, and more and more spending, we feel that our American system of free enterprise and individual freedom must perish from the earth.

H. G. FRANKEL,
FRANKEL CARBON & RIBBON CO.
DENVER, COLO.

A Tribute to John Foster Dulles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLARD S. CURTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 26, 1959

Mr. CURTIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therein an editorial from the Levittown Times of May 25, 1959, of Levittown, Pa., wherein is expressed with great clarity the feeling of all of us regarding the late Secretary of State:

MR. DULLES VALIANT, DEDICATED PATRIOT

We cannot here and now write the verdict of history on John Foster Dulles as Secretary of State.

But in our own time, with only the short perspective of his final tragic illness, we can recognize him as a valiant, dedicated, selfless diplomatic soldier who may literally have given his life in the service of his country.

He was a soldier who did not serve in vain. He personally, as perhaps no other single Secretary of State in history, gave free men a rocklike defense against the aggressive force of totalitarian tyranny.

In his 6 crowded years as President Eisenhower's foreign affairs chief, Dulles traveled a fantastic 560,000 miles, visiting again and again every sensitive corner of the globe. He elevated face-to-face diplomacy to levels never before imagined.

The President gave him an amazingly free hand in setting the course of American policy. He was the boss of the State Department, and in effect he took it with him wherever he went.

Dulles believed that to assert the free world's strength effectively against encroaching communism it was necessary not only to hold a tight line but to take risks. By his own word, he did.

He was a tough negotiator, a fit adversary for the stubborn Russians and Red Chinese. He was willing to move to the edge of conflict to force his opponents to back down.

These tactics kept the Red tide in check. But they did not break the stalemate. And, in consequence of that, Dulles was assailed in some quarters as too rigid, too unimaginative to lead the free nations to a lasting peace, free of cold war tensions.

Some of the militant phrases he used, like "massive retaliation," were criticized as either provocative or empty of meaning.

Yet, the real meaning of Dulles was not what he said but what he did. Free men everywhere saw this the instant he was stricken and could no longer serve.

Many once skeptical Asians are glad today that Dulles held firm against Peiping when it pushed against the tiny but symbolic offshore Chinese islands of Quemoy and Matsu. They are coming to see the face of communism as he saw it.

The Europeans, who many times felt him inflexible in cold war dealings, were stunned when he was no longer there to stand firm. They were grateful for his sturdiness in Berlin, in the Lebanon-Jordan Middle East crisis, in the Trieste settlement that removed a sore spot for free Italy.

His 6 years at the core of trouble in one of the world's most troubled times were the crown of a life devoted to diplomacy and pointed toward the post of Secretary of State.

While 19 and still a junior at Princeton, Dulles went to his first world conference for Theodore Roosevelt. Diplomatic assignments came often thereafter. The greatest before the Eisenhower era was his brilliant supervising of the post-World War II Japanese Peace Treaty.

Historians will decide whether any man could have gone beyond holding the line and led us closer to lasting peace in this tense age. Whatever their judgment of this man, it will surely be said that he tried—tried to the limits of his ability and energy. The world honors him for his tireless efforts to keep free men free and make them secure.

Origin and History of Reserve Officers' Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. O. C. FISHER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 25, 1959

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, on May 4, 1959, I had the honor of addressing the Reserve Officers' Association of Washington at an annual banquet held at Bolling Field Officers Club on the subject

of the Reserve Officers Incentive Act. On that same program a very interesting and informative address was delivered by Hon. George H. Foster, colonel, U.S.A.R., retired, on the subject of the origin and history of the Reserve Officers' Corps. Mr. Foster, an ex-commissioner of the Court of Claims, is a prominent attorney and a recognized authority on the subject of his discussion. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include Mr. Foster's address. It follows:

It is always a pleasure to talk to Reserve officers. You are Air Force Reserves and I am not one and therefore cannot speak to you about your special branch of our defense forces. However, as one of the oldest Reserve officers, in point of service, at least, I would like to review, briefly, the origin and development of the Officers Reserve Corps. Having been a Reserve officer since 1917 and having served as an enlisted man in the National Guard for 6 years previously, I am able to recall much of the development of the Officers' Reserve Corps from firsthand information. During all of my adult life I have been connected with the Army. Now I am a retired colonel in the Reserve Corps, having reached the age of 60 in August 1951. I am also a retired Commissioner of the U.S. Court of Claims.

The Officers' Reserve Corps had its start in 1908 when, by the act of April 23, 1908, Congress established the Medical Reserve Corps. Previous to this the Army had contract surgeons and dentists who had no military status. When the Medical Reserve was created in 1908 the contract surgeons were commissioned in that Reserve. In the Medical Reserve the highest rank available was first lieutenant.

For some years previous to 1908 there was a Regular Army Reserve. This, however, was limited to enlisted men. They would be enlisted in the Regular Army for 7 years and after 3 or 4 years active they would be transferred to the Regular Army Reserve for the remainder of the enlisted period. This organization never amounted to much and it was abolished about 1916.

There was also authority commencing in 1903 for enlisting, after examination, qualified men, for use as officers in any volunteer Army later authorized in case of war. When needed they could be commissioned as such volunteers in grade up to major.

The real start of the present Officers' Reserve Corps was the National Defense Act of 1916. Section 37 of that act authorized the establishment of the Officers' Reserve Corps of the Regular Army. Such corps was, in the language of the act, "to have available for service, temporary officers in the Regular Army." The grade was not to exceed that of major, with a few exceptions. I do not know how many of the Officers' Reserve Corps served in World War I, but the number was relatively small. Most of the officers, other than Regular officers, were the product of the 90 day officer training schools. They were called national Army officers officially, but sometimes called 90-day wonders and sometimes Sears, Roebuck officers. However, the member of the Officers' Reserve Corps who did serve in World War I were actually a part of the Regular Army, but only technically so.

After the war was over in 1920 the National Defense Act was amended. Section 37 was amended to provide for a separate Officers' Reserve Corps. This was established as a component of the Army, or Army of the United States. The 1920 act provided that the Army of the United States should consist of three components: (1) The Regular Army; (2) the National Guard while in the service of the United States; (3) the organized Reserves, including the Officers' Reserve Corps and Enlisted Reserve Corps.

Both the 1916 act and the 1920 act provided that members of the Officers' Reserve Corps could not be retired or paid retirement pay. Even if disabled they were left to the mercy of the Veterans' Administration. Actually, this provision against retirement in the National Defense Act was not repealed until 1949, long after provision had been made for disability retirement and even retirement for age and length of service. This was clearly an oversight, and it has not had any effect adversely.

Because of the denial of disability retirement for those disabled in World War I, Congress in 1928 enacted a law known as the Emergency Officers' Retirement Act. The pressure for this was irresistable. There were many instances where two officers, one a Regular and the other a non-Regular, were similarly disabled, sometimes in the same engagement. The Regular got 75 percent of his pay for life and the non-Regular a much smaller pension. When this bill had passed both Houses of Congress it was vetoed by President Coolidge. However, the Congress passed the bill over the veto. Some 7,000 officers were placed on the retired list. The extent of the disability required for retirement was 30 percent.

In 1933 at the insistence of President Roosevelt a drastic change was made in this law. Not only was a 30 percent disability required but the disability had to have its origin in the character of the service. That is, it had to result from something incident to the service. As a result, the list of retirees was reduced from 7,000 to about 2,000. Some are still being carried on the emergency officers' retired list. These officers are listed in volume 1 of the U.S. Army Register under retirement Code K–4.

In the late thirties the need for a larger Army became evident. In August 1935, Congress passed an act, referred to as the Thomason Act, providing for calling to active duty for a year, not to exceed at one time, 1,000 Reserve second lieutenants. This was with the view of appointing them in the Regular Army if they became qualified. This act was amended in 1939 to permit 3,000 Air Corps officers and 300 staff officers. By this time the lack of disability retirement rights for such Reserves was realized and an act of April 3, 1939, provided that in case of disability these non-Regulars should be afforded the same pensions, compensation, retirement pay and hospital benefits as may be provided by law and regulation for officers of the same grade and length of service in the Regular Army. While this act was actually aimed at the Reserves on the extended active duty it was broad enough to encompass all the non-Regulars who were appointed during World War II. In fact, upward of 30,000 officers are now drawing retirement pay under the 1939 act.

RESERVES BETWEEN THE TWO WORLD WARS

Commencing about 1922 Congress began making appropriations for active duty training of Reserves. These were the 15 (later 14) days of summer training duty for Reserves. This was the only opportunity that Reserves then had to recoup the money they had to lay out for uniforms and equipment. He was not paid for this inactive training. Provision for inactive duty training was not made until 1948.

WORLD WAR II

During World War II practically all the Reserve officers then on the rolls, were called into service. By joint resolution of August 27, 1940, authority for 1 year's active duty was provided. When we entered the war after Pearl Harbor, the tour of duty was extended for the period of the war and 6 months thereafter. I do not know just how many Reserve officers served during the war but in 1939 Congress reported to the Senate that as of June 30, 1939, the officer corps of the Army consisted of 13,032 Regular officers, 14,455 National Guard officers, and 104,375 Reserve officers. Of these Reserve officers the War Department thought that 14,000 had had World War I service. That was a very large corps of retreads.

Of course, by far the largest number of officers in the Army during World War II was the group appointed under authority of a joint resolution of September 22, 1941. This act provided that such officers as were needed could be commissioned. That law provided that such persons be appointed in the Army of the United States, without components. That is, they were not Regulars, not National Guard, nor were they Reserve officers. They were in the Army but they did not belong to either of the components. Of course, for all practical purposes they were the same as Reserve officers, as the act provided that they should have the pay and allowances, and the rights and privileges of a Reserve officer.

POST WORLD WAR II

Having fought two wars with officers other than Regulars, and feeling it desirable that Reserves be fully trained, Congress in 1946 turned its attention to afford an inducement to Reserves to retain their active interest in military affairs. One way to do this was to reward such officers with long service a measure of compensation; namely a retirement right for age and service. The bill to provide this had a long and trying time in Congress. The House passed a bill in 1946 which did not get through the Senate. Retirement for Reserves was not popular with the Regular personnel and the Department of the Army, but it was finally passed on June 29, 1948. The position that the Department first took was that retirement should not be given unless the officer had had 15 years of active service. Of course in 1946 the chances of a Reserve serving on active duty for 15 years was remote. Personally, I had been in the Reserves since 1917 and served in both wars, yet I could muster only 8 years of service. President Eisenhower, as the Chief of Staff did a great deal to cause the Department to alter its views. I need not, I think do more than say that the 1948 act provided retirement based on at least 20 years of service, active and inactive, upon attaining the age of 60.

TENURE

From 1916 to 1952 appointments were for 5 years. In 1952 provision was made for indefinite duration of appointment.

So much for the general background.

Of more present interest is a short résumé of the present rights of Reserves.

As to disabled officers, their rights are in all particulars the same as Regulars.

The retirement law for Reserves is the same, granted service and age as the Regulars, in principle. The rate of retired pay is 2½ times years of service, with a very important difference. While the act is somewhat difficult to explain it can be simplified by treating all active service in full. Inactive service is counted at one-seventh. That is, each 7 years of inactive service counts as 1 year of active service. By adding to your active years one-seventh of your inactive years you get a constructive service which is multiplied by 2½ to give you the percentage of your active duty pay that will constitute your retired pay.

There is, however, another provision for retirement for Reserves.

Any Reserve who has had 20 years of active service either as an officer or an enlisted man, at least 10 of which is active commissioned service, can be retired without waiting to reach 60. The minimum pay for such

retirement is 50 percent of active duty pay, again 2½ times years of service.

In addition, Reserves retired under the basic Reserve Retirement Act who have had at least 8 years of active service, not counting training service, are entitled to hospitalization for themselves and dependents at hospitals of any of the armed services.

And last, but by no means unimportant, is the fact that the retired Reserve can work for the Government and receive full pay as a civilian and draw his full retirement pay. This is the one thing that you have over the Regulars.

Address by Hon. James C. Davis of Georgia, before the Alexandria, Va., Rotary Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 26, 1959

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, My good friend and colleague, the Honorable JAMES C. DAVIS of Georgia, was guest speaker for the Alexandria, Va., Rotary Club at a luncheon meeting today in my congressional district.

I was indeed fortunate in being able to obtain a copy of his speech, and as I am firmly convinced this message is of interest not only to the membership of this august body, but also to the entire citizenry of these United States, I am pleased and honored to be able to present it in its entirety to you:

SPEECH DELIVERED TO ALEXANDRIA ROTARY CLUB LUNCHEON MEETING, MAY 26, 1959

I appreciate very much the kind remarks of Mr. Marshall Beverley in his introduction. He is a staunch believer in the principle of States rights, and I have admired him for the fact that he recognizes the need for continued maintenance of our segregated school system. I appreciate the fact that he stands squarely in the open in favor of these principles.

I regard it as a privilege to be invited to address your splendid club. It has been my pleasure at home in Georgia to speak to the Rotary clubs in my congressional district from time to time. The membership of the Rotary clubs at home consists of some of our finest and most outstanding citizens. From my knowledge of Rotarians there, I know your club here in Alexandria is made up of high type and outstanding business and civic leaders.

I know you are seriously concerned with the grave issues which all of us face today, issues which require the best thought and effort not only of our officials, Federal, State, and local, but of each individual citizen. For in the final analysis no single one of us can shunt his responsibility for good government off onto the shoulders of his neighbor. Under our form of government, each citizen must bear an equal responsibility for good government. Just to the extent that I or you neglect that duty, just to that extent we may expect a failure in government.

One of the greatest domestic issues facing the American people today is the problem of preserving the rights of the individual States against ever-increasing Federal encroachment—the problem of States rights on the one hand against Federal domination and tyranny on the other.

The term "States rights" is but the American term for the principle of local self-government—a fundamental human right for which, over the centuries, those who love liberty have fought, struggled, and died. In the establishment of our American Government we recognized this right of self-government. We incorporated it in our written Constitution, and we gave it its American name of States rights.

The other principle relied upon by the founders was, of course, the principle of separation of powers—the creation of three coordinate branches of the Federal Government, legislative, executive, and judicial, each of which would be independent of the other.

Those who founded our Government, being realists, knew that the power of government would, on many occasions at least, fall into the hands of selfish men of boundless ambition. They knew that the idea of benevolent government, without checks is a delusion. They knew the utter fallacy of setting up a government without limitations in the reliance that good men would control it. In this respect Thomas Jefferson said:

"In the questions of power then, let no more be heard of confidence in man, but bind him down from mischief by the chains of the Constitution."

I think that Thomas Jefferson believed that the structure of our liberty rests upon the twin pillars of States' rights and separation of powers. So long as these pillars stand unimpaired, our liberties stand also. But if either of them be struck down, or slowly chipped away, then surely and inevitably our temple of liberty will come crashing down.

With almost prophetic vision that great Virginian Thomas Jefferson warned that the germ of dissolution of our Federal system lay in the Federal Judiciary. On that subject he said:

"Working like gravity by night and by day, gaining a little today and a little tomorrow, and advancing its noiseless step like a theif, over the field of jurisdiction, until all shall be usurped from the States, and the government of all be consolidated into one."

Although the Supreme Court had manifested the inclination throughout the years to expand its jurisdiction and influence, the basic principle of States' rights remained fundamentally intact, remained a sturdy support of the Constitutional liberties of the people throughout the years until about a quarter of a century ago. Until the 1930's our governmental system was still fundamentally based on States' rights, both in principle and in practice. This was so, not to the extent that many had desired, to be sure; not to the extent that the framers of the Constitution had recommended; but still to the extent that the vast majority of those vital economic, political, and social activities most closely affecting the lives of the people remained the subjects of State control and regulation, and were outside the province of the Federal Government.

In the last quarter century, however, we have seen assaults on States' rights at many points. We have seen the National Government in Washington expanded to its present swollen size, to the accompaniment of a steady elimination of the reserved powers of the States.

All three branches of the Federal Government have participated in this movement. The people of the United States, rendered fearful and timid by economic depression, acquiesced in it.

The Supreme Court resisted the trend until the 1930's; but in that era the Supreme Court's role became, and has been since, one of aggrandizing the Federal Government at the expense of the State.

Since that time the Federal Supreme Court has handed down a long string of decisions which have tied the hands of State courts, State Legislatures, and other State and local governmental agencies, rendering them powerless in many respects to oppose Communist infiltration and communistic activities. Among these decisions have been the Slochower case from New York, the Steve Nelson case from Pennsylvania, the Schware case from New Mexico, the Cole vs. Young from New York, the Watkins case from Illinois, the Passport cases, and many others. That Court also handicapped the courts and law enforcement officers in the Mallory case decision.

One of the many Supreme Court decisions affecting local government and States' rights was the school segregation decision in 1954. In the school cases the Supreme Court struck one of its hardest blows against the States and against the Constitution.

The people of Virginia are facing some vital decisions regarding the operation of your schools. The future of Virginia, and indeed the future of the South and of our country, will to a considerable extent be affected by the decisions you make and the action which the people of Virginia take this year and next year regarding the operation of your school system. Now I want to talk to you some today about the important question of segregation in the schools.

I was chairman of a subcommittee of Congress which made a detailed investigation of the integrated Washington school system in September and October 1956, 2 years after the schools were integrated in 1954. I am in position to know the facts about the Washington schools.

To the investigating committee in 1956, Dr. Carl Hansen, then assistant superintendent of schools, and now the superintendent of Washington schools made this statement: "I think that the integration program in this city has been a miracle of social adjustment."

That statement was in direct conflict with the overwhelming evidence about the chaotic conditions in the Washington schools which are driving out the white parents and children, and which have already made Washington a predominantly Negro city, a city in which the school population is 75 percent colored and the overall population is 53 percent colored. While Dr. Hansen was making that general statement, principals and teachers were giving specific testimony along these lines:

The principal of Eastern High School in Washington swore that he retired in 1955 as a result of ill health directly attributable to the conditions that developed in Eastern High School after the integration of the District schools; that fighting, including stabbings, went on continuously; that there were many sex problems; that colored boys began writing notes to the white girls, telling them their phone numbers and asking the girls for their numbers; that he heard colored boys making obscene remarks about a white girl passing in the hall; that white girls complained of being touched by colored boys in a suggestive manner when passing in the halls; that one white girl left school one afternoon and was surrounded by a group of colored boys and girls; that one of the colored boys put a knife at her back, marched her down an alley and backed her against a wall, and that while the group debated as to whether they should make her take her clothes off, she broke away and ran home. He testified that never in all of his experience had he observed such filthy and revolting habits in the lavatories. He testified that there were a dozen or more colored girls who became pregnant during his last year at Eastern High School, and that virtually all social activities were abandoned in that school after integration.

Here are just a few instances of typical testimony of principals and teachers:

The principal of Theodore Roosevelt High School testified to disorder in the classrooms, including fights, foul and obscene language, carrying knives, pregnacies, passing obscene notes, continual efforts on the part of colored boys to approach white girls, even up to the week of the testimony; 10th grade students reading at 4th-, 5th-, and 6th-grade levels, etc.

The principal of Davis Elementary School told the committee that the head of the NAACP Educational Committee in Washington had called her up and demanded that a Negro child who had been transferred to kindergarten from first grade be put back in the first grade. She said this Negro told her, "I will give you 3 days, and then you will hear from me again." She told the committee about pupils in the fifth grade reading on first-grade level.

The principal at McFarland Junior High School, a formerly all-white school, told the committee that school probably would get back to a segregated status. His prediction is rapidly coming to pass. He told the committee that disciplinary problems had a frustrating effect upon the teachers; that this had its effect upon the teaching of the students. He detailed these problems as being such things as stealing, boys feeling girls, disobedience in the classroom, carrying knives, and that sort of things. He said it was necessary to call the police about 50 times during the previous school year.

An elementary schoolteacher at the Emery School testified that teaching in the schools was very difficult after integration; that it affected her health to the extent that she was a nervous wreck.

A teacher in McKinley High School testified that the colored students required considerably more time than the white students, and that as a result the white students suffered educationally because he could not get to them to give them individual instruction. One teacher told of a white senior at McKinley High School attacked by a group of colored boys and beaten so severely that 13 stitches were required to be taken in his face; this was because he objected to an integrated prom at the school. The father of this boy brought him to the Capitol to exhibit his injuries to members of the committee. I saw these injuries myself, and got the story from the boy and his father. That formerly all-white school is now 92 percent colored and 8 percent white.

A teacher at Roosevelt High School, formerly all-white, testified to disciplinary problems, concealed weapons, pregnancies, fighting, lying, stealing, one Negro boy and a white girl writing love letters to each other, miserably low grades. She testified she went to see a doctor at the end of the school year who told her, "You are on the verge of a complete mental and physical breakdown."

These instances I have given you do not even begin to be all of the testimony about the deplorable and chaotic conditions in the District of Columbia schools after integration. They are merely typical of testimony given to the committee day after day. I have dwelt at some length on the undisputed testimony about conditions in the schools simply to point out that Dr. Hansen's statement, "I think that the integration program in this city has been a miracle of social adjustment," is as different from the actual facts presented as daylight is from darkness, and to point up his attitude that this forced system of integration in Washington must be portrayed, at all costs, as a miraculous success.

The plan of integration was so set up that it was so difficult as to be practically impossible for a white child to transfer out of an integrated school.

The only relief for a parent who could not afford to send his child to a private school was to move out of the city of Washington. This they proceeded to do in droves. This is most disturbing to all who are interested in the future of the Nation's Capital. On March 2 this year, the District of Columbia Board of Commissioners made the announcement that Negroes in Washington now constitute 53 percent of the total population. The school census taken in October 1958 showed that in Washington schools the colored pupils were 74.1 percent of the total and whites only 25.9 percent. In the last 5 years Washington has lost 123,000 white people, leaving the white population 387,000. In the same 5 years the Negro population increased 98,000 to a total of 438,000.

The notoriously radical newspaper, the Washington Post, has been one of the most ardent advocates beating the drums for race mixing throughout the years.

Even this notoriously radical newspaper, blinded by its bias, was prodded into a mournful editorial on March 4 this year entitled, "New Form of Segregation," and reluctantly agreed that the situation is bad, and that it is going to get worse.

The record shows that 62 percent of the teachers in the Washington schools now are colored with only 38 percent white.

There are 4,287 teachers in the school system, and of this number, 1,092 are on a temporary basis. The temporary teachers are those who cannot qualify for a permanent teacher's position. The school records in Washington show that the great majority of teachers now applying to the Washington school system for positions are of low ability. In 1958, of 216 teachers who applied, 52 passed the examination; in 1957, of 177 applicants, 40 passed, etc. In the elementary schools more than 30 percent of the teachers are temporary. In mathematics, more than 35 percent are temporary.

On May 3, 2 weeks ago, Dr. Carl Hansen, now Superintendent of the Washington schools, made a television appearance in Atlanta to speak in behalf of the Washington integrated school system. His expenses were paid by the Georgia Council on Human Relations, who also, he said, tendered him an extra $100 for working the appearance.

In his Atlanta program Dr. Hansen was asked the question, "What would you say has been the reception of the people in Washington to the new system?"

His answer to that was, "I think the vast majority of the people in Washington feel that this has been a good thing to do."

As to that statement, the facts speak for themselves. The mass exodus of white people from Washington since 1954 refutes that statement far better than anything I could say.

The facts are almost directly in opposition to the answers given by Dr. Hansen. At the committee hearings, teacher after teacher told us, not in generalities, but of specific instances of friction and trouble. They came before us for 9 days giving detailed information. In this 30-minute speech I cannot even make a good beginning toward giving you the information we received in the school investigation. However, I can send you the printed hearings consisting of 512 printed pages. I will be glad to do so on request, and you may read this testimony for yourself.

School conditions in Washington for white children and white parents are pathetic today. In some respects they are worse than they were in 1954 and 1956. Activities like this are going on: In February of this year a Negro teacher in an elementary school staged a play in the school in which two of the characters were husband and wife. This Negro teacher cast a little white girl in the role of the wife, and a Negro boy in the role of the husband. A few weeks ago a worried father told me that a Negro boy tried to kiss his daughter in the school; that she was able to fight him off, but he did succeed in kissing her girl companion.

One parent of a daughter in one of the Washington schools brought me valentines from a Negro boy to his daughter, and valentines from another Negro boy to another white girl in the same school.

In one of the schools a white girl married a Negro boy who previously attended the same school with her.

In Washington schools today there is being carried on a revolting, systematic, progressive, disgusting campaign of race amalgamation. The situation is not improved. These conditions will develop anywhere under the same circumstances.

The pregnancy situation in the junior and senior high schools is so acute that on the 6th day of May the District Congress of Parents and Teachers adopted a resolution calling for a special education program to insure continued schooling for the many pregnant students of the Washington school system. In that connection, the District of Columbia public health reports show that more than one out of every four Negroes born in Washington is an illegitimate child. This is the atmosphere and these are the conditions to which white boys and girls are subjected in the Washington integrated schools.

To bring the school situation up to date, on Wednesday, May 11, one member of the District of Columbia School Board proposed an ultimatum to require the temporary teachers—who make up about one-fourth of the teaching force—to qualify for certification or leave the system. He said he would rather have double-sized classes taught by qualified teachers than to retain incompetents. On the same day the proposal was also made to increase the compulsory school attendance age in the District from 16 years to 21 years. The reason given for that extraordinary proposal was that children who dropped out of high school at the age of 16 tend to drift into delinquency, often do not become self-supporting, and, more significantly, give birth to those who follow the same pattern of life. The situation, instead of being the "miracle of social adjustment" claimed by the Superintendent of Schools, is bad and is growing worse.

The school problem has reached the stage where the people of Virginia must soon determine whether they will permit the miserable conditions now prevailing in Washington to spill over into Virginia, whether this NAACP-sponsored plot will succeed to transfer control of the public schools system from the State to the Federal Government. I believe that the Virginians of today will make no decision which will stamp them as being unworthy descendents of their revered forebearers, Washington, Jefferson, Lee, Madison, Marshall, Henry, Randolph, Monroe, Mason, and other patriots of the Old Dominion, so proudly acclaimed by the Nation at large. I believe that we of this generation will no more accept oppression or dictatorship than they did.

In carrying on the battle to preserve the principle of States' rights, we are not fighting for any mere slogan. Local self-government is the guarantee of individual liberty, which is the highest aim of all government.

This principle which has come down to us through the ages rings as loudly in our ears as it ever did in theirs, that "resistance to tyranny is obedience to God."

Plato said many years ago that the penalty good men pay for indifference to public affairs is to be ruled by evil men. Edmund Burke said many generations later that all that is necessary for the triumph of evil is that good men do nothing.

The lessons of history are before us to read. Our fight is ahead of us, not behind us. If we do our part, with faith in Almighty God, we will win it.

Corn Has It Better Than You at 65

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. BOYLE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 26, 1959

Mr. BOYLE. Mr. Speaker, of constant concern to me is the welfare of our senior citizens, who today face the problem of "making-do" with inadequate benefits, in our run-away economy, after a lifetime of service as solid citizens.

In the 86th Congress, legislation must be enacted which will increase the amount of outside earnings permitted without deduction from benefits and provide insurance against the costs of hospitals, nursing homes, and surgical services for persons under the coverage of old-age and survivors insurance benefits.

In this worldwide clash of ideologies, the American people continue to hold firm to their belief in the supreme importance of the human person. One of the hallmarks of our present civilization is our devotion to that ideal and our efforts in effecting its accomplishment. Our Federal Social Security Act embraces that principle for the whole country and corresponding State laws reemphasize it within each and every political subdivision of our land. Disturbances in the economy, or any other events creating human deprivation, distress and want, which cannot be alleviated by individual effort, must consequently set into motion action by the Congress of the United States and the legislatures of the several States to assist our senior citizens.

The presence of over 14 million senior citizens and their ever-present problems will be a challenge through the coming years. With science prolonging the life of the American citizen a singular achievement has been wrought. It is incumbent upon us to find ways and means of solving this new and tender problem.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I want to include a very timely and well written article by Cclumnist Thomas Collins writing in the Chicago Daily News—who pointed up the problem under the title "Corn Has It Better Than You at 65":

CORN HAS IT BETTER THAN YOU AT 65?
(By Thomas Collins)

How come I have to retire at 65?

That's a stupid question. Everybody retires at 65.

But how come?

Because you are old.

That's what a 15-year-old daughter would tell her 40-year-old father. What is old?

Old is 65 years old.

Sixty-four and 11 months is not old?

No.

But 65 is old?

Yes.

Who says so?

Let's change the subject.

O.K. we'll talk about money. When they retire me at 65 my income will be cut from $600 a month to $150 a month. That is a fourth. Will my landlord cut my rent to a fourth of what it has been?

You're being difficult.

I am not. You and my landlord, and my grocer, and the phone company, and the clothing store are being difficult. Don't you think they should cut their prices down to one-fourth for me since my income has been cut one-fourth?

No.

Then how do I make it?

Get another job.

Now you're being stupid. I'm old. Remember? Nobody will give me a job.

Well, you should have saved some money for retirement.

Ha. That's the best joke yet. I saved in 1920, in 1930, in 1940, and in 1950. You should have been around, sonny. Those dollars came hard. And do you know what those dollars are worth now. Have you heard about inflation? That was a pretty dirty trick to play on people who are retiring in 1959, don't you think?

Let's change the subject.

OK, we'll talk about medical bills. Have you had arthritis lately? And what do you think about the price you pay to get it treated after 65?

That's a sensitive subject. It's Off Limits for Discussion.

What do you mean? Who says it's Off Limits?

All right. Cool it off and hand it back.

Very well. Since the business world says I can't work after 65, and since it will pay me only one-fourth of my income when it retires me, how come I can't get my arthritis cured for one-fourth the cost? And, by the way, have you seen how much medicine costs—if you can scrape up enough cash to pay the doctor to prescribe some?

What do you mean getting arthritis?

I'm old. Remember? I worked through World War I, World War II, the Korean War, the Depression, and Bath Tub Gin. I'm a people. And people get arthritis, hardening of the arteries, bugs, gray hair, false teeth and indigestion. Do you think I made a mistake in being a people?

No doubt about it. You should have been an ear of Iowa corn. Then America would have put you in a nice aluminum house, kept the bugs out of you, and paid a premium to preserve you.

Dick Neuberger Selects Oregon's Scenic Gems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 26, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, native or adopted sons and daughters of Oregon can vouch for the Oregon which has been described by my good friend and colleague Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER in the following article, "Make Mine Oregon." It appeared in the June 1959 issue of Pageant magazine.

A native of the State, a student of its beauties, and probably its most well-known author-politician, DICK NEUBERGER agreed to select his favorite five spots in Oregon for the magazine. It was a difficul assignment. How does one separate gem from gem?

But he took the plunge and I am happy to report that one is in the Fourth Congressional District—it is Ashland's Shakespearean Festival in the Rogue River Valley. A second jewel, Crater Lake National Park in the Cascade Range, adjoins the Fourth District.

I am glad I did not have to make the five selections. Oregon in this centennial year is more lovely than ever. It is beautiful.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I now include "Make Mine Oregon":

MAKE MINE OREGON
(By RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, U.S. Senator, Oregon)

One sultry day last June, my wife Maurine was at a swimming party in Washington, D.C., with nine other wives of U.S. Senators.

Pool-side conversation turned to the subject of each wife's home State. Maurine was amazed to find she was the only woman there who still had a house of her own in the State which had sent her husband to the Senate. The others confessed they rarely returned to their States, except perhaps during election years.

When Maurine—like a good Senate wife—reported her findings to me, we tried to figure it out. It didn't take long. Our home State is Oregon. Obviously, the rest of the Senate wives by the pool that afternoon came from States whose charms were pallid by contrast with Oregon's.

The evergreen forests and snowy peaks of Oregon have such a hold on us that we head westward the minute the Vice President's gavel falls on the closing Senate session. We never return to the Capital until the reading clerk is ready to intone the first rollcall of the new Congress. And we usually travel by train, so we can savor the thrill of rolling into Oregon through the great natural gateway of the Columbia Gorge.

Indeed, we understand well the sentiments of the young married couple, schoolteachers from New York City, who worked for a summer as lookouts in Oregon's Mount Hood National Forest. They lived in a crackerbox cabin on a lonely bowsprit of lava rock above a sea of fir trees. "It's downright breathtaking," they exclaimed. "And we even got paid for it. We had no idea our country contained a Shangri-La."

They were not the first or the most renowned to react so exuberantly. Six decades before, a mustached little Englishman avidly angled for Chinook salmon from the Clackamas River and exulted:

"I have lived. The American Continent," said Rudyard Kipling, "may now sink under the sea, for I have taken the best that it yields, and the best was neither dollars, love, nor real estate."

Oregon is one of the few States of the West where it was rare for a frontiersman to perish from hunger. Tales of cannibalism might come from California or Colorado, but in Oregon there was always a stream bursting with fish or a mountain swale dotted with elk. Waterfowl streaked the sky overhead. Oregon was breadbasket and lumberyard for California's gold rush.

The Columbia River is a symbol of Oregon's remarkable fecundity. Its salmon runs are worth $20 million annually. It has the proportions of the Rhine or St. Lawrence. In its swift reaches lie over 40 percent of our country's potential hydroelectric power. It frequently attains a depth of 300 feet and annually carries 180 million acre-feet of water to the sea. The surging Colorado, next principal river of the American West, has a runoff of only 18 million acre-feet.

Throughout western Oregon, evergreen trees flourish like weeds do everywhere else. They thrive in backyards, cling precariously to mountainsides. Trees grow so profusely in Oregon that the early settlers actually burned off virgin fir and pine so they could clear the land for potatoes. This wasteful practice was stopped in time to save for Oregon some 434 billion board feet of sawtimber, which makes it by far the country's leading lumber-producing State.

But these trees do more than support 70 percent of Oregon manufacturing payrolls. They safeguard the runoff of innumerable lakes and rivers; they furnish the snug home for big game, birds, and other wild creatures.

Across the street from our 45-year-old colonial-style residence in Portland are fir trees twice the height of our three-storied roof. More evergreens grow in Portland than in any other city of the world, even including those in Vienna, immortalized by Johann Strauss' lilting "Tales From the Vienna Woods."

A mere 1 percent of the national population—1,760,000—people inhabit Oregon, a realm more than twice the size of Pennsylvania. This means that elk, mule deer, pronghorned antelope and cougars have not yet been civilized out of existence in our State. People fish for smelt in the rushing Sandy River with wastebaskets, washtubs and stewpots. Shovels and rakes bring in a rich harvest of crab, clams and oysters from the sea.

Oregon's 167 State parks are the most numerous of any State, and why not? Around every bend in the road is a scene worth permanent protection. At Silver Creek Falls, a sheer cliff is embroidered with a varied series of lacy cataracts. At Ecola Park, timbered headlands of the Coast Range kneel spectacularly in the Pacific. Lewis and Clark, first of all westbound Americans, picked the name ecola, the Clatsop Indian word for "whale." My pulse always beats faster when I am camping or surf-bathing where our Nation's most important exploring party reached its goal.

Sometimes as I sit in my leather chair on the Senate floor, between Senators FRANK CHURCH, of Idaho, and ALBERT GORE, of Tennessee, I think of hand-hewn Timberline Lodge, notched into the great glacial face of Mount Hood, with its tempting choice between 3-mile ski runs and a steam-heated pool. My mind dwells in reverie on the meadows of clematis and bride's bonnet which dot the granite Wallowa Range, where gleaming little lakes are alive with trout.

I recall turbulent rides on the Rogue River in the boat which brings mail to the people of the wilderness, and I remember riding out of Hells Canyon across the frowing hump of Freezeout Saddle. Hells Canyon is 6,500 feet deep—deeper even than the Grand Canyon of the Colorado—and sometimes the comfortable Senate chair fades away and I am peering giddily down at the green Snake River, over a mile below.

Being a U.S. Senator from Oregon has its rewards. But the penalty is spending so much time 3,000 miles away from Oregon.

Oregon can spoil people for other places. Roses grow in abundance in Portland, the long, cool spring giving this loveliest of all flowers a special sheen and fragrance. If rodeos are your weakness, the annual Pendleton Round-Up is without peer. If flights of migratory waterfowl at sunset make you feel humble and nostalgic, the Malheur National Wildlife Refuge is in a class by itself.

If the Malheaur Refuge were in distant Africa, Americans might cross the Atlantic and the Mediterranean to be awed by it. The immense refuge, established by President Theodore Roosevelt as a wildlife sanctuary, is 100 miles long and 30 miles wide. One sees countless sandhill cranes, egrets, herons, pelicans, ducks and geese, swans, gulls, quail, sage hens, and loons. As a wayfarer walks along the dikes, small game starts up—deer, raccoons, beavers, porcupine, badgers, coyotes, antelope.

Oregon, less publicized than such States as California and Colorado, appears to my biased eyes to possess more grandeur than either Colorado lacks the ocean to offer contrast to its mountains. California, for all its magnificence, is searingly dry and arid. But Oregon lilts to murmuring water.

Oregon reflects intellect and ideas, too. Her people have taxed themselves sacrifically in order to develop one of the finest school systems in the Nation. During the Korean war, in Army aptitude and intelligence tests, GI's from Oregan had a higher proportion of successful grades than those from any other State except Minnesota. In the percentage of its adult population with less than 5 years of schooling, Oregon comes up with only 4.3 percent—the best record save for Iowa, with 3.9 percent.

Oregon is but 1 century old this year, yet its contributions to Government would be worthy of a State in the Union since colonial times. It was a precedent-breaking Oregon law which resulted in the original U.S. Supreme Court decision upholding a limitation on the number of hours which women could be worked in factories or laundries.

Oregon also was the first State to adopt the initiative and referendum. To this day, petitions are circulated on Oregon street corners and rural roads, as proposals are placed on the ballot through the collection of signatures. Some people have reduced signature collecting to a skilled pastime, although pretty girls generally have the highest skill of all. (And Oregon, where Jantzen bathing suits were originated, has breathtakingly pretty girls.) Some 26 other States have copied Oregon's initiative and referendum laws.

Furthermore, until Oregon demonstrated that there was a better way to do it, all U.S. Senators were appointed by State legislatures. Land companies, timber barons, and railroads bought and sold Senate seats like baubles. Finally, in Oregon, a brilliant reformer named William S. U'Rren initiated a movement which developed over the years until, in 1906, Oregon became the first State ever to elect a U.S. Senator by direct popular vote. The old appointment method was thoroughly discredited. The 17th amendment to the Federal Constitution followed, requiring Members of the Senate from every State to be chosen at the ballot box.

So plenty of original thinking has occurred in Oregon against the backdrop of limitless forests and glacial mountains. I always get a thrill when I enter a remote ranchhouse and find books from our well-stocked State library. Oregon citizens are assiduous readers of books, magazines, Government document and even the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Below the timbered ramparts of the Siskiyou Range, Southern Oregon College sponsors one of the Nation's finest Shakespearean festivals each August in an Elizabethan-style theater. Actors and actresses from as far as England participate. Tourists who have fished for salmon or steelhead trout by day sit under the stars at night for performances of "King Lear" or "Much Ado About Nothing."

Yet, in Oregon, man's handiwork will always seem secondary to the State's cosmic natural environment.

Look down into the blue cauldron of Crater Lake, the great National Park of our State. The icy water fills the volcanic hollow of Mount Mazama, which blew off its summit in prehistoric times. It is 2,000 feet from rim to water, and uncharted distances from there to the lake bottom. The ubiquitous evergreen, in the form of stately pines, stockades the lake's shore and the croutonlike islands. Lupines and heather ring the rocks.

No Oregon resident can stand on the brink of this mighty spectacle without immeasurable pride in a State which a generous Creator has tinted and touched so gloriously.

A Tribute to Carl Holderman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 26, 1959

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, a poet once describing man's way from life to death had this to say of it: "I shall not pass this way again." And so it has been from the beginning of time and man.

And, on Wednesday last a good friend, a great public servant and one who loved his fellow man, passed this way for the last time. And his passing has filled the hearts of many with sorrow.

Those who knew him most intimately, who had worked with him in the labor that was his love, the officers and executive board of the New Jersey State CIO Council, recorded their deep sorrow over "the passing of our brother and former president, Carl Holderman." In this manner Carl Holderman devoted his entire life to the service of all who must toil. Every workingman and woman, both from within and without the ranks of organized labor, has had his life enriched by the noble contributions made by this great leader of the New Jersey trade union movement. His achievements will forever constitute a monument to the goodness and greatness of this outstanding fighter for social, economic, and political justice.

The above is an eloquent and fitting tribute to any man. And by none could it have been more richly deserved than Carl Holderman.

It had been my privilege and pleasure during the past 14 years to have known Carl Holderman as a friend. Many times I was the beneficiary of his good counsel, unselfish assistance, and generous and kindly guidance. All of this was aimed in the direction of the general common good.

Mr. Holderman was appointed commissioner of labor and industry by Gov. Robert B. Meyner, in 1954. In assuming the post, he resigned as president of the New Jersey Council of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, a position he had held since 1945.

He had been identified with trade unionism in the State since 1919, when he was elected to a minor office in a local union. He believed strongly in labor's role in politics as a means of eradicating corrupt influence from governmental offices.

As an organizer for the CIO Political Action Committee, Carl Holderman often appeared before the State legisla-

ture to express his views on pending bills.

He left public school at 13 to work for the Erie Railroad as a messenger. After 2 years he was made a shop worker. Four years later he took a job in a textile mill.

Mr. Holderman worked in mills in Hornell and in Paterson and Union City, N.J., for 14 years and was a member of the American Federation of Labor's hosiery workers' union. In 1926 he became manager of the union's New York-New Jersey district and 2 years later became an international vice president.

In 1928, Mr. Holderman was named to the executive board of the New Jersey Federation of Labor. Three years later, he became business manager of a cooperative labor publishing house in Philadelphia.

He returned to the AFL in 1933 as an organizer of hosiery workers in Pennsylvania. Four years later Mr. Holderman was elected president of Labor's Non-Partisan League of New Jersey, an organization he help to found in 1936.

In 1937 he was regional director of the CIO Textile Workers Organizing Committee, which set out to unionize 1,250,000 employees in the industry under the guidance of John L. Lewis. In the same year, Mr. Holderman, worked toward the organization of a labor party in New Jersey among CIO and AFL unions.

In World War II he served on the War Labor Board and the Newark Labor Relations Board and Defense Council.

Holderman was above all else a man of character and integrity, and idealist and dedicated servant of the rank and file worker in his State and in the Nation. He was a foe of corruption and shady dealings in the trade union movement and in political life. He was a sophisticated and able operator in the fields of both politics and labor, but he never compromised with what he believed to be the ethical and wise position for a labor union or a political party.

Carl had great breadth of outlook; his interests and sympathies were wide and deep. Though his first and primary loyalties were to the working people of his State and to the administration of the legislation governing industrial relations and the social welfare of our society, he gave much thought to international questions and worked with various groups who feel that it is to the vital interest of the people of this country to seek ways and means of insuring the growth of democracy and free institutions everywhere.

Carl Holderman was a wonderful human being; warm, companionable and wise. His influence, his sagacity and his leadership will be greatly missed in New Jersey and throughout this country.

Carl Holderman shall not pass this way again—but I am sure that none will ever forget the good things he did while passing along the way.

Under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include the following editorial which appeared in the Newark Evening News of May 21:

CARL HOLDERMAN

The fiber required for survival as a labor organizer in the brickbat era of the 1920's carried Carl Holderman on to the presidency of the New Jersey CIO and then into the office of Commissioner of Labor and Industry. When some protested the Cabinet appointment on the ground he would favor labor over industry, he was the first to agree.

As the Governor's emissary to labor he handled the political requirements of that post capably, and a large share of his energy was directed to making his department serve working people of the State in the field of industrial safety and the like.

In Mr. Holderman's death, the Governor has lost an able cabinet officer, and New Jersey labor has lost a friend.

Hazleton (Pa.) Church Celebrating 112th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 26, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news article which appeared in the Hazleton Plain Speaker of Saturday, May 16, 1959:

The members of Grace United Church of Christ will celebrate the 112th anniversary of the founding of the congregation beginning on Sunday.

The special speaker for the occasion will be Dr. William Toth, chairman of the department of history at Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster, Pa. He will address the members and friends of the congregation at both services of worship at 8:30 a.m. and 10:45 a.m.

Dr. Toth studied at Franklin and Marshall College, the Seminary at Lancaster, the University of Budapest, and Yale University. Next year he will be on sabbatical leave from F & M and will travel, research, and lecture in various countries of Europe. Dr. Toth has written scholarly articles and several books in the field of history and religion. His last appearance in Hazleton was a few years ago when he spoke at the Reformation Day services sponsored by the Hazleton Ministerial Association. The title of his sermon at both services on Sunday will be "The Precious Possession of Christ—the Church."

The three choirs under the direction of Miss Chlora Fey will render special music for this occasion.

The annual "Love Gifts" from members of the church will be received at these services. Last year these gifts amounted to $1,800.

Last year the congregation gave total benevolences of $6,788 to the denominational apportionment, World Service, and other denomination causes, including some causes outside the denomination. Total congregational expenses were $17,596. Capital outlay for improvements to the church property amounted to $2,919.

Officers of the Consistory are as follows: President, William Y. Gebard, pastor; vice president, Robert Pensock; secretary, John F. Boettger; treasurer, Donald Reimold. Members of the official board are John Boettger, George Guscott, T. D. Kreiger, Landis Oberholtzer, William Toennes, Eugene Welsh, Irvin Hoppich, John Schafer, Charles Koch, Robert Pensock, John Schnorr, Paul Sell, and Clarence Shermer.

The general officers of the Sunday school are Mrs. Robert Pensock, superintendent; Thomas Burgess, secretary; Harold Benner, treasurer.

Executive heads of the departments of the school are Clarence Shermer, adults; John Benner, youth; Mrs. Ruth Siglin, juniors; Miss Hilda Wendel, primary; Mrs. Harry Howey, kindergarten; Mrs. Harry Schmauch, nursery; Mrs. Fred Walk, cradle roll. Mrs. T. D. Kreiger serves as president of the Women's Guild, Mrs. Conrad Klotz as head of the Mission Group, Robert Koch is president of the Youth Fellowship, Robert Knyrim supervises the Grace Dart League.

The congregation has entered men's and women's bowling teams in the Sunday School League, a team in the Sunday School Basketball League, and a team in the softball league sponsored by the Protestant churches of the area. The budget for the year 1959 approved by the official board and the congregation is $23,422.

The congregation has opened its facilities for work with Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, and Brownies. Competent leadership promotes the work of these community organizations every Tuesday, Wednesday, and Friday nights.

Many of the members of Grace Church serve the community in the following organizations: Junior Chamber of Commerce, Salvation Army, Y.M.C.A., Y.W.C.A., Pennsylvania National Education Association, Child Care Clinic, Community Chest, Hazleton Women's Club, Crippled Children's Association, State Hospital Auxiliary, Community Chorus, Hazleton Art League, and the Concert Association.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

What Should Be America's Role in World Politics?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. VANIK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 27, 1959

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following seminar addressed to the senior class of Akron University by Prof. Alfred J. Hotz, of the political science department of Western Reserve University in Cleveland, Ohio.

In this era of international tension it is particularly timely that all Americans be informed of the problems which face their Nation in the sphere of world politics.

WHAT SHOULD BE AMERICA'S ROLE IN WORLD POLITICS?

(By Dr. Alfred J. Holtz, senior seminar, general studies program, Akron University, Apr. 23, 1959)

What should be America's role in world politics in this mid-20th century? Stated in most simple terms, America's role should be to maintain peace, with honor. As President Eisenhower warned: "Such a peace cannot be achieved suddenly by force, by edict, or by treaty. It can only come slowly and tortuously. It will not be won by dark threats or glittering slogans. It will be born only of courage, knowledge, patience, leadership."

Is such a peace, with honor possible, or even probable, when we soberly analyze the issues and problems that divide the world today? In my measured judgment, such a peace, tenuous and tortuous, can be, and must be, maintained by-and-through American leadership. Yet, to accomplish this difficult objective will require a sound understanding of three massive realities: (1) the nature of the world problem; (2) the crucial issues that divide the present-day world; and (3) the possible and suggestive alternative policies to be pursued by the United States.

First, the nature of the world problem can be simply stated as the rivalry between the Communist-imperialist states and the western-democratic states, for the extension and expansion of their respective systems to the rest of the world. World politics has always, in past history, involved a basic struggle for power and influence over other national-sovereign states. Unhappily, in the past these ancient rivalries even as recent as World War II, have invariably ended in armed conflict.

So long as there are sovereign states, so long as there is no world government, with commensurate power, there will be, at best, a constant power struggle between those nation-states who have sufficient power (political, military, economic) to wage such a struggle for power; or, at worst, another war.

The power struggle is inevitable. Indeed, all politics, local, national, and international, is power politics. At the local, State, and National levels of politics, we, in the United States, appeal to our politicians to achieve worthy objectives. That is the reason that we have political parties, who periodically present the ovters with alternative policies and programs—i.e., at election time. The victorious "politician" after ascending to his position must employ power to achieve the results expected of him. Power, itself, is amoral—without morals. Power, even at the national level, can be used for legitimate objectives—internal order, economic security, justice for all, etc. Power, at the national level, can also be used for wrong objectives—and a government, or a politician, is then referred to as corrupt.

The essential fact that I wish to reiterate is: that all politics is power politics, for power is the capacity to produce results, or to achieve objectives. Thus, as George Kennan wrote: "Power does exist and is, indeed, a necessity of civilization, flowing from certain facts about human nature—certain imperfections if you will—that are basic and are not going to be corrected by any man-made device whether institutional or educational. These basic facts provide one of the main keys to the understanding of history."

Within the United States, as well as within the other liberal-democratic states, political power is constitutionalized and institutionalized. Yet, we must frankly admit that sometimes, even within our beloved Nation, there exist political, social, and economic evils.

Indeed, that is why our periodic elections provide the opportunity for interested citizens to change the guard, as the saying goes, whether in the White House, Congress, or other political institution. Thus, we should, as political realists, reaffirm the statement made by the distinguished theologian, Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr: "Man's capacity for justice makes democracy possible; but man's inclination to injustice makes democracy necessary."

When this concept of dualistic man is projected onto the international level, we see no constitutional restraints, nor common objectives. What we see instead is a bipolar power struggle between the Western democracies and the Communist imperialists. This power struggle cannot be eliminated by moralistic admonitions to do away with power politics, nor ameliorated by invocations that we should turn to international law.

For, international law is so fundamentally different from constitutional law within a nation-state (i.e., United States) that it should probably be called by a different name to avoid confusion. For real law can be effective only when two conditions prevail—a moral concensus within the world community, and adequate power of enforcement. Neither of these conditions for effective international law prevail at the present time, nor are either of these conditions likely to prevail in the foreseeable future.

As Secretary of State Dulles stated: "Treaty pledges, no matter how solemn, will never restrain powerful and ambitious rulers who do not accept the restraints of moral law and who are not responsible to the will of the people. As against such despots there must be other and further restraints. Thus, the struggle goes on. * * * Treaty declarations must be backed by a purpose that is ever sustained by an intelligence that is ever alert, and by power which is ever ready and able to punish aggressors so that aggression will not pay."

The nature of the problem is then: the inevitable struggle for power as waged between sovereign states, each of which is capable of defining and defending its national interests. The national interests are those vital interests, both ethical (moral) and material, which a nation will defend with its ultimate weapon. The national interest includes a nation's territorial integrity, political independence, and economic productivity.

No nation, however responsible, or peaceful, can long survive without the necessary power to sustain and defend its national interest. The basic power factors include the size and geographic position of the nation-state, its economic resources, industrial potential (both quantitative and qualitative), its political stability, its national morale, and its military establishment.

Military force, when supported by other power factors, may modify the behavior of potential aggressors. Clausewitz wrote: "War is the continuation of politics by other means." Good intentions, and high-sounding moral resolutions cannot preserve peace with honor. In brief, for any nation to survive (i.e., defend its legitimate national interests), and indeed to preserve its value system (the American way of life), it must be prepared to employ its military force. Therefore, the sole question is whether military force should (would be) utilized for aggressive-expansionist national objectives, or for restricted defensive objectives.

In the present bipolar world, the Communist-imperialist bloc has expanded its domain, as clearly evident in East Europe, in China, primarily by the use of military force. This military expansion has been contained thus far to some extent by American military power. Its political extension has been countered in Europe by the Western coalition, i.e., more specifically—the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). Communist expansion has been somewhat restrained in Asia by the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO); and by certain bilateral pacts, led by the United States.

More simply stated, the United States has attempted to forge coalitions of nations, thereby bringing to fruition the balance-of-power mechanism. Now, the balance-of-power system, in both domestic and international politics, is designed merely to prevent a particular power group from acquiring a monopoly of power. Even the best of alliance systems can never guarantee peace; though, if properly employed, a sound alliance system has, thus far, prevented any single state from achieving world empire.

The nature of the problem (i.e., the eternal struggle for power) has been compounded since the end of World War II, by the unceasing hostility of the Communist-imperialist bloc toward all non-Communist states. Whether or not we Americans accept or understand the Leninist declaration that war is inevitable between the Communist and Western systems, it is reasonably clear that Soviet-Red Chinese leadership acts on that premise. To be sure, Khrushchev, at the 20th Communist Party Congress, stated that war is not fatalistically inevitable. Yet, a closer analysis of Khrushchev's entire speech reveals that he was not asserting a self-denying ordinance to Soviet military force (against its use), but was, instead, assuming a passive military posture by the United States.

More recently, the Moscow declaration (November 16, 1957), with its clear denuncia-

tion of all that the West (United States) stands for, and with its brutal enunciation of Communist global objectives, was so blatant, and so ill-concealed, that even the Communist Tito was prompted to reject it, while Poland's Gomulka attempted to soften its import.

America's role in world politics is both great and grave—the more so, because liberal democracies are numerically in the minority in the mid-20th century world. Actually, and factually, true democratic nation-states are in the minority, whereas totalitarian dictatorships, along with authoritarian states, are in the majority. If the world balance of power is not to be tipped irrevocably against the United States (and our allies), we must remain united and strong. More specifically, that means that America and her allies must not merely pursue a policy of mere containment of the Communist empire; but that we must produce a policy of expansion of western ideals, ideas, and institutions—at least to that part of the world, frequently referred to as the "uncommitted world"—the Afro-Asian world.

Whether we know it, or not; whether we like it, or not, the western coalition, led by the United States, is engaged in a bitter, and crucial struggle for power and influence in the world, and is dramatically opposed by the Soviet-Red Chinese empire. More precisely, the present balance of power will not necessarily remain relatively favorable to our side, nor even tolerable for the West, unless American leadership commences real action policies on all fronts—that is, political, economic, military, and psychological.

Sir Oliver Franks, British Ambassador to the United States, declared, in 1955: "I believe that history has given us (the West) a period within which to work out our problems. The period began with the end of the Second World War, and it may last as long as the working lifetime of my generation. It will not be longer; it may be shorter. Within that period, no one year or the decisions made in it are likely to be in the strict sense crucial; neither this year (1955), nor the year thereafter. Within the period there is always time. But the whole period, whatever its duration may turn out to be, is crucial. What we do or fail to do in it will be decisive. After that there will be no second chance."

Those of us assembled here are living during this crucial period of decisions, and we are discussing today those grave determinations whose consequences may not afford us a second chance. Indeed, the very fact that Khrushchev feels powerful enough to raise the Berlin crisis again; and that the Kremlin launches blustering threats of nuclear warfare against such small peaceful nations as Switzerland, Denmark, Norway, and others, seriously suggests that the West, and particularly the United States, has not properly used the years since Ambassador Franks' clairvoyant warning, issued in 1955. Moreover, the very fact that Red China has felt powerful enough to act so brutally in Tibet, as evidenced recently, illustrates the power balance is shifting slowly and imperceptibly in favor of the Communist bloc.

Now, if I may move to my second major area for your consideration—i.e., the crucial issues that divide the bipolar world. Essentially, as I stated earlier, the major issue that divides the democratic (Western) coalition from the Communist bloc is which grouping will not only defend its national interests per se, but which bloc can extend its particular system to the uncommitted third bloc—i.e., the Afro-Asian world, which area holds the determination of the ultimate world balance of power.

This broad general issue (the present and future balance of power) may be delineated by a brief analysis of the separate-though-interlocked issues—i.e., the military issue, the economic issue, and the political issue.

The military issue is quite clear—the arms race. Actually, the United States, in the immediate post-War II period did its utmost to prevent the arms race—for we demobilized our huge World War II military machine, and offered to internationalize our atomic bomb production—i.e., the Baruch plan. But the Soviet Union refused to cooperate on both counts.

Indeed, Stalin employed a highly mobilized armed force to encourage the Greek civil war to impose the first Berlin blockade, and to unleash the Korean war. Soviet leadership, whether under Stalin, or presently Khrushchev, openly avows the famous Clousewitz dictum that war is a continuation of politics by other means.

A recent Soviet General Staff paper put this doctrine more bluntly when it stated: "The objective of (Soviet) military strategy is the creation by military means of those conditions under which politics (Soviet ideology) is in a position to achieve the aims it sets for itself."

Former Ambassador to Russia, George Kennan, said that "a major war with Russia within the next decade is likely unless the weapons race is halted and our relations (United States) with the Soviet Union improve."

The one hopeful note, in this otherwise dismal picture is that Soviet ideology, dynamic as it appears, does not necessarily prescribe the actual initiation of war by the Communist military machine. Indeed, thus far, at least, Soviet doctrine opposes the taking of inadmissable military risks—and in that sense is defenseive—i.e., the survival of the Soviet States. Yet, the Soviet ideology has as its major objective the expansion of Communist power by whatever means, including the employment of military force, if not counter-balanced by Western force.

More simply stated, the Soviet Union would prefer to achieve its objective of an expanding Communist Empire by not engaging in a general all-out war, but by employing a variety of military measures against the non-Communist world, none of which appear, at the moment, to be of sufficient gravity to call for the fullest measure of response by the West, particularly the United States.

The Berlin crisis, at present, openly perpetrated by Khrushchev, and perhaps perpetrated for some months ahead, unless the United States firmly undertakes to warn the Soviets that we shall take the calculated risk of war, is an example of Communist ambiguous aggression, rather than open military war by the Russians. However, Khrushchev presented the West with an ultimative note, answerable by May 27—and what the American position will be in these critical days of the future, I would not, at this moment, be prepared to predict. Yet, I sincerely trust that the United States will be prepared to defend, with military force, if necessary, our national interests,—which, in my measured judgment, include the defense of West Berlin at all costs.

The comparative quiet of direct Soviet military pressure in the early 1950's only came about after the American military response to Korea, with its subsequent buildup of our conventional and nuclear armed forces. Thus, we were compelled by military necessity to acknowledge that military force is an instrument of American policy in defense of our national interests.

A closer look at the present Soviet military establishment, and its component weapons system, suggests the future military problem to be confronted. Having maintained a 3-to-1 advantage in ground forces over those of the combined Western coalition, the Soviet Union has dramatically built up its atomic-hydrogen capabilities in an attempt to overtake the initial nuclear advantage held by the United States—an advantage, incidentally, which we have never applied directly in a military sense thus far.

While the United States today has a far larger number of nuclear weapons in its military arsenal than does the Soviet Union, all sound intelligence estimates agree that Russia has a sufficiency of nuclear weapons capable of devastating our industrial centers. Indeed, it is significant that the major difference, as between the United States and the Soviet Union, during the most recent nuclear tests has been the Soviet objective to produce larger bombs, of greater firepower, as contrasted to our objective of low-yield nuclear weapons for purposes of more sophisticated and selected warfare.

The major Soviet military weakness, thus far, has been the lack of long-range delivery systems designed to place the continental United States under direct attack, or at least under the threat of attack. Up to the present date, we have held a qualitative and quantitative advantage in piloted medium and long-range bombers. That military fact preserved heretofore the basic concept of a deterrent to any large-scale Soviet military venture against the free world periphery.

However, the American deterrent has been undoubtedly weakened by the Soviet comparative success in the missile field. Even the best and most objective Western military experts disagree on the exact progress of Soviet missile development. Yet, the concensus appears to be that with respect to short-range missiles (up to 700 miles), and with regard to intercontinental missiles (range up to 5,000 miles), the Russians are presently ahead of the United States.

The spectacular success of the Soviet sputniks, while perhaps originally exaggerated by both the Kremlin and by us, presents us with two major military conclusions. First, it is reasonably clear that the Soviet Union is attempting to leapfrog the American temporary advantage in piloted long-range bombers by intensifying their miltary technology in the missile field. Second, the Kremlin is expecting within the next few years to achieve a counterdeterrent by making more vulnerable to possible attack the United States proper.

Once having achieved such military sufficiency in ICBM's, the Soviet would nullify the prevailing military balance of power. Thus, while Soviet missile development is in one sense a defensive operation, its end result would be offensive. Behind a sturdy missile shield, the Soviet Union would again assert, as it has in the past, both direct and indirect military pressure all along the entire Eurasian periphery. Therefore, we should expect a return to a variety of forms of Communist military pressure—namely, military demonstrations such as the Red Chinese against Quemoy; the fomenting of proxy wars, such as in Korea; the creating of internal dissension through support of local Communists, as in Malaya or Burma; the encouraging of new military conflicts through Soviet arms deliveries, as exemplified to Nasser's Egypt, but presently to Iraq; and open threats against West Berlin.

Parenthetically, Soviet political tactics coincide with the above-mentioned military strategy and tactics. On the one hand, Soviet leaders proclaim their soothing logic of peaceful coexistence with the West—the so-called spirit of Geneva. On the other hand, the Kremlin launches blustering threats of nuclear warfare against such small peaceful nations as Switzerland, Denmark, Norway, and others. In both instances, the Soviet objective is designed to neutralize the Western will to resist Soviet expansion. Expressions of peaceful coexistence neutralize those well-meaning, but ill-informed, Westerners who have faith in Soviet good intentions. Threats of atomic warfare, or blackmail if you will, neutralize those who sincerely fear nuclear attack.

However, it should be added that Soviet military doctrine is fully prepared to utilize

nuclear weapons as part and parcel of Russian military pressure. Indeed, the Kremlin has kept a more balanced view on the horrors of atomic war than have we. A recent Soviet General Staff report declared: "It is entirely clear that atomic and hydrogen weapons alone, without the decisive operations of (Soviet) ground forces with their contemporary material, cannot decide the outcome of war." A balanced utilization of nuclear and conventional forces is reaffirmed in their statement that it will be "necessary to advance on the territory of other states, not in order to seize their territories, nor to suppress some people, but to destroy the barbarous imperialist robbers" (meaning the United States). Indeed recently, there came an official declaration from Red China that it was prepared to sacrifice 300 million Chinese in a new war. Incidentally, Red China has announced a 16 percent increase in its military budget for next year.

Now, to the final major problem to be analyzed—i.e., the American response to the Soviet military challenge. The answer, in my measured judgment should be obvious; yet, I feel that we have compounded our problem by a strange combination of philosophic tradition and psychological trauma.

Traditionally speaking, we Americans have held to the illusion that military force should not be an instrument of national policy. Part of this view was held due to our profession of ethical concern against the use of war, even though, as a Nation, the United States has engaged in war in defense of the national interest.

Part of our past views were due to fortuitous circumstance. That is to say, until World War II, the United States had reaped the benefits of an unearned military security because of the British Navy and the French Army. Today, the Western military balance of power must be assumed by the United States.

Our psychological trauma has resulted from the new awesome dimensions of the consequences of atomic war. Please don't misunderstand me when I say that if American leadership were to give vent to these fears and cringe from the military responsibility to be borne, even at the cost of atomic war, the Soviet Empire would expand to encircle the globe by virtue of our default. Thus, Khrushchev hopes that the United States will concede West Berlin to the expanding Communist empire by default through our retreat.

Moreover, the United States is constantly being pressured by the so-called neutralist nations, such as India, to reduce our military preparedness. Two things should be clear. First, India has protested less against the Soviet continued military build-up, including Soviet atomic testing, than against Western defense preparedness. This despite the fact that India's national security is presently being shielded by the military umbrella of American power.

Second, India, and the other neutralist states, made no great outcry against Soviet sputniks, whose military implications should have been obvious to all. Indeed, India proclaimed great praise for Soviet scientific technology, suggesting, in effect, the supremacy of the Soviet system over that of the West. Moreover, neutralist schizophrenia is further exemplified by the incessant criticism of Western materialism, supposedly because we do not grant due concern to spiritual and ethical aspects, yet no such criticism is directed against Soviet materialism. Thus, I do not think that the United States should take too seriously the neutralist view against military force, nor should we be deterred from building up the commensurate military establishment in an effort to maintain a tolerable balance of military power vis-a-vis the Communist empire.

The key point to remember in this grave military dilemma is that Americans must first create within themselves a proper attitude of mind, a firm will to resist, and to communicate this attitude with clarity and dispatch to the Communist leadership. For essentially, the military deterrent can only be effective if it is credible—in other words, if the enemy credits us with the military capability and the psychological will to employ our weapons system when and where required. Therefore, the present balance of terror is measured less by the uneasy equilibrium of military power per se, than by the political assessment of risks involved, an area of calculation in which the Soviets are superior to the Americans.

Paradoxically, the more successful we are in deterring the Soviets from a general war, the more likely we shall be confronted with the possibilities of ambiguous aggression, affecting a local balance of power, as in Berlin, or, as in the Middle East. Consequently, there will be the continued requirement to increase our military strength to achieve two military objectives: one, continued deterrence, and two, sophisticated-selected warfare.

Deterrence, to be effective in the future, will require a substantial development of the missile field, with greater dispersion of our launching sites, including atomic submarines loaded with the solid-fuel propellant, the Polaris. It will demand also a firmer understanding with our NATO allies, especially Great Britain, which for some strange reason is quaking in the wake of the crucial decision to hold West Berlin at all costs.

Sophisticated selected warfare to counter ambiguous aggression will require mobile aircraft of shorter range, capable of something less than atomic attack; combat-ready amphibious forces, backed by sturdy naval support, for purposes of both firepower and logistical support; and a highly trained ground force, backed by air elements necessary for tactical support.

In brief, our military policy should be to attempt to avoid a major conflagration, if possible, but to accept the risk and even necessity for involvement in minor conflicts, including Berlin, and to deal with these at the least practicable level of armed violence with a view to acceptance of temporary armed truces that promise no final settlement, but which at least grant us the time and the opportunity for political negotiations with our adversary. We should have the modesty to admit that it is not within our power to settle all, or even a substantial part, of the great issues that exacerbate the irrevocable conflicts between the Communist Empire and the Western World, and the patience to recognize that the unpretentious political settlements we may achieve in the future (i.e., Berlin) are momentary and temporary.

This leads me into a very brief discussion of the second grave issue—the political problem—and America's role in an attempt to resolve the deep-seated political-ideological conflict that divides the Communist world from the Western World, and thereby prescribes the present bipolar world. Frankly speaking, I see no way, as of this moment, whereby Americans, who firmly preach, and more resolutely practice, real political democracy, can ever merge with those Russians and Chinese, who devoted articulate, and devastatingly insist, that communism must embrace the entire world.

The political issue, then, is clear—i.e., which of the two political systems can offer the greater attractions to the third bloc—the Afro-Asian world. And here, I am reminded of one of the most expressive definitions that I have ever heard as to what is democracy. Interestingly enough, this definition of democracy came from one of my Asian graduate students, who was working on his master's degree at Western Reserve University. He said: "Democracy is not the color of one's skin, nor the slant of one's eyes; but it is the color of one's thinking and the slant of one's ideas."

Quite obviously, the United States requires new thinking and new ideas as to its role as world leader—though the basic principles of world politics are age-old. America must not miss this great challenge and opportunity; nor employ weak excuses, and run away from the awesome risks that lay in wake of Soviet constant pressure.

In my measured judgment, America's best political efforts should be directed toward encouraging the development of democratic institutions, and a liberal economic system in such Asian nations as India. For the great struggle for power and influence in Afro-Asia, as between the Communist empire and the free world, will be finally determined by the relative success of India versus Red China. India's emerging democratic institutions, buttressed by its new 5-year plan, aided by Western, and particularly American economic aid, must win in a battle for the mind and hearts of Asians against the fierce competition from Red China, with its monolithic dictatorship, buttressed by its forced labor under its new 5-year plan.

In the Middle East, Arabic nationalism must be encouraged by the vision and vigor of American leadership, which, in frank terms, means money and guns to those Arabic states that do not wish to fall to Communist subversion and infiltration (i.e., the kind of ambiguous aggression), as represented in Iraq.

But, more important still, is the obvious fact that the United States should not hesitate to direct support of all kinds to the modern State of Israel. Here is the one true democracy in all of the Middle East region—for Israel is a young nation, yet basd upon the pride of an ancient culture (the Hebrew faith in one God, and the Hebrew language). Israel has embraced modern self-determination, with dignity of freedom, pride of soil, and production (economic) through free enterprise, interspersed with some social ownership. Ambassador Abba Eban stated recently (April 16, 1959), in a speech in Cleveland, that modern Israel is a pioneer people, weaving a tapestry of a new civilization. Thus, the moral grandeur of these democratic Israeli serve as an exemplary lesson for all Afro-Arabic-Asian nations to follow, if they only will alert themselves to their opportunities.

Yet, we know full well that political democracy cannot long survive in economic chaos. Therefore, we as students of world politics, must address our attention to the third issue—the economic race that encompasses the bipolar struggle.

America's role in the economic power balance is very great. I firmly believe that, since World War II, the United States has initiated and implemented more fruitful economic plans for foreign aid and assistance than has the Soviet empire. Commencing with the postwar loans to Britain and France, the Marshall plan, the International Bank, and the present Mutual Security Act, America has advanced, during the period July 1, 1957–December 31, 1957, a total of $60 billions in grants and credits. During the year of 1958, roughly another $5 billion was granted to those nations who were attempting to develop their political institutions, and advance their peoples' socio-economic welfare; and, thereby, not fall prey to Communist overtures.

Briefly stated, West Europe received about $37.2 billion (economic aid $24.9 billion, and military $12.3 billion). Asia and the Pacific region received around $13.6 billion (economic aid $8.4 billion and military aid $5.2 billion) mostly to South Korea, Japan,

and Vietnam, nations directly pressured by the Soviet-Red Chinese empire. The Near East and Africa received from the United States a total of $7 billion (economic $4.1 billion, and military $2.9 billion). The American Republics around $1.7 billion (economic $1.4 billion, and military $3 billion). Since the Korean war, the largest proportion of our foreign aid, by necessity, had to be allocated for military aid, rather than economic improvements to advance the national interests of those Afro-Asian states, who desired of their own accord to remain out of the fierce embrace of the Communist empire.

Thus, the real economic issue should be: Will the present administration recognize that the Soviet-Red Chinese Empire, while maintaining its huge armaments race against the West, is presently also trying its utmost to enter the economic competition for the minds and hearts of the Afro-Asian world, previously monopolized by the United States?

Recently, Khrushchev frankly stated to a group of visiting American Congressman that the Soviet Union values foreign trade and economic aid "least for economic reasons and most for political purposes." Even without this Communist perversion of economic aid, as part of Soviet foreign policy, the United States should devote more of its energies to new ideas to aid the economic improvement of the Afro-Asian world, such ideas as a World Development Fund, or SUNFED (under the auspices of the United Nations).

America is rich in economic resources, though, of late, rather poor in new and fresh ideas in the realm of economic power, including its concomitant factor—science and technology. I see no earthly reason why the Eisenhower administration should not press forward a revived Marshall plan (i.e., call it a Herter plan) for Afro-Asia. I see no conceivable reason why, with forthright imagination and forceful leadership from the White House, such a reasonable and responsible economic plan cannot be sold to Congress and the American people.

Now, finally, and briefly, to alternative approaches to world peace—our third major area for analysis and discussion. In all candor, I see no practicable alternative to our immediate bipolar struggle against Communist imperialism than a coalition of liberal-democratic nations, with major emphasis upon maintaining a favorable world balance of power, (i.e., enlarged American support for NATO, SEATO, etc.)

There are those who propose the United Nations as an alternative to the coalition approach. There are some here (and several of your readings affirm) who insist that the alternative is the establishment of a world government. May I again declare, without equivocation, that those of you here who take this optimistic view, and those authors of the selected readings who write in this vein, are just plainly ignorant of the political facts of life, however sincere and dedicated you, or they, may be.

Please read the capsule form of my analysis of the United Nations, entitled "The U.N.: New Perspectives," published by the Church Peace Union. This small effort on my part is merely a summation of the larger work on the United Nations, presently in manuscript form, awaiting review and reappraisal by myself (the author), before it will be published by Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Moreover, I call to the defense of my major theses, relative to the possible effectiveness of the United Nations, such a distinguished statesman as former Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, who placed the United Nations in proper perspectiv when he wrote: "In a sense, we are standing with one foot in the world of our hopes for a future world order among nations, and the other foot in the world of power (struggle)."

In summation, may I reiterate that America's present short-range world problem is to prudently play the power struggle, maintaining by all the methods necessary, including the calculated risk of war, with the Communist expanding empire. Our long-range objective should be to plant young men and women, who with new and pragmatic ideas will not cringe from the awesome responsibility that is theirs to assume.

Thus, Akron University, both students and faculty, have a great challenge ahead, and a grave responsibility in the future. Each of you in this audience have an individual responsibility to assist and support our national leadership which sometimes stumbles and fumbles the ball, so to speak, because its human frailty, yet magnanimity of spirit, is clearly evident, as was true even of the Truman administration. Especially those here assembled, who will not enter directly into the American political arena (i.e., run for national political office) have a tremendous responsibility to learn, to think, to act within your purview and power as responsible citizens, whether you enter the business world, the teaching profession, or the world of art and culture. You cannot escape your responsibility, even though, I fear, many of you will attempt to escape the challenge ahead.

The United States must, in its own national interest continue to lead the free world, with all that that entails, including the risk of war, as, for example, in the present Berlin crisis.

DAV Services in Florida

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 27, 1959

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, an exceptional record of vital rehabilitation services freely extended to thousands of Florida citizens has recently come to my attention. These splendid humanitarian services are not sufficiently appreciated by those who have benefited thereby, directly and indirectly.

Among the several congressionally chartered veteran organizations, which have State departments and local chapters in Florida, is the Disabled American Veterans. The DAV is the only such organization composed exclusively of those Americans who have been either wounded, gassed, injured, or disabled by reason of active service in the Armed Forces of the United States, or of some country allied with it, during time of war. Formed in 1920, under the leadership of Judge Robert S. Marx; DAV legislative activities have benefited every compensated disabled veteran very substantially. Its present national commander is another judge, David B. Williams, of Concord, Mass. Its national adjutant is John E. Feighner, of Cincinnati, Ohio. Its national legislative director is Elmer N. Freudenberger, its national director of claims, Cicero F. Hogan, and its national director of employment relations, John W. Burris—all located at its national service headquarters at 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

DAV ORGANIZATION

Inasmuch as less than 10 percent of our country's war veterans are receiving monthly disability compensation payments for service-connected disabilities—some 2 million—the DAV can never aspire to become the largest of the several veteran organizations. Nevertheless, since shortly after its formation in 1920, the DAV national headquarters, located in Cincinnati, Ohio, has maintained the largest staff, of any veteran organization, of full-time trained national service officers, 138 of them, who are located in the 63 regional and 3 district offices of the U.S. Veterans' Administration, and in its central office in Washington, D.C. They have ready access to the official claim records of those claimants who have given them their powers of attorney. All of them being war-handicapped veterans themselves, these service officers are sympathetic and alert as to the problems of other less well-informed claimants.

The DAV maintains three VSO's in Florida—Mr. Albert Guerve, Mr. Robert Bregan, and Mr. Charles N. Girard located in the VA regional office, Post Office Box 1437, St. Petersburg. The VA hospitals coming under the jurisdiction of this office are: a 450-bed general medical hospital at Coral Gables, a 516-bed general medical hospital at Bay Pines, a 729-bed hospital—DOM—at Bay Pines and a 354-bed general medical hospital at Lake City.

NEW VETERANS' HOSPITALS

It is noteworthy, in discussing veterans' hospitals in Florida, that the Veterans' Administration approved and the President authorized the construction of some 814 additional general, medical, and surgical and neuropsychiatric beds during the last 2 years, 350 for Bay Pines, 350 for Coral Gables, and 114 for Lake City. A large share of the credit goes to the veterans organizations, including the DAV, that have fought for so many years for a recognition by the VA that Florida's veteran influx has been and will continue to mount so rapidly that it is essential new bed authorizations be made. Florida is a veteran impacted State and many of us in Congress have been fighting along with veterans' organizations in Florida to get the VA to realize this.

This improved hospital program for Florida includes the construction of a new 800-bed hospital at Coral Gables, an additional 500-bed hospital at Bay Pines, and the renovation of existing facilities at Lake City to accommodate 114 additional beds.

The department commander, Mr. Robert T. Kelly, 482 Perrine Avenue, Perrine, is chairman for the DAV's national convention to be held in the Hotel Danville, Miami, during the week beginning August 16, 1959. The department adjutant is Mr. Horace E. Johnson, Post Office Box 567, St. Petersburg, Fla. Mr. Miles H. Draper, First National Bank Building, Tampa, a long time friend of mine, is 1 of the 12 trustees of the DAV Service Foundation and was its president and chairman of its board of trustees from 1949 to 1957.

VETERANS' BENEFITS AND SERVICES

During the last fiscal year, the VA paid out $146,511,000 for its veteran program in Florida, including $46,778,453 disability compensation to its 53,356 service disabled veterans. These Federal expenditures in Florida furnish substantial purchasing power in all communities.

Only about 8 percent—4,440—are members of the 59 DAV chapters in Florida.

This 8 percent membership is strange, in view of the very outstanding record of personalized service activities and accomplishments of the DAV national service officer in behalf of Florida veterans and dependents during the last 10 fiscal years, as revealed by the following statistics:

Claimants contacted (estimate)	66,769
Claims folders reviewed	55,641
Appearances before rating boards	31,994
Compensation increases obtained	4,638
Service connections obtained	1,604
Nonservice pensions	1,411
Death benefits obtained	138
Total monetary benefits obtained	$3,551,662.46

These above figures do not include the accomplishments of other national service officers on duty in the central office of the Veterans' Administration, handling appeals and reviews, or in its three district offices, handling death and insurance cases. Over the last 10 years, they reported 83,611 claims handled in such district offices, resulting in monetary benefits of $20,850,335.32, and in the central office, they handled 58,282 reviews and appeals, resulting in monetary benefits of $5,337,389.05. Proportionate additional benefits were thereby obtained for Florida veterans, their dependents and their survivors.

These figures fail properly to paint the picture of the extent and value of the individualized advice, counsel, and assistance extended to all of the claimants who have contacted DAV service officers in person, by telephone, and by letter.

Pertinent advice was furnished to all disabled veterans—only about 10 percent of whom were DAV members—their dependents, and others, in response to their varied claims for service connection, disability compensation, medical treatment, hospitalization, prosthetic appliances, vocational training, insurance, death compensation or pension, VA guarantee loans for homes, farms, and businesses, and so forth. Helpful advice was also given as to counseling and placement into suitable useful employment—to utilize their remaining abilities—civil service examinations, appointments, retentions, retirement benefits and multifarious other problems.

FAIR TREATMENT FOR VETERAN ASKED

Every claim presents different problems. Too few Americans fully realize that governmental benefits are not automatically awarded to disabled veterans—not given on a silver platter. Frequently, because of lack of official records, death or disappearance of former buddies and associates, lapse of memory with the passage of time, lack of information and experience, proof of the legal service-connection of a disability becomes extremely difficult—too many times impossible. A claims and rating board can obviously not grant favorable action merely based on the opinions, impressions, or conclusions of persons who submit notarized affidavits. Specific, detailed, pertinent facts are essential.

The VA, which acts as judge and jury, cannot properly prosecute claims against itself. As the defendant, in effect, the U.S. Veterans' Administration must award the benefits provided under the laws administered by it, only under certain conditions.

A DAV national service officer can and does advise a claimant precisely why his claim may previously have been denied and then specifies what additional evidence is essential. The claimant must necessarily bear the burden of obtaining such fact-giving affidavit evidence. The experienced national service officer will, of course, advise him as to its possible improvement, before presenting same to the adjudication agency, in the light of all of the circumstances and facts, and of the pertiment laws, precedents, regulations and schedule of disability ratings. No DAV national service officer, I feel certain, ever uses his skill, except in behalf of worthy claimants, with justifiable claims.

The VA has denied more claims that it has allowed—because most claims are not properly prepared. It is very significant, as pointed out by the DAV acting national director of claims, Chester A. Cash, that a much higher percentage of those claims, which have been prepared and presented with the aid of a DAV national service officer, are eventually favorably acted upon, than is the case as to those claimants who have not given their powers of attorney to any such special advocate.

Another fact not generally known is that, under the overall review of claims inaugurated by the VA some 4 years ago, the disability conpensation payments of about 37,200 veterans have been discontinued, and reduced as to about 27,300 others at an aggregate loss to them of more than $28 million per year. About 2.6 percent of such discontinuances and reductions have probably occurred to disabled veterans in Florida with a consequent loss of about $738,000 per year. I have joined with the chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee in introducing legislation to make sure the disabled veteran gets a fair break in these review cases and in holding hearings on such cases in Florida recently.

Most of these unfortunate claimants were not represented by the DAV or by any other veteran organization. Judging by the past, such unfavorable adjudications will occur as to an additional equal number or more during the next 3 years, before such review is completed. I urge every disabled veteran in Florida to give his power of attorney to the national service officer of the DAV, or of some other veteran organization, or of the American Red Cross, just as a protective measure.

The average claimant who receives helpful advice probably does not realize the background of training and experience of a competent expert national service officer.

Measured by the DAV's overall costs of about $12,197,600 during a 10-year period, one would find that it was expended about $3.50 for each claim folder reviewed, or about $8.80 for each rating board appearance, or again, about $22.70 for each favorable award obtained, or about $123 for each service connection obtained, or about $54 for each compensation increased obtained, and has obtained about $14.10 of direct monetary benefits for claimants for each dollar expended by the DAV for its national service officer setup. Moreover, such benefits will generally continue for many years.

DAV SERVICES RENDERED

Evidently, most claimants are not aware of the fact that the DAV receives no Government subsidy whatsoever. The DAV is enabled to maintain its nationwide staff of expert national service officers primarily because of income from membership dues collected by its local chapters and from the net income on its Idento-Tag—miniature automobile license tags—project, owned by the DAV and operated by its employees, most of whom are disabled veterans, their wives, or their widows, or other handicapped Americans—a rehabilitation project in thus furnishing them with useful employment. Incidentally, without checking as to whether they had previously sent in a donation, more than 1,400,000 owners of sets of lost keys have received them back from the DAV's Idento-Tag department, 12,238 of whom, during the last 8 years, were Florida residents.

Every eligible veteran, by becoming a DAV member, and by explaining these factors to fellow citizens, can help the DAV to procure such much-needed public support as will enable it to maintain its invaluable nationwide service setup on a more adequate basis. So much more could be accomplished for distressed disabled veterans, if the DAV could be enabled, financially, to maintain an expert service officer in every one of the 173 VA hospitals.

During the last 10 years, the DAV has also relied on appropriations from its separately incorporated trustee, the DAV Service Foundation, aggregating $3,340,000, exclusively for salaries to its national service officers. Its reserves having been thus nearly exhausted, the DAV Service Foundation is therefore very much in need of the generous support of all serviced claimants, DAV members and other social-minded Americans—by direct donations, by designations in insurance policies, by bequests in wills, by assignments of stocks and bonds and by establishing special types of trust funds.

A special type of memorial trust fund originated about 3 years ago with concerned disabled veteran members of the DAV chapter in Butte, Mont., which established the first perpetual rehabilitation fund of $1,000 with the DAV Service Foundation. Recently it added another $100 thereto. Since then, every DAV

unit in that State has established such a special memorial trust fund, ranging from $100 to $1,100, equivalent to about $4 per DAV member.

As a DAV life member, I am pleased to enroll as one of the benefactors on the memorial honor roll of the DAV Service Foundation, with the realization that only the interest earnings therefrom will be available for appropriation to the DAV for its use in continuing to maintain its national service officer setup in my State of Florida.

Each claimant who has received any such rehabilitation service can help to make it possible for the DAV to continue such excellent rehabilitation services in Florida by sending in donations to the DAV Service Foundation, 631 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. Every such "serviced" claimant who is eligible can and should also become a DAV member, preferably a life member, for which the total fee is $100—$50 to those born before January 1, 1902, or World War I veterans—payable in installments within 2 full fiscal year periods.

Every American can help to make our Government more representative by being a supporting member of at least one organization which reflects his interests and viewpoints—labor unions, trade associations and various religious, fraternal, and civic associations. All of America's veterans ought to be members of one or more of the patriotic, service-giving veteran organizations. All of America's disabled defenders, who are receiving disability compensation, have greatly benefited by their own official voice—the DAV.

Do Refugees Have Names?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BYRON L. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 27, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I commend to the Members the very moving sermon preached last Sunday by Rev. James Clark Brown. It contains specific suggestions for ways in which individuals can help meet the refugee problem.

DO REFUGEES HAVE NAMES?

(Sermon by the Reverend James Clark Brown at Cleveland Park Congregational Church, Washington, D.C., May 24, 1959)

Our city has been host this past week to a distinguished group of some 200 American citizens. They came to Washington from every part of the United States for the purpose of attending what Vice President NIXON, in speaking to them, described as "one of the most important conferences to be held in this city for several years." They came in response to a special and urgent invitation from the President of the United States, who said to them: "I have asked you to come together to share with the Government your experience, your judgment, and your insight regarding the things which should be done and how best to do them."

The things to be done concern the tragic plight of several million human beings who, in such varied places as Greece, India, Morocco, Jordan, Hong Kong, and elsewhere, are holding on—not so much to life but—to existence midst all the hardship, hunger, loneliness, and heartbreak of being refugees. Among the millions of their number are the very young, the very aged, and those whose faces are older than their years. I wish that you and I knew, at least, some of their names. I wish that we knew them as persons, as friends, instead of simply numbers and statistics.

But, even statistically, anyone who is not completely calloused to human suffering will be humbled by the tragedy and enormity of their number. I am undistinguished but was among the delegates present at this White House conference concerned with the refugee. The Assistant Secretary of State, John W. Hanes, said that "according to the most reliable estimates"—and surely it is an absolutely minimal estimate—"there are presently about 2,350,000 unassimilated refugees who may be considered to need some form of international assistance."

Can we succeed in personalizing, humanizing such statistics? Mathematics was never my best subject but I have enreavored to work out what it would mean if each of these 2,350,000 persons were to take 2 minutes each, to tell us their names and to say what desolate camp or refugee center they are existing in. How long would you and I need to remain where we are if each of this number of refugees spoke to us for just 2 minutes? The answer is that we would remain here for more than 9 years listening to their story.

Even so, these figures do not include the 12 million East Germans who have found refuge in free Germany and who still are arriving at the incredible rate of 2,000 per week. It also does not include the 15 million persons in Pakistan and India who, though faced with hunger and homelessness, are nonetheless not technically regarded as refugees because they happen to be citizens of the country in which they are struggling to maintain their desperate existence.

You may be tempted, on hearing of such additional numbers of persons in circumstances of need, to respond: "The problem is so vast and depressing as to be unmanageable." Clearly, the problem of the refugee is a worldwide affliction for which there is no total or final cure. Nor will there ever be a total cure so long as tyranny and selfishness and pride is manifest in the policies of national governments. There is, however, much that can be done by persons like you and me and by government which will effectivly bring help and hope to millions of persons who are so desperately in need of both.

One of the things we can do is to become acquainted with some of the basic facts about the problems and needs of the refugee. Such facts may prevent us from being ignorant of the reality of human suffering and at the same time enable us to think more clearly and to act more intelligently in relieving their suffering.

Let us listen, then—not for 9 years but for 5 minutes—to some facts concerning the hungry, homeless persons who do have names. Persons who, if they could speak to us, might well begin by reminding us of our common humanity, saying in a paraphrase of the words which Shapespeare put in the speech of Shylock the Jew:

"I am a refugee. But does not a refugee have eyes? Does he not have senses, affections, passions, a name as dear to God as yours? Am I not fed with the same food, hurt with the same loneliness, warmed and cooled by the same winter and summer as you, who live comfortably, eat well, and sleep warmly? If you prick us, do we not bleed, if you tickle us, do we not laugh? If we do not have food to eat, do we not die? I am a refugee."

There are nearly 1 million Palestine-Arab refugees. They have been living since the Palestine war in 1948 in the Arab land bordering Israel, but the Arab countries have refused to accept responsibility for them as permanent residents and have continued to insist on their right to return to Israel. There is little likelihood that Israel, which in recent years has taken in a million refugees, will admit thousands of hostile Arabs. The United Nations maintains a relief and education program of some $30 million annually—an average of $30 assistance per person per year—but it has had to curtail part of its program for lack of funds.

In Hong Kong there are a million homeless persons. One of every three persons there is a refugee. Having fled from Red China some 700,000 persons live in abject poverty, forming squatter communities of hillside shacks patched together from old pieces of tin, plaited bamboo, and bits of wood. Tens of thousands sleep on top of buildings or in doorways or set up housekeeping beneath stairways. Tuberculosis and dysentery are commonplace in these surroundings and one-third of the children die of some form of tuberculosis. Much of the help that reaches the refugees comes from the United States, which sends $5 million annually in food alone from surplus stocks. Hopes for a solution to the problem lie mainly in expanding the economy, since there is no possibility of mass immigration either to Taiwan or southeast Asian countries. A total of $100 million would be necessary to cover the elementary needs of the poor, but it is recognized that there is little chance of obtaining this amount. The United Nations is involved in a special appeal on behalf of these refugees.

During the last few years 180,000 Algerians have fled their strife-torn homes and sought refuge in Morocco and Tunisia. Eighty-five percent of these were women and children. They have been living in desperate need. Most live in caves or gourbis, the native hut made of mud and cow dung with straw roofs. The refugees receive international aid from the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner and the International Red Cross, as well as direct assistance from other governments that is channeled through Tunisian authorities. A gift of 7,000 tons of U.S. wheat helped keep the refugees alive during the last 3 months. This has now been consumed and many of the refugees get less than 1,600 calories daily. There are no schools for refugee children, except those improvised by adult refugees.

There are 100,000 escapees from behind the Iron Curtain still in Europe. Some 35,000 of this group are in one of the 120 European refugee camps. The remainder, although living outside camps, in many cases live under conditions as bad or worse than those of the in-camp refugees. Of the 35,000 living in camps, 18,000 have spent at least 10 years there. Virtually all are refugees from Communist countries, but some older ones were among those taken from their homes in the days of Hitler's mass deportations. Dr. Lindt, the Swiss who serves as High Commissioner for the United Nations, regards the camp refugees as a top priority group for help. He is seeking an additional $3,500,000 for his clear-the-camps program. If available, funds would go for housing and to train the refugees for new jobs. Small business loans also would be granted to help them make a new start. Additional medical help and institutional care would be given to the aged and infirm.

The latest dramatic refugee-producing development is the brutal Chinese Communist subjugation of Tibet. The flight of the Dalai Lama and the savage fighting has resulted in the exile of at least 12,000 refugees into the border areas of northern India. American voluntary agencies have offered and are pro-

viding valuable assistance to those refugees, and the Indian authorities have been assured of American sympathy and readiness to provide further help as required.

These are some of the basic facts concerning only some of the more than 3 million of our fellow human beings. But for the grace of God, and geography, their circumstance might be yours or mine. Such facts are a solemn documentation of the words spoken by the late Justice Robert Jackson while presiding at the Nuremberg trials. He said: "It is common to speak of our time as standing at the apex of civilization. The reality is that in the long perspective of history the present century will not hold an admirable position. No half century has ever witnessed such slaughter on such a scale, such cruelties, such wholesale deportations, and annihilations of minorities. These are the overshadowing facts by which generations to come will remember these decades."

There is, however, more than indictment in Justice Jackson's words. There is a momentous challenge to you and me, to all of the free world whether we be humanitarians, Jews, or Christians. It is the challenge to prove that Justice Jackson's statement is not altogether accurate. For by our intelligent concern and compassionate action may we not yet write into the history of this century such deeds that shall justify our being remembered as those who responded to cruelty with compassion, to hunger with the glad giving of bread, to loneliness with companionship prompted by love? At least for myself, as a professing Christian, I cannot escape the clear word of my Lord: "Inasmuch as you minister unto the least of my brothers you do so unto me."

What then, positively, may we do? Our action must involve both governmental and citizen programs. Already the United Nations has begun to implement a resolution approved last December by 31 non-Communist governments who, in observing a World Refugee Year which will begin June 1, will promote study of, and provide additional opportunities for, assisting the refugee. President Eisenhower has issued a proclamation designating the year beginning July 1, 1959, for observance of the World Refugee Year in the United States.

In Congress, Representative WALTER introduced legislation last week (H.J. Res. 397) which may well be the basis of providing a national example to other governments for a more fair and equitable distribution of those refugees whose need and desire is to emigrate. Our State Department has announced a five-point program including a modest $4 million increase above its current expenditures in refugee assistance and a substantial increase of between $10 and $20 million in the distribution of food to refugees under the surplus agricultural commodity program. Some of us may regard such proposals as being insufficiently bold and imaginative, but it does represent an increase over current programs.

The opportunity for us as citizens to participate in refugee assistance is splendidly available in the establishment and activity of the United States Committee for Refugees, whose chairman is our distinguished and dynamic Christian neghbor, the Very Reverend Francis B. Sayre, dean of the Washington Cathedral.

I am hopeful that you may be so personally concerned and determined that we will, both as citizens and through our Government, resourcefully meet this challenge, that you will come up with what Victor Hugo is reported to have described as "the most powerful influence in the world, an idea whose time has come." Until I hear from you let me briefly suggest two or three ideas of my own:

1. I propose that every church and synagogue in our land incorporate into its budget during the World Refugee Year a generous amount of money which will enable the United States Committee for Refugees to use such moneys where it may effect the maximum benefit.

2. I propose that each church and synagogue, wherever possible, make arrangements through the World Refugee Year Office, United Nations, New York, or again through the United States Committee for Refugees (11 West 42d Street, New York), to sponsor some refugee or a personal project in his behalf, providing a loan for example, enabling a person whose name we know to learn a trade; or to allow a mother in Hong Kong whose name we would know, and that of her child, to receive adequate medical attention to arrest tubercular affliction.

3. I propose that we as citizens increasingly give our support to every endeavor of the United States Committee for Refugees, within Congress, and the White House, which would allow the words inscribed on the base of the Statute of Liberty in New York harbor to be more than mere words:

"Give me your tired, your poor,
Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free,
The wretched refuse of your teeming shore.
Send these, the homeless, tempest tossed, to me.
I lift my lamp beside the golden door."

I also hope that you will say to me after this sermon and that you will mean it as deeply 6 months from now: "I want to be among those in our church who are working and planning with reference to our church's participation in the World Refugee Year program."

Let me say one more thing and I am through. We have been concerned with the question, "Do refugees have names?" Well of course they do, and as a matter of fact the name of one of them is prominently displayed just now from billboard and movie marquees across our land: Anne Frank. I urge you to see this film which tells the true and poignant story of a remarkably sensitive and intelligent young girl of 13 and of the diary she faithfully kept for 2 years while having fled from Germany, hid out with her family in Amsterdam during the Nazi occupation of Holland. The Gestapo discovered their hiding place; however, and Anne Frank was sent to a concentration camp, Bergen-Belsen, where 7 months later, at the age of 15, she died. Among a pile of old books, magazines, and newspapers which were left lying on the floor of the Amsterdam secret annex was Anne's diary. I want to read you now a single paragraph of this remarkable girl's diary, written after 2 years of hiding from the Nazis and 8 months before she was to die. Under the entry of July 15, 1942, she writes:

"It's really a wonder that I haven't dropped all my ideals, because they seem so absurd and impossible to carry out. Yet I keep them, because in spite of everything I still believe that people are really good at heart. I simply can't build up my hopes on a foundation consisting of confusion, misery, and death. I see the world gradually being turned into a wilderness, I hear the ever-approaching thunder, which will destroy us too, I can feel the sufferings of millions, and yet, if I look up into the heavens, I think that it will all come right, that this cruelty too will end, and that peace and tranquillity will return again.

"In the meantime, I must uphold my ideals, for perhaps the time will come when I shall be able to carry them out.

"Yours,

"ANNE."

Let us pray. Our Heavenly Father, grant that Thy kingdom may come on earth as it is in heaven, by reason of our love of Thee and of one another. Amen.

Conversion of Saline and Brackish Waters to Fresh Water

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 11, 1959

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, May 25, the Honorable Fred A. Seaton, Secretary of the Interior, addressed the Sixth National Watershed Congress. This meeting was one of the most enjoyable events that I have attended during this session of Congress. Secretary Seaton's address on the subject of conversion of saline and brackish waters to fresh water was one of the most interesting and constructive talks that it has been my privilege to hear on this particular subject. It is replete with up-to-date information which should be valuable to every Member of Congress. It is my pleasure to have it inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD where its values may be preserved and those interested may have access to it:

As participants in this Sixth National Watershed Congress, you and I join in our dedication to the continuing cause of water conservation.

We know that the availability of water—just plain, ordinary water—is rapidly becoming a major concern to America and the world. In fact, as early as 1975–80, it may be our number one domestic problem.

The facts indicate the accuracy of such a conclusion.

American industries, farms, and homes are today calling for an ever-rising tide of water.

Our population is growing by one person every 11 seconds, by 330 every hour, by 8,000 every day, by a quarter of a million every month. We now number 175 million. By 1980, just 21 years away, there will be nearly 275 million of us. By the year 2000 (and I remind you that however remote that date may sound, it is only 41 years away), we may well double our present population and number 350 million souls.

Presently, we use about 240 billion gallons of water a day. In 20 years our needs will demand at least 500 or 600 billion gallons—nearly two or three times as much—if we have it available.

This is nothing to panic about, but it is a matter of real concern—one which leaves us no choice other than to continue our current conservation progress and to plan wisely and imaginatively for the years ahead.

Many areas will continue to get from conventional sources all the water they need in the foreseeable future. Fresh water we haven't even begun to touch in our conservation programs now flows in wasteful abundance into the sea. Surprisingly enough, even after a century of conservation, we are using only about one-third of the water that courses to the ocean from the 17 Western States, and only about one-eighth of the supply in the East.

Thankfully, we are making progress gradually but steadily in capturing and using a bigger and bigger percentage of this flow. In addition to efforts of individual farmers—and they are doing more for themselves than even before—all branches of Government, are sharing in the task. For instance, in fiscal 1959, the Federal Government is investing in land and water conservation and development $1,714 million; in fiscal 1960, the ad-

ministration proposes an overall program of $1,917 million.

One day, though, and sooner than many people think, we shall have to follow a new trail for our water supply, at least for certain areas. That trail leads both to huge known supplies of brackish water inland and also to the inexhaustible oceans and seas of the world.

Getting the salts out of sea water, to be sure, is nothing new. Sailors have done that for centuries. Today the crews of the atomic submarines *Nautilus*, *Skate*, and *Seawolf* drink water converted by heat from their atomic reactors. In fact, like Julius Caesar and the ancient Phoenicians, people generally know how to turn sea water into fresh: just distill it. The basic science is as old as recorded history. But what we're still searching for is the answer to the question: how do you do this on a large scale at a cost cheap enough to substitute for water from conventional sources?

Presently operated salt water conversion plants do the job all right, but their costs are high. Sheer necessity, not competitive advantage, has caused them to be built, particularly in recent years.

On the arid island of Aruba in the Caribbean, for example, people are drinking and the oil industry is using 3½ million gallons of converted sea water a day. The cost is about $1.75 per thousand gallons, compared to the District of Columbia's minimum rate of 26 cents per thousand.

The people on the Island of St. Thomas in the Virgin Islands would also like to be using converted water (though the price may differ). And they will be, once their conversion plant, authorized last September, is built. No wonder they're interested. Because their population has outstripped their water supply, their alternative is to go all the way to Puerto Rico and haul potable water by barge, at a cost of nearly $5 per thousand gallons. The Virgin Islands Government reports that in fiscal year 1958 it spent on this operation nearly $177,000.

Consider another example: Coalinga, a small community in California.

For years its people had to haul in their drinking water at a cost of $7 per 1,000 gallons; when they got tired of that expense, they cut the bill to $1.45 per thousand gallons, and their town made U.S. history by becoming the first to get its drinking water supply from converted brackish well water.

Further south in California, people aren't that desperate yet, though they are indeed hard-pressed.

Years ago, Los Angeles and southern California had to dig and tunnel the Colorado River Aqueduct 250 miles across deserts and through mountains to drain fresh water out of the Colorado River. That undertaking, once criticized as a gigantic waste, has long since proved its feasibility. Even so it will be inadequate to the needs in 10 years or sooner.

So today the people of southern California are looking toward another answer to their problem, a $1½ billion project which would bring them water from the Feather River—more than 500 miles away—water far more expensive than that now obtained from the Colorado.

In California, as in many other places east and inbetween, new supplies of natural fresh water will surely become more expensive in the years ahead and the supply available will be less than needed. Our hope is that just as surely the cost of converting saline water to fresh will come down. In one community after another, as I foresee the future, these cost curves will one day cross, and then converted sea water will be the less expensive of the two; in some localities it will be the only reliable source.

Of course, for some towns there is just one curve, one price, and one choice: Pay the bill, suffer stagnation of growth, or move out. Their water supplies are running out and no more is in sight.

The goal of the Office of Saline Water of the Department of the Interior is to help forestall any such disasters by developing processes to make tremendous quantities of converted water available and bring the conversion cost curve down. In that work, we enjoy full cooperation with private enterprise, colleges, universities, and the scientists of more than 16 nations of the world.

The saline water conversion program was authorized by Congress in 1952—just 7 years ago. In that span of time, the curve of comparative cost has gone down faster and further than in all previous human history.

Consider where we were as recently as the late thirties: Then it cost between $4 and $5 to convert 1,000 gallons of sea water to fresh. Meanwhile equipment, fuel, and labor costs have gone up, and between 1939 and 1952 inflation shrunk the dollar into a 50-cent piece. In spite of all that, the cost of saline water conversion has been cut by more than half. In the most effective existing sea-water conversion plants, it is now about $1.75 per thousand gallons.

The Government's saline-water investigation began with laboratory research. Next it included small pilot plants. Now it is about to move on to the building of large demonstration plants.

This year, 1959, the program stands in the wings of a new and larger stage; where, for the first time, we are quite hopeful of breaking the dollar-per-thousand gallons barrier.

For that, we have farseeing members of both major political parties and dedicated scientists to thank, as well as such organizations as yours.

Last September 2, President Eisenhower approved Public Law 85-883. The bill was sponsored by Senators CLINTON ANDERSON, LYNDON JOHNSON, FRANCIS CASE, THOMAS KUCHEL, and ALEXANDER WILEY. The companion bill in the House was sponsored by Congressman HOLIFIELD, and similar bills were introduced by Representatives WILSON, ENGLE, ROOSEVELT, KING, TEAGUE of California, and RHODES of Arizona.

This new law authorizes the Department of the Interior to construct and operate five saline water conversion demonstration plants.

Three will be designed to produce fresh water out of water from the sea. One plant is to be located on the east coast, one on the west, and one on the gulf. Two are to be designed to turn out more than a million gallons of potable water a day.

In addition, there will be two plants for the treatment of inland brackish water, one located in the Southwest and one in the northern Great Plains. One is to have a capacity of 250,000 gallons per day or more.

One the advice of three scientific consultants to the Department—Dr. Ralph Morgan of Purdue University, Dudley F. Phelps, a New York industrial engineer, and Capt. Ivan Monk of the U.S. Navy—I have selected a new process for the first million-gallon-per-day demonstration plant. It is known as long-tube vertical multiple-effect distillation, developed jointly by the Office of Saline Water and the late W. L. Badger of Ann Arbor, Mich. Pilot plant tests of this process indicate a major breakthrough in the control of salt scale, a breakthrough which obviates the need for using acid or high cost alloys to control scale, thus substantially cutting costs.

Potable water can be produced in this new plant, we believe, for less than $1 per thousand gallons—less, in other words, than the current price of fresh water in Key West, Fla. Moreover, as the size of the plant increases, we can expect the price per gallon to come down perhaps to the point where a 15-20 million gallon-per-day plant using this process may eventually convert sea water into a thousand gallons of fresh for less than 60 cents. Right across the Potomac from here, people in Alexandria are paying more than that now.

Please understand we cannot guarantee all the cost figures I am presenting to you. As a matter of fact, we hope to meet or better them, but if we were absolutely certain all factors would work out as projected, there would be little or no point in building the plants for both experimental and demonstration purposes.

In the second million-gallon-per-day demonstration plant, another process is to be used, that of multistage flash distillation.

For this plant, we are asking the Atomic Energy Commission to supply a low-temperature, low-pressure atomic reactor as the heat source. This flash distillation process also lends itself to large-scale conversion, and with atomic heat we can reasonably expect to open a new field for the peaceful application of atomic energy.

The types of plant selected, the next question is: Where should we build them?

Last week a special board made up of consultants to the Department met to tackle that problem. Its members were Sheppard T. Powell, of Baltimore, an expert in industrial water problems; Lewis S. Finch, of Indianapolis, president of the American Water Works Association; and Dr. Wilburn C. Schroeder, professor of chemical engineering at the University of Maryland.

On the basis of their recommendations, I can say to you tonight that the first plant, using the long-tube-vertical process, will be located on the gulf and that the second plant, using flash distillation, will be on the west coast.

These areas were selected both because of their more critical need for water and their intense public interest in the saline water conversion program.

Selecting from 31 gulf coast and 18 west coast applications, I shall soon announce the exact location of these two plants.

That choice will not be an easy one. Motivated by an urgent, and in some cases by a desperate need for more water, over 150 cities in all have asked to be considered as a site for a sea or brackish water plant.

Where are these cities? Confined to a few hot and arid States in the South and Southwest? Not at all. Applications have poured in from every part of the coastal perimeter of the United States. Of the 21 States on gulf or ocean only two—Delaware and Alabama—had no applicants.

And that fact should not arouse wonder. In 1957, you may recall, over 1,000 communities, the hometowns of one-seventh of our entire population, endured water shortages to some degree—shortages which varied from a lack of water for lawns or gardens to an actual absence of water to drink.

That is a major reason we are moving the program ahead of the schedule the Congress originally set forth.

Under the capable leadership of former Congressman A. L. Miller as Director of the Office of Saline Water, the second process for the demonstration plant program was announced almost 3 weeks ahead of schedule. The third process will be ready for announcement almost 3 months ahead of the established congressional deadline.

Looking to the future we hold the great hope that a key fact of human history is about to change: The fact that up to now nearly all the people of the world have necessarily depended for life entirely on fresh water upon and beneath the land.

Bearing in mind that an acre-foot of water amounts to 325,851 gallons, we are a long way from the day when converted sea water can profitably be used for irrigation, in competition with conventional sources—if they exist—but that is not to say it can never be done.

Once we can economically tap the oceans for fresh water, not only for human and industrial use, as now we know we can—but also for agriculture—wastelands can become gardens.

Think what that achievement would mean in sections of California and Arizona where the rainfall every year averages only 10–12 inches and the population has increased in 20 years by 55 percent; in western Mexico and lower California; in the famine-cursed "drought quadrangle" of northeastern Brazil; in vast unpopulated expanses of Africa; in Saudi Arabia, practically a sea-ringed desert; in West Pakistan; in the Negev area of Israel, an arrow-shaped desert pointing into the salty waters of the Gulf of Aqaba; or in Australia, an island continent large as the United States with no more fresh water than in the flow of our Columbia River.

From where we now stand, we can with justification gaze toward a new horizon where these lands flourish, some of them for the first time since the days of Babylon and Carthage, some for the first time in all recorded history. For the future of life on this planet, the implications in saline and brackish water conversion stagger the imagination.

Bringing blessings to Americans and to millions of people around the globe, the arrival of one or more genuinely low-cost processes can well turn out to be one of the most important scientific achievements of our time.

In this year 1959 the river of research is broadening and deepening beyond all precedent as it begins its final flow toward an estuary of triumph.

Sunday: A Magic Pause

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 27, 1959

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, the editor of the Selma Times-Journal in Selma, Ala., recently wrote an eloquent and thoughtful article which I think every American can read with his own particular nostalgic reflections. Under leave to extend my remarks, I ask unanimous consent for this fine editorial to be included in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed as follows:

SUNDAY: A MAGIC PAUSE

In a world of clamor and turmoil, of frenzied pace and breathless confusion, men of good will everywhere may be thankful for the quality of Sunday.

Millions of Americans these days travel the length and breadth of their own land. Millions, too, see Europe, and increasing numbers see Asia, South America, and Africa. These lucky ones know for themselves what the rest of their countrymen can readily imagine: Sunday is everywhere the same.

It's more, much more, than just a time of rest and worship.

It's a moment of peace amid the tumult.

It's a welcome space, in an age when men find fewer and fewer spaces in their crowded days.

On Sundays, men recover some of the dignity they cast to the winds in the weeklong competitive struggle.

They have time to think, a rarer and rarer experience for many nowadays. They can take stock, reflect, see themselves and their lives in some sort of perspective.

The full riches of family living pour in upon them. Sunday is a day of companionship, of long walks and talks, of smoothing the raw edges gouged in one's feeling in the battles of the working day.

Sunday is a magic pause when life renews itself a little. You can feel it in the air on a farm road in Iowa, on a boulevard in Chicago, a park in Paris, on a winding coastal highway in Portugal, anywhere at all.

Sunday is just different. If it should ever cease to be, then man should take alarm. For he may be in danger of losing the crowning spirit that makes him what he is.

John Foster Dulles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. CARLTON LOSER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 27, 1959

Mr. LOSER. Mr. Speaker, under the unanimous consent rule to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I incorporate a fine editorial which appeared in the Nashville, Tenn., Banner of May 25, 1959, eulogizing the late Secretary of State, Mr. John Foster Dulles. "Giant of Statesmanship" is the title. It follows:

JOHN FUSTER DULLES: GIANT OF STATESMANSHIP

In the death of John Foster Dulles, America has lost more than a patriot of shining courage and dauntless faith. He also was a giant of statesmanship; a pathfinder, whose perseverance in the battle for peace with justice was for all humanity.

He died in the service of his country. The Nation he loved is one today in recognizing that—with tributes even from those who beset his task with the carping criticism of political derivation. For in the final analysis there can be no denial of the stature of the man, and the quality of deeds wrought of indomitable purpose.

Dulles met head on the challenge of free world leadership that increasingly has passed into America's hands. His tenure at the State Department helm coincided with the assumption of that full weight of responsibility. He was in that capacity a distinguished member of the administration team that faced the realities and junked the debilitating policies of appeasement and surrender. He became a symbol of tireless devotion to what he believed to be the best interests of his country and the non-Communist world.

A target of professional politicians during his early days in office, by the time he stepped aside—the victim of cancer—his severest critics had melted away, and Democrats and Republicans alike hailed him, for his indefatigable efforts had left a deep imprint on the history of the 20th century.

In the case of John Foster Dulles, the office found the man. A lifetime of training and preparation was his—and with it the wisdom that fortified the spirit he exemplified. Not blindness, nor wishful thinking, nor the penchant for playing by ear the diplomatic score—but patient and courageous and skilled address to the pattern of free world purpose. He yielded neither to the vain delusion of easy victory nor to national and international hysteria.

President Eisenhower's estimate of him is shared by the constituency he served even above and beyond the call of duty. Said the Chief Executive, he knew of no man "who has equaled his wisdom and his knowledge in the whole complicated business" of international affairs.

He waged skillfully the battle for peace, not just for our time or his generation—but to span with courage an era of chaos, and build on a foundation of principle and strength for security, an enduring better world which was his dream.

There are no indispensable men, and John Foster Dulles knew it; but there are indispensable principles—and he personified them. More than that, he worked to instill them in the fabric of international affairs.

His example, and the foundation he laid, are his Nation's legacy from a great life. Whatever emerges in tests still to come, of free world solidarity—resisting and ultimately defeating the rapacious enemy bent on freedom's conquest—will be in great measure due to the tireless and gifted labors of John Foster Dulles.

He has passed that mantle to others, with a prayer for their successful execution of an unfinished task.

His like will not soon be seen again.

Results of Poll Taken in the New Sixth Congressional District of Washington State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 27, 1959

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I recently mailed a questionnaire to about 52,000 residents of my congressional district. It contained 12 questions dealing with issues pending before this Congress. To date there has been a better than average response to such questionnaires. Although more returns are to be expected, a sufficient number have now been received to determine the general views of the people of my area. The results of the poll expressed in terms of percentages are as follows:

1. Do you support the President in his efforts to achieve a balanced budget? Yes, 91 percent; no, 9 percent.

2. If the budget for fiscal 1960 is not balanced, would you favor increasing taxes to eliminate the deficit? Yes, 36 percent; no, 64 percent.

3. Do you favor continuance of our mutual security (foreign aid) program? If yes, at present cost (40 percent); at reduced cost (55 percent); at increased cost (5 percent). Yes, 81 percent; no, 19 percent.

4. Do you approve of our firm stand with respect to Berlin? Yes, 96 percent; no, 4 percent.

5. Should Red China be admitted to the United Nations? Yes, 21 percent; no, 79 percent.

6. Should the United States engage in trade with Red China? Yes, 31 percent; no, 69 percent.

7. Would you favor increasing the highway gasoline tax by 1½ cents to put the Federal highway building program on a self-supporting basis? Yes, 56 percent; no, 44 percent.

8. Should the social security law be broadened to include medical services, to be financed by increased contributions by individuals and employers? Yes, 49.6 percent; no, 50.4 percent.

9. Do you favor Federal aid for local school construction? Yes, 42 percent; no, 58 percent.

10. Should the Federal Government continue its program of financial assistance for local airport construction? Yes, 33 percent; no, 67 percent.

11. Would you favor a law calling for a secret ballot in the election or removal of union officials, and in other vital union matters? Yes, 93 percent; no, 7 percent.

12. Do you believe that the Government should continue its farm price support program? Yes, 18 percent; no, 82 percent.

Drive Carefully This Weekend

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 27, 1959

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, the Memorial Day weekend which we face will claim the lives and health of many of our citizens who will be involved in highway traffic accidents.

As chairman of the Health and Safety Subcommittee, which has jurisdiction over legislative attempts to curb the terrible toll of life and property on our highways, I have become painfully aware of the high rate of accidents.

Let me urge my colleagues to do all that they can to promote traffic safety and to make a special effort to encourage safe driving this coming weekend.

There appeared in the Selma Times-Journal, of Selma, Ala., this week, an editorial on this subject which brings home the point I am attempting to make.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert at this point the editorial:

USE INTELLIGENCE BEHIND WHEEL

Only a few days away is the first of the year's big holiday weekends, Memorial Day. With more care on the road than ever, we can expect plenty of trouble unless we exercise extreme care.

We don't have the National Safety Council's traffic fatality estimates yet, but we know they won't be small, even though the holiday itself falls on a Saturday.

As we prepare for our spring excursions on the highways, we might take note of the safety bulletin put out by the Family Economics Bureau of Northwestern National Life Insurance Co.

It makes the point that most motorists have the needed intelligence to drive properly and safely, but generally they don't use more than half that capability when they're behind the wheel.

The half of their mind not attending to driving is taken up with such things as talking, listening to the radio, daydreaming, gazing at people and the like along the way, thinking about family, home, office, and so on.

Put a woman in the driver's seat and the situation is the same. The only difference is in what she's thinking about or attending to.

There are, of course, many, many reasons for automobile accidents. But far from the least of them is the blunt fact, never harped on enough, that drivers for the most part just don't pay strict attention to the business of driving.

In all too many cases, the car is seen, consciously or otherwise, as a kind of floating extension of your living room, your office, your backyard.

Watch the driver in front of you for 5 minutes. Count the times he turns his head and looks away from the road, the times he takes his hands off the wheel to gesture, relax as if he were at home on a couch, etc.

You'll be amazed at how incidental the actual driving operation seems to many on the roads. The danger is compounded when we realize how many who stare straight ahead and keep their hands on the wheel still are giving just half their minds to the driving job.

In the end, only one thing can be said to them: The death that can come in one awful second of distraction is not incidental.

Let's Give Home Rule to Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SIDNEY R. YATES
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 27, 1959

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article in the First Column, by Leo A. Lerner, appearing in the Chicago North Side newspaper:

LET'S GIVE HOME RULE TO WASHINGTON

Now children, gather close and daddy will tell you a story.

The State of Alaska contains about 100,000 people. Its 40,000 voters have elected two U.S. Senators and one Congressman to serve in the Congress of the United States.

The State of Hawaii has about 500,000 inhabitants. Its little more than 100,000 voters (fewer than the number eligible to vote in any of the Chicago congressional districts) will soon elect two U.S. Senators and one Congressman (maybe two) to serve at Washington in the U.S. Congress.

The State of Nevada has about 250,000 people, including faro dealers. These citizens, including about 75,000 voters, have elected two U.S. Senators and one Congressman to the Congress of the United States.

The State of Arizona, a very fast growing American State, has less than a million people in it, but elects two U.S. Senators, three Congressmen, and every village in it, including Indian pueblos, has its own government.

Hold still a minute, I'll soon be through with the statistics. The State of Wyoming contains about 300,000 people, and it, too, elect two U.S. Senators and a Congressman.

Now we will take a jet plane to the District of Columbia, where Washington, our Nation's Capital, is situated. A million people live in Washington. These people are Americans just like all the rest of us. They eat, sleep, dream, make love (when they get a chance), and eat banana splits in Woolworth's.

But there's one thing the people who live in the District of Columbia can't do. They can't vote.

And that's just one thing they can't do. The other is that they have nothing to say about governing their own city.

Washington, D.C., contains more people than three States like Wyoming. Wyoming has two U.S. Senators and one Congressman. But the people of Washington, D.C., have no representation at all.

Oh, some Washingtonians, those with a permanent address elsewhere, vote in their hometowns, by mail or by making a special trip, but those who live in Washington have no home rule in their hometown and no voice in the American Federal Government.

Washingtonians have no aldermen, no mayor, no Senators, and no Congressmen. They are in the center of democracy, but as far as deciding their own destiny is concerned they might as well be living in the penal colony in French Guiana.

All that fuss about Alaska and Hawaii sounded hypocritical to me when I thought of the voteless, voiceless people in the District of Columbia.

My friend Herblock, the cartoonist who lives in Washington, once drew a cartoon showing Nikita Khrushchev, saying, "I'll give the West a good deal—go tell them I'll guarantee West Berlin as much democracy as they allow in the District of Columbia."

That hurts, mostly because it is so true.

A committee of Congress runs Washington, which means that Congressmen from far-off places like Nome or Howland Island (total population four) control the destiny of a million people who can't vote.

It's nutty, but it's stranger than fiction.

What fiction writer in the 20th century would have such a fantastic imagination as to dream up this libel against the United States of America?

I am for making the District of Columbia the 51st State. The Americans who live there should be able to vote and run their own municipal government.

If it weren't for a third baseman named Harmon Killebrew, Washingtonians could hardly hold up their heads.

Handicapped Make Good Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD G. WOLF
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 27, 1959

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I would like to insert into the RECORD an article by Mr. John R. Adney, Miles, Iowa, which appeared in the Davenport Democrat on April 15, 1959. Mr. Adney has devoted much time, effort, and substance to the problems of the physically handicapped.

The efforts which have been made by the State and Federal Governments to retrain people who are, or who become, physically handicapped must be continued. Their productivity should not be lost to the Nation and they deserve the right to lead independent lives.

The article follows:

HANDICAPPED MAKE GOOD WORKERS

All of us are convinced that every individual is entitled to an opportunity equal to his abilities. The so-called disabled person is far more like than unlike the average individual.

His need to be recognized and treated as such, both in society and business, lies at the root of fuller acceptance and opportunity for the handicapped.

The economic and humanitarian need for offering proper employment to physically impaired workers is too obvious to be doubted. As good American citizens they are entitled to a fair chance to make their own way.

Judging from individual output records for similar jobs the production rate of handicapped workers is slightly higher than of unimpaired workers. For minor injuries, the safety record of handicapped workers is substantially the same as for unimpaired workers.

The handicapped have the same wide range of skills, abilities, and interests as the nonhandicapped. The absentee records of

physically impaired workers and others are substantially the same.

The physically handicapped worker can be insured without penalty. There is no provision in workmens' compensation insurance policies or rates that penalize an employer for hiring handicapped workers.

Employers who are interested in effective programs for utilization of handicapped labor can obtain valuable assistance by using the services of the State employment service and the State division of vocational rehabilitation.

In His Courage and Faith, Mr. Dulles Never Wavered

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. CARLTON LOSER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 27, 1959

Mr. LOSER. Mr. Speaker, I present to my colleagues a splendid editorial which appeared in the Nashville Tennessean of May 25, 1959, eulogizing our late Secretary of State, Mr. John Foster Dulles.

It beautifully describes his life as "a shining symbol of courage and faith in the ideal of liberty for all and dignity for the individual man." It follows:

IN HIS COURAGE AND FAITH, MR. DULLES NEVER WAVERED

For the Nation and the world something important is missing as Mr. John Foster Dulles passes on, the victim of an insidious enemy which he never feared but could not master.

His life is a shining symbol of courage and faith in the ideal of liberty for all and dignity for the individual man.

As Secretary of State for 6 years, Mr. Dulles stood in the forefront of an army of free people engaged in battle with aggressive forces of destruction. He fought without ceasing, and with a strong heart, regardless of the stress and strain.

And in the end, wounded unto death, this spirit still prevailed though he yielded the responsibility to other, and younger hands.

He would have been the last, we think, to claim that he always found the perfect answers to a multitude of problems. Some of his approaches and solutions were open to justifiable criticism. But appreciation was not lacking for his devotion to basic principles and his refusal to be diverted from the course.

There was inspiration in his belief that right ultimately would prevail over wrong, provided it made no unworthy compromises.

Few if any secretaries of state have been wholly popular, and such wide favor has been all the harder to attain in the cold war period. Mr. Dulles was no exception to the rule.

In an appraisal of Mr. Dulles' record, there is no call to pass over points of past criticism. Appreciation of his objectives need not blur the disagreements resulting from tactics which were at times questionable, or the occasional evidences of recklessness.

With a rare agility of mind he could create a phrase or think up a slogan for an occasion. As an outstanding example, there was the philosophy of brinksmanship for the advertising of which he had a direct responsibility. This helped no situation at home or abroad, and sight may have been lost of the fact that it almost involved the country in Indo-China when the cause was already lost.

The doctrine of "massive retaliation," as Mr. Dulles voiced it, was far from an adequate defense policy, and the call for liberation proved to be meaningless save for its partisan implications. This can also be said of the unleashing of Nationalist China which is leashed now more than ever since Mr. Dulles has disavowed Chiang Kai-shek's ambitions on the mainland.

The U.S. policy on Quemoy is still a mystery, although it appeared to have deterred aggression when proclaimed. And though the State Department was firm in opposing British-French intervention at Suez, Mr. Dulles played a part in precipitating this crisis by the blunt manner of withdrawing of help from the Aswan Dam. More than anything else, this served to create ill feeling among our allies.

"Bold initiative" was another phrase often voiced, but the Dulles policy toward communism finally boiled down to "containment"—that of his predecessor Mr. Dean Acheson. Although there were setbacks for Western interests in Indo-China and Iraq, adherence to the status quo was generally successful until the issue of Germany came to a head this year.

It was only then, not long before his illness became acute, that Mr. Dulles began to show signs of the flexibility that had been lacking—though he did not retreat on the fundamental need of defending his country's rights and responsibilities. He had come to the point of negotiation in an effort to ease tensions, although not convinced that the summit meeting would be fruitful.

Officially, he was not the author of foreign policy, for it was his duty to carry out the wishes of the President. But to a remarkable degree, that had been his role.

To the very end he held to the view that because communism was evil its dissolution was only a matter of time. Perhaps he was right in that, but there is no current indication that the crackup is near.

There was no stronger advocate of the need for close cooperation with our allies in the efforts to end the cold war.

Though Mr. Dulles did not have close ties with the Congress, he was effective in dealing with it. In his frequent meetings with the press he seemed to find pleasure, and because of his vast store of knowledge in foreign affairs he usually dominated such sessions.

The saying is that Mr. Dulles, at an age when most boys were playing marbles, decided to grow up to be Secretary of State. His grandfather was Secretary of State to Benjamin Harrison and his uncle, Robert Lansing, held that office under Woodrow Wilson. He learned much, and he learned it early in life; and he put his knowledge to good use in a nonpartisan manner until named to the Eisenhower Cabinet. His career as a diplomat went back intermittently 52 years to the Hague Peace Conference of 1907.

More than any of his predecessors, he was a one-man State Department, and that is one explanation for his endless travels as a trouble shooter. This did not serve to build a sound organization and confronted such a team man as Mr. Christian Herter with difficulties when he took over on the eve of important decisions.

Above all else, however, Mr. Dulles was the champion of a great cause and we can be sure he never faltered in his conviction that it would triumph.

He was above compromising with principle, and this is one of the finest lessons to be learned from his career. His name will command the free world's admiration and there is little doubt it will be held in long, if not fond remembrance by those elements he so resolutely opposed.

The Delaware Antituberculosis Society Releases Study on Cancer and Tobacco

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 27, 1959

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, a recent medical report on a relationship between ordinary lung damage and damage from lung cancer has received little public attention.

The study was made by Dr. Walter Finke, and was first published in the New York State Journal of Medicine, December 1, 1958.

When released by the Delaware Antituberculosis Society recently in Delaware the study was given wide circulation, and was extensively reported in the Journal-Every Evening, Wilmington, Del., May 18, 1959.

I include the article from the Journal-Every Evening for the information of my colleagues:

MAN ABOUT TOWN

A recent medical report on a relationship found between ordinary lung damage—such as caused by TB—and malignant damage from lung cancer has received astonishingly little public attention despite some implications that might ease the minds of cigarette smokers.

Most people who get lung cancer are cigarette smokers, but the tantilizing question of why most cigarette smokers don't get lung cancer remains.

How is a person to know whether he can safely smoke three packs a day and live to be 100, or whether he is one whose lungs are being damaged with every puff and being laid open to a malignant growth?

Until now, there have been only hints. English scientists have found correlations between lung cancer and work in certain industries plus smoking.

However, the National Tuberculosis Association has reprinted an article by Dr. Walter Finke, first published in the New York State Journal of Medicine, December 1, 1958, that points to chronic respiratory illness as a preliminary condition for the development of lung cancer.

The study was released here by the Delaware Anti-Tuberculosis Society.

"Severe lung insults" (such as a daily barrage of tar and nicotine) merely throw the cancer switch on lungs which have been laid open to the disease by an earlier long history of TB or chronic smoker's cough or any number of preexisting respiratory sicknesses, it explains.

One long shot in the dark to try to explain the current pandemic of lung cancer has traced the history of a number of victims back to the influenza epidemic of 1918–20.

Dr. Finke pointed out that lung cancer rose sharply after this epidemic and the current tremendous increase in lung cancer is largely confined to older persons who were exposed to the virus of the 1918–20 worldwide epidemic.

From the smoker's point of view, the study indicates, if he has had a serious lung illness in the past, or has a chronic dry cough, or if he's 40 or older, maybe he should switch to chewing gum.

The problem of switching is dealt with by a recent study released by the Delaware Cancer Society which shows that there are

no observable difference of intelligence or social and economic status between smokers and nonsmokers.

It is based on a study by a psychiatrist and a psychologist at the University of Oregon Medical School.

They say smokers have a higher anxiety level, report more psychosomatic symptoms, drink more coffee and liquor, and seek more excitement.

The two investigators say moderation is probably the sensible solution since it's not easy for a smoking-type man to stop smoking.

They recommend that antiexcessive smoking education should begin in high school and continue in college—"this is when people start to smoke."

Pornographic Material in the Mails

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELIZABETH KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 19, 1959

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, several days ago the Department of Justice announced that three men had been indicted in Detroit for violation of a law Congress passed to step up the campaign against persons who distribute obscene material through the mails.

These indictments, Mr. Speaker, will be good news for parents, schoolteachers, and others who are seriously worried over the increasing amount of pornographic material which is being placed in the hands of our young people.

The law which the 85th Congress passed, in response to strong demands by the public, enables the Government to prosecute a person charged with violation of this law at the point where the material was distributed. Previously, the Government was required to bring the indictment at the point of mailing.

This provision of the law was a handicap to law-enforcement officials. The new weapon which Congress voted should go a long way in helping to eradicate this national evil.

All of us want to keep this highly unsuitable material out of the hands of our children. It is difficult to believe that men would stoop to practice this despicable deed. Yet, it is reported to be a highly lucrative business and I assume some persons felt the high return warranted the risk involved.

Perhaps this new weapon in the hands of Federal law-enforcement officials will bring about a real crackdown. It is encouraging that the Department of Justice has moved so rapidly under the new law.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the Federal officials who obtained this first indictment under the new law. I know they will do everything they possibly can to eradicate this loathsome racket.

And especially, Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my gracious and wonderfully capable colleague, the Honorable KATHRYN GRANAHAN, of Philadelphia, for the magnificent work she is doing as chairman of a subcommittee of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee in bringing this whole matter not only to the attention of Members of the Congress but to the American people. Mrs. GRANAHAN is giving unselfishly of her time and talents toward this serious problem, and she is to be congratulated for her outstanding service to the parents and youth of America.

The USIA and the Non-Russian Nations in the U.S.S.R.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 27, 1959

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, we hear much nowadays of the need to understand the Russians. This is certainly to the good since such attained understanding can contribute much toward a realistic policy toward Russia and its nationals. However, to understand the Soviet Union means much more than just getting to know the Russians. It is estimated by many scholars on the subject that over half of the population in this empire is non-Russian. Thus, for friendly relations with the peoples in the U.S.S.R. and a realistic policy toward the Soviet Union, it appears even more important for us to understand the Baltic countries, White Ruthenia, Ukraine, the Caucasian nations, and the Moslem nations in this empire.

This valuable perspective is provided in a recent testimony given by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, of Georgetown University. Appearing before the House Committee on Appropriations, Dr. Dobriansky, who is also the national chairman of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, testified in support of additional USIA funds to direct and bolster our VOA broadcasts to the non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. The general observations made in this testimony might well be pondered by every American interested in a realistic policy toward the U.S.S.R., one with maximum economy and productive results. Under unanimous consent, I include this testimony in the RECORD:

TESTIMONY ON USIA FUND REQUESTS BY DR. LEV E. DOBRIANSKY, PROFESSOR AT GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY, AND CHAIRMAN, UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE OF AMERICA, BEFORE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, FRIDAY, APRIL 17, 1959, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Mr. Chairman and members, I am grateful for this opportunity to testify in support of the request made by the U.S. Information Agency for funds to establish new transmitters for Voice of America broadcasts to the non-Russian nations within the Soviet Union. Although many shortcomings and defects continue to exist in the policy and operations of USIA, the requested funds should be appropriated specifically in order (1) to redress several recent and blunderous changes in the Voice of America concerning our broadcasts to these vital and strategic areas in the U.S.S.R. and (2) to even expand these broadcasts because of the internal satellite and captive status of these non-Russian nations.

The reasons which we offer to justify this position are as follows:

(1) Last year some officials in the USIA concocted the bright idea of having the Lithuanians, Latvians, Estonians, Ukrainians, Georgians, Armenians, Turkestani, and the Azerbaijani listen to our broadcasts either in the language of their captor, namely, Russian, or in English. When strong opposition to this plan of alienating these truly natural allies developed both in the Congress and among private groups, the argument for curtailing broadcasts in the languages of these different peoples was shifted to the pretext of transmitter shortages and lack of appropriations. Hearings on this affair were held by the Subcommittee on State Department Organization and Foreign Operations and my own testimony appears in its "Review of U.S. Information Agency Operations" (Committee on Foreign Affairs, 1959, pp. 102–161). Nevertheless, on the given pretext the Agency drastically reduced the Baltic and Ukrainian language broadcasts and eliminated entirely the Moslemic Uzbek program to Central Asia. It appears now that the reestablishment and further improvement of these broadcasts are predicated on additional appropriations. If, indeed, such appropriations are necessary, then they should be made with the two aims cited above.

(2) The dimension of activity suggested by the concept of the non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. is still little appreciated or even recognized by our Government or people. The incontrovertible facts that (a) over half the population in the U.S.S.R. is non-Russian, (b) almost half of the armed forces in the U.S.S.R. is non-Russian, (c) the so-called Soviet economy is an empire economy thriving on rich captive resources, and (d) the history of every non-Russian nation in this substrate empire is, to present date, one of a struggle for national independence and freedom—these basic and determining facts continue to largely escape the understanding and imaginative thinking of our policymakers. We are told, for instance, to understand better the 100 million Russians but we virtually ignore the even greater need for understanding the 110 million non-Russians whose aspirations and histories are by far more affinite to our own traditions and whose unreliability for Moscow has been attested to by countless Russian overseers. To sustain and extend these aspirations in this peripheral area closest to the very heart of the empire logically would seem to be the highest priority target of our psychological efforts. Instead, our broadcasts to these non-Russian nations are grossly inadequate in scope and depth for the achievement of this logical end. For example, at present there are no broadcasts to the 10 million Byelorussians or the 30 million Moslems in the U.S.S.R. As a background to these observations, may I submit for the record this article on "Lands and Nations in the U.S.S.R."

(3) Our failure to capture the dominant spirit of these non-Russian nations accounts in the greatest measure for the extreme irony that, in Asia and Africa today, Moscow, rather than we, is viewed as the main proponent of national independence, anticolonialism, and anti-imperialism. The one power that itself possesses a vastly extended empire, consisting of these internal satellites within the U.S.S.R. and also the external satellites in Europe and Asia, has by deception seized the role for which we, by tradition and spirituality, are best and honorably fitted. This situation is not only ironical but incredible and humiliating. While in our simplicity we continue to fight the ghosts of international communism, Soviet communism, and Marxian ideology, behind these smokescreens the Muscovites capably apply the borderlands

policy of the past tyrants of Muscovy to surpass the imperialist and colonial successes of previous Czars. While people in this country, like the Overstreets who profess to tell us "What We Must Know About Communism," speak of a "strange new force," the "strangest and most enigmatic in all history," Russian scholars themselves, like Berdyaev and others who experience this force, long ago taught that Russian communism is the third form of Russian imperialism, the dominant preceding forms being the Third Rome ideology and Pan-Slavism. Actually, what is truly enigmatic is not Russia but our trained incapacity to comprehend its imperialism and colonialism within the legalistic subterfuge known as the Soviet Union.

In short, our further reverses in the unending cold war—and there are many in the offing—will not be the result of any missile gap, space lag, fictitious overall economic competition from Moscow, or domestic inflation, all of which are of subsidiary significance to the cold war context. Instead, they will be the direct result of a protracted misconception of the real nature of the enemy, his traditional modes of conspiracy and diplomatic and political duplicity, and his centuries-long messianism. They will also be the indirect result of our fantastic neglect of the non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R., most of whom are the first victims of Red Russian totalitarian imperialism and upon the subjugation of whom the extensions of Moscow's empire are made possible. The present state of USIA's operations regarding the basic area of the U.S.S.R. in the main reflect this neglect. With your permission to submit this background material into the record,[1] I cannot stress too strongly your responsibility to bring about appropriate changes in this paramount respect. Our prudent and imaginative activity in this new dimension—the non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R.—stands to out-value at far lesser cost our missiles, our nuclear bombs, and other hardware as concerns the insecurity of Muscovy in its traditional strides for world domination.

[1] "The Voice of America?"—an editorial—the Ukrainian Quarterly, Sept. 1958; "VOA and the Non-Russian Nations in the U.S.S.R."

Budget Busters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEO E. ALLEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 27, 1959

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial entitled "Budget Busters," from the Rockford, Ill., Morning Star of May 24, 1959:

BUDGET BUSTERS

Democratic spenders in Congress are pushing ahead in their determined drive to upset the administration's balanced budget and to open wide the floodgates of inflation. The House brushed aside economy pleas in passing a $2.1 billion budget-busting omnibus bill, which goes far beyond administration recommendations.

The catchall House bill, which now goes to Senate-House conference, compares with a Senate-passed program of $2.7 billion and the administration proposal, totaling $1.6 billion.

Under the House bill, construction of 35,000 units of public housing a year for 4 years, or a total of 140,000 new housing units, would be authorized. The bill the Senate passed calls for 45,000 additional public housing units a year for 4 years. The administration asked for no new public housing, contending there is no need for further low-rent public housing.

The House bill includes a 3-year, $1.5 billion program of urban renewal and slum clearance, $400 million for college housing units, $100 million for housing for the elderly, and lower down payments on home mortgages of the Federal Housing Administration. The Senate bill calls for an outlay of $2.1 billion over a 6-year period for slum-clearance projects and $300 million for college housing loans.

The administration proposed a 6-year program of urban renewal totaling $1.3 billion. It also asked for $200 million in fiscal 1959 for college-dormitory construction loans.

The conservative coalition of Republicans and southern Democrats succeeded in writing into the House bill a requirement that none of the funds the bill authorized could be committed for any project unless Congress appropriated the money later in separate legislation. This would close the backdoor to the Treasury which has been used to bypass congressional control of the purse strings.

Republicans are confident that President Eisenhower will veto the Democratic housing legislation. The President called on Congress last January to terminate the public-housing program. He also regards the Democratic provisions for slum clearance as excessive.

The housing legislation passed by Congress would mean more Government debt, more inflation, and more socialism. Housing starts, without a Federal program, are expected to set new records this year. There is no justification for Federal pump priming.

A Stitch in Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD L. JACKSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 27, 1959

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Los Angeles Evening Herald-Express, May 6, 1959:

A STITCH IN TIME

Congressman FRANCIS E. WALTER, Pennsylvania Democrat, and chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, apparently believes in the theory:

Don't let's just talk about it—let's do something about it.

So he has introduced a bill in the House which would make it a crime for an officer of a labor organization to interfere with foreign shipments of defense materiel in time of war or during a national emergency proclaimed by the President.

This legislation, if passed, should take care of the case of Harry Bridges, president of the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, which was expelled from the CIO in 1950 as being Communist-dominated.

Bridges, long a thorn of controversy in the United States, made so bold in testimony recently before the Committee on Un-American Activities as to state that he would advocate a longshoremen's strike to halt shipments of arms to Chiang Kai-shek and Nationalist China in the event that war should break out between that free nation and Communist China.

Bridges did not state that he would withhold such action if the President of the United States, the Congress, or the people of this country wished it otherwise, and if the United States being an ally of Nationalist China intended to send arms to Nationalist China as a mutual national defense policy.

In fact, he intimated otherwise; that he would advocate the longshoremen's strike regardless of any U.S. decision.

In an editorial at that time, the Herald-Express asked this question concerning Bridges' declaration:

"Would the President and other U.S. defense chiefs be forced to stand aside and allow this defiant action to threaten the Nation's security?"

Chairman WALTER of the committee has answered this important question for Americans in a positive and outright manner. If other patriotic Americans in the House and Senate of Congress will support his bill, we should have a strong safeguard against Bridges and any others of his ilk.

Here is what Chairman WALTER had to say about the matter:

"The testimony of Harry Bridges is a warning and a challenge which the Government of the United States must accept before it is too late.

"It is not enough for us to wince at his threats. We must have an effective weapon to be employed the very moment he and those like him seek to stifle our efforts to protect this Nation."

If WALTER's bill is passed, we hope that Congress makes the penalty fit the crime and that punishment will not be a misdemeanor slap on the wrist but a felony with the heaviest possible sentence involved.

The lives of millions of Americans could be involved.

Christianity or Communism?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 27, 1959

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in view of the continuing struggle that the nations of the free world are engaged in with the atheistic, materialistic philosophy of the Communist bloc, I feel that the editor of the Lansing Journal, Lansing, Ill., on May 21, 1959, tells most clearly the issues involved in the struggle between godless communism and our own Christian heritage:

CHRISTIANITY OR COMMUNISM?

There are more than four times as many Christian missionaries from the United States in Asia and Africa today—24,284 from Protestant churches and 6,124 from Catholic—than ever before, despite the fact that the wave of anti-Westernism that followed World War II practically wiped out foreign missions.

"U.S. missionaries were tortured, killed, driven out of Communist China," writes Stanley High in the June Reader's Digest. "In other parts of Asia * * * missions were attacked, missionaries widely discredited.

"But, today, the foreign-missions enterprise, stimulated by a growing spiritual ferment in the hearts and minds of the people of many countries, is reaching more people than ever before * * * in more countries than ever: 117."

Mr. High notes in his article that most of the religions of the East are escapist in nature and that these people presently find themselves "between two worlds: the old one gone or going, the new one not yet come." The result, he describes as a spiritual vacuum in which the asceticism of their fathers, a brotherhood of emptiness is no help in meeting the disturbing realities of life.

This void, the author points out, must be filled by godless communism, by withdrawal into a world of meditation or by the progressive idealism of Christianity. This, he says, is the challenge and the opportunity that faces the missionary today.

Mr. High cites, as his authority, Dr. E. Stanley Jones who began his career as a Methodist missionary in Lucknow, India, 45 years ago, and who "has probably spoken face to face with more non-Christians in more countries than any other person in the world." It was Dr. Jones who was first able to interest high-caste Hindu and Moslem intellectuals in attending a Bible class, and who was active in the pioneering missionary work of establishing school and hospitals and the dangerous beginnings of social reforms. Today, at 75, Dr. Jones continues his travels across Asia, speaking day after day, winning more converts than ever before—even Communists.

To all who have helped through the years to support foreign missions, the Digest report comes, not only as good news, but as convincing evidence that Christianity is on the march and that their continued aid now will mean even more than in the past.

We have it on the authority of Dr. Jones that "in Asia and Africa (which are the prime targets of the Kremlin) a new spiritual era is beginning."

The Last Journey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 26, 1959

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, in the passing of John Foster Dulles, America has lost a great statesman and the free world has lost a champion dedicated to the preservation of world peace. He will be missed by all of us.

I wish to include the following editorial which appeared in the Buffalo Evening News, Buffalo, N.Y., on May 25, 1959:

THE LAST JOURNEY

John Foster Dulles, who traveled to the far parts of the earth in tireless quest of harmony among men and nations, has taken the last journey. Death came to the former Secretary of State Sunday.

The departure of this devoted American was not made in the privacy we prefer to associate with death. Ravaged by mankind's most dread destroyer, cancer, the world watched in uncomfortable helplessness as his life ebbed away for many weeks. It was something that couldn't be helped. For Mr. Dulles was, in the best sense, an international citizen as well as a truly great citizen of his own country.

When he was first stricken more than 2 years ago, the news was received with dismay in all friendly lands and those who recognized his stature on the world scene were appalled. There was rejoicing when he received a reprieve that was to be extended for all too brief a time. The sorrow at his passing was the more acute because of it.

Like all men touched by greatness, Mr. Dulles had his critics, many of them, at home and abroad. They were vociferous, insistent, and sometimes abusive in degrees dependent upon their depth of disagreement with the policies of which he was coauthor and custodian. However, when the gravity of his illness became apparent, this captious chorus died down. The impending loss of the services he supplied in full measure for 6 years was too stunning to be contemplated in an atmosphere of petty faultfinding. At their most critical, his detractors were never known to question his rocklike integrity or put aside the realization that he was one of the firmest anchors of policy in the Western World.

Even though there was time to be prepared and resiged to a great loss, the actual death of John Foster Dulles is a numbing shock. His successor, a fine and competent man, sits in his chair at Geneva to cope with the foes he fought so ably for so long. Posterity alone can assess the contribution of this dedicated man to the cause of tranquility in a disordered world, but the sincerity of his mourners is very deep and real in our own time.

New Research Laboratory Marks AVCO Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 18, 1959

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, on May 14, the distinguished majority leader, Congressman JOHN MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, spoke in tribute of the AVCO Corp. upon the establishment of its new laboratories in Wilmington, Mass. As a member of the Committee on Science and Astronautics I would like to join with him in congratulating AVCO for its foresight in creating great new facilities for vigorously pursuing its mission in this the space age.

AVCO has made major contributions to space technology that have substantially strengthened our country's military capabilities. As well, AVCO's research and development have enhanced the comprehensive space exploration programs presently being undertaken by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

AVCO's laboratories have been given a major responsibility for the research theory on the problem of reentry of space vehicles, rockets, and missiles into the earth's atmosphere. Under the guidance of Dr. Arthur Kantrowitz, an understanding of the related chemical and physical factors involved made possible the design and development of the successful nose cones for the Atlas, Titan, and Minuteman rockets.

The AVCO Research and Advanced Development Division now has the responsibility for the design development and production of the nose cones for the "second generation" Titan and "third generation" Minuteman ICBM's. The logical outgrowth of basic research and understanding of hypersonics and the newly developed materials to withstand reentry conditions has led to a preeminent capability in the many new areas which are opening in space technology. AVCO has been working diligently for 3 years on recovery systems for satellites, and in particular, to achieving early reliable and simple techniques for the recovery of manned satellites.

This new $16 million advanced laboratory and research center, financed by the corporation, is practical evidence of AVCO's faith in the future growth of space technology and of its foresight as a major contributor to the growing body of scientific knowledge so vital to our U.S. ballistic missile capability and to maintaining our U.S. leadership of the free world in the exploration of space.

Congratulations and a hearty pat on the back to AVCO for a job well done and for success in the future.

Wheat Marketing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD L. JACKSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 27, 1959

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Santa Monica (Calif.) Outlook for May 15, 1959:

THE LOOKOUT

(By Louise Randall Piersen)

Read this and weep.

Four years ago, Evetts Haley, Jr., a college graduate just turned 20, bought a cattle ranch in Oklahoma.

He planted some wheat in his bottom land which made good feed for his cattle, and when he had more than he needed he would sell a load for cash.

When Haley had acquired a wife, was about to become a father, and there was a disastrous drought, he took a load into Muskogee to sell it but was denied a marketing quota card.

A Government survey of his farm had revealed he had planted wheat in excess of his allotted quota, had been arbitrarily assessed a fine of $506.11, and couldn't sell his wheat until it was paid.

So Haley trucked the wheat back, fed it to his cattle, but was told he would have to pay the fine, anyway.

As he didn't have the $506.11, he sold his cattle, locked the wheat up in his granary, and moved to Texas, where he took a job to support his little family.

But the Government proceeded to sue Haley for the $506.11, and the case went to trial in Judge T. Whitfield Davidson's Federal court at Dallas on September 8, 1958.

In a ringing indictment of highhanded Government agencies which persecute a man for doing something he has a right to do under the Constitution, Judge Whitfield found for Haley.

"It is not a question of marketing," said Judge Whitfield. "It is a question of whether production is unlawful and in violation of the Constitution.

"There are some 18 things that the Constitution says that Congress may or may not do. * * * There is nothing that says that

Congress shall have the power to regulate production in agriculture."

Judge Whitfield's decision was widely hailed as a blow in behalf of liberty and justice except by the Agriculture Department bureaucrats, who took the case to the Supreme Court without notifying Haley or his attorneys of the impending action.

Haley was not given a hearing, and his lawyers had no chance to make arguments in his behalf.

On February 24, 1959, the Supreme Court (which had gally bypassed the appellate court) ruled curtly, "The judgment is reversed. (*Wickard* v. *Filburn*, 317 U.S. 111.)"

But this man Filburn had received subsidies under AAA, and the Court had ruled that the Government can and must control those whom it subsidizes, while Haley had never asked for or received one red cent.

"I will never willingly pay the current penalty," says Haley, who is appealing for a rehearing. But what earthly chance has he got?

Sons of the American Revolution Support H.R. 3

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURR P. HARRISON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 27, 1959

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia, the Honorable HARRY F. BYRD, recently delivered a significant address at Warrenton, Va., from which the National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution drew in composing its resolution memorializing the Congress to enact into law H.R. 3, authored by the Honorable HOWARD F. SMITH, dean of the Virginia delegation in this House.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, Mr. Speaker, I include the text of the resolution, adopted at the 69th Annual Congress of the National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution, held at Pittsburgh, Pa., May 17–20, 1959:

Whereas compatriot Senator HARRY F. BYRD of Virginia made an outstanding speech at Warrenton, Va., on May 1, 1959, excerpts from which follow:

"Fundamentally, our form of government rests upon the sovereignty of the States which form the Union. And for 6 years since Warren was appointed Chief Justice, the Warren Court has struck directly at the roots of our democracy including a clear line of decisions destructive of States' rights and concentrating power in the Federal Government.

"Since 1953 the Warren Court has handed down a number of decisions which would:

"1. Limit the powers of the legislative branch of the Federal Government to investigate;

"2. Open confidential files of the FBI and interfere with its administrative responsibilities;

"3. Disregard the clear intent of the laws, especially for evicting subversives from public positions;

"4. Destroy the effectiveness of local police protection;

"5. Strike down the rights of individuals;

"6. Destroy the sovereignty of States guaranteed by the Constitution; and

"7. Preempt and nullify perfectly good and constitutional State laws.

"All of this does violence to American fundamentals.

"Our Constitution establishes three branches of government—legislative, executive, and judicial, but we find the Warren Court assuming the authority of all three.

"Under our system the Central Government has no authority except that granted to it by the States, but we find the Warren Court destroying the rights of States, and preempting State laws."

Therefore, be it resolved, That the National Congress of the Sons of the American Revolution condemns the acts and conduct of the Supreme Court of the United States in respect to the above and foregoing matters and memorializes the Congress of the United States to enact into law the pending bill by Representative SMITH, Democrat of Virginia, declaring that no act of the Congress supersedes a State law unless the Congress specifically declares its intention of doing so or unless the laws are clearly incompatible, and further memorializes the Congress to adopt further adequate laws to preserve and protect States' rights.

The Danger of Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 27, 1959

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in the concentration of world problems in the role that our Nation has taken as a leader of the free world, we often forget that every action of our Government, whether international or domestic, directly affects all of our citizens.

Recently, due to the public interest shown by the newspapers of the country, the average citizen has become aware of the problems of inflation as caused by excessive Government spending.

As Members of Congress, we often speak of grassroots thinking, and I, therefore, submit for the RECORD an editorial of May 21 in the Harvey Tribune, Harvey, Ill., as being typical of community newspaper and editorial policy by calling its readers, attention to the real danger of inflation:

THE DANGER OF INFLATION

Students of economics are always concerned with the problem caused by rapid inflation. The reader may sometimes wonder what to believe, and how to analyze the present trend in our country, because of the conflicting statements concerning the strength of the U.S. economy, and the danger to our economy from inflation.

It is true that we have enjoyed a steady period of inflation since the Revolutionary War, in the 18th century, and that there is no reason to think that this trend will be reversed. Inflation during most of these years has developed at a slow pace, or as a result of a series of ups and downs, with the general trend always upward.

The inflationary cycle which followed World War II was a very rapid period of inflation, and was checked only briefly in 1948–49, and another similar check was halted by the outbreak of the Korean conflict. This was only checked in 1958, by what has been known as the 1958 recession.

Many economic experts believe this was a good thing for the economy, although the country is an expanding one, with a population increase of more than two million each year, and, obviously, the economy must also expand if the living standard is to continue to rise.

There are many indications that the administration is seriously concerned with the threat of continuing inflation. In fact, President Eisenhower's warning to both the steel industry and labor, that another steep rise in the price of steel could not be tolerated, is an indication of the seriousness with which the administration views the inflationary threat.

One need only look back a few decades, or less, and study the difficulties caused in France by runaway inflation which was also so extreme in Germany that the currency had to be repudiated after World War II, as money became almost valueless.

And while the U.S. dollar is not becoming almost valueless, it is true that for the first time in decades gold has begun to flow out of the United States and our trade balance is now lost for the first time in many years. In other words, we are buying more abroad than we are selling, and this is the first time this has happened in many years. Many believe this is because the price of our products is so high that foreign nations cannot buy many of them.

The effect on national defense is serious, since the cost of national defense accounts for more than 50 percent of the total national budget of more than $70 billion, and as inflation increases the cost of defense hardware increases. The Government is again having trouble selling its bonds, because people realize that even $3 invested today may be worth no more than $4 10 years from now. They believe this because $3 invested in 1950 is today worth $6, while the Government will only pay $4 on this money—if it were an A.U. bond investment—in 1960.

One can, therefore, realize the seriousness of the threat of inflation, and understand the grave attitude in the White House concerning another sharp rise in the price of steel. Such a rise would inevitably bring about price increases in appliances, automobiles, and practically all of the goods which require considerable amounts of steel in their manufacture.

For these reasons, we believe the great majority of Americans support President Eisenhower in his effort to hold the line at this time. Simply appealing to the patriotic sentiments of all citizens, we believe that the best interests of our country will be served by restraint, and prevention of any new sharp inflationary spiral.

New York State Distressed Labor Markets Increased in Number

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 27, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 20, 1959, at pages A4228 to A4231, I inserted a report emphasizing the need for passage of the area redevelopment bill.

I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following supplement to that report, bringing the report up to date. The supplement was also published by the Area Employment Expansion Committee of New York City:

NEW YORK STATE DISTRESSED LABOR MARKETS INCREASED IN NUMBER

Continued high level of unemployment in Buffalo resulted in its being classified as a chronically distressed area. A total of 13 labor markets in New York State are now classified as distressed and would be eligible for assistance under the area redevelopment bill. They contain a civilian work force of over 1 million people and had an average unemployment rate of 11.5 percent in March 1959 (table I). The distressed areas include about one-eighth of New York State's civilian work force.

Rising national employment has lowered unemployment rates but has not resulted in any New York State distressed labor market area from graduating from this category. The Buffalo labor market was added to this list with receipt of the March unemployment figure of 11.5 percent. This labor market has had more than a 9 percent level of unemployment since February 1958. Relief from high level unemployment is not likely to occur in the forthcoming months because of the local downward movement of automobile and aviation production, shrinkage in steel employment due to automation and the closing of a number of apparel and other soft goods plants. A large scale program of economic redevelopment is necessary in this labor market.

The other major distressed labor market is Utica-Rome.

The smaller distressed labor markets include Amsterdam, Auburn, Batavia, Elmira, Glens Falls-Hudson Falls, Gloversville, Kingston, Newburgh-Middletown-Bacon, Oneida, Plattsburgh, and Watertown.

TABLE I.—*New York State labor force and unemployment in labor markets, March 1959*

Labor market area	Labor force (civilian) total	Unemployment total	Unemployment as percent of the labor force	Number in excess of 6 percent
A. State, total	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
B. Distressed areas [2]	1,030,950	118,180	11.5	56,323
Major	665,800	76,000	11.4	36,052
Buffalo	527,600	60,500	11.5	28,844
Utica-Rome	138,200	15,500	11.2	7,208
Smaller	365,150	42,180	11.6	20,271
Amsterdam [3]	23,000	3,100	13.5	1,720
Auburn	25,900	3,200	12.2	1,646
Batavia [3]	21,200	2,200	10.4	928
Elmira	40,600	4,300	10.6	1,864
Glens Falls-Hudson Falls [4]	37,700	3,400	9.0	1,138
Gloversville [3]	23,450	5,000	21.3	3,593
Kingston [3]	42,450	4,400	10.4	1,853
Newburgh-Middletown-Beacon [5]	78,400	7,630	9.7	2,926
Oneida [6]	17,850	2,150	12.0	1,079
Plattsburgh [3]	20,050	2,800	14.0	1,597
Watertown	34,550	4,000	11.6	1,927
C. Substantial labor surplus areas	6,248,350	467,950	7.5	93,049
Major	6,073,650	448,600	7.4	84,181
Albany-Schenectady-Troy	243,900	20,500	8.4	5,866
Binghamton	94,400	7,100	7.5	1,436
New York	5,312,200	391,100	7.4	72,368
Rochester	247,100	15,800	6.4	974
Syracuse	176,050	14,100	8.0	3,537
Smaller	145,350	15,900	10.9	7,179
Corning-Hornell [5]	39,000	4,100	10.4	1,760
Jamestown-Dunkirk	59,800	7,400	12.4	3,812
Olean-Salamanca [3]	31,150	2,950	9.5	1,081
Wellsville [6]	15,400	1,450	9.5	526
Very small	29,350	3,450	11.8	1,689
Catskill [7]	9,900	700	7.1	106
Orleans [8]	14,000	2,000	14.3	1,160
Waterford-Mechanicsville-Stillwater	5,450	750	13.8	423
D. Other nonsubstantial labor surplus areas [9]	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)

[1] Information not available.
[2] Eligible for assistance under the House Banking Committee recommendation, i.e., unemployment of 6 percent in at least 18 of the previous 24 months, 9 percent during at least 15 of the previous 18 months, 12 percent during the previous 12 months, or 15 percent during the previous 6-month period.
[3] January 1959.
[4] November 1958.
[5] December 1958.
[6] October 1958.
[7] September 1958.
[8] June 1958.
[9] Information not available for the following 11 small and 12 very small labor areas:
Small areas: Chenango, Delaware, Dutchess, Hudson, Oneonta, Ontario, Oswego-Fulton, St. Lawrence, Saratoga, Tompkins, and Wayne.
Very small areas: Cortland, Essex, Franklin, Hamilton, Lewis, Livingston, Schoharie, Schuyler, Seneca, Tioga, Wyoming, and Yates.

Source: Division of Employment, Department of Labor, State of New York.

Early Princetonian

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 27, 1959

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, one of the great men in American public life, Sigmund Spaeth, was given a warmhearted reception by leaders in all walks of life on the occasion of his 50th year in music.

Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt recalled his White House appearances, and spoke of the late President's interest in Dr. Spaeth.

Mayor Robert F. Wagner spoke of his years of dedicated activity in bringing music to the average person and lifting from this great art the veil of academic technicalities, and demonstrating that anyone can learn to appreciate and enjoy good music.

David Lawrence, editor of U.S. News & World Report, recalls that Dr. Spaeth was an outstanding member of the faculty of Princeton University, where he was an instructor in German at the time Woodrow Wilson was president of the university. Sigmund Spaeth wrote the program notes and reviews of concerts for the Daily Princetonian at that time, and was concertmaster of the university orchestra as well as a violin soloist. He sang in the glee club and the chapel choir and served as president of the local choral society.

I am pleased to call attention to the great work of a distinguished American who is remembered with special pleasure by many who knew him during his years at Princeton University as a force for good in the community. May his tribe increase.

I include here some of the moving tributes to Dr. Spaeth which appeared in the Music Journal, April-May 1959 issue:

A RECOLLECTION

(By Eleanor Roosevelt)

Dr. Spaeth appeared twice at the White House during my husband's term of office—once at a luncheon which I gave for the ladies of the diplomatic service, with Vandy Cape and Beatrice Harrison on the same program. I can remember still how much pleasure he gave to all of us, and I think Amelia Earhart was with us on that occasion. Later he gave us an evening concert after a dinner in honor of the Grand Duchess of Luxembourg. My husband enjoyed Dr. Spaeth tremendously and I have always had a great admiration for him and a warm recollection of his personality.

NEW YORK APPRECIATES A PRACTICAL MUSIC LOVER

(By Robert F. Wagner, mayor of the city of New York)

Music is the truly international language—and I know of no individual who has done more since the turn of the century to bring it to the hearts and homes of Americans than Sigmund Spaeth. On this, the 50th anniversary in music of Dr. Spaeth, I know I express the feelings of every resident of our great city in conveying my tribute to Sigmund Spaeth and in expressing anew my admiration and appreciation for his years of dedicated activity. He has served all of us remarkably well.

I recall with particular delight the "Tune Detective" programs in the earlier days of radio, in which I was continually amazed and amused to learn how melody, the lifeblood of music, quickly works its way into our favor and how some of our most popular and beloved tunes can be traced to earlier, more serious works.

One would require far more space than these pages afford to cite the unique and lasting contributions of Sigmund Spaeth to the growth of American culture in the field of music. (I am not forgetting that he at one time broadcast tennis and foot-

ball for WNYC.) They vary from writing and lecturing to judging the finals in New York City's annual barbershop quartet competition these many years, with occasional MC duties also in Central Park. We have a city anthem—"Our New York"—and the words and music are by Sigmund Spaeth. Our distinguished city stations, WNYC and WNYC–FM, have this year presented their 20th annual American music festival; for two decades Dr. Spaeth has been a constant source of encouragement and help to these hundreds of concerts.

For 9 fruitful years he was president of the National Association for American Composers and Conductors. It was the original Municipal Art Committee which laid the groundwork for our great City Center of Music and Drama; again Dr. Spaeth was in the vanguard, propounding valuable ideas as a committee member. Currently he is giving important aid as a member of a committee I have established for a George M. Cohan memorial, as well as that of this year's Handel Festival.

Strictly as an amateur, whose pursuits with the violin never led him to the virtuoso stage, I shall always be grateful to Sigmund Spaeth for bringing music to the level of the average person, for lifting from music the veil of academic technicalities, and demonstrating anyone can learn to appreciate and enjoy good music. From everyone who has ever sung or whistled or got pleasure from a tune, congratulations are in order to Sigmund Spaeth on his golden anniversary in music.

EARLY PRINCETONIAN

(By David Lawrence)

(David Lawrence is a widely read commentator on current events and politics, both in his popular syndicated column and in the significant magazine U.S. News & World Report, of which he is editor and Washington correspondent. Among his well known books is "The True Story of Woodrow Wilson" and he has also written many articles for the leading magazines.)

Sigmund Spaeth was an outstanding member of the Princeton faculty, which he joined in 1906 as an instructor in German. At the time, Woodrow Wilson was president of the university, and while Sigmund had an older brother, Duncan, who was an outstanding teacher of English, "Sig," as we called him, made his own mark in many ways.

Sig Spaeth, of course, had a unique way of teaching German. He really made it interesting. His classes included many men who were not only active in college days, but who later became prominent in public life.

Sig Spaeth was, even in our college days, known for his interest in music. He wrote the program notes and reviews of concerts for the Daily Princetonian, and was concertmaster of the university orchestra as well as a violin soloist. He will be remembered for his singing in the glee club and the chapel choir and serving as president of the local choral society.

All in all, I would say that Sig Spaeth was an inspiraton to all of us in student days at Princeton, and we of the alumni are gratified that he has made such a success in his chosen field.

FOR THE NATIONAL FEDERATION OF MUSIC CLUBS

(By Helen Havener)

(Helen Havener has for years been a mainstay of the National Federation of Music Clubs as executive secretary, handling all public relations, as well as the details of conventions, etc., managing the Music Clubs Magazine and supervising the organization's national headquarters in New York City. She has been of inestimable service to all the officers mentioned in this article.)

There is probably no member of the National Federation of Music Clubs who has given longer or more devoted service to the organization than Dr. Sigmund Spaeth, editor of the Music Journal, who is being saluted in this month's issue for his 50 years of dedication to the cause of music.

Dr. Spaeth's connection with the world's largest musical organization dates back to the Tri-Cities Convention in 1921, for which the clubs of Davenport, Iowa, and Rock Island and Moline, Ill., were cohosts. At that time Dr. Spaeth was serving as educational director for the American Piano Co., promoting the electric piano, known as the Ampico, with Rachmaninoff, Godowsky, Levitzki, and other artists giving live performances for comparison with their record rolls.

With the flair for the unusual and picturesque which is one of his outstanding characteristics he staged a spectacular novelty at this convention by inviting everyone to an open-air breakfast at 7 a.m. at which there was a concert demonstration featuring the Ampico, with the late Henry Souvaine, prominently identified during the last years of his life with the Metropolitan Opera broadcasts, as the chief performer. There was some grumbling in advance of the breakfast when bellboys knocked on all the hotel doors at an early hour, but nobody really minded, after being regaled with music and food on a pleasant hilltop, and the occasion is regarded as one memorable in federation history.

Although Dr. Spaeth did not begin service as a federation chairman until the late 1930's, he was a frequent and always welcome visitor at conventions. He was a guest at a federation function in the home of Mrs. Frank A. Seiberling (then national president), in Akron, Ohio, after the 1921 convention, and in 1923, at the Asheville, N.C., biennial, he played the important role of Apollo in the Carl Venth opera, "The Sun God," also bringing two professional singers to supplement the cast: James Stanley, baritone, and Ray Vir Den, tenor (later the husband of Frances Alda and president of the Dutch Treat Club). From time to time Dr. Spaeth dropped in at other conventions, if he chanced to be passing through, and in 1941, at the Los Angeles biennial, his featured speech made headlines all over the country.

Sigmund Spaeth was active in the federation under several presidents, including Mrs. Julia Fuqua Ober, the late Mrs. Anne Macomber Gannett, Mrs. Royden James Keith, Mrs. Ada Holding Miller and her current national president, Mrs. Ronald A. Dougan. His successive chairmanships have included radio and television, motion pictures, and later audio-visual education, when study of these three media was grouped together under that title. He also served as consultant for two prior national presidents, the late Ruth Haller Ottoway, afterward Mrs. Nikolai Sokoloff, and her successor, Mrs. John Alexander Jardine, when audio-visual projects were under discussion.

In his various chairmanships, Dr. Spaeth instituted campaign which resulted in general improvement in standards in the fields with which he was associated, and at one time he actually prevented the dropping of good music altogether from the air. He was instrumental also in securing the federation's cooperation in support of such films as "A Song To Remember," "The Great Caruso," Rhapsody in Blue," and "Interrupted Melody," resulting in their commercial as well as artistic success.

For many years his stimulating reviews of films and records, radio and television programs have been one of the most popular departments in the federation's official publication, Music Clubs magazine. Through the years these contributions have been of tremendous value, always preserving the highest standards, written in clear and practical style, and encouraging thousands to support the best in the various fields of communication. In recent years, since Mrs. Naomi Reynolds took over the chairmanship of audio-visual education, with Dr. Spaeth serving as eastern representative (since the federation's bylaws preclude serving more than 4 years in one chairmanship), he has restricted his reviews to records and films, previewed in New York.

At the Miami biennial in 1955 Dr. Spaeth was active throughout the entire convention, contributing a variety of services and receiving a presidential citation from the retiring president, Mrs. Miller, to whom he in turn awarded the Henry Hadley Medal of the National Association for American Composers and Conductors, over which he presided for 9 years. The Miami convention also had the honor of a special issue of Music Journal, edited by Dr. Spaeth as a guest, and it was this that led to his permanent editorship of that highly successful magazine.

Those who attended the New York convention still have vivid memories of the celebrity luncheon at which Dr. Spaeth served as master of ceremonies. His own impromptu piano accompaniments for Fritzi Scheff, Charles Kullman, and Frederick Jagel were unexpected features of the program, and he also introduced Margaret Harshaw, Frank La Forge, Abram Chasins, and other distinguished artists.

In San Diego this year Sigmund Spaeth appears as a luncheon speaker April 21 and on the motion picture panel conducted by Naomi Reynolds April 24, with a probable surprise contribution to the men's Mexican dinner on the 23d. (Even without his actual presence, the spirit of Sigmund Spaeth was felt at the Columbus convention when our current national biennial program chairman, Eleanor Pascoe, who is also chairman of the past presidents assembly, put on a hilarious production of his famous "Jack and Jill" parodies at the past presidents assembly tea.)

It is gratifying to reflect that so many of the Spaeth 50 years with music have been shared with the National Federation of Music Clubs in so many different capacities. We shall all be reading his new book of the same title with avid interest, for Sigmund Spaeth has truly been one of us through the years. May his stimulating enthusiasm long continue to exert its influence throughout the world of music.

HE MADE THE MOVIES, TOO

(By Eric Johnston)

(Eric Johnston has been president of the Motion Picture Association of America since 1945 and also heads the companion organizations, the Association of Motion Picture Producers and the Motion Picture Export Association of America. For 4 years he served as president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. Three Presidents, F. D. Roosevelt, Truman, and Eisenhower, have appointed him as an administrator and Ambassador with diplomatic responsibilities, and he still actively represents the United States abroad.)

Every generation has its musical favorites and its favorite music. Today the popular people of music appear to be the Elvis Presleys, the Tommy Sands, all the lanky and twitching young men singing in strident voices and repeating and repeating the same chords on their electric guitars.

As I look back, as sometimes I must, I know that my generation also had its musical favorites and favorite music. Thinking back to my budding days, my memory fashions a pattern in which I find Dr. Sigmund Spaeth and radio and Saturday movie matinees with a best girl and again Dr. Spaeth and again.

In my generation in music, Dr. Spaeth was everywhere, seemingly all at the same time. He was the Tune Detective, the musician, the one-man band, the educator and the elucidator. He was even in the movies on Saturday afternoon.

In my generation, the song that ran through our minds, the song that we sang around the piano at the fraternity house on a weekend night, was "Frankie and Johnny." That song, in a way, inspired us—and Dr. Spaeth is associated with it too.

The records tell us that this man, who got his doctorate the hard way, earning it at Princeton, where he wrote his dissertation on "Milton's Knowledge of Music" (John Milton, that is), actually did play the piano in a place in St. Louis called the Mansion House, where it was said that Frankie slew her lover. Let me try to unravel this.

The Mansion House was a lowdown dive, but I want to add hastily that this association of Dr. Spaeth took place in a motion picture and not in real life.

In this film version of the "Frankie and Johnny" ballad, Dr. Spaeth enacted the piano player, besides selecting and arranging other songs of the period. But he was also a dramatic actor in this film, along with Helen Morgan as Frankie and Chester Morris as Johnny.

Dr. Spaeth had the climactic line of this classic, although it was the only bit of dialog they trusted him with. The line was: "Frankie just shot Johnny."

But we don't need the records, at least I don't, to recall Dr. Spaeth as the tune detective. He was famous in that character on radio for some years and in the movie shorts after the movies got to talking in 1927.

I doubt if anyone of my vintage can forget his analysis of "Yes, We Have No Bananas," a song we also sang down at the fraternity house. Dr. Spaeth proved to our everlasting amazement that "Yes, We Have No" actually was lifted from the opening phrase of Handel's "Hallelujah Chorus."

And if that wasn't enough to make us sit up and notice really great music, he performed the same FBI job on another of our favorites, "I'm Always Chasing Rainbows." This one, he said—and proved it—came from Chopin's "Fantasie Impromptu."

I have welcomed this opportunity to talk about Dr. Spaeth on this year that marks his golden anniversary and love affair with the world's music. It is surely one of the happiest marriages of our time.

There is no doubt that this greatly talented man has perhaps done more than any other to bring the American people and great music together in our generation. All the best to him in the years ahead.

On and Off the Records

(By George R. Marek)

(George R. Marek is vice president and general manager of RCA Victor Records. Before joining that organization in 1950 he was vice president of J. D. Tarcher & Co., advertising agency. Mr. Marek has written extensively on music and has, since 1940, been music editor of Good Housekeeping magazine. His books include "The Good Housekeeping Guide to Musical Enjoyment," "Front Seat at the Opera," "Puccini," and "A World Treasury of Grand Opera." He appears frequently on the Saturday broadcasts of the "Metropolitan Opera Quiz.")

The relations between Sigmund Spaeth and the record industry have been very close through a large part of his 50 years with music. He has been particularly helpful in writing the liners (editorial comments) on the outside of disk covers, making his materials entertaining as well as educational and thus adding to the popularity of the recordings concerned.

In the RCA Victor catalog Dr. Spaeth contributed the comments for the first album made by Margaret Truman, including some important information on the backgrounds of the colonial songs recorded by her. His liner on the 25th anniversary record of Arthur Fiedler was a sincere and well-phrased tribute to that popular and highly successful orchestral conductor. There are Spaeth notes also on the covers of several of the famous Treasury series, for which his personal recollections of the artists of the past proved most valuable. In his lighter moments, Dr. Spaeth wrote authoritatively on an album of barbershop quartets and the spectacular band music of Morton Gould, as well as the Kostelanetz operatic records.

His activities have been significant also in promoting records of all kinds. "Sigmund Spaeth's Record Library" was the title of a series of broadcasts over station WQXR which served as a stimulus to wider and more intelligent listening to records in American homes. His ABC network program, "At Home With Music," made constant use of good records, and this series was quite properly nominated for a Peabody award.

It is not generally known that some years ago a highly popular record library known as Music You Enjoy resulted from the combined efforts of Dr. Spaeth, Howard Barlow and the Columbia Symphony Orchestra. These records were sold mostly through newspapers, as a stimulus to circulation, and the New York Journal-American alone is said to have disposed of more than half a million sets in a short time. (Some of the records were later made available also in a reduced size for children, under the title of "Little Masters.")

Recently Dr. Spaeth has been active in presenting a "Basic Library of the World's Greatest Music," for sale in supermarkets, making possible the work of a national committee for the musical arts, headed by Alec Templeton, with Quaintance Eaton as executive secretary, for which Dr. Spaeth has been the regular speaker at organizational chapter meetings.

The RCA Victor laboratory was used not long ago for recording a special set of interviews by Sigmund Spaeth with outstanding artists of the internationally known community concerts, each interview being followed by one or more selections from the repertoire of the singer or instrumentalist concerned. These records have been heard on local radio stations in connection with community concert campaigns and are available for this purpose through the New York office of the organization.

There is at least historic interest in the miniature records made by Simon & Schuster for the first edition of Sigmund Spaeth's "Barber Shop Ballads, in which he himself sang baritone with three other experts in that highly individual type of harmony. Unfortunately this was before the days of unbreakable records, and most of the dics came back in fragments, making a whole set today a collectors item. Less known are some of the recordings and transcriptions made by Dr. Spaeth for the promotion of various motion pictures, including the famous "A Song to Remember" (Chopin's film biography, with piano-playing by José Iturbi), "Ive Always Loved You" (for which Artur Rubinstein did the off-screen performances) and "Scheherazade," in which the late Walter Damrosch joined Dr. Spaeth in a recorded discussion.

Finally we have had several years of authoritative reviewing of records by Sigmund Spaeth, at one time in Theater Arts magazine, later in his own Music Journal and his syndicated column, Music for Everybody, and, perhaps most significantly, in the Music Clubs magazine, which goes to the 600,000 members of the National Federation of Music Clubs, long served by Dr. Spaeth as chairman of Audio-Visual Education.

For a man who has never considered himself a recording artist in any sense, much less a scientific expert in discography, this all adds up to considerable and consistently commendable achievement in a field today universally recognized for its contriubtions to the advancement of music in America.

This Was a Musical Family

(By Albert Charles Norton)

(The author of this personal history is a well known writer of hymns and gospel songs, in his youth a pupil of Dr. J. Duncan Spaeth in Philadelphia, where he also knew the other members of the family. He has been a contributor to Music Journal in the past, discussing unusual personalities in the musical field.)

November 22, 1902 was a great day for boys of the Central High School in Philadelphia. For it was the day of Dedication. Literally, the whole city turned out. The speaker for the ocasion was the President of the United States: Theodore Roosevelt. And the cheerleader was Dr. Duncan Spaeth, popular chairman of athletics, coach of the school crew, and the inspiring professor of english philology and literature. In that audience were many prominent alumni of the school, member of the Spaeth family, and an old graduate, Sep Winner, composer of "Listen to the Mocking Bird" and "Whispering Hope."

It was with no little satisfaction that we followed Dr. Duncan Spaeth through the years—as professor of English literature at Princeton during the era of Woodrow Wilson and later. His creation of wining crews and his adult community forums have been lasting contributions to the fame of Princeton.

Among those enthusiastic graduate students at Princeton (and also on the faculty) was Dr. Duncan's younger half-brother Sigmund Spaeth, in whose honor this story is written. For, in keeping with the family tradition and a big brother's inspiration, Sigmund was headed for a career in music and to become himself a master in his field. To gain a closer understanding and to express a genuine appreciation of these men we must literally take a Rhine journey and in the land of the Nibelungs find the sources from whence came this distinguished family.

It was at Esslingen on the banks of the Neckar, amid the Swabian hills, that the Spaeth father Adolph was born. Surrounded by medieval castles, churches, quaint shops, and an industrious peasantry, the young man grew in stature and spirit. A lover of music and of his church, he studied for the ministry, first at Blaubeuren and then at Tübingen, with Friedrich Silcher, composer of the famous "Lorelei" tune, as his music teacher. The years pass, and we follow him abroad—to Scotland, where we find him as tutor in the family of the Duke of Argyle, with a developing romance and marriage to Maria Duncan. Next we find him in Philadelphia, a leader in a growing German-American community centered about St. Johannis Church. Son J. Duncan is at the organ, and later, seventh son Sigmund is in the choir. From Reverend Adolph's pen come eloquent addresses, scholarly books and many German hymns, still sung in the Lutheran Church. His second son, Henry Douglas, also entered the Lutheran ministry and held pastorates in Williamsport, Pa., and Liberty, N.Y. Ernest Spaeth, with the family spirit of adventure, went West to ranch in Wyoming and to become a State sheep commissioner. Maria Elisabeth, still living in Philadelphia, became a kindergarten teacher and gave to Sigmund his first musical instruction through nursery rhymes. Carola, Sigmund's own sister, became an accomplished musician and artist, sharing with her brother many happy hours of study and performance. Nor must we forget son Reynold who went to Bangkok as head of the Rockefeller Hospital but still found time to sing and to whistle tunes of America and of the East. The mother of the three younger

Spaeths was born Harriett Reynolds Krauth, daughter of Rev. Charles Porterfield Krauth, vice provost of the University of Pennsylvania, herself an author and musician, editor of the Lutheran "Church Book With Music."

With such a family background, Sigmund Spaeth came on the scene to pioneer in promoting the universal language of music. In this year 1959 his significance in music is equaled by few. His travels, his studies with the masters at home and abroad, his encyclopedic knowledge are familiar to every reader of his books and to every listener to his broadcasts. Every student and teacher is familiar with the famous "Tune Detective" and opera commentator. His popular lectures with piano illustrations have brought music into the heart of every city. His sense of humor as well as of human psychology have been expressed in all his writings, and to many today music is no longer a labor over interminable and boring exercises—but just plain fun. Comedy, pathos, drama, laughter, and the depths of emotion have entered the lives of his readers. We "boys of the old school" are most happy to join the host of friends and extend our personal felicitations to Dr. Sigmund Spaeth on this golden anniversary.

The St. Lawrence Seaway and Harbor Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. D. BAUMHART, JR.
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 5, 1959

Mr. BAUMHART. Mr. Speaker, the editorial reprinted below, relative to harbor development and the seaway, appeared in the Sandusky Register, Sandusky, Ohio, on May 23, 1959. Recommended improvements to the Lorain and Sandusky Harbors in my congressional district have been approved by the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of the Budget, and are incorporated in the rivers and harbors bill presently under consideration by the House Public Works Committee. If the full value of the seaway is to be felt in the near future, planning programs should be instituted and funds allocated without delay:

SEAWAY HOPE DEFERRED

Only one American inland port, that of Detroit, can handle big ships plying the St. Lawrence Seaway fully loaded, which need a controlling depth of 25½ feet. Harbors at Buffalo, Chicago, Duluth-Superior, Cleveland, Toledo, Erie, and Milwaukee vary between 20 and 24 feet and must, therefore, restrict themselves to handling partially filled big seaway ships or smaller craft with less draft. Sandusky Bay's depth is 22 feet.

A U.S. engineer's survey recommends the expenditure of $63,662,300 in Federal funds to bring the St. Lawrence and Great Lakes ports on the American side up to full seaway capability. This would be in addition to deepening Great Lakes connecting channels to 27 feet, the seaway controlling depth, to carry traffic from Toledo to Duluth. The channel work would cost $146,500,000. The total Federal cost would exceed $210 million.

This finding defers the great hopes held out for the seaway for at least another decade. The channel deepening is proceeding slowly. The Army Engineers asked for $29 million this year, but the administration trimmed it to $23 million. The harbor work is still in the survey stage. There has been time since the passage of the seaway bill to do the necessary channeling and harbor improvement work. The delay will cost the country dear in postponing the full advantages the seaway has to bring.

Unification of Military Procurement and Supply

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 27, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on May 12, 1959, I called to the attention of the Members of the House the contents of a letter which I addressed to the Chairman, Council of Economic Advisers, Hon. Raymond J. Saulnier, regarding the need for forceful action toward unification of military procurement and supply not only for the sake of defense itself but to relieve the economy of the inflationary pressures which are now being exerted upon it.

On May 22 I again wrote to Mr. Saulnier on "How do we get hold of this problem?" and I wish to have it inserted in the RECORD for the information of my colleagues:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., May 22, 1959.

Hon. RAYMOND J. SAULNIER,
Council of Economic Advisers,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR DR. SAULNIER: Reference is made to your letter of May 5, 1959, in response to mine of April 8, 1959.

I am in complete agreement with the implication of your question, "How do we get hold of this problem." In other words, this matter has been studied and restudied and what is needed now is a program of positive action.

As I stated in my previous letter, the McCormack-Curtis amendment to the Department of Defense Reorganization Act, 1958, gives the Secretary of Defense broad authority "for the carrying out of any supply or service activity common to more than one military department by a single agency or such other organizational entities as he deems appropriate."

It has been estimated that the supply and service activities or support activities take the major portion of the annual budget and besides this, we have the enormous inventories and facilities of the various military services all over the world.

When the Department of Defense Reorganization Act, Public Law 85-599, was before the House of Representatives on June 12, 1958, Congressman MCCORMACK listed a number of supply and service activities which fall within the scope of the amendment. Some months ago, I wrote to the Secretary of Defense and asked that he list all the activities which would fall within the scope of the amendment and to advise with respect to each just what action had been taken or was contemplated. I understand that Senators DOUGLAS, LAUSCHE, and perhaps others have written similar letters but have had no response to date.

It is my firm conviction that a topside action committee should be constituted to operate at the Presidential level to set up time schedules for the fulfillment of a number of programs which have been on dead center for a long time. I would include the following as a start:

1. Schedule the transfer of common-use administrative or commercial-type supply and services to GSA as contemplated by the GSA Act which is now 10 years old. This will involve the transfer of facilities and personnel with the activities.

2. Evaluate the present single manager plans for (a) subsistence and clothing, (b) petroleum products, (c) medical supply and if basically successful, streamline them and extend the plans to other classes of items. Also determine if they should be combined into a system of general military supply depots.

3. Consolidate and streamline surplus property disposal including the donable program.

4. Make provision for a property inventory control system which will permit a review of existing common items in all the military inventories before additional orders are placed.

5. Institute a genuine action program to develop to the maximum standardization of supply items, form procedures, systems, reporting, accounting, etc. (For example there should be a discontinuance of special service insignia on blankets and other items of common supply which prevent excesses from being transferred to other agencies. Recently, the Marine Corps declared 260,000 blankets excess but as they bore special insignia, the other services did not want them.)

6. Make a speedy determination as to when stock funds should and should not be used.

In order to get a running start on the overall program, I recommend that the Hoover task force committee be utilized as an advisory committee to assist a special action task force. The Hoover task force members, as you know, have spent long periods of time studying these matters, are wholly objective in their views and were carefully chosen in the first place because of their competence in the respective fields.

The importance of these matters in their economic impact on the country is related to there being in effective existence a streamlined, efficient, and economical supply system. Little or no use has apparently been made of the Defense Reorganization Act of 1958 which was designed to provide all necessary legislative authority. Real action thus is an executive responsibility.

Since the Department of Defense is making such unsatisfactory progress under its own volition, I suggest the appropriateness of the Bureau of the Budget, in its capacity as the management arm for the President, being directed to establish such internal organization in the Bureau as is necessary to really take hold of this matter and accomplish the results—and benefits—which have so clearly been blueprinted as attainable.

Sincerely,

THOMAS B. CURTIS.

Forgotten Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MORGAN M. MOULDER
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 27, 1959

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

Whereas the forgotten old Veterans of World War I, who saved the world for democ-

racy 41 years ago, need economic aid of an age pension under H.R. 1181 for an American standard of living; and

Whereas all prior war veteran groups have been granted an age pension without regimentation and without being required to file an unlimited number of annual and other reports with the Veterans' Administration, and without other un-American limitations: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Missouri Department, Veterans of World War I, United States of America, Inc., at its regular annual convention, held in El Dorado Springs, Mo., May 16 and 17, 1959, That the President and the Congress of the United States of America are hereby requested and urged to promptly pass H.R. 1181 for the relief of the forgotten old Veterans of World War I.

ROY F. HAMPEL,
Commander, Missouri Department, Veterans of World War I, U.S.A., Inc.
FRANK J. NESSELHAUF,
Adjutant, Missouri Department, Veterans of World War I, U.S.A., Inc.

Harry Bridges Outrage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD L. JACKSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 27, 1959

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Los Angeles Evening Herald Express:

HARRY BRIDGES OUTRAGE

Harry Bridges testified before the House Committee on Un-American Activities, took the fifth on the question of whether he is or was a Communist, and allowed that he would advocate a longshoremen's strike to prevent American arms from reaching Formosa in the event of war between Nationalist and Communist China.

He made a slight modification: The union membership, he said, would have to decide whether arms would be taken to an American ally.

This is one of the most outrageous statements to come from a source noted for outrageous statements.

Locally, the American Legion's California District 23 in an angry resolution correctly described Bridges' stand in these words:

"Totally disloyal, un-American and treacherous."

It is a sign of decadence that our laws permit the alien Bridges to remain in this country.

Suppose Communist China should launch an all-out attack on Formosa and Nationalist China, as it has threatened on numerous occasions.

Suppose the United States rushes to the defense of its ally.

And suppose Harry Bridges should succeed in calling a longshoremen's strike which would keep U.S. arms from reaching Nationalist China for its defense.

Would the President and other U.S. defense chiefs be forced to stand aside and allow this defiant action to threaten this Nation's security?

Or would Bridges be deported and thrown out of this country for good, so that he no longer could menace the Americanism for which the people stand?

Many of the members of Bridges' big union are disgusted with his latest declaration against the national defense of this country, and with the longshoremen's union caucus in Seattle which urged U.S. recognition of Red China.

This is indicated by dissension in Los Angeles-Long Beach Harbor longshoremen's circles, which was capped by the resignation of one of the union's leaders.

We have the utmost confidence in the loyalty of the members of this powerful union to the United States of America. We feel that the vast majority of them are upright, honest, and loyal citzens the same as other millions of Americans.

And we think this is a dastardly act by Bridges, to even insinuate that he could force them to be disloyal in the event of an attack by Communist China against our ally, Nationalist China.

Silver Jubilee of Archbishop Francis P. Keough of the Archdiocese of Baltimore

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. FALLON
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 27, 1959

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, citizens of all denominations—Protestants, Jews, and Catholics—have just united in a magnificent tribute upon the occasion of the silver jubilee of Archbishop Francis P. Keogh, of the Archdiocese of Baltimore. The observance of his 25th year in the episcopacy of the Catholic Church represented a tribute to his laudable activities, benefiting persons of various creeds, in alleviating their sufferings, privations, and need for custodial care.

Members of the hierarchy from different States of the Union assembled in Baltimore on May 21, the primal see of the Catholic Church in America. The most heartwarming acclaim of the archbishop was manifested by both clergy and laity, who rejoiced in the completion of his 25 years as a bishop and additional years as an ordained priest.

Bishop Lawrence J. Shehan, of the diocese of Bridgeport, Conn., delivered the sermon at the pontificial mass, reviewing in a masterful manner the history of the episcopate of the Catholic Church. At the luncheon, following the ceremonies, Bishop Jerome D. Sebastian, auxiliary bishop of Baltimore, delivered a glowing account of the archbishop's administration in Baltimore, and tendered gifts to the jubilarian.

The secular press, as well as the diocesan publications, were as one in felicitating the Baltimore prelate, who, by reason of his charities, has become known as the archbishop of the poor. In the Baltimore News Post, a most interesting article was written, giving the measure of the man. Its composer is Gerard E. Sherry, the well-known and highly respected editor of the Catholic Review, and the article deserves the widest reading by peoples of all religions.

Under previous consent I submit excerpts from this article to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD:

TRIBUTE TO ARCHBISHOP FRANCIS P. KEOUGH
(By Gerard E. Sherry)

I suppose there are very few laymen and women who can claim to have as their boss an archbishop, both in the very spiritual sense of ecclesiastical discipline and in the very material sense of earning one's daily bread. Such is my lot, and I wouldn't swap it for most of what the secular newspaper field has to offer.

Little known, perhaps, is the fact that almost all of the Catholic weekly newspapers in this country are owned and operated by the dioceses in which they are published. Furthermore, the publisher of the paper is nearly always the bishop. This is the case in Baltimore, and we have no more dedicated person to the apostolate of the Catholic press than Archbishop Francis P. Keough. Today he celebrates the 25th anniversary of his elevation to the fullness of the priesthood as a bishop.

* * * * *

I remember my very first meeting with Archbishop Keough some 3½ years ago, when he hired me as managing editor of the Review. There were no pious platitudes uttered but only a forthright statement of his aims in relation to the editorial running of the Catholic Review. There was a stated policy. There was the understanding that one would keep within the bounds of this policy.

He said then that this did not mean the stiflings of editorial expression nor the exclusion of the art of controversy. Naturally, however, any controversy would have to be conducted in good taste and in a charitable manner.

* * * * *

The archbishop's philosophy is that each one may hold and defend his own opinion. But such an opinion must be presented with due restraint. He has often advised me that no one should be condemned simply because he disagrees with the opinion of another, much less must his loyalty be challenged.

* * * * *

Archbishop Keough is concerned not merely with the spiritual life of the faithful of the archdiocese of Baltimore, but also with their material pursuit of peace and happiness. Hence, his concern for the poor, the sick, and the aged.

This concern for the dignity of the human being flows not only from the nature of his office as spiritual head of the archdiocese, but also from an innate sympathy and understanding of the problems of men.

To have an interview with him is quite an experience, as many will attest. Busier than most executives of big corporations (and having under his spiritual and material care properties and finances greater than most executives) he nevertheless is the perfect listener and wise counselor. The door is open to all—too many perhaps—but his patience and graciousness are a pride to behold.

* * * * *

The archbishop has outstanding qualities; an ability to portray all the dignity of his office without affectation or condescension; an ability to be great without advertising the fact.

At the many arduous ceremonials he must perform in the course of his duties he still has time to offer kind words of encouragement to his assistants, the altar boys and sacristans. And as he goes down from the altar into the congregation he wears a friendly smile and offers a friendly greeting to all.

A man with a remarkable memory, the Archbishop has often surprised lay men and women whom he has not seen for several years by not only greeting them, but also addressing them by their first name. He is a man of the people and keeps close to them.

Inconvenienced by ill health, he nevertheless seldom refuses a request from a pastor or a religious order to officiate at the dedica-

tion of an institution or school—and there are plenty of such monuments to his tenacity and administrative skills here in Maryland.

Finally, he's my boss. No man could wish for a better one. His many personal kindnesses and courtesies have helped when help was needed. He has been stern at times; but then wise admonition is always good for the soul. It's good for an editor, too. And who else but the publisher should give it.

Statehood Makes Hawaii New Distribution and Sales Center of the Pacific

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. BURNS
DELEGATE FROM HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 27, 1959

Mr. BURNS of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable H. Tucker Gratz, of Honolulu, T.H., a constituent for whom I have a high regard and deep affection, has written an article for the Server in response to queries as to the effect of Hawaii statehood on sales and distribution activities by U.S. organizations in the Pacific.

Mr. Gratz is president of Better Brands, Ltd., an organization having offices in Japan, Korea, Taiwan, Okinawa, Hong Kong, Philippines, Guam, Vietnam, and the Trust Territory. He travels the Pacific region several times each year and has intimate knowledge of the people and markets.

The article, which appeared in the May 11 edition of the Server, is commended to the attention of the Members of Congress who will, I am sure, find it of great interest:

STATEHOOD MAKES HAWAII NEW DISTRIBUTION, SALES CENTER OF PACIFIC, DECLARES GRATZ

The friendly hand of the United States reached out 2,400 miles toward 1¼ billion individuals in the far western Pacific, when Hawaiian statehood legislation was passed by Congress. A great percentage of these billion people are hungry for American products—and it is the largest untapped market for U.S. merchandise in the world.

Not all peoples of the vast Asian area are free. The Communists hold some half-billion in serfdom. But, there are tens of millions of free human beings in this vast region, and they are experiencing a steadily increasing standard of living. In areas such as Australia standards already compare favorably with many parts of America.

REAL OPPORTUNITY

The success of U.S. products in the Pacific can be judged by our own organization. We have active sales and distribution outlets in Japan, Korea, Taiwan, Hong Kong, Philippines, Guam, Vietnam, and the trust territory. Year after year we have seen the volume increase on lines of first-quality products. This is not a dumping area for seconds, but it provides a real opportunity for merchandise of the standard we enjoy.

Granting statehood for Hawaii is the first positive U.S. action toward recognition of the vast Pacific. And, these islands are destined to be the business, communication, educational, and cultural center for American interests in the South, and Far East regions of this great ocean.

This function comes naturally to Hawaii. Nowhere else have peoples fused so happily. Hawaii has two daily newspapers published in Japanese. One daily is printed in Chinese characters. At least two papers are in dialects of the Philippines. Additional publications appear in Korean, and other eastern languages. Of the island's permanent population, 32 percent are of Japanese extraction; 30 percent are Caucasian; 17 percent Hawaiian, or part Hawaiian; 11 percent Filipino; 6 percent Chinese, and 4 percent from other regions. Yet, all have one common tongue and culture—American.

Many interesting stories can be told about Hawaii and her people. A few days ago I interviewed girls for a new position. All racial groups are welcomed. First to arrive was an attractive second or third generation Japanese girl. I asked if she spoke Japanese. She smiled prettily and said, "Not a word." The next young lady was Caucasian, the daughter of a retired Army officer. Almost automatically I asked, "Do you speak other languages?" She replied, "Yes, I speak and write Japanese fluently."

With Hawaii's strategic location, and intimate understanding of her neighbors in the vast Pacific rim from Australia to Japan, the islands can't help but be the American headquarters center for this half of the world. It is impractical to think of businessmen with regular contacts in the east trying to operate even from the west coast of the mainland. In Hawaii they are 2,400 miles nearer their job. And experienced and trained veterans of Far East business are available for counsel. As an example, we in Better Brands receive 11 or 12 inquiries each month for information and help on matters regarding sales and merchandising in the Pacific area.

Hawaiian commercial and professional firms have long been doing business in the new American frontier. Hawaiian Dredging & Construction Co. is an excellent example. They have major contracts now in progress in the Suez Canal, Kuwait, Japan, and other areas, yet they find Hawaii offers the most practical operation center. Their established bases undoubtedly can be of assistance to other American operations.

As another example, a Hawaiian public relations firm has affiliated offices in Australia, New Zealand, Fiji, Philippines, Hong Kong, Taiwan, and Japan.

HAWAII OFFERS KNOW-HOW

It is safe to say that Hawaii offers mainland business interests a wealth of experience and know-how that can cut years from trial-and-error approaches to the Pacific market.

Hawaii, as an island chain, is a sizable market within itself. Some 635,000 persons, including military personnel, live within the soon-to-be 50th State. The booming tourist industry brought an additional 183,500 persons last year. These people left $82 million in the islands during a period when the United States generally was in a business slump. With the start of commercial jet air service this year, travel is expected to skyrocket.

Per capita income of the people of Hawaii is higher than that of the State of Texas.

No business organization, however large, can afford to overlook an area in which the Armed Forces spend $327 million, and servicemen and their families spend another $300 million, each year for goods and services.

But Hawaii is more than a new State market, it is a new American frontier for trade, commerce, and communications covering millions of people in the Pacific rim.

Statehood for Hawaii marks another highly interesting development. It points clearly to the continued westward movement of the center of civilization and culture around the globe. This gradual rotation can be fairly accurately traced for some 2,000 years. Starting in the Middle East, or probably at an earlier date in India or China, it moved westward to Greece, Rome, middle Europe, England, and the east coast of the United States. Within the last decades we have witnessed movement to the west coast. California already threatens to become our most highly populated State.

Hawaii is the new U.S. sales and distribution center of the Pacific, as this movement continues westward. It is the beginning of the merger of cultures that will make the Pacific a land of great opportunity. People, land area, natural resources.

UHF-VHF Dilemma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 27, 1959

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply disturbed over a report in Broadcasters magazine that the Federal Communications Commission plans to allocate another VHF television channel in the Hartford area.

I have written to Chairman John C. Doerfer, of the Federal Communications Commission, and told him that this will not only complicate the existing and utterly confusing VHF-UHF pattern, but it will absolutely drive two UHF television stations in my congressional district at Springfield, Mass., right out of business. They are channels 40 and 22.

Mr. Speaker, channel 3 in Hartford is a CBS affiliate and it provides more than fringe VHF service to western Massachusetts, as the Federal Communications Commission would imply. As a matter of fact, it is so effective in blanketing my area that UHF channel 40 is about ready to lose its CBS affiliation.

Channel 8 VHF, which is affiliated with ABC, is also providing good coverage to the same area because of its increase in power output. The reports that another VHF channel will go into the Hartford area, naturally will lead me to believe that NBC wants a western New England outlet. If so, UHF channel 22 at Springfield might just as well fold up.

Mr. Speaker, the loss of these UHF channels will deprive the people of access to local programing, discussion of community problems, the stimulus for fund raising drives and desirable entertainment by local civic and fraternal organizations.

Jack Gould, of the New York Times, who is undoubtedly the country's most perceptive television critic and is well respected throughout the industry, devoted his column to the UHF-VHF dilemma in the Sunday Times of May 17. I submit this article with my remarks for the RECORD, and commend it to my colleagues for study:

NEED FOR SPACE—FCC REPORT ILLUSTRATES COMPLEXITY OF ALLOCATING TELEVISION CHANNELS

(By Jack Gould)

The continuing problem of how to find enough room on the air for more television stations has led to a new report by the Federal Communications Commission.

The root of the space problem is that nothing like a truly national TV service has been either established or, indeed, is in prospect. While there are 551 TV stations, including 42 educational outlets in operation, there are still a great many populated areas receiving service from only 2 stations. Unless this lack can be remedied, competition between networks is bound to be lopsided and the prospects for adequate educational or independent local or community TV rather remote.

What has necessitated the reexamination of TV's future is the failure of ultra-high-frequency television. It had been hoped that UHF, operating on channels 14 through 83, would bloom and prove a happy and workable supplement to very-high-frequency television, operating on the familiar channels of 2 through 13. Had UHF prospered, there would have been enough room on the air for every type of conceivable TV service.

OBJECTIVE

It is the disappointing experience with UHF that underlies the latest FCC report, a document that on the whole affords an eminently realistic analysis of the complexity of the situation with respect to allocating channels. Included in the report is a series of proposed remedies, at least one of which is highly controversial, but none of the suggested solutions holds promise of practical relief for many years to come.

The immediate objective of the FCC is to squeeze in a few more stations into the present band spanning channels 2 through 13; this will afford expanded service in a handful of large communities. But in adopting this course of technical expediency, which is probably unavoidable, the FCC undoubtedly is compounding the difficulty that it seeks to resolve.

The nub of the whole problem confronting both the FCC and Congress is a familiar one in TV: which comes first, the chicken or the egg? Or, to speak in electronic jargon, do you first have stations in order to sell sets, or do you first sell sets in order to have an audience for new stations?

In its report the FCC reaffirms that channels 2 through 13 cannot contain all the outlets for which, as a matter of farsighted policy, the Government at least should plan. This means that there must be a second band of channels of some sort. Because the FCC raises a glimmer of hope that the band might have the technical advantages of channels 2 through 13—something UHF never had—there has been a measure of idealistic rejoicing in some quarters.

PROSPECTS

But optimism scarcely seems warranted.

So long as channels 2 through 13 remain in use it is illusory to hope to activate a second group of supplementary channels. Every year that passes, with the sale of additional receivers capable of picking up only channels 2 through 13, dependence on the existing band is intensified. And while Congress and the FCC debate and ponder, this process is going right along.

To make a second band possible, the FCC has made one recommendation that has stirred up a formidable row. This is a proposal that manufacturers of television sets, as a condition of their distribution of receivers in interstate commerce, be required by law to include in their product the necessary tuners capable of receiving whatever channels may be authorized in a second band.

The attractive thought behind this suggestion is that with the normal replacement of sets over a decade there will be established a ready-made audience capable of receiving stations in the second band. If the proposal could be sure of accomplishing its purpose, public interest would clearly warrant its adoption. But there does not appear to be much chance that such would be the case.

PROBLEM

The cost of a TV set would have to be increased substantially were the receiver to include the circuitry needed to pick up the second band; this added fee, of course, would be passed along to the consumer. But until such sets were sold in very substantial volume, which in itself would take many years, what broadcaster would open a station when he knew that for a long time his audience would be too small to allow successful operation? And if there aré no second-band stations in his area, is the consumer going to be eager to pay for extra equipment that could prove to be useless?

Assuming the extra charge for a second-band receiver were $25 and 4 million sets were sold in a year, the gamble of the public would run to $100 million annually, or in a decade, $1 billion. Without some ironclad assurance that the public is investing in a certainty, not a theoretical possibility, that seems quite an imposition.

Under such circumstances there can only be the gravest misgivings over the plans of the FCC—and a substantial body of Congress—to approach the future TV in terms of two bands, one band that everybody can pick up on their present receiving equipment and one band that they cannot. It was such an unrealistic two-band policy that killed UHF.

If television is to have a democratic foundation, then all stations must be placed on equal footing. This means the adoption of one new band on which all stations will function as of a given date. This will enable new broadcasters to make plans for taking to the air in the secure knowledge that they will be seen; it would require set manufacturers to make the transition out of self-interest, not through Government edict. It will assure the public that any extra set charge will be valid and justified.

SOLUTION

The only way in which this goal can be reached is by moving all of television to the ultra-high-frequency band. When frequency modulation radio was moved up in the spectrum simultaneous service on the old and new FM bands was permitted for a specified period to minimize the hardships of the transition.

Today's large TV operators and the networks are far fom enthusiastic over UHF because it will mean a reduction in the area that their signals cover. Admittedly, UHF does pose many very formidable technical challenges, but, for want of economic incentive to open the band, there has not been intensified research in the area.

Both the Senate and House Committees on Interstate and Foreign Commerce plan long hearings on how to split up the spectrum to best advantage. Indeed, the politicians seem to be preempting more and more of the highly complex engineering problems which the FCC was established to resolve.

But the interest of the committees is understandable. Such are the fantastic stakes in the present pattern of TV that realistically it may be impossible to break out of the status quo. The FCC report, the prevailing congressional atmosphere, and the lack of public concern do not bode encouragingly for the bold approach that is needed if television broadcsating is not to continue indefinitely in substantially its present form.

Protection Versus Free Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUSSELL V. MACK
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 7, 1959

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the tide of anxiety over competition from foreign sources is rapidly rising in this country. More and more questions are being asked about our foreign trade policy of the past 25 years and its effect in exposing our industries to low-wage foreign competition.

It has been pointed out that our position is not a surprising one since it is a natural result of our domestic economic policies, as affected by war and defense policies, on the one hand, and our foreign economic policies, on the other.

At home we pursued a highly expansive economic policy and this was abetted by war and postwar defense outlays. The two combined to bring about high prices and high costs. On the foreign front we followed an opposite policy, that is, one of free trade. The two could not avoid colliding sooner or later. The day of collision was hurried greatly by our foreign assistance program under which we helped build up foreign technology and helped vastly at mechanization of foreign production.

Since the Marshall plan was first instituted we have exported machinery to the extent of $30 billion. Also we have guided thousands of foreign productivity teams through our plants and mills. They have not gone away, we may be sure, without notes and ideas.

We may as well face the fact that we have opened the door through which our technological and industrial leadership is escaping. Dozens of our own industries are also using this exit to join those they cannot lick.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I offer a letter to the editor of the Journal of Commerce devoted in great part to this subject. It is directed to the question of pricing ourselves out of world markets. The letter, by O. R. Strackbein, follows:

ECONOMIC CHICKENS COMING HOME?

EDITOR, JOURNAL OF COMMERCE:

On May 5 you ran a three-column front page news item devoted to an address by Assistant Secretary of Commerce Henry Kearns in which he explained our foreign trade slump and went far toward denying that we are pricing ourselves out of foreign markets.

In one of his irresponsible flights of rhetoric the Assistant Secretary charged that those who believe in protectionism are seizing upon our trade problems in an effort to destroy our world trade (if he was correctly quoted).

PROBLEM SERIOUS

The problem is a serious one without the addition of mud-slinging by officials who rather odiously place themselves in the po-

sition of favoring the interests of one group of taxpayers at the expense of another.

Our uncomfortable international competitive position is not so much one of pricing ourselves out of our accustomed markets. At bottom the change is the natural result of our domestic and foreign economic policies of the past 25 years.

The reductions of our tariffs were intended to do, if they meant anything, what they have done, i.e. expose us to more and more foreign competition. Otherwise, they would have been meaningless. We are only beginning to feel the consequences that many of us long foresaw. The delay was caused through concealment of underlying movements by extraordinary war and postwar developments.

EXPANSION ABROAD

Tariff reductions, however, are not the total explanation. Probably just as effective and actually cumulative, because of similar competitive effects, has been the installation abroad of many billions of dollars worth of modern machinery and equipment in the past 6 or 7 years.

Rather rapidly in some areas and swiftly in particular industries we are losing our technological lead. With the lower wages continuing to prevail abroad we are losing our immunity to import competition as productivity rises there. It needed no increasing wages here to produce our discomfiture.

CAPITAL LOOKS ABROAD

High wages here are therefore not the only nor the supreme culprit. After all, we have farm price supports, social security, restricted immigration, and other interferences with the free market that makes for an artificial economy.

High wages in combination with these other factors do cause pressure for mechanization and the latter makes for unemployment unless absorption takes place. More and more of our capital looks abroad for expansion because the outlook seems better there, particularly as a means of competing abroad and as a base for exports to third countries.

The result could be chronic unemployment here because the expansion necessary for absorption of the unemployed will be dampened.

In time our economy will be beached as the tide flows out, in response to 25 years of national policy that did not know how to turn when the writing was on the wall. We have been following economic policies at home that are diametrically opposed to our foreign economic policy. When the chickens come home we are surprised, troubled, and helpless.

After all, we do have the know-how, don't we? Or do some others now have it too?

O. R. STRACKBEIN,
Chairman, the Nationwide Committee on Export-Import Policy.

Lung Cancer in Japan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. VAUGHAN GARY
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 27, 1959

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to point out that charges have been made by some that smoking causes lung cancer, but as yet scientific evidence has not substantiated these charges. As search for the truth continues, I include with my remarks the following United Press dispatch dated March 28, 1959, from Osaka, Japan:

OSAKA, JAPAN.—Prof. Toru Miyaji of Osaka University's Medical School says most lung-cancer deaths in Japan appear to be due to factory-polluted air rather than cigarettes.

Miyaji determined by the study of 38,145 autopsies performed in major Japanese hospitals in the past 10 years that the national incidence of lung cancer averages about 2.6 percent.

In industrial areas, the number of lung cancer cases reported ranged up to almost twice the average—5 percent in Osaka-Kobe, 4.4 percent in Morioka, and 4.2 percent in Yawata-Kokura.

In areas where the air is relatively clear, however, the lung-cancer rate was as little as half the national average—1.6 percent in Kanagawa, for example, and only 1.3 percent in the ancient Japanese capital of Kyoto.

Housing for the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. RHODES
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 27, 1959

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the housing needs of elderly persons are becoming increasingly serious as the number of such individuals grows steadily each year.

Congress has recognized this problem in authorizing aged housing projects as part of the public housing program. Last week the House passed S. 57, the Housing Act of 1959, authorizing a new program to stimulate the construction of decent housing for the aged at reasonable cost.

The Reading Housing Authority deserves commendation for proceeding with its plans to build a 102-unit housing project for the aged, the first such project in the Middle Atlantic region of the Public Housing Administration.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Reading Times of May 26, 1959, commenting on this subject:

NEW HOUSING FOR THE AGED PREOCCUPIES MANY AREAS

The Reading Housing Authority is processing, for Federal approval, a housing project for the aged. It will have 102 units and, after the Authority made an extensive survey, will be located next to Glenside Homes, the Authority's original project.

Similar projects are being processed or built in many cities throughout the country so we may assume that the day is rapidly passing when very many old people, leaving their jobs because of superannuation, perforce will move in with the family of a son or a daughter or seek shelter in a public or private home for the aged. Social-security benefits plus retirement allowances from former employers, are enabling men and women with modest savings to take advantage of these opportunities for a more satisfying mode of living than was available to old people in the past.

The new housing accommodations vary substantially, from area to area, and range from small, easy-to-keep cottages and apartments in so-called retirement villages to low-rate residential hotels in downtown sections of the larger cities. For old persons who can no longer live independently or who prefer to reside with others there are modern institutions.

The increasing proportion of old people in the population has been a prime factor in spurring interest in housing for the elderly. There are now 15 million men and women in the country aged 65 or older and the number is expected to reach 25 million by 1980. The group is already big enough to command political attention.

Congress amended the National Housing Act 3 years ago to encourage provision of more rental accommodations for elderly persons and to ease sale terms on houses suitable for persons of advanced years. Now private real estate developers, in some sections of the country, are finding there is money to be made in meeting the housing needs of the elderly.

Persons in the upper age groups have been migrating in considerable numbers to the South and Southwest but New England and the Midwest still have the largest proportions of older people. The common assumption that most retired persons want to spend their time sitting in the sun is being rapidly dissipated. People are stopping work now at an age when many of them still want to lead active lives. The facts seem to be that they are more contented if they stay where their principal interests lie and where their friends live.

A unique development in the institutional care of the aged is Presbyterian Village near Detroit. It is situated on a 32-acre tract, has apartments and cottages and a nursing home. Regular rates are $70 to $90 a month for apartments and $150 for room and board in the communal dwelling. Guests who cannot afford to pay the regular rates apply for public assistance and Presbyterian churches in the district contribute additional funds needed.

When and as the proposed units being planned by the Reading Housing Authority are built, it will be of substantial interest to see how they are accepted by the older people and whether they will create a demand for additional units. In any event the authority is to be commended for its farsightedness in going ahead with the project. We only hope there is no slip between Reading and Washington and that work can be started on the project as early as may be.

Establishment of the New York-New Jersey Transportation Agency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. DORN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 12, 1959

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following memorandum from the New York Chamber of Commerce:

NEW YORK, N.Y., *May 19, 1959.*

Members of Congress from New York and New Jersey:

It is a matter of the utmost importance that Congress give early approval to the legislation recently enacted by New York and New Jersey, which would establish the New York-New Jersey Transportation Agency. We urge that you use your good offices to insure prompt congressional action.

Establishment of this agency by our two States is an important step toward the ulti-

mate solution of the vexing commuter transportation difficulties. It is vitally important that the transportation agency receive congressional blessing, in order that it may proceed without delay to devise a master plan for the most efficient long-range use of rail commutation facilities in the metropolitan area.

Since 1951 our chamber has urged action by New York and New Jersey to resolve the growing rail commutation problem. We proposed the establishment of the Metropolitan Rapid Transit Commission, and cooperated in its basic studies. We vigorously supported the proposal to establish a bistate commuter transportation agency, which is now authorized.

It is imperative that the essential rail commuter facilities in the New York metropolitan area be retained and, if possible, improved. A breakdown of any major part of our commuting network would be a major catastrophe.

We respectfully urge the earliest possible congressional approval of the creation of the bistate transportation agency.

Sincerely yours,

LESTER A. CRONE,
Chairman, Committee on Industry, Trade, and Transportation.

Poison in Your Water—No. 85

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 27, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the San Francisco Examiner of February 24, 1958, entitled "Ills Laid to Belvedere Sewage Dumping":

ILLS LAID TO BELVEDERE SEWAGE DUMPING
(By George Wells)

A group of Marin County citizens charged yesterday that the dumping of raw sewage in Belvedere Cove had caused a serious outbreak of amoebic dysentery.

Attorney Delger Trowbridge, representing three residents who claim to speak for more than 100 persons, said he had medical testimony to back up the statement.

The charge was made as Trowbridge prepared to file tomorrow a suit for a restraining order that would prevent the city of Belvedere from dumping sewage into the cove.

He said three occupants of one home would each ask for $20,000 damages because "their enjoyment of the cove had been limited and their health endangered."

The attorney's announcement came as Marin County Health Officer Caroline Albrecht said she was going to ask the district attorney's office to obtain an injunction prohibiting Belvedere from dumping raw sewage into the bay.

She said the city should be given a reasonable amount of time to construct a sewage treatment plant.

Belvedere is the only city in the bay area that is dumping raw sewage into the bay, according to William Desmond, Marin's director of sanitation.

This, he said, is in direct violation of State regulations prohibiting the pollution of water.

Belvedere City Manager Britton Rey admitted that the town's sewage is pumped into Raccoon Straits because, he said, the residents of the city's 1,800 homes are not numerous enough to justify construction of a sewage plant.

About one-half of the city's sewage goes into Belvedere Cove during storm periods when the lines to the straits back up, it was said.

Rey said a citizens' committee was currently at work on a master plan for a sewage treatment plant.

The International Claims Settlement Act H.R. 6827

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 26, 1959

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, April 30, 1959, I introduced H.R. 6827. This bill would amend the International Claims Settlement Act to eliminate an inequity which has appeared in the operation of the International Claims Settlement program in regard to claims respecting property in Bulgaria, Hungary, or Rumania.

It appears that operation of the present law may provide substantial windfalls to certain claimants, while at the same time providing virtually no compensation to others. A number of large business enterprises which suffered losses recompensible under the act deducted those losses during war years, when their effective tax bracket may have been, because of excess profits taxes, higher than 90 percent. Thus, the effective loss suffered in several cases was only a small fraction of the value of property destroyed or seized.

To permit those companies now to submit claims for the full value of the property destroyed or seized would enable some to make a profit—an opportunity not available to individuals whose loss during war years could not be offset against wartime profits.

For instance, if a corporation suffered a loss in 1942 of $100,000 and deducted it against profits which were taxed at the rate of 90 percent, the actual loss of the corporation was $10,000. If it were now to claim a loss of $100,000. Under the International Claims Settlement Act, and if the Commission ultimately paid 50 cents on the dollar on all claims, the corporation would receive $50,000 in compensation for its claim. Thus, the corporation would make a profit of $40,000 on the transaction, before taxes.

My bill would reduce any claim submitted to the Commission by the amount of the tax benefit obtained from a deduction of the underlying loss. The practical effect of this would be to make available for distribution on other claims—and thus to the aggrieved noncommercial individual claimants—a greater sum.

And since payment of these claims may be taxable to the claimant, the bill would also provide an exemption from income tax to the recipient on all claims which had been thus reduced, in order to prevent a double burden.

Mr. Speaker, I realize that the point is a somewhat refined one. There is no doubt, however, that a serious injustice will be done to a number of individuals unless prompt action is taken by the Congress to remedy the situation. Since this part of the work of the Commission must terminate by law during August of 1959, it is most important that this measure be promptly considered, and, I hope, promptly passed. A similar bill was introduced in the 85th Congress by Senator HUMPHREY. That bill, S. 979, passed the other body, but failed to receive committee consideration here before the session ended.

Auto Imports: It's a One-Way Street

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 27, 1959

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, during debate on reciprocal trade last year I warned my colleagues from Michigan about the automobile industry moving overseas and foreign cars coming into America displacing our working people. I might add, Mr. Speaker, that this trend not only hurts the automobile worker but the automobile dealer, the mechanic, the garageman, the gasoline stations, parts dealers, and our States through declining revenue.

Again, let me warn my friends from all over this country that your business and your job is in jeopardy. The one-worlders, do-gooders, and dreamers think you are expendable. The following news story indicates this serious trend:

[From the Anderson (S.C.) Daily Mail, May 14, 1959]

FOREIGN CARS GAIN SALES
(By Sam Dawson)

LONDON.—England, like many continental European countries, ranks its autos as the fastest growing dollar earner.

English car makers are increasing output and say this year's overseas orders are so good that production is their chief problem. Like optimism oozes from automen in Germany, France, and Italy.

It's a one-way street.

U.S. auto exports have been falling and its auto imports rising sometimes doubling from year to year. These European cars still constitute a minor share of the U.S. domestic market. But Detroit isn't happy about losing its overseas sales.

It has offset this to some extent by putting plants on this side of the Atlantic. These cater to the European taste in cars. They get the advantages of lower production costs in most cases. And they escape the heavy duty and sometimes import curbs which American-made cars face. In some cases these American overseas plants ship their cars to America.

But the non-American-made models have been cleaning up. British Motor Corp. officials predict they'll send 100,000 cars to North America this year, or twice last year's

figure. Standard Motor's overseas sales so far are 50 percent ahead of last year. Rootes autos says its U.S. sales are running 74 percent ahead of 1958.

But the British are running into stiffer competition on the Continent and their exports there are down.

The Common Market's shrinking trade barriers has put car makers there into keener competition with each other, also. When the tariffs were cut the first year, Fiat of Italy quickly cut its prices to compensate for any advantage the incoming German cars would gain.

French Simca, partly owned by Chrysler, expects its American partner to push sales in the United States this year.

All anxiously eye Detroit's upcoming debut of smaller American cars but insist that shouldn't bite into their own American market, which they call a special one. That, of course, remains to be seen.

Domestic markets in England, France, Italy, and Germany are expected to grow this year because installment buying is beginning to catch on after the pattern long common in America.

The Crisis in Agriculture: Wheat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 25, 1959

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, there is no domestic problem confronting the American people that is so serious as the mounting crisis in agriculture.

The 86th Congress will have failed a crucial test of its responsibility if we adjourn without constructive action to meet this crisis in our largest and most essential industry.

The farm problem is a national problem affecting every home in America—the farmer squeezed between low farm prices and rising costs, the taxpayer plagued by costly and ineffective existing programs, the worker and businessman who depend upon farm purchasing power to absorb their products, and the consumer who depends upon a healthy agricultural establishment for his daily bread.

The House Committee on Agriculture has reported legislation designed to meet one of the most urgent aspects of the farm problem—the pileup of wheat surpluses.

This legislation calls upon wheat farmers to cut back their wheat acreage by 25 percent, in return for which they would be offered 90 percent of parity price supports on their new smaller production.

For the 2-year period covered by the bill—1960–61—it would reduce wheat production by 480 million bushels and would lower costs of the wheat program by $528 million.

I respectfully submit that this is a bill clearly superior to the wheat legislation recently passed by the other body.

It is my hope that the positive step toward a solution of the farm problem offered in the House wheat bill, H.R. 7246, will win quick approval by the Committee on Rules and the membership of the House.

The major provisions of the bill, as summarized in the excellent committee report, are as follows:

First. Each farm acreage allotment of wheat, under the 55 million national allotment, would be reduced 25 percent in 1960 and 1961. This land in the 25 percent reduction would not be eligible for the soil bank or for planting to any crop subject to price support under the Agricultural Act of 1949.

Second. Producers who grow no crops on land and do not graze the land in the 25 percent reduction would be eligible to receive payments in kind—wheat—equivalent to one-third of the average annual production of the retired acres during the preceeding 3 years.

Third. The support price would be at 90 percent of parity in 1960 and 1961.

Fourth. All growers, cooperators and noncooperators, would be eligible for price support at 50 percent of parity, if marketing quotas are disapproved by more than one-third of the growers voting in referendums.

Fifth. The 15-acre exemption would be reduced to the smaller of 12 acres, or the highest planted acreage in 1957, 1958, or 1959, and the 200-bushel exemption would be repealed.

Sixth. The 30-acre ceiling on the wheat-for-feed exemption would be removed, and there would be no limit on production for on-the-farm use.

Seventh. For the 2 years this program is in effect it would increase the present penalty for overplanting from 45 percent of parity to 65 percent, and the penalty computations would be based on double the normal yield or the actual yield, whichever is lower.

Eighth. If marketing quotas are disapproved, the Commodity Credit Corporation could not release wheat from its holdings at less than 75 percent of parity, plus 5 percent, plus carrying charges.

Ninth. Voting eligibility for marketing quota referendums would be based on the previous year's planting record rather than on the announced intention of planting for the coming year.

Tenth. Acreage histories for the 2-year life of this program would be automatically preserved.

At the end of the 2 years, the wheat program would revert to the program provided under present law, unless the Congress takes further action before the 1962 crop is planted.

The People Speak

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEO W. O'BRIEN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 27, 1959

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, the voices of great men have been raised in sorrowful lament over the death of a great man, John Foster Dulles.

But, throughout our land, millions of plain folk are also bowed in sadness.

A lady of my district wrote a little poem to express her feelings. She never dreamed that it would appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I ask the privilege of placing it there because it so well says what all our people are saying in their hearts:

JOHN FOSTER DULLES

Tree from the root of Jesse formed,
Rugged, straight, and strong;
Unshaken when by error stormed
Inviolate to wrong.

Rock to build ideals upon,
That the ages can't efface;
And nations carve their future on
His timeless face.

But stately trees will e're spire
To touch the hand of God
And be cut down; their sole desire
To be His staff and rod.

And rocks will tend to form a room
To shelter human clay,
Or hold Christ's body in a tomb
Till resurrection day.

—*Katherine Mary Coyne.*

Opposition to Khrushchev's Visit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 21, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a most interesting letter written by Mr. Eugene W. Castle, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, to Mr. David Dubinsky, president of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union in New York, concerning the opposition of the vast majority of Americans to inviting Khrushchev to visit the United States:

NEW YORK, N.Y., *May 19, 1959.*

Mr. DAVID DUBINSKY,
President, International Ladies Garment Workers Union, New York City.

DEAR MR. DUBINSKY: The vast majority of Americans who want to preserve our constitutional rights and liberties are deeply indebted to you for your forthright and patriotic declaration rejecting participation in, or invitation to, the cultural fair to be staged in Moscow in late July. And it is heartening to know, too, that Mr. George Meany, president of the AFL–CIO, upholds your position in this vital matter.

As you clearly conveyed in your recent statement, the great advantage to the Soviet Government in the forthcoming propaganda cultural fairs, both in Moscow and New York City, is that these fairs, and especially the one here, will provide a false and wholly exaggerated demonstration to millions of unthinking Americans of the purported power and distorted accomplishments of the Soviet Union. And all this will take place in the heart of New York City, under a U.S.A. dateline to the world.

But, worse still, the invasion of New York City by the Soviets through their cultural fair will enable them to export this propaganda achievement throughout the world. And they will continue to do this for a period of years just as they are still doing with the youth festival held in Moscow several years ago.

It is tragic that our leaders at the political summit in Washington, D.C., are today per-

forming handsprings and tripping over themselves officially to assist and expand Khrushchev's propaganda mill. They are doing this while they bitterly, and rightfully, condemn the menace of world communism and frantically demand more billions to fight this menace. These two totally divergent attitudes are completely irreconcilable. Free Americans should not be subjected to such deceit.

In addition to the infamous propaganda fairs to be held in New York City and Moscow, the American people are about to be conditioned for the visit of the "Red Hitler," Nikita Khrushchev, to the United States.

On the same day that Soviet Foreign Minister Gromyko was rejecting the Allied proposals for the settlement of the West Berlin problem at Geneva, U.S. Secretary of State Christian Herter publicly and officially announced that an invitation to Khrushchev to come to the United States was in the immediate offing.

Our citizens are soon to be subjected to a repetition of the sorrowful spectacle occasioned by the recent visit of ex-bank robber and Budapest doubledealer, Anastas Mikoyan. President George Meany was one of the very few distinguished Americans who publicly condemned the sad spectacle occasioned by Mikoyan's propaganda inspired reception in official Washington and his subsequent barnstorming of the United States.

Surely, the interest of world peace at this critical hour would be far better served if Khrushchev stayed in Moscow and Vice President NIXON remained in Washington, D.C.

The overwhelming majority of our citizens do not want and completely reject Khrushchev's slave world. And since Soviet citizens have no freedom of choice, the politically hopeful Mr. NIXON cannot gain any votes by utilizing the Cultural Fair and Mr. Khrushchev's office in the Kremlin as a means of gaining headlines for himself. On the contrary, millions of American citizens will reject and condemn such tactics.

While the Soviet Government threatens to make a separate treaty with its stooge government in East Berlin, and while they directly threaten our battle-won rights to maintain our Armed Forces in West Berlin to safeguard our continued occupation of the American sector in that divided city, there is no valid reason why the U.S. Government should sanction so-called cultural fairs in New York City and Moscow.

Coming at this time, these fairs are likely to prove of the greatest value in promoting the false peace claims of the Kremlin. And, God forbid, should we become involved in a brush-fire war or worse over West Berlin at the time that these fairs are taking place, our Government and its 12,000 U.S. Information Agency press agents will quickly become the laughing stock of friend and foe alike.

Our Government has no right to expose our citizens to this propaganda trap. President Eisenhower should insist that these fairs, both in New York City and Moscow, be postponed indefinitely. Moreover, the Cultural Exchange Pact of January 27, 1958, between the United States and the U.S.S.R., which has infiltrated our country with Soviet spies and an avalanche of made-in-Moscow propaganda on a scale never before permitted or even dreamed of, should be terminated now and not extended for another 2 years as was recently proposed.

I sincerely believe that all religious leaders of all faiths throughout our country would render a great service if they would voice vigorous disapproval and forceful condemnation of the growing tendency of our political leaders officially to promote godless Russia with so-called cultural exchange pacts, programs, and exhibitions. These serve only to propagate the underhanded plans and harmful objectives of Khrushchev and his fellow dictators in the Kremlin whose avowed aim is to wipe out all religion and conquer the world.

These efforts help the Kremlin immeasurably, while they hamper and hurt the legitimate aspirations and aims of the governments of the peoples of the free world. Only headline hunters and self-serving political luminaries gain temporary benefits for themselves from their illicit relations with the Kremlin.

The time has arrived to put a stop to these malpractices.

Sincerely,

EUGENE W. CASTLE.

Poison in Your Water—No. 87

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 27, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the Augusta (Ga.) Herald of February 18, 1958, entitled "Oates Creek for Rats":

[From the Augusta (Ga.) Herald, Feb. 18, 1959]

OATES CREEK FOR RATS

(By Margaret Twiggs)

Raw waste pouring into the Oates Creek open sewer from two meatpacking plants supports a large population of rodents and definitely affects the Richmond County Health Department rodent control program, a health department official said today.

Sanitary Engineer C. K. Memory said:

"While there is no harmful bacteria from the waste it does not help our rodent control program as it gives the rats a source of food supply."

He added the rats burrow along the banks of the stream which flows a winding way through a large residential area in the Milledgeville Road section.

Is it possible for the two meatpacking houses, Avers Provision Co. and Shapiro's Packing Co., to tie into a nearby trunk line for sanitary sewers?

"Yes," replied Memory.

City Engineer M. P. Phillips said Avers gave the city an easement through its property providing the city in return allowed the company three taps onto the sewer line.

"In August 1955 Avers applied for one tap which is the only one it has applied for so far. I believe this was for other sewage than the raw waste," he said.

He also said Shapiro was requested to tie into the sewer line about 2 years ago but so far it has made no application to tap in.

Since Shapiro is in the county, the city has no further authority in the matter, Phillips said.

Memory said his department will begin immediately to concentrate on an all-out effort to get the two concerns to tie into the line located 100 feet from the Avers plant and about 60 to 70 feet directly in front of the Shapiro plant.

Memory explained that the effect of the raw waste was not as harmful as the home sewage that pours into Oates Creek as the result of a combined sanitary and storm sewer which empties into the creek.

The rats living off the raw waste are carriers of murine typhus which was prevalent here prior to 1950 when the Federal Government made a tremendous effort to eliminate it, according to Memory.

Memory described murine typhus as similar to Brille's fever. He said rats along the creek banks are carriers of the black plague which has not been prevalent in this country for a number of years.

Since 1950, there have been only scattered cases of murine typhus in the county, mostly among workers in feed mills where there are a lot of rats, he added.

Letter From Constituent on the Farm Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. LEVERING
OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 27, 1959

Mr. LEVERING. Mr. Speaker, out of a sincere desire to be of all possible service and to fully represent all the fine people I have the honor to represent in Ohio's 17th Congressional District, I welcome their views on current issues before the Congress, whether I agree with them or not.

I am gratified by the volume of mail I receive daily, for I know as a rule that people who write are people who think. In my judgment, a thoughtful and vocal citizenry is absolutely essential to the success of representative government.

Under unanimous consent granted, I am inserting into the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from one of my constitutents, Mr. John P. Conlon, of Newark, Ohio. I call this pungent satire to the attention of my colleagues, believing that it points up one of the most serious problems before this Congress, the farm problem, and suggest that we all should think—think as we have never thought before—upon the solution of the problem. The letter follows:

NEWARK, OHIO, *May 24, 1959.*

Representative ROBERT LEVERING,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I recently thought up a fine solution to the wheat surplus problem. I think it is a stupid solution, but no more stupid than the problem. Here's the dope.

Convert all the wheat to starch. Convert the starch to nitrostarch. Take it out to Eniwetok and blow it all at once, one time each year. This would not only get rid of the wheat, but it would contribute to fuller employment.

First, the conversion of the wheat to starch would take many more plants, and in turn boost the machinery business and construction.

Secondly, the nitration would have to be done at proper plants, and this would mean reactivating explosives plants now shut down.

Third, it would take immense amounts of packing material and the lumber, paper, and crating people would get back to work.

Fourth, it would take immense numbers of freight cars to ship, and revive a lot of sick railroads.

Fifth, it would use many ships and give our merchant fleet and the shipping industries of friendly nations a boost.

Sixth, it would require coverage by TV and the taxpayers could see where their money was going when it is touched off. This

would give many TV news analysts a chance at a Pacific trip.

It might also give the Communists such amusement that they might laugh themselves to death and we would be shut of another problem.

There it is. It may sound foolish, but no more so than some of our other problems. You are welcome to use this solution for whatever purpose you see fit. Who knows, some day it might make you famous?

Yours truly,

JOHN P. CONLON.

P.S.—This is also applicable to corn, rice, and other such cereals.

Address by the Honorable Hugh M. Milton II, Under Secretary of the Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 20, 1959

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to hear the inspiring address delivered by Hon. Hugh M. Milton II, Under Secretary of the Army, at the dedication of the Mote U.S. Army Reserve Training Center, Parma, Ohio, on Sunday, May 24, 1959.

Under leave granted, I insert Secretary Milton's address in the RECORD:

ADDRESS BY UNDER SECRETARY OF THE ARMY, HON. HUGH M. MILTON II, AT DEDICATION OF THE MOTE U.S. ARMY RESERVE TRAINING CENTER, PARMA, OHIO

It is a very real pleasure for me to be here with you and participate in the dedication ceremonies of this U.S. Army Training Center. I should like at this time to take the opportunity to extend to you greetings from the Secretary of Defense, Secretary of the Army, and the Army Chief of Staff. On behalf of all of us here in Washington, I would like to express our sincere appreciation to the citizens of Parma and the State of Ohio for their outstanding support of the Reserve component program. You may know, over the past few years in my official capacity I have dealt with matters concerning the civilian components of the Army, and I realize, and I say this with humility, perhaps better than most, how tirelessly and unselfishly the officers and men of the U.S. Army Reserve in Parma and in the State of Ohio, as well as throughout the Nation, contribute of their time and effort to the common cause of our Nation's defense.

It is indeed a privilege and great honor to be here today on the occasion of this dedication ceremony.

We have come here today, my friends, for a far greater purpose than to just dedicate a building.

We are assembled to honor the memory of an American patriot, a hero, whose gallant example should forever inspire us to serve our country to the utmost of our ability; but even more, that we are meant to pledge our own best efforts to build a strength that will maintain our fredom.

As we dedicate this building, as we honor the memory of Lt. Kingston H. Mote, it is only proper that we should review the part that each of us is called upon to play in maintaining our precious American liberty.

The citizens of this community have decided to call this building the Kingston H. Mote Army Reserve Center. It is the undaunted and dedicated spirit of this Ohio soldier that you honor. Because his example as a God-fearing citizen and as a true American patriot was so outstanding, you have selected his name to remind all of us of our duty as Americans. I do not think that anywhere in the glorious history of the State of Ohio could you have found a finer example of honest, sincere, and dedicated patriotism for the rest of us to try to emulate than the record set by this young man in the few years he was given to live among us.

Many of you here today knew Lieutenant Mote personally. Many of you know his mother, Mrs. Sena V. Mote, whom we are honored to have with us at this time. But whether we knew him personally, or by reputation, we can only be inspired by looking for a moment at his heroic list of achievements.

Born in Cleveland on the 8th day of November 1921, he gave up his life on the field of battle in Germany on the 15th day of April 1945. In the less than 24 years that elapsed between those two dates he endeared himself to our memory in many ways. Educated in Cleveland and in Parma, his high school annual prophetically said of him in 1939, "He had a heart to resolve, a head to contrive, and a hand to execute."

He entered Ohio University in the fall of 1939, and upon graduation was called to the colors. Having been a member of his college infantry ROTC section, he went immediately to the infantry school at Fort Benning and upon graduation was commissioned a second lieutenant of infantry. He was assigned to the 83d Infantry Division, the famous Ohio Thunderbolt Division, elements of which will be stationed in this very building.

On the night of November 20, 1943, a fire broke out in one of the officer's quarters. Lieutenant Mote, demonstrating the valor that was to be typical of his entire military career, risking his own life, entered the burning building and saved the life of an unconscious officer by carrying him to safety. He was awarded the Soldiers medal for valor for this conspicuous act of bravery.

He accompanied the 83d when it sailed for further training in England on April 6, 1944. Twelve days after the invasion of Hitler's fortress Europe was launched by the Allies, Lieutenant Mote and the 83d entered the furious fighting in the hedgerows of Normany. In July the lieutenant was wounded in action, but after treatment insisted upon returning to his unit, G company of the 331st Infantry.

The division broke out of Normandy on July 25, fought their way to the Brittany Peninsula, and then held the south flank of the Allied armies along the Loire River line. It was on this mission that the 331st Infantry bottled up 60,000 Nazis in St. Nazaire. Relieved of this duty in September, a few days later they were pushing the enemy out of Luxembourg and over the Moselle River. On December 6 the 83d Division moved into the hellish Hurtgen Forest and soon pushed through this bloodiest battleground to secure the west bank of the Roer River.

In this drive Lieutenant Mote's company G made the successful key attack on December 10 to capture Gey—the most formidable Nazi stronghold west of the Roer River. It was after this engagement that the men of the young lieutenant's company began to believe him indestructible. For his leadership in combat he was given a battlefield promotion to first lieutenant. It was Christmas Day that he received word of his promotion, and with his unit he was on the way to the Battle of the Bulge, near Aachen, at the time.

Here again this Ohio patriot was to distinguish himself by gallantry in action. In 5 days the division severed the German supply lines and on the 12th of January the 331st Infantry attacked to secured ground from which to launch an armored offensive. Although his company was in battalion reserve as they approached the key high ground, Lieutenant Mote saw the leader of the attacking company fall and without hesitation he moved forward and led the attack to gain the enemy strongpoint. In this action he was again wounded. In recognition of his bravery and sterling leadership under heavy artillery and mortar fire, a grateful Nation awarded him the Silver Star Medal.

It was late in February when the lieutenant was sufficiently recovered from his wounds to rejoin his unit but he was with the 331st when they secured the west bank of the Rhine at Neuss. On March 29, the 83d crossed the Rhine and encountered the fanatic defense of the elite German SS troops. With little time for either food or sleep the 331st pushed rapidly toward Berlin, releasing thousands of Allied prisoners en route and capturing over a thousand German SS troopers.

In an unprecedented drive, the division covered 200 miles in 10 days and crossed the Elbe River on April 13. Two days later the second battalion pushed out of the bridgehead and in the attack on Hohenlepte, Lt. Kingson H. Mote made the supreme sacrifice.

Present at this ceremony today are two men who, with his beloved father, John Mote, played a key role in molding the character of this remarkable young man—Mr. William A. Rolland, his Sunday school teacher, and Mr. W. E. Bassett, his high school principal. The guiding influence of these three men, coupled with the loving devotion of his mother, welded the character of Kingston Mote and provided him with the faith, and the firm belief in the requirement for freedom that inspired him to achieve his enviable place among the heroes of our national life.

It is this great faith in our country's destiny, so nobly exemplified by Lieutenant Mote, that we can profit most by understanding. Why must every generation of Americans be called upon to sacrifice, that we may remain a free nation? How is it that we cannot pass to our children the peace we fought for in two world wars and in Korea.

These are questions that trouble us all, no matter where we serve. As taxpayers, we look at this building and ask ourselves, why must we spend more than a half million dollars for a structure of this type? As parents we wonder why our sons are preparing for a possible new war. And the men who make up the elements of the 83d Division who are stationed here, they too have many questions about the necessity for their sacrifice. And yet, as we ask these questions, we know the answer. The world is both united and divided as never before. The Iron Curtain and the Bamboo Curtain separate two entirely different ideologies. In the free world we are united because we believe in the principle of the dignity of the individual. We believe that governments are created by the people and to serve the people. In the Communist camp they believe that the individual exists only to serve the government, as the ruling clique believes best. We believe in God. They do not. We believe in free elections, where the people have a choice as to who shall serve them. They believe only in the party which takes all, owns all, and serves only itself. We believe in freedom. They believe in slavery.

We know, and they know, that as long as there is one man in slavery in this world, all freemen are in danger. And as long as there is one freeman on the face of this globe, the spark exists that may set free those who are enslaved. They have threatened in every possible way to intimidate us. They are continually seeking ways and means of infiltrating into our midst, of causing trouble and turbulence wherever possible, and whenever possible. Their code permits them to break treaties and solemn obligations when it suits their convenience

and this course of action is most disturbing to the peace. There is no limit to which communism will not go in order to accomplish their avowed and firm intention to dominate the entire world.

In the face of this threat we have been forced to make certain sacrifices that are contrary to our liking. All of us would like to devote our energies to building a better world and living a fuller life. But we know too well that if we do not have the means to preserve that which we already have, there is no reason for building for the tomorrow. First things come first, and that which we now have, we are firmly resolved we will not lose.

One hundred and eighty-four years ago, when our forefathers founded this Nation, Russia must have seemed as far away from the Ohio territory as does the moon today. And probably those early settlers knew less and cared less about Russia than we do about the moon. But in the less than two centuries that have elapsed since that day, we have compressed time in such a manner that a shot fired in anger on the other side of the earth can mushroom into an atomic explosion on the shores of Lake Erie minutes later.

As a Nation and as individuals, we are involved in any trouble that occurs anywhere in the world. In this sense, when we split the atom, we united the world. If we are to maintain the peace that we desire so sincerely in the metropolitan Cleveland area, we must exert every effort to see that there is peace in Turkey, in Formosa, as well as in all of the other NATO nations, the Manila Pact nations, the Latin American nations, and the United Nations.

Now this is only doing what Americans have always done. Only we are doing it on a larger scale. For basically, we are protecting ourselves and the allies on whom we depend. We are seeking to secure the economic, spiritual, political and scientific traditions that are the heritage of the modern world. The only way that we can do this is by trying with all of our might to maintain the peace.

Why must we undertake so much responsibility?

For one thing, because our stake is so great—we have so much to lose. Our freedom is so comprehensive, our opportunities so available to all, that we dare not let them slip from us. For another, we alone have the means and the strength to assume this responsibility. And a third reason is we all realize that if we allow a tiny hole to be created in the dike, it will spread until the whole frontier of freedom crumbles and is buried beneath the inky blackness of Communist oppression.

This situation is new only in its scope. When Ohio became the 17th State of the Union, we stood guard over a hostile frontier and your pioneer forefathers fought police actions and full scale wars. They lived with a rifle in their hands. Today, the frontier has returned—but today it is as high as outer space and as wide as the universe. The rifle is not the only weapon our soldiers are armed with on this new frontier, and the very fearsomeness of some of our new weapons makes it necessary that war be the last resort for defending the new frontier.

Freemen have always chosen peace—when they could keep peace without losing freedom. History has taught us that peace with freedom comes only to the nation that has the strength, both economically and militarily, to win a war should war be forced upon it. That is the reason we have built this new Reserve center, and the 374 others of like nature that have been or are being constructed across our Nation. This is the reason that 300,000 of our young men are serving in Army Reserve units, doing double duty as civilians and as soldiers, as are 400,000 in our National Guard. These men realize, as did Lieutenant Mote, that in this country we have every freedom, except the freedom to shirk our responsibilities.

These men realize that we are doing even more than seeking a peace. They know that we are striving for a peace that is built upon freedom and justice. The power that we are building is not dedicated to maintaining the type of peace that might be found in a slave labor camp—or in the grave. We are building for a just and honorable lasting peace. This was the goal that our forefathers sought when they signed the Declaration of Independence, it was the type of peace that Kingston Mote died for in World War II, and it was in defense of this kind of a peace that our sons went to Korea just a few years ago. We will not accept less today. The whole world must understand this.

Let me ask the same question that the President asked in his state of the Union message to Congress last January. He posed this rhetorical question:

"Can government based upon liberty and the God-given rights of man permanently endure when ceaselessly challenged by a dictatorship, hostile to our mode of life, and controlling an economic and military power of great and growing strength."

With the lesson of history in mind, President Eisenhower answered his own question this way: "For us the answer has always been found, and is still found, in the devotion, the wisdom, the courage, and the fortitude of our people."

This power, this strength that we must have, is it dollarpower that we need?

You and I know that it is not, for all of the wealth that we have burried at Fort Knox will not buy us 1 day, or 1 hour of freedom, should the Communists ever become convinced that we are lacking in the willpower and manpower to resist his attack.

Is it manpower alone that provides our strength?

Well, manpower is one of our most precious and most important strengths, but manpower alone is not enough, for in number of bodies the Communists in Europe and Asia far outnumber us.

Our strength is in the willpower that we can muster. Within this building—in this great Cleveland metropolitan area—and throughout our Nation, each of us has the responsibility of rendering energetic, enthusiastic and wholehearted support to our defense mission. I think that all of us accept this responsibility, but because we are ordinarily more concerned with our own private responsibilities than with national affairs, we require someone to sound the alarm and alert us to the approaching danger.

We have made, and we are continuing to make, every possible effort to replace distrust and tension with a true peace and with the real prosperity that can only come with such a peace. In the United Nations and in the diplomatic councils of the world, we have striven and are still trying by every possible means for an honorable peace. We are trying by every conceivable means to bridge the gap between our two worlds by international conferences at every level up to and including the summit. We should, and shall continue to seek a just and lasting peace with liberty and freedom for all the people of the world.

Let us remember that even as we seek this road to peace, a practical reality warns us that we must keep our powder dry. Within this building our youth will train so that we may be absolutely sure that we have the capability of fighting a modern war with modern weapons. The fact that they are training and preparing to use these new inventions will not be overlooked in Moscow. If the Communist recognizes that we have a real strength in being—that is ready and capable of resisting an attack—that attack is likely not to come. Seldom, if ever, is an armed policeman the victim of a holdup.

My friends, we are a peaceful nation, and would like to live amongst our neighbors in this complex community of nations in an atmosphere of peace—in a climate which would permit the growth of the miracles of science and further their applications to the overall good of humanity. However, all that we, as a nation stand for is in jeopardy if for one moment we forget that we must remain fully prepared and ever alert to meet any challenge directed against our philosophy of life.

Not too long ago while in Hawaii, standing on the battleship *Arizona*, I was given an everlasting message of remembrance that we should remain fully prepared and ever alert.

You, I am sure, all remember the *Arizona* was one of the ships that was sunk by the Japanese on December 7, 1941. As I stood there looking at the flag which the Navy raises to half mast every day, I heard my guide saying that down beneath the water there were more than 1,000 American bodies, where the next of kin had said, "Don't try to get them out. Let them sleep there for all eternity, lulled in their everlasting sleep by the waves of the Pacific."

While standing there in reverent silence, I looked off the bow of the ship and saw some bubbles rising to the surface. I inquired of the guide, "What is happening there? Why are those bubbles rising?" and he said, "Somewhere down in the bowels of the *Arizona*, there is a tank of air or oil, and these bubbles are merely the escaping air coming to the surface."

I said to myself, "No, that is not the answer." And here is a beautiful metaphor for the American people.

There are a thousand sacred dead down there in the bottom of the sea, and those bubbles are their voices rising to tell us that they have died for an ideal and that we, too, must be vigilant, that we must be sure that they did not die in vain and that the torch which they threw us, we will ever carry high. So it is up to each and every one of us to be ever on the lert. We must carry and hold high this living torch for all to see lest we forget what these men died for.

We must be vigilant and constantly on guard if we are to remain as a bulwark against the ever-pressing tide of international communism. This Nation and its allies must remain militarily strong. In my opinion, we are taking appropriate action to achieve this military strength.

In order to give a new dimension to the Army Reserve in our defense structure, we are now developing only those units which can meet the instant requirements of war as we know it today. We are in the midst of a reorganization which will eliminate all units no longer required in the joint war plans for the defense of our Nation. We are organizing such new units as will be required early in a general mobilization. We are adding certain types of new units which did not exist under the old concept, but which will be required in a modern war. The men who will fill these new units and man these new weapons must be properly trained in the use of their new equipment. We are now in the process of developing and putting into use new training techniques, and new means of selecting personnel to assure that our combat units will be manned by soldiers who can withstand the unprecedented stresses of the nuclear battlefield. Our efforts in this field are based upon a fundamental faith in the character and the ruggedness, as well as the adaptability of the American soldier, whether he be in the Army or in the Reserve.

We must not lose sight of the fact that in the long run our military bulwarks will not protect us if we as individuals fail to accept

our responsibilities with the total dedication that Lt. Kingston Mote demonstrated during his lifetime.

Here again, my friends, and a most important fact is that you and I must have faith and we must believe in the principles as set forth by our governmental leaders. We must have faith in the national policies for which this great Republic stands—we must believe and not waver from a steadfast adherence to the great tenets of our American faith.

Poison in Your Water—No. 86

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 27, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I am inserting into the Appendix of the RECORD an article appearing in the Wichita Falls (Tex.) Times of August 14, 1958, entitled "Business Research Finds City Growth Depends on Water":

FACTS ABOUT THE LAKE—BUSINESS RESEARCH FINDS CITY GROWTH DEPENDS ON WATER

(By Fred Buckles)

"The Bureau of Business Research reports that its studies indicate that, if adequate and acceptable water supplies are provided at reasonable cost, major urban and industrial expansion will take place in the Wichita Falls area."

This key statement in the comprehensive water study report released recently by Senator LYNDON JOHNSON underlines the need for additional water for Wichita Falls.

The joint report on the water developments and potentialities of Texas was prepared by the State board of water engineers, Army Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation and the Soil Conservation Service.

"The present supply for Wichita Falls is obtained from Lake Kickapoo on the Little Wichita River," the Johnson report says.

MAJOR SUPPLY NEEDED

"A major additional water supply will be required to meet anticipated increases in water requirements."

The comprehensive study found that water sources in the Wichita Falls area are limited.

"Numerous reservoir sites exist that are suitable from the standpoints of topography and streamflow, but the number that can be considered for development of municipal and industrial water supplies is presently limited because of pollution which arises primarily from natural sources and to a lesser extent from man-made sources."

The report says the Scotland and Ringgold sites on the Little Wichita River are potential sources for obtaining such an additional supply for Wichita Falls. It points out that a State permit was issued to Water District No. 1 for development of the Ringgold site for municipal and industrial water supply.

Federal agencies—the Bureau of Reclamation, Army Engineers, U.S. Geological Survey, and W. J. Turnbull, Soils Division Chief of the Army Engineers at Vicksburg, Miss.—recommended the Ringgold site.

The Scotland site has substantial oil development which would cost $1.8 million to protect if a reservoir were built there. Ringgold Reservoir has no oil development. The Scotland site's ultimate yield of water is about what Ringgold initial development would be, some 25 million gallons per day, but it could not be expanded while Ringgold could be developed ultimately to a 67 million gallon per day yield, providing enough water for Wichita Falls for the next 37 years.

The study states Ringgold Reservoir has been recommended by consulting engineers for private construction and financing.

It says the Bureau of Reclamation has completed a report on the results of its reconnaissance investigations of potential water supply development for the city of Wichita Falls.

FOR AGENCIES

The study combined the facilities of four key Federal and State agencies dealing with water development and future sources.

The report facused attention on the need for more water for Wichita Falls to provide for urban and industrial expansion.

"The Texas water problem has become more serious each year because of the State's phenomenal growth of population, industry, and agriculture," the agencies declared in the report.

"The future growth and progress of Texas will be limited only by its available supplies of water.

"That growth is being limited now," the report emphasizes, "and the limitation will be continued, unless and until an adequate statewide program for control and use of the State's waters is developed."

"Urban and industrial growth in Texas in recent years has greatly increased municipal and industrial water requirements, reflecting the increase in urban population, a steadily rising per capita use of water, and the growth of industries, such as petroleum refining and petrochemical manufacturing, which need larger water supplies for their operations."

OVER LONG RANGE

"These upward trends in Texas municipal and industrial growth and water requirements are expected to continue over the next 50 years," the report said, according to surveys and reports made over the last 10 years by the Bureau of Business Research of the University of Texas for the Bureau of Reclamation.

Secretary Dulles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 25, 1959

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Laconia Evening Citizen of May 25, 1959, published in Laconia, N.H., entitled "Secretary Dulles":

SECRETARY DULLES

Those who heard Secretary Dulles speak at the University of New Hampshire 1 year ago this month, particularly those who shook hands with him and chatted at the reception arranged by Governor Dwinell and President Johnson, are treasuring the memory of a born diplomat. Congressman MERROW in a felicitous introduction from the platform of New Hampshire Hall described him, truly as one of the greatest men ever to hold the office of Secretary of State.

Associated Press articles in today's Evening Citizen dealing with Mr. Dulles' extraordinary career are well worth reading.

Secretary Dulles could change position quickly when occasion demanded, and one had the feeling that when he did so it was but part of a plan, with each move foreseen long in advance. In the past week visas have been granted for at least two American newsmen to enter Red China, something which the Secretary has been stoutly refusing to sanction. Yet we do not take this to mean that the change in policy has come about merely because Mr. Dulles has been succeeded by Mr. Herter. We suspect that Secretary Dulles' own sense of timing indicated when the change would occur, whether he was in office or not.

American Policy and the Non-Russian Nations in the U.S.S.R.—House Joint Resolution 355

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 29, 1959

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, most Americans are unaware of the fact that some of the greatest potentials for world freedom exist within the Soviet Union itself. Many do not even know that over half of the population in the U.S.S.R. is non-Russian, made up of formerly independent nations which aspire to the blessings of national freedom which we in this country enjoy. Those who do know these basic facts have, unfortunately, come up with no creative and imaginative ideas designed to realize these potentials. In short, we have no effective American policy toward the non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R., a policy with deep economic, political, cultural, military, and historical ramifications.

To develop these potentials for world freedom, I have introduced House Joint Resolution 355, calling for U.S. diplomatic relations with the Republics of Ukraine and Byelorussia. This measure represents a call for action on the diplomatic plane. I am happy to see from the comments made by the National Review, in its May 23 issue, that growing public interest is being shown in this measure. Much can be done on other planes. The Free World Forum contains in its March issue an article written by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, of Georgetown University, on "American Policy and the Non-Russian Nations in the U.S.S.R." The article shows the grave defects of our policy on the psychological-informational plane. Many of the arguments developed by Dr. Dobriansky, who was on the National War College faculty last year, apply to the need for sober consideration of my measure on the diplomatic level. Because of its pertinence to a very basic and yet scarcely explored issue, I ask that this article be printed in the RECORD.

AMERICAN POLICY AND THE NON-RUSSIAN NATIONS IN THE U.S.S.R.

(By Lev E. Dobriansky)

Moscow's propaganda for internal consumption emphasizes repeatedly that the non-Russian Republics are "independent." According to the Kremlin, this "independence" was achieved by each of the non-Russian nations largely through the efforts

of the big Russian Communist brother. In recognition of this, the Lithuanians, Ukrainians, Georgians, and others willingly and independently joined their Russian brothers in preserving the union. The Soviet Union is thus a federated union of many nations existing side by side in brotherly love. The constitution of the U.S.S.R. provides for secession, but this, after all, is a symbol of the strength of the union since it is unthinkable that any of the "voluntary" members would ever entertain the thought of seceding.

No bit of Moscow's propaganda can be more spurious. Behind the facade which is posed for the outside world, too, is the imperialist subjugation of these non-Russian nations ever since the entrenchment of Bolshevism in Russia itself. Yet the facade is powerfully meaningful. In contrast to the old empire, Moscow has had to counter with the pressing nationalist urges of the non-Russian nations now held captive in the new empire called the Soviet Union. On this the data are plain and overwhelming.

I

On the basis of the historical record these past four decades, commonsense would dictate that the West, and particularly the United States, should encourage and support the natural nationalism of these captive non-Russian nations. Instead, on the propaganda level, the opposite seems to take place in the United States. Last year the U.S. Information Agency decided to cut back its programs to several of these non-Russian nations.

The Agency's decision eliminated the Uzbek language program and curtailed the Baltic, Ukrainian, and Georgian language programs beamed to the Soviet Union. This decision cannot be said to rest solely on an alleged technical argument of transmitter shortage. Instead, it clearly reflects certain policy directions for the Voice of America which are ill advised. One ought not believe that the decision arrived at by USIA and perhaps also by the Department of State is the result, in any degree, of any subversive Communist influence operating within these areas. Rather the decision seems to be the product of considerable misunderstanding as regards the nature of our mortal enemy, the aspirations and requirements of the captive nations both within and outside the Soviet Union, and as regards the modes of effective appeal to the subjugated non-Russian peoples in the U.S.S.R.

To any informed person the broad non-Russian periphery of the Soviet Union is the solar plexis of the Russian Communist empire. Its youth make up about 50 percent of the armed forces of the U.S.S.R. In over three decades of Russian Communist domination, the non-Russian colonies within the U.S.S.R. consistently resisted Russian power and rule. From these facts alone it should be obvious that, in terms of U.S. security interests, the non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. constitute a high priority target for U.S. information and propaganda. A broadened and skillful aim at this vital target would successfully turn the tables on spurious Russian propaganda concerning colonialism, nationalism, and independence in Asia and Africa.

Moves along these lines of curtailment were first indicated in an article written by Earl H. Voss.[1] The article showed that thought was being given to the elimination of the Uzbek broadcast and also to the possibility of imitating BBC in having only the Russian language broadcasts beamed to the U.S.S.R. The latter implies, of course, the abolition of the other non-Russian language broadcasts, such as the Lithuanian, Ukrainian, etc. In his reply to many inquiries the USIA Director stated that a study was being made along these lines.

[1] Washington Sunday Star, Jan. 19, 1958.

Close observers of the situation felt that such proposals to contract VOA in these and, later, other areas of the Communist empire were tied up with a move to be soft toward the Russians in preparation for a summit conference at that time. The reader must recall that this was the period of another large-scale push for a summit conference. Developments concerning VOA cannot be understood in void of this empirical context. In the initial stage, discussions with USIA authorities disclosed not even an allusion to any problem of transmitter shortage that would compel the curtailment of the non-Russian language programs. Instead, authoritative concern was expressed about the unfavored prospect of "splinterizing" the Soviet Union. Moreover, through cultural exchanges and similar arrangements the USIA felt that we could make solid strides toward peace with the U.S.S.R.

It was quite clear then, and is so now, that some of these authorities fail to understand the major problems of the Soviet Union or, more accurately, those of the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic in its domination over the non-Russian nations within the U.S.S.R. As shown by their official communications, for example, these nations are merely minority groups with minority languages, as though they were counterparts to the minority groups in the United States. If the blanket of U.S.S.R. were legalistically thrown over Poland and it become a republic like Lithuania or Ukraine, then, according to their lights, the Polish Nation would become another minority group. These points are crucial to the issue at hand. The effectiveness of VOA depends on the content and direction of its programs and only secondarily on the quality and quantity of its technical instruments.[2]

On the basis of original suspicions on the correlation between the summit push and the proposed changes a number of American organizations prepared a memorandum on "The Prospect of Another Summit Conference." In their behalf, at the end of April, Senators H. ALEXANDER SMITH and PAUL H. DOUGLAS and also Congressmen WALTER H. JUDD and MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN jointly presented this memorandum to Secretary of State Dulles. In the discussion of its contents the Secretary of State expressed his wholehearted agreement with the views and recommendations set forth in the memorandum. Significantly enough, point four in the memorandum calls for increasing the number of non-Russian language broadcasts to the U.S.S.R. It is little wonder, then, that Senator DOUGLAS was later aroused to say: "It is * * * shocking to learn that the Voice of America is now engaged in a series of actions which do violence to one of the major proposals with which Secretary Dulles expressed his agreement."[3]

This background to the transmitter shortage pretext for the curtailment of the several non-Russian language broadcasts to the U.S.S.R. invites certain remarks concerning the content effectiveness of VOA. The reason why we lag far behind Moscow in effective propaganda appeal is explained in a significant passage in one of Vice President NIXON's latest addresses. Speaking to the Harvard Business School Association last September, Mr. NIXON stated in effect that the way to combat Russian Communist imperialism and colonialism is to revitalize the American Revolution. He urged that we should be standing for, not against, the nationalist movements in other countries. As he put it, "it is ironic in the extreme that the United States should ever be cast in the role of opposing legitimate nationalist movements. Many of the ideas which motivate today's nationalists stem from American history and have ben taught in American universities at home and abroad. * * * We, rather than the Soviet Union, should be the natural champion of legitimate nationalist movements." How true this is, especially among the non-Russian nations both within and outside the U.S.S.R.

If allowed for a period of time, the changes effected by USIA will work to Moscow's advantage. They will actually work in behalf of Mr. Khrushchev's aims as conveyed to Mr. Adlai Stevenson on his recent visit to the Soviet Union. "Mr. Khrushchev was saying," Stevenson reports, "that whatever goes on in the Communist world is a family affair and doesn't concern outsiders, that Soviet oppression of the uprising in Hungary in 1956 was not interference, and that Soviet pressure on Yugoslavia to conform to Moscow is not a case of meddling in another country's affairs. But Khrushchev also made it clear that what went on in the free world is a proper concern of the Soviet Union."[4] These are the same aims that Khrushchev has endeavored to realize through a summit meeting.

It must be emphasized that this issue has absolutely nothing to do with official talk and programing leading to premature revolt and the like. It has to do with policy wisdom and propaganda efficiency. The Voice of America is not only a technical instrument for the transmission of factual information, it is also a psychological weapon employed for the prime purpose of influencing minds and hearts to the justice and political integrity and intentions of our side in the global struggle. Some official statements on the aims and purposes of VOA leaves one with the distinct impression that the Voice of America is simply an innocuous medium set up to inform the rest of the world about what Americans are doing in their everyday existence and living. They just don't seem to evince a propaganda acumen aimed at progressively weakening the enemy by carefully designed programs and words. There doesn't seem to be that ardor or fervor in the agency to undertake those things implied by Vice President NIXON.

II

Let's look, then, more directly at VOA's recent changes. They are (1) the elimination of the regular 15-minute daily program in the Moslem Uzbek language beamed from Munich to Central Asia, (2) the reduction of 1 hour each in the daily Lithuanian, Latvian, Estonian, and Ukrainian programs, and (3) an increase in English-language programs beamed to the U.S.S.R., as well as a half-hour increase in the Russian-language program.

These changes will have some unfavorable bearing on U.S. relations with the Moslem peoples, not only in the U.S.S.R. but also with those knowledgeable Moslems in Asia, Africa, and the Middle East. Our relations, such as they are, with the other non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. will likewise be adversely affected. These changes lack adequate justification. In fact, they possess all the earmarks of the first step in a policy of psychological disengagement with regard to the entire Russian Communist empire.

According to USIA officials, the reasons for these changes are several. Concerning (1) the Uzbek program, they are allegedly (a) to maximize our use of available transmitters, (b) insufficient evidence as to whether this program was being heard to an appreciable extent, and (c) a scarcity of available funds, or transmitters or of qualified personnel. On close examination these reasons for eliminating the Uzbek program are weak, to say the least. While Moscow today is build-

[2] See the excellent article by C. L. Sulzberger, "Moscow's Huge Colonialist Hoax," New York Times, Mar. 1, 1958.

[3] Hon. PAUL H. DOUGLAS in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Aug. 22, 1958.

[4] Washington Evening Star, Aug. 27, 1958.

ing tremendous radio facilities in Tashkent to influence the free Moslem world to its way of thinking, we have decided to abolish the only meager program in VOA aimed at the unfree Moslems in central Asia. The New York Times indicated the absurdity of this change.[5]

Just contrast this with the spirit that inspired the message of Secretary of State Dean Acheson on June 29, 1951 when VOA broadcasts to the Turkestani, Volga-Tatars, and the Moslem Azerbaijani were commenced. He declared:

"The people of the United States have a friendly regard for the Moslem peoples of the U.S.S.R. The proud history of the Tatars of the Volga who have maintained their ancient culture and traditions despite all obstacles; the brave Azerbaijanis and other mountain people of the Caucasus whose centuries-old struggle for their human rights have provided some of history's most glorious pages; the people of Turkestan whose ancient cities of Bokhara, Samarkand, Merv and Tashkent represent monuments of a lofty culture; these, like the other God-fearing peoples of the Soviet Union are regarded by us Americans as stanch pillars against atheistic, materialistic tyranny.

The Voice of America will henceforth bring you in your own language the truth which the Communists fear and try to keep from you. We shall tell you what is happening in the free world and particularly in those regions of the free world linked with you by religion, tradition and culture. We shall keep you informed of the aggressive actions of those disturbing the world peace. We shall tell you how freemen are standing firm against the further spread of despotism.

As I said last month to the people of Georgia, "the goal of the American people and their Government is a peaceful world where all men can live and work freely and happily, without want or fear and with the right to worship God in their own way. This is our vision of the future; we invite you to share it."

On the basis of known facts, one could add to this splendid message the spirit of nationalism which the various Moslem nations and peoples in the Russian Communist empire share with their brethren in the free world. This nationalistic force, which we are not tapping at all, is even more important than their common religion.

In terms of political rationality and advantage, it is evident that if transmitters are to be usefully maximized, they certainly should be in the direction of the Moslems in central Asia. There is considerable more evidence demonstrating Turkestanian opposition to Russian communism and its imperialist colonialism over the past 40 years than can be shown in favor of the Russians against their own Moscow regime. By political analysis the 35 million Moslems in the U.S.S.R. have a higher target priority over most of the areas in the free world to which we beam VOA broadcasts. Second, the reason of insufficient evidence on the reception of this program raises the question as to what kind of evidence USIA is seeking on the basis of an admittedly puny operation directed at these people? Clearly, if the problem were understood properly it would be plainly recognized that the cause-and-effect sequence is really the other way around: this is a vitally important target area; thus we must have an effective program; therefore, resources must be made available to it, even at the cost of less important areas.

III

USIA's reasons for cutting down the Baltic and Ukrainian language programs are as follows. It is contended that (a) such reductions will permit a more concentrated use of transmitters in order to overcome the heavy jamming of these programs and (b) the concentration of transmitters on particular programs necessarily decreases the number of programs which these transmitters can carry. The extra time, however, will be devoted to English language programs beamed to the U.S.S.R. and, by way of a half-hour increase, to the Russian language program, both of which, quite significantly, are not subjected by Moscow to such heavy jamming.

The question remains: "Why does Moscow jam these particular non-Russian broadcasts most heavily, whereas our English and Russian language broadcasts are less or not jammed at all?" One can only reasonably infer that Moscow fears these latter broadcasts less. This striking fact of disproportionate jamming is indeed a sound point of departure for an inquiry into these cases and also the relative contents or sensitive aspects of these programs. Commonsense would dictate steps of concentration and expansion of the non-Russian broadcasts because of the excessive jamming.

The plausilbe point is made that these changes, by virtue of transmitter concentration, will enable us to overcome the heavy jamming. This is all to the good. But it does not in itself justify the allocation of the extra time to the English and Russian language broadcasts. Indeed, with concentration of transmitters for the non-Russian language broadcasts, this time and more should be devoted to these evidently more sensitive programs. As in the Moslem case above, there is again much more evidence to show that we have considerably more to gain by concentrating on these Baltic, Ukrainian, and other non-Russian broadcasts to the U.S.S.R. than on either the English or Russian language programs. That is, unless our self-defeating goal is eventually to imitate BBC and have these non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. listen, if they will at all, in the language of their captor. The changes made are certainly in this direction, one of psychological disengagement.

For the moment let's agree that transmitter concentration necessarily decreases the number of programs. Still, why more time and programs for Russian and English language broadcasts? For, applying USIA's formula, this presumably means more programs on fewer transmitters per program. Here, too, one runs into a priority valuation. Very simply, if it is conceded that the U.S.S.R. has top priority for our broadcasts, then why can't more transmitters be made available at this time to our broadcasts to the Soviet Union at the expense of less sensitive programs to areas with lower priority? This is another sensible alternative and in accord with the view that the purpose of this Agency was to combat the propaganda of the Soviet Union.

IV

In the eyes of some USIA officials the languages of the Lithuanians, Latvians, Estonians, Ukrainians, Turkestanis are minority languages of minority groups. This, perhaps more than any other fact, explains these unthought changes. The recent study of the Senate Judiciary Committee on "The Soviet Empire: Prison House of Nations and Races" and many other studies, particularly those of the Select House Committee To Investigate Communist Aggression, show that the non-Russian nations have striven desperately to preserve their distinctive languages and other cultural identities against the russification programs of Moscow.

The recourse to expanded English broadcasts to the U.S.S.R. appears almost as out of place in terms of the global psychological conflict. The present movement in American education is to have our people learn the languages of other peoples primarily in order to understand them better, to make warm contact with them. Evidently the tendency in the Voice is contrary to this movement and its objectives. USIA's fantastic formula is: Reduce the programs in the language of the masses, have them listen more in the language of their captor, and the relative few who wish to perfect their English, very likely for political ends against our own interest, let's accommodate them, too.

In conclusion, then, to predicate these politically unwise changes on the technical ground of transmitter shortage is in itself cause for wonderment concerning the objectives and purposes of VOA, especially in relation to the logically high priority targets within the Soviet Union itself. Moreover, the manipulations of time and facilities in favor of English and Russian language broadcasts at the expense of the more sensitive non-Russian broadcasts—and this despite the general condition of transmitter shortage—only serve to intensify this wonderment. Also, one cannot but seriously question the preferred technical argument. If the non-Russian areas in the U.S.S.R. are objectively recognized to be high priority targets existing in the immediate environment of the Russian Communist enemy, then it would appear that a reallocation of transmitters is in order—at this time even at the expense of low priority areas in the free world. In this connection, one might ask whether any thought had been given to the use of our floating transmitters for broadcasts to the Ukraine, the Baltic area, the Caucasus, and Turkestan? Why couldn't these be used somewhere near Turkey or Pakistan to meet the requirements of these high priority target areas?

Furthermore, if jamming is characteristic of VOA broadcasts, it must be equally so for Radio Liberation broadcasts out of Munich. In considering immediate alternatives, has a joint use of Radio Liberation transmitters been considered in the interest of economy, efficient concentration, and plain propaganda effectiveness? All sorts of legalistic reasons for not considering Radio Liberation at this present moment of supposed transmitter urgency will not do in the light of all facts in the situation. The plain fact is that this whole problem, from policy to action, hasn't been seriously and thoroughly thought out. Striking advantages thus continue to elude us.

[5] Editorial on "Krushchev and the Moslems," New York Times, July 22, 1958.

Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 21, 1959

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the St. Marys, Pa., Daily Press of Saturday, May 23, 1959.

FOREIGN AID

Each year about this time the American people are told that every cent the White House asks for foreign aid is vital and any reduction of the amount requested would imperil America's standing abroad.

The truth of the matter is, American prestige in most parts of the world never was high, and is in the lower brass ranks now, despite some $70 billion that have been shipped abroad within the last decade or so—money extracted from your wages or salaries in the form of income tax or indirect levies on what you have to buy.

Of all the millions that have been sent to Yugoslavia, this country has no guarantee

Marshal Tito would not turn against us in event of trouble.

Sending money overseas has won no friends for the United States, rather petty jealousies, bickering, and wondering why more money wasn't sent.

In helping other nations regain their contemplated economies, to help people with their agricultural programs so the hungry can be better fed, is okay with most Americans and creates no argument—it's the outright giving of cash and military assistance that casts a shadow of disappointment over some phases of any foreign aid measure.

Time after time Washington has warned of the many serious things that will happen if one thin dime is slashed off the asked foreign aid amount. In many cases the asked amount has been reduced to some extent without dire consequences.

If all foreign aid were cut off abruptly it is doubtful if anything of danger would happen. It has become an annual bugaboo that has cost the taxpayers of the United States billions of dollars that otherwise could have been used to reduce the national debt, slash income tax payments, build new schools, hospitals, and back public housing developments in the thousands from Maine to California.

The average taxpayer thinks of foreign aid as being something entirely apart from his way of life without realizing his tax dollar is what is supporting it.

Our Plan To Welcome Khrushchev When and If He Comes Over Here

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT R. BARRY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 27, 1959

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to bring to the attention of the Congress and of the Nation, the suggestion contained in the editorial of Mr. Oxie Reichler, distinguished editor of the Herald Statesman, of Yonkers, N.Y., that the American people greet Premier Khrushchev with dignity, restraint, and silence, should he visit our shores:

The editorial follows:

[From the Yonkers (N.Y.) Herald Statesman, May 21, 1959]

OUR PLAN TO WELCOME KHRUSHCHEV WHEN AND IF HE COMES OVER HERE

If Nikita Khrushchev, Premier of Soviet Russia, should come to the United States of America—and it begins to look as if he might be coming sooner or later—it is the Herald Statesman's hope that we Americans will exercise restraint in our curiosity and definitely curb our traditional spirit of welcome to visitors.

There are reports that Mr. Khrushchev has been renewing his pressure for an invitation to the United States, to an extent which may make such a bid inevitable. Besides, if a so-called summit meeting is held this summer, it may well be in the United States.

It is obvious that we substantially overdid our welcome to Anastas Mikoyan, the Soviet Deputy Premier—to an extent that not only irritated many sober-minded Americans but infuriated many to behold such maudlin sentimentality over one of the masterminds in the butchering of political enemies or innocents, and in vast inhuman acts of cruelty and worse, not to mention the maltreatment and kidnaping and slaughter of our own fellow countrymen.

We suggest that the Herald Statesman plan for a Khrushchev visit be applied nationwide from the moment he steps onto our shores.

Let him have his official and informal greetings from the President, as required by protocol, but let us forego the invariable crowds, the cheering, the fulsome adoration which we like to shower upon a foreign dignitary.

Let him have his ride up Broadway, if that is essential, but with no ticker tape, no glad outcries of welcome. If there are people along the curb, let them try hard to be silent.

Absence from the Soviet Premier's route, from the places where he speaks, and silence on the part of passersby—these can be more potent than the occasional picketing and placarding and the other usual implements of protest.

Let America give Khrushchev the kind of treatment we should have given Mr. Mikoyan. This would demonstrate our national respect for freedoms, which both so often threaten to take away from us as they have from their own people and from the satellites they have seized.

By silence we would be giving "voice"—in the most stentorian manner possible—to our opinion of Khrushchev's betrayal of every agreement at Geneva 4 years ago, his harsh oppression in Hungary, his blackmailing of every member nation of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), his runout on the reunion of the two Germanys, his harassment of Berlin, and his incessant threats to destroy the West with hydrogen bombs.

If we love freedom, we can show him—by acting like intelligent and self-respecting human beings—our revulsion against Communist enslavement of peoples and nations, and our opinion of the Communist program of constant threat to destroy the free world and to launch World War III unless we appease its insatiable maw.

If Communists—whether in Soviet Russia or in China or elsewhere—choose to act like brutes and bullies, who must always get their own way without resistance, we must try to make their leaders understand that the time has come for a revival of decency, courage and no surrender.

Our silence and indifference can be a valuable weapon in the cold war—far more effective and dignified than hypocritical adulation. Isn't it worth a trial?

Cancer, Air Pollution, Viruses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH Q. ALEXANDER
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 27, 1959

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, in the growing search for the cause of and cure for lung cancer, as yet the answer has not been found.

In the case of lung cancer there are many theories, but no proof as to the cause and cure. In the search for the truth, I add to my remarks two releases by the United Press, respectively dated May 9 and May 11:

ST. LOUIS.—A possible connection between caffeine and cancer was seen in a paper presented today to the 59th meeting of the Society of American Bacteriologists.

Mrs. Pat Lingle, a graduate student working in the Southern Illinois University research laboratory, Carbondale, said experiments showed caffeine can "stunt the growth" of living cells. The experiments conducted by Mrs. Lingle and Mrs. Carl C. Lindegren, wife of the laboratory director, were made with yeast cultures.

They reported that some cultures are more resistant than others, but the cells of all the cultures underwent some mutations at a caffeine dosage of two-tenths of 1 percent.

Dr. Lindegren said that these resemble cancer cells in being unable to breathe.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.—A prominent research scientist said today that virus-like phenomena could be responsible for all types of cancer.

If true, said Dr. S. E. Luria, professor of microbiology at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, it might become possible soon to postulate a drug cure for cancer.

Luria made the statement in reviewing the evidence of his own and others' work in the field of virology and microbiology. His studies have been supported for many years by the American Cancer Society.

Luria said his conclusions were based more on analogies than on firm knowledge about the relationships between viruses and cancer.

Drug treatment of cancer would be possible if cancers reacted the same as virus-infected cells.

Luria said that the chemical secrets of viruses were rapidly coming to light, and primitive but successful chemical attacks already have been made against them.

The Wailing Wall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAMER H. BUDGE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 18, 1959

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks there follows an article appearing in the Juvenile Court Judges Journal, published at Pittsburgh, Pa., under date of April 1959. It contains an excellent message and was written by the Honorable James P. Gossett, probate judge of Gooding County, Idaho:

THE WAILING WALL

(By James P. Gossett)

(A western judge speaks: How a wealth of local resources of people and good will can be found in almost any rural county of our land is shown in the accompanying article by Judge Gossett. Born and raised in South Carolina, Judge Gossett was graduated from Yale University, is a world traveler, has operated a ranch on the Snake River in Idaho, and, as his article shows, is a writer of note. His message should be particularly interesting and inspiring to judges in rural counties—and these constitute the vast majority of our judges of children's courts—because it shows how the judge, by improvising, can match the efforts of the large courts with all their experts and specialized facilities, by using "The Acres of Diamonds" in his own backyard.)

There is prevalent among the judges of the less populous juvenile jurisdictions an unfortunate negative attitude toward what they are able to accomplish. It derives from their lack of facilities compared with the courts of metropolitan areas. The title I have chosen for this piece is apt, I think, because the lament of these judges is indeed

raising a wall between themselves and effective functioning among their charges.

My State ranks 12th in area but 43d in population. Except for the concentrations in and about our few cities, our people are strewn to the four winds within our borders. My own jurisdiction consists of one of the smaller counties without a city of any size, and the problems incident to meager facilities are not new to me. I too must plead guilty to a share in the agonizing mentioned above.

However, I was once told by one of the most prominent jurists in the land that as necessity is the mother of invention so is dedication the progenitor of inspiration. Over the past decade I have found this to be substantially true. So obsessed do we become with our physical deficiencies that we lose sight of the transcendent values of our purpose; and in so doing we fail to recognize the advantages that accrue to us. It has been my experience that as my interest in and appreciation of the problems of my young people increased, roads over, under, and around obstacles imposed by lacks were opened by the larger view of must.

Certainly the less heavily freighted juvenile courts have circumstances favoring their efforts that cannot possibly exist for courts through which traffic is heavy. Not the least of these is the proportionately greater amount of time that can be by the judge devoted to the individual case. If the judge is the figure in his community that he should be, no amount of effort put forth by delegated jurisdiction in the form of social worker or probation officer—however devoted—can possibly have the same impact as an equivalent amount of time and effort expended by the judge in person. The judge's first-hand acquaintance with such vital factors as family, neighborhood, school influences and associations, economic status, religious proclivities, and a thousand and one individually personal things give to him the opportunity for made-to-measure dispositions that avoid stereotyped sterility.

The more intimate personal relations that obtain between the residents in a small community constitute a pool of resources for judges with courts like mine that is seldom, if ever, found in big city jurisdictions. "Everybody knowing everybody else's business" has a way, if properly employed, of making for a community sense of responsibility for the community's children. And there, I believe, is one of the great keys to our common urgent problem: the creation and sustaining of a community sense of responsibility among our adults for all the children.

The way, of course, to achieve this end is to promote the greatest possible adult participation in children's activities—both good and could be better activities. Here success feeds upon success in an arithmetic progression that is astonishing. In our community we have attempted to transplant the theory and the spirit of the 4–H and Future Farmers of America movements that have, out here anyway, been so outstandingly successful.

JUNIOR DEPUTIES

A project that has prospered us has been the "Junior Deputies." The sheriff in this part of the country is still a very potent personality. Our sheriff and his deputies are personable young men, and all veterans of World War II. Playing those two facts to the hilt, we have built a Junior Deputies program in which membership can be had only by qualification as to character, behavior, attitude, etc., over a candidacy period. There is a long and impatient waiting list.

While we have no Big Brother organization as such, we do have a number of groups that perform the same function, and I believe—forgive me—with a bit less ostentation and possibly condescension. In these instances the overlapping and interlocking of the day-to-day lives of small community people have been worked to advantage. Civic groups and church groups have more cohesiviness and better definition of purpose in their work among young folks. Our churches particularly have worked minor miracles with teenage groups that, among us, would otherwise be hard put to find constructive use for leisure. These groups have successfully developed the fellowship end product that in large cities frequently takes a much more unsavory shape.

Having only State-employed social workers, and very few of them, and no such thing as school visitors, we have had to go directly into the schools for help along those lines. It is not at all infrequent for a school superintendent, or principal, or a teacher to accept full responsibility as a child's parole officer. It may sound strange but it is nonetheless true that our school personnel have been about our most effective custodians.

In this connection it appears that in some ways our big systems may have gone in too much for specialization, which, no matter how learnedly applied, cannot but mean—to a degree—diversity of aim. Cooperation of school people has been all that could be asked and much, much more than would be expected by those who haven't tried it. Far from being the result of a potpourri of experts, such success as we have had has been attained by placing as much of the child's life as we could over a common denominator that was more or less natural and understandable to the child.

Being a nonpopulous jurisdiction, the closer connections between the court, the parents, the schools, the law-enforcement people, the adult community and other public agencies has made possible a mutuality of responsibility and of aim with a minimum of antagonism. A few thousand people can be reached almost individually through groups, and made aware of problems—and their answers—in a manner impossible to achieve in a big city. And I am sure that I need not assess the importance to awareness and understanding.

A judge who can live with and among those within his jurisdiction has an undeniable advantage. An elected judge in a small community cannot but have the blessing of most of his people if he is of them. True, we have to use our county nurse occasionally as an investigator; but we get pertinent details in her reports that the professional snooper with a masters degree more often than not overlooks—and they are always sympathetic objective reports. True, we may have to have Mary's English teacher hold her driver's license and issue it to her only on special occasions in order to teach Mary that driving a car is an adult privilege requiring an attendant sense of responsibility. But then, Mary usually thinks her English teacher is "cool" anyway, which helps.

As long as the load permits I would much prefer to make my own decisions and dispositions in the case of every single child brought to the attention of the court. I was a pretty mean blankety-blank myself, and I think I generally have a pretty fair idea of what's going on in the brain behind that tearful, resentful, or even belligerent little face. I think I would rather have the decisions made tempered by my own apprenticeship at adulthood than strained by the cold, untrammeled professionalism of a doctor's degree.

My editor and I don't fight, because I write for his paper; my sheriff and I don't fight because we are good friends on and off duty; and our wives are socially acceptable each to the other; my county nurse (my social service in toto) and I don't fight because our offices adjoin, and she can't get along much better without me than I can without her.

Because I am a "catch-all" probate court that handles everything but bedpans, I come in official contact with most of the adults within my jurisdiction sooner or later, and because I am a "joiner," I come in unofficial contact with most of them anyway. They know me—and about me—and I know them—and about them. All of that makes for an even break at the starting gun: something neither the big city authorities nor its children often have. For a judge who knows what he is trying to do and who really wants to do it, that constitutes a large segment of sufficiency.

A Machine That Does Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. VANIK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 27, 1959

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, at the School of Library Science of Western Reserve University in Cleveland, Ohio, a center for documentation and communication research has been established to document and expedite scientific communication. This center has also pioneered in plans for the creation of a national center for the coordination of scientific and technical information.

I recommend serious consideration of the following article by Allen Kent, associate director of the center for documentation and communication research, School of Library Science, Western Reserve University, which appeared in the April issue of Harpers magazine entitled "A Machine That Does Research":

A MACHINE THAT DOES RESEARCH

(By Allen Kent)

A new kind of electronic brain, now being developed in Cleveland, can pick out a sliver of vital information from a haystack of unwanted papers—and may save millions of dollars and countless hours of labor for American scholars and businessmen.

Not long ago the director of a large engineering organization was chagrined to discover that his research staff had spent $50,000 and a year's time in repeating an unsuccessful design program for building military trucks that he himself had rejected 10 years before. For a decade the original research report had lain buried in the company library.

An official of Pan American World Airways heard about an unclassified 85-page report on air cargo that had been prepared at the Stanford Research Institute in 1956. He wrote to Stanford to get it and enclosed a Pan Am purchase order.

"Sorry, we did this for the USAFHQ, DCS/D," Stanford replied. "Why not write them?" (Stanford's reports are the property of its clients, he learned later.) He wrote again, with a new purchase order, to the Air Forces HQ, DCS/D, requesting a copy of the booklet.

"Sorry, they're all distributed; don't have any. Try ASTIA," came the reply.

He wrote a new purchase order and letter to ASTIA in Dayton.

"Sorry, you're not qualified to receive this report. Try OTS."

Another letter, another purchase order, this time to OTS, Department of Commerce in Washington. To that, he received no reply whatever.

I agree with the man who told the story that Pan Am had a need and a right to know

how to solve this problem. But whose responsibility was it to make that report available? * * *

In 1950, an article on the application of Boolean algebra to electrical circuits appeared in a journal of the Soviet Academy of Science, and though an English abstract was later published in Mathematical Reviews, it was not "discovered" until 5 years later—after several teams of mathematicians in a variety of American industrial concerns had spent more than 15 man-years in unsuccessful attempts to solve the problem. * * *

American industrial and scientific research is littered with examples of inefficiency like these because obsolete library methods can neither keep track of the mounting volume of scientific and technical research, nor make it accessible in a hurry. An executive of a large steel company has insisted that it is cheaper to repeat an experiment if the cost does not exceed $100,000 than to pay for a search to determine whether it has been done before. And Thomas Vaughan, vice president of Colgate-Palmolive, has guessed that if better library methods could cut only 1 percent of the research worker's time, they would save American industry something like $20 million a year.

This torrent of new knowledge comes from Government agencies, universities, and industries here and abroad. Internationally, there are about 50,000 journals in the natural and physical sciences. Chemical Abstracts, an American publication indexes some 100,000 articles a year, and special libraries throughout the country draw on over 300 various abstracting and indexing sources. The U.S. Patent Office admits to being almost 4 years behind in searching applications for patents.

In 1955 Vannevar Bush urged the Patent Office to explore the techniques of automation for speeding up their work.[1] In that same year, with a similar but broader objective in mind, Western Reserve University in Cleveland initiated a far-reaching program to improve library methods in its new center for documentation and communication research. Western Reserve has natural assets for the job: its school of library science, which fosters the center, is one of the oldest, best known, and most progressive in the country; and Cleveland's industrial and research facilities offer a rich source of support. The center's chief outside sponsor from the start has been the American Society for Metals, and scores of sponsors and customers for its various services now range from firms like Union Carbide Corp. and General Electric Co., to Duke University, the U.S. Army, and the U.S. Air Force.

The program began small but it has rapidly gained momentum. From the beginning it has been closely integrated with the school of library science, and the school's dean, Dr. J. H. Shera, is the center's spokesman and a national leader in the new field of documentation. But in view of the magnitude and complexity of the research needs of modern science and technology—and of the caution with which responsible government officials are obliged to come to decisions—the center's main advantage is a human quality. Its men and women—from Western Reserve's president, John S. Millis, to the part-time graduate assistant—are dedicated to the idea that a reasonable approach to the staggering problems of scientific communication can be found. Important tangible results have come much faster than we ever expected—when a few of us used to get together a short 5 years ago and talk. James W. Perry, who is now director of the center, was then a library fellow at Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and I was associated with him there.

[1] The Office now has a long-range program dealing with the use of electronic equipment in its searches. It is called "Haystaq."

But Western Reserve—and the Nation's research effort—have a long way to go; and in this field no organization can go it alone.

CAN WE SPEED UP THE LIBRARY?

The focus of the rapidly expanding program of the Center for Documentation is its electronic research machine—called the Western Reserve searching selector—designed and nurtured by J. W. Perry. The machine is now installed in the bare second-floor master bedroom of a converted brick and stucco house on fraternity row where the Center is housed, and it rattles along noisily 8 to 10 hours a day. With the assistance of human operators and a Flexowriter which is wired into it, the machine scans the encoded abstracts of scientific articles and produces in typewritten form a bibliography of existing knowledge on a given problem. It can work on 10 questions simultaneously.

Early next year, the present selector will step down to the status of student-trainer, and a new high-speed machine now being built by General Electric will take over. With transistors instead of tubes in its innards and magnetic tape instead of paper tape in its craw, the new machine will hum not rattle, and will flash the red light indicating a fruitful connection 5,000 times as often. But even this new electronic searcher will be only part of a pilot project for a greater design.

The centers' staff of about 50, many of them women, is sprinkled liberally with graduate students in a new branch of library science, working part time—for pay, for love of research, and for master's and doctors' degrees. The center's first doctor of philosophy's hope to graduate this September and will be qualified professionally as documentalists to take jobs in industry, government, and university libraries, at salaries a third higher than those of the usual doctor of library science. For the library of the future will not be a cloister, presided over by a kindly spirit withdrawn from the turmoil of the outside world, but a throbbing nerve center of commercial, scientific, and industrial research.

I am well aware that this picture may be horrifying to conservative scholars—but the historical and linguistic implications of this intellectual experiment are exciting, too. Because much of the work of any research and communications center depends on translation and language analysis, a foreign tongue and symbolic logic may be more useful tools for some specialists than electronics.

At present, the program at Western Reserve centers mainly on metallurgy. Through the cooperation of the American Society for Metals, we receive journals from all parts of the world. Graduate students, acting as subject analysts, prepare detailed abstracts of the important articles, encode them into machine language, much as a clerk codes messages for transatlantic transmission into cables. Punched into standard IBM cards, these abstracts are then automatically checked against a code dictionary, which is also on IBM cards. One of the center's tasks is to develop this dictionary of punched cards, whose terms and phrases bring in related generic concepts and broaden the reference which the research machine will produce on a given question. For example, the code for induction furnace will permit searches not only for that term, but also more generically for electrical heating equipment or electrical equipment or heating equipment or heating.

Once the dictionary meanings are transferred to the punched cards of the metallurgical abstract, the units are transferred (automatically) to punched paper tape. These rolls of tape, each covering about 50 abstracts, are stored in small paper boxes (5 by 6 by 1½ inches in size). Stacked on a table or lined up on a shelf, a hundred of these boxed rolls of tape contain the basic findings, encoded in machine language, of thousands of scientific journals. These rolls constitute the library. The WRU Center also keeps the uncoded abstracts and copies of the original articles, filed in the traditional manner and identified by the serial number of the stored code version.

HOW TO FIND THINGS OUT

When a request for a search comes in, the human operators encode the question, wire (or "program") the Searching Selector for that question, and insert the encoded "library" tape in the Flexowriter, which transfers the impulses by wire into the selector. The machine then rattles through its noisy routine of response and rejection (flashing white or red lights on its switchboard front to indicate misses or hits), and the Flexowriter (unmanned) types out on ordinary manuscript paper the serial numbers of the relevant abstracts. Obviously, the results can be sent anywhere, and the laboratory technician or inventor who asked the question can study the material at his own convenience.

During the past year—under a test sponsored by the American Society for Metals—trial customers ordered more than a hundred machine searches. Many of these would have taken a corps of librarians weeks or months to duplicate by conventional methods. For example, one company, working on a jet airplane, wanted to find a high-temperature-resistant metal possessing the optimum combinations of fabricating properties. The inquiry was expressed as a request for all the literature on "the formability of the sheet form of as many of the high-temperature alloys as have been tested." In this case, center staff clarified the question, encoded it, programed it, fed the library through the reading unit of the selector, and eventually sent the results to the customer in the form of abstracts of the relevant articles.

Since January 1 of his year, the center has been supplying a current awareness service to 10 industrial, university, and Government organizations—keeping them up to date on the current world output in metallurgy. This service not only guarantees nearly complete coverage of the field but cuts down on the time lag in library processing of journals.

The next step for Western Reserve will be to install the GE high-speed machine. Western Reserve is also looking for about $350,000 to stock the new library and train competent subject specialists. Such an investment would underwrite a model center for pilot searching operations of a convincing variety and size and would serve as a foundation for a national literature exploitation center. Small pilot projects in the main scientific fields (biology, biochemistry, chemistry, physics, mathematics) will require trainees with an undergraduate major in science, a master's degree in librarianship, and preferably some experience in the field in which they will be abstracting.

DO WE WANT A NATIONAL CENTER?

In theory, at least, automation in library procedures makes possible a national system of information facilities that will increase the efficiency of the research worker and safeguard our scientific and industrial progress. But strong disagreement exists among Government officials and professional experts in the field as to the degree of centralization that is desirable and as to the estimated cost of launching any national program. Whenever the subject comes up (as it came up in congressional hearings last spring, in a pioneering conference in Cleveland 3 years ago, in discussions—both public and private—by the National Science Foundation and the National Research Council), wild differences arise in the guesses about costs (one can't call them estimates) which are aired by the various experts talking at the moment. And as always in mat-

ters of technology and science these days, someone makes comparisons—in awe or horror—with the Soviet Union, which has a centralized research service employing 2,000 staff members.

On the question of costs, I believe that a budget of $36 million—to be expended over a period of 10 years—would suffice to create an effective national center of scientific information. (I have heard estimates that go up to $300 million.) At the end of this period, I think, these services would become financially self-supporting. In effect, the center would be handling a new form of publication—encoded on magnetic tape or other easily reproducible storage medium—and the returns would amortize the costs of machine searching among a large number of clients.

The existence of a national center would not prevent the formation of other, specialized processing centers, like many publishing houses, whose output might be purchased or rented by organizations wishing to operate their own research machines. At the present time many large industrial organizations, such as Du Pont, Union Carbide, and Smith, Kline, and French, independently process their own materials at enormous costs in duplicated effort. A well-planned network of specialized centers would make possible a blend of centralized and decentralized processing and use of research literature. At the present time, American industry and Government are paying no less than $1 billion a year (15 to 20 percent of the total national research expenditures) for the existing antiquated and uncoordinated system of information services. A few millions of dollars a year to launch an efficient national center would be modest.

It is difficult to clarify just where our responsible national authorities stand on this question. At the time of the congressional hearings in 1958, the National Research Council announced that it was going to establish an advisory board on information and documentation in science, to be aided by a small full-time professional staff. But this program has not yet been implemented. This winter, on Pearl Harbor Day, Dr. James R. Killian's Science Advisory Committee released a report on scientific information problems which proposed to expand and formalize one of the National Science Foundation functions under the name of "Science Information Service." The New York Times (one of the very few newspapers that attempted to cover this piece of nearly inscrutable news) headlined it "President Authorizes Formation of a Science Information Service." Rejecting the Russian centralized information system, Dr. Killian's release said that the new Science Information Service would assist, cooperate with, and supplement the many existing scientific information activities but would assume responsibility for none of them; it would be acting in "the best American tradition of private enterprise and Government working together for the national good."

The reluctance of the National Research Council, the National Science Foundation, and the Killian Science Advisory Committee, to act with respect to their several responsibilities in this field may result from their having been established at widely different periods of time, largely without reference to one another, and without any clear directive from Congress as to the authority of each. Be that as it may, excessive fear of centralization is as destructive as any other fear—and the chaos of our present no-system is all too real.

"REALLY SHATTERING"

With neither awe nor horror, we ought to take notice of what the Russians are doing; for—putting aside the cold war and weapons race—the problems of communication in science, technology, and other fields of knowledge are international, more today than ever before. If the Russians are finding answers where we are groping, it is compounding our stupidity to ignore them.

Last fall I spent 4 weeks in the Soviet Union (as part of a longer European trip) finding out what I could about the activities of the Soviet All-Union Institute of Scientific and Technical Information in Moscow (called VINITI). This vast enterprise, which now has a staff of 2,000 was set up in 1952 for the purpose of acquiring, analyzing, abstracting, and disseminating to scientists and engineers the world output of technical periodicals. It now receives 15,000 periodicals and processes nearly 500,000 articles a year; and it pays abstractors enough money to encourage competition for such part-time jobs. Russian abstractors get five times as much as American professionals, for whom abstracting is mostly a labor of love. By the end of 1957, a British scientist returning from a visit to the institute called its activities "really shattering * * * no other agency in the world is doing this job."

During those weeks in Moscow, I spent a good deal of time at the institute. I visited the editorial offices of the abstracting journals and expres bulletins which they put out, saw the products of their laboratory for electro modeling which is designing and building a machine to be used for storing and searching chemical information, and talked with Government planning officials and with linguists, logicions, mathematicians, chemists, and engineers. Finally, in a meeting with some 200 members of the staff, we batted the subject back and forth for 3 hours—the audience shouting the words that the interpreter and I could not get out.

Their response confirmed my impression that Russian scientists are keenly interested in the problem of creating a common "machine language" and a novel information machine for translating, searching, and correlating scientific literature by automatic means.

WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?

The United States has abstracting services galore—special librarians have listed 312 of them—but they are completely independent and uncoordinated in coverage, quality, and form of publication.[2] And their editors are in no mood to surrender their independence. There is considerable scattered research directed toward documentation, machine searching, and machine translating; but the programs of only 2 or 3 of the 45 organizations listed by a National Science Foundation survey show any real evidence of a coordinated atack on the problem. The Killian report mentioned above makes no clear recommendation on how a balance between centralization and decentralization services can be achieved.

The strong centralized system of the U.S.S.R.—which undoubtedly has economic advantages—is not, I believe, practical or desirable for this country; we are too far along on our own way. For us, it seems to me, the only reasonable course is the creation of a new type of library—a library of encoded information, prepared and stored on the spot, but available for searching, duplication, and distribution anywhere by machine methods. Many separately staffed abstracting services and libraries will operate; but there should be coordination on a national scale.

Internationally, a coordinated program for processing scientific literature is a technical possibility today, if technicians of the various interested countries can agree on philosophy, principles, and detailed codes. Western Reserve is planning a conference to be held in Cleveland next September which will bring together specialists in "machine documentation" from a dozen nations to work toward this kind of agreement. Scientific information processed by automation should not be any nation's monopoly.

As I see it, the plan that our Government should follow is threefold:

(1) We have to work with other nations in formulating a common machine language. (We should encourage the institute in Moscow to translate their abstract services into English and sell or exchange them in the United States simultaneously with the Russian editions.)

(2) We should develop a series of integrated national and regional information centers in the United States—to translate, encode, and make availalbe the world's scientific research reports.

(3) We should increase Government and private support of these efforts.

In any crash program, it is necessary to work simultaneously on several courses until the best one seems clear. In this program, the ultimate course will be the one that the research man—the industrial or scientific user of technical information—finds best. In the competitive American market place, the customer is right. It is an expensive way to make progress—the way of the rich—but let's get on with it.

[2] H. Shera, A. Kent, and J. W. Perry (editors), Information Systems in Documentation, New York, Interscience Publishers, 1957, pp. 539–559.

The Russian Problem: From Ivan the Terrible to Nikita the Sanguine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 21, 1959

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, history is basically a cumulative flow of events and happenings that makes the past always in some essential way present. This is true of our history as a nation. It is likewise true of Russia as an empire-building nation. History provides perspectives which are crucial to any intelligent understanding of contemporary issues and problems.

The problem of the cold war, for example, is viewed by some scholars as a permanent problem so long as the Soviet Union exists. Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, who is a professor of Soviet economics at Georgetown University and also national chairman of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, shows in a recent article that the cold war phenomenon is a centuries-old Russian expansionist technique. Under the title of "The Russian Problem: From Ivan the Terrible to Nikita the Sanguine," the article develops a formula of understanding the Russian problem from the 16th century to the present.

By unanimous consent I am extending my remarks to include Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky's article from the March 1959 issue of the Ukrainian Quarterly:

THE RUSSIAN PROBLEM: FROM IVAN THE TERRIBLE TO NIKITA THE SANGUINE

(By Lev E. Dobriansky)

In the light of Russian political and diplomatic history the recent Mikoyan exhibition in the United States confirmed many established techniques of Russian empire building. Many Americans are unaware of these

traditional techniques and jump to the conclusion that Mikoyan's behavior was only a deceptive product of Communist tactics. A few even believed that the man was sincere and that the present rulers in Moscow are desirous of ending the cold war. In both cases a historical myopia prevails, along with an inordinate disdain for an institutional analysis which alone can insure some realism and maturity in our outlook toward the operations of a dedicated enemy.

Regardless of transient and momentary fluctuations in the behavior of the Kremlin, it can be reasonably argued that from the viewpoint of history alone the cold war is here to stay so long as the Russian colossus continue to breathe and unless a hot war, for one reason or another, should break out. Paradoxical as it may appear to some, the Mikoyan venture was a cold war instrument in application and its emphasis on Russian longing for peace was by no means the first of its kind in the long history of Russian empire building. It cannot be too strongly stated that in order to understand the current tactics of Khrushchev and company—the scientific feats, the economic challenge, the fictitious superiority of U.S.S.R.'s armed forces, etc.—the lessons of Russia's successful empire building in the past must be securely grasped. Pragmatic, day-to-day analysis and evaluation may make for sensational newsprint but they are no substitute for cumulative experience and secular judgment.

DOMINANT VIEWS TOWARD THE PROBLEM

Most of us realize that the world today is seriously challenged by what many regard as the challenge of communism. Some of us who are guided by the clear-cut evidences of history prefer to designate objects by their proper names, to call a thing for what it is, without fear or sentiment. Penetrating through the ideologic veneer, cold analysis will show that the challenge is one of the Russian problem. As in the past, this problem is being felt all over the world: in the Far East, in the Middle East, in Africa, in Latin America, and even here in the United States. But it is also being tragically encountered within the farflung borders of the present Russian Communist Empire.

The Russian problem is one that was born, cultivated, and shaped in a definite historical and cultural environment. It is assuredly not a problem that suddenly emerged, as many in this country suppose, in 1947, with the spurious origination of the cold war. Indeed, the problem and the cold war activity which it intrinsically engenders did not first come into existence in 1917, with the ascent of the Russian Bolsheviks. They are only creatures of the problem. If perspective and the secular institutional viewpoint are to be valued, the problem can be traced back to the very origins of the history of Russia which, more accurately, means the history of Muscovy.

How does one view the nature of the global Russian problem today? How has it come to be what it is? How does the West, and the United States in particular, understand it, its features, character, and portent? These are fundamental questions which are very infrequently raised and discussed. It is a truism that times change, but it is an attainment of truth to perceive the persistent being of things. By virtue of its technology and other assets the United States has changed radically and enormously since the beginnings of the Republic. Nevertheless, despite the manifold change, there is an institutional being in the Republic which has persistently attested to the preservation of individual liberty, relatively free economic enterprise, trial by jury, government by checks and balances, and a host of other traditional treasures of social existence. With rational and spiritual grounds of justification, it is an institutional habituation that has made it possible for us to maintain our unique cultural fabric. The same applies to other States and nations. The predominant force of tradition, especially abetted by unprecedented successes, applies also to the Russian and Muscovite segment of the Soviet Union. It is in this institutional context of being and becoming that the Russian problem is viewed here.

Before defining and analyzing this problem it would be well to consider some general views held in government and private circles with regard to the challenge facing us. One view may be called the sentimentalist view. It is based on the identity of human nature. After all, it will be argued, the Russians are a part of humanity; they are people like ourselves; consequently, they are subject to very substantial changes in habit and disposition. Those whose thnking is dominated by this view will quickly point to Russians who are highly cultured and of fine breed. The defendant of this superficial view will say, "You can't look upon these Russians as being barbaric and predatory. We should expand our cultural exchange programs in order to understand the Russians better and thus avoid a terrible world holocaust."

Doubtlessly the elements of this sentimentalist view are true, but they are misplaced. It is astounding how many of us live by short memories and, as a result, become susceptible to all sorts of passing fancies. Have we forgotten so soon that back in the twenties and thirties there were also cultured and warmly human Germans and Japanese? In fact, in the context of Western society, Germans by and large were quantitatively more cultured than can be said of the Russians. Moreover, it would be nonsensical to deny the civilization and culture of the Japanese people. Despite all of this, including the often overlooked fact that our accessibility to Germany and Japan was far greater that it is in relation to the Soviet Union, we did find ourselves in war. We traded with them, we talked, we exchanged; yet we ended in war. With a more conspiratorial and deceitful enemy, will these means perhaps work toward our own destruction, aside from having little to do with the avoidance of conflict? Be nice, understand, exchange are rather extraneous to the problem at hand.

Another prevalent and popular view concerns the conflict in ideology. This view may be properly designated as the misplaced ideologic view. According to it, we are fighting communism. This is the real enemy and threat to the United States and the entire free world. Proponents sometimes call this enemy international communism or Soviet communism or world communism, each being a vague abstraction that only befogs the issue. In comparison with other free nations, including England, the United States seems to unduly restrict the current struggle within the narrow limits of this ideologic doctrine. When we adopt this view, our approach becomes excessively rationalist and quite misleading. It is one which tends to shut off centuries of history and national experience. No room is afforded by this view for any cultural and institutional analyses which can scarcely tolerate conceptions that would have the Soviet Union emerging from some historical hiatus, without roots in history, peoples and so forth. But such is the case in our present thinking, and ultimately it will demand its price.

A fact worth considering is that countries and nations who have had long experiences with Russian diplomacy and expansionism actually scotch this superficial ideologic view of the struggle. If they were in more formidable material circumstances, they would certainly be more outspoken on this. They fully recognize the fact that this misleading ideologic viewpoint on simply fighting communism has to the largest extent worked to preclude our understanding of the real adversary. Above all, it has precluded a realistic assessment of the enemy's power and its military and economic potentials. If this is only partly correct, then it follows that we have been wastefully dispersing our forces and assets by virtue of not recognizing the ramifications of our misunderstanding or, more properly, our lack of understanding the real problem. This lack is basically at the source of our being continually on the defensive. It explains the ever present contradictions between our espousals of principles and our passive deeds, viz, between our expressed liberation policy and our containing behavior. It fundamentally accounts for our inabilities to cope with the Russian drive for extreme nationalism in the Middle East[1] to realize the potentials for freedom resident among the captive non-Russian nations within the Soviet Union itself, and to successfully combat Russian propaganda in all spheres, be it scientific, economic, military,[2] political, or cultural.

THE RUSSIAN PROBLEM DEFINED

What, then, is the nature of the Russian problem? As is necessary for the solution of all problems, the first step is to define the problem. And this foremost of problems today may be satisfactorily defined as follows: rooted in four centuries of development, the Russian problem is an institutional nexus between external imperialist, colonial predation, and internal totalitarian coercion. It is important to view the history of any phenomenon in terms of its totality, its central directions, and chief features. History does divulge its own patterns. The overall and prime feature of Russian history is external predation. If one cannot see this, then he has yet much to learn about this history down to present times. Moreover, this feature of predation supports and is supported by the equally important feature of internal totalitarian coercion.

The striking aspect of this institutional nexus is the interplay between these two phenomena. The success of the one is dependent on that of the other. Thus the problem encompasses within its own nature a vicious circle that for its existence and the glory of the Russian mission in the world must continually widen. Regardless of the ideologic guise under which it has operated—today, communism; yesterday, orthodoxy and pan-slavism—this concentric growth has brought about the subjugation of good parts of Europe and Asia. Modern technology has facilitated this growth so that now it threatens the security of our own Nation.

Another essential aspect of the nexus is the demographic one. The statistics quoted here will doubtlessly be contradicted by the results of the recent population census taken in the Soviet Union; but Western students have learned some time ago to discount Moscow's official figures in whatever vital area. There are about 90 million Russians. Against this amount stand some 110 million non-Russians in the U.S.S.R. itself and another 100 million in the external satellite area in Central Europe. Excluding the captive non-Russian populations in the Far East and in south Asia, it is evident that similar to the Turks in the Ottoman Empire, the Russians are clearly in the minority. As in the other case, the Russian empire, today under the legalistic veil of the U.S.S.R. possesses in captivity a majority of non-Russians to do its work.

Now, once one recognizes this Russian problem, he is faced by another. The question that arises in one's mind is not a new one. In fact, going back to the beginning of the 16th century, the ambassador of Emperor

[1] See article on "Guiding Impressions of the Middle East," the Ukranian Quarterly, September 1958, pp. 226–235.

[2] See "Basic Misconceptions in U.S. Military Thought on the U.S.S.R.," the Ukrainian Quarterly, December 1958, pp. 299–310.

Maximilian to Muscovy defined it well when he said, "I do not know whether it is the character of the Russian nation which has formed such autocrats or whether the autocrats themselves have given this character to the nation." Baron von Herberstein was obviously in doubt about the source of the problem, but he at least recognized the major problem itself. In terms of tyranny, state controls, censorship, pretentious military prowess, and other familiar institutional facets, the Muscovy he knew was substantially no different from the Russian-based Soviet Union we know in our day. Fluctuations in the exercise of these institutional facets, by way of relaxations, glowing promises of improvement, and changes in characters, have marked the history of the Muscovite and later Russian state from his day down to our own. Nevertheless, the nexus was maintained and the empire grew. This notable fact is particularly important for those in our day who are easily deluded by transient and incidental changes in the Soviet Union.

This institutional mirror of the political body of Russia has been shown time and time again by objective foreign observers. In the 19th century, people like de Tocqueville and de Custine vividly painted the picture of Russian society as it was and, one could say, as it is in substantial form today. It is most heartening to note that some of our leaders are beginning to realize the importance of the perspective stressed in our definition of the Russian problem. Recently, with reference to Marquis de Custine's classic, "Journey for Our Time," Senator FULBRIGHT, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, told a witness: "I know you would be interested in it, because in its description of how the Russian people think it sounds in many cases as if it was written yesterday."[2]

In point of fact, this psychocultural analysis by de Custine is indispensable to the competent knowledge of anyone dealing with Russia. It should be donated as a charitable present to our Cyrus Eatons, Stevensons, and Ellenders who, if they would pause to think, could benefit from this classic. Few proper names need be changed in this work for it to describe the basic institutions of present-day Russia. As de Custine puts it in cultural terms, "Russian civilization is still so close to its source that it resembles barbarism * * * Russia is no more than a conquering society. Its strength is not in ideas, it is in war; that is to say, in ruse and in ferocity."[4] The existence of space satellites, rockets, missiles and other technologic novelties of our day do not diminish the pertinence of this truth to contemporary Russia in the least. Indeed, they only magnify it as they aggravate the problem itself.

The phrase about war "in ruse and in ferocity" is most significant. The techniques of deception and chicanery have long been employed in Russia's foreign affairs. What we call the cold war today is in essence an old Russian institution, well antedating the indirect aggression Mr. Dulles perceives in the Middle East or, for that matter, operational Leninism itself. What we are witnessing today, from Mikoyan's pleas for peace without justice to tune-saving babble in the United Nations and elsewhere, has numerous traditional precedents in the empire-building history of Russia. These tactics and techniques were formed and fashioned for well-nigh 400 years.

Dealing with working and fact-based concepts, it is not the aim of this article to recite all the outstanding evidence supporting our definition of the Russian problem. The sole general fact that in the span of a few centuries an unprecedented empire was created by the Russians would seem to suffice. However, it is necessary to demonstrate the striking relevance of de Custine's observations to the present by citing several prominent examples of how this was accomplished. Contrary to false popular impressions, direct Russian military aggression has always been secondary and subsidiary. It has been in the field of what is known today as cold war activity that Russia has always relied for its primary weapons to achieve predatory conquest. And such activity embraces subversion, infiltration, divide and conquer maneuvers, friendship societies, ideologic diversion, pretenses at peace promotion, diplomatic blackmail and several other deceptive devices.

In this dimension the distance between Mikoyan in the present, or a Khrushchev, to an Ivan the Terrible in the past is short, indeed. Few appreciate the fact that the first Czar of Muscovy laid the formal groundwork of the many exhibitions we are witnessing today. His crucial conquest of the Khanate of Kazan in 1552, which actually started Muscovy on a unique empire-building enterprise, was preceded by 33 years of cold war operation. He was the first to put into successful practice what Lenin, almost 400 years later, codified as neither peace nor war or what Secretary Dulles today calls indirect aggression. Ivan sponsored a competing native candidate for the throne of Kazan as early as 1519 and, through him, succeeded in weakening the Khanate to such an extent that by 1552 Muscovite troops had only to move in. The policy of Khrushchev toward Nasser and his pan-Arab plans is not much different.

Building on this and other similarly successful feats under Ivan, as, for instance, the subsequent subversion of Astrakhan, Moscovy provides many such essential cases for the following centuries. The conquest of Ukraine was begun in the 17th century with the breach of the Pereyaslav Treaty of 1654, a military pact which Muscovy distored into an integral political union of Muscovy and Ukraine. Significantly, this untruth was sounded again in the U.S.S.R. in 1954 during the so-called Pereyaslav celebrations. The full conquest of Ukraine was not achieved until Catherine's time, but the period is replete with Muscovite political preparations, subversion, and monistic orthodox ideology. Moreover, this period discloses a powerful truth which has been repeated as a cyclical pattern in our times. And that is, so long as Ukraine was free, Poland, the Caucasus, and other neighboring areas were free of Muscovite or Russian domination: once it was submerged, the others followed. This happened in the 18th century; it was repeated in this century.

Thus it was not long that the partition of Poland ensued under Catherine the Great. Here, too, the Russian Ambassadors Repnin and Stackelberg played the role which we in our time saw Vishinsky execute in Latvia—"accept this, or else." Before the second partition in 1793, renegade Poles were organized to call for the "liberation" of the people from Polish boyars and the Church. With Poland and Ukraine submerged, the Caucasus soon followed. This event was prepared decades in advance.[5] The process of weakening the area was seen even durthe Russo-Turkish War of 1768–1774. Although in a pact with Georgia, Catherine had her troops withdrawn on the eve of battle, leaving Georgia to the devastating blows of the Turks. It is evident that the Russian infamy in the Warsaw uprising of the last war is not without able precedent. The stage and characters are different, but the form and act continue to repeat themselves. If space permitted, the operations of Russian diplomacy in Persia and elsewhere during the 19th century would tell the same story.

THE INTERNAL COMPONENT OF THE PROBLEM

Our problem, then, is not the challenge of communism; it is the despotic challenge of traditional Russian institutions. In the period covered above, other ideologies prevailed as both instruments and smoke screens for totalitarian Russian expansion. Fatuous Communist doctrine does not differ in this respect from the Petrine doctrine and panslavism of the past. What is fundamentally important for the West to understand is that the imperialist and colonial objectives of Russia and its tactics and techniques have been substantially the same these past 400 years. We are deluding ourselves if we continue to believe that any enhanced output of technologic gadgets will alter the structure of the Russian institutional nexus.

Those who would seek to impute any anti-Russian bias to this realistic interpretation either do not understand the reasoning involved or are quick to shield their own biases. It is often intellectually sickening to hear that we cannot face up to the bold and stubborn facts because it would be construed as anti-Russian, i.e., against the Russian people. The forceful truth is that along with other peoples and nations, the Russian people have long been oppressed by the internal component of the institutional nexus in this Russian problem. Here, too, it is not difficult to trace the facets of this component from the time of Ivan's Oprichniks to Khrushchev's security forces, from Peter's crash economic programs to the present 7-year plan, from the Czarist mir to the present collectives. It will be readily admitted that many liberal forces were at work in the old empire and, no doubt, that such forces are latent in the present empire. But one must also be intellectually honest to admit that these forces really had little effect upon official Russian policies.

A clear analytical grasp of the Russian problem as defined here enables one to see the dual direction that a successful policy must logically take in order to solve this historic problem for all time. Present U.S. policy rests on a basic misunderstanding of the problem. In turn, this misunderstanding stymies the full use of our own traditional forces which, if unleashed, would overwhelm the enemy in the current struggle. The antidote to the external part of the Russian institutional nexus, namely predatory conquest, is our manifold support of the patriotic nationalisms of every captive non-Russian nation in the present Russian Communist empire. For obvious reasons, the emphasis of this direction should be placed on those within the Soviet Union itself. The antidote to the internal part of the nexus is our appeal to the Russian people in terms of individual liberty, improved living conditions, and democratic freedoms. By nature of the nexus that exists, the antidotes cannot but reinforce each other. We still have time to pursue these logical directions. What is necessary first is an intelligent awareness of the Russian problem.

[2] "Review of Foreign Policy," 1952, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C., p. 191.

[4] Marquis de Custine, "Journey for Our Time," New York, 1951, p. 331.

[5] For a keen analysis of this, see "The Strength and Weakness of U.S.S.R." by Vano Jan Nanwashvili, Boston, 1956.

Somewhere Beyond the Ocean Blue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 6, 1959

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, as Memorial Day approaches and our thoughts naturally turn to the sacrifices

made through the years by those who believed our Nation was worth fighting for, Mr. Fred V. Hayford, of Lansing, Mich., has sent to me the following poem which he has composed as a tribute to those who have defended our country:

SOMEWHERE BEYOND THE OCEAN BLUE

(By Fred V. Hayford)

A grateful nation should always keep in mind,
Achievements, which history recorded, as being fine;
First, here at home, our forefathers made their stand,
To provide posterity a home, in a vast free land;
Again and again, when enemies tried to invade our shores,
A new generation stepped forward, to do the chores;
On land, sea, or in the air, wherever necessary to go,
Americans were on hand, as our former enemies now know.

Somewhere beyond the ocean blue.
Other grateful nations still think of you;
Your deeds of valor also saved their fair lands,
As you boys pushed forward, over their white sands;
For our cause was so fair and just,
And for freedom's sake, to win, we must:
And now, for those who lived, and those who died,
"We bow our heads in thanks" with sincere pride.

Down With Deficit Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 27, 1959

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month, the Tribune-Democrat, published in Johnstown, Pa., joined the Chicago Tribune and other newspapers in a unique campaign to urge Congress to eliminate unnecessary spending in the Federal Government. Since then, I have received scores of messages from readers who are deeply concerned with Federal policies and practices that are the basic reason for inflation and which will bring eventual bankruptcy to the Nation unless checked and reversed.

The newspapers and the citizens responding to this patriotic movement are to be congratulated. Since coming to Congress, I have been an incessant foe of extravagance with U.S. Treasury funds, but somehow the number of economy minded Representatives and Senators has not prevailed except for a very short period. Under the demands of an irate citizenry, I am hopeful that even Members with the most burning penchant for spending tax dollars will begin to tighten the reins on runaway inflation. The place to start is right here in Congress when the appropriation bills are under consideration; only if the Government lives within the limits of its income will our dollar retain its value.

Deficit spending, except in extreme emergencies, is immoral. It leaves to future generations the debts incurred by wastrels of preceeding eras. For a while there was no immediate visible evidence to contradict the preachments of political imposters who insisted that "it makes no difference if we have a big national debt—we owe it all to ourselves." This spurious but appealing reasoning was repeated over and over as the presses printed more and more dollars for use in any number of paternalistic ventures and for distribution to friends and enemies all over the world. U.S. Government money began to flow like water, and everyone was offered a drink.

Now, at long last, the past is catching up. The water is fast losing strength. The bureaucrats who opened the spigots have plenty of victuals for themselves, but the people who pay their way are finding that they have been sold down the river that erodes the value of their incomes. Pensioners have been cheated; men and women who saved for retirement have had their nest evaporate in an atmosphere of Federal extravagance; the average worker who has been fortunate enough to enjoy wage increases finds that he is in truth standing still economically; and those whose incomes remain the same are slipping to lower living standards.

National debt makes no difference? If there is anyone still supporting that theory, perhaps he would like to explain away the $7,600 million interest that was paid on the national debt in fiscal 1958. That money came from taxes. In the hands of the Nation's taxpayers, it could have bought upwards of half a million $15,000 homes; or 3 million automobiles selling for $2,500 each; or paid $4,570 toward college tuition and expenses of every boy and girl who will be graduated from high school this year.

Mr. Speaker, if the American public had an extra $7½ billion to spend as it chooses, there would be no need for depressed area legislation or other projects that are contemplated for reviving the economy. More new houses and new cars would put new demands on coal, steel, glass, tools, plastics, ceramics, pottery, railroads, and the many other industries that must keep running at high levels of operation if a sound economic structure is to be maintained.

We are not pointing in the direction of economic stability if deficit spending is continued. The job of the Federal Government is to return to a sound monetary basis and to start cutting down on the national debt. Inflation is deadly poisonous. The only antidote is an integrious money policy to be administered by the Federal Government.

Housing Act of 1959

SPEECH

OF

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1959

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (S. 57) to extend and amend laws relating to the provision and improvement of housing and the renewal of urban communities, and for other purposes.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, as this Nation has prospered and expanded in the post World War II years, we have seen the greatest building boom in history. Our cities and our countryside are crowded with great and modern industrial plants. We have pushed our skyscrapers to heights never dreamed of and made of them aluminum and steel shafts of dramatic architectural design. Whole new suburban communities have come into being.

We have seen the construction of many attractive and functional new school buildings in which we educate the children who live in the lovely ramblers and ranch houses that make up our new suburbia and the fine new residential sections of our cities.

Of all this we may be proud, especially proud that so much of it was made possible with the aid of the Federal Government. The Congress at the very outset of our tremendous postwar expansion and development saw the need for programs that would satisfy the demands of our citizens for adequate housing.

There is danger that we should fail now to see these worthwhile programs through. For the task is nowhere near finished. The tragedy is that despite the Nation's great prosperity and the healthy postwar economic boom and expansion there are still hundreds of thousands of our citizenes living in substandard housing. Nearly everyone of our cities is blighted by sprawling slum areas. I am conscious, as I am sure we all are, of the great cost of programs to alleviate these conditions. But so long as hundreds of thousands of Americans live in substandard areas and are denied the privilege of adequate housing; so long as college students are forced to live in basements and firetrap garrets, we have a responsibility to do everything in our power to bring about the elimination of such conditions. Until we do this, not through an inadequate and long drawn out program, but in a speedy and efficient manner, the housing task the Government tackled some years ago is unfinished business.

In addition to meeting the required demand for housing, it will serve to promote construction and also serve to stimulate the economy in economically distressed areas.

I urge that we face up to this challenge by the final adoption of S. 57, the housing bill.

Free World Recognized Dulles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 26, 1959

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, America and the peoples of the world have been

aided in their progress for peace by Secretary of State John Foster Dulles.

As a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, I knew his competence and complete dedication.

As a friend who has known him a long time, and who has worked with him I have admired his high principles and friendly approach.

His willingness to be helpful and his understanding replies have made him many loyal friends. As a friend, I have always enjoyed as well his good humor and gleeful chuckle.

Foster Dulles has been a product of America in her best tradition, and we are proud of him. You future generations who follow us, remember Foster Dulles as an ever active, tireless, and competent public servant of wide capacities from a lifetime of preparation, working in a troubled sea of change after World War II.

The advice and counsel of Foster Dulles are respected among the peoples of the world, and he has been a warmhearted friend of high principle.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article from the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette on Mr. Dulles:

FREE WORLD RECOGNIZED DULLES

(By David Lawrence)

GENEVA, May 26.—The air waves of Europe have been filled with tributes to John Foster Dulles. Words of praise were broadcast by the radio stations everywhere on Sunday as the sad news of the death of the former Secretary of State became known. The contrast between what is being said now and what was said a year or so ago is striking. Somehow the free world came to appreciate Mr. Dulles only when it was apparent that, being stricken with a fatal cancer, he would be lost to the councils of the Western governments.

Listening to the eloquent eulogy by Selwyn Lloyd, the British Foreign Minister, as it came over the British Broadcasting Co. on Sunday afternoon, this correspondent felt that no more fitting appraisal could have been uttered in government circles anywhere. For, as Mr. Lloyd put it, there was no inflexibility about Mr. Dulles except on matters of principle, and he had the courage to stick to moral principle even in the face of the bitterest criticism.

The position of John Foster Dulles in history is in a sense being fixed earlier than might otherwise have been the case. For he was suddenly removed from the scenes of his greatest labors at a time of crisis. His statesmanship began to be appraised in the highest terms when it was realized that he would no longer be available to guide the free world.

Mistakes there were in Mr. Dulles' handling of some of the multifarious problems that came to him for solution, but he was the first to admit them and to correct them. He was not rigid in a negotiation. Indeed, he was resourceful and never felt that the door should be slammed when there was a possibility of agreement.

He had a faith that the West could win the long battle with the Communists only by sticking to principle and refusing to compromise on fundamentals. His critics thought he was unrealistic and that he should accept the Soviet position as one not likely ever to change. Dulles realized that Americans often were too impatient and sometimes were ready to appease on the false theory that this would be of benefit in the end and bring peace. He felt just the opposite—that appeasement or surrender at the time would mean dangerous complications later on and that maybe we would not have been plunged into two world wars if firmness, instead of vacillating diplomacy, had been manifested early enough by the Western Allies.

Mr. Dulles frequently was represented as a believer in a one-man Department because he handled so many problems personally. But he did develop a fine staff, and his legacy is the great team in the Department of State today.

The picture of Mr. Dulles that unfriendly critics painted was that of a man who unduly influenced President Eisenhower. This was not true. Mr. Dulles always functioned as an adviser—as a lawyer to his client—pointing out the different courses of action and leaving it to the President to make the decision. It was this quality of deference rather than any kind of domination which endeared Mr. Dulles to the President. In fact, Mr. Eisenhower's respect and admiration for Mr. Dulles constantly grew, and a deep affection developed between the two men. When Mr. Eisenhower learned that there was no hope of a recovery and that Mr. Dulles had himself recognized the facts and submitted his resignation, the grief of the President was noticeable. The hesitation in announcing the immediate appointment of a successor was due in large part to the feeling that no news should for a day or two at least be permitted to overshadow the story of the departing statesman from the Government he had served so long and so faithfully.

Mr. Eisenhower had tears in his eyes when, at the press conference in Augusta, he announced Dulles' resignation. To Press Secretary Hagerty, who rode away from the scene with him, the President said: "It's like losing a brother."

Somehow, since a termination of service was inevitable some future day, it is a splendid thing that John Foster Dulles, lying on his hospital bed these last few weeks, lived to see his principles vindicated in the worldwide acclaim given him.

John Foster Dulles is gone. A great statesman—perhaps one of the greatest in modern times—has departed. While the free world today appreciates what he did, it is important now that his principles and the doctrines he preached shall not be forsaken by his own Government or by the governments of the free world for the preservation of whose liberties and freedoms he gave unstintingly and unselfishly all his ability.

Obscene Literature

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 27, 1959

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, a great many parents all over the country are grateful that the TV Academy chose Miss Loretta Young for one of its coveted awards this year. Her program of April 26, 1959, was an outstanding moral, social, and civic contribution. It portrayed vividly an alarming criminal consequence of the sale of obscene literature on newsstands; it also demonstrated the need for community wide participation in the drive to clean up the printed material available to American youth.

The general public as well as the television industry is indebted to Miss Young for her superb performance in behalf of decency. Realizing the urgent need for exposing irresponsible news dealers, producers of that show have expertly dramatized the problem a second time. Another effective use would be to make prints of the film for use at meetings of parent-teachers organizations, veterans' groups, and various civic clubs.

The story emphasized that society is to blame if news vendors flaunt the laws of decency by putting salacious literature up for sale. Every adult who has any love whatsoever for his family, his neighbor's children, his community, and his country should ponder Miss Young's observation that "we are going to pay an awful price for it" unless the situation is remedied.

Anyone who is resigned to believing that the practice cannot be stopped should become acquainted with what is taking place in my district. Individuals and organizations alike have begun to demand a cleanup of newsstands, with the result that guilty newsdealers have been notified that they must cease peddling filth or be prosecuted. Distributors serving the area have agreed to stop serving obscene material, not only to stands, but to outlets throughout the district.

The same vigilance is required to halt activities of direct mail houses that violate the sanctity of homes and solicit children. Parents who find that lewd material is coming through the mail have a duty to society as well as to their own boys and girls to report the offenses to their local postmasters, and other postal authorities.

Last year, Congress strengthened the law to simplify prosecution of traffickers of foul and filthy printed material. How communities may implement the law is being demonstrated in several areas of my district, and I take this opportunity to congratulate all participants for their forthright courage and duty.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker, Sam Rayburn

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va.*
Abernethy, Thomas G., *Miss.* 6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind.* 4000 Mass. Ave.
Addonizio, Hugh J., *N. J.*
Albert, Carl, *Okla.* 5115 Allen Terrace
Alexander, Hugh Q., *N. C.*
Alford, Dale, *Ark.*
Alger, Bruce, *Tex.*
Allen, Leo E., *Ill.* University Club
Andersen, H. Carl, *Minn.* 4000 Mass. Ave.
Anderson, LeRoy H., *Mont.* 911 Beverly Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Andrews, George W., *Ala.* 3108 Cathedral Ave.
Anfuso, Victor L., *N. Y.*
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill.* 4815 Dexter St.
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*
Ashmore, Robert T., *S. C.*
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo.* Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Auchincloss, James C., *N. J.* 113 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.

Avery, William H., *Kans.*
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*
Bailey, Cleveland M., *W. Va.*
Baker, Howard H., *Tenn.*
Baldwin, John F., Jr., *Calif.*
Barden, Graham A., *N. C.* 2601 Woodley Pl.
Baring, Walter S., *Nev.*
Barr, Joseph W., *Ind.* Tulip Lane and Glen Mill Rd., Rockville Md.
Barrett, William A., *Pa.*
Barry, Robert R., *N. Y.* 3019 Normanstone Drive
Bass, Perkins, *N. H.*
Bass, Ross, *Tenn.*
Bates, William H., *Mass.*
Baumhart, A. D., Jr., *Ohio*
Becker, Frank J., *N. Y.*
Beckworth, Lindley, *Tex.*
Belcher, Page, *Okla.*
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla.* 1530 38th St. SE.
Bennett, John B., *Mich.* 3718 Cardiff Rd., Chevy Chase, Md.
Bentley, Alvin M., *Mich.*
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak.* 118 Schotts Court NE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*
Blatnik, John A., *Minn.*
Blitch, Iris Faircloth, (Mrs.), *Ga.*
Boggs, Hale, *La.*
Boland, Edward P., *Mass.*
Bolling, Richard, *Mo.* 3409 Lowell St.
Bolton, Frances P. (Mrs.), *Ohio.* 2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bonner, Herbert C., *N. C.* Calvert-Woodley
Bosch, Albert H., *N. Y.*
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio.* 4301 Mass. Ave.
Bowles, Chester, *Conn.*
Boykin, Frank W., *Ala.* The Washington
Boyle, Charles A., *Ill.*
Brademas, John, *Ind.*
Bray, William G., *Ind.*
Breeding, J. Floyd, *Kans.*
Brewster, Daniel B., *Md.*
Brock, Lawrence, *Nebr.*
Brooks, Jack, *Tex.*
Brooks, Overton, *La.* 4413 46th St.
Broomfield, William S., *Mich.*
Brown, Charles H., *Mo.* 3723 N. Oakland St., Arlington, Va.
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio.* Alban Towers
Brown, Paul, *Ga.* Boston House
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va.*
Buckley, Charles A., *N. Y.*
Budge, Hamer H., *Idaho*
Burdick, Quentin, *N. Dak.*
Burke, Frank W., *Ky.*
Burke, James A., *Mass.*
Burleson, Omar, *Tex.* 2737 Devonshire Pl.
Bush, Alvin R., *Pa.*
Byrne, James A., *Pa.*
Byrnes, John W., *Wis.* 1215 25th St. So., Arlington, Va.
Cahill, William T., *N. J.*
Canfield, Gordon, *N. J.*
Cannon, Clarence, *Mo.*
Carnahan, A. S. J., *Mo.*
Carter, Steven V., *Iowa*
Casey, Bob, *Tex.*
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich.*
Celler, Emanuel, *N. Y.* The Mayflower
Chamberlain, Charles E., *Mich.*
Chelf, Frank, *Ky.*
Chenoweth, J. Edgar, *Colo.*
Chiperfield, Robert B., *Ill.* 1713 House Office Building
Church, Marguerite Stitt (Mrs.), *Ill.* 2122 Mass. Ave.
Clark, Frank M., *Pa.* 3735 Gunston Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Coad, Merwin, *Iowa*
Coffin, Frank M., *Maine*
Cohelan, Jeffery, *Calif.* 2820 Ordway St.
Collier, Harold R., *Ill.*
Colmer, William M., *Miss.*
Conte, Silvio O., *Mass.*
Cook, Robert E., *Ohio*
Cooley, Harold D., *N. C.* 2480 16th St.
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa.*
Cramer, William C., *Fla.* 6714 Joallen Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Cunningham, Glenn, *Nebr.* 4920 Yorktown Blvd., Arlington Va.
Curtin, Willard S., *Pa.*
Curtis, Laurence, *Mass.* 3314 O St.
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo.*
Daddario, Emilio Q., *Conn.*
Dague, Paul B., *Pa.*
Daniels, Dominick V., *N. J.*
Davis, Clifford, *Tenn.* 4611 Butterworth Pl.
Davis, James C., *Ga.*
Dawson, William L., *Ill.*
Delaney, James J., *N. Y.*
Dent, John H., *Pa.*
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind.*
Derounian, Steven B., *N. Y.*
Derwinski, Edward J., *Ill.*
Devine, Samuel L., *Ohio*
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich.*
Dingell, John D., *Mich.*
Dixon, Henry Aldous, *Utah.* 1817 N. Quinn St., Arlington, Va.
Dollinger, Isidore, *N. Y.*
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass.*
Dooley, Edwin B., *N. Y.*
Dorn, Francis E., *N. Y.*
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S. C.*
Dowdy, John, *Tex.*
Downing, Thomas N., *Va.*
Doyle, Clyde, *Calif.* 3877 30th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Dulski, Thaddeus J., *N. Y.*
Durham, Carl T., *N. C.* The Lee House
Dwyer, Florence P. (Mrs.), *N. J.*
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla.*
Elliott, Carl, *Ala.*
Everett, Robert A., *Tenn.*
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn.* 5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md.*
Farbstein, Leonard, *N. Y.*
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla.*
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio.*
Fenton, Ivor D., *Pa.* 3725 Macomb St.
Fino, Paul A., *N. Y.*
Fisher, O. C., *Tex.* Calvert-Woodley
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa.* The Congressional
Flynn, Gerald T., *Wis.*
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga.*
Fogarty, John E., *R. I.* 1133 House Office Building
Foley, John R., *Md.*
Forand, Aime J., *R. I.* 4108 Dresden St., Kensington, Md.
Ford, Gerald R., Jr., *Mich.* 514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Forrester, E. L., *Ga.*
Fountain, L. H., *N. C.* The Westchester
Frazier, James B., Jr., *Tenn.* Fairfax Hotel
Frelinghuysen, Peter, Jr., *N. J.* 3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md.*
Fulton, James G., *Pa.*
Gallagher, Cornelius E., *N. J.*
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md.*
Gary, J. Vaughan, *Va.*
Gathings, E. C., *Ark.* 6377 31st Pl.
Gavin, Leon H., *Pa.*
George, Newell A., *Kans.*
Giaimo, Robert N., *Conn.*
Glenn, Milton W., *N. J.* Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Granahan, Kathryn E. (Mrs.), *Pa.*
Grant, George M., *Ala.* 4801 Conn. Ave.
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill.*
Green, Edith (Mrs.), *Oreg.*
Green, William J., Jr., *Pa.*
Griffin, Robert P., *Mich.*
Griffiths, Martha W. (Mrs.), *Mich.*
Gross, H. R., *Iowa.*
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif.*
Hagen, Harlan, *Calif.*
Haley, James A., *Fla.*
Hall, David M., *N. C.*
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind.* 4926 Upton St.
Halpern, Seymour, *N. Y.*
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va.*
Hargis, Denver D., *Kans.*
Harmon, Randall S., *Ind.*
Harris, Oren, *Ark.* 1627 Myrtle St.
Harrison, Burr P., *Va.*
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio.* 1323 Barger Drive, Falls Church, Va.
Healey, James C., *N. Y.*
Hébert, F. Edward, *La.* 26 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Hechler, Ken, *W. Va.*
Hemphill, Robert W., *S. C.*
Henderson, John E., *Ohio.*
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla.*
Hess, William E., *Ohio.*
Hiestand, Edgar W., *Calif.*
Hoeven, Charles B., *Iowa.* 100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hoffman, Clare E., *Mich.* 3018 M St. SE.
Hoffman, Elmer J., *Ill.*
Hogan, Earl, *Ind.* 5211 Flanders Ave., Garrett Pk., Kensington, Md.
Holifield, Chet, *Calif.*
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa.*
Holt, Joe, *Calif.*
Holtzman, Lester, *N. Y.*
Horan, Walt, *Wash.*
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif.*
Huddleston, George, Jr., *Ala.*
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo.*
Ikard, Frank, *Tex.*
Irwin, Donald J., *Conn.* The Coronet
Jackson, Donald L., *Calif.*
Jarman, John, *Okla.*
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va.*
Jensen, Ben F., *Iowa.* 2120 16th St.
Johansen, August E., *Mich.*
Johnson, Byron L., *Colo.*
Johnson, Harold T., *Calif.*
Johnson, Lester R., *Wis.*
Johnson, Thomas F., *Md.*
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N. C.*
Jones, Paul C., *Mo.* 1111 Army Navy Dr., Arlington, Va.
Jones, Robert E., *Ala.*
Judd, Walter H., *Minn.* 3083 Ordway St.
Karsten, Frank M., *Mo.*
Karth, Joseph E., *Minn.*
Kasem, George A., *Calif.*
Kastenmeier, Robert W., *Wis.*
Kearns, Carroll D., *Pa.* Sheraton-Park
Kee, Elizabeth (Mrs.), *W. Va.*
Keith, Hastings, *Mass.*
Kelly, Edna F. (Mrs.), *N. Y.*
Keogh, Eugene J., *N. Y.* The Mayflower
Kilburn, Clarence E., *N. Y.*
Kilday, Paul J., *Tex.* 3507 Albemarle St.
Kilgore, Joe M., *Tex.* 4848 Upton St.
King, Cecil R., *Calif.*
King, David S., *Utah*
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio.*
Kitchin, A. Paul, *N. C.*
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill.*
Knox, Victor A., *Mich.*
Kowalski, Frank, *Conn.*
Lafore, John A., Jr., *Pa.*
Laird, Melvin R., *Wis.*
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga.*

Appendix

Address by Hon. Edmund G. Muskie, of Maine, Before Tennessee Municipal League

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 28, 1959

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, within the past few days it was my privilege to accompany my able colleague [EDMUND S. MUSKIE], the junior Senator from Maine, to Tennessee. Mr. MUSKIE addressed the Tennessee Municipal League at Gatlinburg. His remarks before that body were most inspiring and made special mention of the Tennessee Valley Authority. His recognition and understanding of this fine demonstration of power and resources development in my State is greatly appreciated by all of us in Tennessee. I ask unanimous consent that Senator MUSKIE's speech be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

While I deeply appreciate the invitation of the Tennessee Municipal League, extended through Senators ESTES KEFAUVER and ALBERT GORE, I must confess feeling a little as though I were carrying coals to Newcastle. It is not that the subject of my remarks is an unworthy one—far from it—but it may seem presumptuous for a new Senator from northern New England to come into this beautiful State to discuss the role of Government in achieving full utilization of our resources.

I say this because seldom in our history has there been such a spectacular example of creative and wise use of resources, as is exemplified in the Tennessee Valley.

I was interested to read recently that the TVA continues to be one of the first things that many youthful foreign visitors ask to see when they have an opportunity to travel in the United States. The TVA is still one of the best examples available of an imaginative approach to resource development within the framework of a Federal system of government. It goes without saying that the development of our natural resources represents one of our most fruitful areas of Federal, State, and local cooperation. It is striking that in the TVA instance, the decision was made to step outside the usual framework of Government in order to achieve maximum results. This willingness to try the flexible approach undoubtedly was of crucial importance in producing the dramatic results which are today obvious to anyone who comes into this area with open eyes and an open mind. There are several important points which are underscored by the success of the TVA experiment. I should like to explore each of these points more fully.

Before I do that, I would like first to outline my general philosophical position on resource development. First, it is well to remember that the conservation movement is largerly limited to the 20th century in America. Theodore Roosevelt was the first great public figure to dramatize conservation as a live issue and to make it part of the official policy of the U.S. Government to achieve conservation of our resources. Prior to Theodore Roosevelt, we had operated on the assumption that we had resources to burn and I suppose, in one sense, we did have. In any event, the abundant resources of this great continent were gobbled up and exploited as if there were no limits. Today, this is no longer true. We are operating in a period of history when we can no longer afford to waste a single resource, material, or human.

Indeed, if we are to achieve the good life for coming generations of Americans, we are probably going to need another Theodore Roosevelt to again rekindle the issue. With a population increasing at the rate of about 3 million a year, with every decade adding another 30 million Americans, we can easily look forward to the time when there will be more than 200 million of us and this probably within the lifetime of most of us here today.

It is clear that resource development rates very high on the agenda of American democracy. We dare not do less than the maximum in view of the cold war struggle in which our Nation is engaged.

What lessons can we draw from the TVA experiment which might apply on a broader national plane? First, there is the necessity for bold creative thinking. The Tennessee Valley Authority idea was several decades in the making, as various individuals dreamed of the possibility of harnessing the water resources of the Tennessee River.

Secondly, there is the need for courageous political leadership in behalf of the idea. Who knows what the fate of the TVA idea would have been if the late Senator Norris and a few other courageous pioneers had not been prepared to do battle over a long period of time.

Thirdly, there is the need for wise and effective administration to implement legislative plans once they have been drawn. Here the lesson of the TVA is most instructive.

The many excellent cooperative efforts carried on under the authority of the TVA have shown us how successfully modern federalism can function on a day-to-day basis. The TVA partnership efforts with State departments of health, conservation and parks, with municipal power boards, with rural electric cooperatives, with State and local planning commissions, with agricultural and engineering experiment stations, with State extension services, and with many other agencies, are all examples of how successful optimum use of a comprehensive water resource development project.

The value of such a comprehensive development project is that it provides for an overall development of an area's natural resources. A multipurpose project, such as the TVA, provides optimum benefits in a host of areas wherein conservation and development are essential for the advancement and protection of the general welfare. You have shown, here in Tennessee, that flood control, irrigation, soil and forest conservation, fish and wildlife conservation, power production, navigation, and recreational facilities, can be combined fruitfully in a common program of action. In the long run, such a program benefits not only the State and the region directly involved, but also offers direct benefits to the Nation itself.

This is true, of course, because the Nation's general welfare and economic growth are hampered or retarded when separate States, or even when whole regions, fall below a national minimum standard of performance. I think it is possible to see that these stimulants to the economic growth of individual States can sometimes be acquired best through cooperative Federal action.

Most important of all, the TVA experiment reveals so clearly that creative thinking in the field of conservation given the proper legislative support, and administered with boldness and dedication, can restore the faith of the people themselves in their capacity for self-government, and equally important for economic progress.

It would certainly be a philosophy of despair if we were to conclude that we lack the capacity within our democratic system to achieve the maximum utilization of our resources.

As a matter of fact, it seems to me that we have now reached the point in our Nation's development when an equally imaginative approach is needed with respect to the development of our human resources. Perhaps the conservation movement in the last half of the 20th century ought to be devoted to the wisest possible use of our people's talents and abilities. I do not profess to know the details of all of the major instances in which we are clearly wasting human resources but here are a few examples which have come to my attention recently:

1. In the field of education, we are told that for every young American successfully engaged in the pursuit of a higher education at the college level, there is one more having essentially the same ability who is not. At the public school level, the problem is well known: A recent survey by the Office of Education reveals a continual shortage of 140,000 classrooms. The National Education Association, Research Division, estimated at the beginning of the current 1958–59 school year that 135,000 more qualified teachers were needed than were available this year.

2. When the National Manpower Council published a volume entitled "A Policy for Skilled Manpower" in 1954, they found it impossible to tell exactly how many skilled workers there were in this country. In other words, as recently as the last Federal census in 1950, the best we could do was to estimate that there were between 8 and 9 million skilled workers. The council reported no reliable basis for estimating the number of skilled workers in operative, clerical, sales, service, farm, and certain other occupations. This reminds me of my elementary course in physics in high school when I first encountered the question which I am sure is still discussed in the same classes when they study sound. When a tree crashes in the wilderness outside the range of any ear, does its fall create sound? Can there be sound when there is no one to hear it? In connection with the subject we are discussing, is anything whose existence is unknown to anyone a resource? Is it a wise national policy not to know who our skilled workers are and where they are located?

3. A subcommittee of the Senate, of which I am a member, recently had prepared a

study which reveals some rather glaring inadequacies relating to foreign language training. The study shows that only a token percentage of the members of the military, economic, and technical assistance programs abroad are capable of speaking the language of the country they serve. By way of contrast, reports indicate that the majority of high level Russian personnel assigned to embassies and economic missions in most foreign countries have a fluent proficiency in the language of the country to which they are sent.

The Russians start the teaching of foreign languages in grade school. Their policy is for each of their 15 million high school students to study a foreign language. One authoritative source estimates that 45 percent of the Russian high school generation studies English, 35 percent German, and 25 percent French. At university level, the study of foreign languages in the Soviet Union is mandatory. By way of contrast, less than 15 percent of our 8 million high school students are currently studying any foreign language. Less than 10 public high schools out of a total of 25,000 in the United States offer a Russian language course. Probably less than one one-thousandth of 1 percent of our high school students are studying Russian. About 1 American university in 10 offers a Russian course. It has been estimated that 10 million Russians have the ability to read the English language, whereas most reports indicate that only 10,000 Americans, including students, have the ability to read Russian. Of course, this effects the scientific community as well as any other. Reports indicate that half of Russia's 1 million scientists can read English, whereas not more than 1,000 of the 1 million American scientists have the ability to read Russian. That would be about one-tenth of 1 percent.

On the basis of this evidence, it seems to me that the Soviet Union is making more effective use of its human resources in this important area of activity than we are.

4. Another Senate subcommittee, of which I happen to be a member, recently held hearings on a proposal to create a Department of Science and Technology with Cabinet status in the Federal Government. These hearings revealed the absence of any overall policy with respect to science at the highest level of the Federal Government. Here again we have a tragic example of an ineffective utilization of human resources. I am sure that if one had the personal knowledge and the research facilities, this kind of analysis could be pushed into many other areas of our national life. If, for example, the statistics are correct which show that 16 million Americans are suffering from some form of mental illness, one wonders what the cost is in terms of their inability to perform adequately their individual roles in our national life. While no one knows exactly what American industry loses each year because of mental illness, a survey completed in 1954 by the Menninger Foundation suggested that the loss would run into billions of dollars annually.

I think that the time has arrived for a new conservation movement which would center its attention on the purely human aspects of resource development. It is clear that in this area of public policy, we have often lacked imaginative thinking and courageous political leadership, to say nothing of administrative competence in dealing with the problem. I am encouraged to believe that I am not exaggerating the scope of the problem when I read that the President's Science Advisory Committee has just released an 18,000-word report which concludes that a doubling of our current annual investment in education is probably a minimal rather than an extravagant goal.

What are the lessons we should learn from the TVA as they apply to the broader problems of national survival and natural growth?

First, it seems to me that we want to do more than merely survive. That is to say, that when we speak of national survival, we have in mind something more than our continued existence as an independent, geographically identifiable state. If I am not mistaken, we have a deeper desire for America to survive and to prosper as a vital, meaningful force which, by its leadership and by its example, can lift the world upward gradually to higher levels of social and economic progress for men and women everywhere. This suggests, I hope, that we are concerned with more than Maginot Line security. We are concerned with more than a retaliatory capability which can destroy our potential enemy. We are concerned with more—and I should say something far different—than political domination of other areas of the world. We are concerned with demonstrating here, at home, and to the peoples overseas that our way of life does give us strength, that it does enable us to prevail over those who would destroy us, and that it is the last best hope of ordinary people everywhere who yearn for opportunity, dignity, and freedom.

Second, I say that we are concerned with this—and I mean concern with an emotion that we have never had to feel before. Our policies and programs since our beginning have been based on the assumption that we had resources to burn, that no other nation could match them, that our way of life and our institutions had an irresistible attraction for peoples not privileged to enjoy them—the assumption of manifest superiority.

This is an assumption that is no longer valid. What we are, what we have, and what we offer, are being weighted on the balance against the supposed attractions of an alien system. We are being judged by people who are not advocates of higher democracy or communism, but who are concerned as to their own status in life and its improvement. To these peoples, we are no longer manifestly superior.

To capture their minds and hearts—and there are more than a billion of them—it is necessary that we utilize to the maximum every resource at our disposal—material, human, and ideological. We must live our national life with a fire, and enthusiasm, and a confidence in ourselves that we have always found it possible to summon in times of national crisis.

What does maximum utilization require?

It requires, first of all, that we become a progressively stronger economic force in the world, gaining strength not only for ourselves, but for peoples everywhere who seek to develop an economic climate favorable to the recognition of the dignity and worth of the individual.

It requires secondly, the establishment of a military posture which is dynamic, not static, which utilizes to the full the tools of scientific research, and which unhesitatingly and firmly seizes every advantage and makes maximum use of every new development which promises to strengthen our sinews. Such a posture is the shield behind which we can mobilize the economic and ideological strength which will give us the ultimate victory.

Thirdly, that we develop every resource here at home. Measured by the tasks to be performed, there is plenty of work for all our people and they must all be kept busy to the limit of their skills and their capacities. We do not have enough scientists. We do not have enough teachers, we do not have enough doctors, nurses, psychiatrists, technicians of all kinds. Everywhere we turn we find shortages of skills. Who says there isn't enough work to keep all Americans employed? There is work begging to be done. How do we fit the square pegs in the round holes?

One great bridge between the man and the job is the educational process. This isn't to say that with the proper schools we can train anyone to do anything. It isn't to say that the answer to current unemployment is to send everyone to school. It is to say that we have great unfilled needs in the field of human skills, that we are doing too little about it, and that we cannot retain the image of America as the strength and hope of the world unless we utilize every potential talent which we have wherever it may be found. It is time to deal with a national problem by providing a national answer to it.

We won't do it today, or tomorrow, by sitting on our hands. We will not do it today, or tomorrow, by smugly glorying in past victories. We will not do it today, or tomorrow, without thinking, without taking the people into our confidence—without asserting the creative and productive capacity which lies in the hearts and minds of a free people.

Someone once said, "the road that stretches before the feet of a man is a challenge to his heart long before it tests the strength of his legs." What he was saying is that the heart is often capable of greater decisions than the mind: The heart of America is its secret weapon.

World Refugee Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 28, 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "World Refugee Year," published in the Christian Science Monitor of May 23, 1959.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WORLD REFUGEE YEAR

For some 15 million persons crowded into shanties or camp barracks around the world, daily life is a drab, uncertain, jobless, and sometimes mealless grind. They are Palestinian Arabs, Chinese in Hong Kong, East Europeans, and, most recently, Tibetans. They have in common their loss of homes, jobs, status, and homeland. Mostly their exile has been dictated by war.

Now, 31 members of the United Nations have agreed to launch a coordinated yearlong drive to rescue as many of these refugees as possible from idleness, hopelessness, and hunger.

World Refugee Year starts in June. Its approach is both humane and practical. Each of the participating nations is organizing its existing private and official refugee relief groups for a frontal attack on this still unsolved problem born of international unrest.

In the United States, a conference of some 160 leaders of such organizations already has been held under the auspices of the President. In Britain, the Queen is to head the refugee aid program. The Communist bloc nations, from which most of the current refugees have fled, are not participating.

With a plethora of charities knocking at his door, the average man is likely to fall back on the maxim that "charity begins at home." We hope that for World Refugee

Year, at least, citizens in the "have" nations will consider a version that reads: "Charity begins with the homeless."

Anniversary of Italian Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 28, 1959

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement which I have prepared on the friendship between the United States and Italy. This statement is prepared for the anniversary of the founding of Italy's Republic in 1946.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On next Tuesday, June 2, 1959, Italy will celebrate its 13th anniversary as a republic. This day will recall to mind how the people of postwar Italy, who had been subjected to untold suffering and the destruction of modern warfare, called for a plebiscite and voted for a republican form of government.

The road of democracy in Italy had been difficult: Many obstacles had to be overcome. Many hardships have been suffered by Italians who have fought for liberty against oppression.

Italians remember this day 13 years ago, and outstanding is their gratitude to the statesmen who successfully established a new democratic government without bloodshed.

We Americans viewed this vote of confidence in democracy by the Italian people with understanding and admiration. Further, our foreign policy was then geared to mutual assistance with Italy, which action gave support to the new Republic's rise to maturity.

Under the leadership of the statesman Alcide de Gasperi, the infant Republic strengthened its position and became an ally of the United States in the fight against communism.

The friendship between the United States and Italy has been evidenced in many ways during the past 13 years. Italy has been an indispensable partner in the European recovery program and in the North Atlantic alliance.

Italy's identification with the aims of Western democracies has been reaffirmed by its leaders throughout this period. As recent as March 1959, its Parliament voted, by a substantial majority, to follow a policy of absolute faithfulness to the Atlantic alliance.

Soon, ballistic missiles of the United States will be placed at strategic bases on Italian territory to protect the nations of the free world from Communist aggression.

In 1952, only a short time after the birth of the new Republic, the headquarters of General Gruenther, then commander of NATO, was surprised at the achievement of Italy in supplying its full quota of 12 divisions for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Italy was among the first to honor its commitments.

The stalwart support of NATO by Italy was noted recently by the late John Foster Dulles. The U.S. Ambassador James David Zellerbach, in a statement printed in the Department of State bulletin of December 1958, said, among other things, the following: "Our partnership with Italy has shown itself to be firmly rooted and capable of dealing harmoniously with international issues as they arise. This is the first great fact about Italo-American relations." Ambassador Zellerbach further recalled that for a long time Italy was denied United Nations membership by the Soviet veto. However, with constant support from the United States and the free world countries, Italy finally achieved full U.N. membership. The Ambassador's appraisal of Italy's friendship was expressed in the following words: "Italy has given the United States her friendship and confidence, I think we have every reason to accord Italy an equal trust."

Today, Italy is determined to bring her full measure of strength to the solution of the free world's problems. That she is ready to do so is a tribute to the vitality of her people and the vision of her Government.

On the occasion of the visit of former Prime Minister Fanfani with President Eisenhower in July of 1958, a White House press release said: "The President and the Italian Prime Minister reaffirmed the dedication of their countries to the North Atlantic alliance and to the United Nations, established to defend the peace and protect the rights of people to live in freedom under the government of their own choosing. They reiterated their firm convictions that the combined strength and consistent action of the free and independent countries of the North Atlantic alliance are vital to the peace and security, and will remain a cornerstone of their foreign policies."

Moreover, Prime Minister Fanfani acknowledged before this honorable body, on July 29, 1958, the appreciation of Italy for the support and assistance of the United States. He further assured us of Italy's firm desire to reciprocate. He said that Italy intends to give within the limits of her power, to the end that she will do her full part in averting from other areas of the world that danger of Communist subversion which has been averted in Italy.

The Republic of Italy has been, for the past 13 years, a battleground against the spread of communism. During the nationwide elections of 1948, 1953, and 1958, the democratic forces, with the cooperation of the Holy See through its Catholic Actions Organization, have delivered repeated defeats to the Communist parties of Italy.

I should like to add that Americans, too, campaigned in Italy, especially during the crucial 1948 elections. Financial aid was increased by our Government, and a letter-writing campaign on the part of Americans with relatives in Italy was encouraged to defeat the Communist threat to Italy. These victories are important to us here because should Italy go Communist, the entire free world would be endangered and the Communist menace would be that much closer to the United States, and, furthermore, there would be a general weakening of southern European defenses.

The respect of the United States for Italy has been demonstrated during the visits of Prime Minister Alcide de Gesperi, on September 24, 1951; President Giovanni Gronchi, on February 2, 1956; and Prime Minister Amintore Fanfani, on July 29, 1958, when each was not only received by the President, but given the privilege of addressing the Houses of Congress.

I should like to discuss briefly some of Italy's gifts to our United States. Any schoolboy will tell us, of course, that Christopher Columbus discovered America, and that the very name "America" is derived from that of an Italian mapmaker and navigator, Amerigo Vespucci. In addition, there have been such men as Cabot, who laid the foundation for English settlements in this country; Verrazzano, discoverer of New York Bay; and Malespina, who explored the West. Nor can we forget that Paoli Busti founded Buffalo; Father Cataldo, Spokane; Henry DiTonti, Detroit. There are many others.

It is with pleasure that I publicly acknowledge the friendship, confidence, and mutual aims shared by the United States and Italy on the occasion of the 13th anniversary of the Republic of Italy. I am confident that this body joins with me in extending congratulations and best wishes to the Italian people and to their leaders, Giovanni Gronchi, President; Antonio Segni, Prime Minister; Giuseppe Pella, Foreign Minister; and Manlio Bronsio, Italian Ambassador to the United States.

I would like to extend my congratulations to the Italian-American organizations of Maryland, who have sponsored a celebration to honor this anniversary of the Republic of Italy.

I would like also to extend my congratulations and best wishes to the Italian consul in Baltimore, Md., Litterio Carlo, and his staff.

It is consistent with the best interests of the United States to honor a nation which since its birth 13 years ago has been a stanch ally and friend.

Address by Boyd Leedom, Chairman, National Labor Relations Board, to Florida Bar Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 28, 1959

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "The Challenge of Industrial Progress to Florida Lawyers" delivered by my good friend and fellow South Dakotan, the distinguished Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board, Boyd Leedom, before the annual meeting of the Florida Bar Association.

Boyd Leedom, who for the past 4 years has served with distinction on the NLRB, discussed with the Florida bar the problems created by employers who adamantly refuse to deal with organized labor within the context of our Federal labor-management statutes. Such employers will go out of business before allowing their employees to organize—such an attitude is neither realistic nor equitable. This hard-headed type of resistence to the desires of employees is as reprehensive as the autocratic actions of the venal labor boss, who forces employees to join unions against their will. Whether it be autocratic employer or autocratic union boss, their actions are contrary to the fundamental greatness of this Nation—that being that this is government of laws not of men. Those who refuse to abide by the statutory code enacted by their fellow men do a disservice to all, including themselves.

I hope that Boyd Leedom's speech will be distributed to the bar associations of all the States of the Union, for it deserves wide circulation and thoughtful consideration by all responsible American citizens.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CHALLENGE OF INDUSTRIAL PROGRESS TO FLORIDA LAWYERS

(Address of Boyd Leedom, Chairman, National Labor Relations Board, before the Florida bar, Miami Beach, Fla.)

I am truly honored by this opportunity to address the State bar of the State of Florida. Without intending the least bit of flattery, I say that I regard this audience one of unusual significance, for two reasons. First, there is no more important occupational group in all of American life than lawyers. Their direct contribution to the American way is, in a real sense, unsurpassed. For our system is one of government by law, which has emphasized to a marked degree the freedom of the human spirit. Indeed, the freedom to think and to act much as one pleases is at the root of Americans' famed initiative; and it is the basic ingredient of all the unusual material advantages of our free enterprise system. And you, the legal profession, have been the architects of these freedoms.

The second significant thing about this audience is that we are in Florida. No one denies that Florida is a remarkable State. For decades she has had but one competitor for the distinction of being the ideal place in which to live—sunlit, smog-free Florida. Unique among all the States, she is of the South, yet, in many respects, much like her sisters of the North. And in this singular situation, she enjoys many of the advantages of each the North and the South and escapes some of their besetting detriments. I can cinch my conviction of Florida's preeminence by saying that when as a small boy, living on the dry and treeless prairies of Dakota, I looked at the verdant palms and the plump, bright-orange oranges of this fair State, through the magic lenses of my grandmother's stereoscope, I thought for sure Florida must be out of my world, a kind of heaven on earth that I could never attain. And so to address her lawyers in their annual assembly in this truly great State is both a privilege and a responsibility.

I want to talk to you about Florida's future, and of your responsibilities as effective citizens in one of her most vital areas; that is, the relationship between management, those who own and operate her businesses and industries, on the one hand, and her labor force on the other hand; those whose toil keeps the wheels of her industry turning. I really believe that the lawyers of Florida are key people in the determination of the rate of Florida's progress in this dynamic field of labor-management relations as she moves into what can be a most remarkable industrial expansion.

Inasmuch as Florida is a kind of half-way house on the road to outer space, I hardly need point out here that industrial and scientific developments in the decade or two just ahead strain the imagination. A couple of weeks ago I heard a good speech at the annual convention of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce held in Washington. The speaker was Mr. Don G. Mitchell, president of the General Telephone & Electronics Corp. He made this interesting comment on what the future holds:

"Here are some of the developments you can expect to see over the next few years: a single communications system in your home, combining telephone, television, and radio; your television screen will be a flat panel hanging on the wall; there will be radar steering on your automobile; machines will type spoken words directly on paper, and other machines will translate foreign languages as fast as they are spoken. There will be scores of new synthetic materials, and gas turbine-powered automobiles, and the production of electricity direct from atomic energy. These are only a few high-spots because the new products of the 1960's will extend across the entire spectrum of science."

And now before I speak of your part in all of this, I want to say something about myself, not so much to gratify the desire we all have to be the center of attention, but rather to try to qualify the witness, so to speak, and to prevent the complete rejection of what I say later, on the ground, for example, that it is the biased view of a bureaucrat who seeks to nail down more tightly his own favorite brand of Government interference in your lives.

I have been in the Federal Government only 4 years. I come from a State, South Dakota, that is about as close to American tradition as a State can be, and as free of all the "isms." Union people might echo that it is an understatement to say I am not steeped in unionism. And if it is true that unions enjoyed an accelerated growth under the New Deal, I cannot claim any of that reflected credit, or blame, depending on your viewpoint, as I was never a New Dealer. My State may be industrialized as little as any of the 48 or maybe even of the 50. And I am no industrialist. Furthermore, I did not seek the job I now have, and cannot be said to have any preconceived objectives which I am striving to realize as Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board. Unless, therefore, I have prejudices on this subject, born of nothing, I can be most objective as I view the relationship of management on the one hand, and organized labor on the other, here in America.

I am truly distressed with the picture I see. While it is the official position of management to support the concept of collective bargaining by employees, great segments of employers, as evidenced by case after case coming before us involving union elections in the business and industrial plants of the country, take every legal step possible—and many employers overreach legality—to thwart their employees' efforts to organize even when the union involved is a respectable, decent union. And some employers harbor the thought, I am sure, that there is no such thing as a decent union unless it might be one dominated by their own companies.

I am troubled by the philosophy still present among some employers, in this State as well as others, of avoiding dealing with a union even at the expense of going out of business. The extent to which it has manifested itself, especially among smaller business establishment, has made me ponder this problem.

I concede that many businessmen have been sorely provoked by many unions. Threats of violence, actual violence, roofing tacks in driveways and sugar in gasoline tanks, slashed tires, and upset trucks do not exactly endear any part of unionism to the businessman who is going broke by reason of such unlawful practices, to say nothing of the corruption revealed by the McClellan committee. But today I emphasize management's responsibilities, as I am speaking, in the main, to representatives of management, assuming as I do that the number of lawyers in the Florida bar who represent unions is relatively very small. And, furthermore, I am speaking in terms of basic principles, not necessarily of unions as they are but as most might be if some of management's attitude were different. I raise the question as to whether responsible management should in good faith accept by word and deed the principle of collective bargaining and by wholehearted cooperation with employees and the representatives of their choice, take the initiative in turning the dog-eat-dog philosophy that prevails in many places between organized labor and employers, into a relationship of real teamwork.

In the very nature of things, management cannot expect to make the unions over. Management will do well to correct her own failings in this heated area. The same is of course true of the unions; but obviously if I were to talk to you today of the shortcomings of the unions I would only add fuel to a fire that seems at times now to be almost out of control. I reserve that for discussions with union groups.

I suggest to you that the basic principle of our present Federal law, which recognizes the worker's right to organize in dealing with his employer, or not to join with others so to deal, is here to stay and that it is right and just; and that the alternative would be a backward step ultimately subjecting all workers to the paternalism of their employers. It should be recalled that it was the feudalism of the Middle Ages, followed by the sweat shop conditions of more recent times and bitter industrial strife, that was the forerunner of the present law and that this law articulated that free Americans, entitled to a fair living and decent working conditions, would not be denied the right to organize and to bargain collectively with their employers. I am not suggesting that all employers should accept all unions, or any union for that matter, with open arms. It is not to be denied that some employers maintain such favorable working conditions that employees may not need or desire concerted action. Also, some unions have proven utter lack of capacity fairly and honestly to represent employees.

Few employers in this enlightened age openly admit that they would, even if they could, completely thwart unionism. Today, however, I want to look behind this facade of general acceptance of our national labor concept and to reach a behind-the-scenes, illusive, undeclared warfare that I believe involves an actual rejection by much of management of these basic principles. Since hostility is likely to beget hostility, I raise the question as to whether this attitude may in turn be at least partly responsible for union conduct that many people regard as quite unreasonable even though lawful. It is quibbling to embrace the abstract principle of collective bargaining and then fight tooth and nail to deny it to one's own employees. When our businesses and industries of common characteristics seem to find it good and necessary to join together to solve their common problems and advance their common purposes, and delegate all sorts of specialized functions to agents of their choice, it seems difficult to find a valid objection to workers' concerted action through agents of their choice.

In an effort to let you see the picture I am trying to sketch, I should say that the National Labor Relations Board was not created to assist unions in their organizational efforts. Most of you, of course, know that we act as an umpire to see that the rules are followed. But there seem to be some lawyers who do not disabuse their client's concept of the Labor Board as an integral part of a devilish scheme to put some union in charge of his business. Our main purpose, encompassed in our enforcement of all the provisions of the national Labor-Management Relations Act, is to see to it, on charges duly filed, that the heart of the act, section 7, is made effective. This section guarantees an employee the right to join or not to join a union free of coercion from both his employer and the unions. But many employers, and apparently some of their attorneys, seem to feel it is still their God-given right to determine unilaterally what is best for their particular employees, and that unions and the Board are usurpers of that right, which usurpation can be met only by keeping the union out at all costs.

This attitude within this State, I think, has been reflected in the reception our Board personnel had initially, at least, when in 1956 we established a regional office in Florida. We carefully selected a Regional Director who is a native of your State, a lawyer knowledgeable in our act and, we think, as

fair and objective as a man can be. It is his function and the function of his staff to enforce the law for, and against, unions, and for, and against, employers, with equal fairness and vigor, in the protection of the individual employee's rights. And this I can promise you is exactly what he will do if you will seek his aid and give him your cooperation.

Let me deal with just a few specifics to illustrate that cooperation with the Board has not always been forthcoming. Our jurisdictional standards require a determination of the volume of business done by the company involved to ascertain if there is sufficient impact on commerce to warrant our intervention. Generally speaking, employers furnish such information willingly. Florida became conspicuous in our agency because of the frequency of subpoena proceedings required to get such commerce data. Finally, however, Supreme Court decisions and the rule we laid down in the Tropicana case, coming from this State, have resulted in much less difficulty for us in this area. In Tropicana, the Board decided that in any case where it had legal jurisdiction and the respondent company was recalcitrant in furnishing data needed to determine if the business met the jurisdictional standards, we would assume it had sufficient business, and put the burden on the company to prove otherwise. It is somewhat ironical but Florida can thus be credited with this salutary principle.

We think that some State court judges and Federal district judges, including some in Florida, continue to exercise jurisdiction where it has been fully preempted by the Federal Government and lodged exclusively with the National Labor Relations Board. The Supreme Court, in a series of decisions extending to April of this year, when the Garmon case was decided, has drawn a fairly clear line in this area that should not be so very difficult now to follow. While the Board has not been overly jealous of its jurisdiction, only confusion results in any situation where any court seeks to function without real authority.

In dealing with Florida situations involving the National Labor Relations Board, the hotel industry and our recent decision with respect thereto cannot go unmentioned. Last week we assumed jurisdiction over all hotels doing a gross annual business of $500,000 or more. This came about through litigation arising in this State. The Supreme Court had held that the Board had not been justified in denying jurisdiction solely by reason of its long-standing policy of excluding hotels as an industry. In reaching our decision to exercise jurisdiction on the $500,000 standard, interested parties, employers and unions alike, filed briefs and we heard oral argument. The employer position in this proceeding was against extension of jurisdiction over the industry, but even as the case was being considered we were importuned to come to the relief of employer hotels in a dispute here in Florida. The case could not come before us as we had not then decided to take jurisdiction over hotels. But this illustrates that our jurisdiction is deemed good or bad depending largely on whose ox is being gored.

You may agree that I have spoken quite frankly about the shortcomings of some employers, especially in your own State, in their approach to this important economic problem of labor-management relations. I wish I could feel, in making this kind of speech, that I was actually doing some good in an area where I am sure much needs to be done. But I know my very subject matter carries its own barrier to acceptance—where management insists on its own way, and unions do the same, and the third way, along some middle ground, necessarily gets little attention. Some union leaders continue to berate management as if management were a mortal enemy. And some of management privately oppose unionism as such, and temper their public pronouncements as required to suit the public mind.

The lawyer's chance for a key role in reconciling these opposing forces stems largely from his professionalism which calls for a degree of aloofness to the money-madness that stifles our society. True, many a lawyer will operate in the little area delineated by the cone of his vision as he fixes his eyes on a fee. But even if such a lawyer makes a million "keeping the union out at all costs" he will never really be significant in the development of Florida, or of America, or in advancing or preserving our civilization. The Florida bar, I am sure, abounds in potential Thomas Jeffersons who could again give voice to other versions of Jefferson's great pronouncements. The Patrick Henrys of our profession, and there are many, are not concerned primarily about the fee but great principles founded in righteousness. This dynamic and controversial field of labor-management relations is filled with emotional and explosive clients. It needs the attention of hosts of reconciling lawyers. We need some of Abe Lincoln's ingenuity. He had an obstreperous client who insisted on replevining a trunk of little value, mostly to spite his adversary by dragging him into court. Lincoln counseled against it to no avail, and then solved the knotty problem by charging his client a fee of $15; buying the trunk for $10; and delivering it to his unyielding client. Thus lawyers on both sides of the controversy, more effectively than any other segment of society, can help produce labor leaders less inclined to get all they can get, and more inclined to give a little, and management people more concerned for their workers' welfare than they are for an ever-growing profit column.

Pictures often speak louder than words. I think the International Ladies Garment Workers Union may have had this in mind in a recent newspaper advertisement. It shows on one side of the page the hand of the Statue of Liberty holding high the flame of freedom. On the opposite side is a little child's hand holding an ice cream cone, typically American, and intended to be a symbol, as I interpret the ad, of the material advantages our industrial system has brought to all our people, including those who labor for their livehood. As I read the ad I thought of the inscription that appears on the base of the great American goddess as she stands in New York harbor. I couldn't recall it well then, but I give it to you now:

"Give me your tired, your poor,
Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free,
The wretched refuse of your teeming shore;
Send these, the homeless, tempest-tossed, to me:
I lift my lamp beside the golden door."

I think none of us knows exactly what has made America what she is. But we do know many of the parts that make up her system. Among them are opportunity for private initiative, private ownership of property, the investment of private capital for profit, and a trade union movement, the heart of which is the right of workers to bargain collectively. No American should recklessly or surreptitiously attack any known ingredient of our system, for the part attacked may be the key to such success as we have attained.

We will all agree that the American way is under serious challenge. It will not be easy, but it is very important, that the torch of liberty keep burning brightly for all segments of our society, and that the inscription at its base remain true. Thus the hands of all our children shall remain free to grasp the ice cream cone that stands for material well being. I am persuaded that lawyers, along with the clergy, the teachers, the engineers and the scientists of America, have the opportunity for greatness, as this exciting and vital drama unfolds. You alone, of course, can determine your own part—whether it shall be an ennobling contribution or a harmful detraction. You must decide for yourself whether to join the constructive forces that serve humanity and solve problems or the deplorable forces that only add new problems to the old. What you do collectively will have a great influence on your State and could have a marked effect on America and this civilization.

Character Training—An Address by Geraldine Earlin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 27, 1959

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, my constituent, Mrs. Geraldine Earlin, of West Englewood, N.J., delivered a very fine address on character training at the education forum of the New Jersey Federation of Woman's Clubs Education and Youth Conservation Conference, held at Asbury Park, N.J., on April 7, 1959. Mrs. Earlin is widely known for her constant advocacy and devotion to the highest patriotic ideals.

In addition to speaking wisely and plainly on character training for our youth, Mrs. Earlin also makes out a good case for the passage of a resolution by Congress which would designate February as American History Month. My House Joint Resolution 120 has that as its purpose. Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record, I ask unanimous consent to include this fine patriotic document:

CHARACTER TRAINING

There is an extreme and urgent necessity for teaching our youth love of God, love and loyalty to family, and to our county and its Constitution as written by our Founding Fathers if we are to survive as the great nation which is by right our heritage.

To show these needs I have taken statements made by prominent people in various walks of life and the first ones are from a sermon which I was privileged to hear several Sundays ago: It is love, not the vaunting of authority, that can make a home a happy home. The happiest home is the home in which father and mother and children are one in love of God, and of one another. Riches do not make happy homes. When husband and wife truly love each other, they have treasures which no wealth can give, and no poverty can take away. Loving God, they abide by His holy will. Their home is a sanctuary built for God's glory, a haven of refuge wherein love and peace are ever found, a nursery from which good citizens are given to the state and saint to heaven.

We need homes like these for the support of honesty and decency and truth in this Nation. No country is stronger than its homes. They are the foundation upon which ultimately, under God, all hope for sound

and solid progress must rest. No nation, whatever its wealth and influence and power in the world may be, has ever been able to tear the Almighty out of the hearts and homes of its people without witnessing the foreboding of approaching disaster.

The New York State Board of Regents issued a statement, March 28, 1955, on "America's Moral and Spiritual Heritage," which will be hailed by all who believe in God, the moral law and the principles laid down by our Founding Fathers. The statement reiterates the principle that "Belief in and dependence on God is the very cornerstone upon which our Founding Fathers builded" and cites the Declaration of Independence, the pronouncements of Washington, Franklin, Lincoln, Jefferson, and Dwight Eisenhower as proofs.

The Regents call on schools to stress spiritual heritage; to have the children inspired by the example of their ancestors; to be guided by the faith and love of their parents; to be encouraged by their spiritually sensitive teachers, so that there will be renewed in their daily lives America's moral and spiritual heritage:

"Liberty under God—respect for the dignity and rights of each individual—devotion to freedom."

Throughout our entire history as a Nation, these fundamental beliefs have been our guiding star and our compass in time of storm and trouble.

In the words of the Chancellor of the Board of Regents, opening the 1955 convocation "Freedom is not free—it must constantly be defended and cared for lest we lose it. That is the price we pay for it. We must reinterpret for our children the initiative, the courage, and faith of the Founding Fathers. We must root deeply in our hearts faith in the unimpeachable dignity of the individual and in the unquenchable spirit of free man."

One of our great generals, Gen. Mark Clark, recently said that he believes most of our people would be better Americans if they were more demonstrative, more sentimental and emotional in the performance of their patriotic duties. He suggested there should be more frequent and more enthusiastic occasions for patriotic demonstrations in America to give our people higher concepts of loyalty.

The fundamentals of good Americanism, he said, are faith in our country, its Constitution, its laws and history, and its spiritual and religious dedication. Teach these fundamentals to young Americans, and they in turn and time will keep America great.

It is not old fashioned, but the duty and challenge of Americans in all generations, to give youth faith, to teach youth conviction and courage, to inspire youth with religious and moral guidance and to make youth worthy of its American heritage.

Circuit Court Judge, Jacob M. Braude, Cook County, Ill., said in a recent article (Family Weekly, Mar. 15, 1959), there are 15 factors in the pattern of delinquency besetting our young people today. He said he could think of no instance of a boy or girl in trouble in his court where one or more of these factors weren't directly responsible, and all of them can be controlled. Among others he listed improper literature, idleness, and unemployment, lack of religious training, lack of discipline in the home and the schools. He said crime prevention begins in the high chair—not the electric chair.

In the September 1956 issue of Scouting magazine, Dr. Arthur A. Schuck, chief Scout executive of the National Council, Boy Scouts of America, wrote an article entitled "Our Answer to Brainwashing," in which he was discussing the meanings of the Scouts' 4-year program, continuing through 1960, "Onward for God and My Country." In the course of his study he was also discussing how the Chinese Communists in Korea were able to break many of our American boys, taken prisoner, because in his words:

"Too many of them proved woefully lacking in basic knowledge of American history, institutions, and ideals, and quite unable to produce reasons for their belief in democracy."

In discussing the study made by the committee appointed by the Secretary of Defense, he said it found:

"There was often a failure to know about or appreciate the hardships endured by our forefathers in building a free nation, or to accept the need for similar sacrifices today to keep our Nation strong. On the other hand there were those who found that their faith in and loyalty to family, country, religion, and comrades were shallow and weak under stress.

"The committee * * * concluded that the weakness of the men who broke involved traits that cannot be imparted in a few months of military indoctrination but are the product of years of training in home, school, church, and community. Our whole system of education, formal and informal, needs to make sure that our young people are thoroughly grounded in moral and religious principles. Our children as they grow up must not merely take American values for granted. They must be so familiar with the fundamental facts of American history, American government, American economic and social life that they know why they believe in our way of life and need not be confused and embarrassed when critics challenge those beliefs. They must understand that it is a privilege and a responsibility for every citizen to be a part of the team as we plan and work together at local, State and National levels."

From an editorial in the May 20, 1956, issue of New York Journal American we read that Joseph B. Cavallaro, chairman of New York City's Board of Higher Education, suggested that American history courses should be compulsory in every tax-supported educational institution. This editorial said that from surveys made in 1950 it was learned that 76 percent of institutions of higher learning did not include American history as a required course for enrollment and 66 percent did not make American history a required course in their own classrooms. Reportedly there has been some improvement but not enough for in 1955 a specimen college inquiry in Ohio revealed that a surprising number of freshmen did not know when or how the United States began.

Mr. Cavallaro emphasized that American history must be taught rightly—that our youth must know what is meant by American heritage and American ideals.

The editorial asks: "How is any American to be a good citizen if he has little or no knowledge of the proud and aspiring origin of his country, its magnificent traditions and ideals."

Both the paper and Mr. Cavallaro are in agreement that the antidote for communism lies in the full and proper study of American history. The best way to defeat subversion is for Americans to know what the subverters are trying to subvert.

Since it seems to be agreed by divergent opinions that belief in God and belief in and loyalty to our country is the recipe for molding our children's character, I believe you will be pleased to know that there are two bills in the House of Representatives, Washington, D.C., House Joint Resolutions Nos. 120 and 132, calling upon the President of the United States to always proclaim February as American History Month.

Passage of one of these bills would most certainly be a constructive move toward strengthening the loyalty and background in basic American principles of our youth. This great need was evidenced by General Dean, upon his return as a prisoner after the Korean war. You will remember that all of the press agreed that there was something lacking in the background of those soldiers who refused to come back and in those who collaborated with their Red captors. General Dean said we had failed these soldiers.

SOME INTERESTING FACTS

Since it seems to be agreed by divergent opinions that belief in God and belief in and loyalty to our country is the recipe for molding our children's character, you will be pleased to know that our General Federation of Women's Clubs does have a resolution "U.S. History a Required Course." Unfortunately, there are but eight States in the Union that do require American history to be taught in their high schools, however, New Jersey is proud to be one of those eight States. I can think of no better project for our general federation than to see that every State passes a history bill similar to that of New Jersey.

Since much of the responsibility of the founding of our country lay on the shoulders of George Washington, the Father of our Country, and since his birthday and that of Abraham Lincoln and Thomas Edison, whose life exemplifies what can be accomplished under our free enterprise system (which is truly American) I am sure you will be pleased to know that the New Jersey Legislature adopted Senate Joint Resolution No. 1 on January 19, 1959, designating February as American History Month and called upon the Governor to always proclaim the occasion. The resolution also called upon our citizens to plan appropriate programs commemorating these three men.

You will also be pleased to know that the New Jersey State Federation of Women's Clubs is urging all clubs to support this movement. Also you might like to know that at the January meeting of the board of directors of the New Jersey State Federation of Women's Clubs they took action to call upon Governor Meyner to proclaim February American History Month this year. He has done so for the past 3 years and there have been 38 or more Governors throughout our Nation who have made such proclamations each year.

It is encouraging to know that the Wayne, N.J., public schools have implemented an Americanization program on American history through the cooperation of the American Legion Post No. 174 and school administration as reported in the January 22, 1959, North Jersey Times. They plan to have prominent military and civilian personalities come to Wayne from time to time to speak to their high school students. Their first speaker was Capt. John Bulkeley, U.S.N., World War II hero, who evacuated Gen. Douglas MacArthur from Corregidor. He told the students the surest way to combat communism was through education and pointed out that but 8 percent of the American prisoners of war in the Communist camps in Korea were able to resist the Red philosphy and these because they were educated and knew what they were fighting about. He said that 80 percent were indifferent and 12 percent succumbed to communism.

He charged that the American people have forgotten the meaning of July 4th, the Declaration of Independence, and the Constitution and predicted failure to recognize the danger and combat it would bring about the loss of all that had been accomplished for the freedom of men in 2,000 years. He called for a program for instilling knowledge and pride in young folks of the great heritage that is theirs and urged for a reevaluation of all that the United States has stood for and that only this knowledge and the determination to fight for it would halt

the advance of foreign ideologies. (From Jan. 29, 1959, North Jersey Times.)

This same school system has just approved a course for their seniors on the subjects: "What Is Communism?" and "What Is Americanism?" based on the book "Masters of Deceit," written by J. Edgar Hoover, FBI Chief. (From Feb. 19, 1959, North Jersey Times.)

Senator HUGH SCOTT, Republican, Pennsylvania, addressing a meeting of the American Bar Foundation, February 22, 1959, called for a "drastic overhaul" of American education "before patriotism goes out of style." He said, "We need unremitting emphasis on the origin of our Nation, on what made it strong and great and kept it free, and upon the fundamentals of our national purpose." He also said, "I would like our schools to stir our students to love of country, to prepare them to counter the washers of brains. If this be 'propaganda,' I would also like our Armed Forces to employ much more of it."

The Senator called the lack of patriotic indoctrination "an infinitely more dangerous gap than lack of missiles." (Feb. 23, 1959, Daily News, New York.)

In a talk before the Woman's Club of Clearwater, Fla., in January 1959, Gen. William H. Wilbur, of Highland Park, Ill., referring to the crime and corruption in this country today, said the FBI reports that of the 2½ million crimes committed, the major half was by persons under 18 years of age. He said "America has greatly changed in less than two generations," as he spoke of the permissive philosophy which abounds today.

In quoting Judge Sam Leibowitz of New York he said, "A child must be disciplined to do the things he does not want to do." And in this connection he continued by saying, he had been fortunate in reading from the handwriting of George Washington, the 110 rules of conduct which at the age of 11, he lived by. (From Clearwater Sun, Florida.)

The special commitee of Government officials and retired officers which studied the problem of American prisoners of war captured by the Communists in Korea said, "The prisoners of war who were taken in by the Communists had lost their battle before they entered the service. Good citizens—loyal Americans—the responsibility for their building lies with their home, the school, the church, the community." The committee suggested Government agencies get together with civilian educational institutions, churches and other patriotic organizations to prove better understanding of American ideals. (Millville Daily Republican, Aug. 23, 1955.)

Leap Forward, Dixie

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 28, 1959

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Ralph McGill, publisher of the Atlanta Constitution, which appeared in the Nashville Tennessean on April 23, 1959. The article is an interesting discussion of the South, its growth and expansion. Mr. McGill has a sympathetic understanding of the sociological problems it now faces and must work to overcome.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEAP FORWARD, DIXIE

(By Ralph McGill)

WASHINGTON.—Pennsylvania Avenue is a street of beauty, memories, and legends. One of my memories of it dates to 1938. I turned in at the Pennsylvania gate and Steve Early steered me in for a brief talk with Franklin D. Roosevelt. I recall his conclusion: "The South must take a great leap forward."

He had not long before received the report of an all-but-forgotten President's Committee on the South. It had concluded, after long study by economists and sociologists, that the South was the Nation's economic problem No. 1.

It was true. Some were made merely angry. But others were stimulated to great self-examination and public debate. Forums, study groups, and ferment of talk began and have never stopped to this day.

The old agricultural South of tenants, sharecroppers, dubious paternalism, and isolation from the national mainstream was dead. A new South was in the long, hard travail of birth.

There were many exhibits of death and rebirth.

MOVING TO TOWN

There were the empty cabins in weed-grown fields. Here and there were lonely, sentinel-like chimneys where a cropper's abandoned house had burned.

And, in the towns, there were the dejected, displaced families. They were unskilled, and were offering their labor for what it would bring. They came into direct economic competition with the already depressed Negro workers. Relief offices were overburdened. I found myself thinking of these refugees from a broken economy years later when I saw the displaced persons camps in Europe. There was some of the same pathos in the faces, the hopeless, dumb questioning of the eyes.

All this comes back—walking by the White House and remembering the turning in and hearing Franklin Roosevelt say, "The South must make a great leap forward."

NOW IT IS HAPPENING

It is almost incredible that this was said so recently as 1938 because now, a mere 21 years later, the South almost literally is exploding with industrial expansion and development. It is in the midst, too, of a great sociological revolution. More and more people are leaving the land. Every year more rural counties become impoverished of population and income. The cities grow.

The great leap forward is being made—but it is by no means finished.

All the while education has been a part of the big jump. Schools and technical training—these are the jumping muscles.

In 1901, in a report published by the University of Tennessee, the average schoolhouse in the South cost $276 each and teachers averaged $25 per month. Five cents per day was the average per-pupil expenditure on those in actual attendance. And the average school year was but 87 days.

There was not much growth muscle in that.

Here, on Pennsylvania Avenue, stopping to look at the serene beauty of the White House with the green lawn before it, one feels the presence of history.

SYMBOL OF FREEDOM

This is a Nation. We are first of all Americans. Our first loyalty must be to the Nation. The White House is the symbol of the free representative system. We accept the results of elections. Once, just once, there was refusal to do so. The South dissented from Lincoln's victory. The price paid for that was a terrible one.

The Supreme Court Building and its Justices are the symbol of law. There may be those who will refuse to accept a rule of law and the orders of the courts. We may freely disagree with and criticize the courts and decisions. But if we ever defy courts and law, or cause people to doubt them, then the Nation is finished.

There can be just one victim of closed schools. That is the school child. Despite the loud and distorted clamor of defiance, the voice of the school child can be heard asking "What about me?" We tend to forget that an educated child is more important to the future than a prejudice or any man's political future.

The American way is law and justice.

The South must make a long leap forward.

Supremacy of the Law, Our Common Law Heritage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 28, 1959

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled, "Supremacy of the Law, Our Common Law Heritage," delivered by Mr. Ross L. Malone, president of the American Bar Association.

This address was delivered on the very fitting occasion of the unveiling in Jamestown, Va., on May 17, 1959, of the plaque on Jamestown Island commemorating the advent of common law at Jamestown in the year 1607.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUPREMACY OF THE LAW, OUR COMMON LAW HERITAGE

(Address by Ross L. Malone, president, American Bar Association, on the occasion of the unveiling of the plaque on Jamestown Island commemorating the advent of common law at Jamestown in the year 1607, Jamestown, Va., May 17, 1959)

The American Bar Association and its president are honored by the invitation to particiapte in this unique and significant occasion. While the event which we commemorate today has special significance for the State of Virginia, the common law of England has had a marked and continuing influence upon the entire Nation in many aspects of its life.

This is particularly true as to the lawyers of the United States in the day-to-day practice of their profession. The common law of England permeates their lives and their thinking. It influences their advice to their clients and forms the basis for the protection of their clients. It provides the framework for the jurisprudence of 49 of our 50 States, and at least one legal scholar has concluded that, in effect, the 50th State, Louisiana, also has adopted the common law.

To an even greater extent the judges of this country are affected by the common law in the performance of the vital function of the courts. It always guides them, and frequently it controls their decisions. The common law of England, as it has been found applicable to life in the United States, and as it has been modified by our courts and legislative bodies since the separation of the Colonies from England, is the law of the United States today.

The charter which James I issued for the Virginia Colony in 1606 was not limited to lawyers and judges in its impact upon the United States. Its provision that "all and every the persons being our subjects, which shall dwell and inhabit within * * * said several colonies and plantation * * * shall have and enjoy all liberties, franchises, and immunities, within any of our other dominions, to all intents and purposes, as if they had been abiding and born, within this our realm of England, or any other of our said dominions" has influenced the lives of all of the citizens of our country.

President Eisenhower, in proclaiming Law Day in the United States in 1959, described the place of law in our lives when he said, "A free people can assure the blessings of liberty for themselves only if they recognize the necessity that the rule of law shall be supreme and that all men shall be equal before the law," and continued, that "this Nation was conceived by our forefathers as a Nation of free men enjoying ordered liberty under law and the supremacy of the law is essential to the existence of the Nation."

The seed of the common law of England was transferred to the new world by the charter of James I. It was planted in this soil by the Advent which we today commemorate. It germinated and flourished in its new environment, and on separation of the Colonies from the mother country survived the separation from its source, and lived to provide the very foundation of the unique governmental form which the Colonies gave to the world.

The very fact of its survival testifies to the soundness of its conception, and to its vitality. When we look around the world at the countries to which the vigor and initiative of England has transplanted the common law, we conclude that the common law is indeed, as Chief Justice Harlan F. Stone described it, "the expression in legal form of the genius of the race".

At an international conference of lawyers, which I attended recently in Australia, a native lawyer of the Federation of Malaya, the newest member of the Commonwealth, rose and paid a tribute to the common law which was magnificent in its simplicity. He said, "We have had the English common law for over 100 years. It is the finest law in the world."

Chief Justice Stone, in his analysis of the common law, found that it had three distinguishing characteristics: Its use of the jury to decide issues of fact; its development of law by a system of judicial precedent; and its "all pervading doctrine of the supremacy of law".

The first characteristic, that of the use of the jury, has since become a casualty of World War II in England. It is no longer in general use in civil cases there and its use in criminal cases has been curtailed. The United States may follow the same pattern ultimately, but the day appears far distant.

The common law system of judicial precedent for the development of law, to which Chief Justice Stone referred, is the principal characteristic of the jurisprudence of this country and a major source of its strength. It is an inherent part of the system which we received from England and its development has continued in this country.

In many respects, the genius of the common law is the process by which judicial precedent is applied to the solution of controversies in the light of current conditions. Through such application our courts provide stability, yet avoid immobility, in our judicial concepts.

Overemphasis upon precedent produces immobility. Undue weight given to current conditions destroys stability. The balancing of these two factors which has occurred through the years in the courts of this country, and of England before us, has made possible the strength and longevity of the common law.

The third characteristic of the common law mentioned by Chief Justice Stone, "the all pervading doctrine of the supremacy of law," has reached its highest state of development in the United States. Our unique constitutional system, in which the separation of powers is accomplished and the rights of our individual citizens are defined, has resulted in the elevation of law to a unique position of supremacy as a component of our democracy.

The termination of "the supremacy of law" in this country is our most direct path to self-destruction. It is a path which divides very early; one fork leads to anarchy, the other to dictatorship. It is difficult to say which destination is the more lethal to a free people. The supremacy of the rule of law, and of the institutions by which law is made effective is our protective barrier against this forked path to self-destruction—a barrier the maintenance of which is dictated by our own self-interest.

Dean Roscoe Pound has pointed out that a necessary aspect of the supremacy of law, under the common law concept, is the existence of independent courts. Thus he said, "In the Roman Empire and in the tradition of the civil law the judge is a part of the administrative hierarchy. At common law he is independent. He wields the royal authority to do justice. He is not accountable to administrative superiors. In the words attributed by Coke to Bracton, he decides under God and the law. His independence is guaranteed."

Independent courts are essential to the supremacy of the law in this country. They must be equally independent of government and private influence. Only through the existence of independent courts can the rights of individual citizens be protected and the Bill of Rights be a living force in our lives.

As a corollary to the necessity for independent courts, it is important that we have good judges. It is important that we have judges who understand the reason for the independence of our courts; judges who understand the difference between independent courts and independent judges; judges who will not abuse the independence of the courts upon which they sit.

The supremacy of the law, which we inherited as a concept of the common law of England, can be maintained only so long as it is undergirded by public understanding and confidence in the courts. Every citizen has a duty to contribute to that support. The legal profession has a primary responsibility for leadership in providing it.

The common law concept of the supremacy of law, which has contributed so much to the strength of this Nation today, assumes added significance at the international level. The impact of the nuclear and space ages upon a world, torn by disagreement and threatened by a cold war, has caused people in increasing numbers to turn to the rule of law as a relatively unexplored means for accomplishing the peaceful solution of problems between nations.

We have seen an ordered society emerge on this continent when the rule of law governs relations between men. Today we look hopefully toward the time when the rule of law will supplant force in governing relations between nations.

The countries which share the heritage of the common law of England have a special obligation of leadership in seeking that objective. When realized, it will constitute the realization of the ultimate potentialities of the common law in the lives of men.

Need for Executive Leadership in Defense Decisions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 28, 1959

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, if there is any area in which the President of the United States is considered supreme it is in national defense. Military command requires executive rather than legislative leadership. The Constitution makes the President the Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces. The whole background of the present President qualifies him above all for decisions in the military field.

And yet in the current Nike-Bomarc controversy, the administration has turned to the Congress to make an executive decision—to exert the necessary leadership to recommend what course is in the national interest.

Mr. President, the Milwaukee Journal perceptively discusses this issue, particularly in the light of the observations on this administration failure discussed in a recent speech of one of this body's outstanding experts on national defense, the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON]. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial from the Milwaukee Journal be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXECUTIVE DUCKING OF DEFENSE DECISIONS CAUSES CONFUSION

The Army is protesting a recommended slash in Nike Hercules launching sites with a vehemence that borders on insubordination.

In some quarters there undoubtedly will be an inclination to brush aside this outspoken criticism of the Senate Armed Services Committee action as pique. And there may be some of that because of the committee's apparent preference for the Air Force Bomarc, which is also a nuclear tipped antiaircraft missile but with greater range than the Nike Hercules.

But back of the committee's action and the Army's reaction lies something far more serious—the failure of Secretary of Defense McElroy and President Eisenhower as commander in chief to exert the leadership expected of them.

In its news columns the New York Times reported that the committee recommended elimination of three-fourths of the Nike Hercules launching sites in order "to force the Pentagon to choose between" the two antiaircraft missile weapons.

And in his weekend speech in Milwaukee Senator SYMINGTON (Democrat, of Missouri) noted that McElroy in his appearance before the committee suggested that Congress "put the Pentagon's feet to the fire" to force defense officials to eliminate missile duplication, such as that between the Nike Hercules and the Bomarc.

For a Secretary of Defense to make such a statement is incredible. It is a confession of ineffectiveness. It is as though the president of a corporation went before his board

of directors and asked the board to force him to make up his mind whether product A or product B should be given the company's major sales push.

Congress should not have to put anyone's feet to the fire. Decision making of this type is an executive responsibility. President Eisenhower said so at his May 13 press conference. When asked about eliminating missile duplication, he said, "I believe that it really belongs in the executive department. We cannot duck our responsibility in this particular place."

But what happens when the responsibility is ducked—when the Defense Department and the President neither decide between competing missiles nor state clearly why both are needed? Then unsatisfactory competition continues, as it has in the 1,500 mile missile field between the Army's Jupiter and the Air Force's Thor.

Is the reduction in Nike Hercules launching sites proper, or is the Army right when it says it is too risky to cut back the 100 mile Nike Hercules at a time when the 400 mile Bomarc is still not operational?

We are certainly not competent to say, and we doubt if many Congressmen are. It is not their decision to make anyway. The choice should rest with the Defense Secretary, acting on advice of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and with the backing of the President.

Address Delivered at Dedication of Kazim Temple, Roanoke, Va.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 28, 1959

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Imperial Sir George E. Stringfellow, A.A.O.N.M.S., of East Orange, N.J., at the dedication of Kazim Temple, Roanoke, Va., April 18, 1959, together with an editorial from the Roanoke World-News entitled "In Our Own Opinion."

There being no objection, the address and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY IMPERIAL SIR GEORGE E. STRINGFELLOW, A.A.O.N.M.S., EAST ORANGE, N.J., AT THE DEDICATION OF KAZIM TEMPLE, ROANOKE, VA., APRIL 18, 1959

It is always a pleasure to participate in ceremonies dedicating a new temple of the Ancient Arabic Order Nobles of the Mystic Shrine. It is particularly gratifying to me that our newest temple should be here in the Blue Ridge of my own native Virginia.

To the officers, past and present, and to all of the nobility of Kazim Temple, I bring to you the greetings and the good wishes of the imperial council and the imperial divan of our great fraternity. I congratulate you on a job well done. It is a beautiful temple that will in theory, if not in face, become in the years ahead an ever welcome oasis for the more than 830,000 nobles who travel this way.

It has been 89 years since Dr. Walter M. Fleming wrote the original ritual of the Shrine which is now on display in the Shrine Rooms of the George Washington National Masonic Memorial in Alexandria. It has been 87 years since Dr. Fleming, Billy Florence, and 11 other friends gathered in the old Masonic Hall in New York and created Mecca Temple and thus founded a new order, wherein Master Masons of the higher degree might find refreshment from their labors in the symbolic and philosophic crafts of builders.

It has been said that Dr. Fleming and his associates builded better than they knew, but those early years were indeed a struggle. As we look back on it now, it seems inconceivable that the Shrine could have existed at all. At the end of 4 years, there were hardly more than a hundred members. Only one ceremonial performance of the ritual had been achieved. The fraternity had been financed almost entirely out of the pocket of Dr. Fleming. But such was the faith and the energy of this man and a few of his friends that slowly at first, and then with a great surge, the Shrine began to grow, and now—today—it is the most glamorous of all fraternal orders. It is the same great heritage of faith, transmitted more than three-quarters of a century later, to the nobility of Kazim Temple, that has made this great new structure possible. Here in this temple, in the beautiful new Cathedral of the Scottist Rite next door, and in your blue lodges, you Shriners of Roanoke must and will carry on the great traditions that are your heritage.

Here, you Shriners of Kazim, will find the pleasure, the joy and the fun to which your merry hearts are entitled. Here, you Shriners of Kazim, will practice the charity, indulge the honor and enhance the glory your reverent minds have created in this fraternity. But there is even more than all this.

It is here—in this temple—in the cathedral and in our lodges that we Masons and Shriners must forever continue the struggle for human liberty and the freedom of the individual. The very name of our fraternity bespeaks freedom. We are Freemasons, and we must forever be free.

But liberty and freedom do not come easy. Your own great John Randolph of Roanoke knew this to be true, and he fought throughout his life that right and justice should prevail. Randolph said: "Among the strange notions which have been broached since I have been in the political theatre, there is one that has lately seized the minds of men, that all things must be done for them by the government, and that they are to do nothing for themselves."

Randolph knew this should not come to pass. It was then—and now—the purchase price of votes of power-mad individuals and groups of individuals who demanded change for the sake of change; and Randolph knew that this lust for innovation always had been the death of all republics.

Freemasonry and the Shrine, wherever their light has shown in the dark passages of controversy, have always stood for the right of freemen to seek and know the truth. Masonry and the Shrine will never ground their arms in the fight for freedom of the intellect, for liberty of conscience, and the right of all men to stand erect, unfettered and unafraid, equal before God and the law, each respecting the rights of his fellows. The demand we make is for government without tyranny and religion without superstition.

No amount of propaganda from the socialistic dreamers and the fuzzy-minds, and no amount of calumny that may be dropped on the heads of those who seek and find the truth must sway us from our Masonic mission. Even the edicts of the Supreme Court or the laws of the Congress cannot change the truth. And in the end, truth must and will prevail.

The world is now engaged in a struggle to determine whether all men shall be free, or whether they shall become the puppets—or worse, the slaves—of a comparatively few men who seem to wield a devilish power over the multitudes, who either cannot or will not seek the truth. In Russia, in Asia, in Africa, and in the islands of the ocean, there is a constant clamor designed to bring all men under the yoke of some kind of socialism. There is a demand for the levelling of all men—but those who preach this Godless philosophy know full well that the level to be attained will be slavery to the many.

Masonry and the Shrine will have no part of it. That is why during my year that it has been my privilege to serve as the imperial potentate of the Shriners of North America, I have constantly urged that every Shriner participate more fully in his blue lodge, for it is there at the altar that we learn the lessons of friendship and love and honor. It is there that we find the light that will guide us to the truth. And it is the truth that shall keep us freemen in this world of confusion.

In the future, this new temple will ring with the joy that is the Shrine. The bands, the marching units that have paraded the Shrine into a glory all its own, the clowns, the dances, the fellowship and the communion of men, must and will bring a great new spirit to Kazim. And it follows that this great new spirit of Kazim will bring a greater and better life for the people of Roanoke.

And in the future, this great new temple will help to reveal the great love of Shriners everywhere for those little children who are our guests in the mansions of mercy we call the Shriners' Hospitals for Crippled Children. No greater evidence of true love ever graced America. Here were kids without a chance, until Freeland Kendrick and Forrest Adair combined to lead the Shriners of North America into what has been called the world's greatest philanthropy. This great work is now being expanded under the inspiring leadership of Hon. Galloway Calhoun, 33 degree, past grand master of the Grand Lodge of Free and Accepted Masons of Texas, past imperial potentate, A.A.O.N.M.S., and president and chairman of the board of trustees, Shriners Hospitals, Tyler, Tex. We do not seek Government support. In the tradition of Masonry, we do it for ourselves. Charity is the expression of love. For our little guests, our gifts are presented in the spirit of the teachings of the craft, not as a publicity medium for the selfish.

The hope of the world lies in the teachings of Masonry and the Shrine. Though Masonry is not a religion, it is nevertheless religious. It expresses and teaches man's reverence for the Supreme Architect of the Universe, who has builded here on earth his temple of humanity.

To the joys and pleasures of tomorrow; to the love of one man for another; to the freedom of thought and the liberty from tyranny; to the Great God of mankind, we humbly dedicate this temple of Kazim.

[From the Roanoke World-News, Apr. 18, 1959]

IN OUR OWN OPINION

TWO NEW MASONIC TEMPLES OPENED

Members of Kazim Temple of the Shrine and members of the Scottish Rite bodies have just cause for pride in their beautiful new temples which are being dedicated this weekend.

The adjoining modernistic structures, located just west of Calvary Baptist Church on Campbell Avenue, provide southwest Virginia Masons with some of the finest facilities to be found anywhere in the country.

Formal occupation of the temples marks the realization of a long-held dream. For years they owned the big tract of land at Grandin and Brandon Roads SW., which became known as Shrine Hill although no structure ever was erected.

Eventually, leaders became convinced that less pretentious temples on a site nearer the center of the city would be preferable. At the same time the city school board was in the market for the site of a future high school, possibly an educational center.

Shrine and Scottish Rite officials got together with city council and the school board to effect a trade for the old Andrews property. Both have been well satisfied with the deal.

The corridor-connected temples have been erected and furnished at total cost of around $1 million. They stand as a tribute to the vision and determination of the two fraternal groups and as a credit to the city.

Presence of George E. Stringfellow, native Virginian and imperial potentate of the Shrine, adds particular joy to the 2-day program of dedication.

The World-News extends a welcome to him and salutes the two temples for this expression of their fine citizenship.

Our Unknown Planet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 28, 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an excellent article by James B. Kelley reviewing the accomplishments of the recently completed International Geophysical Year, which was published in the May issue of Commonweal magazine, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

In this article, Mr. Kelley tells not only of the many successes of IGY, but also of the problems which arose in this international undertaking.

I invite attention to the concluding paragraph which affirms my own thinking on the beneficial results which can come from such international endeavors:

The net results of the International Geophysical Year seem to show that in those fields of human activity where men of good will are gathered for a worthy purpose, it can be assumed that the usual tensions and struggles associated with international politics can be submerged. This is a real step forward.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR UNKNOWN PLANET
(By James B. Kelley)

The primary objective of the recently completed International Geophysical Year—July 1, 1957, to December 31, 1958—was "the acquisition of data taken simultaneously at various points on the earth in order to give a planetary view of phenomena and events in most of the major fields of geophysics."

Any geophysical investigation, is of course, intensely difficult. For when the scientist undertakes to study the earth of which he is an integral part, he is in somewhat the same position as a man who might be dropped blindfolded into the middle of a dense forest and then told to describe this forest—its length, breadth, width, age, geographical location, topography and everything else about it—with only one assistance: he would be allowed to remove the blindfold, but he would not be allowed to move from the spot where he was standing.

Obviously, then, if the geophysicist or geodetist is to study the earth—and this means its internal composition, its topography, the floors of its oceans, the heights of its mountains, the composition of its atmosphere, everything about it—he must not be alone. He needs the coordinated assistance of every available hand and mind. Thousands of observations must be taken simultaneously, they must be taken at all seasons of the year; they must be repeated during some of those seasons to be certain that special conditions did not exist. In other words, the study of the earth is not a one-man or a one-nation job. For worthwhile results the study must involve people of many lands acquainted with many local phenomena.

Thus it was that while statesmen were walking a tightwire across a caldron of thermonuclear war threats, more than 50,000 men and women (and some children, too) from 66 countries of the world were cooperating in a massive effort to gather information about our planet and the universe in which it spins. Both sides of the Iron Curtain were represented, the only notable exception being Communist China, which refused to enter because of Nationalist China's participation.

From three world data centers—one in the United States, one in the U.S.S.R., and a third broken up into subcenters in Australia, Japan, and several sections of Western Europe—the information gathered was relayed and then farmed out according to its classification (solar activity, cosmic rays, seismology, meteorology, etc.) to the various subcenters under the direction of the main center. It is noteworthy that during the IGY the small nations of the world had an equal opportunity to show their strength and ability, this being one occasion where sheer weight of numbers or force of arms did not determine the importance of a national voice.

The background for the IGY is interesting. The idea started with Chevalier de Lamarck, a Frenchman, who early in the 19th century suggested and then began the first international collection of weather reports. In 1829, Alexander von Humboldt, the famous German physicist, set up a chain of magnetic observation stations which ranged across Europe to Peiping and on to Sitka, Alaska. Von Humboldt brought both the United States and Great Britain into the effort, and he was followed some years later by an Austrian naval officer, Lt. Karl Wyprecht, an Arctic explorer who proposed that a series of data stations be erected in various parts of the world for the purpose of gathering weather, geomagnetic, atmospheric, and geological information. As a result of this proposal, the Polar Year of 1882–83 was established. Fifty years later, in 1932, the Second Polar Year was organized, and more than a hundred data stations were set up in the polar regions.

The IGY which entered the planning stage in the spring of 1953 saw the greatest collection of scientific talent gathered for a single project in the history of the modern scientific world. And this IGY brought perhaps the most startling and impressive events to occur in our lifetimes—the successful launching from the earth of a number of artificial satellites.

As everyone knows, these launchings took on immense political significance. Since the U.S.S.R. was ahead of the United States by about 4 months, and in fact had two satellites in orbit before the United States had launched its first one successfully, many of the more important and basic studies of the IGY were lost in a welter of propaganda, claims, counterclaims and general excitement. To the scientist, of course, concerned as he was with no more than upper atmospheric studies, weather charts, space forces, space radiation, and scores of other atmospheric and space problems, the satellite was only an extremely important and valuable device for obtaining information which could be had no other way. Therefore, any successful satellite was to him an accomplishment to be welcomed. Things did not turn out that way, as we know, and since the world is the way it is geopolitically, the situation had to be tolerated geophysically.

But toward the end of the IGY the various satellites launched from the earth began to assume their proper significance in the press and in the public mind. Vanguard I, the American satellite launched in March 1959, is still giving invaluable information to the mapmakers of the world. And important as this contribution is, even more important, is the information it has supplied to geodetists on the shape and structure of the earth. Explorer I and later Pioneer I gave the world a picture of the spatial radiation distribution which was previously either unknown or inaccurately known.

All the satellites together, including the unsuccessful one, and the rockets which were sent aloft have permitted Dr. James A. Van Allen and his colleagues to plot the probable distribution of radiation up to a distance of 30,000 miles from the earth. The picture of this distribution changed several times as more information came back from space and at one point it looked as though manned space travel might be impossible because of the intense radiation at moderate distances—say, 10,000 to 20,000 miles—from the earth. Even after the IGY ended last December 31, the exploration continued, and a weather satellite is now circling the earth across the poles.

The full impact of the information which the rockets and satellites returned to the data centers on earth may not be known for several years, but even now, as the data continues to be processed and assimilated, is it clear that this new knowledge will have many and important uses. If from no other standpoint, the IGY would have to be counted a success in the extraordinary advances it brought in the field of rocketry. Concerning this point, few people seem to realize that a total of seven nations—Australia, Canada, Great Britain, France and Japan, as well as the United States and U.S.S.R.—launched 400 rockets and satellites during the IGY. Each of these rockets contributed a share in the year's total achievement.

While these 400 rockets searched space, and a half dozen others either went into orbit or probed reaches hitherto unknown by man, 20 countries sent 80 ships over the oceans of the earth in an effort to "place international oceanography on a firm footing." Among the notable oceanographic findings were indications that warm climates are moving north. And rivers were discovered in the oceans which behave much as rivers on land. They flow quite independently of the oceans, with the effect of delivering billions of gallons of water every second across thousands of miles of ocean. The discovery of these rivers, some of which flow from two hundred to a thousand feet below the surface of the sea, causes questions to be raised concerning the advisability of dumping large quantities of radioactive wastes into the oceans. Wastes dumped in a "safe" area of the ocean might possibly be carried thousands of miles by these rivers to other—not so safe—parts of the world.

The drifting and drift paths of ice—the iceberg is still a menace to shipping as events of this past winter proved—were also traced and charted anew during the International Geophysical Year. The coordination of the data gathered by the countries engaged in this phase of the study for the IGY is probably an outstanding example of the necessity of nations working in concert toward a single goal. Floating ice is a menace to all

shipping; the iceberg knows nothing of politics or philosophy, and appears to be fairly impervious to even the best detection methods. If the world's shipping was to be protected, information and data had to be brought together and examined not within national boundaries but within the chart rooms of the entire world.

It would not be honest to leave the impression that everything ran smoothly during the IGY, that there were no international differences. The struggle between the East and the West in Europe and throughout the rest of the world showed up more than once in the course of the year. Australia was not enthusiastic about having a permanent Soviet team in the Antarctic; these was some fear voiced that physical scientists might be replaced by military scientists at points a little too close to home. There was also some misgiving on the part of smaller nations that the great powers might decide to retain data which had possible military significance for fear of its falling into unfriendly hands. And Communist China's attitude was unfortunate, although this situation eased when Peiping later showed considerable interest in the IGY and in having the program continued for another full year.

Perhaps the biggest division between the East and West was raised at the Moscow Conference on the IGY held during the first 10 days of August 1958. The USSR backed by China, Poland, and East Germany, wanted to extend the IGY for another year. The United States felt it should be terminated. The case for both sides was good. The Soviet Union pointed out, with logic, that much work was yet to be done and hence the year should be continued. The United States said its Government had been committed for the 18-month period and was not prepared to carry on further with the same kind of effort. It maintained that there was much work to be done but that before this work could be undertaken intelligently an examination of what had been accomplished and what needed to be accomplished should be made.

The conference adjourned on the note that cooperation would continue in those areas where it seemed the most valuable results could be obtained. Provisions would be made for an exchange of data still to be gathered and, of course, the data already gathered would be published for the benefit of all. This was a compromise that seemed, to all concerned, eminently reasonable.

All in all, it can be recorded that the scientists of the world—and this includes the backyard observers as well as those in the great laboratories—were able to work together to increase their knowledge. They had their troubles, but it is important to remember that these troubles came not simply because they were Russians or Germans or Frenchmen or Americans or whatever, but because they were intelligent men who had real and legitimate differences of opinion. If they had not had such differences, this would have been not only unique in the annals of scientific investigation but downright suspicious. And if some people thought data were being suppressed, this would not be the first time this thought has occurred even among members of the same laboratory team.

The net results of the international geophysical year seem to show that in those fields of human activity where men of goodwill are gathered for a worthy purpose, it can be assumed that the usual tensions and struggles associated with international politics can be submerged. This is a real step forward.

Distressed Areas Still on Increase

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 28, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to exend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following fact sheet compiled by the Area Employment Expansion Committee in New York which sets forth the major chronically distressed labor market areas as of April of this year; an editorial entitled "Too Many Out of Work," from Life magazine of April 13, 1959; a press release from the Area Employment Expansion Committee, dated May 18, 1959; and, finally, a news article from the New York Times of May 25, 1959:

Area Employment Expansion Committee, New York, N. Y., Fact Sheet No. 37—Unemployment and labor force in major chronically distressed labor market areas, April 1959 [1]

Labor market area	Period of chronic distress		January 1959			March 1959		
	Start of labor surplus [2]	Number of months	Civilian labor force	Unemployment	Percent	Civilian labor force	Unemployment	Percent
Total			5,747,925	708,800	12.3	5,682,990	646,770	11.4
Connecticut:								
Bridgeport	November 1957	18	141,000	16,000	11.3	140,600	13,500	9.6
Waterbury	July 1957	22	77,000	8,100	10.5	78,600	6,200	7.9
Indiana:								
Evansville	September 1957	20	84,200	7,900	9.7	81,300	7,500	9.2
Terre Haute	January 1952	88	44,400	4,600	10.5	44,100	4,100	9.3
Kentucky: Louisville	November 1957	18	300,900	24,400	8.1	300,100	21,400	7.1
Massachusetts:								
Fall River	January 1957	28	58,410	6,620	11.3	57,400	4,800	8.4
Lawrence	January 1952	88	56,440	5,350	9.5	56,910	4,830	8.5
Lowell	do	88	53,200	6,100	11.5	53,100	5,950	11.2
New Bedford	November 1957	18	66,200	8,550	12.9	66,430	8,190	12.3
Michigan:								
Detroit	March 1956	38	1,521,000	[3] 222,000	14.6	[3] 1,474,000	205,000	13.9
Flint	April 1957	25	141,300	[3] 9,800	7.0	[3] 141,000	13,700	9.7
Grand Rapids	February 1957	27	140,000	[3] 13,700	9.8	[3] 137,000	13,500	9.8
Muskegon	July 1956	34	57,600	[3] 6,700	11.8	[3] 56,000	5,400	9.6
New Jersey: Atlantic City	November 1957	18	63,100	11,600	18.3	63,700	9,600	15.1
New York: Utica-Rome	do	18	137,400	16,200	11.8	[3] 138,000	15,500	11.2
North Carolina:								
Asheville	January 1956	40	51,500	4,300	8.3	[3] 51,000	3,900	7.6
Durham	January 1957	28	47,525	3,500	7.4	[3] 47,000	3,200	6.7
Ohio: Lorain-Elyria	November 1957	18	62,700	7,100	11.3	[3] 63,000	5,000	7.9
Pennsylvania:								
Altoona	January 1952	88	53,600	7,700	14.4	53,600	6,400	11.9
Erie	January 1957	28	100,000	16,900	16.9	[3] 99,000	15,300	15.4
Johnstown	July 1953	70	98,300	16,500	16.8	[3] 98,000	14,800	15.1
Pittsburgh	January 1958	16	972,200	117,000	12.0	[3] 971,000	104,000	10.7
Reading	July 1957	22	120,700	9,400	7.8	120,500	8,100	6.7
Scranton	January 1952	88	103,100	17,400	16.9	102,900	16,500	16.0
Wilkes-Barre-Hazleton	do	88	139,000	24,700	17.8	138,300	23,700	17.1
York	May 1957	24	103,200	9,000	8.7	103,300	8,200	7.9
Rhode Island: Providence	July 1951	94	348,300	43,200	12.4	[3] 344,000	38,900	11.3
Tennessee:								
Chattanooga	January 1957	28	115,150	8,450	7.3	[3] 115,000	[3] 7,850	6.8
Knoxville	January 1956	40	141,700	11,500	8.1	[3] 140,000	9,400	6.7
West Virginia:								
Charleston	March 1954	62	114,450	13,200	11.5	114,550	13,100	11.4
Huntington-Ashland	March 1957	26	92,000	13,350	14.5	92,150	12,300	13.3
Wheeling-Steubenville	November 1957	18	141,450	18,450	13.0	141,450	16,950	12.0

[1] Major areas eligible for assistance under area redevelopment bill adopted by House Banking and Currency Committee.
[2] Start of period of labor surplus for determining current eligibility for assistance under area redevelopment bill.
[3] Estimated.
Source: U.S. Bureau of Employment Security.

A PLEA FOR ACTION ON AREA REDEVELOPMENT LEGISLATION—TOO MANY OUT OF WORK

[From Life, April 13, 1959]

The paradox shown on the preceding pages—unemployment in the midst of plenty—is darkening the otherwise sunny slopes of a broad and growing recovery.

As Secretary of Labor Mitchell points out, unemployment may be expected to diminish soon and steadily. With industrial production close to its 1956 all-time peak, employers have just about reached the limit of stretching the work week of employed workers, and will soon have to start hiring others in order to keep pace with the recovery. Mitchell may be overoptimistic in predicting a drop to as low as 3 million (or about 4 percent, the 1955 level when the auto industry turned out a record 9 million units), but if 4 percent could be achieved that would be tolerable in a country this huge—provided the unemployment is chiefly frictional (men moving, or changing jobs) rather than chronic, like the permanent disemployment of the mountain miners.

Walter Reuther, as might be expected, overstates the case for big spending remedies, just as Industrialist Sligh may be underrating the case for Government concern. Promoting full employment is the official policy of the U.S. Government, and has been since the Full Employment Act of 1946 created a standing committee of Congress to help effectuate it. It is the Government's proper role to do whatever it can to keep the economy expanding and fully employed.

There is certainly room for debate on what measures are needed. Since the recovery is already strong, no pump-priming public works seem called for, save the new schools, hospitals, and urban renewal which are justified on grounds of social neglect. Since the chronic unemployment is so pinpointed, equally pinpointed measures are called for to attack it. The shifting of Government contracts and extension of unemployment assistance will help. But to a large extent many of the unemployed have lost their jobs forever, don't have the skills now needed to change, and often can't afford to move. Moreover, it would be a social waste to make ghost towns out of existing communities with their established schools, plants, roads, and other facilities. The real answer is to get new industries into these communities, and to retrain their unemployed workers in skills that are needed.

Such a program is the objective of two bills (by Democrat DOUGLAS, and Republican DIRKSEN) now before Congress, which differ principally as to the amounts to be spent and to the extent of Federal participation with State and local area development programs.

Although this type of program should have had top priority when the recession was at its worst, it was aborted last year because the Democratic Congress authorized more than President Eisenhower was willing to allocate to it, so he vetoed the measure. Since action is needed, and pronto, the President ought to exercise his own leadership on the No. 1 domestic problem confronting him, and make good his 1952 promise in New England that any threat of major unemployment would be met by "the full power of Government * * * instantly marshalled, instantly concentrated and localized." Let him get the opposing sides together to work out some compromise that he would be willing to sign if passed. Much can be accomplished by such programs, as trailblazing efforts by groups like the New England council have already proved, and could be greatly increased by the availability of assistance-loans for new development.

[Press release of Area Employment Expansion Committee, New York, N.Y., May 18, 1959]

NEW YORK, May 18.—While rising national employment has reduced total unemployment, the number of hard core, chronically distressed major labor markets has actually increased from 23 in January 1959 to 32 in April, declared Solomon Barkin, secretary-treasurer of the Area Employment Expansion Committee. With an average unemployment rate of 11.4 percent in March 1959, the latest date for which data have been compiled, the 32 major distressed areas have a civilian labor force of 5.8 million or about 9 percent of the Nation's working population. The 647,000 unemployed workers in these areas comprise 15 percent of total unemployment in the United States, Barkin pointed out. Additional areas will be added during the next few months with little likelihood of more than a few being removed.

The causes of chronic unemployment in these labor markets are the contraction or closing of the traditional, basic industries which constituted the economic backbone of these communities, he said. The shrinkage of employment in the coal mining, textiles, metal manufacturing, automobile, and durable goods manufacturing industries have left great gaps in the economic structure of these communities.

"April 1959 unemployment figures show that unemployment in the mining industry was 9.2 percent; construction, 11.3 percent; automobile manufacturing, 8.6 percent; and electrical machinery, 6.6 percent," he declared. "The high rates of unemployment in these industries, and in the textile industry, are basic to the continuing distress in these areas. They explain the persistently high number of persons, 1.4 million, who have been unemployed for 15 weeks or more."

The new major labor markets added to the list of chronically distressed communities as defined in the area redevelopment bill recommended by the Housing Banking and Currency Committee includes Connecticut: Bridgeport, Waterbury; Kentucky: Louisville; Michigan: Flint; Ohio: Lorain-Elyria; Pennsylvania: Pittsburgh, Reading, York; West Virginia: Wheeling-Steubenville.

The unemployment rates in the chronically distressed major labor markets have risen to unusually high rates, Barkin said. Scranton, Pa., has the highest rate with 16 percent unemployment.

"Unemployment has been persistent in these communities. In 12 of these labor markets, a substantial labor surplus has persisted for 3 or more years and in 7 markets there has been a surplus for more than 7 years. In none of these areas has there been less than 18 months of substantial labor surplus," Barkin declared.

The area redevelopment bill passed by the Senate earlier this year, and adopted by the House Banking and Currency Committee is designed to help these communities redevelop their economies, he concluded. This bill is now before the House Rules Committee.

(A subsequent release will provide similar data for the smaller labor markets throughout the United States.)

[From the New York Times, May 25, 1959]

DISTRESSED AREAS STILL ON INCREASE—MAJOR JOBLESS MARKETS RISE TO 32 IN 4 MONTHS—STATE'S PICTURE BETTER

Despite a drop in unemployment, the number of major labor market areas classified as chronically distressed is still on the rise.

This finding was made public yesterday by Solomon Barkin, secretary-treasurer of the Area Employment Expansion Committee and a labor economist. He found that from January, when the total stood at 23, to last month the number of hard-core distressed areas increased to 32.

Meanwhile, the State industrial commissioner, M. P. Catherwood, reported increased employment in three major cities. He noted that as a result Syracuse, Binghamton, and Buffalo had received lower ratings on the Federal list of areas receiving priority in the awarding of Government contracts because of unemployment. In the State as a whole, he said, the employment picture is brightening.

The 32 major distressed areas in the Nation have a civilian labor force of 5,800,000, or about 9 percent of the Nation's working population. In these areas about 647,000 workers are unemployed, about 15 percent of the country's total joblessness.

Mr. Barkin attributed chronic unemployment in the areas to contraction or closing of traditional or basic industries and the shrinkage of employment in coal mining, textiles, metal manufacturing, automobile and durable goods industries.

Among the new distressed areas are Bridgeport and Waterbury, Conn.; Louisville, Ky.; Flint, Mich.; Lorain and Elyria, Ohio; Pittsburgh, Reading, and York, Pa., and Wheeling and Steubenville, W. Va.

"Unemployment has been persistent in these comunities," Mr. Barkin said. "In 12 of these labor markets a substantial labor surplus has persisted for 3 or more years and in 7 markets there has been a surplus for more than 7 years. In none of these areas has there been less than 18 months of substantial labor surplus."

The Area Employment Expansion Committee, with offices at 99 University Place, was organized to press for legislation to aid distressed areas.

World Communications Center

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 28, 1959

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD articles from the Washington Post of May 26, and the Washington Star of the same date, reporting on the agreement between Mr. William Zeckendorf and the newspaperwomen of Washington for the construction of a world communications center.

May I offer my congratulations to the women of the press who originated the idea in 1955 and to Mr. Zeckendorf for his desire to develop it.

As I understand it, the press community of Washington, which includes newspapers, radio, and TV, has quadrupled since the National Press Building was built 40 years ago.

Obviously there is need for a second press building—a modern building to house these farflung facilities. It speaks well for the newspaperwomen that since the idea for a new center was originated they have made it clear that the building should serve the best interests of all the press community, women and men alike.

Under the plans, I believe, the ladies would run the top penthouse floor as a dining room with guest cards for newsmakers and those covering the news.

The newswomen have long had a gifted hand in gathering such an assemblage together with glamorous and newsmaking results. The Nation's Capital has much to look forward to when the center is built.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, May 26, 1959]

PRESS-RADIO AREA PLANNED IN SOUTHWEST

(By Elsie Carper)

A multistoried world communications center to house offices for the expanding press, radio, and TV industry is planned for the southwest redevelopment area by builder William Zeckendorf, president of Webb & Knapp.

The center will be a central feature of Webb & Knapp's design for the plaza, a 20-acre enclosed park area of office buildings, a hotel and theater, bordering the proposed 10th Street mall.

Two national press organizations ratified an agreement yesterday with Webb & Knapp to occupy the top floor of the building. The Women's National Press Club approved the memorandum of understanding at a noon meeting and the American Newspaper Women's Club at a meeting held last night.

Zeckendorf is to submit his plans for the plaza to the Redevelopment Land Agency on June 2. RLA, which holds title to the land, has an agreement with Webb & Knapp giving the firm first priority in the redevelopment of the plaza and other parts of southwest area C.

The center has been a project of the two clubs for the past 4 years.

In a joint statement, Lee Walsh, president of the Women's National Press Club, and Alice T. Curran, president of the American Newspaper Women's Club, said that the center, located close to the Capitol and White House, "should meet the up-to-date needs of national and international correspondents and news-gathering agencies."

Plans for the center include a press conference floor, specially designed and equipped radio and TV offices and studios, and a penthouse restaurant and bar with a panoramic view of the Washington skyline.

[From the Washington Evening Star, May 26, 1959]

NEWSWOMEN OK PLAN FOR CLUBHOUSE

The two Washington women's press clubs have ratified a memorandum of understanding with William Zeckendorf under which the New York real estate tycoon proposes to provide clubhouse space for the women in a world communications center in southwest Washington.

Parties to the agreement are the Women's National Press Club and the American Newspaper Women's Club.

The American Newspaper Women's Club, headed by Mrs. Alice T. Curran, met last night and ratified the agreement.

Mrs. Lee Walsh, president of the Women's National Press Club, said her group ratified the agreement at a Hotel Statler business meeting at noon.

The memorandum already has been signed by Mr. Zeckendorf, Mrs. Walsh, and Mrs. Curran.

Basically, it describes Mr. Zeckendorf's plan to build a 250,000-square-foot world communication center in the so-called plaza section of the southwest redevelopment area. The huge office building would be located between 11th Street and the proposed South (10th Street) Mall, extending from D Street SW. to the new southwest (F Street) freeway.

Mr. Zeckendorf's firm, Webb & Knapp, will present a plan for developing the larger plaza area, of which the communications center is a part, to the District Redevelopment Land Agency at a meeting June 2.

It was understood that Webb & Knapp officials also have sounded out the National Press Club—the newspaper men's club which excludes women—about participating in the proposed southwest project. The New Yorkers reportedly have offered to buy the National Press Club building at 14th and F Streets NW. Webb & Knapp officials, however, refused to discuss details of the talks.

Statistics Show Armed Forces Veterans Make Good Students—GI Bill Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 28, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the veterans of this Nation's Armed Forces have distinguished themselves not only on the battlefield, but in the classroom as well.

During the hearings before the Senate Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee, which have just concluded, on the proposal to extend the benefits of the Korean conflict GI bill, a number of educators testified as to the emotional stability and general good conduct of veterans who attended classes on their campuses. Their work was more current and better prepared, these educators said, and veterans provided fewer disciplinary problems on the campus than nonveterans.

In addition, George E. Emery, veterans' coordinator at the University of Massachusetts, has released some figures showing the veterans' outstanding scholastic performance. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a news release from the University of Massachusetts for June 25, 1958, at the close of the last school year, giving statistics on the scholastic standings of veterans.

There being no objection, the news release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMHERST, MASS., June 25, 1958.—Veterans continue to show a high degree of scholastic achievement in the University of Massachusetts, a survey by George E. Emery, veterans' coordinator, shows.

With veterans accounting for 38 percent of the men graduating, 63 percent of honor graduates were veterans.

All three men receiving B.A. degrees magna cum laude in the College of Arts and Sciences were veterans. Of the nine men graduating cum laude, six were veterans. In the same college, of the four men receiving B.S. degrees, magna cum laude, one was a veteran. Of the four men graduating cum laude, three were veterans.

Two veterans received the highest honors granted in the College of Agriculture, both magna cum laude. Of the three men receiving cum laudes, one was a veteran.

Veterans took three of the six cum laude degrees granted to men in the School of Business Administration.

In the School of Engineering, a veteran earned the only cum laude degree in chemical engineering; all three magna cum laude electrical engineering degrees were earned by veterans and of the nine cum laude degrees granted in electrical engineering, six were earned by veterans. In mechanical engineering, the three magna cum laude degrees were earned by veterans and of the four cum laudes, three were veterans.

In the division of physical education, the two cum laude degrees were earned by veterans.

Of the 32 undergraduate men elected to the honor society, Phi Kappa Phi, 21 were veterans. Of the 11 men elected to Sigma Xi, honorary scientific society, seven were veterans.

Departmental honors were awarded to 14 men; of these 6 were veterans.

Somebody Needs To Care

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 28, 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an address which I delivered at the annual convention of the National Farmers Union in Springfield, Ill., on March 17 of this year, entitled "Somebody Needs To Care" be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOMEBODY NEEDS TO CARE

(Address by Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat of Minnesota, at annual convention of the National Farmers Union, Springfield, Ill., March 17, 1959)

It is an honor and a pleasure to be here in the Midwest today with you Farmers Union folk. I think that you all know that I consider the family farmers as the very bedrock of American democracy.

It is a special honor and pleasure to be on the platform with your president, Jim Patton. From where I sit in Washington, I have had ample opportunity to judge the effectiveness, or lack of effectiveness, of spokesmen for American agriculture. And I want you all to know that no witness who has appeared before us carries more weight and influence or has earned more respect than your Jim Patton.

Whether they agree or disagree with his views, no one in or out of Congress can successfully challenge the sincerity of Jim Patton's convictions, nor his dedication to his purpose of serving you and other family farmers of America. And, furthermore, his guidance and counsel have made a tremendous contribution toward sound liberal progress in our democracy.

And I could not pass this opportunity, today, to pay a deserved tribute to your Johnny Baker, your Washington "hired hand." Many of us on Capitol Hill depend upon John's wide range of knowledge and his sagacity. We know we can always depend upon his ready, willing, and able assistance when the need arises.

You do not need me to describe for you the tragedy that has fallen upon agriculture in these recent years. No one in all the world knows better than you do.

You have been there, where it happened.

No one foresaw more clearly and more sharply than you in the Farmers Union the consequences which have followed from the errors of the past 6 years.

You saw it coming. You saw it come. You have suffered under its blows.

You know more certainly than anyone else in the world that the farmers' incomes have eroded away steadily and dangerously, while the farmers' costs have climbed.

You know more surely than anyone that our farm programs have been wrecked, piece by piece, during these 6 years, until now the very concept of a national farm program has been made almost disreputable in the public mind.

The principle of a national farm program has been crushed under a burden of sense-

less, purposeless costs, by a record of clumsy, wrongminded administration. Because you have so nobly understood the purposes of the farm programs of the New Deal, you have been hurt more cruelly than anyone to see them wrecked—you have been hurt in your hearts, as well as in the material way that all farmers have been hurt.

You know also the bitter, shameful waste of our Nation's great opportunity to use its food for building peace which these past 6 years have brought. You have suffered in your souls to hear the denunciation of "burdensome surpluses;" it is an affront to the justified pride you take in the noble work of producing food. It is an affront to the compassion that decent people must feel for the hunger of millions and millions of human beings who do not have enough; it is a cruel rebuke to the dream you have, that you share with all men of good will on earth, that our generation might leave to our children a world of peace and progress and prosperity.

Why, we have not even had the imagination and compassion needed to feed our own hungry neighbors, right here in the richest country in all history.

There are little children so hungry they cannot keep up with their schoolwork literally within a stone's throw of the offices of the U.S. Department of Agriculture in Washington, where Ezra Taft Benson sits on top of a $9 billion mountain of surpluses. There are hundreds of children in the District of Columbia who suffer from a disease that the medical men call malnutrition, who cannot learn, who cannot grow properly, who cannot fight off the attacks of other diseases, because they do not get enough to eat.

You know, better than any expert in agricultural statistics can ever know, the dark despair of young couples on the farm who are laboring under the heavy burden of debt that beginning farmers so often face, as their incomes sink lower and lower and their costs rise up and up.

You know at firsthand how the farmer committee system has been demoralized and shattered.

You know that the Secretary of Agriculture has become the czar over the Rural Electrification Administration, that he has seized the authority of the Administrator of that program and invested it in an appointee who sits under his eyes and under his thumb.

I have reintroduced a bill that would give back to the administrator of REA the full authority and loanmaking powers he is supposed to have, and always did have before this administration took over. And, I promise you today, we are going to put the Humphrey-Price bill into law.

You know the wrongness and the injustice of the latest attack that has been leveled against the farmers' REA co-ops, in the form of a demand that they pay higher interest rates.

You may not fully realize how shockingly unjust and selfish it is, because the facts do not receive much publicity.

You may not know, for example, that since this tight-money high-interest-rate administration took power, its policies have resulted in a 62-percent gain in annual income for the people who receive interest. This is far, far greater than any gain in income received by any other group in our economy. It is a revealing contrast to what has happened to farmers' incomes.

The administration now says that the farmers should pay higher interest rates on their REA loans to help the Government carry the mounting costs of carrying the Government debt. They leave unsaid the fact that it is this administration's support for the moneylenders that is primarily responsible for boosting the cost of interest on the debt, until it has become the biggest single item in the Federal budget aside from defense. About 11 cents of every tax dollar now goes for interest.

Here is the full story of how much the American taxpayers have been burdened by the high-interest, tight-money policy of supporting the collectors of interest in our economy. In 1952, the interest on the Federal debt was only $5.8 billion. In the budget now before Congress it is $8.1 billion—and that probably will not be enough.

This is an increase of $2.3 billion in interest costs that the taxpayers must pay every year. Do you know how much $2.3 billion is? Well, here is one way of putting it: It is just about as much, every year, as the grand total that all the REA co-ops in the country have borrowed from the Government in all the 24 years since REA was created in 1935.

Now the White House is trying to put the bite on the farmers' co-ops to help balance its budget. After wrecking the Government farm programs, they want to handicap the farmers' self-help associations by making co-ops pay taxes on the refunds that they give to their patrons.

At least, we should not be surprised by this latest attack on the co-ops. The country had full advance warning when the Washington lobbyist for the co-op-hating NTEA was given a job on the President's White House staff. Yes, we saw it coming, and come it did.

If the administration were really sincere about wanting to balance the budget, it might take a look at some of the really big loopholes in the corporation tax laws instead of picking on the farmers.

An investment adviser told the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee last week that Uncle Sam has lost $46 billion in tax revenue in the past 7 years through loopholes in the corporation tax laws. Most of those loopholes were put there by the Republican 83d Congress, at the specific request of the Eisenhower administration. And they would have been even wider, if we had not fought to squeeze them shut in Congress, against fervent administration pressure.

Yes, you in the Farmers Union know about these things. You know the full measure of the injustice to farm families, the senseless waste of wealth and national opportunity, that the past 6 years have brought.

And it was very substantially because you know these things so well, you Democrats and Republicans alike in the Farmers Union, that my party received such an overwhelming mandate from the Farm Belt States in the congressional and senatorial elections last fall. I give a big share of the credit for the Democratic election victory to the leadership and the brilliant educational work of the Farmers Union in the farm communities of the West and Midwest.

The Democratic Party has received a powerful mandate from the farm people of America to oppose the tragic wrongs that have been done to American agriculture under the Eisenhower administration.

We must honor that mandate from farm people. We are determined to develop a new and better farm bill. We will need, and welcome, your help. We believe we can pass it and make it stick, veto or no veto. If we cannot make it stick the first time, we will pass another, and we will keep on until we do make it stick.

But it is only fair to warn you that the Democratic Congress is working under extremely serious and inescapable limitations. We cannot do everything you would wish we would do. We cannot do everything we want to do.

First, we are working under the limits imposed by the President's veto power. I think it is only fair and accurate to expect that the President will veto any bill we might pass which will do anything substantial to raise farm prices.

This means that Congress is limited in what it can do for farmers to what can be passed by a two-thirds vote, over a Presidential veto.

Secondly, Congress is limited in what it can do for farmers by the veto power by administration which is held by the Secretary of Agriculture.

You have seen how good farm programs can be ruined by unsympathetic administration. The power of the Secretary of Agriculture to negate the intent and spirit of Congress is great.

The Secretary's power to veto by administrative action limits the good that Congress can do for farmers to those things that are so simple, so direct, that the results can come through to the farm in spite of all the negativism, foot dragging and hostility that it will encounter as it passes through the Department of Agriculture's hands.

Despite these terribly severe handicaps, at least some of us in the Democratic Congress are determined to pass a bill that will help the farmers of America.

And you can mark it down as absolutely certain that the Democratic Congress will not let the administration pull down the temple of agricultural programs completely in its final hours, as it has proposed and wishes to do.

The Democratic Congress will never, never, never give Ezra Taft Benson the zero-parity floor he has asked for. We will not give him the marketplace no-parity gimmick he has asked for either.

The Democratic Congress will not yield even the next step of another 15 point cut in support floors, from 75 percent of parity down to 60 percent, that the Eisenhower administration has requested as its second-best objective.

The Democratic Congress will not allow the administration to get away with putting a penalty tax on the refunds that your cooperatives pay to their patrons.

The Democratic Congress will not let the administration jack up REA interest rates, nor throw the REA co-ops to the wolves of Wall Street.

You can count on that. You can bank on it. You can bet your economic lives on it—and that is exactly what the stakes are in agricultural policy today. For while the administration has a powerful veto weapon to use against Congress when it tries to help the farmer, we have a veto power of our own when it comes to acting on the administration's plans to harm the farmers. And we will use it. We will not give up a single inch.

This tragic era for agriculture—the dark era of Ezra—has had a good and constructive result along with all the misery and waste. So it seems to me, at any rate.

It has made us grow up and come of age in our thinking about farm policy.

We now realize that the real argument in farm policy should not be over methods and details. The real argument is over basic objectives.

Are you for a program to help the family farm? Or are you against the family farm? That, my friends, is the real issue, the real dividing line, in farm policy debate today.

Almost any farmer in America can think up the general outline of a farm plan that will work—if there is a will to make it work.

Methods are important. Details are important. Some will work better than others. Some well-intentioned ideas might not work at all. We need highly skilled technical experts and conscientious administration to carry out our farm programs. But our trouble is not for lack of ideas and conscientious, skilled people to put them into effect. The Department of Agriculture is

overflowing with fine, dedicated public servants—who could make a farm program work and work well, if they were given a chance.

What we lack in Washington today is a positive will to help the farmers.

There was a time not so long ago when we took it for franted that one of the bedrock principles of American life was the rightness of cooperation by the public to protect and improve farmers' incomes. Unhappily, this is not so today.

The most damaging product of the age of Ezra is the dangerous erosion of America's will to do justice for her farm people.

For the first time in the history of our Nation, a cancer of doubt has arisen in the public consciousness as to the merit of our family farming system.

The swift rise of vertical integration provides the mechanism whereby big concentrated business and financial interests can extend their domination over agriculture. This mechanism will leave the farm family on the farm. But it will take away its economic independence. The farmer will be told what to grow and where to sell, and the vertical integrator will control what the farmer gets for his efforts.

Let me read to you what the Department of Agriculture's experts foresee in this emerging new system of agricultural domination. This is from a report published recently by the Department:

"Vertical integration may vitally affect the role of the farmers. * * * Contract arrangements may leave producers with little more than general land management and caretaker functions. * * * Livestock production contracts vary from arrangements involving control of only a few decisions to contracts virtually relegating the producer to a piece-worker role."

This ominous forecast for American agriculture holds a powerful, fascinating allure for all too many people in our country today. Its allure has been heightened immeasurably by the discouraging, demoralizing shambles that the Eisenhower administration has made of our farm programs. There is a growing sentiment in our country for just giving up on the farm problem.

This sentiment is strong among those who do not understand the tremendous values and strengths in our family farming system, nor the unusual problems which farm families must face. There are millions and millions of citizens in our population who are far removed from the soil. Their number is increasing year by year. Domination of agriculture by centralized corporate power appeals to many of them as an easy way out of the farm problem.

And it appeals even more strongly to those who simply do not care about what happens to farm people.

The most serious problem farmers face is the growing strength of the public sentiment that either does not know, or does not care, about the value to our national life of preserving the independently owned, owner operated, family sized farm system of agriculture.

I would be less than honest with you if I did not admit that even in the Democratic Party, there are some who do not appreciate the value of preserving our family farm pattern against the growing domination of centralized economic interests.

The persistent discrediting of farm programs that has gone on during the past 6 years has resulted in some degree in discrediting farmers themselves by implication. Remember, farmers have had no one in the President's Cabinet to plead their case to the public. With no national voice to speak out in their behalf, it is becoming harder and harder to maintain a sympathetic understanding of the farmers' unusual economic problems among the increasing urban majority of our people.

There is no single thing more critically important to the future of the family farm than having a national spokesman in the national administration who can and will stick up for the farmers and explain their problems to the people.

Until 6 years ago, farmers had an understanding and loyal champion right in the White House. The world's most famous "retired farmer" of Independence, Mo., was then on the job. There is no better place to have a friend who understands your problems than right in the White House.

Not only farmers, but the entire Nation, need a man in the White House who has understanding of and sympathy for farmers.

The vast majority of people in the other countries of the world are farmers, and their problems, while different from ours, are important to all of us who look forward to a time of true peace in the world.

Today we realize more keenly than ever the need to find peaceful ways of reaching into the lives of other people.

I want to talk to you about the international situation as well as the domestic situation, for we face a grave challenge which can not be ignored.

That challenge can best be met by proving we really care about people, at home or abroad, and care about progress—and most of all about peace with justice.

Whenever we neglect our own people, we have little to offer to the rest of the world in asking vast millions to rally to our banner of freedom and democracy.

We must prove we care at home—and then prove we care also about our fellow human beings everywhere.

Last night, the President of the United States talked to his countrymen and to the world of this latest Soviet-precipitated crisis over Berlin. Even as we demonstrate to the world that we are utterly determined to resist Communist aggression, we must be alert to the opportunities to wage peace—consistently, vigorously, and dramatically.

We must constantly seek to express the American dedication to people, peace, and progress throughout the world—not only in the words of peace, but in the very deeds and works of peace.

You people here, and others like you throughout the country, are producers of what can be one of the greatest assets our country has in its all-out competition with Soviet Russia—a force for freedom and peace more far-reaching than any military weapon.

Food is the common denominator of international life. Man must eat to survive. It may well be that bread, not guns, will decide mankind's future destiny.

In areas of Africa and Asia, as well as other parts of the world, food means far more to vast millions of people today than anything else.

A breakthrough in the conquest of hunger could be more significant in the cold war than the conquest of outer space.

Thanks to you farm people, and others like you, the United States is today in a far better position than Russia to lead the world toward the conquest of hunger and want.

Our much-abused abundance is a tremendously vital asset to our international relations, if we have the vision and determination to use it wisely for humanity.

For years, as you know, I have been seeking to have America capitalize on what I regard as one of the most significant laws currently on our statute books.

I refer to the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act—Public Law 480. Under this law, from the sale of American crops there becomes available to us for use in foreign countries for reloan and reinvestment hundreds of millions of dollars in the form of foreign counterpart currencies.

These currencies represent one of the great assets of the free world. No other nation has such a rich resource—well over $2½ billion of idle funds.

It is an asset which should be put to work, instead of lying fallow in State central banks.

It is an asset which should be used today—now—for investment and research instead of allowing inflation gradually to erode its purchasing power.

Out of my recent trip to Western Europe, I have developed a series of recommendations for expanding the specific use of such funds. My goal is to use food for peace, food to nourish, to link nations in friendship, food to fulfill the Biblical mandate, "to feed the hungry and heal the sick."

This leads me to my principal recommendation of this afternoon. Within a very brief time, I shall introduce in the U.S. Senate a Food for Peace Act. This act has already gained the support of other Democratic Senators who are in total agreement with me that our agricultural abundance should be used as a more effective arm of our international relations.

The Food for Peace Act will redirect the emphasis of Public Law 480 more toward foreign policy objectives which serve the interests of the entire Nation, rather than its present handling as a temporary farm surplus disposal program.

This will be a blueprint for a long-term food policy, to be substituted for our present year-to-year thinking and inadequate planning. By this act we shall announce boldly to the developing areas of the world that we are going to use food as a positive force in building a peaceful world.

Regrettably, the American people have been led to think our abundance and ability to produce in abundance is some shameful millstone around our necks—instead of perhaps one of the greatest advantages we hold on the world scene.

From the President on down, no one high in our Government has seemed to realize what a potential force for freedom we have in the very thing many have complained so loudly about—our food abundance.

Every move to make greater use of food and fiber to bolster ties with underdeveloped areas of the world has had to be forced upon this administration.

They are too timid, and too unimaginative. They are hesitant when they should be bold. They have once again sent recommendations to the Congress that are either impossible or almost intangible.

The Food for Peace Act will call for the creation of a special agency attached to the White House, headed by a Peace Food Administrator appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate.

During the war, we created a new post of War Food Administrator, entirely independent of the Secretary of Agriculture, because we fully recognized the importance of food to victory. In our current struggle for a secure peace in the world, it it no less important to have in our Government a top-level official whose full responsibility shall be the more effective use of our abundance of food and fiber, in the Nation's interests, as a vital arm of our foreign policy.

The Peace Food Administrator should be someone with a vision of what our food can mean to the world, and someone with the ability and boldness to end buck-passing and conflict between the many agencies of Government involved one way or another in food use abroad.

We shall transfer the administration of Public Law 480 out of the Department of Agriculture and the administration of the appropriate part of the Mutual Security Act out of the State Department and place them under the new Peace Food Administrator, along with existing units in the departments working in this field.

A Peace Food Policy Committee whose members are high-level representatives of all the departments concerned shall advise and consult with the Peace Food Administrator.

In addition, the Administrator will have the benefit of the counsel of a special advisory committee made up of representatives of the major farm organizations, food and fiber exporters, representatives of the voluntary agencies such as CARE and church groups, and representatives of voluntary health groups.

Public Law 480 will be extended for 5 years, with an authorized program level of $10 billion for the 5-year period.

We shall tell the new nations that we are going to "back stop" them in their plans to industrialize, and to improve their economies by way of long-term loans for purchase of U.S. abundant foods. We are not going to stand idly by and watch them tighten their already pinched belts by cutting down on food imports at the time when they need still larger imports. We know that they are trying to conserve their limited amounts of capital in order to wisely and prudently expand their productive base.

We shall through the Peace Food Administration cooperate with other member-nations of the United Nations to establish national food reserves in food deficit areas, contributing specified amounts of existing CCC holdings.

Because most of the people of the world are hungry for fats, we will channel edible oils by donation into any of the international programs such as national food reserve, the United Nations Development Fund, or our own bilateral relief feeding programs.

We shall see that the foreign currencies resulting from title I sales shall be used to promote both vocational and general education in the countries concerned.

We shall see that such funds are used upon request to pay for increased FAO technical assistance in conducting nutrition research and surveys, and carrying on programs that feed the hungry, and in training local people needed to manage these programs.

Through the Peace Food Administration we can work out plans to support the FAO's projected Free the World From Hunger Campaign; to find the means to aid in overseas school lunch campaigns, summer camp programs, and milk feeding programs.

Through the Peace Food Administration we can move swiftly when famine or disaster strike, bringing aid to those sorely in need.

Through this projected agency, we can sit down together with representatives of other exporting nations and make sure that we are working toward the common good. We can work with representatives of those countries whose people are in need, and plan the best ways of supplying the need. If we can write mutual defense agreements with some 45 nations of the world to check military aggression, surely we can write mutual food agreements designed to check hunger and malnutrition.

I firmly believe that a Peace Food Administration operating for these purposes and along these general lines, would open new doors of opportunity for our own hard pressed farm people, and new doors of opportunity toward building a peaceful world.

It offers us a dramatic way to show the world we care more about people living, than people dying.

We need far less talk that portrays us as a bellicose and belligerent people, and much more emphasis on the works of peace—emphasis on programs and policies that are aimed at better living for people everywhere.

The world is weary of war, and threats of war.

The people of this world want someone to help them on the path of helping themselves, rather than someone to frighten them.

What the world needs is hope and promise, not fear and tragedy.

What the world needs is more leaders who really care about people.

Old Fighter Planes or Food?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 28, 1959

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the essence of the current foreign aid dispute between military aid and economic aid was brilliantly distilled recently by an editorial in the Milwaukee Journal entitled "Old Fighter Planes or Food?" I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OLD FIGHTER PLANES OR FOOD?

Haiti has been recently plagued by starvation. Inflation has all but wrecked its economy. Yet, according to Marquis Childs, when a recent visitor called on President Francois Duvalier to talk over the nation's problems he was greeted with the astonishing statement that the urgent need was for some modern fighter planes.

A nation deep in poverty and needing no more arms than necessary for internal security demanding modern fighter planes.

Yet this is an all too typical picture in many Latin American countries. Representative CHESTER BOWLES (Democrat, Conn.) has been making this point in a powerful series of speeches in Congress. He is arguing for an end to much military aid and a bolstering up of meaningful economic aid.

Military equipment, most of it obsolete to our own forces, is sent to many a country which can't afford to keep it in operation. Money is wasted that is badly needed to overcome poverty and bring economic development. The military equipment is in every way a burden on the people—and often a means of keeping them enslaved or threatening them with entanglement in war.

Haiti spends 20 percent of its budget on military and constabulary forces—much of it keeping up equipment we give to no real purpose. Brazil spends 29 percent; Chile, 24 percent; Paraguay, 28 percent; Peru, 20 percent; Colombia, 21 percent; Honduras, 18 percent.

The United States, of course, spends 50 percent of its budget on Defense Department military functions—57 percent if one includes atomic energy, defense stockpiling and military assistance. Under President Eisenhower's proposed budget for 1960, national security costs would take 59 percent of the budget.

The United States, however, is a rich nation. There is reason to believe that its deterrent force has, at least, helped keep the world from major war. Our Armed Forces have strength and purpose. Those of most small countries do not. And our forces, the UN and the Organization of American States (OAS) protect the Latin American nations from aggression.

The money used for unneeded military forces by Latin American nations, put into economic development and programs to feed and educate people, would go a long way toward making these nations modern and self-sufficient. Our military aid program invites them to saddle their people with wasteful and unneeded military burdens.

It ought to be reduced in most and cut out in many instances.

Atlantic City, the Gay Dowager

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 28, 1959

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, a few days ago Atlantic City, one of the finest resort communities in the Nation, prepared a special supplement for the New York Times outlining the many advantages and facilities of that great city.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the lead article from this supplement, written by John T. Cunningham, of the staff of the Newark Evening News. This material is a chapter from Mr. Cunningham's book "The New Jersey Shore," recently published by Rutgers University Press.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GAY DOWAGER

(By John T. Cunningham)

(The following is a condensation of the chapter on Atlantic City from Mr. Cunningham's comprehensive and appealing book, "The New Jersey Shore," recently published by Rutgers University Press, New Brunswick, N.J. Mr. Cunningham, a native Jerseyite, is also author of a number of equally interesting and authoritative subjects on New Jersey.)

Imagine a city on a sandbar 4 miles at sea, where nothing can be grown and no fresh water is naturally available. Imagine skyscraper hotels built on sand, amusement piers jutting into the ocean nearly a half mile, boards spread over a million square feet to keep restless feet out of the sand—and all of these where there is no steel, no lumber, no clay. Imagine a city with 60,000 year-round residents in the most unlikely spot possible for a city.

That's Atlantic City.

Take this unlikely city and make it so elastic that it must absorb as many as a half million people every weekend in July or August—people who come or go unpredictably, and usually without advance notice, lured by hot sun or repelled by cool rain. The city must be prepared to feed, house, amuse, doctor and pamper these people on cue. Visitors expect sanitary and healthful beaches, so the waste of a half-million humans must be disposed of.

Enough of logic or illogic. Atlantic City for 75 years has been America's best-known resort. Today its millions of annual visitors come from far and wide; it is safe to say that practically everyone in the country has been in Atlantic City or knows personally someone who has been there.

Atlantic City's shimmering glory reaches its peak in July and August, as is the case with all resort towns, but its strength has been the ability to keep people coming around the calendar. A recent study by

the Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia disclosed a startling fact: 75 percent of Atlantic City's estimated annual $700 million to $800 million business is transacted in the off months, from September to June. That's contrary to all resort rules.

Atlantic City's off-season success lies largely in its ability to cater to the American propensity for birds of like feather to convention together. Sooner or later every organization chooses Atlantic City for its convention—one out of every five conventions held in America gathers on the Boardwalk.

Week in and week out they convene—doctors, lawyers, bankers, teachers, plumbers, industrialists, labor leaders, morticians, and a thousand and one other varieties of men and women who meet to exchange ideas and to hear of new developments. They come because the city's 300 to 400 hotels and motels can house them, because the city's 500 restaurants can feed them, and because the gigantic convention hall can accommodate more people than live permanently in Asbury Park and Long Branch put together.

Atlantic City supplies amusement to meet virtually any tourist or convention demand, tailored to fit virtually any wallet. A writer for the American Guide Series once summed it up about as well as can be done:

"Atlantic City is an amusement factory, operated on the straight line, mass production pattern. The belt is the Boardwalk along which each specialist adds his bit to assemble the finished product—the departing visitor—sated, tanned, and bedecked with souvenirs."

Two things—transportation and promotion—transformed Atlantic City from a barren island wasteland to what she is today.

First and foremost came transportation. A small band of enthusiasts built the first link, over the rivers and through the woods and across the bay, and on July 1, 1854, a Camden & Atlantic Railroad train rolled across the south Jersey flatland from Camden to Atlantic City in 2½ hours. Aboard rode 600 dignitaries, and, of course, the press. Never has the press been very far from Atlantic City's heart or mind.

Railroads brought weekending millions to Atlantic City faster than many of them could get to their jobs during the week. The city, led by its hotelkeepers, firmly decided that prosperity lay in spreading the magic name throughout the land—throughout the world, in case any Hindus or Egyptians or Mongols might be planning a world tour.

Promotion reached high peaks in Atlantic City long before the grandfathers of today's Madison Avenue hucksters even discovered the word "colossal." One bit of promotion caught hold and became a major tradition. Word of the centennial exposition in Philadelphia in 1876 caused some hustlers in Atlantic City to suggest an Easter parade in the resort town on Easter Sunday.

Not many arrived on the 1876 Easter special trains, but in 1896 nearly 40,000 folks strolled the Boardwalk to show their finery on a cool Easter Sunday. By leaving off their coats, though, "bright and chipper Easter girls and many fashionably attired young men * * * made themselves believe it was a balmy day." That could have been written about this year, or any of the years since 1896. The Easter parade, widely imitated, has never ceased to be an Atlantic City institution.

Atlantic City made the beautiful girl its symbol, and with its mimeograph machines created the legend that every American female is shaped in a mold marked 36-24-36, give or take a bit. Promoters have put as many young women as possible into bathing suits and paraded them before judges to prove the figures.

Miss America rules supreme as the queen of American beauty, just as she has ever since the first of her royal family was discovered in Atlantic City in 1921. She also rules supreme as the top American promotional device; she has been imitated everywhere. Today, of course, Miss America is chosen merely to prove that talent is not dead. The fact that the hotels and the boardwalk get an extra week's business is merely a pleasant coincidence.

Atlantic City has been called many things (with views of visiting journalists sometimes disagreeing with typewriters in the city's publicity office). However, ever since the old resort paused in 1954 to celebrate its hundredth anniversary, the term Gay Dowager creeps into an occasional official press release.

Gay Dowager—that's good. That's a way to say that practically nothing under the Atlantic City sun is new—but that an annual spring beauty treatment hides the wrinkles and the gray hair and makes the old girl as chipper as a youngster.

What really is new at Atlantic City?

The boardwalk? Not a bit of it—the present boardwalk dates from 1896, allowing for a widening to 60 feet in 1902 and for the annual $100,000 refurbishing. The present boardwalk is old, but at that is only the fifth in a line dating from 1870.

Atlantic City's rise dates from the first boardwalk, and to this day Atlantic City's charm centers around that wooden pathway. There is nothing like it on the face of the earth, and—even though shops may be featuring the latest fads and boardwalk theaters may be showing the latest Hollywood smashes—the boardwalk's appeals are old, old stuff.

The amusement piers have stretched out over the Atlantic Ocean since 1882; the newest of the lot came into being in 1913. None is as much a magnet as the Steel Pier, with its incredible variety of amusement, but that dates all the way back to 1898. Possibly no single amusement enterprise in any corner of the globe has been as widely advertised as the Steel Pier, probably no other single spot has featured as many different stars of show business.

For all the hotels and amusements and promotion, Atlantic City's real attraction is its beach which in its organization and its safety is one of the wonders of the modern resort world.

Each year as many as 10 million people go down to the sea at Atlantic City. Often 200,000 people—half the population of Newark—swim on a Saturday or a Sunday. Just the immensity of these masses would make it seem inevitable that a few would be lost, stomped down to the ocean's bottom to perish. That makes the record of the Atlantic City Beach Patrol far more than laudable; it's fantastic.

Records carefully kept by the Beach Patrol starting in 1913 show some astounding facts. Since 1913 the patrol has rescued nearly 65,000 persons, with an average of well under a single drowning per year—less than 1 drowning a year, out of 10 million people who enter the ocean.

No one knows for sure how many people have ridden out to Atlantic City by train or by wagon or by automobile since 1854. Surely the number from the time Absecon Boulevard was finished in 1919 approaches the half-billion mark. Probably a billion people is not too high a guess at the total of visitors over a full century of time.

Most would agree that these days Atlantic City is handsome and affable and charming—the year round. In November 20,000 to 30,000 New Jersey teachers crowd its hotels for their convention. In December the city and its neighbors sparkle with a splendorous Christmas glow. The New Year holiday attracts 50,000 or more people—a good mid-July crowd for most resorts. Huge crowds jam the Boardwalk when Washington's Birthday falls on a weekend. Easter Sunday finds the planks echoing to the tap of new high heels. Summer weekends bring pleasure-bent crowds.

All year long the show goes on—for conventions, for reunions, for holidays. Atlantic City stays alive. Regardless of varying opinions about the queen, she is remarkable. She loves people, she lives to welcome them, to entertain them, to send them home eager to return.

Atlantic City is exciting and warmhearted. She makes a man spend a bankroll without a murmur. She is nice to children, hints at excitement for their parents. She sparkles, she fascinates, she warms. You've got to like the "Gay Dowager"; she gives you a run for your money.

Cal Farley's Boys Ranch Has Helped Many Homeless Youngsters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 28, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, more than 1,500 homeless boys have found shelter and, more important, love and a sense of responsibility and belonging, at Cal Farley's Boys Ranch near Amarillo, Tex.

Mr. Farley has operated the Boys Ranch for 20 years and has helped a great many young men on their way to happy, productive lives. In a Nation with growing juvenile delinquency problems, Cal Farley's Ranch shows one way delinquency can be prevented.

Mr. President, the State of Texas and this Nation are much better places because of men like Cal Farley. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Delta Democrat-Times, as reprinted by the Amarillo (Tex.) Globe-Times for Thursday, April 16, 1959, under the heading "Cal Farley's Rule."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAL FARLEY'S RULE

Cal Farley has operated a boys ranch at Amarillo, Tex., for 20 years. More than 1,500 homeless boys have found a home there and grown to manhood. So when Farley passes on some rules for rearing men, dads with just one or two boys might do well to pay attention. Farley says the rules are deceptively simple and therefore easy to overlook. He lists them as follows:

Teach the boy to obey. A boy's own rules turn out to be no rules at all. Take time to be a boy's companion. Be specific with the boy. Uncertainty in youth leaves the door open for lifelong doubt and conflict. Give the boy responsibility. Let him learn early how to be part of a team. Love the boy. Show him that love is a kind of mutual respect, reflecting itself in one's conduct. (The Delta Democrat-Times.)

The Negro and Desegregation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 28, 1959

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Negro and Desegregation," published in the Anderson (S.C.) Herald of January 18, 1959. The Herald is South Carolina's leading Negro newspaper.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NEGRO AND DESEGREGATION

The desegregation movement has shifted to Atlanta, Ga. This writer predicted in an editorial in the Telegram a year ago that the battle for integration for the rest of the South would be won or lost at Atlanta.

This Atlanta movement is not completely understandable to a Negro who thinks, and who wants to see his race advance on all fronts. Atlanta is the Negro capital of the world. There is no city anywhere in the world where Negroes own as much as those in Atlanta.

It is the Negro business, educational, and cultural center of the world. There is no other city that has six Negro colleges and universities. There are 228 Negro college instructors and professors employed by these 6 institutions.

It appears that the Negro leaders are a little off in their thinking. The State of Georgia would give those six schools of higher learning what ever millions they needed to make them second to none, and it appears to me that any sensible Negro would rather attend a school operated by his own race than he would one operated by others.

What will happen to these six colleges and universities if Negroes are admitted to the white colleges of the State? What will happen to these 238 instructors and professors under integration? What will happen to the other four Negro colleges in the State?

Someone has definitely sold the Negro leaders a bill of goods on integration to the extent that they are willing to sacrifice economic advantages for the mere privilege of associating with others on an equal basis. The unfortunate thing about this whole issue is that the masses of Negroes have had no opportunity to be heard. This integration movement is carried on by the so-called uppercrust Negro, the fortunate few, and they do not have the welfare of the masses of Negroes at heart.

These leaders who are fighting for desegregation, practice more segregation against their own people than they themselves are victims of at the hands of others. Not only are the unfortunate members of our race segregated by the so-called uppercrust Negro, but these well situated advocates of integration will not help the masses of our race although they are able to do so.

Ted Lewis is one of Atlanta's leading Negro businessmen. Some time ago he was having financial difficulty. He went to some of the city's leading Negro businessmen, including the bankers, and tried to borrow $2,500. They turned him down flat. He went to the small-loan department of the C and S Bank. One of the officials went over his plans with him, and then recommended that he borrow $5,000 instead of $2,500. The bank let him have the money without question. As the result he is a success today, a credit to Georgia and his race.

These big Negroes who are running roughshod over everyone in their fight for integration, won't help deserving members of their own race, and they are creating so much bitterness, hatred and prejudice, that before long these little Negroes won't be able to get the help in the future from white people that they have gotten in the past.

These advocates of desegregation want to force white people to desegregate, but they haven't desegregated within our race. In some sections of South Carolina the yellow Negroes won't have anything to do with the dark Negroes. I know Negroes in Charleston who will not speak to other Negroes because they are of different stations in life.

In some sections the yellow and mulatto Negroes have churches that dark Negroes cannot attend. Out from Bridgeton, New Jersey is a community known as Gouldtown. They are all white-looking Negroes, and will not accept a pastor sent by the Bishop unless he is near white.

The educated Negro shuns the uneducated of his race. The professional members of our race will rob and exploit the unfortunate members of our race. But they refuse to associate with them on an equal social basis.

When you know the facts about the so-called big Negroes, this fight for integration becomes a huge joke. At the rate that they are going, in a few years there will not be a Negro race. You can hardly conceive of sensible leaders advocating a movement that is going to do away with our race. But that is what they are doing.

There are no people who should be prouder of their race, and their heritage, than us. We should not suffer from a persecution or inferiority complex to the extent that we will go to court to convince others that we are their equal. You should feel that you are the equal of any man and demonstrate if by your character and deportment, and you will win the respect and admiration of others to the extent that you will not be regarded as a Negro, but as a man, an American.

I spent this weekend in Atlanta to get a firsthand report on reaction to recent Federal court decisions on buses and schools.

One Negro leader explained their fight for integration in the colleges in this manner. "If our youngsters go to their schools they will form friendships that will pay off in the future. When that white boy gets at the top in the business world," he said, "and an opening comes, he will reach back for his colored classmate. Many positions will be filled by Negroes because of the ties formed in college. These opportunities would come through no other manner," he concluded.

In other words, we want to ride to the top on the other fellow's coattail. We should seek job opportunity and advance on merit, ability and qualifications, and not because of our friendship with someone else. Be prepared and seek job opportunities on your own. Integration is not going to make up for the lack of preparation. Integration is not a cureall for our many problems.

Proposed Repeal of the Loyalty Oath

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 28, 1959

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix an editorial from the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch commenting upon the bill introduced by Senator CLARK and me to repeal the special oath and affidavit required under the National Defense Education Act.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR KENNEDY'S GOOD EXAMPLE

Senator KENNEDY of Massachusetts has declared himself in favor of repealing the special loyalty oath required of students who receive loans under the Defense Education Act. He has done so in recognition of the fact that there is a growing list of colleges that have declined to take funds under a law whose disclaimer affidavit amounts to a reflection on the patriotism of loyal students. We trust that Senators HENNINGS and SYMINGTON of Missouri both are opposed to the oath requirement and are sure that Senator DOUGLAS is also opposed. If enough Congressmen will declare themselves, the repeal of this offensive as well as ineffective throwback to the McCarthy era will take place almost automatically.

Inflation: What Businessmen Can Do About It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 28, 1959

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Inflation: What Businessmen Can Do About It," delivered by Mr. James F. Oates, Jr., president of the Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INFLATION: WHAT BUSINESSMEN CAN DO ABOUT IT

(By James F. Oates, Jr.)

Next July the Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States will celebrate its 100th anniversary, which qualifies it as a venerable institution. In comparison with the New York Chamber of Commerce, however, the Equitable appears as an upstart. The chamber had been functioning for 91 years when the Equitable was founded. Think of it.

The Equitable has long been a supporter of the chamber. Mr. Thomas I. Parkinson, whose portrait hangs on the front wall of this room was president of the Equitable for 26 years, from 1927 to 1953. He was very active in chamber affairs throughout most of that period, and from May 1934 to May 1936 served as president of both the chamber and the Equitable. Many of you will remember him as a pioneer and fearless crusader against inflationary policies when the Nation first started down that dangerous and uncharted road. I understand he does you and me the honor of being here today.

Today the Equitable has 18 officers who carry membership in the New York chamber. I am told that this exceeds the number of members affiliated with any other corporation in the city. Four Equitable officers have important assignments on working committees of the New York chamber, and three sit on committees of the national chamber.

Today all business and community leaders as well as all business associations face together a critical challenge to close ranks in the battle against inflation, to close ranks behind capable organizations like the New York chamber and the national chamber, which are in the forefront of the anti-inflation fight.

ILLUSIONS ABOUT INFLATION MUST BE CORRECTED

By and large the public knows little or nothing about the causes of inflation and too many of them think the consequences are desirable. Even among some businessmen and professional people, there exists an alarming state of ignorance and apathy as to its consequences and yet a rather fatalistic acceptance that continuing inflation is inevitable. As I see it, the battle against inflation must be waged on the educational front. We shall win the battle only when the mass of our voters come to understand at least the fundamentals of the causes and consequences of inflation.

The fear of inflation is an important factor behind the drop in the past few months in Government security prices and the subsequent record high levels in stock market prices. Recent stock market behavior points the wholesome lesson that prices will not inevitably and continuously rise. In recent weeks, however, price earnings ratios for common stocks have reached historic highs and prices of long-term U.S. Governments were near historic lows. This led one reputable financial newsletter to observe, after serious and deliberate reflection, that either we were in a new era and ought to recast our thinking accordingly, or we were not in a new era and should ponder more carefully the ominous significance of these historical facts and relationships.

FACT FINDING COMES FIRST

Obviously a great need exists for ascertaining, analyzing and interpreting the facts bearing on inflation. We in the business community have a great responsibility to the Nation at large to present and analyze these facts for the general public. This is, as I am sure you realize, easier said then done. Inflation is a mysterious phenomenon, both in its nature and in its source. The experts violently disagree. We must try to isolate and focus attention on the fundamentals.

We have a responsibility to clear up the misunderstanding which exists regarding the nature and extent of our recent price advances. We have a responsibility to give proper perspective to this price experience for purposes of assessing the current economic situation. We have a responsibility in educating the public to recognize the degree to which current inflationary pressures are within man's control. And we have a responsibility and opportunity to lead others to proceed vigorously toward removing those inflationary pressures that continue to plague us.

THE CONSUMER GOES ON A SPENDING SPREE

Let us look for a moment at the Consumer Price Index—the most comprehensive measure of goods and services that individuals buy. In the 1945–48 period, associated primarily with the immediate aftermath of war, and in 1950–52, a period that embraced a war, the Consumer Price Index rose by 5 percent or better per year. Since 1952, however, and despite a substantial price increase in the past 2 years, the price rise has averaged only one and one-half percent per year.

The price rise in the immediate postwar period, 1945–48, is, of course, explainable largely by the fact that the huge reserve of buying power built up during the war by business, banks and consumers was unleashed during a competitive scramble to acquire the still limited quantity of available civilian goods. This great demand for goods was intensified by the enormous pentup desires of the public—desires which were denied during 3½ years of war and the initial years of peace following the war. The price rise in the 1950–52 period is similarly attributable first to the buying spree at the start of the Korean war induced by memories of shortages and second to the subsequent large-scale increase in military spending.

The only other postwar period in which prices rose sharply was in 1955–58 when the Consumer Price Index registered a 3 percent per year increase. In 1955 we had the fantastic boom in consumer spending on housing and automobiles that was financed in part by a previously scheduled $5 billion tax cut and by an unprecedented expansion in consumer credit. In 1956 and 1957 record high investments in new plant and equipment were incurred as manufacturers strove to increase capacity to fulfill their revised estimates of current and future demand.

ADDITIONAL PRESSURES ON PRICES

In the past 12 months, a period first of sharply declining business activity and, later, of recent partial recovery, prices continued to rise. One of the principal reasons for such increase was the wage increases granted under new labor contracts or automatically under contracts negotiated in previous years. The impact of such long-term contracts can be sizable. Dr. Yale Brozen, University of Chicago economist, estimates "that 4.5 million workers will receive such wage increases in 1958; and many of them * * * in industries which at the time were facing severe unemployment—such as steel and railroads."

The Federal Reserve's reversal, in the autumn of 1957, of its tight money policy in order to increase the amount of credit available was another important factor in supporting prices. The impact of its various operations can best be measured by the change in the loan and investment accounts of the commercial banks and by the change in the free reserve position of the System's member banks. From the end of November 1957 to the end of July 1958, the loan and investment portfolios of commercial banks increased by $10 billion; during the same 8 months, member banks' free reserves (i.e., their excess reserves less borrowings) grew by almost a billion dollars and in the process changed from a net debt position to a status of substantial surplus.

INFLATIONARY BIAS ALLOWED TO CREEP IN

While the factors above-enumerated were of special import in explaining price changes in specific periods since World War II, other factors were imparting an inflationary bias to our economy throughout the entire postwar period.

First is the inflationary bias resulting from interpretation of the Employment Act of 1946 to mean that policies favoring maximum employment and production are to be given priority over price stability. I use the term "interpretation" advisedly because the wording in the act states clearly that, "It is the continuing policy and responsibility of the Federal Government to use all practicable means * * * to promote maximum employment, production, and purchasing power." This statutory language certainly implies that the maintenance of maximum purchasing power (i.e., price stability) is equal and coordinate in status with the other goals of maximum employment and production.

Dr. Edwin G. Nourse, former Chairman, Council of Economic Advisers, under the Truman administration, has publicly voiced the same viewpoint. He recently stated that: "The greatest threat to the accomplishments of the objectives of the Employment Act is to be found in the inflationary bias that we have allowed to creep in." Notice the use of the phrase "allowed to creep in." There is nothing in the act itself that requires or authorizes the Government to subordinate the objectives of maintaining price stability to the objective of maintaining "full" or "maximum employment." By permitting the currency to depreciate, the other objectives of the Employment Act are imperiled. If a proper and sustainable economic growth is to be attained, no single one of the triumvirate of objectives can be ignored or given less favored treatment.

The second major factor tending to give an inflationary bias in recent years is our entire political and economic environment. It is an environment which permits, indeed encourages, labor to seek wage increases in excess of productivity gains. It is an environment which acquiesces in the absorption by business of wage increases as added costs and their transference to the consuming public in the form of higher prices.

Finally, another very important inflationary force is the new peacetime high Federal spending program for fiscal year 1959 and its associated record peacetime Federal deficit. As you know, official Budget Bureau estimates place that deficit at slightly over $12 billion.

Because of present bond market conditions, current expectations seem to be that the bulk of that deficit will be financed by the sale of short-term Government securities. To the extent that such Treasury financing is done, not with the savings of nonbank investors, but with borrowings from the commercial banks, to that extent inflation will be encouraged.

SUBSTANTIAL INFLATION UNLIKELY—MILD INFLATION A POSSIBILITY

Now, in the light of these circumstances, what can we say about our past inflation? It is submitted that certain of the important inflationary pressures and conditions that have existed in the immediate past either do not exist at present or do not carry the same impact. For an obvious example, we do not now face an enormous pentup postwar demand for housing, automobiles and other consumer durables. These past demands have been satisfied. Current demands for such items are of much less size and intensity. The huge reserve of buying power built up during the war has been greatly reduced. Our tremendous output of goods and services during recent years has seen to that. The capacity presently available to meet an increased demand is also substantial. This is true, not only in terms of idle plant and equipment, but also in terms of idle manpower and idle natural resources.

With these specific inflationary pressures now removed or dampened considerably, sharp price rises of, say, 4 or 5 percent or more per year are most improbable. If people fear a sever inflation of this degree, their fears are groundless. There is nothing to suggest that we place a high degree of probability on such a rise occurring. It will not occur unless war comes again.

Let us consider the period since 1952. The easy consumer credit which figured importantly in the recent boom can hardly, at the present time, be made any easier. Further impact along these lines is bound to be much less in the future than in the past. Both widespread industry cost-cutting and large-scale business expenditures for modernizing plant and equipment have helped in recent months to increase productivity sharply and to enhance appreciably the economy's ability to supply in increasing amounts the goods and services the consumer will demand, as recovery moves ahead. Furthermore, the Federal Reserve has now abandoned its easy money policy and is more watchfully concerned with a policy of comfortable restraint towards the inflationary pressures that may develop.

With the upswing in the economy, the clamor for tax cuts has disappeared—despite earnest predictions made last spring and winter by many prominent persons that unless tax cuts were forthcoming quickly and in sizable amounts, the economy would rapidly go to pot. Well, the economy didn't go to pot and instead is displaying renewed vigor. The business recovery, now underway, will raise corporate profits and personal incomes. These will automatically increase tax contributions to the Treasury and thereby reduce the Federal deficit for fiscal 1959 by a few billions of dollars. Secretary of Treasury Anderson said recently that the recovery will not only replenish our revenues but will help us to reduce Government expenditures in some areas. The President's recent emphasis on economy measures is most significant and heartening.

Results of recent Treasury financing programs are, in some important respects, encouraging and may augur well for the future. Because of realistic pricing, nonbank subscribers are figuring more importantly than originally expected. This may then be evidence that satisfactory rates will increase substantially nonbank purchases of Treasury securities and will help to reduce the inflationary potential inherent in financing the Federal deficit through the commercial banks.

In the light of all these considerations the average price increase in the years immediately ahead is not likely to differ significantly from the 1½ percent per year experience recorded since 1952. I must say that within the present framework of fiscal responsibility and political-economic conditions such an average price rise is quite possible. Therefore, I repeat that future price increases of 4 or 5 percent per year are most unlikely while increases of 2 percent per year or less are a possibility.

INFLATION NEITHER DESIRABLE NOR ACCEPTABLE

Is such a so-called mild inflation desirable and therefore acceptable? Some people think so. They think that it is good or even essential for economic growth. These people overlook our historical record which indicates we have had economic growth when price levels were stable or falling.

Some like it for its exhilarating effects. In its early stages inflation produces, like an opiate, a sense of well-being and prosperity. They forget that, like an opiate, it requires increasingly large dosages to produce the same stimulation and after continued usage produces moral decay, social injustices, and eventually economic stagnation. Consequently, mild inflations are neither desirable nor acceptable as a way of life. When businessmen assume inflation in their planning they necessarily help to create it.

REJECTS IDEA OF INEVITABILITY

Others avoid the issue of desirability and acceptability and instead cry out, "What are we to do? Inflation is inevitable." I not only reject the assumption of desirability and acceptability, but also reject categorically the assumption of inevitability. I reject it on the grounds of general economic facts which indicate otherwise, and I also reject it on the grounds that much of our political-economic environment is capable of change and that we can change it. Many Americans were highly pleased to note that Mr. Julian Baird, Under Secretary of the Treasury, recently stated that inflation was not inevitable; that it was man-made and could be man-controlled.

Dr. Per Jacobsson, managing director of the International Monetary Fund, in a recent speech before the American Finance Association in New York, reported that in his travels throughout Europe he is repeatedly confronted with the question: "Will inflation be checked in America?" His reply is always "Yes," based upon his analysis of the economic facts and his interpretation of the Federal Reserve's willingness to fight inflation vigorously and early.

Dr. Jacobson gives the following reasons why he believes inflation will be checked in America:

1. American labor is tending to price itself out of both the domestic and world markets. This is reflected domestically by widespread installation of new labor-saving equipment and abroad by loss of export markets for many products. Nearly 4 million workers are still unemployed and the labor force increases by 800,000 annually.

2. There exists much excess idle plant capacity.

3. Many raw material substitutes are now available which compete with rubber, wool and cotton. Aluminum, for which we have great capacity, is replacing steel for many structural uses and is substituting for copper in parts of the electrical industry.

4. Amazing worldwide technological progress in agriculture confronts the United States with a long-term problem of surplus agricultural commodities. Europe now is practically self-sufficient in most agricultural products and, hence, U.S. export markets for agricultural commodities will be greatly impaired.

5. Industrial technology has progressed rapidly in Europe. Europeans have adopted American methods and with modern plants are now obtaining high productivity from their labor. This offers increasing competition in world markets for American manufactured goods.

6. Courageous action in early stages of the present recovery in the United States indicates the Federal Reserve's determination to keep inflation under control in this country.

In conclusion he said, "Let's hope that developments from here forward in America demonstrate that I have given my friends good advice."

I agree with Per Jacobsson that favorable conditions now exist for stalling or slowing down the price rise of recent years and I also agree that with wise and courageous action we can check inflation in America. The acceptance of the inevitability of a continued price rise is not an acknowledgment of economic determinism but merely a political judgment that the will to control it has disappeared.

NOW IS TIME TO STRIKE EFFECTIVELY AGAINST INFLATION

Now is the time to face up to the very essence of our democracy and to show the world that we do have the courage to govern ourselves wisely; that we do have a proper sense of values and are ready to decide what needs we shall give up to make other needs more secure; that we do possess capable reasoning powers and have the wit to think our problems through to an effective solution; and that we do have the self-discipline, ability, and courage to stand by our values and see our policies through whatever the personal cost.

Now is the time to destroy some of the illusions we have acquired, to destroy the belief that easy money which encourages excessive debt is sound, to destroy the illusion "that we can get more out of our economy than we put in." Instead we must develop higher levels of economic citizenship and still higher levels of public and private responsibility. We must display the moral stamina necessary to place long-run interests of our Nation ahead of individual personal desires.

Our Government sets the economic tone and climate for the country, and since the Federal deficit is the harbinger of an increased money supply and later inflationary pressure, the crux of the anti-inflation fight must be waged first at the Government level. Federal expenditures must be brought into an early balance with the level dictated by Federal receipts.

CONGRESS HAS POWER TO CONTROL INFLATION

Inflation control is within the power of the Congress and many of its Members know it. Congressman JOHN BYRNES, of Wisconsin, for example, told his fellow legislators not so long ago, "The situation we are facing today and the cause of it is no secret. A majority of the Congress has gone wild in authorizing and appropriating for new and increased expenditures. It is going to do you no good to blame the executive or anyone else. The executive cannot spend 1 cent that this Congress does not authorize and appropriate."

A few months ago, Representative CLARENCE CANNON, of Missouri, chairman, House Appropriations Committee, also in the same vein told his colleagues, "When you go home at the close of this session and your people complain about the high cost of living, do not pass the buck. Tell them the facts. Tell them the national debt is higher because you voted to make it higher. Tell them the dollar has gone down and the cost of groceries has gone up because you voted to depreciate the dollar and voted to raise prices."

We need, I insist, to recognize that the success of our efforts will depend primarily upon our success in convincing the Congress to set the proper tone and climate for the Nation's activities. We need to persuade the Congress to act so as to encourage respect for monetary stability. Such respect for the value of the dollar can best be encouraged, on the one hand, by a demonstration of fiscal integrity with either a check on Federal spending or increased taxation so as to achieve early restoration of a balanced budget and, on the other hand, by a national declaration of purpose with regard to the level of prices that could achieve a moral force equal and coordinate to that already attained with respect to the levels of production and employment. It is high time that we stop fencing with windmills and concentrate our attention on the political scene where the malignancy of inflation originates.

BUSINESSMEN SHOULD HELP CONGRESS

Let us, however, be fair enough to realize that Congress is subjected to a constant variety of pressures advanced by groups of citizens seeking to advance their own respective self-interests. I have often thought that the role of a Member of Congress is far from enviable. He is placed under continuous exhortation by articulate constituents and held accountable for Jovian wisdom on imponderable issues of the greatest complexity. Many of the issues respecting inflatfon and the causes are intricate, technical, and highly controversial. A Congressman cannot be expected to be expert in all fields. He needs help in understanding the issues. Can he be blamed for voting inflationary policies if all he hears week in and week out is special pleading by representatives of labor, agriculture, and yes, business?

I submit that criticism can fairly be leveled at business leaders who are informed of the facts but who have failed to exhaust all efforts to develop a general public understanding of the issues. We need to correct the faulty impression of some members of our society regarding the assumed inevitability, desirability, and acceptability of inflation.

NEED IS TO ORGANIZE ANTI-INFLATION FORCES

We need to formulate a national policy against inflation and to band together for concerted action. We need to line up solidly behind capable organizations such as the local and national chambers of commerce which are already active in the fight against inflation. Such organizations are well organ-

ized to lead the fight. Since they are already in existence nationally and locally in communities across the Nation, they are well suited to be one of the main rallying points for local, regional, and national forces interested in stemming inflation.

If we can all recognize even mild inflation for what it is—a symptom of failure—failure on our part to govern ourselves wisely, if we can all recognize that for the community as a whole there is no hedge against inflation, and, finally, if we can all recognize the price paid to avoid any inflation is much less than the price exacted by further inflation—then, and only then, shall we have laid the groundwork for a successful anti-inflation campaign.

To do this, we in industry, must give our chambers of commerce our fullest financial support. We need to develop our techniques for participating actively on both an individual and corporate basis and on all levels and in all phases of the anti-inflation fight. We need to organize to share our experiences in this matter and to discuss the best ways and means to carry the fight forward.

We in the Equitable are sincerely interested in pursuing this matter further. We are ready to cooperate, to our fullest extent, with the New York and national chambers in implementing and invigorating the anti-inflation forces of our country. May I hope that all of you will share these views and join hands in this great effort, upon the success of which the future of our Nation and the freedom of the Western World are so largely dependent.

The Life and Career of John Foster Dulles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PRESCOTT BUSH
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 28, 1959

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD sundry editorials from four Connecticut newspapers regarding the life and career of John Foster Dulles.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New Haven (Conn.) Register, May 25, 1959]

JOHN FOSTER DULLES

History and the passage of time will, of course, have to measure fully the contributions of our former Secretary of State John Foster Dulles.

Thus will be assessed, in the ultimate, the degree of his success or failure, and the degree of international greatness to be accorded him in years to come.

However, there is one thing which can be said of John Foster Dulles right now without fear of argument or contradiction.

If courage, and fortitude, ability to rise above the ills of the body, loyalty, patriotism, and persistence in the face of adversity are the ingredients which go into the making of a great man;

Then—John Foster Dulles is assured of recognition as a great man, both now and for all time.

John Foster Dulles served the United States as its Secretary of State in a time of ever-deepening crisis.

He faced each successive crisis, too, with a will to compromise, if fair compromise could be reached, yet never with a will to appease, backtrack, or surrender.

It was this facet of his character which earned him world respect, and free world recognition as the strongest bastion in its diplomatic defensive ring.

And because of this it is now being said, and will be said for some time, that to find a replacement of equal worth will be hard indeed.

In international diplomatic circles John Foster Dulles was not a man who was universally loved, or even universally admired.

He was too firm, too dedicated for that. A position built upon moral rectitude is not easy to combat—nor, in the case of allies, is it sometimes easy with which to work. But complete respect was always commanded by John Foster Dulles, whether from friends or from foes.

And despite the slanderous attacks of Communists in recent years and the at-home cries of "brinkmanship" there was never any question of his true generosity of view. The Japanese peace treaty, which was so personal an achievement for him, is a model of constructive aid to a one-time enemy. His grasp of a democratic Germany's needs was as sympathetic as his rejection of any totalitarian taint in German postwar attitudes. Wherever there was trouble during his stewardship, he represented the United States first but provided, secondly, a sensitive concern for the requirements of nations and peoples who were our allies.

John Foster Dulles has left us all an ineradicable memory of personal gallantry in his last illness—a heritage of unimpeachable faith in his conduct of American foreign affairs. He stood foursquare on that which he believed represented the right and the just.

The American people, we feel, will recognize in this memory and in this heritage a foundation upon which can be built for John Foster Dulles a monument as firm as his own granite spirit.

[From the Hartford (Conn.) Courant, May 25, 1959]

JOHN FOSTER DULLES

It was only a little more than a month ago, on April 15, that illness forced the indestructible John Foster Dulles to retire. Today he is dead. There can be but few on this side of the Iron Curtain who do not feel sorrow, an almost personal sense of loss, at his going.

One still sees him as a tall, ruddy-complexioned man with downturned corners of a mouth ever ready to smile, as sharp eyes peered through big, round glasses. It is ironical that he should die just now. His colleagues, the Foreign Ministers of East and West, are face to face in a meeting at Geneva he did much to prepare. With no discredit to the able Mr. Herter, who is only beginning to write his own record, the allies at Geneva seem almost rudderless without the veteran we instinctively think of still as Secretary of State.

It is curious, moreover, that a free world that not long ago disagreed violently with Mr. Dulles should now look upon him with warmth and affection. Something more than the tragedy of illness and death accounts for this. Is it because we have lost a towering figure in a confused and troubled world that often seems to be led by little men?

It is no exaggeration to say that, rightly or wrongly, Mr. Dulles incarnated the unpopularity that was often the lot of the United States during his 6 years in office. The Paris taxi driver, the German newspaperman, the British professor were as one in berating him. They saw him as the man most responsible for transforming a once-idealistic United States into an atom-happy colossus that counted its strength in destructive power alone, and was all but deaf and blind to the hopes and fears of new nations of wretched peoples struggling to be free. Indeed much of the non-Communist world saw in him the source of the bitter things revealed in "The Ugly American." Typical was the Indian diplomat who said, in that musically mispronounced English of his kind, "Thees Mr. Dulles of yours is the only bull I know who brings his own china shop weeth heem."

How accurate was this view of Mr. Dulles? For the truth we shall have to await another day. But it does little good now for those of us who feel we have lost a friend and champion to gloss over the criticisms only recently hurled at him.

There is in the record, for example, his famous statement endorsing the Portuguese claim to Goa in India. NATO bases or not, this as much as anything else burned into the soul of the Far East the certainty that we are now the imperialists to be hated. Before that there was the gospel of liberation, in origin largely a domestic political attack on the policy of containment. It came to an empty end when Hungary revolted, and we could not help. Then, through all the years, there ran the doctrine of massive retaliation. It was a threat that we would drop H-bombs on Moscow if the Communists launched another brushfire war anywhere. This was at the time a necessary warning. But it was also a threat that we would start World War III over some Quemoy.

Yes, these things are in the record. But let us not forget that there are also in the record such facts as that Mr. Dulles first came to Washington at the request of former Governor Dewey in 1944. His mission was to keep the Republican Party from killing the United Nations as it had killed the League of Nations in 1920. He succeeded.

Here indeed was a man whose life, apart from an often active private career in law, had been devoted to the growth of international law. As a young man he had assisted Woodrow Wilson at Versailles. Lately, under a Democratic as under a Republican administration, he worked, often through the churches, toward peace by means of international justice. Nor let us forget that it was his insight and moral toughness that put us unerringly on the side of right in the sudden shock of the Suez war of 1956.

Most of all Mr. Dulles will be remembered, no doubt, for what was attacked as brinksmanship. This was based on his startling words in an article about him in Life in January, 1956:

"Some say that we were brought to the verge of war. Of course we were brought to the verge of war. The ability to get to the verge without getting into the war is the necessary art. If you cannot master it, you inevitably get into war. If you try to run away from it, if you are scared to go to the brink, you are lost. We've had to look it square in the face—on the question of enlarging the Korean war, on the question of getting into the Indochina war, on the question of Formosa. We walked to the brink and we looked it in the face. We took strong action."

This was the heart of the Dulles foreign policy. The thesis was not diplomatically phrased. And, on the face of it, it does look like the policy of a warmonger. Did not Mr. Dulles in fact make military pacts with any and all who announced themselves as being against communism? Did he not do so even at a cost of propping up feudal regimes whose hungry, miserable, diseased, and ignorant people were in revolt against them? He did.

To see only this, though, is to miss the point. What Mr. Dulles meant by what was damned as brinksmanship was something far different. It was the passionate determination that neither we nor the world should

be condemned once more, through the tragedy of miscalculation by an aggressor, to suffer world war. John Foster Dulles knew well that World War I, which set the course for this whole unhappy century to date, was begun because Kaiser Wilhelm didn't even know whether Great Britan would come in against him once he started to march, let alone the United States. Mr. Dulles knew, too, that tragedy had followed tragedy, until it happened all over again in World War II. By 1939 Adolf Hitler, the megalomaniac, had written off not only France but also Britain. He was also sure that a fat United States was too selfishly materialistic to lift a finger to halt the triumph of the Nazi master race and its friends. So again the same fundamental misconception brought the world to Armageddon.

This was what John Foster Dulles was passionately determined to prevent, now that he was a chief actor on the stage. And it was given to him to act a larger role than is usual for a Secretary of State. By saying one should not be afraid to go to the brink he meant that we should make it clear beyond all doubt to the postwar dictator, whether named Stalin or Khrushchev, that we would fight again if the life of freedom were again challenged. This was the direct opposite of taking foolhardy risks of war. It was the voice of an insight sharp enough, and a resolution strong enough, to keep the peace.

It would be good if this voice might be heard again today, in Geneva and in the Kremlin, warning that if need be we would fight for freedom once again. Now that cannot be. But it might be that this fundamental Dulles' thesis, as put into effect day in and day out in those incredible years of flying trips around the world, is a vital element in the free world's strength still. Whatever the future may bring, in his lifetime it did keep the peace. Let that be his monument.

[From the Naugatuck (Conn.) Daily News, May 25, 1959]

JOHN FOSTER DULLES

We cannot here and now write the verdict of history on John Foster Dulles as Secretary of State.

But in our own time, with only the short perspective of his final tragic illness, we can recognize him as a valiant, dedicated, selfless diplomatic soldier who may literally have given his life in the service of his country.

He was a soldier who did not serve in vain. He personally, as perhaps no other single Secretary of State in history, gave free men a rocklike defense against the aggressive force of totalitarian tyranny.

In his 6 crowded years as President Eisenhower's foreign affairs chief, Dulles traveled a fantastic 560,000 miles, visiting again and again every sensitive corner of the globe. He elevated face-to-face diplomacy to levels never before imagined.

The President gave him an amazingly free hand in setting the course of American policy. He was the boss of the State Department, and in effect he took it with him wherever he went.

Dulles believed that to assert the free world's strength effectively against encroaching communism, it was necessary not only to hold a tight line but to take risks. By his own word, he did.

He was a tough negotiator, a fit adversary for the stubborn Russians and Red Chinese. He was willing to move to the edge of conflict to force his opponents to back down.

These tactics kept the Red tide in check. But they did not break the stalemate. And in consequence of that, Dulles was assailed in some quarters as too rigid, too unimaginative to lead the free nations to a lasting peace, free of cold war tensions.

Some of the militant phrases he used, like "massive retaliation," were criticized as either provocative or empty of meaning.

Yet the real meaning of Dulles was not what he said but what he did. Free men everywhere saw this the instant he was stricken and could no longer serve.

Many once skeptical Asians are glad today that Dulles held firm against Peiping when it pushed against the tiny but symbolic offshore Chinese islands of Quemoy and Matsu. They are coming to see the face of communism as he saw it.

The Europeans, who many times felt him inflexible in cold war dealings, were stunned when he was no longer there to stand firm. They were grateful for his sturdiness in Berlin, in the Lebanon-Jordan Middle East crisis, in the Trieste settlement that removed a sore spot for free Italy.

His 6 years at the core of trouble in one of the world's most troubled times were the crown of a life devoted to diplomacy and pointed toward the post of Secretary of State.

While 19 and still a junior at Princeton, Dulles went to his first world conference for Theodore Roosevelt. Diplomatic assignments came often thereafter. The greatest before the Eisenhower era was his brilliant supervising of the post-World War II Japanese peace treaty.

Historians will decide whether any man could have gone beyond holding the line and led us closer to lasting peace in this tense age. Whatever their judgment of this man, it will surely be said that he tried—tried to the limits of his ability and energy. The free world honors him in death (with new and greater appreciation of his sacrifices) for his tireless efforts to keep free men free and make them secure.

[From the Bridgeport (Conn.) Post, May 25, 1959]

A DEDICATED FIGHTER FOR PEACE

John Foster Dulles was a man of tremendous, dynamic energy, a person of positive action. In one of his addresses he wrote:

"Those who love and want peace must recognize that unless they exert themselves as vigorously for peace as they do for victory, and as vigorously for justice as they do for peace, they are not apt to have either peace or justice."

In his 6 years as Secretary of State he never failed to strive for such a great goal. He did not seek the impossible and he had always before him a cold, practical policy in dealing with the international intrigue of Communist politicians. More than any other leader of the free West, he knew the full scope of the imperialistic aims of the Kremlin, the brutal stubbornness of Russian leaders, and the deadlines of Communist power.

Throughout his service, dedicated to peace and justice, in what John Adams once called our country's most important post, Mr. Dulles demonstrated his insatiable zeal, tenacious courage, and firmness in all his defensive maneuvers, in the manner of his most illustrious predecessors.

It was because of the results he accomplished, and his unwavering dedication to fighting from strength, without concession or appeasement, that President Eisenhower repeatedly referred to the late Secretary as the greatest the Nation ever had. He had no magic formula, but as a great international lawyer, better equipped for the top diplomatic post than the majority of his predecessors, he was never unrealistic in the execution of U.S. policy.

His triumphs were notable, but he had alined against him many political foes, and it was only when cancer struck him that these political leaders had a good word to say for him. And when they realized that even while ill, or recovering from surgery, Mr. Dulles was working tirelessly for his country's interests, even his most severe critics rallied to him. While in the hospital, they have prayed for his recovery, recognizing at last that his service, his patriotism, and his knowledge of the tactics of the intransigent Communists were invaluable.

Historians will, of course, assess his record in what has been called the most difficult job in the world, and his charting of the course followed by the United States and our allies through one of the most hazardous periods in modern times.

How great a champion he was to our cause in this turbulent period may never be fully known. But one thing will always stand out in the years to come. He fought valiantly for peace virtually to the day of his death and he was in a large way responsible for what peace we are enjoying today.

Oregon's Scenic Seacoast and the Town of Yachats

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 28, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, this is the centennial year of Oregon's statehood, so all of us from Oregon are profoundly conscious of the scenic and historical legacy which our great State enjoys.

The June 1959 issue of the Ford Times has published an excellent article describing the history and attractions of the Oregon seacoast community of Yachats, in Lincoln County.

Author of the article is Comdr. Nelson H. Randall, USNR, retired, who presently lives in the Willamette Valley city of Corvallis, site of Oregon State College. The article is illustrated with vivid and striking color paintings of Yachats and the Oregon coast by Nelson Sandgren, likewise a resident of Corvallis, Oreg.

I am pleased that the Ford Times and other national periodicals are featuring the Oregon shoreline, Mr. President, because it is one of the loveliest seacoasts in the world. A photographer for Life magazine once told me that he had photographed every shoreline on earth, from the Antarctic all the way to the Northwest Passage, but that none had the variety and exquisite beauty of the seacoast of Oregon.

Mr. Nelson Sandgren, with his pictures, and Comdr. Nelson H. Randall, with his article, have done justice to a portion of that seacoast, and I ask unanimous consent that the article from the Ford Times for June, by Commander Randall, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. The title of the article is "No Yachts in Yachats." Ford Times is published by the Ford Motor Co.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NO YACHTS IN YACHATS

(By Nelson H. Randall)

On the Oregon coast there is a town named Yachats. That name aroused my in-

terest, conjuring up yachts with white sails dotting a harbor, similar to those I have seen on war-time weekends at Marblehead, Massachusetts, and I felt a nostalgic urge to find out what Yachats looked like.

Driving north from Florence along U.S. Highway 101, which climbs far up on the almost vertical cliffs, I was afforded a panorama of rolling surf on a long stretch of beach; the breakers spread out like white ruffles on a petticoat. Occasionally I could see whales spouting, many of them so close to shore it was possible to distinguish their arched backs as they sounded; and at one famous spot there were hundreds of sea lions crowding the rocks.

On rounding a curve about 3 miles south of Yachats my view was suddenly blocked by the steep and rocky side of Cape Perpetua, a historic landmark which was discovered by Captain James Cook in 1778. According to his journal, he so named it because it was sighted on St. Perpetua's Day, March 7. With its jagged rocks and twisted trees, Cape Perpetua has apparently taken a perpetual beating from storms and winds, but as I saw it in the bright sunlight, looming sharp against the sky, it appeared as a symbol of perpetuity and seemed well-named.

The highway skirts the base of the cape, and the town of Yachats, when first sighted about 2 miles farther on, appears as a cluster of low, light-colored buildings on a narrow stretch of flat land squeezed between mountains and ocean. Passing an intriguing log hotel at the mouth of the Yachats River, I followed the road signs to a State park perched on a rocky point.

A friendly fisherman genially answered some questions regarding the town. Yachats is probably one of the most universally mispronounced names. In the early records it was spelled "Ya-huts," the name of a small tribe of Alsea Indians. The present pronunciation is Yah'hots. It has been said that it means "at the foot of the mountain."

My friend hauled in his line from which dangled two fat sea perch, or pink tails, as he called them. Kelp fish, rock cod, and salmon are also caught from the rocks, and, except for the salmon, no license is required to fish here. In the sandy coves nearby there are frequent runs of sea smelt, which are caught by wading waist deep into the surf with large nets. "The smelt are running" is a signal for most of the population to start running also, with their smelt nets.

When the glowing disk of the sun dropped toward the horizon, I returned to the log hotel I had noticed as I came into town, and, with the rhythmic roll of the surf in the background, was soon lulled to sleep. Next morning everybody in Yachats seemed to be out digging for razor clams.

The razor clam is unique, because it has a digging device of its own at the end of the shell opposite the neck, and once it starts going down in the soft sand it takes some fast digging to catch it. The popularity of the sport was attested by the crowd on the beach that morning, armed with clam guns, as their special shovels are called, digging hurriedly where a clam sign appeared, or lying prone with one arm down a hole, trying to outrace the bivalve.

The best clamming is at low tide, preferably a minus one, when vast expanses of nearly level beach are exposed. This also makes it easy to walk around the outcroppings of rocks, highlighted by little sequin-like pools left in the hollows by the receding tide. In these pools I found light green sea anemones, which close over and swallow whatever falls into their maws, and many other forms of multicolored sea life. Clinging to the rocky sides of these marine gardens were masses of starfish, from the tiny baby ones to big fat grandparents, sea urchins covered with purple spines, and large clusters of mussels which the early Indians used for their main item of food. On the beach I found many perfect sand dollars, and a number of agates and jaspers. This area, I learned, is a mecca for agate hunters, although the best finds are made after a storm has washed away the sand from the pebble beds.

I left Yachats reluctantly, wondering where else I could find so many interesting features per square mile. On my way out of town I paused for a last look at the fishing fleet still hovering offshore. After all, those trollers were the nearest things to yachts that I had seen around Yachats.

New Novel by Gene Hendryx, of Alpine, Tex., Relating to Marines in Wartime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 28, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, when Gene Hendryx, of Alpine, Tex., writes about the U.S. Marine Corps, the writing has a ring of authenticity. Mr. Hendryx served as a marine in World War II, in campaigns such as the Solomon slands, Guam, and Iwo Jima. He was discharged with a total disability from diseases contracted in the Pacific. He disciplined himself for recovery. He is a fighter of peace now; a fighter for good government side by side with us in Texas.

Although busily engaged as general manager of radio station KVLF in Alpine, Gene Hendryx still found time to put his memories of marines in action into a novel entitled 'Semper Fi", which is soon to be published.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the San Angelo (Tex.) Standard-Times for Sunday, March 29, 1959, entitled "Gene Hendryx Novel Slated To Go to Press in Summer."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GENE HENDRYX NOVEL SLATED TO GO TO PRESS IN SUMMER

Gene Hendryx, prominent West Texas radio station owner and ex-Marine, joined the ranks of the Nation's novelists this week with announcement by Pageant Press of New York of a summer publication date for his first book, "Semper Fi!"

Hendryx's souvenirs from World War II campaigns in the Solomon Islands, Guam, and Iwo Jima included yellow jaundice, malaria, dengue fever and just about everything else the Pacific had to offer. He also brought back enough poignant memories to fill a book.

"Semper Fi!" is dedicated to men who died while serving with the Ninth Marines. The fictional character at the story's center is Ray Lang, a young football player from Hondo whose experiences in the Marine Corps roughly parallel Hendryx's own.

UVALDE NATIVE

Hendryx was reared in Uvalde, played football for the Uvalde Coyotes, and cut high school short to join the Marines. At war's end he was discharged with a total disability from diseases contracted in the Pacific.

After a long period of hospitalization he was able to finish high school at Uvalde and continue his convalescence while a student at Sul Ross State College in Alpine. He took a B.S. degree there in economics and an M.A. in Government.

While a student he also became interested in radio and held a part time job with the Alpine radio station. After graduation he became commercial manager of KIUN at Pecos and in 1954 became one of three founders and owners of KCMR at McCamey.

PUBLIC FIGURE

Hendryx had become general manager of KVLF in Alpine in 1950 and is now president, having bought controlling interest in 1956 after sale of the McCamey station.

Energetic in public affairs, Hendryx is president of Sul Ross Ex-Student Association, director of the Texas Association of Broadcasters, a former county chairman of the Democratic Party and a past president of the Alpine Chamber of Commerce. He is also Most Excellent High Priest of Royal Arch Masons, a Rotarian, Knight Templar and Shriner.

The father of sons aged 5 and 2, Hendryx is married to the former Lucille Kempen of Alpine.

"Semper Fi!" was written in spare hours, Hendryx says. "I've got a couple more novels I've been kicking around in my mind," he adds, "but I will probably never write them unless this first effort meets with some chance of success."

He says the book is written in rough and tumble Marine Corps language, pulling no punches. "However," he notes, "it is one of the few war books ever written that is not dominated by sex."

Judiciary Subcommittee Hearings on Insurance—The Insurance Editor of the U.S. Investor Comments Upon Current Hearings by Senate Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 28, 1959

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, in the current issue of the U.S. Investor appeared an important article, written by Mr. Roger Kenney, insurance editor of that periodical. The comments upon the problem now under study are of such importance that I feel they should be incorporated in the RECORD, and I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LESSONS FROM THAT SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE WARMUP SESSION ON RATES—INDUSTRY SHOULD NOT BE MISLED BY VAGUENESS OF DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE TESTIMONY—SUBCOMMITTEE IS LAYING GROUNDWORK FOR BIGGER THINGS TO COME

(By Roger Kenney)

The shape of things to come on this question of rates, ratemaking, rate deviations, etc., was pretty well marked out in Washington on May 12 when the Senate Antitrust

Subcommittee, under the chairmanship of Senator O'MAHONEY, took it upon itself to secure the views of the Justice Department on what should be done to preserve competition and the public interest in this important sphere of property and casualty company operations. The witness on that occasion was Robert A. Bicks, Acting Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Antitrust Division, who very early in his testimony made the bold statement that a regular pattern of control has been established in nearly all the States with respect to both fire and casualty rates. With this as a precept, he suggested that the Senate subcommittee would do well to start with an inquiry into the functions of the rating bureaus for the purpose of ascertaining the extent of freedom to cut rates and alter coverage presently accorded fire and casualty insurers.

Keeping in mind that he was making this suggestion on the basis of investigations already made—and probably currently going on—by the Justice Department, it is rather significant that he pointed his remarks at the strict rating laws passed by so many States in the late 1940's. "The model bill," said he, "requires that every member or subscriber to a rating organization shall adhere to the filings made on its behalf by such organization, except that any such insurer may make written application to the commissioner for permission to file a deviation." Indicating that up to this point, the model law seemed to meet the requirements of Public Law 15 which stipulates that reasonable and fair competition shall be encouraged by the State laws and regulatory practices, he went on, however, to call attention to the fact that the would-be deviator must notify the rating organization, and the latter organization, in turn (with all the power that lies behind members acting in concert), is entitled to a hearing on the question whether the deviation shall be allowed. Not only that, but if the would-be deviator is fortunate enough to survive this ordeal, he receives approval of his proposed rate or deviation only for 1 year. Whereupon he must go through the entire process again, with all that implies in the way of a heavy time and expense-consuming process. As Mr. Bicks put it: "The upshot is that any insurer who wishes to compete ratewise may face real practical difficulties. Activities by insurers pressuring uniform rates could reach the point where they might constitute an act of boycott, coercion, or intimidation which are specifically prohibited under the McCarran Act (Public Law 15) and thus come directly within the realm of Federal jurisdiction."

"TOO VAGUE," WE DON'T THINK SO

The immediate reaction in the industry to Mr. Bicks' testimony was that it was "too vague"—that he was "content to talk in generalities on a subject which calls for specific treatment." For our own part, after carefully observing the operations of the Justice Department through the years, we are not ready to subscribe to this view. What you must remember is that the very nature of this Department's work calls for a closed-mouth attitude—even on the witness stand—so much so that we are surprised that under the relentless questioning of Donald P. McHugh, counsel for the Senate subcommittee, Mr. Bicks admitted that the Justice Department is reviewing the alleged harassing tactics which have been directed against the Insurance Company of North America to determine whether such actions constitute "boycott, coercion or intimidation" within the meaning of the McCarran Act.

JUSTICE DEPARTMENT VERY MUCH IN THE PICTURE

Taking this statement in connection with his previous remarks to the effect that the Justice Department's investigation had revealed that a "regular pattern of control (of rating bureaus) has been established in nearly all States," you have a strong hint that the Senate subcommittee is to have a good deal of support from the Justice Department in its investiagtion of what "makes" and "goes" in rating procedure in the fire and casualty field. And this is not necessarily a bad thing for the industry, since a whole lot needs to be done to clear the air on just how easy or how difficult it should be for independent companies to deviate or make independent filings.

INDEPENDENTS ARE WELL ORGANIZED

On this score, it is well to keep in mind that no longer are the independents in the fire and casualty industry a group of mavericks choosing to go their own way in a highly individual manner, but rather a well-organized and closely knit group under the forceful leadership of Vestal Lemon, general manager of the National Association of Independent Insurers. Lest you forget, it was the same Mr. Lemon who, during the meeting of his organization last November just prior to the convention of the National Association of Insurance Commissioners at New Orleans, enumerated certain developments and matters which call for sober reflection and critical analysis by those who, like his organization, stand unalterably for continued State regulation.

First and foremost on his list was the alleged attempt by powerful segments of the industry—aided and abetted in certain instances by regulatory authorities—to enact legislation which would force all independent companies into rating bureaus and at the same time bring about conditions making deviations and independent filings well nigh impossible. We dare say that Mr. Lemon will be called upon to expound before the Senate subcommittee on this very serious charge—and it certainly will make interesting listening not only for the subcommittee but the Justice Department as well.

The point to remember is that Mr. Lemon has placed certain State regulatory authorities in the same category with certain powerful segments of the industry and has thus laid the groundwork for the very kind of suit which Mr. Bicks seemed to be considering when, during his testimony of the past week, he remarked that State laws making bureau membership mandatory, like that of Texas, go a long way to prevent deviation and have the effect of discouraging deviation. Whether Mr. Lemon's testimony before the Senate subcommittee will trigger a suit by the Justice Department on the constitutionality of such laws is at least an interesting speculation.

Of course, the fact that even at this early date the name of the North America Companies has come in for special mention in connection with its difficulties in getting and holding deviations means that this situation is due for some very special attention by the Senate subcommittee. Indeed, we would not be at all surprised if there was some wholesale subpenaing of the files pertaining to the famous NYFIRO case in New York as well as other equally hard-fought legal battles between the bureau interests on the one side and the North America on the other in different parts of the country. And this could lead to quite a show—what with subpenas going out for the dominant figures on each side—a situation which should be welcomed by all concerned. At least, meeting before the Senate subcommittee isn't as expensive as meeting in court, as both adversaries will agree after what they have been through in the past few years. Not only that, but if anyone is looking for a forum to discuss what's right and what's wrong about rating procedures and practice, rating bureaus, etc., there is no better place than these Senate subcommittee hearings where not a word is dropped without its significance being carefully weighed in the light of possible revision of the McCarran Act.

M'HUGH'S VIEWS ON RATEMAKING

And don't think for a moment that the hearings in Washington will be confined to the question of the right to deviate—all-important though it be. If your memory is good, you will recall that in an address made recently by Donald P. McHugh, counsel for the Senate subcommittee, before zone 2 of the National Association of Insurance Commissioners at White Sulphur Springs, he gave ample evidence of having made a very thorough study of the entire rating machinery in the fire and casualty field, implying that not only had the industry become weighted down with bureaus and pools but the bureaus in turn had become so imbued with their own importance that they were making a needlessly complex task out of their allotted role in ratemaking. In fact, he went so far as to raise the question whether the bureau shouldn't be limited to gathering statistics on pure loss costs. To repeat his words:

"The argument that a bureau-made rate must embrace all components of the premium to deceptive. Stripped of this camouflage, the operations of the bureaus can be critically examined by the subcommittee on their merits. The basic issue is whether or not the type of open price competition commanded by the Sherman Act is suited to insurance in view of the possible effects, such as endangering solvency and driving the small companies out of business.

"The legislative history of Public Law 15 sheds little light upon the type of State rate regulation Congress deemed desirable. The House report decried compulsory bureau membership, urged independence of action, and proclaimed the congressional belief that competitive rates on a sound financial basis are in the public interest. But little can be gleaned of the congressional attitude toward the techniques of bureau ratemaking.

"If the rating bureaus are unable to justify the broad grant of power over rates they now possess, the subcommittee may wish to consider whether the public interest would be better served by a different system. Among the suggested possibilities is the system whereby each insurer sets its own rates but where all companies would belong to a statistical bureau. This agency would develop pure premium upon the combined loss experience of all carriers since practice has demonstrated that sound actuarial principles requires the pooling of experience. No company would be permitted to charge a rate less than this pure premium. Final rates would be calculated by each insurer loading the pure premium with the amount being necessary for overhead, including acquisition costs and profits. This would allow for competition on each element of the premium dollar except the amount allotted for losses.

"Many technical difficulties would still have to be solved under this proposed system. Some precedent already exists in the life insurance field for this approach to rate determination and regulation. In its brief in the SEUA case, the Department of Justice advanced this concept of ratemaking."

A CENSUS WILL BE TAKEN

You don't have to be much of a student of human nature to appreciate that with Mr. McHugh entertaining such thoughts as these, a census is likely to be taken of the bureaus, pools, associations, and the functions they perform for the industry and the public. If that happens, then indeed will some very revealing facts be produced. For instance, back in July 1956, the Casualty & Surety Journal (published by the Association of Casualty and Surety Com-

panies) devoted its entire issue to information about the major associations in the insurance industry—and in that issue it listed some 61 organizations with wide and varied functions, some important and some not so important. And be it noted that the editors made no pretense that the list was in any way complete, simply stating during the course of their introductory remarks: "There is confusion, even in well-informed insurance circles, about the objectives and responsibilities of the industry's multiplicity of organizations."

ONE HUNDRED AND THIRTY-THREE BUREAUS AND POOLS COSTING $72 MILLION

That, dear readers, is the understatement of our time. One of the great weaknesses of the fire and casualty industry has been that when a new problem arises seemingly demanding joint (we were going to say concerted but that is a bad word in Washington) action, a new organization or association has been formed. But no one in authority within the industry has ever taken unto himself the responsibility of weeding out those organizations which have outgrown their usefulness. As a consequence, the industry is weighted down today with bureaus, pools, and associations which, of course, must be supported, and thus, in some measure at least, are a burden upon the policy-buying public, to say nothing about the all-too-often forgotten men of the industry, the dear old stockholders.

It will come as a surprise to our readers to learn that only recently one of the top associations in the industry took upon itself the task of compiling an up-to-date list of bureaus, pools, etc., and their annual cost to the industry—coming up with the astounding information that there are now 133 bureaus, organizations, etc., costing about $72 million to support. Of this amount, $58 million went to support fire organizations and $14 million went for casualty organizations.

In any man's language, that's quite a load for the industry to carry in these days of streamlined competition in the mass market lines. And our guess is that before the Senate subcommittee hearings on rates are completed, much attention will be given to the question as to why this "New England attic" of the fire and casualty business hasn't been cleaned out—long since.

Legislation for the Refugee Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 28, 1959

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter I have received from Clarence A. Leslie, secretary of the New York Conference of the Augustana Lutheran Church, commending the enactment of legislation establishing the Refugee Year.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW YORK CONFERENCE,
AUGUSTANA LUTHERAN CHURCH,
Clifton, N.J., May 6, 1959.

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Chairman, Committee on Immigration,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE SIR: At the convention of the New York Conference of the Augustana Evangelical Lutheran Church held in Jersey City, N.J., April 21–24, 1959, the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

"*Resolved*, That conference urge the President and Congress of the United States to support the Refugee Year—June 1959 to June 1960—by enacting permanent legislation granting permission for resettlement, and copies of this resolution to be forwarded to the appropriate Congressmen and congressional committee."

We are confident that this will receive your earnest consideration.

Sincerely yours,

CLARENCE A. LESLIE,
Secretary.

European Opposition to U.S. Merchant Marine Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 28, 1959

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, as Senators may recall, certain European maritime nations are sending representatives here on June 8, to offer formal protests to our country's maritime policies in aid of the U.S. merchant marine.

We have been assured by the State Department, which is arranging the meeting, that it will be simply an official presentation of views on the part of the eight countries to be represented.

Apparently, this view of the purpose of the meeting is not shared by some of the visitors, if we may credit the news story which appeared on May 25 in the Baltimore Sun, under a London dateline, headed "British Minister Will Head Maritime Assault on District of Columbia." The article indicates that the formal exchange of views may be something other than formal.

So that there may be no misconception of what our European maritime friends have in mind for their coming visit, I ask unanimous consent that the article published in the Baltimore Sun be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRITISH MINISTER WILL LEAD MARITIME ASSAULT ON DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

(By Joseph R. L. Sterne)

LONDON, May 24.—Britain is sending a cabinet minister to Washington June 8 at the head of a delegation which will protest vehemently against American merchant shipping policies.

He is Harold Wilkinson, Minister of Transport and Civil Aviation, whose department has jurisdiction over maritime matters.

The decision to place the British delegation under a cabinet member underscores the importance Britain is attaching to the 10-nation conference.

WILL HIT EVIL POLICIES

Along with other traditional maritime powers, the British will seek to swing world opinion against the evils of American shipping policies.

In particular the attack will be launched against:

1. American encouragement of so-called flags of convenience or necessity fleets which have been built up in recent years by shipowners, mostly Americans and Greeks, who want to avoid high taxes.

2. American flag discrimination practices which direct that 50 percent of Government-owned and financed goods must be carried by American flag ships.

3. American subsidy policies which, in the British view, are going far beyond the point of equaling ship construction and operating cost in comparison with other established maritime nations.

NATIONS LISTED

Protests will be lodged by Britain, Belgium, Denmark, France, West Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Norway and Sweden during the talks in Washington.

In the opinion of the British shipping industry, these policies could destroy the merchant fleets and hence a good part of the military and economic effectiveness of the major NATO countries.

Of the most immediate concern here is the rise of huge merchant fleets under the flags of Honduras, Panama, Liberia and a few other nations that offer tax advantages to shipowners.

Sir Nicholas Cayzer, president of the United Kingdom Chamber of Shipping, recently pointed out that in 1958 Liberia jumped ahead of the United States and Norway to take second place behind Britain in world listings of active merchant fleets.

He referred contempuously to Liberia as a nation which 10 years ago had on register only one ship of 1,000 tons.

British spokesmen concede that American shipowners have such high costs that resort to registration under such flags may, in fact, be a necessity as well as a convenience.

IDEA REPELLENT

But in the British view the idea of having shipowners register under the flag of another nation to avoid taxes is repellent.

British shippers would rather have the United States offer big tax allowances than engage in and encourage what is regarded as fraudulent subterfuge.

Second big target at the Washington conference will be the American 50 percent cargo rule.

Not only does this give American shipowners the right to carry one half of all Government owned and financed cargoes at rates well above those being charged on the world shipping markets, the British contend. It also gives the Americans leeway to undercut their competitors by offering extremely low rates on return journeys to the United States.

CONTRADICTORY OPINION

On the third point British opinion is somewhat contradictory.

Rather than have flags of convenience or necessity fleets and cargo discrimination, the British shipping industry would prefer the American Government to offer outright subsidies to its merchant marine.

New Bedford's Fishing Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 28, 1959

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a series of articles by Mr. Brad Hathaway, of the New Bedford Standard-Times, concerning New Bedford's fishing industry. New Bedford is one of the Nation's old-

est seaports and it has long been a center of domestic fishing activity. It today ranks as one of the leading ports of the country. Both the city and the industry deserve our praise for the fine work which they have done. The industry today is one of the most important influences upon our economy in southeastern Massachusetts. Mr. Hathaway and the New Bedford Standard-Times have done a public service in bringing to the attention of the public these articles which describe the achievements of the New Bedford fishing fleet.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New Bedford (Mass.) Standard-Times, May 19, 1959]

FISH FLEET MUST HAVE DOCK SPACE

(By Brad Hathaway)

New Bedford's multimillion-dollar fishing industry has outgrown its whaling era facilities here and is looking everywhere for help—before it is too late. Biggest problem facing the 180-vessel fleet is docking space, a problem that skippers and boat owners have become increasingly aware of over the years. Increased facilities must be provided soon or the brakes will be applied to the city's fastest growing industry. The New Bedford fishing industry and its allied industries employ more than 3,000 persons.

Value of seafood brought into this port alone last year was nearly $14 million.

MANY OTHER ASSETS

Add the market value of vessels in the fleet, value of machinery, equipment and trucks used in 18 fillet plants, unloading plants and trucking firms, the salaries and wages of those connected with the industry, the cost of fuel, food, and supplies necessary when each vessel makes a trip; the equipment in marine railway yards and in machine shops, and the figure climbs conservatively to more than $100 million.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service statistics show that just 26 years ago, in all of Bristol County, fish landings amounted to 17,152,311 pounds, valued at $591,561.

The statistics, hard to believe but a matter of record, show there were only 31 fishing vessels of over 5 net tons and two mackerel seiners working out of ports in this country. That was in 1933.

Ten years later, landings at New Bedford had risen to 62,163,708 pounds, valued at $5,979,888.

In 1958, there were 111,350,000 pounds of fish, sea scallops and industrial fish worth $13,790,500 landed here. And the number of vessels working out of this port is approximately 180.

LACK OF DOCKING FACILITIES

For the 180 vessels in the fleet which average about 70 feet in length, there are only 728 feet of public wharf in the city devoted exclusively to docking facilities. That is pier 3.

The rest of the vessels tie up alongside other city-owned piers used mainly for unloading purposes or at privately-owned wharves here and in Fairhaven.

The city owns Pier 4 and Homers Wharf. Fish unloading operations are conducted at these wharves. None of the city-owned piers have ever undergone major extensions to create additional facilities, although discussion along this line has been frequent.

Most of the time, two-thirds of the fleet is out fishing or undergoing repair at Fairhaven yards. The lack of docking facilities isn't felt as keenly then as it is when storms force the vessels into port and holidays mean homecoming.

AT MERCY OF WIND, WAVES

After gale warnings are hoisted, it isn't unusual to see seven or more vessels tied abreast to a wharf here to wait out the storm.

Then they're subject to wind and waves. More than once a boat has been torn away from the others, to go aground or smash against the Fairhaven-New Bedford Bridge. The loss sustained while the vessel is laid up to undergo repairs is enormous.

Docking congestion also poses a potential danger from fire and explosions.

Congestion means difficulties in icing down vessels and loading provisions aboard. A dragger or scalloper has to be shunted from dockside to another site so another vessel can tie up alongside a pier to take on supplies.

Most people don't know just how much one fishing vessel is worth to the city and allied industries.

BREAKDOWN OF EARNINGS

Look what happened to the $141,000 gross stock of a typical New Bedford scalloper last year. It was divided as follows: Wages $78,764, food $7,091, fuel $8,987, gear and supplies $4,822, ice $1,766, repairs $15,900, insurance $6,751, mortgage interest $2,900, provisions for Federal and State income taxes $2,112, scallop bags $812, water $105, Social Security taxes $2,418 and other miscellaneous items. Remember: There are 180 vessels in the fleet.

Fishermen say the port must have more unloading facilities to handle the fleet more efficiently.

They say this would attract new buyers and that more competition would help raise the prices they get for fish.

Some dealers and other waterfront personnel reply that unloading facilities are now taxed only when an abnormal number of vessels dock here with large catches.

They point to the many days when the catches of fewer than 10 vessels are sold in the auction room to the city's 5 buyers.

Many more vessels would have to work out of this port or a lot more fish would have to be caught to necessitate the construction of additional unloading facilities here, the dealers say.

That the need for more docking space is of primary and immediate importance is denied by few.

"Something should be done before it is too late," says S. P. Jason, secretary-treasurer and business agent of local 59, Teamsters' Union.

Mr. Jason is a longtime advocate of expanded waterfront facilities here. Truckers in his union transport the city's fish products all along the east coast.

City Councilor Joseph P. Boldiga, an official in the Ronny and Dannie Corp., fishbuying firm on Homers Wharf, says "The vessels need the space and need it bad."

"LOT OF WASTED SHORE SPACE"

"There is a lot of dissatisfaction with the present docking situation," reports John F. Linehan, general manager of New Bedford Seafood Producers Association, "and there is a lot of wasted shore space."

The need for additional facilities here has been outlined over the years by officials in the old Atlantic Fishermen's Union and the present 1,500-member New Bedford Fishermen's Association.

Waterfront interests say concerted effort and organization by all concerned are necessary to solve the problems.

"Come up with a united effort and half the battle's won," they say. "New Bedford (now ranked third in value of fish landings in the Nation) could be the top fishing port in the country."

[From New Bedford (Mass.) Standard-Times, May 20, 1959]

CITY WATERFRONT 50 YEARS BEHIND—POSSIBILITIES FOR EXPANDING FISHERIES DOCKS SUMMARIZED

(By Brad Hathaway)

In the face of New Bedford's shoreline is changed by construction of additional facilities here for the 180-vessel fishing fleet, it will be the first time in more than a half-century. The need for more docking space for the fleet is evident, but just where the space should be provided is undecided.

Foremost in the minds of many waterfront observers is the extension of city-owned Homers Wharf and the purchase and extension of a wharf owned by New Bedford Gas and Edison Light Co., now occupied by Acushnet Fish Corp.

This, they say, should be the first step in an overall program designed to make both sides of New Bedford Harbor a mecca for the growing fishing fleet, rather than a port of congestion.

Ideas of solving the problem come from fishermen, vessel captains and businessmen. Some ideas are old; some are new.

They involve the Fairhaven waterfront, Fish Island, Popes Island, property of the New Bedford, Woods Hole, Martha's Vineyard and Nantucket Steamship Authority, the State Pier, city-owned piers, land north of the Maritime Terminal and south of Greene and Wood Pier.

In the 1930s, piers 3 and 4 were extended to the west edge of the harbor channel in Public Works Administration projects. But the extensions amounted to only a few feet. No major pier facilities have been constructed here since the turn of the century.

Studies show that Homers Wharf can be extended 175 feet and that the gas company wharf could be lengthened 165 feet. The extensions would provide nearly 700 feet of additional docking space.

Mentioned in passing as docking and unloading site possibilities are the north side of Popes Island and the State pier.

The State pier also houses the U.S. Naval Reserve facility, which some feel could become a centralized housing unit for waterfront unions, the Seafood Producers Association, boat settlement houses, and others.

The U.S. Naval Reserve moves out late in June to new headquarters at Fort Rodman. The pier building, occuying 14,000 square feet and comprising some 23 rooms, will then be available for lease from the State.

Height of the State pier, however, has been termed a hindrance to the fleet and the conversion of the pier into a fishing fleet facility would mean the end of foreign and coastwise shipping into New Bedford.

There are some, including at least two members of the advisory committee to the New Bedford Harbor Development Commission who feel the city would have more to gain than to lose if the steamship authority took the island boat line out of New Bedford.

They say the waterfront space occupied by the authority could be put to more profitable use for the community by the fishing industry.

As for Fish Island, Mayor Lawler still has plans for its development as a Coast Guard base.

"I'm going to make a concerted effort to get a commitment from the Coast Guard on whether it would like to make use of Fish Island," the mayor said last week.

"The answer will let us know if Fish Island will be developed as a Coast Guard base or whether we should turn another way and see if it is feasible to convert it into use by the fishing industry."

Fairhaven's waterfront, from the site of Mullins Freezer, north to the Fairhaven-New Bedford Bridge, also has been pointed out

as a possible area of development for fishing vessel berthing sites.

Some have suggested that a bulkhead causeway be constructed from Marine Park to Crow Island, with possible finger piers jutting toward the Fairhaven shore.

WOULD USE FILL

A project north of the city's maritime terminal whereby fill from dredging could be used to extend the shoreline, providing land for unloading sites in the future, also is suggested by some fishing industry personnel.

One drawback to this location north of Fairhaven-New Bedford Bridge is that every time a vessel heads north, the bridge span must be opened.

Some say that hours for the opening of the span could be set up so the inconvenience to motorists would be minor. Others point out that Route 95E crossing the river farther to the north, will funnel off a lot of traffic which now moves on Route 6.

Another site location proposed by fishing industry leaders is south of Greene and Wood Pier, occupied by Ell Vee Dee, Inc.

However, extensive and expensive dredging operations would have to be conducted here for suitable depth.

FIND ROCKBOTTOM

In May 1944, probings made by Army engineers of the U.S. Engineers Office in Providence showed that the harbor bottom off the Blackmer Street area is of solid rock, with varying degrees of mud and gravel atop the rock bed.

At one spot there was only 6.6 feet of mud and water to the rock at mean low tide.

At that time Army engineers said they believed the rock bed would interfere with a proposal to construct a 500-foot long, 150-foot wide pier for the fishing industry. The proposal was dropped and nothing new was done.

[From New Bedford (Mass.) Standard-Times, May 21, 1959]

DRIVE FOR FISH FACILITIES IS GAINING

(By Brad Hathaway)

The drive to increase facilities here for the fishing fleet is gaining momentum. Various study groups and committees are giving serious consideration to solutions. "We've needed additional docking facilities here for a long, long time," said Mayor Lawler. "And any project undertaken is going to cost man-sized money." Just how much it will cost to extend facilities here is not known: Hundreds of thousands of dollars, perhaps millions.

Plans to extend Homers Wharf, with the State sharing 50 percent of the cost, already are being drawn. Mayor Lawler, going ahead with a suggestion by the Harbor Development Commission, is also having a marine engineer survey the entire harbor.

URGES LONG-RANGE PLANS

John F. Linehan, general manager of New Bedford Seafood Producers Association, says, "I believe a long-range program encompassing the entire harbor should be drawn up.

"Such an expansion program could be in the form of a 20-year plan. Any work done is going to be expensive. But, there are some things which could be done immediately to fit into the overall plan—such as the proposed extension of Homers Wharf."

Continuing with his discussion of industry needs, Mr. Linehan said, "The Coast Guard should very definitely be a part of this overall picture.

"We owe it to the Coast Guard to provide its vessels with good docking and operational facilities here. The value of the Coast Guard to Greater New Bedford is no less than the value of any industry or business bringing money and people into the area from outside the State."

The group that has been working the longest on docking problems is the Fairhaven Planning Board.

Although its present plans deal only with the Fairhaven shoreline, the board has said it would like to confer with the New Bedford Harbor Development Commission and to have the town included in any overall harbor program.

COMMISSION AT WORK

The Waterfront Development Commission of the Fairhaven board, under Chairman Earl Holden, has been working for several months on proposed improvements to the Fairhaven side of the harbor.

Its plans include the widening and extension of piers in the town and the dredging and developing of the shore in an area from about the foot of Union Street to the bridge.

Preliminary plans call for a harbor of refuge some 15 feet deep between Crow Island, Marine Park and the Fairhaven shore. New shoreline facilities would add a mile of berthing space to the present docking space in town.

Town businessmen are now being queried on their ideas for expansion.

A New Bedford fisherman who has devoted much of his time in the last few months to studying the needs of the industry and possibilities for expansion feels that a fish pier, similar to those in Boston and Gloucester, is an answer to the problem.

SPOKESMAN FOR INDUSTRY

He is Ralph P. M. Raabe of 252 Shaw Street, a member of the New Bedford Fishermen's Association and designated a spokesman for the union in discussing fishing industry needs.

Study committees have been set up by the Industrial Foundation and the Seafood Producers Association. The advisory board of the HDC is also vitally interested in the needs of the industry and has called a meeting with waterfront personnel for 7:30 tonight in city hall to become better acquainted with the situation.

The most important body studying the problem is the Harbor Development Commission. It will be that group which will finally decide when, where, and what will be constructed here to serve the industry better.

The commission already has recommended the harbor survey.

Some waterfront personnel feel the commission has been slow to act on many problems facing the fishing industry, despite the recommendation.

They feel the commission membership is inadequate and is not working in the best interests of the industry. They said some of the men are not familiar enough with the fishing industry to know what is going on.

"The commission is a new organization and still feeling its way around," said Mr. Linehan. "Eventually, members will pave the way to a solution to the problems. Just give them a chance."

Attorney Louis Stone, chairman of the commission, said this week, "We are exploring other means to acquire additional docking space here. This is still in the embryonic stage and can't be made public at the present time.

"We know that added facilities here are needed immediately. We are continually working on the problem."

The extension of Homers Wharf is being sought by Mayor Lawler through the State Department of Public Works.

"This will be just a start," the mayor said. "Now we hope to get an overall plan and then will do what we can to implement the plan over a period of time.

"I hope the State sees eye to eye with us and will participate in the program."

COMMON EFFORT NEEDED

The need for the various study committees to joint together in a common effort, to pool resources and to advance their ideas based on knowledge of fishing industry needs, is of primary importance now, and for at least three good reasons:

Dollars and jobs are being lost to the community because of a lack of facilities to handle fishing vessels which would otherwise operate out of this port.

Competitive ports, eager to attract some of the business New Bedford now has, are spending more time and money to improve their facilities.

By neglecting port improvement, New Bedford jeopardizes its chances of getting a fair share of future business which may develop within the fishing industry or affiliated industries on the northeast coast.

Whatever is going to be done—and something must be, if the industry is to remain economically healthy—will take time, and it should be started without further delay.

Hot Rod Club: Antidote to Delinquency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 28, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the Nation today is faced with a serious problem of delinquency among our youth.

Daily, the newspapers carry stories of the activities of young folks, for a variety of motives, which are outside the accepted modes of conduct in our society and which, regrettably, sometimes involve not only delinquency but crime.

I am, therefore, always particularly pleased to find constructive efforts in communities to provide leadership, guidance, and counseling—and above all understanding—of the problems of youth, coupled with realistic efforts to channel their almost limitless reservoirs of energy, ingenuity, imagination, and capability into useful activities.

As a splendid example, a recent edition of the Milwaukee Journal carried an article by Laura Pilarski, reviewing the activities of the hot rod club in Whitefish Bay, Wis. Composed of youths from 16 to 19, the Vagabonds, with guidance and assistance from the local police department, are making constructive contributions to improve safety in the community.

For example, in conjunction with the Whitefish Bay Police Department—a supporter of the club—the hot rodders recently assisted in spot checking for safety some 2,000 cars passing through the area. They gave after school hours for this project. In addition to imbuing these youth with a greater sense of road safety, the club membership is providing them with a knowledge of mechanics, group organization and cooperation, and respect for—and efforts to cooperate with—local law-enforcement officers. Of special significance is the fact that these hot rodders have a strict code within their own club to encourage the observance of traffic safety and good rules of conduct for the highways.

Currently, various Senate Subcommittees on Juvenile Delinquency have either

already held, or are holding, hearings considering numerous pieces of legislation in order to cope with the nationwide problem of delinquency among our youth. These bills cover a wide variety of subjects, including the problem of drug addiction, distribution of indecent publications, providing assistance to the States and institutions of higher learning for the treatment and rehabilitation of juvenile delinquents, and other approaches to the problems.

Believing, however, that one of the most effective efforts to combat delinquency is programing in the local community—such as illustrated by the cooperation between the Whitefish Bay Hot Rod Club and the local police department.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written by Laura Pilarski, and published in the Milwaukee Journal on May 23, 1959.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEENAGERS AND DRIVING—THIS HOTROD CLUB HAS POLICE SUPPORT—WHITEFISH BAY YOUTHS SPOT CHECK 2,000 AUTOMOBILES TO AID SAFETY CAMPAIGN

(By Laura Pilarski)

Every other Sunday, teenage boys collect in the council chambers of the Whitefish Bay village hall for some serious talk about automobiles.

They range in age from 16 to 19. They wear black poplin jackets with a covered wagon symbol and the word "Vagabonds" on them.

The group, now 3 years old, is a hotrod club. The covered wagon stands for its goal of rolling along. Wanderlust also is reflected in the club's name.

Parliamentarian discussion about cars is but one phase of the club program. Members customize their own models, rebuild engines for drag racing and offer help to the Whitefish Bay police department in safety campaigns.

CLUB SELLS BROOMS

They also sell brooms. This project is undertaken annually in cooperation with the Sertoma club, a service club which assists the hotrodders. This sweepstakes event will be held Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday. Proceeds will help the club.

In conjunction with the police department, another booster of the club, the hotrodders recently have spot checked for safety some 2,000 cars passing through the Bay area. They gave afterschool hours to this project.

Police Chief Orval Meister of Whitefish Bay told how appreciative he was for the service of Vagabonds. He mentioned that last year club members undertook a hubcap marking program at service stations as part of a campaign against hubcap thefts.

CITES GROUP SPIRIT

Members credit their adviser, Lt. Alex Boeder, of the Whitefish Bay police force, for much of their success and enthusiasm. One hotrodder characterized him as "a real great guy."

Lieutenant Boeder said the club was developing a terrific group spirit and promising talent in mechanics. He described his role as rounding up people and events to fill the bill the club outlines. He pointed out that the group functioned under very stringent rules.

The club president, Dennis Lambrecht, 17, of 4619 North 8th Street, Glendale, agreed the constitution was tough. Its provisions bar any boy who is failing in school.

CAN BE EXPELLED

The rules require that a member be suspended for a first traffic violation and expelled for a second one. They also detail a compulsory schedule of individual car checks for members.

Lambrecht, a junior at Nicolet High School, said he shared the family car with his father. He jointed the club, he said, because he always has been interested in cars and engines.

He listed present membership as 15 actives. He said that driving safety and a healthy respect for cars were their main concerns.

"It makes you mad to see young drivers who have no respect for the machine they're responsible for," Lambrecht commented. "It's like using a good golf club to hit a stone."

"Tiny," the club's vice president, said a car was a complicated piece of equipment and worthy of good care.

GOOD AS MECHANIC

Tiny, who stands 6 feet 6, is Dennis Krueger, a senior at Whitefish Bay High School. He is 17 and lives at 5036 North Ardmore Avenue.

He owns a 1957 Ford convertible which he described as an early graduation gift. He knows enough about mechanics to put in a new car transmission for a friend.

Larry Sacks, 18, of 4911 North Diversey Boulevard, a club member 1½ years, told how the Vagabonds stressed safety and gave boys a chance to learn about automotive mechanics. He is an engineering student, a freshman, at Marquette University.

RULES ARE EMPHASIZED

Larry displayed a pamphlet which the Vagabonds have distributed during public safety check duties. It was prepared by the club and emphasizes these rules:

Have your car safety checked regularly.
Slow down and live.
Think ahead, look ahead.
Observe all rules of road courtesy.

In hot rod lingo, these rules mean the Vagabonds are against "squirrels," "shot rodders," and "cowboys." All these terms, the members said, refer to the driver who is reckless, a showoff, and impairs the safety of others.

We Can Lose the Cold War on the Educational Front

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 28, 1959

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, recently Dr. Frank C. Laubach, who has spent much time in the Far East and Southeast Asia, talked to a few of us around the luncheon table about some of the problems as he saw them in that part of the world. At the time I asked him if he would not reduce his thoughts to writing. This he has done.

The paper by Dr. Laubach is thought provoking. I believe that everyone can well read it with interest.

Accordingly, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the paper was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE CAN LOSE THE COLD WAR ON THE EDUCATIONAL FRONT

(Dr. Frank C. Laubach)

On January 14, 1959, Secretary of State Dulles, speaking before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, described our entire foreign policy. His statement was clear; it was comprehensive. But he omitted one objective, because we have omitted it from our Government program. We are not trying to lift a billion people in the free world out of illiteracy. We are offering economic and technical aid; but as yet we are blind to the fact that illiteracy is a sound barrier preventing that billion people from rising in the economic and cultural scale. Illiterates everywhere have little or no money—little or no decent living standards; these things require a certain level of knowledge. Illiteracy and poverty go together; one is the cause of the other.

There is more illiteracy, and more hunger, in the underdeveloped countries of the free world than there was 30 years ago. This is because miraculous health and sanitation progress has sent the world population zooming faster than people have been taught to read, and faster than food has been produced to feed them. In America, where mechanized scientific agriculture produces far more food than we can consume, we are as yet unaware of the consequences of the rising illiteracy and the increasing hunger on the other side of the free world. The chasm widens every day. The rich grow richer—the hungry grow hungrier.

We have been blind to this stupendous gap in our world program because Americans have had so little contact with that illiterate horde. In Asia and Africa there is no middle class like that which includes the majority of us in America. The rich one-tenth at their top are highly educated, make the laws to suit themselves, control the armies, run the governments, mint and own the money, own all the land. Those are the people with whom Americans have come into contact. The nine-tenths at the bottom are the have-nots. They are wholly illiterate, build their own houses, and live almost wholly without money. When we Americans travel abroad, we see these illiterates only from a distance; we tell one another that they do not really matter, for they are helpless. We may feel a twinge of pity as we pass them at a distance, but they do not bothers our conscience for long.

Yet these billion underprivileged people will probably decide the future of the world. They have changed from a state of helpless despair to grim and ever-growing determination to come up out of their deep poverty and ignorance. This is because many factors have played on them during this century to stir up their longings. Missionaries gave them a gospel of hope. They saw our soldiers during the Second World War—they saw our business men, our tourists—they saw the food they ate—they saw their clothes, the houses our people lived in, the autos we traveled in. They heard echoes of Woodrow Wilson's 14 points, and they heard something about the Four Freedoms. We stirred those people more than they had ever been stirred in all the ages past.

The hungry multitudes concluded that we have so much while they have nothing, because we have secrets in books and magazines and we use those secrets to forge ahead. In this, they are absolutely right. Knowledge is the secret of our power; the illiterates want that knowledge. They want to read, and they want the books which will reveal the secrets of progress.

But we have done little or nothing as a government to meet their passion for literacy and for books. We still coast along on the fatal illusion that those people do not matter. Meanwhile, the Communists have infiltrated among them, telling the nine-

tenths at the bottom that all Russians are literate and have access to books and magazines and the secrets of progress. They tell those illiterates that China is now making every man, woman and child literate as fast as possible; they tell them that if they will overthrow their present governments and go Communist, all of them will become educated, just as they all become educated in Communist countries—and that all of them will be emancipated from the anguish of everlasting hunger, and from the darkness of eternal ignorance. This is a kind of fulfillment that every illiterate desires.

Meanwhile, our Government does nothing, and says nothing or next to nothing, about this passion of the hungry multitudes to come up out of poverty through education. It is our fatal mistake; it must change without delay. Waiting a few more years can lose the world on this educational front.

For the Communists have an astonishing accomplishment in literacy to show the rest of the world. Lenin was convinced that in order to make all Russians Communist, it was necessary to teach everybody to read newspapers, and then to pour a constant stream of daily Communist propaganda into every Russian home. So he began a tremendous compulsory literacy campaign, using 3 million volunteers to teach. In 20 years, Russia was lifted from 9 percent literacy to over 90 percent literacy; today Russia is probably as literate as the United States. She is publishing more books, magazines, and newspapers than we are. This tremendous literacy drive was compulsory, but it was the most popular thing the Communist government ever undertook, because people wanted to become literate.

We were shocked by sputnik into the realization that at the apex, Russia was abreast or ahead of us in science. We need to be shocked into the realization that this scientific superstructure is based upon an educational foundation as broad as our own. When the Communists promise universal education, they mean it. But their education would all be Communist, and everything else would be eradicated.

Since China went Communist, she has shown the same realization that to succeed she must make her 600 million people literate. The Chinese characters constituted a formidable barrier to literacy; so 2 years ago China adopted a Roman alphabet as good as the best in the world, and now she is engaged in a drive to make every man, woman, and child literate in this new alphabet. In all likelihood, China will be as literate as Russia within 20 years. It is the most popular thing the Communists are doing, for people know that education is the strong rope up which they must climb to better things.

Meanwhile, America is devoting her time and effort and money to educating 175 million Americans to keep up with Russia. She is doing almost nothing to help a billion people in the free world rise up out of the dictatorship of ignorance. Mr. Hollister, former Director of ICA, wrote in the Saturday Evening Post of March 28: "In using the taxpayers' money, my sole concern was, and is, the self-interest of this Nation." We talk, and in the matter of literacy, we act, as though our only real concern is ourselves. As a Christian, this makes me shudder. How much more must it make the hungry illiterates shudder when it is interpreted by the Communists as proof that we are utterly indifferent to their needs?

This neglect of our free world illiterates is not only wicked; it is against the interests of America herself. A billion people will turn against us at every opportunity if they believe that their only hope of rising to a new level of life lies in communism.

So right now we are falling frighteningly behind the Communists in the battle of literacy. Not because we lack the know-how; we know how to make those countries literate. Not for lack of eagerness on the part of the masses; they are crazy to learn. Not from opposition by other governments; they are desperately eager for literacy for their masses, as a way to ward off communism.

And nobody opposes literacy from an economic standpoint. It has no enemies in the United States, for literacy abroad would be a boon to American business by providing greater foreign markets. Literacy is a program which will not have serious opposition anywhere. My experience through the United States and throughout the 97 countries where I have worked indicates that if the United States were to espouse literacy strongly in backward areas it would be one of the most popular causes we ever promoted; it would undercut the terrific effects of Communist propaganda. That is mutual security.

Unless and until we bend our efforts to educate this illiterate billion, I think we are pouring $40 billion a year for military defense down a rathole, and that our economic and technical aid is wasted; for we shall lose the world on the educational front.

Do we have enough money to undertake this free world literacy program? Certainly we have. If we shift the list of priorities, and place this one high where it belongs, we can carry this literacy effort at a very moderate cost. It will swiftly reduce other expenses we are shouldering around the world; for it will help those people to help themselves, which is after all what we most desire.

I have presented this tremendous gap in our world defense program to the three largest American philanthropic foundations. All of them said they had not dared to attack the problem because it is too big. So the biggest hole in our world defense wall is left wide open because it is so big nobody has been willing to try to close it. And through that hole the Communists will take the world, unless we stop being awed by its magnitude, and close it.

The hundreds of literacy men and women, Americans and nationals, whom I have helped to train during the past 30 years, stand ready to help anywhere in the world. They agree with me that these illiterate multitudes are the easiest people in the world to win as our fast friends, if we convince them that we really care for them. We do not think the gap is too big for America.

Mr. Hudoba, of Sports Afield, Writes on Migratory Fisheries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 28, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, one of the most thoughtful and informed commentators in the field of wildlife and fisheries is Michael Hudoba, the Washington correspondent of Sports Afield magazine. Mr. Hudoba is known on both sides of Capitol Hill as a stalwart conservationist, and a man who has dedicated his career to the preservation of natural resources.

Mr. Hudoba contributed to the May 1959 issue of Sports Afield magazine a challenging column on the question of protecting migratory fisheries in the Pacific Northwest. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the column by Michael Hudoba be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MICHAEL HUDOBA'S REPORT FROM WASHINGTON—TAKE YOUR CHOICE: DAMS OR SALMON—BIOLOGISTS RACING AGAINST TIME TO SOLVE PROBLEMS POSED BY 600-FOOT DAMS, SOLUTION NOT YET IN SIGHT

Salmon and steelhead and dams are rapidly approaching a head-on collision in the Pacific Northwest. The outlook for fish does not hold any great hopes. Here is an area where the mighty Columbia and its tributary stream, the Snake, head in mile-high snowcapped and glacier-bound reaches of the Wyoming, Montana, and Canadian Rockies and pour their turmoiled waters into the Pacific at the Columbia's mouth. It is here lies the greatest power potential on the North American Continent according to engineers. Hundreds of miles of rushing water pour through great gorges carved out of the rugged mountain chains in past eons of history. The very thought of piles of concrete and steel 600, 700, 800 feet high harnessing the rushing torrents keep imaginative engineering dreamers awake nights in ecstatic glee.

The problem is not new. It has been going ever since settlement of the Northwest. And dams are not the sole trouble. If salmon and steelhead eventually disappear, high hydroelectric dams will probably administer the coup de grace, but agriculture, logging, pollution, siltation, expanding civilization, removal of industrial gravel from spawning beds, forest fires—all will have had their influence.

As salmon and steelhead have waged their persistent battle for survival, attitudes have changed. When the first big dam was built astraddle the lower Columbia during the thirties, the engineers in charge were almost contemptuous of the fish problem. They declared publicly that their interest lay in producing power. It was only through the strenuous efforts by conservationists that fish ladders, traps, and fish lifts were included in the 60-foot-high concrete block across the migration route. When 500-foot Grand Coulee Dam went in far upstream on the Columbia, all fish passage attempts were completely abandoned in favor of attempts to transplant the upriver runs into lower tributaries.

Had appreciation of the importance of the fish resource to the people of the Northwest been more realized by the engineers in the early days, the present crisis might have been arrested. Funds for research into the complicated problems have always been extremely small when compared with the cost of the dams, or even the fish passage facilities which have been included in all since Grand Coulee was built.

But salmon have done well in spite of adversity. They have successfully negotiated the under-100-foot dams in the lower reaches. In fact, those of salmon and steelhead races which fight their way into the upper Columbia and the vast Snake River, with its important spawning tributaries, have gradually increased in spite of such deterrents. For dams of this height, the big fellows have been able to go over or were artificially helped by trapping and hauling around the dams. The small migratory fingerlings return to the ocean by tumbling over the spillways or riding the lower waters as they race through the blades of spinning turbines.

But now new problems are pressing ever more closely. The lowhead dams on the lower Columbia are about completed and the eyes of power-hungry planners and turned

upstream where canyons are deep. Dams 500, 600, 700 feet high are planned across the Snake, the important Salmon, the Clearwater, the Grand Ponde and the Imnaha, to name a few. One 250-foot dam is already built at Brownlee and another just below at Oxbow. It was here 4,000 salmon and steelhead died last summer because of a faulty fish trap, and another estimated 6,000 of the 12,000 which were hauled around the dams have failed to show up on the spawning beds.

The proponents of the high dams are almost lightly giving the State and Federal fishway management agencies 5, even 10 years' time in which to solve the difficult fish passage problems. Presumably, if they are not solved then, the mighty runs of upriver salmon and steelhead will be given the goodby death kiss.

Recently, a newly activated fisheries subcommittee of the Columbia Basin Interagency Committee under Albert M. Day has demanded recognition for increased funds for research if it is to do its share in solving these difficult tasks.

The Oregon congressional delegation led by Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER, Democrat of Oregon, has launched a move to seek $700,000 Federal funds for July 1959 for this purpose and continuing appropriations of at least $1 million a year until answers are found.

Collapse of U.S. Dollar: Savings Bonds Plan for Annuity Ended

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 28, 1959

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, yesterday there was published a very interesting article by the very fine writer, Sylvia Porter. The article is entitled "Collapse of U.S. Dollar: Savings Bonds Plan for Annuity Ended."

In the article Miss Porter treats of a particular case in which an effort was made to build up an annuity by means of savings bonds.

I believe the article is a thought-provoking one. Certainly it illustrates what I have long felt clearly, namely, that the little fellow, who from time to time is encouraged and urged by the Government—for patriotic reasons—to invest in Government savings bonds, the few dollars which he may be able to save from time to time, is the one who gets the worst end of the deal, when we consider all of the bond transactions in which the Government is engaged.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article by Miss Porter printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COLLAPSE OF U.S. DOLLAR: SAVINGS BONDS PLAN FOR ANNUITY ENDED

(By Sylvia Porter)

My lifelong friend, Mac, called me the other day and after short pleasantries, he blurted it out: "You know those 'baby bonds' I've been buying every week since 1937 to build an annuity for Janice and me? Well, I've decided to cash them all in and I want your advice."

"Wait a minute," I protested and my mind raced back. Mac had started buying a $37.50 U.S. savings bond each week 22 years ago to create an annuity on his own. His plan had been to start cashing in a bond a week at $50 when he retired and he had deliberately disciplined himself into buying enough bonds regularly to keep him going for a lot of years in later life. I had enthusiastically endorsed this program from the start, had written about it repeatedly during the wartime forties. Now here he was—after all these years of buying baby bonds, war bonds, savings bonds—throwing over the whole program.

"You retiring, Mac?"

DOLLAR PREDICAMENT

"No. I just don't want to hold these bonds any longer. That $50 a week doesn't mean to me what it did. I don't have to tell you what has happened to the dollar. And I'm tired of having my friends tell me I'm a fool not to put my money in investments that can earn a lot more."

"And you want me to tell you what stocks to buy?"

"Not stocks," he said and here came his surprise. "I want to go into other U.S. Government securities and I want you to help me."

So then we worked it out. Mac is cashing in the whole wad and his savings bond nest-egg has grown to many thousands of dollars over these 2 decades. He's paying a tax on the accumulated interest and he is:

Investing one-third in the U.S. Treasury's 2⅝ percent bonds due February 15, 1965, selling in the market at around 91 cents on the dollar;

Investing one-third in the U.S. Treasury's 2½ percent bonds due December 15, 1969, selling in the market at around 85 cents on the dollar;

Investing one-third in the U.S. Treasury's 2½-percent bonds due September 15, 1972, selling in the market at around 83 cents on the dollar.

PAY OFF UNDOUBTED

This is what Mac will achieve:

As these bonds come due, each will be paid off at 100 cents on the dollar. There is no doubt of the payoff. He is thus guaranteed a gain of nine points on his 2⅝s in 1965 and of 15 to 17 points on his 2½s in 1969 and in 1972.

On this gain, he'll pay a long-term capital gains tax—assuming this tax is still in effect in the years to come.

Each year he'll collect interest, amounting to $2.50 per $100 on his 2½s, $2.62 per $100 on his 2⅝s.

These are minor coupons in these days of rising interest rates but, because he is buying the bonds at such deep discounts from their original sale prices, his annual return actually ranges from 4¼ to almost 4½ percent. This is dramatically more than he has been getting on his savings bonds, and he has been earning nothing on his matured baby bonds.

CAN DECLINE MORE

"Don't forget the bonds you're buying can decline some more in price, and probably will," I warned Mac several times. "These are not riskless savings bonds; these are marketable securities. That gain is guaranteed only if you hold to maturity. You could have losses meanwhile."

"I figure I can hold," he said. "This is a better deal for me. What a shame my annuity plan didn't work out. You ought to tell others what you have told me. It's only fair."

Yes. Mac has made a better deal financially by switching from his savings bonds to the Treasury's marketable bonds now selling at prices equivalent to annual returns of 4¼ percent and more. It is a shame that the interest the Treasury is paying to little buyers of its savings bonds is now so much less than it is paying to big buyers of its other types of securities. It is high time that the Treasury put the little bond buyer more on a par with others. It is only fair that you be told the facts.

This I have done in this true tale about Mac.

Stalin Era in Russia Past

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 28, 1959

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter I have received from Cyrus S. Eaton, of Cleveland, Ohio, together with an article entitled "Stalin Era Past, Americans Stress," written by Harrison E. Salisbury, and published in the New York Times.

There being no objection, the letter and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CHESAPEAKE & OHIO RAILROAD CO.,
Cleveland, Ohio, May 14 1959.

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: American visitors to the Soviet Union, including last year's delegations of electric power officials, steel executives and educators, have come away with the feeling that Russian progress in science, industry and education, as well as other fields, is not being fully reported in the American press.

This sentiment is forcefully reflected in the enclosed Moscow interview of Dr. Harlan Hatcher, distinguished president of the University of Michigan, by Harrison Salisbury, one of the most responsible correspondents of the New York Times. I may add that the Hatcher-Salisbury interview confirms my own careful observations in the Soviet Union last fall.

The views that Dr. Hatcher expressed to Mr. Salisbury deserve to be read by everyone interested in our relations with the Soviet Union, upon which the fate of mankind depends.

Sincerely yours,

CYRUS EATON.

[From the New York Times, May 12, 1959]

STALIN ERA PAST, AMERICANS STRESS—VISITING EDUCATORS ALSO SAY SOVIET MUST REVISE IDEA OF ROBBER BARONS' UNITED STATES

(By Harrison E. Salisbury)

Moscow, May 11.—President Harlan H. Hatcher of the University of Michigan said today it was time that Americans realized the Stalin era was dead and that Russians recognized that the age of the robber nations was past.

President Hatcher made his comment in summing up his favorable impressions of the Soviet educational system from a month's inspection of Soviet universities.

Dr. Hatcher is the leader of one of several American educational groups that have been surveying the Soviet educational field. Other ranking educators who have just completed a study tour include President Henry T. Heald of the Ford Foundation and Shepherd Stone of the Ford Foundation, Prof. Philip E. Mosely, director of studies of the Council of Foreign Relations; F. Cyril James, vice chancellor of McGill University, Mon-

treal; Norman P. Auburn, president of Akron University, and William Pine, head of the scholarship program of the Ford Motor Co. fund.

SOVIET GETS HIGH MARKS

Dr. Hatcher spoke only for himself. However, the educators generally gave Soviet higher education very high marks.

"Soviet society is moving at a much faster rate than is generally realized either here or abroad," Dr. Hatcher declared. "Education is the motivating and guiding force in this evolution. I think that the direction of this movement is going to surprise everyone."

Dr. Hatcher said it was time that "my countrymen begin to understand that changes can take place in the Soviet system and that these changes are actually occurring before our eyes."

He said he felt that too many persons in the United States, particularly at the policy-making level, tended to overlook the evolution that has occurred in the last 6 years.

"Stalin is dead and it is time that Washington began to realize this," Dr. Hatcher said. "And in the same connection it is high time that Moscow understands that the era of the robber barons, the era of primitive 19th century capitalism, has ended in the United States and given way to a completely new way of life."

UNIVERSITIES VISITED

The group of educators headed by Dr. Hatcher has visited seven of the principal Soviet universities—Moscow, Leningrad, Kiev, Tiflis, Tashkent, Samarkand, and Irkutsk. Their principal impression in Soviet higher education was one of drive, energy, pioneering spirit and high competence. They devoted chief attention to the humanities and were surprised to find that contrary to the reports of some observers Soviet humanities were not being skimped for the sake of science.

"On the contrary, we have found that the humanities here have benefited from the impact of new scientific attitudes," Dr. Hatcher said. He gave much credit to the excellent foundation laid in the Soviet 10-year schools in languages and in literature, not only of Russia but of foreign countries.

"Students arrive at the university wonderfully well prepared," he said. "They have excellent study habits. Their extracurricular activities are tied into serious subjects. Reading habits are widespread and good. The use of libraries is exceptional."

It was his opinion that Soviet scientists, engineers, and technicians had a broader basis of the humanities than many in the United States.

He helped conduct a seminar for graduate students at Moscow University in contemporary literature and was surprised at how widely read and conversant the students were with English and American literature.

"There is a spirit of competition all the way through the Soviet education system and indeed Soviet life which I did not expect to find," he said.

As far as ideology is concerned, Dr. Hatcher said, he examined the content of many ideological courses and found their general nature not so different in concept from American courses in civics and government as he had expected.

He was particularly struck by the driving energy and pioneering spirit east of the Urals. Irkutsk University with 3,500 students soon will double in size while Moscow and Leningrad will remain relatively stable.

Workload at the New York Naval Shipyard Matter of Vital Importance Both to the Nation and to Brooklyn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. DORN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1959

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Speaker, the workload at the New York Naval Shipyard is a matter of vital importance both to the Nation and to Brooklyn. Nationally, because it keeps in operation the know-how naval shipyard, which is so vital to our defense activity. To Brooklyn, because of its economic impact. In this connection, I include a letter from Mr. Daniel Stea, president of the Master Mechanics and Foremen's Association of the New York Naval Shipyard:

MASTER MECHANICS AND
FOREMEN'S ASSOCIATION,
NEW YORK NAVAL SHIPYARD,
Brooklyn, New York, May 27, 1959.

Hon. FRANCIS E. DORN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. DORN: First, let me introduce myself. I am president of the Master Mechanics and Foremen's Association of the Third Naval District, situated in the New York Naval Shipyard, more familiarly known as the Brooklyn Navy Yard. The master mechanics and foremen represent the highest echelon of civilian management in the naval industrial establishment. Furthermore, in the issue to be presented in this letter, I feel sure I speak not only for top-level civilian management but all civilian personnel of the New York Naval Shipyard.

The matter which is the subject of this letter concerns the congressional action on the Navy's request for an additional modern-attack aircraft carrier of the *Forrestal* class. Congressional decision regarding this carrier is of critical importance, first to the national security and, second, to the personnel of the New York Naval Shipyard.

The fight to obtain congressional approval of a carrier such as this is not new. Therefore, we here in the shipyard have had a chance to search our souls and examine the data and logic of the issue, not only from the point of view of our immediate work needs, but from the broader and more important aspect of the national security. My presentation here focuses on the issue of our national security. On the other hand, this is not to minimize the importance of maintaining employment for the shipyard's approximately 13,000 people, plus another 10,000 in private industry whose employment depends upon the workload assigned here in the shipyard.

Speaking strictly as a layman, it appears to me that the needs of the Nation are confused by the complications and structure of our pattern of obtaining approval for such an item as a carrier. Our Navy's leaders have stated the country's needs in no uncertain terms. They have reiterated repeatedly the practical necessity for having available modern-attack aircraft carriers in today's state of world affairs. In essence, our Navy's top military leaders have asserted that limited war remains a probability. The use of unlimited weapons such as chemical warfare, biological warfare, and nuclear warheads are more a matter of cancelling out the enemy's preparation, with everybody agreeing that the introduction of these weapons would result in total catastrophe.

There remains only an evaluation of the expressed needs of our Navy's top military leaders—the same people who have fought the wars and have seen the modern weapons in actual use. Also, their needs have been expressed as a consequence of their responsibility to operate the Navy. But for some people, even in the Congress, such expressed needs require an open season type of technical evaluation. We begin to listen to the sensationalists, the space-cadets and the "rover" boys. Again, speaking as a layman, the utterances from such specialists simply do not make any sense.

For example, tomahawks have been compared with our weapons. Yet, tomahawks were never used in our operational Navy. The tomahawk must be compared with weapons in the culture in which used. On the other hand, the submarine will stand comparison. The submarine has been used in our Navy and in recent wars. A submarine is a formidable weapon. But, a submarine can hardly be equated with a carrier. The nations that have lost the big wars were always ahead in submarines. It seems as though whether we are ahead of anybody in tomahawks or submarines means very little.

Still another question arises in connection with the issue at hand, that is, the matter of the fueling system. Atomic energy has demonstrated its tremendous potential in the case of submarines. However, again, according to our Navy's top military leaders, the question of atomic power for aircraft carriers is another matter. To me, it appears that atomic power, even for the aircraft carrier, would have certain advantages. On the other hand, the need for a modern-attack aircraft carrier, whether atomic-powered or otherwise, is of primary and overriding importance. It must be emphasized that the most critical aspect of the problem here centers around the need for a longer flight deck for our modern high-speed carrier aircraft. It would be sheer folly were the Congress to deprive our Nation of its basic needs for security because they have in mind something even better.

What can the Congress be thinking about when they question the usefulness of the modern-attack aircraft carrier when no sensible substitute has been proposed? Are we thinking only in terms of unlimited warfare and total destruction in which case perhaps it would be better to discontinue our sessions altogether and have some fun while we still may.

The freedom which makes America so great allows for many a dissenting voice even that of a certain pretender to the throne of the kingdom of atomic submarines who continually persists in imagining and constructing weapons which are designed exclusively to satisfy the needs of the war of the worlds. Such fantasy planning, in the absence of operational experience possessed by the top Navy's military leaders can only avalanche us all into the next world. It is significant that this same individual is equally vociferous in his utterances regarding our system of education, our industrial organization structure, our mode of living and everything else in which he lacks operational experiences. On the other hand, we feel that we can be proud of what we have in America

whether it be the best system of education in the world or the best Navy in the world, both of which have made steady and sure progress through many years of trials and tribulations. Who would deny that the unprecedented progress of our great Nation has been the consequent of our democratic progress which develops the maximum potential of our people in an organized context, at the same time allowing for individual differences.

To say the least, we resent the attentions given these nonsensical attacks on all that has been important to our life, liberty and pursuit of happiness, to say nothing of our military victories. We deplore the unwillingness of such individuals to meet actual issues head on, answer specific questions and come up with facts but, instead, hide behind big heads on small bodies with a total disregard for the higher level operational experiences of our civilian and military leaders.

There comes a time when the aggressiveness of our righteous and proper actions must be stepped up—a time when vigilance is called for. We ask you in the name of our country and all it stands for to consider the practical implications of disregarding the expressed needs of our Navy's top military leaders, and their wonderful record of defense over the years—of disregarding these people and taking note of those individuals whose sensationalism appears to be their greatest virtue. We ask that Congress get down to brass tacks and give our Nation the weapons our military leaders know are required. We ask this in the name of the 13,000 people of the New York Naval Shipyard and of those who have worked here in the past and will continue to dedicate their efforts here in the future.

We are proud of building naval ships such as modern-attack aircraft carriers. We are proud to be the ones who can do what our military leaders need done for our national security, and we will not be thwarted by the ideas of the science-fiction thinkers, particularly in the face of fundamental factual data and logic to the contrary.

We ask that this letter be read to the Congress and made a matter of CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Respectfully yours,

D. STEA, *President.*

REA Loans: Not an Expense, an Investment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 28, 1959

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Not an Expense, an Investment," which was published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of Friday, May 15, 1959. The editorial calls attention to the 24th anniversary of REA and discusses its value.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The 24th birthday which REA is just celebrating is a good time to stop and reflect whether REA loans are a source of national expense or of national profit. During this now nearly quarter of a century, the Rural Electrification Administration has made loans totaling more than $3,800 million.

That money has built 1,480,000 miles of distribution lines and brought central station electric service to 5,140,000 rural customers. When REA started, 89 percent of American farmers lacked electric service. Now 96 percent of them have it. But REA's job is far from done. Once they get electricity, farmers, like anyone else, use it increasingly. It is up to the rural electric cooperatives financed by REA funds to keep up with that increasing demand.

Borrowers have repaid $599,700,000 in principal due to REA. They have paid $357,600,000 in interest. They have made advance payments on principal totaling $141,700,000. Only 1 of 1,082 borrowers is behind in payments. During a large part of REA's life the interest rate paid on its loans equaled or exceeded the rate which the Government had to pay for the money. That, we believe, is the way it ought to be. REA cooperatives need Federal financing because other financing is not available to them; but they do not need an interest subsidy. Current loan rates should reflect the current state of the money market.

When this has been said, it remains profoundly true that funds lent to REA cooperatives are performing a service for our people that would not otherwise be performed, and are being paid back promptly. "The rural electrification program," says REA Administrator David A. Hamil, "has proved one of the soundest investments ever made by the people of this country." It is a sound and profitable investment for everyone concerned.

Education To Match Our Times

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 28, 1959

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, we are at that time of the year when the closing of the academic program for a brief vacation period has an even greater significance for hundreds of thousands of our young people of the graduating classes than it has for the pupil census as a whole.

In speaking of this special significance of the season to the graduates—especially the high school seniors—I have primary reference to the counseling they receive on their future problems and prospects, notably during the commencement ceremonies.

Of course the number of commencement exercises and the number of commencement addresses which have been delivered, even in the lifetime of those of us present in this body today, have been virtually countless. Each graduating class received its full share of the pearls of wisdom from the text of the commencement speaker. It is difficult to discern much that is not repetitious of a great deal that has been said before when we hear or read a commencement address only recently delivered.

Sometimes, however, even though the theme may be ancient, the new text that comes to our attention has a freshness of rhetoric or a special approach to logical conclusions which prompts us to listen more attentively or read with somewhat more pleasure and enlightenment than would normally be the case.

On the otherhand, sometimes the author and speaker of the commencement address is a person who excites our imagination and given cause for us to examine his product somewhat more closely.

Mr. President, I believe it was a combination of these conditions—plus an intriguing title—which prompted me to read with much pleasure and profit a commencement address delivered at Harpers Ferry, W. Va., last night to the high school graduating class of that community by the distinguished senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH].

I had the privilege of serving in the House of Representatives with the able senior Senator from West Virginia, where he capably called upon his background as an educator and journalist, as well as his ability as a practitioner and teacher of the spoken word, to clearly present his viewpoints on many vital issues. In this body, where it again is a privilege to serve with the gentleman, we know that his horizon has been broadened by both additional experience as an educator and a businessman, and his lengthy prior period of service in the Congress. Thus, as he spoke to graduating classes recently at Glen Rogers and Harpers Ferry in his home State of West Virginia, and as he speaks tonight to the senior class of Elkview High School, tomorrow night at Dunbar High School, and subsequently to the graduating classes of other high schools in his native State, the senior Senator from West Virginia wears the toga of wide experience and delivers messages to the graduates which are as meaningful as they are rhetorically pleasant to hear or read.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of the address delivered by the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] at the commencement exercises May 27, 1959, in Harpers Ferry, W. Va., for the graduating class of the high school there, entitled "Education To Match Our Times."

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EDUCATION TO MATCH OUR TIMES

(Address by Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH, Democrat of West Virginia)

Ladies an gentlemen and graduates of Harpers Ferry High School, I am grateful for the opportunity to share in the commencement program of the class of 1959. It is a particular benefit for those of us who are largely preoccupied with the affairs of an adult world to return to the presence of youth—to share again in the sense of challenge and the drama of a beckoning world.

Especially is this so at commencement time—the very word itself indicating a beginning rather than an end, and the diploma being a license to proceed on new terms rather than to retire on the old ones. It is customary at such a time for the person in my present role to tell you that you are now entering the world—that life is a serious affair, and that you must now place aside the idle pleasures and pastimes of youth.

I believe I need not tell you this—even if it were so. For I believe that not only have you been in this world for some time, but

I daresay that life wears as real a face to youth as it does to adults. Your sorrows and your joys, your victories and your defeats, are felt as keenly—perhaps more so—than those of your elders, since your sensibilities have not been dulled by custom and usage.

And surely there is no more infuriating statement to the young than the self-righteous comment that "You're too young to understand—when you're older, dear"—as though age alone wears the badge of understanding.

But if commencement is not this simple act of entering the world, it is in truth the beginning of a new and significant phase in your life. For some of you it means a brief interlude before assuming a new role as student in college. For others it presents the prospect of a choice in business or industry or agriculture. And for some of you it may mean the assumption of family responsibilities in the not-to-distant future.

All of you, however, share at least one common element in this experience: you are leaving behind the relatively sheltered atmosphere of high school where many of the decisions have been made for you and where the range of your own freedoms and responsibilities has been comparatively restricted. From here on, for better or worse, whether in college, at work, or in marriage, the responsibility of your own acts, your own determinations, will be increasingly yours. The world will henceforth adopt the view of the poet who stated:

"Our acts our angles are, or good or ill,
Our fatal shadows that walk by us still."

—*Epilog to Beaumont and Fletcher's "Honest Man's Fortune."*

Thus, your growing freedom of the right to choose carries with it the responsibility for making your choice. In this respect you as individuals must carry on the process of education—on your own initative—from where you leave it today. And it is your fate and your fortune to embark upon this adventure during perhaps the most difficult and complex times our society has ever faced.

It has become a commonplace to refer to ours as a time of revolution—industrial revolution at home and political and social revolutions abroad. Yet the true revolution is still the one we gave birth to almost 185 years ago—the revolution of the individual. The true revolution is the revolution of Thomas Jefferson, not Karl Marx—of the belief in the dignity of the individual rather than the authority of the State. This is the revolution of the American proposition which was so clearly stated by Henry Thoreau when he wrote that "there will never be a really free and enlighened state until the state comes to recognize the individual as a higher and independent power, from which all its own power and authority are derived, and treats him accordingly."

Thus it is that the task of education today—formal education in the schools, as well as self-education in your own lives—is to recreate the sense of individual responsibility, and this means to reestablish and rededicate our belief in man—the belief that man can control his own destiny if he will. For freedom and responsibility are but opposite handles of the same pitcher.

No one understood this better than Abraham Lincoln—who knew so much of the terror and wonder of the human soul—when, in the dreadful December of 1862, he pointed the way of duty to the Congress in these words:

"Fellow citizens, we cannot escape history. We of this Congress and this administration will be remembered in spite of ourselves. No personal significance or insignificance can spare one or another of us. The fiery trial through which we pass will light us down, in honor or dishonor, to the latest generation. We—even we here—hold the power and bear the responsibility."

We pay that our Nation may never again bear such a burden. Yet, while our times do not always provide the occasions for dramatic and heroic actions, the measure of our own responsibility is not lessened. The daily choices, which gather as the sands in an hour glass, are just as vital in our own lives as the most momentous decisions in the affairs of state. I am not, therefore, addressing you in terms of the kind of responsibility exercised by Lincoln, or by our leaders today. I am talking about responsibility—duty—moral obligation—call it what you will—in the terms that you face it, not in my terms, nor in your parents', nor in your teachers'.

First—and also the final—in importance is the obligation to seek to live up to your full resources as a human being. And this, I assure you, is no easy matter. The great psychologist and philosopher, William James, remarked on this point, that "as a rule men habitually use only a small part of the powers which they actually possess and which they might use under appropriate conditions. Most of us feel as if a sort of cloud weighed upon us. * * * Compared with what we ought to be, we are only half awake. Our fires are damped, our drafts are checked. We are making use of only a small part of our possible mental and physical resources." This James called the habit of inferiority to our full self.

To speak in concrete terms this means to accept those choices which challenge your full capacities—not to look for the short-cut and the painless way of "three easy lessons" which has become almost a national disease among us. For those of you who are going to college it will mean, among other things, choosing courses of genuine educational value rather than the so-called "snap" courses which make for easy grades. For others it may mean turning down a job which offers immediate but short-term rewards for a lengthy apprenticeship to a genuine and honest craft. But for each of you there exists the overriding obligation to discover yourself, for the one individual on earth you cannot afford to be a stranger to is—yourself—your own true self.

To know thyself—to expand the area of one's own consciousness—this is the first injunction laid upon, the first duty to be fulfilled by the responsible citizen. For those of you who are now about to be confronted with a new challenge in the process of self-discovery it is not too early to give thought to the role of your work in this respect.

Ralph Waldo Emerson stated that "A man coins his life in his work." Thus, whether you are destined for a career in the professions or the field of scholarship, whether in commerce or industry, whether in agriculture or the skilled crafts, your work is the main element offering direction, purpose, and continuity in your life. And here also we find freedom and responsibility joined—the freedom to make your choice in the light of your own interests and talents, and the responsibility to dignify your work, whatever your calling, by bringing your full energies and your best efforts to bear upon it. No society in history has offered the bewildering variety and complexity of opportunities that exist in our Nation today. But this very wealth may present its own problems to the novice, especially to the young person of unusual gifts who may squander his energies in several directions. The task of determining your interests and assessing your aptitudes and talents is therefore on which deserves the most serious thought you can give and the most competent professional assistance you can obtain.

In the choice also of your long-range goals and aspirations there lies the foundation for your discovery of self and your development as an individual. The person who takes for his own the aims and ideals that have guided the aspirations of mankind in general—this person may occasionally lose a battle, but he will win the final war. And though the person who seeks always his own private advantage, whose eye is on the main chance, may appear to prosper, the suspicion and distrust that he engenders eventually destroys the only qualities worth calling human.

Nor is this merely a Pollyana platitude of an elder trying to steer you through the rough waters ahead. The insights of the great moral teachers of the ages—of Leviticus, of Jesus of Nazareth, of the Buddha, of Confucius—all rest on the solid foundation of knowledge of the human soul. And for even the most "sophisticated" there is a growing acknowledgment of these truths in the study of modern psychology.

In recent years, for example, there has been an increasing acceptance among many rather hard-headed psychologists of a point of view called self-actualization. Though the word is a tongue twister, the idea is a rather simple one—as are many profound ideas. Briefly, it is the view that the truly successful people—an Albert Schweitzer, an Albert Einstein, an Eleanor Roosevelt, a Mahatma Gandhi—the people who provide for all the world a moral ideal—these people are motivated not by fears and anxieties about their own private and personal benefits, but by the drive to actualize the self, to live up to the full potentialities of their own true selves.

This too, however, involves the problem of self-knowledge and the challenge of decisions. For just as in our work, so in our choice of ideals and values, each of us must define the problem for himself. For each of us has his own unique pattern of interests and talents, and each of us has a limited amount of energies which can be devoted to causes outside ourselves. To join in support of every worthy cause which seeks to enlist our efforts, to march to every passing band is to squander and dissipate our energies. Rather, the part of wisdom is to determine those areas where one can most effectively serve and, in the words of Thoreau, for each to "step to the music which he hears, however measured or far away."

In closing, let me reemphasize that the growing into manhood and womanhood is part of a continuing education. Your teachers and your school have laid the foundation. The next development lies with you.

To come to a knowledge of yourself, and to attempt to live to the measure of your full self is your chief responsibility. If this obligation is fulfilled you will, in the process, answer whatever rightful claims your fellow men and women may make against you. In this way also you will fulfill the hope of a democratic society and justify our faith in the dignity of man—a faith which it is ever necessary for us to reaffirm to the world. If each of you lives in the light of this belief, bearing it with you in your hearts and minds your frontiers of the future will be worthwhile and rewarding.

Answer of Krebiozen Research Foundation to the Background Paper on Krebiozen of the American Cancer Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROLAND V. LIBONATI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 27, 1959

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, the importance of finding a key to the arrest-

ment and cure of cancer is paramount in the minds of every human being in America today. The controversy over the question of krebiozen has been the result of certain interests in both the medical and pharmaceutical activities involved in the cancer program.

Several months ago the American Cancer Society released a so-called background paper on krebiozen. The whole purpose of the document was to discount Dr. Andrew C. Ivy, one of the greatest physiologists in the world, and to minimize and destroy the importance of krebiozen as a cancer remedy. But, fortunately for humankind, ailing and dying due to the affliction of cancer, the proposed scientific treatment of krebiozen in this background paper was based upon misinformation and outright mistatement of situations, conditions, and medical reports touching upon the area of krebiozen research.

It seems peculiar that, while every real doctor, blessed by God to carry out the great oath of Hipprocrates to serve the people, is endeavoring to discover, formulate, and develop a cancer remedy; but the pseudo-political leaders of the American Cancer Association and the profit marginal snatching servants of the American Cancer Society, upon whose directorate sit many of those who control the destinies of the American Medical Association, are using every effort to discourage, hamper, and belittle the one remedy that has proven itself; over 500 medical men, who have personally used the drug upon their patients and have submitted reports to the Krebiozen Foundation, describing, step-by-step, the progressive effects of krebiozen upon those terminal cases that have been given krebiozen in the last stages of cancer have proven it.

The American Medical Association, through its officials, has distorted and lied about the results of the administration of krebiozen to these unfortunates. It is only natural that Dr. Ivy, who has been the recipient of their vicious propaganda to destroy him as a medical authority in research, and as a member of the profession as well, could not now be expected, after such vilification and persecution, to turn krebiozen over to their self-appointed committee and, without any determining control on Dr. Ivy's part, or his associates, permit them to test the same and to enter their findings which, no doubt, regardless of the value of the drug, would result in the same forgone conclusion voiced falsely year ago in the false findings that they have heretofore publicized, that "it is worthless."

Dr. Ivy and his associate, Dr. Durovic, are not fools, to place the whole future of krebiozen at stake in the hands of the enemy since krebiozen has been tested by over 500 medical men, members of the American Medical Association, and found to have merit and biological activity. It would be like placing the head of a new-born babe within reach of the jaws of a wolf. Several of the false leaders of the American Medical Association would do anything to destroy krebiozen but, unfortunately for them, public clamor, echoing in the hills, is growing louder and louder. Their pet cancer foundations and projects are losing donors and, in their powerful position, they finally had to capitulate and answer the people with the so-called research of the background paper on krebiozen by the American Cancer Society which, in itself, is an insult to the intelligence of the American people.

There are presently 42 persons, two of whom are physicians, who are alive and free from cancer and who, as terminal cases, were sent home to die, and then received krebiozen and are now without a trace of cancerous tissue or growth. There are also, at the present time, 64 other persons, two of whom are physicians, where their cancerous condition is in a state of arrestment and completely controlled, who also were terminal cases and sent home to die. It is certain that the truth always seeks out the liar.

Dr. John R. Heller, director of the National Cancer Institute, with its millions of dollars for research given by the Government through the Congress, should now in our estimation, change sides and forget the sweet mouthings in defense of the position taken by the American Medical Association and the American Cancer Society. He should trust those who are trustworthy and, thereby do a service to the common man on the street. He has only the importance that the Congress and his Government have given him in doing a job for the people. He had better move in the right direction and become more of a humanitarian and less a research perfectionist planner. Dr. Heller knows and is fully cognizant of the nefarious practices against krebiozen and its medical sponsors and also the distortion and the suppression of evidence given to the American Medical Association.

He further knows that the American Medical Association is in control of the American Cancer Society and the individuals serving in its official family are known enemies who have fought against krebiozen. Dr. Heller would best serve the people by granting a free test of this drug with Dr. Ivy as a member to insure honest results. The drug has already been tested by over 500 physicians and not found wanting. After all, 42 people who were sent home to die and are now, through the use of krebiozen, without a cancerous condition and free of cancer, should mean something to him. These things do not occur by accident. It is very kind of him to appear before the Subcommittee on Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare of the House Committee on Appropriations, to approve the funds set out for the operation of the National Cancer Institute and to mouth pretty statements but, whether he knows it or not, he is unwittingly a party to a common conspiracy to destroy a drug which is not toxic, and that will alleviate the sufferings and pain of unfortunates, regardless of its value as a curative substance, and he further knows that in excess of 100 persons who received krebiozen are either fully cured of the disease of cancer, or the disease is now controlled.

Dr. Heller is a strong leader in medical circles and, therefore, should act as a courageous man, in spite of the opposition of those of high professional reputation. He is a great doctor who, because of his high talents, controls the National Cancer Institutes, but he also enjoys a fiduciary relationship to the man on the street who look to men like Dr. Heller for protection and for the advancement of the development in research of drugs to alleviate and cure the ailments of man. The following paper by Dr. Andrew C. Ivy is his answer to the American Cancer Society paper. He must be heard:

ANSWER OF KREBIOZEN RESEARCH FOUNDATION TO THE BACKGROUND PAPER ON KREBIOZEN OF THE AMERICAN CANCER SOCIETY

INTRODUCTION

On March 9, 1959, the American Cancer Society released what it calls a background paper on krebiozen, which has since been reprinted in the Journal of the American Medical Association.

It would be expected that in addressing the public on any matter relating to cancer, the American Cancer Society would exercise an exact regard for truth. Yet this paper is neither honest nor truthful. It misrepresents the facts, omits much pertinent material and makes use of half-truths and falsities in order to discredit krebiozen and its supporters in the eyes of the public.

The overall aim of this paper is obviously to persuade the public by a variety of stratagems that blame for the failure to test krebiozen rest with Dr. Ivy and the Krebiozen Research Foundation rather than with the agencies which have refused such a test.

As a matter of actual fact, those chiefly concerned with krebiozen experimentation have sought such a test since 1952.

At that time Dr. Ivy proposed it to the American Medical Association as a means of ending the controversy over krebiozen. The American Medical Association refused.

In February 1958 in response to public interest, the American Cancer Society invited and the Krebiozen Research Foundation submitted a proposal for the testing of krebiozen. The American Cancer Society stalled this proposal for many months and finally rejected it.

Then in August 1958, Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS in a Senate speech proposed that the National Cancer Institute undertake substantially the same test the Krebiozen Research Foundation had submitted earlier to the American Cancer Society and remarked: "This is a fair test. It can do no harm. It might do great good."

The Senator's proposal was immediately accepted by Dr. Ivy and the Krebiozen Research Foundation. The National Cancer Institute and its director, Dr. John R. Heller, rejected it.

Thus, a fair test to determine once and for all whether krebiozen is active against cancer has been sought from every responsible agency which could formally conduct it.

The fact that it has been refused by each in turn creates a paradox, very costly to the public, which is not easily explained in view of the extensive search for potential cancer remedies now being sponsored at great expense by two of these same organizations—the American Cancer Society and the National Cancer Institute.

Some 40,000 chemical compounds are being screened each year on the bare chance that they will show anticancer activity. Krebiozen alone—a drug which at the least has the evidence of some 300 doctors that it gives a 70-percent beneficial activity in advanced and terminal cancer patients—is denied a test by the very people who profess

to be leading the search for drug remedies against cancer.

The background paper of the American Cancer Society is an attempt to rationalize this situation by an attack on Dr. Ivy, on krebiozen, and on all others connected with it.

For purposes of reply, the charges, hints, and insinuations scattered through this document can be grouped under four main headings:

I. Regarding the test proposed by the Krebiozen Research Foundation and Dr. Andrew C. Ivy;

II. Regarding the substance itself, its discoverer, and his associates;

III. Regarding previous purported evaluations of the drug made by the agencies of organized medicine; and

IV. Regarding the attitude of the National Cancer Institute toward a fair test of krebiozen proposed by Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, of Illinois.

I. REGARDING THE TEST PROPOSED BY THE KREBIOZEN RESEARCH FOUNDATION AND DR. ANDREW C. IVY

The American Cancer Society paper states that, "the owners and proponents have demanded that the substance (krebiozen) be tested according to their own terms, which are demonstrably unscientific." The fact is, that we have asked for the most scientific test possible. The double-blind test is standard in the laboratory and is the world over accepted as the best method for evaluating the activity of a drug.

In this connection it should be noted that at one of the meetings with Senator DOUGLAS between Drs. Ivy and Durovic and members of the National Cancer Institute staff, Dr. Durovic asked Dr. Heller if he considered the double-blind test unscientific.

Dr. Heller answered: "No, of course not. It is our standard of drug evaluation at the National Cancer Institute."

Nevertheless, he admitted in answer to another question that, in his capacity as a director of the American Cancer Society, he had voted a little earlier that the proposal to evaluate krebiozen by this method should be turned down as unscientific.

This type of inconsistency has been manifest at every turn in negotiations for a test of krebiozen. Yet, neither the American Medical Association, the American Cancer Society, nor the National Cancer Institute has ever stated that the type of test proposed by the Krebiozen Foundation would not give clear-cut results as to krebiozen's activity. Nor could they do so. From Pasteur on, the double-blind test has been accepted in science as the most objective and certain method for evaluating a new therapy, since it rules out subjective impressions of both the physicians giving the treatment and the patients receiving it. Only results based on facts count.

Yet, the American Cancer Society and National Cancer Institute contend for one reason or another, that this method should not be used for krebiozen. One reason assigned for refusing the test, for example, is that its results—under the stipulated conditions—would not be acceptable to the scientific community.

This is to misinterpret the problem. What is required in the present situation is not to find something "acceptable to the scientific community," but to establish a fact. A fact, once established, compels acceptance. It is not something which can be refused or rejected at the whim or pleasure of a guild or professional group.

And if krebiozen is of value, who would wish to reject this truth? Surely not the humane and dedicated physicians who together make up the scientific community, and who are saddened almost daily at their helplessness to save patients in the late stages of cancer. It is they who are eager to do more than just lower the opiate curtain over the victims of malignancy.

Entirely invalid is the astonishing opposition to Dr. Ivy's assisting in the administration of the drug on the ground that this would not permit an opportunity to determine whether physicians generally can obtain the same results. This is to suggest that Dr. Ivy is a magician. It ignores the fact that krebiozen has been used by more than 300 qualified physicians, under suggestions from Dr. Ivy and his associates, as to the dosages and technique of administration. Dr. Ivy treated only a part of the patients personally. It is on the basis of reports of those physicians as well as Dr. Ivy's observations, that the foundation has ascertained krebiozen's incontrovertible beneficial effects.

The foundation has proposed that Dr. Ivy assist in the administration of the drug, because there is no denying that he has more knowledge and experience in its dosage-rates for different types of cancer than anyone else. Furthermore, his presence in administering the drug would be of inestimable value in avoiding possible errors, either intentional or inadvertent, which would make a thoroughly valid test unreliable. Neither Dr. Ivy, nor anyone else, could, by serving in this capacity, make an inactive drug give positive results. But relative novices in the administration of a new drug could inadvertently, unintentionally or through ignorance make a useful drug appear to be worthless.

II. REGARDING THE SUBSTANCE ITSELF, ITS DISCOVERER, AND HIS ASSOCIATES

In its efforts to cast doubt on krebiozen, the American Cancer Society intimates that the very existence of this drug is problematical. And this in the face of certain established evidence of its chemical composition. To this end, it also attempts to create suspicion as to the character, methods and intentions of its discoverer, Dr. Stevan Durovic, and as to the motives and professional competence of physicians taking part in its experimental application.

It ignores and misrepresents the great amount of material published about krebiozen during the past 8 years—material which includes accounts of the theory on which this drug is based, its process of manufacture, and what has been learned as to its chemistry.

Most glaring of all is the failure of the American Cancer Society even to refer to the great number of patients treated with krebiozen, many of whom have gained positive results.

Thus, asking the question, "What is krebiozen?" the American Cancer Society completely balks the true answer and calculatingly or out of ignorance, perverts the issue.

Krebiozen is a substance produced on the basis of a new concept of what cancer is and how it should be treated.

According to this theory, every living cell produces, among other substances, one which regulates its growth. If for any reason a cell is injured (by chemical, or physical means, for instance) so as to impair production of this substance, then such a cell becomes decontrolled and starts to divide. The result is a cancerous growth.

If this autogenous control factor—normally made by the cells themselves—can be supplied artificially, then the cancerous cell may be again controlled.

On the basis of this new approach, cells of healthy horses were stimulated by a growth factor, (in this case an extract of actinomyces bovis, which causes rapid cell growth and division) in order to induce them to defend themselves by producing larger than normal quantities of the growth regulatory substance (krebiozen).

Tried first on spontaneous tumors in animals, krebiozen was found to be highly active against tumor growth. It was later established to have the same activity against human tumor; clinical trial demonstrating that the active single dose is 0.01 milligram of crude substance, which is dissolved in 1 cubic centimeter of mineral oil for administration.

It is important to note here that at the time of krebiozen's discovery, no known substance was potent in such small amounts. Some years later, however, an even more potent substance was discovered in aldosterone, a hormone produced by the adrenal glands and now used in the treatment of edema. In any case however, it has long been known that hormones act in the body in infinitesimal amounts.

On the basis of its biological activity as well as its chemical properties, krebiozen is classified as a local hormone or autacoid.

The American Cancer Society paper deliberately disregards all of this scientific information and states only that krebiozen is "an alleged anticancer drug said to have been produced by Dr. Stevan Durovic." Nor does the American Cancer Society make any reference to the clinical investigation of krebiozen, which in the number of patients and physicians involved, as well as in its duration, is probably the most extensive in the history of cancer research.

Since 1950, krebiozen has been used in the treatment of approximately 1,500 cancer patients by some hundreds of physicians in the United States and 29 foreign countries. The results can be summarized as follows:

1. A demonstrated activity in different dosages against all types of cancer.

2. Subjective improvement such as relief or complete abolition of pain in 70 percent of treated cases. Objective improvement ranging from decrease to complete disappearance of tumor in 50 percent of treated cases.

3. Of 500 hopeless patients treated 5 to 9 years, 10 percent have been free of detectible signs of cancer for 3 to 8 years.

The American Cancer Society chooses not to acquaint the public with these facts but continues that in making krebiozen "Dr. Durovic claims that he injected 2,000 Argentinian horses with actinomyces bovis, a micro-organism which causes lumpy jaw in cattle, and from the blood of these infected horses he extracted 2 grams—about one-half teaspoonful—of a whitish powder which he named krebiozen."

This is not accurate. The horses were injected with a sterile extract of actinomyces bovis. Hence the horses were not infected. With this misleading statement, the American Cancer Society is trying to give the impression that krebiozen is some concoction brewed from the blood of infected horses in impossibly small amounts. It is of a piece with what follows, namely that the full details of the method of extraction have never been disclosed and that Dr. Ivy has said that the process of manufacturing krebiozen has never been revealed.

These statements are also untrue.

Krebiozen is made by extracting the blood of injected horses with organic solvents (such as ether and benzene). The organic solvents are evaporated and the greasy-oily residue extracted with redistilled water, which when evaporated leaves krebiozen powder.

These basic scientific steps were disclosed publicly in 1951 and have been published several times since. (Report of the Krebiozen Research Foundation, 1954; "Observations on Krebiozen in the Management of Cancer," Ivy, Pick, and Phillips, 1956; "Medical Therapeutic Improvement of Canine Cataract," annual meeting of the Illinois Veterinary Association, February 1959.)

Dr. Ivy has never stated that this process has not been disclosed. He has said that the laboratory flow sheet or manufacturing details for krebiozen have not been revealed. Krebiozen is the property of Duga Labora-

tories, a pharmaceutical house incorporated in the State of Illinois, which financed the research leading to the drug's discovery. No pharmaceutical company reveals all of its manufacturing details on any substance.

Nevertheless, enough has been published regarding the manufacture of krebiozen so that Dr. Ivy was able to make a batch of the drug from 46 horses in 1956, or to enable any other competent investigator to do the same thing.

Thus, it can be seen that the allegations of the American Cancer Society in this regard are false and directed not at an honest delineation of the actual situation but used to convince the public that krebiozen is a secret remedy. Having made this attempt, the American Cancer Society goes on to intimate that it may also be nonexistent.

In this connection, it states "* * * Dr. Durovic brought this powder [krebiozen] to the United States. Here, without prior chemical analysis of the powder, he dissolved it in No. 9 mineral oil in the ratio of one part of krebiozen to 100,000 parts mineral oil." And again, "* * * he [Dr. Ivy] has neither seen nor analyzed the original substance in the undissolved state."

Here, the American Cancer Society makes use of two statements which are technically correct to bolster its previous false statement that the chemical composition of krebiozen remains unknown and to mislead the reader as to the scientific competence of Drs. Ivy, Durovic, and associates.

As a matter of fact, Dr. Durovic's procedure in dissolving krebiozen in mineral oil was correct and customary in sicence. In dealing with a new substance, the usual practice is not to spend time and money on chemical analysis until it is first shown that the product is active. For example, insulin was discovered and introduced in therapy in 1924 but its chemical formula was not established until 1956.

The basic chemical composition of krebiozen was determined in 1952 and announced in 1953. Additional data was published in 1956. Further chemical analysis showed that krebiozen is a lipopolysaccharide (a complex sugar linked to a fatty molecule). This gradual accumulation of chemical data regarding krebiozen, is similar to the progress made with insulin and cortisone and is in the best sicentific tradition.

It is correct that Dr. Ivy did not chemically analyze krebiozen powder before it was dissolved in mineral oil. But he did analyze it after it had been reextracted from the mineral oil.

The reader (of the American Cancer Society document) however, is meant to conclude that krebiozen has never been chemically analyzed and that such analysis is necessary to show that the product is of value in treating cancer patients, none of which is true.

To reinforce the false impression it tries to create regarding krebiozen, the American Cancer Society points out that two chemists, Drs. Paul Kirk of the University of California, and Arthur Furst of Stanford University, testified in 1958 that krebiozen is nothing but nujol.

Dr. Kirk stated he received six ampules from Dr. Batchelder, chairman of the American Cancer Society division in San Francisco. Dr. Furst testified that he found one ampule at Stanford University and that another ampule was given him by the same Dr. Batchelder (scientific procurement?). As an experimental drug krebiozen can only be obtained from the Krebiozen Research Foundation. Neither Dr. Kirk, Dr. Furst, nor Dr. Batchelder ever requested krebiozen and none was ever sent to them by Krebiozen Foundation.

Dr. Kirk also testified that by infra-red spectroscopy he detected something other than mineral oil. In the next breath he denied finding anything but nujol.

Dr. Kirk was quick to qualify his testimony by saying, "the net results of these various tests has convinced me that at least the ampules I received—I don't know a thing about any samples except what I examined—but that the samples I received consist of good grade mineral oil." Thus, after the bold yet bland forray denying the very existence of krebiozen, Dr. Kirk sought to exculpate himself from legal consequences by saying, "I don't know anything about any samples except what I examined." He did not wish to be held accountable for any statement about krebiozen in general but only regarding the six ampules which he used for his purported tests and which are no longer available, thus making it impossible to check the verisimilitude of Dr. Kirk's statements.

Still more striking is the testimony of Dr. Furst that he received only two ampules of krebiozen, and with these two ampules made the following tests: (1) The ultraviolet spectrum; (2) several chemical tests; (3) extractions; (4) toxicity studies on animals; (5) therapeutic tests against Sarcoma 180 in mice; and (6) therapeutic tests on Ehrlich tumor in mice. It is inconceivable that these tests could be done with two ampules of krebiozen. To show how ridiculous Dr. Furst's statements are, it is enough to point out that only to perform the toxicological test, he would have had to inject 12 animals daily for one month. For this one test alone a minimum of 360 ampules of krebiozen would have been required.

In any case, the testimony of these two chemists, referred to in the American Cancer Society report as distinguished, is chemically preposterous, if indeed, they analyzed krebiozen ampules as they swore under oath they did. Krebiozen is dissolved in No. 9 light mineral oil. These men testified that the ampules they analyzed contained nothing but nujol which is heavy mineral oil. Since krebiozen never was dissolved in nujol, but only in light mineral oil No. 9, which is quite different, what is to be inferred about the ability of chemists who cannot distinguish light and heavy mineral oil, which are so different that any school boy could tell one from the other.

Dr. Ivy challenged this testimony in an affidavit stating that either he or these two chemists were lying. Since statements of all three had been made under oath, he urged that the record of this hearing be submitted to a grand jury for a determination of perjury.

But the most significant point in all this mysterious analysis is the Machiavellian role played by the American Cancer Society. Dr. Batchelder, an official of the American Cancer Society, arranged this analysis. The testimony of Drs. Furst and Kirk was widely publicized in May 1958, just prior to the time when the American Cancer Society was reported ready to announce decision on our proposal for testing krebiozen. Dr. Ivy's demand for a determination of perjury upset what was apparently a prearranged plan to use this testimony as the basis for the American Cancer Society refusal to test krebiozen. The final American Cancer Society announcement to this effect was thus delayed until October, when it was said that our proposal was unscientific.

It is precisely this sort of unscientific maneuvering which underscores the need for the controlled double-blind test proposed by the Krebiozen Foundation. How incredible it is that the American Cancer Society can affect such concern as to whether the scientific community would accept this type of test, yet does not hesitate to offer testimony of the sort given by Drs. Kirk and Furst as proof that krebiozen does not merit testing at all.

To bolster the impression that krebiozen is ineffective, the author of the American Cancer Society paper cites the work of John B. Loeffer, Ph.D., who reported in the Journal of the American Medical Association on May 17, 1952, that krebiozen failed to affect transplanted mouse leukemia and lymphosarcoma.

Krebiozen does not affect transplanted animal tumors and was never claimed to do so. This was established at the very beginning of our work with this drug and was reported by us in 1951 in the initial publication on krebiozen. Thus, Dr. Loeffer's work only confirmed our own and if the American Cancer Society publication had been honest, it would have been referred to, if at all, in this sense.

The American Cancer Society paper makes much of the fact that publications concerning krebiozen research have been privately printed and that Dr. Durovic, a research scientist, has published nothing in U.S. scientific journals during his 10 years in this country. The implication is that there is something blameworthy in these facts.

And indeed there is. But it does not accrue to Dr. Ivy and his collaborators or to Dr. Durovic.

The real fact is that all publication on krebiozen in the medical literature has been systematically blocked—through the exercise of bureaucratic control by the American Cancer Society and the American Medical Association over the scientific community.

Publication of a report on 40 cases treated with krebiozen at the Lankenau Institute has not been permitted. This report written by the man who treated these patients is still being suppressed.

Dr. Ivy is the author of 1,500 scientific papers, 65 of them accepted for publication since the time he has been working with krebiozen. Yet he has never succeeded in publishing one article in a medical journal on krebiozen.

The monograph on this subject written by Drs. Ivy, Pick, and Phillips was initially accepted by a medical journal but was later returned after pressure was brought to bear on the publisher. It was subsequently rejected by two other journals and in the end was published by a nonmedical publisher, Henry Regnery, Chicago.

If Dr. Ivy, prominent as he is, failed in this regard, is it any wonder that Dr. Durovic, a stranger and a man under heavy calculated fire almost since his entry into the United States, could not succeed in securing publication for his articles. The latest attempt by Dr. Durovic to gain scientific publication was in December 1958 when he submitted to General Practitioner a very substantial article on the activity of krebiozen against spontaneous tumors in animals. The article was rejected.

Needless to say, the American Cancer Society paper omits all reference to these facts. It never fails however, to identify men who have submitted unfavorable reports on krebiozen as distinguished scientists. Those who have taken part in krebiozen research are scarcely identified at all.

Dr. John F. Pick, of Chicago, for instance, is dismissed as a plastic surgeon; Dr. Louis R. Krasno, as a researcher in antibiotic dusts.

The American Cancer Society almost pointedly refrains from telling its readers that Dr. Pick is one of America's most eminent plastic surgeons, internationally recognized, author of a standard text, "The Surgery of Repair," and well-known for his demonstration among prisoners at Stateville penitentiary, Joliet, Ill., of the role of facial deformity in the genesis of criminality. This involved corrective surgery on more than 1,000 men and aided the rehabilitation of most, a feat for which Dr. Pick has been honored by the John Howard Organization, and scientific as well as legal groups the world over.

The American Cancer Society paper also omits mention of the fact that Dr. Krasno's work with penicillin dust won medal awards

from both the Illinois State and the American Medical Associations in the year of its presentation. Nor does the American Cancer Society inform its readers that Dr. Krasno, a pioneer in aviation medicine, is currently director of medical research for United Airlines.

In support of its thesis that there is something questionable about those who have developed krebiozen, the American Cancer Society attempts to indicate that they have avoided customary procedures for the patenting and marketing of substances designed for use in therapy. In this connection the American Cancer Society paper comments, (1) on the status of the krebiozen patent application; and (2) on licensing procedures.

As to the first it states: "Some years ago, the owners of krebiozen applied for a patent but when the U.S. Patent Office returned the application with request for further information, the owners of krebiozen failed to supply this information and did not resubmit their application. Hence, there is no patent or new application for a patent on krebiozen, either the substance or the process, in the files of the U.S. Patent Office, as of January 1959."

This statement is false.

Dr. Durovic first filed for a patent (No. 254985) November 5, 1951. This application has been amended three times and is still pending under continuation dated May 5, 1958, with the serial No. 732,785.

The American Cancer Society discussion of the problem of licensing is intentionally misleading, directed at making the reader believe that application to license krebiozen for sale has never been made.

The facts are as follows:

The matter of whether krebiozen is subject to the jurisdiction of the Public Health Service, which licenses serums and vaccines, or to that of the Food and Drug Administration, which licenses drugs, is in dispute.

The Duga Laboratories holds krebiozen, by theory and chemical properties, to be a hormone and therefore subject to the Food and Drug Administration. In 1954 application for license was filed with this agency together with all necessary data for obtaining it. The Food and Drug Administration first accepted this filing under No. 9368, but later refused either to grant or deny a license and advised Duga Laboratories to submit krebiozen to the jurisdiction of the Public Health Service.

The reasons for the Food and Drug Administration handling of the krebiozen licensing application are plain to any one who knows the regulations governing the two agencies but they must be explained for the general reader who is not familiar with the technicalities of such procedures.

Under FDA rules, license is granted on a showing that the drug in question is not toxic in the prescribed dose. A showing of activity is not required. Petition for license must be passed on within 60 days. If the petition is not denied in this time, the drug is considered to be licensed. If the petition is refused, the decision is subject to court review if appealed.

Under Public Health Service regulations, however, proof of activity of the substance for which licensing is requested must be given. Furthermore, no time limit is set for decision, making it possible for the Public Health Service to hold up a license indefinitely. And lastly, no recourse to the courts is provided, either to force a decision or to appeal one which is unjust.

In view of the existing controversy over krebiozen and the prejudice against it, we believe that our clinical evidence would not be given consideration on its merits by the Public Health Service. And if this agency rendered an unjust decision, we would have no possibility of court action to rectify it.

This is the true statement of facts which the American Cancer Society distorts in order to convince their readers that the nature of krebiozen is so questionable that its owners have not dared subject it to scrutiny of Government agencies even for their own protection.

Similarly, the American Cancer Society totally misrepresents the financial aspects of the krebiozen problem.

As to the Krebiozen Research Foundation, the American Cancer Society paper states: "The foundation library center reports that the Krebiozen Research Foundation has not published a list of officers, a report of activities, or a financial statement."

Under its articles of incorporation, the foundation must submit each year a list of its officers and a statement of its purposes to the Illinois Secretary of State. A financial statement is filed each year with the U.S. Department of Internal Revenue, where it is open for inspection like all income tax reports of not-for-profit organizations. In view of this, it is not at all clear why the American Cancer Society picks out of thin air the foundation library center, as its authorized source rather than the official agencies.

For 5 years krebiozen was given free and the cost of maintaining the office of the foundation, and of packing and shipping the drug to the doctors administering it and supplying forms for clinical reports, were paid by the Durovics.

In 1954, the foundation was told that the Durovics no longer were in a financial position to support the full cost of the foundation, and the foundation then agreed to accept contributions from patients or their relatives and friends who were financially able and willing to contribute toward the cost of supplying the drug. The foundation always had made it clear, however, that if the patient was unable to do so, it still would continue to supply the drug free of charge. Today about 60 percent of patients still receive the drug free. Relatively few contribute the production cost of the drug given them, and whatever revenue is raised from this source is used exclusively to maintain further experimentation.

No official of the foundation has ever received any compensation for his work. They rely on other sources entirely for their livelihood. All this is omitted in the American Cancer Society paper.

As for Dr. Durovic and his brother, who have borne almost alone the full cost of the foundation's activity in making krebiozen available to those whom it might help, the American Cancer Society remarks:

"These individuals have made clear that they wish to recoup from the sale of the substance an investment claimed to be about $2 million and that they intend to sell the substance for profit as a proprietary drug."

Krebiozen was developed entirely at the expense of Duga Laboratories. If it should prove useful in the treatment of cancer, and commercialized why should not Duga Laboratories, a pharmaceutical house, at least get back its investment? Is this not customary in every country outside Communist rule and is it not the very basis of our American system of free enterprise?

In a further personal attack on the Durovics, the American Cancel Society declares: "The owners of krebiozen have repeatedly petitioned health organizations supported by public funds to underwrite a test of the therapeutic activity of krebiozen in collaboration with them. They hoped to use public funds to defray the cost, estimated at $500,000 or more, of testing this privately owned substance."

This is not correct.

Indeed, the whole discussion on this point is an intentional misrepresentation of the letter and the spirit of the effort to settle the krebiozen controversy by means of a definitive test. As a matter of fact, the owners of krebiozen have never petitioned anyone to test krebiozen. The American Cancer Society invited the Krebiozen Research Foundation to submit a proposal for a test. Senator PAUL DOUGLAS asked the Public Health Service to give krebiozen a fair test. Dr. Ivy requested the American Medical Association to cooperate in a fair test of krebiozen. This is not to deny, however, that Dr. Durovic and his brother are eager to see such a test performed by one or other of these agencies, not in order that they defray the expense, but because they (the Durovics) still believe these agencies ostensibly competent to supervise it.

The indication in the American Cancer Society paper that unproven methods or substances militate against possible cure of cancer by acceptable methods known at present is misleading. The methods known at present, including surgery and X-ray, are unfortunately nothing more than palliatives. These are necessary and must be used until something better is found, but they are not in any way the final goal and answer to ultimate cancer therapy.

Krebiozen is a pioneer substance which opens a new approach to the problem of cancer. It is not destined to exclude surgery where it is indicated. As a matter of fact, until now krebiozen has been used chiefly in cases where all acceptable methods have failed.

Unlike the American Cancer Society, Drs. Ivy and Durovic are very conservative about the use of the word "cure." What they do maintain, however, is that krebiozen represents a very significant advance in the cancer field and that krebiozen therapy is different in principle from any other now used against cancer.

These are all destructive, and too often self-defeating; as for example, the excision of cancerous tissue by surgery or its destruction by radiation. Krebiozen alone has a reparative function and represents an attempt to solve the biological problem of cancer on a biological basis, by supplying the substance which normally prevents cells from becoming cancerous. ("Observations on Krebiozen in the Management of Cancer," Drs. Ivy, Pick, and Phillips, Henry Regnery & Co., 1956.)

Dr. Durovic began the work leading to the discovery of krebiozen 27 years ago. When Dr. Ivy first presented krebiozen and the ideas on which it is based in 1951, many serious scientists considered them nonsensical. Then surgery, X-ray, and more powerful forms of radiation, and cell-destroying chemicals were the best hope of cancer research. Today it is a consoling fact to Drs. Ivy, Durovic, and their associates, that their concept of a natural defense against cancer which may be exploited for the benefit of the cancer patient, is accepted in the scientific world by both friends and enemies of krebiozen. As example, we may cite the words of Dr. Warren H. Cole, president-elect of American Cancer Society and the man who has twice turned thumbs down on krebiozen. Writing in the Journal of the American Medical Association of April 11, 1959, Dr. Cole remarked: "Evidence of the occurrence of spontaneous regression of cancer supports the concept of biological control of cancer and reinforces the hope that more satisfactory methods of treating cancer than surgery and/or radiation may be found in future years."

Even more significant is the work reported last year by the Sloan-Kettering Institute. The American Cancer Society ignores its relationship to krebiozen. Nevertheless, this was known to the American Cancer Society, if from no other source, from the following letter sent on July 22, 1958, by Dr. Ivy to Dr. Harold S. Diehl, American Cancer Society vice president for research and medical affairs:

"I have just completed a study of the June 1958 progress report of the Sloan-Kettering Institute for Cancer Research, which reviews their studies on the natural, body defense mechanisms against cancer.

"An understanding of this report emphasizes anew the importance of facilitating the performance of the double-blind controlled study of krebiozen recommended in February 1958, to the American Cancer Society by the Krebiozen Research Foundation. The Sloan-Kettering report, as far as it goes, confirms in detail the theory on which krebiozen was produced, and provides additional evidence showing why our contention, that krebiozen is therapeutically active in some cancer patients, should be correct.

"Since 1925, I have pointed out to my students that, physiologically, cancer is most likely due to the abnormal repair of an injury of some type, that the body must have some mechanisms for resistance against cancer, and that the only real hope we possess that cancer can be cured is the observation that perhaps in 1 out of 100,000 cases the body of the patient cures itself of cancer. For this reason, I have maintained since 1945 that great research emphasis should be placed on a study of the body mechanisms which provide resistance to the onset, invasion, and metastasis of cancer. As a member and executive director of the National Advisory Cancer Council, I urged that research on the immunology and virology of cancer be energetically promoted.

"This thinking, however, was not new. As stated in a publication in 1956 [1] 'the evidences for the existence of a natural resistance to cancer are numerous.' Many of these evidences were recorded years ago. By 1949 I had reviewed the entire literature to obtain a clue on which to start an investigation of the natural body defenses against cancer.

"It was at this time that Dr. Stevan Durovic came to me with a scientifically rational theory regarding the natural defensive mechanisms of the body against cancer, and a therapeutic product which had caused the liquefaction and disappearance of spontaneous tumors in some dogs and cats. The product was nontoxic per se. I believed a substance which regulated growth, which resisted the abnormal repair of injury, and which was secreted by the reticuloendothelial cells in response to an appropriate stimulation, should be nontoxic.

"Dr. Durovic theorized that 'krebiozen is present especially in the reticuloendothelial (RE) cells, which as is well known, react to various stimuli. When these cells are appropriately stimulated, krebiozen, which is not present in the blood (except in traces perhaps) under normal conditions, is released and can be extracted from the blood plasma' [1,2]. To stimulate the RE cells, he chose an extract of Actinomyces bovis, a mold which causes a tumor consisting in part of RE cells. He theorized that since this organism stimulate RE cells to multiply, it should cause RE cells to increase their secretion of an antitumor or anticancer factor into the bloodstream from which it could be extracted. He used an organic or a fat solvent, like benzene or ether, which is logical because certain physiological active substances in RE cells are soluble in such fat solvents, as well as in water. After evaporating the organic solvent krebiozen was extracted by water from the fatty residue.

"In our [Ivy, Pick, Phillips.] monograph published in 1956 [1], it was stated: 'Since the start of this [the krebiozen] investigation, and especially since 1951, we have been gratified to note the growing interest in the problem of the mechanisms concerned in providing the body with a natural resistance to cancer and how this resistance may be increased * * *.'

"It is gratifying to read in the Sloan-Kettering report the statement that 'There is reason now to believe that natural defenses against cancer exist. It has proved possible, by manipulating and enhancing these defenses, to cure laboratory animals with some types of transplanted cancer.'

"It is further stated in the Sloan-Kettering report, that 'different kinds of cancer may stimulate a common cancer resistance factor, or that different kinds of cancer have something in common that stimulate bodily resistance.' This agrees with our observations that krebiozen is of value in the treatment of some patients who have different types of cancer.

"More pertinent to the krebiozen theory and our therapeutic observation are the statements in the Sloan-Kettering report 'that zymosan does not inhibit the cancer directly but acts in some way in mice to enhance their natural defenses, tipping the scales in favor of the endangered host and against the cancer,' and that 'zymosan, unfortunately, is too toxic in man for clinical use.' Zymosan represents a substance extracted from yeast. Actinomyces bovis is a mold, a relative of the yeasts. When an extract of Actinomyces bovis is injected into mice with tumors, some tumors liquefy and slough out. But, the extract of Actinomyces bovis, like zymosan, is too toxic to use on man. But, Dr. Durovic, to avoid this toxicity, injects horses with the Actinomyces bovis extract, making the horses slightly ill, so that the RE cells secrete the resistance factor, 'krebiozen,' into the blood from which it is extracted, and finally made ready to be given to the cancer patient without making the patient sick. Theoretically, zymosan, if injected into a horse, might also cause the secretion of krebiozen into the blood.

"It is also very interesting to note in the Sloan-Kettering report that the substance called Cytolipin H in cancer cells which stirs up body resistance in a person without cancer consists of 'two molecules of fat hooked to two molecules of sugar.' In 1956 we reported that the microchemical analysis of krebiozen indicated that it could be a polysaccharide (a sugarlike substance) and a steroid (a fattylike substance).[1] Since then further studies indicate that krebiozen is "most probably a polyhydrocarboxylic acid or acids with some evidence of esterification.' That is, a polysaccharide joined to or mixed with a fatty substance.

"The Sloan-Kettering report in summary states: 'If the hunches and hopes of the Sloan-Kettering researchers are fulfilled by further work, then these achievements could signal a major triumph.'

"It should now be clearly evident why I stated above that the Sloan-Kettering report emphasizes anew the importance of facilitating the performance of the double-blind test by an arbitration type of committee. If the proposal of the Krebiozen Research Foundation is approved by the society, then the question of the value of krebiozen can be quickly settled.

"Whereas the Sloan-Kettering report states that as yet no application of their discoveries can be made for the benefit of cancer patients, we believe we have at hand a practical weapon against cancer which was produced on the basis of the same theory on which they are now working. Furthermore, I believe if the financial resources were available that the production of krebiozen could be markedly improved. I said in 1951, it may prove to be a key to 'the cure' and perhaps the prevention of cancer.

"In view of these considerations I should like to emphasize the great responsibility which now confronts the American Cancer Society. It is and has been my considered and sincere conviction that krebiozen represents the only presently available fruit of this new understanding of the problem of cancer to which the Sloan-Kettering researchers are contributing so outstandingly.

"Krebiozen has already been withheld unnecessarily for several years from many cancer patients whom it might help, through no fault of our own, but by the excuses of pseudo-critics.

"The decision of the American Cancer Society will determine whether Krebiozen will be withheld still longer from use in cancer therapy until other workers slowly and laboriously duplicate our work in toto. This decision is a grave responsibility."

III. REGARDING PREVIOUS PURPORTED EVALUATION OF THE DRUG MADE BY THE AGENCIES OF ORGANIZED MEDICINE

In the section captioned, "Has Krebiozen Ever Been Tester?" the American Cancer Society paper cites (a) the status report on krebiozen of the AMA committee on research, (b) the report of the committe on cancer diagnosis and therapy of the National Research Council; (c) the report of a committee of six physicians, headed by Dr. Warren Cole of the University of Illinois, commonly referred to as the Cole committee report, and (d) the opinion of Dr. Stanley Reimann, former director of the Lankenau Cancer Institute, Philadelphia, Pa.

All these reports and evalautions are presented in such a manner as to give a misleading impression that krebiozen was thoroughly, scientifically, and honestly tested by authoritative institutions and found worthless. The American Cancer Society paper gives not the least indication that any of these reports and evaluations have ever been challenged nor of the circumstances surrounding them though it has in its possession evidence showing how much of pressure, prejudice, and dishonesty went into their writing.

We present the facts in these matters. They are supported by uncontroverted documentation and testimony given under oath.

(a) "The Status Report of the Committee on Research of the Council of Pharmacy and Chemistry of the AMA" dealt with 100 cases allegedly treated with krebiozen.

One-fourth of this report—24 case histories—was forged. The secretary of the committee, Dr. Paul Wermer, and Dr. Henry Szujewski, a young Chicago physician then only 2½ years in practice, simply elaborated out of whole cloth fictitious clinical histories for these patients. They used the names and diagnoses of patients treated by another physician, who had been sent to Dr. Szujewski along with other patients for enzyme tests, and on this basis they fabricated 24 case histories denying any beneficial effects from krebiozen and stating that all these patients were dead or dying.

As a matter of fact, these 24 patients were the patients of Dr. Wm. F. P. Phillips, one of the coauthors with Dr. Ivy of the monograph "Observations on Krebiozen in the Management of Cancer." Dr. Phillips treated these patients with krebiozen, made full clinical records, and regularly reported his findings to the Krebiozen Research Foundation, and his reports on these patients are highly favorable.

When called as an adverse witness before the commission of the Illinois General Assembly investigating the krebiozen controversy, Dr. Szujewski admitted under oath that he had never treated any patient with krebiozen.

This falsification was discovered when the commission subpenaed the AMA file of krebiozen, and the patients identified. Ten of those declared dead or dying by the AMA in 1951, then in 1953 appeared before the commission and filed the following protest:

[1] Ivy, A. C., J. F. Pick, and William F. P. Phillips: "Observations on Krebiozen in the Management of Cancer," published by H. Regnery, Chicago, 1956.

[2] Ivy, A. C.: "Krebiozen: An Agent for the Treatment of Malignant Tumors: Investigation of Clinical Activity," Chicago, 1951.

"The Honorable WILLIAM E. POLLACK,
Chairman, Krebiozen Investigating Commission, Chicago, Ill.

"DEAR MR. POLLACK: We have learned that Dr. Paul Wermer of the AMA in his affidavit to the commission has referred to Dr. Henry Szujewski who indicated that the krebiozen patients whose blood was examined by him were dead or dying.

"We the undersigned were among those krebiozen patients and herewith certify that we are alive and in good health for over 3 years.

"We desire to point out that such a false report could be a source of serious embarrassment to us in our social and business activities. Accordingly, we desire to file our protest with the commission.

"Yours sincerely,

"Mrs. Julia Howard, 2427 Bernice Avenue; Cecile Luebkemann, 2442 Rosemont; Mrs. Catherine Firnstal, 6205 N. Oakley; Irene O. Kibby, 1830 North Byron Street; A. M. Howard; Eleanor Gahan, 1619 West Garfield Boulevard; Helen Arndt; Magda Johansen, 3810 North Roy Street; Evelyn Vogel, 1820 Nelson Street; Irene R. Pietrowicz, 3407 North Lowell Avenue."

Today, after 8 years, seven of these patients, all residents of Chicago, are free of cancer.

Of the remaining 76 cases dealt with in the status report, 40 were so close to death that they survived only long enough to receive two ampules of krebiozen. (The first two ampules are administered 72 hours apart.) Of the remaining 36 cases, 33 were so close to death that they received only four ampules of krebiozen. (Our patients have received an average of 80 ampules each.)

Excluding the 24 fabricated cases, the AMA report was based entirely on selected negative cases. Meanwhile, and this is very significant, the AMA had in its possession 140 clinical histories of patients treated in outstanding scientific and medical centers throughout the country, including six large university clinics and two world-famous medical centers. These reports were almost uniformly favorable to krebiozen, and had been supplied the AMA in ample time to be included in its Status Report, but the AMA did not include one of them. Thus, it is obvious that the AMA never intended that krebiozen be honestly and scientifically evaluated, but that its report was and is a smear report.

The statement in the American Cancer Society paper that the case records for the status report were examined at the request of Dr. Ivy and his associates at the Krebiozen Research Foundation is untrue.

It is ridiculous to say or to suppose that Dr. Ivy or his associates requested that phoney case histories should be reviewed or that they intentionally selected 100 negative cases, when our foundation had been regularly receiving favorable reports from some of the finest physicians in this country.

* * * * *

The records of the legislative commission show that an attempt to secure financial rights to krebiozen and control of its commercial exploitation preceded publication of the AMA's status report. These facts, taken from sworn testimony and written material accepted in evidence by the commission, were never denied under oath, though those concerned were given full opportunity to do so.

A group of businessmen headed by Mr. Edwin R. Moore, president of the Bell & Gossett Co., Morton Grove, Ill., attempted to use their acquaintance with the Durovics to gain financial control of krebiozen. It should be borne in mind that these individuals had in no way contributed to the development of the drug financially or otherwise.

They enlisted the aid of Dr. J. J. Moore, then treasurer of the AMA, who brought pressure on the Durovics to give the financial exploitation of krebiozen to these men. Dr. Moore had a very bitter discussion on this subject with Mr. Marko Durovic, as was testified to under oath by the interpreter Dr. Moore brought with him on this occasion. Subsequently, the Durovics were warned that the AMA would destroy krebiozen unless they made a financial arrangement with Mr. Edwin Moore.

When this warning was ignored, Dr. George Lull, secretary and general manager of the AMA stated to the press: "The American Medical Association has begun a critical study of krebiozen, the experimental cancer drug, and will issue a public report on its findings within the next 6 weeks."

Shortly thereafter, Franklin Bing, a former secretary of the AMA Council on Foods and Nutrition wrote to Dr. Ivy informing him that he would be ruined unless he offered the AMA for publication a letter stating "krebiozen has no value in the treatment of cancer." He offered Dr. Ivy a dubious recompense—let him first deny krebiozen publicly and then he might—if he wished—continue his research on it in secret. Probably no scientist ever received a more astonishing or cynical suggestion. Dr. Ivy refused. This refusal was the real reason why the Chicago Medical Society was stirred up to discipline Dr. Ivy. The formal reasons—those given to the profession and the public—were merely invented and were on their face ridiculous, as the then-president of the Chicago Medical Society tacitly admitted when he said the society's action against Dr. Ivy was a big mistake.

Thus the reason for the AMA Status Report on Krebiozen is apparent. It was never intended as a true evaluation of this drug. It had only one purpose, to destroy krebiozen, whatever the consequences to science and humanity.

The transcript of the hearings of the Illinois Legislative Commission investigating the krebiozen controversy contains the full record of this matter.

* * * * *

(b) As further evidence that krebiozen has been tested and found worthless, the American Cancer Society paper cites the "Report of the Committee on Cancer Diagnosis and Therapy of the National Research Council," chairmaned by Dr. Ira T. Nathanson, who was also one of the collaborators on the AMA's status report.

The American Cancer Society paper attempts to convey the idea that this National Research Council committee tested krebiozen. Actually, it did no such thing. It did not make a test. It only endorsed the forged report of the AMA. In 1954, Miss Isabella Wason, executive secretary of the committee, stated: "Dr. Ivy sent us krebiozen to use in clinical trials, but it was not used."

* * * * *

(c) The society's paper also refers to the committee of six physicians headed by Dr. Warren Cole and known as the Cole committee. The report of this committee presented as unfavorable to krebiozen but the American Cancer Society paper omits two salient facts: (1) that this report recognized that krebiozen has some activity in the cancer patient; and (2) that this report was composed of two parts, one of which contradicts the other. The "Summary and Conclusions," which is substantially negative for krebiozen, except that it recognizes its activity, was given wide publicity. The other part of the report, in which the evidence is analyzed, was marked "confidential," and was not published or released to the public until it was called in by the legislative commission. This part contains favorable evidence regarding the effect of krebiozen against cancer. Indeed, the conclusions of the report do not seem to follow the findings. Here is one example:

In the published part, in "Conclusions," the Cole committee report states: "We have been presented with no histological evidence by Dr. Ivy that the material produced degenerative or regressive changes in tumor cells."

In the confidential findings it is stated: "Microscopic slides were examined on nine patients, of whom six were included in the series of patients demonstrated to us. * * * We concurred in the diagnosis of all except one patient. In this patient we considered the slide following Krebiozen therapy was negative for malignancy instead of positive as reported to us. Accordingly this difference in opinion does not reflect disadvantageously on krebiozen therapy, but might reflect advantageously."

In this connection it should be emphasized that among the slides of the nine patients were, besides the case mentioned above, four others which were negative for malignancy. In other words, of nine patients in the diagnosis of whose slides the committee concurred, a total of five were negative for malignancy.

A fact worthwhile mentioning is that at the time the conclusions of the Cole committee were published, this report bore only the signature of its chairman, Dr. Cole. It was revealed at the legislative hearings that a plain signature sheet had been circulated to the other members, who signed without even reading the report.

* * * * *

(d) As fourth evidence which it seeks to use in establishing the ineffectiveness of krebiozen, the American Cancer Society paper quotes Dr. Stanley P. Reimann, director of the Institute for Cancer Research, Philadelphia, Pa., as saying, "We now know we have cured no patient [with krebiozen] and we don't believe the length of life has been prolonged on any we have treated." The files of the Krebiozen Research Foundation reveal that shortly after Dr. Reimann made this statement discounting the effects of krebiozen, we received a letter from the institute stating, "We have had quite a bit of pressure here, even to the extent that for the benefit of the press Dr. Reimann felt it necessary to make a statement that we were discountinuing any further extensive clinical evaluation of the material."

At the Lankenau Cancer Research Institute, under supervision of Dr. Reimann, 21 months of experimentation was conducted with krebiozen on 40 patients. The Institute presented a favorable report to the Krebiozen Research Foundation and to the Cole committee, which confirmed the Krebiozen Research Foundation's mounting accumulation of case reports confirming krebiozen's effectiveness. To show how warped is the view of the Reimann study of krebiozen as presented by the American Cancer Society, we quote in part from the Reimann report as it was given to the Cole committee for review:

"In view of these observations of biological activity of this material (krebiozen), we have been extremely interested in future possibilities of investigation. * * *

"Our conclusions on the material to date, though quite preliminary, are that it is nontoxic per se and has definite biologic activity specifically against tumor cells either directly or indirectly, of sufficient degree to warrant continued investigation both clinically and more important from the basic investigation of its mode of action with the hope that improvements may be made or some further knowledge concerning the biologic factors controlling tumor growth may be contributed. Since this represents the first and only nontoxic

chemical agent to show definite biologic activity of any degree against tumors of many types, it seems justifiable to encourage as much basic and clinical investigation as possible."

• • • • •

IV. REGARDING THE ATTITUDE OF NATIONAL CANCER INSTITUTE TOWARD A FAIR TEST OF KREBIOZEN PROPOSED BY SENATOR PAUL DOUGLAS OF ILLINOIS

The American Cancer Society paper ends by expressing the hope that the "Krebiozen Research Foundation, Dr. Ivy, and Dr. Durovic * * * will recognize the integrity of the National Cancer Institute" and calls on us as a matter of duty to accept its proposal for the testing of krebiozen.

This is a misrepresentation of the whole situation regarding our negotiations with the National Cancer Institute. We are and have been eager to cooperate with the National Cancer Institute in a test which will determine the merits—if any—of krebiozen. Unfortunately, the National Cancer Institute is unwilling to make such a test, despite public protestations to the contrary of its director, Dr. John R. Heller.

Since Dr. Heller has seen fit to tell the public and the Congress one thing while telling us another, we believe it our duty to present the record. The following is a summary of our conversations with the National Cancer Institute Director undertaken in an effort to implement Senator DOUGLAS' proposal for the testing of krebiozen.

The Krebiozen Research Foundation and Dr. Ivy accepted the proposal of Senator DOUGLAS and at his invitation, Drs. Ivy and Durovic met in Washington with Dr. Heller, other members of the National Cancer Institute staff and Mr. Frank McCulloch, the Senator's administrative assistant. This was on September 24, 1958.

At this meeting, it was unanimously agreed that the matter of giving krebiozen a fair test be explored further and Dr. Heller suggested that the committee proposed by the Senator be enlarged to include five members instead of three.

Believing this suggestion was made in good faith, Drs. Ivy and Durovic accepted it since Dr. Heller apparently found no fault with the testing procedure suggested by Senator DOUGLAS. Nor did he at that time appear to question the principle of a joint committee.

At our next meeting on December 5, Dr. Heller for the first time declared that the committee he envisioned must be independent and that for this reason could not include Dr. Ivy. Dr. Heller agreed, however, that Dr. Ivy might serve as its consultant.

But as soon as Dr. Ivy stipulated the conditions under which he would serve this committee as consultant, Dr. Heller introduced a new feature and changed the function of the committee entirely from that of a testing committee to a committee which would decide whether a test of krebiozen should be made or not.

He told Dr. Ivy in a letter of February 6, 1959, that prior to anything else the independent committee would have to examine the files of the Krebiozen Research Foundation and added:

"The committee could reach one of two major conclusions: (1) That the evidence of krebiozen's effects is insufficient to recommend further clinical test; or (2) that a clinical test is recommended."

In other words the goal of Dr. Heller's succession of changes was apparently to create a situation which would relieve the National Cancer Institute of testing krebiozen at all.

Thus, it is clear that in calling on us to comply with the conditions laid down by the National Cancer Institute for the testing of krebiozen, the American Cancer Society is not advocating a test. What it is really asking is that we agree to accept as final, the opinion of still another committee.

If a sincere desire exists to determine the truth about krebiozen, why should Dr. Ivy be excluded from such a committee?

Dr. Ivy, formerly executive director of the National Advisory Cancer Council and also a former director of the American Cancer Society, is an outstanding scientist, world-famous as a physiologist and author of hundreds of scientific papers. He represented world medicine as an expert witness at the Nuremberg trials on the subject of medical ethics and clinical investigation. Even his adversaries recognize that his integrity is unquestionable.

Dr. Ivy has experimented with krebiozen for nearly 10 years. He has more knowledge of the dosage rate and the effect of the drug on various types of tumors than anyone else. In a committee of five, he would have only one vote, which could certainly not be decisive.

If Dr. Ivy had been a member of the AMA committee which prepared the status report on krebiozen, the falsification and superficiality exhibited in this report would have been impossible.

If Dr. Ivy had been a member of the committee on diagnosis and therapy, this committee could never have issued an opinion indicating that it had tested krebiozen when in fact it had not done so.

As a member of a committee to evaluate krebiozen, Dr. Ivy would at least safeguard the objectivity of its findings and guarantee their honesty.

If there were nothing else, the American Cancer Society paper in itself is evidence enough that some such guarantee is needed. In this connection we cite Senator DOUGLAS' reply to receipt of a copy of the American Cancer Society "Background Paper on Krebiczen," sent him by Dr. Diehl. We quote:

"Thank you for sending me a copy of the Cancer Society's background paper on krebiozen.

"With the final conclusion, that there should be a fair test, I obviously concur. That is what I have been urging right along.

"Perhaps it is a service to the efforts in this direction to have the summary you have made available.

"But I must respond in all frankness that your memorandum, if intended to be impartial, seems to me seriously deficient in several respects:

"(a) It refers to the results of the tests of Drs. Kirk and Furst (pp. 7–8), but takes no account of Dr. Ivy's rather devastating answer, a copy of which is enclosed;

"(b) It refers to the adverse findings of the AMA group, Dr. Reimann and the Cole Committee (pp. 8–10), without recognizing the critical analysis or rebuttals of these conclusions;

"(c) It gives a fleeting mention of the publications of Drs. Ivy, Pick, Phillips, and Krasno, without either identifying the publications or suggesting the general nature of their findings;

"(d) It makes no reference to the widespread treatment of patients in the intervening years and to the developing number of cases in which some positive results of treatment with krebiozen have been observed. Some of these case histories, or brief summaries of them were given to Dr. Heller and his associates at the conferences you mention. Others were released in connection with the testimonial dinner to Dr. Ivy in February—when a number of patients who have apparently had amazing results from the treatment were on hand with their doctors;

"I do not assert these cases are a substitute for a fair and scientific test. I only suggest that the omission of any reference to them makes your selection of data for the memorandum appear quite one-sided;

"(e) It sprinkles the words 'propaganda,' 'promotion,' 'alleged,' 'ostensible' sufficiently through the text to give a rather hostile coloration to it all.

"In short, I regret that the memorandum is not more complete, better balanced and more objective. These deficiencies, I fear, no matter how unwitting, may do more to aggravate the fears and suspicions of prejudice that have made it difficult to reach a basis of agreement on a fair test.

"I end as I began by repeating my hope that we can somehow maximize the possibilities for the desired test—and not be content with rubbing salt in old wounds.

"I shall send a copy of this letter to Dr. Heller so that he may share the knowledge of my reactions to a brief reading of your memorandum."

Our answer shows why the American Medical Association, the American Cancer Society, and the National Cancer Institute—all of which have refused this test—are now insisting that we accept their alternative—a test by a so-called independent committee.

The record of organized medicine's opposition to krebiozen, which has been outlined in this, our answer to the American Cancer Society, shows plainly that such a committee would be far from independent. Even if the physicians composing it were themselves not prejudiced against krebiozen, they would be subject to outside pressures which in the past did not scruple to bring false witnesses against krebiozen; organizations using their power and influence to hold into line men whose very careers depend on compliance.

Obviously, these organizations cannot admit at this late date that the campaign against krebiozen, Dr. Ivy, and his associates, begun by the American Medical Association in 1951 and carried on since by these other arms of organized medicine was mistaken; that persecution and falsification have been invoked to nullify a genuine scientific effort in the cancer field.

This would be demonstrated beyond any doubt should krebiozen be proved of value in the treatment of cancer via the double-blind test, where prejudice—for or against—is excluded by the very nature of the test. Hence the refusal of the American Cancer Society to subject krebiozen to this time-honored procedure.

Their real aim is to once again discredit krebiozen without performing any test.

This is the reason behind their demand for an independent committee to pass on the patients' records of the Krebiozen Research Foundation, in fact, to avoid a test.

We submitted our file of 140 cases (all that we had at that time) to the AMA in 1951. The AMA did not use these records. Instead, they preferred to falsify 24 cases for their 100-case report. In 1953 we submitted to the Cole committee for evaluation our file on 500 cases, which were mostly favorable for krebiozen. The Lankenau Cancer Institute submitted 40 cases to the same committee; the Tumor Clinic at Marquette University submitted 4 cases; 13 patients who were free of cancer after krebiozen treatment were brought before this committee. All the Cole committee could determine from these highly favorable presentations was that the substance [krebiozen] was not entirely devoid of biological activity.

If we now submit our file to another committee controlled by the same people their attitude toward krebiozen and our past experience would suggest that the only thing which could be expected would be the conclusion that krebiozen does not merit a further test.

However, the Krebiozen Research Foundation has offered to submit its file to an arbitration type committe, once it has been agreed that this committee will perform the test suggested by Dr. Ivy and Senator DOUGLAS. At the same time the Krebiozen Research Fonndation will be glad to present to the committee corresponding patients together with their physicians. We would then urge the committee to study our records as well as those on which the 100 case report of the AMA was based and of which

we have photostatic copies. But to give our patient records to a loaded committee in advance of any agreement to test krebiozen would simply be to write krebiozen off.

It is significant to point out that most of the records of the Krebiozen Research Foundation are summarized in the monograph "Observations on Krebiozen in the Management of Cancer," published in 1956. This publication which is highly positive for krebiozen of itself would be enough to indicate the value of krebiozen and justify its further exploration and perfection. This publication was sent 3 years ago to all of these organizations and has been deliberately ignored.

CONCLUSIONS

(1) All of the arguments supporting the negative stand of the American Medical Association, the American Cancer Society and the National Cancer Institute toward krebiozen are based on the AMA Status Report of 1951.

This report was based on partially falsified material and on completely superficial and misleading data. (See pp. 19–22).

Therefore, this report does not have the most elementary requisite of an honest presentation and cannot serve as a scientific basis for the evaluation of krebiozen.

(2) Meanwhile krebiozen has been tried clinically by three independent groups on a total of some 1,500 terminal cancer patients.

(a) Dr. Ivy and his group of collaborators in Chicago experimented the material on about 250 cancer patients.

(b) The Lankenau Cancer Institute, Philadelphia, tried the material on 40 patients.

(c) More than 300 physicians in hospitals, university clinics and medical centers throughout the country tested krebiozen on more than 1,200 patients.

This work was directed by the Krebiozen Research Foundation, Chicago, under the scientific direction of Dr. Ivy and all data regarding these cases are in the files of the Krebiozen Research Foundation.

All three of these groups concluded:

(a) That krebiozen showed beneficial activity against cancer in 70 percent of treated cases. To date, the Krebiozen Research Foundation can show some 52 previously terminal cases which are free of detectible cancer for the past 3 to 8 years.

(b) That krebiozen is not toxic.

(3) The impossible situation of sustaining a negative stand against an apparently active anticancer agent and withholding it from cancer sufferers on the basis of falsified data from 1951 and without taking into consideration truthful data obtained before and after, is unprecedented and cannot be tolerated.

We respectfully call on the National Cancer Institute to accept the proposal made by Senator DOUGLAS for a fair test of krebiozen in order to settle the controversy over this drug so that if it is active, as we consider it to be, it may be put at the disposal of cancer sufferers.

J. F. PICK,
Secretary, Krebiozen Research Foundation.

Chesapeake and Ohio National Historical Park

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 28, 1959

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas recently urged the conservationists to mobilize and fight to save the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal property from destruction.

These prophetic words from a member of the U.S. Supreme Court should sound an ominous warning to everybody interested in preserving the C. & O. Canal as the Chesapeake and Ohio National Historical Park.

A recent article in the American Forests, by Daniel A. Poole, points up the importance of the C. & O. Canal fight.

THE C. & O.—PARK OR PARADOX

(By Daniel A. Poole)

Conflicts arising between national parks and reservoirs are more notable for the vociferous public reaction that is generated than for the number of times parks actually are threatened by water projects.

There has developed over the years an unwritten and widely accepted policy that puts national parks off limits to water developments. This policy was fashioned for the most part on the omnipresent anvil of public willingness to forge forces to combat the developers whenever a national park unit is linked with a water project.

This time-tested policy now is receiving a thorough plumbing in Washington where, for the third year, a congressional committee is holding hearings on proposals to give national historical park status to the old Chesapeake & Ohio Canal, which skirts the Potomac River along the Maryland shore. A similar proposal cleared the Senate in 1957. Its death in the House the following year climaxed lengthy hearings that carried into the closing hours of the final session.

The major questions that have emerged from the many days of hearings and many pages of recorded testimony, and which still are unresolved by the committee, present something of a paradox. Would Congress in the face of this unwritten but enforceable policy, cut off metropolitan Washington's source of future water supply if it creates the national historical park? If the Congress refrains from acting merely on the supposition that an economically justifiable water storage impoundment might be recommended for the Potomac near Washington, would all chance of obtaining an adequate park be sacrificed? Or, in recognition of both of those dangers, however nebulous, can Congress write a bill that logically and clearly establishes suitable safeguards for both Washington's water supply and the park?

Those who oppose the historical park and who confess immense interest in Washington's water future actually are professional people employed by rural electric associations and power-producing cooperatives. Park boosters range from traditional national conservation organizations to civic, sportsmen's, nature, and women's associations, and other community groups in Maryland and the District of Columbia.

The C. & O. Canal seldom fails to evoke both surprise and pleasure in those who view it for the first time. From its beginning in Georgetown, a short distance west of the White House, to its end in Cumberland, some 180 miles distant, the canal is a wooded strip of refreshing wildness. Giant sycamores, tulip poplars, oaks, and limber limbed maples isolate it from the world's most important city; and, as it rounds bluffs along the shallow river's edge and cuts inland across alluvial elbows, the canal is a narrow and natural wonderland of forest and water.

The waterway emerged from the successful organization in 1828 of the C. & O. Canal Co., which hoped to promote commerce from Washington to points lying between and beyond Pittsburgh on the Ohio River. Interest in trade with the American West of that era had prompted George Washington to form the Potomac Co. in 1785. The company set to work clearing obstructions in the river channel and constructing a short canal on the Virginia shore to bypass impressive Great Falls, some 14 miles upstream from the city. That first canal failed Washington's expectations, but it led to the support of the larger, more ambitious C. & O. project.

Initiated by President John Quincy Adams' shovel of dirt, the first 22-mile stage of the canal was completed in 3 years. Hampered by repeated delays and increased construction costs, the company finally pushed the canal to Cumberland in 1850, but not before the decision was made to call off plans for continuing across the Alleghenies for connection with Pittsburgh.

As many as 540 barges were in use on the canal in the late 1870's when active commerce was at its peak. Measuring 92 feet long and 14½ feet wide, the mule-powered barges carried 110 to 120 tons of cargo, plus the crews, family members, and spare mules. The bulky boats were raised 605 feet between Georgetown and Cumberland through 74 locks.

Purchased by the Government in 1938, the canal, including towpath, seldom ranges more than 150 feet wide, and only 5,253 acres are within the narrow 180-mile right-of-way. Locks, lockhouses, and the canal bed and towpath have been restored along the first 22 miles between Georgetown and Seneca. Other monuments to early engineering skill and imagination, such as tunnels and aqueducts, remain, although in need of repair in much of the upper section of the canal.

No longer in sight are the blunt-prowed barges that once hung heavy against towlines. In their place graceful canoes glide the waterway, seldom loaded with anything more serious than a picnic lunch or gleeful youngsters. Depending on the season, thousands of hikers, bird watchers, cyclists, fishermen, horsemen, ice skaters, and others now enjoy themselves, only faintly mindful of that distant day when mud-covered mules stoically slogged endless miles back and forth along the towpath.

Once a business enterprise, the C. & O. Canal now is a recreationist's paradise. And happily so, because Washington and its burgeoning suburbs are direly in need of healthful and relaxing outdoor playgrounds. In Washington and in some upriver towns, the canal is just across the street, enclosed in a cathedral of towering trees, and flanked with dogwoods and other understory flowering plants. For many thousands it is seldom further than a bus or trolley ride. And to those who can take the time, limited access points throughout its length place the canal and the adjacent river within a convenient distance for upward of 5 million persons.

At its recent hearing in March, the Public Lands Subcommittee of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee considered testimony on four bills, each related in some way to the historical park proposition.

Bills by Representatives JOHN P. SAYLOR of Pennsylvania and JOHN R. FOLEY of suburban Maryland, H.R. 953 and H.R. 2331, focus directly on the park, with the Foley bill containing an added proviso to the effect that the historical park should not bar water projects that might be authorized by Congress at some future time. Conservationists contend that the proviso gives Congressional recognition to Washington's water supply situation and gives some measure of comfort to those who fear for it. One Congress cannot bind another, however, and in practice the proviso is a statement of intention to serve as a guide to some future Congress which could authorize a dam in any of the national parks if it so chooses. These two bills, H.R. 953 and H.R. 2331, are supported by park enthusiasts throughout the country.

Two other identical bills, also before the subcommittee, contain both that proviso and a more specific reservation of 35 miles of the canal for a large impoundment at River Bend dam site, about 15 miles upstream from Washington. These bills, H.R. 5194 and H.R. 5344, by Representatives FOLEY and RICHARD E. LANKFORD, of Maryland's Eastern Shore electric cooperative region, also would prohibit expenditure of any funds for recreation development within the area of the proposed dam. The District of Columbia Commissioners and the Secretary of the Army, acting for the Corps of Engineers, also would be given veto power over the National Park Service's plans for development and improvement of the entire canal project.

All four bills would enable the National Park Service to acquire up to 15,000 acres of land, minus the present holdings, for expansion of picnic and camping areas, access roads, parking lots, and for the protection of historic locks, lock houses, aqueducts, and tunnels.

Because of these two sets of widely divergent proposals, the park no longer is the principal issue. At issue are the reservation and escape clauses that the rural electric groups hope to get into the park authorization bill. That is, if a bill should be enacted. Its opponents clearly view the park proposal as a threat to their hoped-for TVA-like development of the Potomac Basin. They know the public's insistence that water development and national parks be segregated and are making a test case of their doctrine of multiple uses for the Potomac Basin. The C. & O. Canal bill is merely the vehicle that has been chosen for the test.

Rural electric cooperatives, by law, have preferential use of power that may be generated at Federal dams. The cooperatives' position on the park project was brought to the surface during the House hearings last year, when a committee member asked whether the cooperatives would support or oppose the bill seeking to create the historical park if the Army engineers recommended that no hydroelectric power be developed on the river.

The reply was that the cooperatives' position in that event would not be clear. "Our basic interest," the witness continued, "* * * is in the hope that the Corps of Engineers will favorably report upon the feasibility and desirability of including hydroelectric power in the river if it is developed."

The witness also declared that if the cost of the power delivered to the cooperatives from any dam was more than what the cooperatives presently were paying for other power, they would want "none of it." At this year's hearings, an Army engineers spokesman said that any power that might be developed at River Bend Dam would be incidental.

According to the Washington Evening Star of March 4, 1959, Representative FOLEY's second bill was written and handed to him for introduction by staff aides of the House Interior Committee. The article continued, "Staff members seldom draft such controversial legislation without explicit approval of the committee chairman—in this case, Representative ASPINALL, Democrat, of Colorado.

"Mr. ASPINALL traditionally has been sensitive to the need for long-range planning to protect the Nation's water resources."

Representative SAYLOR, a recognized champion of the national parks, characterized the Foley-Lankford bills during the hearings as "fifth column." The blunt-spoken Pennsylvanian, who was given a national award by major conservation groups last year, charged that the identical Foley-Lankford bills were drawn up by persons who for years have been trying to figure a way to open national parks for water development projects.

Under committee examination, the park opponents found the reservation in the Foley-Lankford bill for an impoundment at the River Bend site difficult to defend. River Bend Dam once figured prominently in planning for Potomac River development. It again is being rumored as the prime recommendation in a new Corps of Engineers study of the basin. There are no signs that the public is ready to accept such a recommendation and the chances for its approval in Congress are dim. Hence the effort in the Foley-Lankford proposal to obtain indirectly what might be called a tactical advantage by reserving the dam site for a dam that may never be built is nebulous at best.

Park supporters have pointed out time and time again that the canal property already is owned by the Federal Government and is being administered as a unit of the national park system. Merely elevating its status to a national historical park, it is argued, has little actual import on the question of whether a large dam which might flood a great part of the park can be built on the Potomac. Should such a dam ever be recommended, conservationists say, its authorization will have to be resolved at that time and not now. The dam and its effect on the canal would be only one of the many facets that the Congress and the public would have to investigate thoroughly.

Public opinion scuttled River Bend Dam in 1929 and 1938. It was exhumed in 1946 when the Corps of Engineers filed a proposed Potomac development plan with Congress which boasted a 14-dam complex on the main river, beginning with River Bend and working upstream into tributaries in Virginia and West Virginia. The Corps of Engineers never did approve its own 1946 plan, however.

While the rural electric cooperative groups oppose the park plan because of a relationship which they say will jeopardize "multiple use" development of the basin, other less-vigorous objection to the park rests on its alleged threat to metropolitan Washington's water supply. There is a wide and understandable diversity of opinion as to the future water needs of metropolitan Washington. Population growth, per capita water consumption at some future date, and water flow expectances in the Potomac all enter into the arguments. Some state that the expected cyclic return of low flow to the river would be insufficient to provide raw water for purification and still leave enough in the river as it flows past Washington to flush pollution downstream from that point. Others say that the lowest flows ever recorded in the Potomac in 1930 exceed by 22 percent the maximum estimated need for the year 2000 as anticipated by the Sanitary Engineer's office for the District of Columbia.

Some argue that a satisfactory source of fresh water is the 25-mile stretch of the Potomac lying between Washington and Indian Head, Md. With proper pollution abatement and treatment facilities in Washington, the proponents of this plan say, a pumping and distribution system, plus purification plants, would yield about 52 billion gallons of water.

The Army engineers presently are restudying the Potomac Basin under a 1956 directive of the Senate Public Works Committee. The engineers have not been successful in obtaining appropriations and, under the circumstances, their final report most likely will not get to Congress until the late 1960's, at the earliest.

This fact seemingly makes support for the River Bend Dam reservation in the Foley-Lankford bill even more indefensible. Any large impoundment that might be construced on the Potomac near Washington, in the normal course of events, would not be initiated until well past the mid-1970's. And many hurdles lie in the way of Federal dam construction. A dam must be recommended, accepted both by the public and Congress, authorized, and funds provided for planning and construction before actual field work begins.

Congress has been given a strong answer to the park paradox. At the 1957 Senate hearings, at last year's House hearings, and again this year, the spokesmen for the Army Corps of Engineers, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and the National Park Service have testified for the record that the proviso in H.R. 2331, which specifies that the historical park should not bar future water development, adequately safeguards metropolitan Washington's water supply.

With reference to specific reservation of land for the River Bend Dam, a corps spokeman said, "We feel in preliminary studies that considerable storage is going to be required. Whether it will have to be on the main stream or whether it can be placed on the tributaries, we are not yet prepared to say."

A spokesman for the District of Columbia's sanitary engineering office also said, "There may be considerations when all of the facts are known which would make a nearby impoundment impracticable financially or otherwise."

Lands that would be acquired for park purposes within the reach of River Bend Dam never will be less expensive than at present. Urban developments are pressing close to the canal in some sections, and the land prices probably never will be cheaper. Should River Bend Dam ever be authorized and built, the land that is acquired now for the historical park would be turned over for the impoundment. It is entirely possible that the land savings alone would more than offset the nominal costs of access roads, parking lots, trails, and picnic areas that the National Park Service proposes in the contested area. If the world's richest nation can afford to pay more than $1 million daily for storage of surplus agricultural products that never will be used, park supporters reason, there should be little objection to investing a few thousand dollars in modest recreational features for the canal historical park.

Recreational opportunity is needed now. It appears unreasonable to ask that the people delay their recreation for 15 to 20 years simply because some persons fear that creation of the historical park would block access to a water supply that metropolitan Washington might need at some future time. The bill that has been introduced, H.R. 2331, already makes provision for that eventuality.

In the face of this overwhelming unanimity, the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park is not paradox; it is a must.

Library Extension Service in Rural Areas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 28, 1959

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the American Library Association has brought to my attention the May issue of the Wilson Library Bulletin, which is entirely devoted to the story of library extension service in rural areas. It con-

tains an appraisal of the progress that has been made as a result of the Library Services Act of 1956.

It is rewarding to know that good library service is gradually being developed in rural areas of the United States. One of the special features in the Bulletin is an article about Oregon's library program, written by Eloise Ebert, State librarian of the Oregon State Library at Salem.

In this article is a quotation I should especially like to share with my colleagues. The quotation is one from Ranganathan which likens the library to a river:

Library is like river. The water in the sea gets distilled and transferred to land; river collects it and feeds most of it back into the sea. So it is with library. The thought in the mind of man gets expressed and recorded; library collects it and feeds most of it back into the mind of man. This is an ever-lasting cycle. New uses are found for river—irrigation, navigation, hydraulic power, and so on; even so, an ever-increasing use is found for library. New canals are led out of river, and a river system is formed; even so, library is diversified, and library system is formed to serve an increasing purpose.

In her concluding paragraph Miss Ebert comments on this quotation. She writes:

To establish new library systems can be as earth-shaking as the digging of canals for a new river system. All parties concerned may have different ideas as to where the canals are to be placed, how deep and wide they should be, what legal limitations must be adhered to, and once the river system is established, how it will be developed to serve its many purposes. We are digging new canals in Oregon.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "The New State Grant Program," written by Eloise Ebert, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NEW STATE GRANT PROGRAM

(By Eloise Ebert)

This is section 1 of the bill passed by the Oregon Legislative Assembly of 1957 which culminated years of effort of members of the Oregon Library Association, the State library staff, and many library friends. The key to its success was William J. Griffith, library development chairman, and Mrs. Eugene Kelty, a dedicated library lobbyist who had formerly been a member of the State legislature. It was to be the beginning of intensified demonstrations, projects, and activities to encourage library cooperation.

A total of $154,078 was appropriated for the 1957–59 biennium to provide minimum funds required to match a $5 million congressional appropriation under the Library Services Act. The Oregon State Library board of trustees adopted the following goals to be considered in approving awards: the promotion of general understanding of what constitutes good library service, the establishment of adequate service to unserved or inadequately served areas, and the inauguration of modern services now lacking.

The Rural Library Services program in Oregon can be roughly divided into two parts—services and activities carried on from the State library, and development projects in the field to be administered locally under a grant-in-aid. Areas requesting a project grant were not required to have voted any new of additional county or multi-county tax to become eligible. This was due to a legal stumbling block to library development in Oregon known as the "6 percent constitutional tax limitation." This limitation meant that no local tax base could be increased by more than 6 percent of the amount levied in any of the 3 preceding years without a special vote. Such an unrealistic limitation has necessitated placing special library levies on the ballot in almost every instance. Local budgets were adopted before final action was taken by the Oregon Legislature and the U.S. Congress, so it would have been almost impossible to have made new local funds a requirement for a local project.

OBJECTIVES AND MEANS

Policy is defined as a series of objectives which a governmental body strives to attain and the means which it consciously plans to use in the pursuit of these objectives. The people in Oregon are agreed on the desired objectives of a library development program; it is the means upon which they disagree. Agreements between the State library board and the respective jurisdictions were drafted and redrafted. The attorney general, district attorneys, city attorneys, county courts, city councils, library boards, librarians and the State library staff all got into the act. Some asked "What do you mean 'seek to encourage the continuance of library service established'? We do not like 'shall utilize our resources to supplement bookmobile service to rural residents.' 'Shall' must be changed to 'may.'" Budgets for the projects were part of the contracts; and local budget committees checked, criticized, amended, and scrutinized each item. Salaries suggested according to State civil service salary schedules were too high. Some county clerks were not agreeable about assuming the extra work load for local accounting, and quick adjustments were necessary to add to their salaries.

The press was not unanimous in its support of the local projects. While not actually opposing books and reading, the editors were not convinced that this Federal-State grant-in-aid program was the best way to improve library services. One editorial captioned "What you pay for libraries: That 'match money gimmick'," referred to this program as a "thing of horror." Another editor in an adjoining town retorted: "If there is a gimmick as they put it, in the match money program, we regard it as a darn good one. In this age when learning and education are of perhaps greater importance than ever, especially in the field of science, this program certainly is of real value. Even aside from this, it is important because it is an opportunity which should not be denied the small town or country boy or girl, man or woman simply because they can't afford to do it on their own. Let's forget the almighty dollar long enough to remember the value received but if you can't, just stop and consider: it is the rural folks' tax money too, not only the city dwellers which pay for governmental expenditures. They often are helping 'foot the bill' for benefits received by townspeople."

Five different field projects were approved covering the gamut from cooperative cataloging, bookmobile demonstrations, to a tri-county regional demonstration. Project directors are now preparing budgets for the 1959–1960 fiscal period when Federal-State funds will diminish and local budgets will need to continue the services. Whether the demonstrations will become permanent and maintain the same level of service still remains to be seen in Oregon. The Oregon Legislative Assembly now in session will undoubtedly appropriate matching funds to continue the rural library services program. The State library in its budget requested funds to match the anticipated $7,500,000 congressional appropriation but this was reduced by the budget division to match $6 million. The library development committee of the Oregon Library Association will work to secure the full amount of matching funds.

Oregonians would understand Ranganathan when he says:

"Library is like river. The water in the sea gets distilled and transferred to land; river collects it and feeds most of it back into the sea. So it is with library. The thought in the mind of man gets expressed and recorded; library collects it and feeds most of it back into the mind of man. This is an everlasting cycle. New uses are found for river—irrigation, navigation, hydraulic power, hydroelectric power, and so on; even so, an ever-increasing use is found for library. New canals are led out of river, and a river system is formed; even so library is diversified, and library system is formed to serve an increasing purpose."

To establish new library systems can be as earth shaking as the digging of canals for a new river system. All parties concerned may have different ideas as to where the canals are to be placed, how deep and wide they should be, what legal limitations must be adhered to, and once the river system is established, how it will be developed to serve its many purposes. We are digging new canals in Oregon.

World Battle for Trade and Jobs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 28, 1959

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, American industry is pricing its goods higher and higher. In many cases this has priced us right out of the world market.

This most serious economic problem is highlighted in an excellent series by Charles Lucey, Scripps-Howard staff writer.

I think this series is an outstanding public service, and I ask unanimous consent that the Lucey article, which appeared in the Washington Daily News on May 19, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WORLD BATTLE FOR TRADE AND JOBS—UNITED STATES IS PRICING ITS GOODS TOO HIGH, EXPERTS CONTEND

(By Charles Lucey)

That 20th century wonder, the vaunted U.S. industrial machine, is running head-on into trouble in world markets because—time and again—it's pricing its goods too high.

Not always but often enough to mean the loss of thousands of American jobs.

From his desk here exporter Frederick R. Pinter picks up a letter:

"Sale of clutch plates and parts has slowed for various reasons," a Brussels agent writes. "First, the number of American autos diminishes more and more in Belgium, making inevitable a reduction in spare parts. We also feel more and more the competition from European manufacturers, whose prices are far lower than American prices."

FIFTY PERCENT LESS

A Mexico City agent reports sales woes—"because most of my clients are importing Japanese parts selling more than 50 percent lower than American products." Still another letter tells of sales lost to Germany in power transmission equipment—United States bids too high on every one of seven items.

"American products are better," says Mr. Pinter. "Often overseas buyers will take them even with a 10 percent price difference—but at 25 percent it's hard to compete. How can we compete and constantly raise prices? We like shorter hours, yes, but it cannot be done against the Germans and others."

Says Joseph Rizzo, veteran foreign trader: "We've priced ourselves out of markets all over the world. We cannot compete pricewise in machine tools. It's the same with grinding wheels in the abrasives industry, yet once we were large exporters. The thing hurting us in Europe is the lower wage differential."

RECORD CITED

Says William R. Herod, president of International General Electric:

"Our records indicate the spread between United States and European industrial wage rates although narrowed slightly recently, is far greater today than 45 or 50 years ago. Before World War I, for example, British rates were 60 percent of ours—today, only slightly over 30 percent.

"On those items in which labor is a substantial cost element—'built' goods as against mass-produced goods—our competitive position is worsening.

"The United States has been favored by tremendous technological leadership. Where we continue to have this leadership we can continue to compete successfully. Our job is to stay ahead technologically—we cannot do business in the same old way at the same old stand with rising U.S. costs."

Notes Adolph Auriema, head of an important export-import business:

"Every time there's a wage increase, prices of the product go up in the same percentage, and not merely enough to cover the wage increase. The more labor goes up, the more profits go up. This means in many cases we are pricing ourselves out of foreign markets."

CAUTION

But in discussing this tendency, he cautions against being too general: He says U.S. technology and mass output can accomplish much. And he notes that foreign wage rates tend to catch up with ours.

Yet Mr. Auriema agrees some U.S. prices are climbing so high foreign products now can hurdle our tariffs and still compete here; He cites electronics with the Japanese underselling us by 30 to 35 percent, as an example.

Wages aren't the only element in high prices. Big government spending which helps breed inflation, heavy taxes which shove up costs—these contribute. Corporate profits likewise—and they hit an alltime high in the first quarter of 1959, in some instances double those of a year earlier.

The U.S. record in inflation is as good or better than in European industrial countries in recent years; wage rates have risen faster in England, France, and Germany. But wage levels there started from so much lower these countries still have immense advantage. And already they've begun battening down the hatches—British wage jumps last year were only half those of 1957.

John F. Smith, Jr., president of Inland Steel, reports average 1957 hourly steel workers' wages at 89 cents in Luxembourg, 78 cents in Belgium, 68 cents in Germany, 41 cents in Japan—and $2.92 in the United States.

THE REAL TEST

In considering wage rates, the real test comes in unit costs of the product made. This means productivity—bringing high-speed, automated machinery and U.S. mass output to bear on manufacturing costs. But America no longer has exclusive copyright on modern industrial performance.

The gap narrows—and this means low foreign wage rates, once easy for us to offset, spell trouble today. And it's relevant that U.S. wage increases have been outrunning output per man-hour—a sure route to inflated prices.

The National Industrial Conference Board, in a considerable study, found unit costs higher in some world areas than in the United States. But in the Western European nations challenging America industrially, they were lower in 55 of 85 instances. This, despite the fact that raw materials costs are higher there—sometimes even double.

From J. Wilner Sundelson, Ford Motor International, comes the view that European production will indeed be as efficient as ours, and that lower wage rates where they do not reflect differences in productivity means underselling the United States.

All this isn't something happening thousands of miles away—it has direct and swift bearing on U.S. factories making autos, electronics, sewing machines, typewriters, textiles, certain kinds of steel, machine tools, those easy post-World War II days when "Made in U.S.A." was a magic symbol are now as far away as the Middle Ages.

The Forlorn Hope

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS H. KUCHEL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 28, 1959

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, today the Washington Daily News had an excellent, and I think very relevant, editorial on the overdue enactment by the Congress of labor reform legislation. The editorial is entitled "The Forlorn Hope."

It indicates, on the one hand, that organized labor is against the recently adopted labor bill on the part of the Senate, and that the United States Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers are likewise opposed to it—however, for different reasons.

I think the forlorn hope represents the thinking of the great majority of the American people in this highly important field, and I ask unanimous consent that the text of the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FORLORN HOPE

Representative HALLECK, of Indiana, the Republican leader in the House, came out of the White House Monday and reported he had told the President there is only "a forlorn hope" of passing labor legislation at this session.

Mr. HALLECK's appraisal was based on his knowledge of the House Labor Committee, now entrusted with whatever chance there is of producing a bill to protect the members of unions, and the public, from the union bosses—Jimmy Hoffa being a star example.

This committee is so splintered in its views that Mr. HALLECK sees little prospect even of a compromise. The conflicting views, all rigid, reflect the heavy outside pressure on Congress.

The United States Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers are opposed to the Kennedy bill (which passed the Senate 90 to 1) because it doesn't go far enough. The AFL–CIO is opposed to the bill because it goes too far. Hoffa and John L. Lewis frankly want no bill at all.

All of these groups maintain aggressive lobbies at the Capitol.

This, as much as anything, explains the dim prospect for any legislation which attempts to give the unions back to their members.

It is the old story of Congress listening to the voices nearest and loudest. The great majorities this legislation is intended to protect virtually are ignored in the infighting now going on over this issue. The public has no well-heeled lobby.

A statesmanlike Congress would heed none of the boisterous voices, but would have the courage to write a bill to safeguard the public interest.

The Christian Amendment Movement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. REES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 25, 1959

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted by the House, I am including one of a series of 13 radio programs prepared by Dr. R. J. G. McKnight, of Pittsburgh, Pa. Dr. McKnight is a scholar of the first rank, and his record is told in "Who's Who in America," also in "World Biography." He has made a specialty of studying the Christian philosophy of civil government, and he brings the fruit of his study to these programs.

The article follows:

It was pointed out in the preceding period that our leaders in national affairs after the Revolution began to abandon the colonists' conception of God in relation to nations and governments. They established the doctrine of separation of church and state. In that respect they did right.

Both church and state are divine institutions. Both come from the hand of God. God has never relinquished His claim to sovereignty over either state or church.

A state or nation is a spiritual entity. It is a moral being. It has moral obligations. The first of these moral obligations is to acknowledge the source of its authority. And the source of a nation's power is written down plainly in God's Word—the Bible. For example, if an officer of the law arrests a motorist, the motorist has a right to ask the officer to display his badge. The officer must have something to show that he has the authority to arrest the motorist. So Paul says: "Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God. Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God" (Romans 13:1,2).

No nation or court of law has the right to sentence a murderer to die unless it has back of such action the authority of God. God alone has the power of life and death. God does delegate this power to properly constituted agencies of government. But the murderer must have his day in court. And the court must also show that it is acting according to an ordinance of God.

God is a God of order. Without order there must be chaos. "God so loved 'the cosmos' (John 3:16, Greek) that He gave His only begotten Son" to reestablish the order as it was before. The order He had established was disrupted by sin.

We are living in a world that is in chaos, economically, politically and morally. We have trusted in blind leaders, and we have fallen into the ditch. We have hewed out for ourselves cisterns that can hold no water, and the race is perishing.

Thinking men everywhere are looking for some solid basis on which to build the foundations of society. Some (and they are all too few) have recognized that all the ills of society spring from a misconception of the relation which man bears to God. The primary concern of humanity is not with the relations between man and man, but with man's relation to God.

If we begin with man's relation to man, we arrive at some petty scheme for social betterment or class legislation, or some fantastic plan for economic security. Sociological and economic planners fail. They always have failed. They will continue to fail. They fail because they begin with man and they end with man. And the last state of man is worse than it was before.

Agitators, philosophers, psychologists, and philanthropists have glorified man. They have canonized man. They have made man the standard. They judge everything by what man wants or what he can enjoy. Everything is made to center about man's well-being.

It might surprise you, if you were to review in your minds the history of the last 200 years, to find that everything that has been attempted in the way of social progress, in this land or in Europe or in any any land, has been attempted in the name of the rights of man. All the acts of the French Revolution, and of all the revolutions that followed it, were a consequence of the declaration of the rights of man.

All the works of the philosophers of the last two centuries are based upon some theory of human liberty. All the discussions of our peace conferences and of our disarmament conferences center about the rights of man. In this present cold war we are most disturbed because the rights of man have been trampled. Rights of man, freedom, independence—these have become the watchwords of humanity.

Did it ever occur to you that the Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, coming into the world in human form, coming at the time when His own race was despised, oppressed, robbed, groaning beneath the yoke of Roman slavery; coming as their Messiah; coming to redeem a bankrupt race—has nothing to say to His own people about their rights?

Nothing at all.

Jesus Christ is preeminently the Apostle of Duty. He tells men that, from the divine point of view, sinful men have no rights until they accept Him as Lord. Translating literally from the Greek: "He came into His own [world] and his own people received Him not. But as many people as did receive Him to them gave He the right and the power to become the children of God, even to them who believe on His name."

The only thing He says about rights is that there are times when Christians must surrender their rights in order to discharge their duties. "Work", "do", "labor"—these are the words that are constantly on His lips. "These things ought ye to have done."

Men today will accept any doctrine, they will follow any leader, they will join any association that promises in any way to secure for them their rights and their liberties. But if you come to them in the name of an organization that lays emphasis on the duties of men, that speaks to them of their duties to God and to humanity, they turn a deaf ear.

No unregenerate man has any "rights" until he receives Christ. Then and only then Christ gives the right to become a child of God, God owes no man anything until this relationship has been established.

"Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city" (Rev. 22: 14). If we are ever to find a permanent basis for justice and peace in this land and throughout the world, we shall find it in our recognition of our duty to the Prince of Peace rather than in the assertion of the rights of man.

And the first duty of man is to acknowledge the Sovereignty of God over all and the Kingship of Jesus Christ His Son.

Visitor in Trujilloland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 28, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Time magazine for May 25, 1959, by Associate Editor George G. Daniels:

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC—VISITOR IN TRUJILLOLAND

(Vacationing in the Caribbean, Time Associate Editor George G. Daniels spent 3 days in the Dominican Republic, where Dictator Rafael Leonidas Trujillo is tensely on guard against any attack by Caribbean revolutionaries. His report:)

No one batted an eye when I presented my tourist card with its "Occupation: Journalist." They quietly took my picture, checked me electronically for weapons, secretly searched my belongings, fastened a couple of plainclothes cops to me like leeches, and turned me loose.

What I saw was the bristling little dictatorship of Generalissimo Trujillo. The Dominicans brag that they have 25,000 men under arms, an air force of 50 jets, and a navy of 19 frigate-destroyer escort-type vessels, all highly efficient. The troops looked neat and tough. Drive west from the center of Ciudad Trujillo, and you come on huge fields with possibly 2,000 to 3,000 men drilling in squad-sized groups. These are the draftees, and their D.I.s strut and chant like U.S. Marines, all very sharp. On the air route from the east, there is a brand-new jet base at San Isidro, about 15 miles from Ciudad Trujillo, with what looked like 8,000-9,000-foot runways and high-speed taxi strips. What is more, Trujillo's navy actually sails—one or two of the frigates were constantly on the horizon while I was there.

IN LOCKSTEP

The city they like to show visitors looks something like the better residential sections of Palm Beach, Fla. The 10-minute drive from the airport takes the visitor past block after block of modern houses that range from $50,000 on up to $200,000. This one belongs to Trujillo's son, that one to his daughter. Brother Hector, the nominal president, lives here; this is one of the chief's houses; his uncle owns this one, aunt that one. Out in the country there are magnificent ranches owned by the chief, a handsome estate with a small French chateau owned by one of his daughters.

Trujillo's country home near San Cristobal, 20 miles west in the foothills, is as big as a castle and guarded like one. I went up there with my two policemen buddies, and a soldier dogged me so closely it looked as if we were in lockstep. The house itself is an immense pile of plate glass and yellowish-brown stone, with galleries running all around. On the next hilltop was a huge neon sign about 50 feet by 20 feet that flashes at night, "telling people," my buddies said, "of all Trujillo's good works."

PAINTED SLUMS

What the Dominicans do not like to talk about is the poverty. They show visitors the new housing project across the river from Ciudad Trujillo, but it is very small potatoes compared with the slums that make up the bulk of the city. The hovels are all freshly painted, generally an ocher or a sky blue or sea green, with a barn-red trim framing the doors and windows. That's the way El Benefactor wants it, and everybody paints once or twice a year. But the houses themselves are miserable one- or two-room shacks, so old and termite-riddled that they list crazily against one another. The children are naked and dirty, the women haggard, and much of the cooking is done on the sidewalk over charcoal braziers—rice, fried bananas, very little meat.

No one begs in the Dominican Republic. First offense draws 6 months on the work farm, the second offense a couple of years, the third, life imprisonment. "Either they work," said my guide, "or they don't eat." Nor is there much unofficial crime, petty thievery and such. What's the penalty? "The penalty, sir, is that you don't do it again."

The restaurants, casinos, and nightclubs are empty, except for pistol-packing big wigs, and only a few of them. The Hotel Jaragua is almost deserted, and the 310-room Embajador, which cost $6 million or so, had about 20 guests. I'm convinced that the slot machines and games are fixed in favor of the tourists, in hopes that someone will spread the good word back home. At least, I could not lose for winning on the slots, and I watched a blackjack dealer accomplish a nearly impossible feat: he went over 21 on 3 of 5 hands, thus keeping the one occupied table at the Embajador going.

Maybe one of the reasons the place is so unattractive is the way they study the stranger. On the second day, in the car, one of my cop chums turned to me and said: "You're German, aren't you?" "No," I said. "I'm Irish-English." "Well, what about your middle name?" he said. "You mean 'Goetz?'" I asked. "Yes." So I said I had just a little German in me, and remembered that the only place my middle name appeared was on my passport (I had not used it on my tourist card), which I had locked in my dispatch case in my room.

Report to Members of the New York Society of the Panama Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. DORN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1959

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following report to members of the New York Society of the Panama Canal:

At the annual reunion meeting, May 2, 1959, of the New York Society of the Panama Canal, the presiding officer, Col. Ralph H. Sartor, called on Mr. Harry Bortin, a Roosevelt Medal holder, of Washington, D.C., to explain briefly the provisions of the following resolution which he had submitted previously, to the undersigned secretary, for consideration at this meeting.

Responding, Mr. Bortin explained briefly the substance of the five "whereas" clauses, and read aloud the three "resolved" clauses of the following resolution, which was thereafter introduced by a member, seconded by another member and, on the presiding officer's call for the ayes and nays, was adopted by unanimous vote.

JOHN J. FITZPATRICK,
Secretary.

The resolution:

"Whereas the factual record in reports previously submitted and explained briefly at annual reunion meeting, May 2, 1959, of the New York Society of the Panama Canal, by Mr. Harry Bortin, shows the 6,865 civilian officers and employees who had earned the Roosevelt Medal for 2 years continuous service on construction of Panama Canal, were excluded from the annuity benefits granted by the 64th Congress in Public Law 316, of March 4, 1915, for like services by officers of the Army, Navy, and Public Health Services; and

"Whereas the exclusion of those civilian canal builders from that law, was considered and protested by former President Theodore Roosevelt, and by Gen. George W. Goethals, and by other Government officials, and by leaders of private organizations, such as American Federation of Labor, and four railroad brotherhoods, as unjust discrimination during the subsequent 29 years, until the 78th Congress, by Public Law 319, of May 29, 1944, corrected that injustice, in part, by granting recognition and annuity benefits to about 80 percent, more or less, of those 6,865 Roosevelt medal holders; and

"Whereas the other 20 percent, more or less, of those medal holders continued to suffer from being unjustly excluded from the recognition and annuity benefits of the 1944 law, for 15 additional years until the present; and

"Whereas on the basis of the facts presented and of our own knowledge of related circumstances, we believe that their exclusion from the recognition and annuity benefits of the 1944 law, is contrary to the principle of "equal justice under law," and is in violation of President Theodore Roosevelt's sincere promises to the civilian canal builders in 1906, on behalf of the people of the United States; and

"Whereas some 194 reputable citizens from 22 States, Canal Zone, and District of Columbia, on the basis of those facts, had petitioned the 86th Congress to end that discrimination, by changing the 1944 law's minimum requirement for eligibility to its benefits, from '3 years' to '2 years'; and Hon. ADAM C. POWELL, JR., Member of Congress from the 16th District of New York State, introduced in the House of Representatives on March 23, 1959, a bill, H.R. 5940, 'to extend the benefits of the Panama Canal Construction Service Annuity Act of May 29, 1944, to certain individuals,' including the holders of Roosevelt Medal who were excluded from the 1944 law, as amended: Therefore be it

"*Resolved by the New York Society of the Panama Canal at its annual reunion meeting on May 2, 1959,* That we approve and endorse the pending legislation in H.R. 5940, as for the public interest in honoring the memory of President Theodore Roosevelt who made possible the building of the Panama Canal, and in fulfilling his promises to the civilian officers and employees who helped to build it; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That the secretary of our society is hereby authorized and directed to certify this resolution as having been duly introduced, seconded, and adopted; and to transmit copies of it to the chairman of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and the chairman of its Subcommittee on Panama Canal; also to the Congressmen and Senators from New York State; also to the Civil Service Commission, and to the Bureau of the Budget, with request to each of them to press for favorable action toward enactment of H.R. 5940, and a companion bill in the Senate, during this session of the 86th Congress; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That the chairmen of the aforesaid House committee and subcommittee be requested to hold public hearings on that bill at an early date, and notify all parties concerned, through this secretary, Mr. John J. Fitzpatrick, and through Mr. Harry Bortin, the Washington representative, in advance of that date, so that they and we may appear to testify, or present statements to the subcommittee, if we should be unable to appear in person at those hearings."

Armed Forces Day Speech by Brig. Gen. Laurence B. Kelley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER ROGERS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1959

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Armed Forces Day is always celebrated in the Panhandle of Texas in the same manner as we do everything—in the biggest and best way possible. This was the case this year on May 16, 1959, at which occasion the principle address at Amarillo Air Force Base was delivered by Brig. Gen. Laurence B. Kelley, Director of Logistics Plans for the Materiel Deputy Chief of Staff for the Department of the Air Force. Under unanimous consent, I insert herein the address of General Kelley:

ARMED FORCES DAY SPEECH BY GENERAL KELLEY, MAY 16, 1959

Ladies and gentlemen, I am very honored to be here today, not just as an Air Force officer, but as a representative of all the United States Armed Forces.

President Eisenhower has described the theme of this tenth annual Armed Forces Day as "Power for peace." Now I don't want to give a long lecture or throw a lot of figures at you, but I would like to spell out the meaning of these words, "Power for peace." For one thing, you're helping to support a military budget this year of some $40 billion and you should know what you're getting for the money. But more important than that, I think you should know why we say power means peace.

Our job in the Armed Forces is first, to prevent war, and second, if war is forced upon us, to win it. Notice that I put prevention first. Do you remember the saying, "There are no atheists in foxholes"? Well, I think I can say with equal truth that there are no warmongers in the Armed Forces. We live every day with the awesome power of our new weapons, and anyone who knows as we do the capability of these things, would have to be a homicidal maniac to be eager to see them used. That is why I believe you can't find people anywhere who more sincerely want peace than we who work in the military services.

Unfortunately, as the world found out once again at Munich, wishful thinking does not maintain peace. All of recorded history is proof of the fact that if you want to avoid war, you must first be prepared to win it. This is precisely what we are trying to do today in the United States Armed Forces.

Let's look for a moment at what we call in military terms, the nature of the enemy threat.

We face today a threat unique in our experience: the possibility of a sudden, destructive surprise attack upon the continental United States. For over a 150 years, we were protected by geography, by the natural barrier of thousands of miles of ocean extending beyond each of our coasts. We could sit comfortably behind this cushion and say to the rest of the world, as we did in the Monroe Doctrine, "You keep out of our affairs, and we'll keep out of yours." After all, we could afford to be cocky; we had not only vast oceans on our side, but the British Navy as well.

The military advantages of our geographic position began to fade with the advent of nuclear weapons and the long-range bomber to deliver them. They declined still more as these bombers became high-performance jet aircraft. And they virtually disappeared with the arrival of the intercontinental ballistic missile. Even the very oceans have changed from a protective moat to a dangerous cover; the waters which once carried American frigates may soon conceal hostile submarines capable of launching missiles right off our very shores. Thus, the new technology of war, in just 15 short years, has placed every inch of American soil and each one of our citizens in a front line position.

If these were simply abstract facts in a textbook on miltary strategy, we'd have no immediate problem. The point is that the Soviet Union already has all of these means of delivery and the weapons to go with them, and further, that this capability of theirs is increasing rapidly. Which leads to another point, one central to the whole matter of general war.

By definition, an aggressor attacks first. President Eisenhower repeated flatly, a few weeks ago, that we would not fire the first shot. The Russians on the other hand, as their recent history proves, would have no scruples whatever about launching a surprise aggression, if they thought they would gain from it more than they would lose.

One final point in this connection. Before the Atomic Age, the most an aggressor could achieve from an initial surprise strike against a major power was the elimination of a fleet, or an army, or perhaps, the capture of a big chunk of territory. Now, there is the distinct possibility that an aggressor could—quite literally—destroy a major nation in a matter of hours.

Here then, is the first and greatest threat facing us: a nuclear attack, delivered with crushing strength and with little or no warning.

A second threat we must counter is the possibility of war which is less than total. This type of war has been termed as area or local war and frequently as limited war. Here too the Soviet Union has an advantage in that they can spark off such a conflict at any time, at any place around their perimeter of influence, which encircles half the globe. Moreover, they can fight it without committing a single Russian soldier, using satellite forces armed with Soviet equipment.

Since I am involved chiefly in the Air Force logistics planning I have some knowledge of what it means to prepare for a war we don't know where, we don't know with whom, we don't know how widespread, and which might start tomorrow morning at eight o'clock. And a look at a map of the world quickly shows that there are about a baker's dozen of places, scattered over the globe where a limited war may conceivably break out. All these unknowns make planning a rather sporting business.

The third type of war has been a constant fact of life for all of us since 1946. I refer of course to the cold war, a war characterized by an unending political, economic and psychological fight between the free and Communist worlds. This war is predominantly nonmilitary, since it is essentially a struggle for the minds of men. But men respect deeds, and our vast military assistance program and our military contributions to regional security organizations such as NATO and SEATO have had a profound effect on our allies. I might add that the effect has been even more profound on the Russians, as the intense interest of the Soviet press in the recent 10th Congress of NATO bears witness. At the conclusion of World War II, much of the world feared—and the Communists fervently prayed—that we would retire into isolation, much as we'd done in 1919. Instead, we not only did not pull back, but we became a bulwark of aid for freedom everywhere—in Greece, Turkey, blockaded Berlin, Korea, Formosa, the Middle East. And this aid was made possible by the shield provided by American deterrent power. Beyond any doubt, the one big reason why the cold war has never completely boiled over during the past decade has been the fact, very evident to the Communists, that they are the ones who would get burned if it did.

We call this concept "deterrence," and it is our basic overall answer to the threat posed by Soviet imperialism.

What is "deterrence"? There is nothing really new about it. Years ago Army posts on the frontier performed a function very similar in design to our deterrent forces today. The Indian raids that did get through were bad enough, of course. However, try to picture what Indian war parties would have done here in the Panhandle if it had not been for the troops based at Fort Sill up in the Territory, Fort Bascom across the line in New Mexico, and Forts Davis and Concho down to the south. The very fact that these posts existed, holding cavalry units ready to go on short notice, very largely kept the Indians in check and permitted settlement of the West.

You wouldn't think so from watching TV but, in actual fact, few of the famous frontier marshals found it necessary to do a lot of shooting. They didn't have to. Wyatt Earp's Colt maintained law and order in Dodge City through its deterrent effect: That is—everyone knew that it was there, that Earp could use it well, and that he was ready to use it. As a result, he rarely had to use it. This, very simply, is what we mean when we speak of deterrence.

In today's terms, it means these three elements. First, we must have strong forces, ready for immediate action. We can no longer depend upon getting the forces we need after the war begins. If we must fight, we shall have to do it with the forces we have in being now, this instant. And these forces must be capable of destroying any possible aggressor's capacity to wage war.

Second, we must possess the national will and determination to develop and provide these forces, and to use them when it is required.

Third, any potential enemy must believe in the fact of our having such forces, and in our determination to use them if need be. If he does not believe in both of these, he may very possibly touch off a war through ignorance or inadvertence. When the files of the German general staff came into our hands in 1945, we found out that Hitler had ordered the invasion of Poland because his intelligence had advised him Britain would not fight to protect Polish freedom. We must be careful that no future aggressor is similarly misled.

Having explained the meaning of deterrence, let me describe now very briefly how we provide it.

I said earlier that the most dangerous form of Soviet aggression would be a surprise atomic air attack. The best way of preventing such an attack is to maintain our own air atomic force capable of destroying the warmaking capacity of any possible aggressor.

A large part of our deterrent strength is vested in the Air Force's Strategic Air Command. They are the boys who carry our Sunday punch. A substantial number of our SAC crews, by the way, are always on 15-minute alert—that is, 15 minutes after the whistle blows, they will have their birds airborne, fully armed and enroute to a predetermined target.

The fast attack carriers, whose nuclear-capable jet aircraft provide the backbone of our naval striking power, add to American deterrence the advantages inherent in their mobility and dispersion. Also, we have intermediate range ballistic missiles already in place overseas, and the Army, for some time now, has had a variety of tactical missiles with nuclear potential operational in the field. Our first-generation ICBM's will soon be available to augment the SAC bombers. You probably know that these ICBM's have a demonstrated capability to reach out thousands of miles and hit any target. As we learn more about these huge, temperamental beasts, we shall use them more and more to supplement our piloted force. A word of caution, though—the true so-called pushbutton war is still a long way off.

Our deterrent strength is, therefore, a mixture of weapons and support provided by all the services—a unified defense team of over 2½ million men. To this should be added the significant power of our free-world allies, consisting of millions of men and thousands of jet aircraft and warships.

I mentioned that we face the prospect of many limited wars, as well as the ever-present threat of the big one. We must, therefore, be able to deliver not only a knockout punch with the full weight of SAC, but a fast jab with anything ranging from a few tactical aircraft or a company of Marines on up to a sizable task force of Army, Navy, and Air Force forces.

Our worldwide tactical air forces—comprising almost one-third of our air strength—are particularly adaptable to the limited conflict. These units can, either from overseas bases or after rapid deployment from domestic bases, engage in limited war without seriously detracting from our general war posture. Their high mobility was demonstrated twice this past year, during the Lebanon and Taiwan Straits situations. In the Middle East case, for example, jet fighters from Myrtle Beach, S.C., touched down at Adana Air Base in Turkey after a nonstop flight of less than 13 hours. Also, in Lebanon, the 6th Fleet landed a strong amphibious force of Marines under naval air cover, and did it on incredibly short notice. The Army also has highly streamlined mobile forces which are available to be airlifted to any potential trouble spot on short notice. It should be remembered, however, that these operations are possible only because the Kremlin is very much aware of the cocked and ready striking force of SAC. The ability to rapidly deploy combat forces an maintain combat capability requires a highly responsive transportation system. MATS, the Military Air Transport Service, enables us to rapidly move vital equipment, supplies, and personnel to bases around the world. This single-manager agency includes Navy units and is supplemented by the Civil Reserve Air Fleet. In the event of an emergency, the commercial aircraft which are included in the CRAF program become immediately available for airlifting essential military cargoes. Another important element of the transportation system is the Military Sea Transportation Service operated by the Navy. MSTS has the capability of moving heavy equipment, bulk shipments, and large forces when such movements are required.

I've talked about our deterrent strength in the usual Army-Navy-Air Force terms. Now let me tell you how these armed services combine their efforts to achieve this strength.

Both legally—as a result of the recent reorganization of the Defense Department—and in practice, the military services are much closer together than most people realize. However, you sometimes get the impression from the newspapers that we are more interested in fighting each other than in preparing for the common defense. Of course we differ among ourselves. Very often, we differ even in the same service as to what will give us the best return on the defense dollar.

Decisions are being made in the Pentagon which crucially affect our national security and, quite naturally, feelings about them run pretty strong. Should we buy another nuclear-powered carrier or another wing of B–52's, another division of paratroops or another squadron of missiles? Yet, if we misjudge, the results may be fatal to the United States. You can see, I think, why legitimate differences may arise.

But I want to stress first that these differences cease the moment a command decision is made. And second, there are no differences whatever out in the field, where the defense policies of the Nation are actually implemented, and where you will always find close and effective cooperation toward a common objective. This is why it is misleading to think only in the old sense of separate Army, Navy, Marine, and Air Force missions—we are, in fact as well as name, the United States Armed Forces.

The cost of operating our Defense Establishment is high, about $40 billion this year. I wish I could tell you that this expense will go down. However, just as you have to pay more for the same thing each year, we do too. Even if we were still using the same types of planes, guns, and ships we had in 1945, our expenses would still have gone up. And the fantastic complexity of our new weapons systems pushes the price up even further.

If I may inject another note, by the way, I might point out that we have not yet begun to feel the cost to be incurred by our forthcoming exploration of space. Not so very many years ago, I flew my first jet plane. It is entirely conceivable that before I retire from the Air Force, I will be

involved in providing logistics support for a Moon base or a manned satellite station. The financing of such ventures, and the cost of the equipment required, may well prove—and please excuse the pun—astronomical. Yet what choice have we? Can we abandon space to the sputniks?

The price certainly comes high for modern military hardware, but it comes even higher in terms of human effort. Right at this minute, while I speak, thousands of our Air Force radar, fighter, and bomber crews are on alert around the globe. These men, and all the men backing them up, are putting their jobs and their country above personal convenience. They are not getting extra pay for their lack of comforts, nor are they getting overtime for the long hours. So far, it isn't a shooting war—and these men know that the better they do their job, the less likely it is that there will be a shooting war. If their tasks are to be meaningful, it seems to me that the entire Nation must put forth extra effort comparable to theirs.

We sometimes forget the extent of the problems that were licked by the Americans before us, problems which, in their time, were as grave as those we face now. Here in the Panhandle, the early settler faced, and triumphed over, Indians, blizzards, drought, and disease. I am confident that the same spirit that met and conquered these obstacles still lives in the land today, and will provide all of us in the United States Armed Forces with the resolute public support we need to do our job of maintaining power for peace.

The Passing of County Government in Connecticut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 28, 1959

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to remark on the great record which is being made by the Legislature of the State of Connecticut under the inspiration and leadership of our great Governor, Abraham Ribicoff. After many years of ill-fated attempts and frustrations, Connecticut has abolished its county government, an anachronism which burdened my State for too long a time. Credit for this accomplishment is due to many people and many organizations, but more than anyone to our great Governor Ribicoff.

I wish to bring to each Member's attention an editorial from the Christian Science Monitor of May 12, 1959, which refers to this accomplishment.

The editorial follows:

SIXTEEN THOUSAND GOVERNMENTS

Connecticut has just sentenced its obsolescent system of county governments to oblivion in the interest of economy.

This move, instigated by efficiency-minded Governor Ribicoff and backed by both houses of the legislature, should pave the way for simplification of some of the complex and expensive government structures that haunt other Governors and harry their taxpayers.

The plain, inescapable fact is that Americans, who used to govern themselves, now are themselves governed from many directions. And one reason is that the jerrybuilding of new and necessary government units has gone on apace while little has been done to eliminate or condense outdated units.

To professional administrators the results in some cases are appalling. For instance in the 174 big-city areas of the American nation (where over 80 percent of current population growth is taking place) there are over 16,000 governmental units with the power to tax and spend. That's an average of about 92 governments to administer each of these population concentrations.

Now it may fairly be said that with such split-up layers of government each unit is clearly responsible for its actions—there is no hiding within the vastness of a larger unit. But what citizen is able to keep his eye on 92 units—or even 50—anyway?

For many of its citizens the United States has become in essence a kind of Overlapping States of America. Border lines between town, county, State, and Federal government have become blurred with shifts of function and proliferation of agencies. Without the aid of sometimes costly professional advice, few taxpayers know to what unit to turn for help with their problems—an essential service they are paying taxes for.

It is for this reason that we believe simplification, regrouping, and/or condensation of government functions from the local to the Federal level is essential.

Connecticut's abolition of its eight counties—accomplished by transferring their few remaining necessary functions to State agencies and saving money on payroll costs—gives on example of what can be done.

In other States, county governments may be strengthened rather than weakened to achieve the desired result. This is particularly so in some 108 of the country's metropolitan areas whose over-all boundaries, although they may contain many suburbs, happen to coincide with the borders of a single county unit. In some of these areas plans are being laid already to condense dozens of service functions such as parks, water, and sewerage under a single government.

The point is to reduce the number of middlemen handling the taxpayer's money for him. Connecticut has set an example worth examination in other States.

A Deluge of Corn Coming?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE BROCK
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 28, 1959

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, during the recent debates on the floor of this House the membership was concerned about placing a limitation on Commodity Credit Corporation loans to farmers producing grain. The House approved a limitation of $50,000 and the Senate is considering lowering the amount of any one loan to $35,000.

Since controls on acreage allotments were removed by Secretary of Agriculture Benson, farmers are putting every available acre into grain. With the promise of a bumper corn crop in 1959 it looks like we are headed for real trouble this coming harvest time with a surplus of corn.

Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I, therefore include in the RECORD an editorial appearing in the Omaha Daily Journal-Stockman on May 25, 1959, on the corn corp outlook for this season:

A DELUGE OF CORN COMING?

Spot checks during corn planting time provide some rather convincing evidence that a much larger acreage than in any other recent year has been put in corn. Farmers weren't just "talking through their hats" when they told the Government planting intentions survey group in March they planned a sizable increase. Apparently they've carried out their intentions. The result is a potential corn crop that could be bigger than even the 1958 record.

Adding to the impetus for more corn have been several seasonal factors, our spot-checkers find. Wet, cold weather during oat seeding time prevented some farmers from sowing as many acres to that crop as they had planned, and these acres are now going into corn. Soybean market prospects have helped switch some acreage to corn. And near ideal corn planting wetaher and conditions in many areas have encouraged farmers to go "all the way" with corn when they got started.

One interesting thing our survey showed was that it is primarily the grain growers who are pulling out all the stops on corn. Livestock farmers go along pretty much according to pattern. A few of the latter admitted they were going even a little lighter on corn this year, having seen everybody else in the community hitting it heavy and thus figuring corn would be dirt cheap as a result.

So, we're off to a big corn year, no doubt about it—some say it could be a four-billion-bushel year, maybe more. But the fact that the seed is in the ground does not insure a big crop, of course. Drought could upset the applecart. There are a few dry spots around, but lack of moisture is not a general worry at this stage of the situation.

Supposing the weather pattern is good, and we go on to a corn crop of 4 billion or even 4.5 billion bushels—what then? Well, a big surplus of corn, to be sure. Corn everywhere. Cash corn would be cheap, and the Government would do a loan business that would make the land-office "sharks" look like pikers. It would mean cheap feed, and plenty of it. Obviously it could stimulate livestock production.

Whether livestockmen could realize any real advantage in such an abundance of cheap feed is doubtful. The increase in red meat output already in the works would be heightened as more farmers attempted to take advantage of cheap feed. The possibility is that nobody would gain except the consumer, who is already the chief beneficiary in this era of big grain and livestock output.

Inclination to feed up a big part of this year's corn crop could mean stronger emphasis on pig production later this year and the possibility of much lower hog prices through 1960. And it could stimulate further the demand for stocker and feeder cattle, adding strength to prices and causing feeders to bid replacement cattle up to the point that margins would be slim, if they existed at all.

There is, we would guess, a good chance that corn production has been seriously overdone—provided the weather permits a big crop. If this possibility materializes, the repercussions could provide a real jolt in many ways.

Extravagant Spending Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WINT SMITH
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 28, 1959

Mr. SMITH of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, recently this letter appeared in the Hill City Times, a typical rural county seat town on the High Plains of Kansas. This letter is inserted because it contains a lot of truth—ideas that the Congress should remember whenever the subject of appropriations comes to the floor of the House.

Over the years, I have consistently pointed an accusing finger at the Congress for all these wild extravagant spending programs, and have said more than once we in the Sixth District of Kansas know full well that we should not be exempted from trying to balance the budget and live within our means. In other words, the people of the sixth district are not exempt from doing their share in this drive for economy.

I commend this article, written by Harold Dwyer, as it appeared in the Hill City Times. This column in which this article appeared is entitled "The Galloping Goose," a rather strange title, but the ideas expressed should come home to roost by those who formulate and pass appropriation bills, namely, the Congress of the United States.

The article follows:

THE GALLOPING GOOSE
(By Harold Dwyer)

MAY 13, 1959.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Here is another word from the common herd.

It is frequently suggested that we write to our Congressmen. I always hesitate, for two reasons. In the first place it seems a waste of perfectly good ink and paper. In the second, your own voting record is such that you do not need to be written to.

But in the matter of this inflation thing, it is hard not to say something to someone. I already know just about how you will vote to help the President hold the line with his budget, but I'm hoping it isn't too much to ask that you do what you can to cause some of the characters with whom you serve, to also see the light.

I marvel at the crust of some of these potlickers who come out into the districts and trowel on the salve to drum up enough votes to be elected, then hightail it right back to Washington to "represent" us by apparently sitting for days and weeks on end with chin in hand and elbow on something soft, just thinking up different angles of running us through the tax wringer, and how to create bigger and better ratholes for the Government to pour the tax money down.

When people do wrong, it is the result of one of two things—either misunderstanding, or with malice aforethought. And these birds are not dumb. They're smart enough to talk a lot of people who should know better, into voting for them. And they're smart enough to see to it that their own nests are not entirely devoid of feathers. So when they sink a fang into the hand that's putting the biscuits on their table, it's no accident. When they start helping to milk the homefolks, the people with whom they grew up, then vote for measures that may just add a few feathers, or enlarge and lengthen the rodent runways, then we may know for sure that they've had yegg blood in their veins all the time.

It's a dead open-and-shut. A man either is—or he isn't. He can no more be half honest than can his wife be half pregnant. If he votes time after time to increase the load on the common people back home who pay the taxes, and at the same time for increased Government spending on projects that will benefit only a few on the inside who have their special cars hitched to the gravy train, then he is inherently criminal—and the truth is not in him.

I know I'm asking you to do one whale of a job. But this is a serious situation. We are being bled white—and much of the tax money being worse than thrown away. Congress is our only point of contact with that situation. To it we must turn for any help to stop the stampede. And Congress has become a standing joke. Maybe on account of having so many standing committees, but more likely because so many of the jokers with whom you serve are yeggs at heart.

If it's wrong to stickup a man at gunpoint and take his money, then it is no less criminal to finagle around and swap favors and pass a law to take it away from him legally. Many of these lugs are in my opinion just as upright and decent as any of the other thugs who ply their trade up and down the dark alleys, only the alley boys take 'em as they come, while their silk-underwear brothers with whom you rub shoulders daily specialize on doing it to their friends and neighbors.

Fully aware am I that we the people out in the bushes are not entirely blameless in this rip-roaring drunken orgy of taxing and borrowing and throwing to the birds. So many of us have a hand out for a handout and "write our Congressman" to support any proposal from which we can hope to get a healthy slice, no matter how it may weaken the economy, nor how surely it may help drive this country to the brink of ruin farther up the creek. We also know that when one leans that way naturally, it doesn't take many such letters to give him a good excuse to go out in that direction.

In the opinion of most of us the President's budget is gosh-awful high as it is, but he understands that about the only way to stop a bad stampede is to get the critters to milling in a circle, and that is probably what he has in mind. We have to get stopped before we can start back. And it seems that we just must hold the line here.

Again let me say that I know fully the size of the task I'm asking you to do. If you think it will help any, you may tell your associates that to me and countless thousands of others, the voting record of you and a few others on this thing is such as to make you and them stand out like a few dozen kernels of wheat in a bushel basket of floor sweepings.

And please know that anything you can and will do to help put out the fire under this inflation pot, will be more than appreciated by millions of us.

Sincerely,

Name _____
Address _____

Cal Farley's Boys Ranch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER ROGERS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 28, 1959

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Saturday, May 23, marked the culmination of Cal Farley's Boys Ranch Week in Texas. In recognition of the event and the 20th anniversary of the perpetration of a magnificent ideal, I rise to pay tribute to one of the greatest living Americans—Cal Farley. The name is well known to many Members of this body, as is the institution which he founded and has fostered since its inception in the spring of 1939.

Long noted for his community contributions, particularly in the promotion of boys' sports, Cal Farley was a successful businessman in Amarillo, Tex. Throughout the thirties his philanthropies were focused more and more on delinquent boys which led him to the formation of the Maverick Club in Amarillo—an organization devoted to providing constructive sports activities for boys who had never had this kind of opportunity—for boys who would otherwise have spent the time finding their own sport in the pursuit of idleness and the resultant social constrictions. Farley's Maverick Club functioned purposefully, it grew, and it performed a notable and worthy community service. With ordinary people exercising ordinary vision in an ordinary community, this might have been the sum and total of this project. The community, the vision, and particularly the man were not, however, ordinary. On the contrary, they were, and are, extraordinary, as is evidenced by the inevitable result. I say inevitable because the urgent need of these boys and the compassion and purposeful ability of Cal Farley were bound to produce one of the greatest humanitarian ventures in our great land.

Through the generosity of Julian Bivins, Panhandle rancher, Cal Farley in 1939 founded Boys Ranch at Tascosa, Tex., an abandoned ghost town near Amarillo which had been a colorful trading post in pioneer days. With six homeless boys, a cook, a supervising couple, and the firm conviction that no boy is born bad, the foundation was laid for the magnificent institution of Boys Ranch. The idea and the man were so consumed with fruition that Cal Farley soon sold his business interests in order to devote full time to the ranch which has, in the 20 years since its founding, given some 1,500 boys "a shirttail to hang on to."

Last Saturday at the ranch, celebrities and notables from all over the United States joined the people of the Panhandle of Texas in saluting Cal Farley—a great American, a great Texan, a great man. The community award presented to Cal, the stirring words of tribute, were all appreciated by him, I know, but I am certain his greatest reward is written in the hearts of men and boys throughout the world as they continue to strive toward goals of responsibility and contributions to society first demonstrated to them at Boys Ranch.

Publication of Cal Farley's biography, "A Shirt Tail To Hang On To," by Beth Day, has just been announced by Henry Holt Publishing Co. In order that the Members may have an account of the scope and accomplishments of Boys Ranch today, I insert herein an account which recently appeared in the Amarillo

Globe-Times by Associated Press writer Finis Mothershead.

THE RANCH PROVIDES A GOOD PLACE FOR BOYS TO GET THINGS DONE HONESTLY

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This is the last of three articles about Boys Ranch founded by Cal Farley, and its heartening success in building useful citizens from underprivileged and prison-bound boys. They're celebrating the ranch's 20th anniversary this week.)

(By Finis Mothershead)

AMARILLO.—If you've had to steal for anything you ever wanted, can you learn to quit stealing?

At Boys Ranch they'll show you it's been done right along for 20 years.

Cal Farley, an ex-wrestler and businessman, is credited for cajoling his neighbors into giving what it took to build this unique foster home, and for keeping after them to make room for still more boys.

He and his coworkers figure this way:

A boy who stole—because he was hungry and cold, at a sorry parent's order or only for the thrill—simply needs a little practice at how to get things honestly.

Give him love and attention, insist on discipline, let him learn responsibility. Most boys will do the rest.

Unprompted, a youngster who's had time to get acquainted sidles up to a sullen new arrival and advises quietly: "Take it easy. They treat you right around here."

It's not uncommon for an underfed waif to gain 10 pounds the first week. And he's startled to discover he gets a monthly salary just for doing his share of the chores.

The formula isn't infallible. Of the 1,500 boys who've grown to young manhood at Boys Ranch since it was established near here in 1939, Farley says 42 flunked and wound up in reformatories.

"We failed on them and you can't be sure exactly where," Farley said the other day. "I wish we could have another chance with those kids."

Boys Ranch takes only boys "from the bottom of the barrel," the lowest 10 percent on the social scale.

In most cases they're from homes broken up by divorce, runaway fathers, or the death of a parent. At least half are in trouble. The rest have no place to live and nobody to look after them.

"Without some good apples among the bad, it would be tremendously harder to get ideas across to the tough ones," said Farley.

Boys Ranchers live in small dormitories built to seem more like large cottages. Married couples have apartments in each of the attractive stone buildings.

Meals are in a dining hall big enough to seat twice as many boys as the 251 now at the ranch. They take turns sitting at the head table, learning to make announcements and appear before a crowd, and at serving food to one another.

A bell signals the start of each day at 6:30 a.m. They dress, make their beds and eat breakfast, clean their dormitories, and go to the modern ranch school by 8:30. With a break for lunch, classes last until 3:10 p.m.

After changing clothes, Boys Ranchers have until 5:15 for assigned chores, which are rotated, or school sports. Then come dinner and an evening of television, movies, school studies, Bible class, intramural athletics—some activity to prevent troublemaking idleness.

As for those salaries, the size varies from $2 a month for preschool tots, who do such things as sweeping sidewalks, to $15. Top pay goes to boys who choose less desirable jobs like dishwashing, or those who achieve the status of junior staff members.

Earnings go into each boy's bank account, along with standard credits for clothing needs. He writes checks to buy a new pair of pants, or dozens of items—chewing gum, soda pop, and the like—for which boys elsewhere spend private home allowances.

In addition to making purchases at a country-type store in the ranch warehouse, he may cash a check for pocket change to take on alternate-Saturday trips to Amarillo. Buses take the boys into town.

Adults keep the smaller boys in groups. The others may go anywhere they please without escort in this Texas Panhandle city. Merchants have found them well behaved. Sometimes the clerks are a little too friendly.

"At a big self-service store," said Farley, "we found they liked our kids so well the checkers didn't look inside a boy's sack—just asked what he had bought and took the right price.

"With some of the kids not far removed from expert thievery, that's too much temptation. We asked the store manager: 'Please be sure what they're taking out. Don't invite them to steal by making it so easy.'"

Little things as well as big make Boys Ranch a pleasant place to live.

Fifty or more dogs, mostly of mixed breed, roam the place, sharing an abundance of boy love. Usually there are two or three litters of fat puppies at play somewhere out-of-doors.

Larger boys have opportunity to raise calves and pigs, and win their share of blue ribbons at area livestock shows. They keep detailed records on an animal's growth and the feed required. When the animal is ready for market, the profit goes to the lad who raised it.

Three sizable ponds stocked with bass and perch afford good fishing. There are two good swimming holes. A site is ready when there's money to build an indoor pool.

Birthdays are big events. There's a dormitory party with cake and ice cream every time one rolls around. Other boys in the dormitory are allowed to give a nickel apiece for a joint gift, and the honoree also gets a present from the ranch.

If a boy has relatives with suitable homes, he may go to visit them every Christmas. In the summer, everybody at the ranch shares a mass vacation trip, sometimes halfway across the Nation.

By the time they come to the ranch, many boys are 2 to 4 years behind their age groups in school. Well over half never finish high school. Each year, however, the graduating class is a little larger. Fourteen are getting diplomas this spring. Four will go on to college.

Boys Ranchers depart for good at 17, normally to enter military service. Many later become teachers, engineers or businessmen.

For the others, who got too far behind in school, the ranch provides more than a dozen types of vocational training. They learn farming and all sorts of trades.

None leaves Boys Ranch without being able to earn a living. He knows how to get what he needs without having to steal.

Getting the Taxpayers Return on Their Tax-Dollar Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVID S. KING

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1959

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, legislation which I introduced today could, in time, swell Federal revenue by as much as a billion dollars annually.

The bill would give the United States a share in the patent royalties on inventions and discoveries which are made under Federal research contracts. I see no defensible reason why the taxpayers and their Government should not share the royalties from developments which are made on tax dollars.

At the same time, I am convinced the bill offers other possible benefits. For one thing, it would, I believe, help small business. It would help combat the strong monopolistic trend which currently dominates the Federal research program.

The record shows that 5 percent of the larger industries and research organizations in this country are now gobbling up about 95 percent of the research contracts. I do not believe that we can safely assume the same industries and organizations have cornered 95 percent of the Nation's research talent.

Our struggle for survival against the forces of totalitarian communism demands that we make full and effective use of our research talent. I will be convinced that we are making full use of all of this talent only when the smaller institutions receive their fair, proportionate share of the research load. I am strongly determined that the smaller institutions will carry their fair share of the research responsibility, and I believe that my patent legislation will help correct the current inequity.

As long as 5 percent of the institutions control 95 percent of the research effort, we can safely assume that they will make 95 percent of the discoveries, and swallow up 95 percent of the patent royalties.

Their income from the patents, which is a pure profit, aggravates the inequity and tightens their stranglehold on research. Too, it has the ill effect of narrowing competition and, in the extreme, killing it entirely.

Their research costs are always covered by the contracts, which also provide a profit. They are entirely free to spend their income from patents on expansion—to build additional facilities, to engage more research talent and to gobble up more contracts.

It is a simple case of the big growing bigger, while their small competitors are denied the opportunity to share in any way in that growth.

My legislation follows a principle employed by industry itself. When an employee in industry makes an invention or discovery in his employer's laboratory, he must, in most cases, share the royalty with the company. In fact, as a rule, the company, and not the employee, holds the patent. The same principle should apply at least in part to the technological advances which our tax dollars produce.

Tax dollars today carry the bulk of the national research effort. The research which the Government sponsors spearheads our current technological progress, and the taxpayers have as much right as the corporations to share the royalties from the publicly financed effort.

I discount the arguments that the legislation would hurt incentive. The bill does not eliminate the incentive by

stripping contractors of the royalties, but simply gives the taxpayers a share of the royalties. It does not fix a definite split on the royalties. It enables the Government to negotiate the split, and to determine percentages which will be equitable to both the contractor and the taxpayers.

The research program and the patent-royalty is ably discussed in an article entitled "Increasing Government-Sponsored Research and Development Creates Patent Policy Problems," which appeared May 4, 1959, in Product Engineering. The article follows:

INCREASING GOVERNMENT-SPONSORED RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT CREATES PATENT POLICY PROBLEMS

WASHINGTON.—U.S. Government patent policies, in the words of one high-ranking patent official, are a mess. And with the Federal Government now financing more than half the research in this country, agitation for a general overhaul of the system is increasing on Capitol Hill.

Several moves are already underway:

The Senate Patents Subcommittee is in the midst of a study just trying to find out what the policies of the various agencies are.

One Congressman is pressing for a Government cut of the royalties on patents growing out of Government-sponsored research.

The new Space Agency has issued a set of regulations, generally opposed by business, which may mark a new pattern in Federal patent policy.

Still two more questions bothering patent officials and Congressmen are: (1) Whether present policies are fostering or hindering commercial development of the byproduct of Government research, and (2) whether the Government is hastening the death of small business by encouraging big business dominance through patents.

Most of the experts agree that a uniform Government policy is needed, and that it should be fixed by Congress. But what the policy should be starts a number of arguments.

GOVERNMENT DOMINATES RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT FIELD

Within the past 10 years Federal expenditures on research have jumped from $1 billion annually to more than $5 billion—with $3.5 billion for the Defense Department alone in the 1960 budget. Private industry altogether spends only $4 billion on its own research.

Many of these Government contracts yield patents which have considerable commercial value. Examples: Transistor and resistor improvements, better computers for ICBM control, heat-resistant alloys for nose cones which also can be used in engines, low temperature experiments in space navigation that apply to the refrigeration or chemical industries. Lithium high temperature grease for airplanes was developed by the Navy. Household spray cans grew out of Agriculture Department research. A number of commercial radar patents are byproducts of Government contracts.

The Defense Department the biggest dispenser of research money, allows a company to keep any patents it develops, except for free use by the Government. Many people have asked why the United States does not at least recoup its research costs by taking a cut of the commercial royalties. The British Government has been doing this since the turn of the century. The Vickers Viscount, developed under government contract, has returned enough to the British treasury to pay off the original research cost and yield a profit. Jet engines have been a profitable venture for the Exchequer. Capt. George N. Robillard, the U.S. Navy patent chief, has been a supporter of the British method for a long time, and Representative FRANK THOMPSON, Democrat, of New Jersey, has introduced a bill to adopt the British system here.

Meanwhile, a firm doing extensive research for the Government is confronted with a variety of policies. The Defense Department is liberal with patents, the NASA is stricter, and the AEC is stricter yet. Since many contracts cut across several agencies, the contractor may be dealing with half a dozen different patent attitudes on the same project.

The economic impact of present policies has had very little attention, and no real studies have been made. The Defense Department feels commercial exploitation is most likely if one company has patent rights. The Tennessee Valley Authority feels differently and has always made fertilizer patents available to everybody. This posed the question: Would the Government have to pay more for research contracts if companies did not have the added temptation of a possible killing on the side? Answers to this and other questions are vital to any new legislation on the subject, and some critics feel that the Senate Patents Subcommittee, instead of merely cataloging present policies of all the various agencies, could spend its time more profitably on these questions.

The report is that excessive channeling of research contracts into big business is causing considerable worry. Big business (over 500 employees) gets at least 95 percent of the Government research, and 100 firms get 85 percent among them. The top 14 companies getting contracts between 1954–56 were all big electric and aircraft companies. The Attorney General has warned that channeling all this patent potential into big big business is just building up the monopoly trend.

The House Small Business Committee recently spoke of "the ominous shadow cast on the future with the monopoly of technology by big business." Small business, say its supporters, helps foot the Government research bill and should at least have access to patents developed at the taxpayers' expense. The big contractors reply that it is their reservoir of know-how that makes research successful.

THE NASA EXPERIENCE

Policymakers, meanwhile, are watching the experience of the new space agency with its relatively "tough" patent provisions. NASA retains patent rights if an invention applies primarily to defense projects. But if it has only incidental use for NASA and "substantial promise of commercial utility," NASA will let the company keep title and collect royalties on the condition that they develop the product commercially within 5 years.

Big NASA contractors have complained about the time-consuming process of getting formal permission from the agency to keep a patent. One contractor, for instance, developed a course director of no use to NASA but useful for blind flying of small private planes. He complains that he cannot get a patent until he proves either that it is primarily of commercial use, or that it was not developed primarily under a Government contract.

NASA's Patent Chief, G. D. O'Brien, says the Agency has actually had no difficulty placing contracts once officials have had a chance to explain patent provisions to bidders. "While they may hesitate at first," O'Brien says, "in no instance have they refused in the end." NASA prefers to let the company keep patent rights because it can impose the 5-year condition. If the patent were offered to everybody, no one would have the incentive to go into production, NASA believes.

LAWYERS BACK INDUSTRY

The American Bar Association backs industry's stand against the NASA pattern. Patents are an incentive to inventive genius, they say, long recognized in the free enterprise scheme of things. Others argue that corporations themselves do not generally let individual scientists keep patent rights, so the incentive factor is already destroyed at the creative level. A Senate Patents Subcommittee, in a study by Prof. Seymour Melman, of Columbia University, concluded that companies have enough other incentives, such as development of know-how, to keep them interested in research even if there were no patents.

Several big corporations have asked the House Space Committee to hold hearings on NASA's policies. But the committee will probably wait until next year when business has had a chance to live with the policies for a reasonable length of time.

Output Controls Stop Programs Working Well

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 28, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the Denver Post, of Denver, Colo., recently published a series of six articles on the farm problem. The articles were written by an extremely capable reporter, Robert H. Hansen. Because of their length, I do not intend to insert, at this time, the entire six installments. But I would like today to bring the attention of the Senate to one of the six. It is headlined "Output Controls Stop Programs Working Well," and it analyzes in cogent terms one of the basic questions at stake in today's farm discussion—what persons in agriculture benefit most from our present farm policy? I ask unanimous consent that this article, which appeared in the May 8, 1959, issue of the Denver Post, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

This particular article by Mr. Hansen, which I am including in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, emphasizes why controls on farm production have not been successful. These controls are geared to acreages. But Mr. Robert H. Hansen, after a careful study of the situation, stresses that improved farm machinery, highly developed fertilizers, and so forth, simply result in infinitely more abundant crops being produced on the same amount of acres.

Mr. Hansen goes on to point out that the small family-size farmer possesses neither the acreage, the equipment, or the money to capitalize on many of the huge farm payments being made by the Government.

Because this article by Robert H. Hansen, from the Denver Post, is so pertinent to issues which we have been discussing in the Senate I know that many of my colleagues will be interested in reading it.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FARM PROBLEM—OUTPUT CONTROLS STOP PROGRAMS WORKING WELL

(By Robert H. Hansen)

Farm programs don't work because farm production controls don't work. Farmers simply grow more on fewer acres with less labor, by using more machines, more fertilizer, more chemicals.

And the more they grow, the more they collect. Crop loans and subsidies go to the biggest producers, in proportion to how much they produce.

Price supports are pegged so high as to keep the small marginal farmer in business. But the big, efficient farmer reaps most of the profits.

Take wheat.

Ninety percent of the cost of wheat price supports results from the production of half of the Nation's 1.5 million wheat farms—the largest ones.

Or cotton.

Seventy-five percent of the cost of the cotton program results from the production of one-fourth of the Nation's million cotton farms—again the largest ones.

Similar situations apply to corn, rice, and other supported crops.

President Eisenhower, in his 1959 farm message to Congress, concluded:

"Clearly, the existing price support program channels most of the dollars to those who store the surpluses and to relatively few producers of a few crops. It does little to help the farmers in the greatest difficulty. * * *

"The control program doesn't work. Mandatory supports are at a level which so stimulates new technology and the flow of capital into production as to offset, in large part, the control effort."

But the little farmer has neither the land nor the equipment, the money, nor the know-how to keep up with the technological revolution in American agriculture which is piling one record crop on top of another—in storehouses.

Storage costs alone are soaring inevitably toward $1 billion a year. By mid-1960 the Government will have a $10 billion stockpile of surplus foods and farm commodities.

The last time the U.S. Department of Agriculture looked, in 1955, 11 grain companies were each collecting over $2 million a year from the Government to store surpluses—when the farm glut was half as enormous as now.

One of these companies, Cargill, Inc., of Minneapolis, Minn., received a total of $9,613,000 for storage of surpluses in warehouses it operates in several States.

Four concerns were each collecting over $1 million a year to store cotton. The largest payment, $10,976,000, went to Federal Compress & Warehouse Co. of Memphis, Tenn.

Last week, Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS, Republican, of Delaware, released figures showing that 10 private firms each collected over $3 million from the Federal Government in 1958 to store farm surpluses. The largest, C.G.F. Grain Co. of Topeka, Kans., collected $14,787,000. (See accompanying tables.)

In all, 38 companies received over $1 million each to store surplus grain, cotton, and rice for the Government in 1958, and another 30 collected over $500,000 each.

(The Colorado Milling & Elevator Co. of Denver was listed as being paid $800,843 for storage of surplus wheat and barley in 1958.)

Over 12,000 private businesses store surpluses for the Government. Together they constitute a powerful potential pressure group interested in keeping the Federal throttle wide open on crop production.

It's all these 12,000 firms can do now to build storage facilities fast enough to keep up with farm output.

The Wall Street Journal says storage firms have enjoyed somewhat higher Federal storage fees than State regulatory bodies would fix, as an incentive to expand their facilities, and now they are pressing for even higher rates because their costs are going up, too.

WILLIAMS objects, however, that storage charges paid by the Government have gone up one-third to one-half since 1950 on most grains and cotton. He doubts rising costs are the sole reason.

So now Congress wants to know who is collecting what, why, and how from the storage program, and what kinds of checks and records the USDA maintains, if any. A full-scale House investigation is getting underway.

Uncle Sam himself owns $234 million worth of storage bins, capable of holding 1 billion bushels, besides the 225 Liberty ships which have been pressed into storage use.

Supervision of storage activities has grown into a vast bureaucracy of 6,300 Government employees. Interest costs on tax dollars tied up in surpluses run $375 million a year; freight charges add another $200 million.

Despite everything the Eisenhower administration has done or tried to do, the total budget of the USDA has more than doubled since 1952—from $3.2 billion a year to $7.3 billion.

Today Federal farm expenditures are the largest single nondefense item in the entire national budget. Much of this spending benefits businessmen more than farmers.

But, in all, U.S. price support and farm income stabilization programs cost the American taxpayers $3.2 billion last year, and are costing $5.4 billion this year, and $4.4 billion next year.

Next year's billion-dollar decrease, however, will not hold if 1959 crops measure up to the record 1959 harvest. And nothing Congress can do this year could take effect in time to prevent the rising tide of surpluses from surpassing $10 billion next year.

Actually, laws passed by Congress are largely responsible for much of the surpluses.

Four-fifths of American agriculture is free of Federal controls. It is the other controlled fifth which is running amuck and causing most of the farm problem.

Of the 250-odd commercial crops in the United States, the prices of only 12 are fixed by law at arbitrarily high levels. These 12 crops account for most of the surplus—corn, cotton, and wheat comprising 85 percent of the stockpile.

High price supports provide irresistible incentives to big farmers to overproduce—to farm for the Government.

Government-guaranteed prices and markets induce farmers to plant more of the wrong crops—supported crops already in surplus. And acreage controls induce them to get more from every acre, by using all possible mechanical and scientific means.

Similar minimum national acreage allotments which result in surpluses over all our needs also are prescribed by law for cotton, rice, and peanuts.

This year the USDA expects another near-record wheat crop, when we already have enough on hand to last 2 years. Much the same is true of corn and cotton.

Sometimes farm laws work in other strange ways.

Take wheat and cotton again. These two crops show how farmers have beaten production controls, and how the law underwrites inefficiency in agriculture.

In 1954, the southwestern States were cut back to 65 percent of the 1952 cotton acreage, but they still grew 88 percent of their 1952 production.

Meantime, 23 eastern States have increased their share of U.S. wheat production from 20 percent to over 30 percent with only 17 percent of the national wheat acreage allotment.

Both of these feats were accomplished through mechanization, irrigation, fertilization and other new technology. Farmers simply made each acre produce higher yields.

But there's a little more to the story, at that—

Legal loopholes, cleverly written into control laws, also help farmers overcome acreage limitations, and promote production of crops in areas least suited to them.

Wheat controls, for example, are based on acres harvested, not planted.

So a farmer can overplant his allotment and later plow under the poorest-looking acreage. Or he can go ahead, harvest it all, pay a penalty on the normal yield, and make a tidy profit.

The key word is "normal." When actual yields run higher than normal yields, farmers who overplant can really reap a windfall.

Last year, actual yields in Kansas hit 27 bushels of wheat per acre, compared with a normal yield of 15 bushels over the last several years.

So Kansas farmers who planted and harvested more than they were supposed to had to pay a penalty on only 15 bushels from every acre more than their allotment. They got the other 12 bushels an acre penalty free.

As a result, crop yields have shot up spectacularly, and they are still climbing.

The average yield of an acre of wheat, for example, has doubled since Congress set the national wheat acreage at 55 million acres in 1938.

That acreage allotment is still in effect today, but farmers averaged 27 bushels per acre last year compared with 13 bushels when the acreage was fixed.

Even with only normal yields—the average for the 1950's has been about 18 bushels per acre—the 55-million-acre national wheat allotment will now produce a surplus over all our domestic and export needs.

And if these farmers elected to put their 12-bushel excess per acre into storage, to sell off in future years when their yields fall below par, they didn't have to pay any penalty at all.

Besides this built-in overproduction bonus, any farmer can harvest up to 15 acres of wheat without having any allotment or paying any penalty. And he can plant as much as he wants to if he plows under all but the best 15 acres before harvest time.

This is the so-called 15-acre exemption which is spreading the wheat belt all over the Nation.

Result: Wheat acreage has had to be cut back in the most efficient producing areas of the Great Plains, and one-third of the wheat surplus now comes from 15-acre plots.

Similarly, cotton controls perpetuate allotments in the South, when the mechanized and irrigated Southwest can grow more and better cotton at lower unit costs.

One-third of the cotton allotments are, five acres or less, confined largely to the South. Price supports are set high enough so these small producers can stay in business.

Yet cotton production is rapidly moving west.

Despite laws designed to the contrary, cotton acreage has increased 85 percent in California, Arizona and New Mexico since 1938, while decreasing 40 percent in the South.

To arrest this trend, some Southern Senators introduced this year a bill to keep cotton allotments in the South when a farmer quits or dies, instead of letting this acreage go to the more efficient farms of the West.

Of course, there's always the other side of the coin.

In the case of cotton, there's the Southern economic, sociological and welfare costs to pay if cotton-growing is allowed to go west. These considerations may well offset the efficiency argument.

The USDA has managed to move much of the surpluses which have resulted from strong supports and weak controls into domestic welfare programs and foreign trade.

In the last 7 years more than 10 billion pounds of surplus foods have gone into domestic welfare programs. Since mid-1954 the USDA has done a $15 billion business in surpluses abroad, giving away what it can't sell.

In the last half of 1958 alone, 1.5 billion pounds of surpluses were donated to benefit 14 million children involved in school lunch programs, 5 million needy in 44 States and 1.4 million inmates of State institutions.

Efforts are underway to dispose of more surpluses through domestic relief programs, but foreign outlets are fast drying up.

Once the United States held 60 to 70 percent of the world cotton market, but now we can claim only 20 to 25 percent.

The United States share of world trade in flue-cured tobacco, our major export tobacco, is expected to drop to 33 percent this year, compared with 43 percent over the years 1947–51.

Here again high price supports are responsible to a large degree, because they hold world prices up and stimulate foreign competition.

Foreign cotton production has doubled since 1949 while U.S. production held constant; foreign tobacco production has climbed about one-third while U.S. production dropped substantially.

Cotton is sold abroad by the USDA at world prices, with the taxpayer absorbing a $40 loss on every bale. Due to international complications and implications, we have to announce our export price a year ahead, inviting foreign competitors to underbid us.

Result: In 1956–57 we exported 7.5 million bales of cotton, last year 5.5 million, this year only 3 million—because we have already announced we will cut our prices again next year and buyers are holding off.

Tobaccco prices are the only ones still supported at a full 90 percent of parity, and due to the curious workings of parity computations they have a tendency to keep rising slightly but steadily.

Every 1 percent increase in tobacco prices, under this peculiar arrangement reduces the blend of U.S. tobaccos in foreign cigarettes by 3 percent as well as the blend of U.S. tobaccos in U.S. cigarettes.

Result: Southern Rhodesia, no longer Winston-Salem, N.C., is now the world's largest tobacco market, and Canada is coming on fast.

At home and abroad, then the U.S. is finding that high price supports don't pay; they cost us dearly in heavy taxes, falling farm income and markets, and rising surpluses.

Payments over million listed to firms for storing cotton

(Calendar year 1955)

Federal Compress & Warehouse Co., Memphis	$10,976,000
Gulf Atlantic Warehouse Co., Houston	1,135,000
Union Compress & Warehouse Co., Memphis	1,266,000
Traders Compress Co., Fort Worth	1,144,000

PAYMENTS OVER $2 MILLION FOR STORAGE OF SURPLUS GRAIN

(Calendar year 1955)

Cargill, Inc., Minneapolis	$9,613,000
Archer-Daniels-Midland Co., Minneapolis	7,966,000
Burrus Mills, Dallas	7,495,000
Union Equity Co-Op, Enid, Okla	6,949,000

Payments over million listed to firms for storing cotton—Continued

PAYMENTS OVER $2 MILLION FOR STORAGE OF SURPLUS GRAIN

(Calendar year 1955)

Continental Grain Co., New York	$6,258,000
C-G-F Grain Co., Topeka	3,497,000
Farmers Union Grain Terminal, St. Paul	3,398,000
F. H. Peavey & Co., Minneapolis	2,860,000
Kimbell Milling Co., Fort Worth	2,229,000
Bunge Grain Corp., New York	2,143,000
Norris Grain Co., Chicago	2,020,000

PAYMENTS OVER $3 MILLION FOR STORAGE OF ALL SURPLUSES

(Calendar year 1958)

C-G-F Grain Co., Topeka	$14,787,000
Cargill, Inc., Minneapolis	13,226,000
Union Equity Corp., Enid, Okla	6,453,000
Archer-Daniels-Midland Co., Minneapolis	6,240,000
Continental Grain Co., New York	5,834,000
Harvest Queen Mill & Elevator Co., Plainview, Tex	5,514,000
Federal Compress & Warehouse Co., Memphis	4,447,000
Goodpasture Grain & Milling Co., Brownfield, Tex	3,677,000
Farmers Union Grain Terminal, St. Paul	3,328,000

The Steel Industry Freeze on Collective Bargaining

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1959

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon I had the pleasure of hearing an address by Mr. David J. McDonald, president of the United Steel Workers, who spoke before a luncheon of newspapermen at the National Press Club.

Mr. McDonald presented his union's position in the current negotiations between the United Steel Workers of America and the steel industry.

So that the Members of Congress may be fully informed on all aspects of the current negotiations, I am taking the privilege of inserting Mr. McDonald's remarks in the RECORD.

The steel industry is undoubtedly one of the cornerstones of our national economy and I am sure that the outcome of the present negotiations is of deep concern to every American. I hope that my colleagues will take the time to read Mr. McDonald's penetrating analysis of the current negotiations as he sees them from his very important vantage point as President of the United Steel Workers Union.

It is my firm conviction that, upon studying the position of the United Steel Workers, we will all have a better understanding of the present negotiations in the steel industry.

Mr. McDonald's remarks follow:

THE STEEL INDUSTRY FREEZE ON COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

(Address by David J. McDonald, president, United Steelworkers of America, to the National Press Club, Washington, D.C.)

Let me say at the very outset, gentlemen, that I am thoroughly aware we are here today for a more serious purpose than breaking bread and exchanging pleasantries.

Since I am not in the mood for pleasantries and I know you would not want me to engage in any reckless appraisal of the situation in the steel industry negotiations, I would like to tell you the facts of the matter as they really exist. As representatives of the Nation's news media you want to learn as much as you can about these negotiations, to keep the public informed. I want to tell you as much as I can for exactly the same reason.

I am certain you would like to know where we stand in our negotiations with the steel industry.

I will tell you straight from the shoulder what has been happening in our negotiations in New York. I am being completely frank when I report that our private discussions have gotten nowhere. I tell you this in the hope that an informed public opinion will help break this logjam.

For 3 weeks we have been engaged in a form of collective bargaining. Four distinguished representatives of the basic steel industry have been meeting on an almost daily basis with four representatives of our union. I repeat—we have been meeting. But I emphasize—it would not be proper to say that we have been bargaining.

There has been an absolute refusal by the companies to bargain in good faith. Industry thus far has merely gone through the motions of collective bargaining.

There you have the whole story to date about the meetings that have taken place between the companies and the union.

Genuine collective bargaining has been the objective of the United Steelworkers from the very beginning. But the position of the companies from the outset has been very simple—there is nothing to bargain about and therefore no reason to bargain.

As far back as April 10, long before actual negotiations got underway, the companies submitted by letter an offer of minus zero. They have never changed their position. They offered a contract extension which would freeze wage rates for a year and, as well, eliminate even the protective clause against rises in the cost of living. This is not an extension. This would be a retreat.

During all of the sessions held so far in New York the industry's position has remained the same. We have not bargained about anything. The industry team has explored the union's various suggestions as to needed improvements. We have not explored the companies' position because there was nothing to explore.

That, I repeat, is the status of our negotiations as of right now. Industry's negotiators still are encircled by that zero.

I am also certain that a summary of the union's position in these negotiations is of primary interest to you and the general public.

By a peculiar brand of Alice-in-Wonderland arithmetic, the steel industry seeks to convince Americans that:

1. Labor's wages are almost solely responsible for inflation.

2. Steelworkers' wages and benefits already are far too high and any further gains would be at the expense of the rest of the Nation's workers.

3. Steel profits are too low and have been declining.

4. Productivity gains are created by management and stockholders, and workers are not entitled to any consideration.

5. Labor's wages are solely responsible for a purported import-export imbalance.

There are the principal points in a shell game used to bewitch and bewilder the American public in a sustained campaign which I candidly admit has not been without effect. But let's quickly examine some facts made public under the hard scrutiny of Government agencies or put into plain view through industry's annual reports and data of the American Iron & Steel Institute.

Are labor's wages responsible for inflation? First, let me say that we concede that runaway inflation is a menace and a problem. But we charge that industry has made a monster out of the word. I have said before and I repeat now that the steel industry's cry of inflation is phony.

The steel industry complains that the alleged wage-cost push has created inflation by forcing prices ever upward in order that business can keep going. American Iron & Steel data show that, from the first half of 1955 to March 1959, payroll cost per ton of steel shipped for all employees—not just production and maintenance workers—rose by only $9.31 per ton as compared to a rise of $34.18 a ton in steel prices.

There is not the slightest reason why the outcome of the steel negotiations should worsen the problem of inflation. Unjustified price increases in the past have contributed heavily to inflation which has created problems for people. Current financial reports reveal alltime record profitability of such magnitude that a cost increase several times the size of past settlements can be absorbed and still leave net profits at a record high, with no steel price increase.

In the first quarter of this year, at an average operating rate of 82.6 percent, United States Steel Corp. could have sold its steel shipments at $18 per ton less, and still earned a net profit after taxes equal to an annual rate of return of 6.8 percent on net worth.

I believe, gentlemen, that most everyone in this room would deem that a satisfactory return on almost any sort of investment short of outright usury. And I believe that these facts serve to explode the myth that wage costs must necessarily cause inflation. Mind you, since World War II there have been 23 steel price increases against 12 wage raises. For every dollar of wage cost, steel has upped its price ante by $3 per ton.

The Kefauver committee report also contains well-documented conclusions that administered steel prices have increased unjustifiably; that these have had no relationship to steel wage increases and have served to enlarge already wide profit margins.

When I say the steel industry's cry of inflation is phony I mean that the steel industry is guilty of using a legitimate problem in an illegitimate manner.

Have steelworkers' wages and benefits been too high? And would further gains be at the expense of the rest of the Nation's workers?

Certainly the steelworker, along with wage and salary earners as a whole, has increased his purchasing power in post-war years. But not at the expense of others, as the industry charges. And not in the fantastic proportions of top management with its stock option benefits.

Actually, progress for the steelworker has helped rather than hurt the purchasing power and living standards of others. All the gains won by steelworkers have been spread to all employes of the industry, whether or not they are members of our union. And while the steelworker is currently being made the whipping boy for all of our fancied economic ills, he also stands as a bell-wether in any effort to achieve new planes of human betterment. All other Americans will feel the impact if the steelworker does not obtain his just due. The precedent of standing still will be reflected in the pay envelopes of virtually every major group of wage and salary workers in the Nation.

Gentlemen, this may be deemed oversimplification. But I have not yet heard a successful rebuttal to our claim that only human beings buy goods. Neither machines, nor unemployed, nor inadequately paid workers can buy goods and without consumer purchasing power our national production is a total waste and a total loss.

Management still clings to the trickle-down philosophy where the major share of earnings and dividends repose in the hands of the few while a figurative bone is thrown to the mass of people.

We've heard industry spokesmen say that labor's earnings make it impossible for industry to make an adequate profit on its investment. We would like to know what amount the industry deems to be an adequate profit. So would the Kefauver Committee, which has tried to elicit that information from my distinguished predecessor on this stand, Roger Blough, chairman of the United States Steel Corp.

Needless to say, the answer to that one is still top secret. Perhaps any sort of answer would cause too much embarrassment in the face of a series of record profit years, capped by another near peak for United States Steel in the recession year of 1958 when the industry was operating at not quite 60 percent of capacity and hundreds of thousands of its employees were out of jobs.

By some peculiar sort of statistical magic industry beats its breast in simulated woe over a purported increase of 288 percent in employment costs as compared with a 30-percent increase in shipments since 1940. But there is strange silence on the fact that in the same period profits, before taxes, were up 606 percent; net profits were up 378 percent and net profits per ton of steel were also at an alltime record high.

It is true that since 1940 payroll costs have risen. Considering all employee costs, that rise has been $37.70 per ton—considerably dwarfed by the $92.91 per ton rise in steel prices over the same period.

We feel that it is somewhat brazen for an industry which already has reported first quarter profits in alltime record figures to plead that it is not getting enough. We await with interest the second quarter returns which are expected to set another new record.

It's been alleged by industry that productivity gains are created by management and that workers are not entitled to a share. Our union has never laid claim to all of the benefits of increased productivity. We insist, however, this is an important factor in wage negotiations and the steel industry's position represents an attempt to retain all of the benefits for stockholders and management. While the precise contribution of labor to higher productivity is difficult to measure the fact cannot be obscured that workers do make a definite and indispensable contribution and are, therefore, entitled to a share of the gains from rising productivity.

Carried to its logical conclusion, industry's position would mean that as output per man-hour grows year after year profits, dividends, and management compensation would grow by leaps and bounds, while workers as a group would receive a diminishing share and the declining few individual workers would be chained to a static standard of living.

A week ago in this forum much was made of the fact that steel imports exceeded steel exports for the first quarter of this year for the first time in history. Sounds menacing on paper, doesn't it?

But those who sought to make propaganda hay of this so-called foreign competition conveniently forgot to point out that much of this foreign business resulted because their own mills, setting production records, simply could not fill all of the orders in a tremendous upsurge of business. Much of that business, I might add, was generated at the outset by a "scare buying" philosophy arising from the industry-planted fear that there might be a midsummer steel strike.

Let me quote a highly regarded syndicated financial columnist. This authority writes:

"American firms are not hungry for business. They're prosperous. They can sell most of what they make at home, so they don't need to compete pricewise with foreign firms. If a steel company, for instance, were to shave a price to take business from a foreign competitor it would have to shave prices to all its customers. It doesn't take the order, then complains that foreign labor costs less than American labor."

We have said repeatedly that among the principal reasons for the alleged foreign competition, particularly stressed in Japanese reinforcing bars, barbed wire and nails, has been the failure of American industry generally to modernize obsolete mills. American companies which modernized have been able to meet this foreign competition and have not lacked for orders.

Perhaps the simple truth is that an industry which regards administered prices as competitive and which for 50 years has been unchallenged in the world markets, is out of practice at the old-fashioned art of selling a good product at a reasonable price. And perhaps foreign firms are satisfied with more modest profits.

I'm afraid the mighty steel industry is running like an elephant from a mouse. Introducing competition into this noncompetitive industry might be a constructive thing.

I hope that the brief conclusions I have drawn here will help this audience to detect and to discount some of the fallacies in the steel industry's position.

We have made what we believe to be fair and reasonable proposals in our contract negotiations with the industry. We have maintained, as always, a degree of flexibility. We have entered these negotiations with a desire for genuine collective bargaining and a full sense of our responsibilities to the Nation as well as to our own members. I have already told you what attitude we have been met with by the industry negotiators.

Despite this apparent intent on the part of the industry negotiators to listen politely and no more, we of the United Steelworkers still hold the earnest hope that we will reach an agreement as far in advance of our contract deadline as possible.

We who speak for the United Steelworkers do not want a strike. The union has never wanted a strike. We will do all in our power to avoid a strike.

There is no reason for a strike to take place if reason and moderation prevail in genuine collective bargaining.

Wilkes-Barre Publishing Company Wins Safety Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news article and

an editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Record of Tuesday, May 26, 1959:

PUBLISHING COMPANY WINS SAFETY PLAQUE—1,216,930 HOURS WORKED WITHOUT DISABLING INJURY

Wilkes-Barre Publishing Co. yesterday received an unusual plant safety award in recognition of its 300 employees having established a safety record of 1,216,930 hours of operation without a disabling injury.

The award, an attractive stainless steel and walnut plaque, was presented to Harrison H. Smith, president of the publishing company, by James F. Malone, executive vice president of Pennsylvania Manufacturers' Association Casualty Insurance Co., at a ceremony in the publishing company's conference room. Participating in the ceremony were other executives of the publishing firm and PMA as well as foremen of various mechanical departments in the plant and some union representatives.

Malone, in presenting the top PMA safety citation, said it marked the first time in the history of the insurance firm's award program that a newspaper publishing firm was able to qualify for the coveted million-hour plaque.

"This award—the first of its kind—is a tremendous achievement and I am very happy that I am able to come here today and present it to you," said Malone. "It is made possible only when everyone in the plant from the top down to the bottom is conscious of one's safety and the safety of the person next to you," he added.

The plaque was made possible by employees of the publishing company, publishers of both Wilkes-Barre Record and Times-Leader. The Evening News, establishing a safety record of 1,216,930 hours of operation without a disabling injury between January 18, 1957, and February 21, 1959.

To give one an idea of the accomplishment, Malone said, it would require one person's working 500 years without an accident in order to achieve a 1 million-hour plaque.

"It is no sacrifice on my part to come here today and award you this safety plaque," Malone said, adding:

"If all our insured plants had no injuries, we'd be the most successful insurance company in the business. Accidents can be prevented, but workers must be made safety conscious. By the same token, if the same care were taken on the highways that we find in the plants, the needless slaughter of thousands would be reduced considerably.

"When we think of the newspaper publishing business, we automatically visualize frequent rushes to meet deadlines and last-minute changes. Since we who are interested in safety know that speed and accidents usually go hand in hand, we congratulate the Wilkes-Barre Publishing Co. for a very outstanding safety achievement in keeping a perfect safety record alive for more than 2 years.

"Safety—whether in the factory, on the highway, or in the home—benefits the community by preventing physical suffering and wage losses to its citizens. It is gratifying to see Wilkes-Barre Publishing Co., a molder of public opinion, in the forefront as a leader for industrial safety."

Smith, in accepting the top PMA award, said:

"On behalf of the 300 publishing company employees, I wish to say that we appreciate the honor very much. I assure you the plaque will be displayed prominently. I hope that we will be in line for a similar award sometime in the future."

SAFETY AWARD PRIZED

Wilkes-Barre Co. and its employees are proud of a safety award received yesterday from Pennsylvania Manufacturers Association Casualty Insurance Co. The award is in recognition of an accident prevention record without precedent among newspapers insured through the Pennsylvania Manufacturers Association. The inscription on the plaque notes that Wilkes-Barre Publishing Co. employees had worked a total of 1,216,930 manhours without a disabling injury.

Some 300 employees contributed to this record. The plaque is a tribute to unfailing regard for the safety of themselves and their fellow workers. The achievement's significance was limned by James F. Malone when he said it would require one person's working 500 years without an accident to earn a 1 million hours' plaque. Mr. Malone, of Pittsburgh, executive vice president of the casualty company, and who was in Philadelphia yesterday, deemed the plaque ceremony in Wilkes-Barre of sufficient note for him and other high officials of the company to be present.

We prize the award and cherish the record making it possible.

Congressman W. F. Norrell Receives Well Deserved Honor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1959

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on May 25 I inquired among my colleagues as to where our beloved colleague, BILL NORRELL, might be as he is always present on the floor and I missed him on that particular day. Upon inquiry I have found out that he was absent while receiving a distinguished alumnus citation from Arkansas Agricultural and Mechanical College. I think that all of my colleagues in the House join me in happiness that this well deserved honor has been bestowed upon Congressman NORRELL. We know him to be a great statesman, and I am happy to include at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the citation of the college so well deserved by him.

ARKANSAS AGRICULTURAL AND MECHANICAL COLLEGE,
OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
College Heights, Ark., May 25, 1959.

DISTINGUISHED ALUMNUS CITATION

It is proverbial that a prophet is without honor in his home country. But the reverse has been true of Congressman WILLIAM F. NORRELL. In his home county—and he is claimed by two adjoining counties—he has endeared himself to a host of friends through his exemplary life and his selfless devotion to the public good. A grateful constituency in 13 counties has elected him to Congress 11 times.

Born in Milo, Ashley County, W. F. NORRELL enrolled in Arkansas A. & M. College when it was a regional agricultural school. His formal education was continued at the College of the Ozarks and at the Arkansas Law School in Little Rock.

After some years of law practice, Mr. NORRELL was elected to the State senate in 1931. He served for 8 successive years, and on several occasions functioned as acting Governor.

As Congressman from the Sixth District since 1938, W. F. NORRELL has been in every sense a Christian statesman. Thanks to his alertness, his district has received its due share of consideration in the matter of locating Federal projects. To cite an instance best known locally, his efforts were responsible for the locating in Monticello of a prisoner-of-war camp. And in 1943, he secured for Arkansas A. & M. College a Navy V–12 training program which not only utilized the facilities of the college in wartime, but provided academic training for some 860 prospective Navy and Marine officers.

In 1922, Congressman NORRELL was married to Miss Catherine Dorris, daughter of a Baptist minister and valued in her own right in Monticello and in the National Capital for outstanding talents in service and leadership. Mr. and Mrs. Norrell, with their accomplished daughter Judy, spend much of their time in Washington, but they consider Monticello their home. Here they have identified themselves most helpfully with religious and civic organizations.

Congressman NORRELL, the alumni of Arkansas A. & M. College take pleasure in the thought that our college may have served you usefully near the beginning of your career.

Now, therefore, by the authority vested in me as president of Arkansas Agricultural and Mechanical College, and upon recommendation of the board of trustees, I cite you, WILLIAM F. NORRELL, as a distinguished alumnus of this college.

HORACE E. THOMPSON,
President.

Marked Tree: Pattern for Model Industrial Development Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1959

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, the May issue of Arkansas Municipalities, the official publication of the Arkansas Municipal League, an organization of mayors and other city officials in Arkansas first established in 1934 to build Arkansas, carries a splendid account of one community in eastern Arkansas under the title, "Marked Tree: Pattern for Model Industrial Development Program."

For the benefit of Members unacquainted with eastern Arkansas, Marked Tree is a city of some 3,000 alert and active citizens working together to build a better community. It derives its name from a habit of early Indians in the area of notching a tree in that vicinity to denote a short portage between the St. Francis and the Little Rivers in Poinsett County. When the railroad was built into that area the name was retained, and in 1897 the community was incorporated under that name.

Marked Tree has always been an important farming center. And, in recent years, the city government, the civic organizations, the business community, and the cooperating citizenship have moved to balance this agricultural economy with industrial development. This article indicates the success of this community endeavor, and it is a real pleasure to bring to the attention of the Members the outstanding work of civic-minded people from a good little city in the alluvial Arkansas Valley:

MARKED TREE: PATTERN FOR MODEL INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

In recent years farmworkers have been replaced by farm machinery. One man on a

tractor can plow as much as 10 men with mules, and 1 operator on a cottonpicker can harvest 2 bales (more than 3,000 pounds) an hour while a hand picker was getting 300 pounds a day.

In every phase of agriculture the story has been the same. The need for farmworkers has declined and the farm operators had no choice but to make the fullest possible use of machine power. This, perhaps more than any other one thing, created the need for industry to provide jobs for the people who could no longer find work on the farms.

It was the young people who were leaving their towns seeking to make a living elsewhere. Business and civic leaders realized they could not afford to lose these young people, and set about industrializing their towns.

The citizens of Marked Tree realized their town needed industry and the climax was reached last year when two manufacturing plants were dedicated the same day.

The first mention of the town's need for industrial growth came in 1948 when the chamber of commerce conducted a clinic to determine civic and economic needs. The results were tabulated and the wheels of progress began to turn.

The first job at hand to attract industry was the improvement of housing, schools, and streets. Many of these improvements were made, and in 1952 the chamber of commerce appointed its first committee on industrial information. While this committee took inventory and published its first findings, the town continued to make the improvements necessary to catch the eye of industrial executives.

In 1955 the East Poinsett Industrial Corp. was formed. This corporation surveyed industrial sites and made arrangements to obtain necessary land if and when a new factory should come knocking. The first industrialist to visit did not locate in Marked Tree but others came. One wanted to set up a factory to manufacture shorts, and so the Mart Manufacturing Co. was formed. The citizens of Marked Tree raised approximately $200,000 to help finance the plant construction.

Later, Gotham Chalkboard & Trim Co. picked Marked Tree as the site of its new plant. This required a local investment of about $100,000.

Both plants are located in an industrial area that was planned for factories. There is room for more industries and the leaders have not ruled out the possibility that other factories will be built. In fact, Marked Tree believes that the two factories are only the beginning.

Last year approval was received from the Federal Housing Authority for a program of slum clearance and development designed to remove about 350 substandard houses These will be replaced with improved houses and a section of land will be used for a park and another section for potential industrial development.

This is the way Marked Tree has met the challenge of the agriculture revolution.

Lot More Space in West Than Population Alarmists Realize

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 28, 1959

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I should like to include in the RECORD an article by William H. Nelson, associate editor of the Grand Junction, Colorado, Daily Sentinel. I think Mr. Nelson's comments concerning population and space will make interesting reading for those easterners who are completely unfamiliar with the West. Mr. Nelson's article also includes, incidentally, some excellent tips for eastern "pavement pantywaists" who may be vacationing in the West this summer. The article follows:

LOT MORE SPACE IN WEST THAN POPULATION ALARMISTS REALIZE

(By William H. Nelson)

What the westerner reads about burgeoning population and dwindling space for people to live in, and what he sees traveling about the wide open spaces of Western States do not jibe.

Articles about the impending population explosion and pieces written in favor of the wilderness bill argue that there is now so little room left that in a few decades there will be inadequate space for ordinary living much less for solitude.

The wilderness bill proponents decry the fact that the present national parks and monuments are so crowded with tourists that they defeat their purpose.

Perhaps the Westerner needs to visit the megopolis areas of the Eastern States to appreciate fully how cities, suburban developments, industries, and highways are gobbling up the countryside. Perhaps the population alarmists and wilderness bill boys should forsake their ivory towers and travel over the unpublicized West. Maybe all would learn quite a bit.

MISS SCENIC AREAS

Most tourists and many longtime residents who travel the main roads and visit only the national parks, national monuments, and private commercial developments never see vast areas of scenic beauty—canyons, rolling hills or picturesque mesas, many only short distances from the main highways.

Colorado National Monument is only a minute part, for instance, of the vast canyon country west of Grand Junction. Nature lovers interested in weird sandstone formations would have a delightful time in any one of dozens of canyons west of the monument in Colorado. If we add canyon country of Utah and Arizona, the possibilities of suitable places for communing with nature are beyond inventory.

How much of the wilderness of the Colorado Plateau—and other parts of the West—could ever be changed from ranching, mining, and recreation to farming, industry, or housing will remain a mystery, at least for the present. We won't attempt to predict what will be necessary in future years, but certainly helicopters, machines powered by atomic energy for purifying and pumping water, and other inventions yet to be made would be necessary to put to ordinary uses the desert primeval of the plateau country.

We do not share the fears of wilderness bill proponents that there will be a person on every rock within a few years. There are just too many rocks piled up in patterns as numberless as snowflakes.

PAVEMENT PANTYWAISTS

A few canyons and gorges have received national and international publicity. But for every one that is known to the public, there are hundreds known only to livestockmen, ardent hikers, and persons who have seen them from the air.

Most tourists and even many residents of the West are pavement pantywaists. They decline to leave the oiled roads to venture onto mesas, through forests, or into canyons away from the plush motels, fancy restaurants, and supermarkets. Too many sightseers breeze through a national park in a few hours, missing the pleasures of side trips to more distant points of interest.

North Dakota Bankers Support Garrison Diversion Unit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. QUENTIN BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 28, 1959

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, all segments and sections in North Dakota support the Garrison diversion unit. A resolution adopted by the North Dakota Bankers Association on May 9 of this year, which is included herein, points up the necessity and feasibility of the project.

RESOLUTION OFFER FOR ADOPTION AT THE 1959 CONVENTION OF THE NORTH DAKOTA BANKERS ASSOCIATION, AT MINOT, N. DAK., MAY 9, 1959

Be it resolved by the bankers of North Dakota, assembled in convention at Minot, N. Dak., this 9th day of May 1959, That the following resolutions and declarations of policy be added to those previously adopted; and

That the officers and member banks alike be guided by them, and wide distribution of them be made and that copies of these recommendations and resolutions be forwarded to the appropriate persons.

Whereas the development of the Garrison diversion project in North Dakota will provide: (1) for the irrigation of over 1 million acres of land in central and eastern North Dakota periodically afflicted by drought thereby stabilizing the agricultural production from this area, (2) an assured and adequate water supply for over 40 municipalities and in addition many new industries, (3) water to replenish lakes, rivers, and streams throughout the area enhancing their use for recreation, fish and wildlife, municipal and many other purposes; and

Whereas the development of the Garrison Diversion Project will bring new opportunities for economic growth and stability to the project area, the State, and consequently the Nation and according to conservative estimates will result in: (1) An increase of $54 million annually in North Dokota's farm income, (2) an increase of $145 million annually in trade and business activities, (3) 1,700 new business establishments, (4) 3,600 new farms, (5) 20,000 new job opportunities, and (6) an increase in population in the area of 100,000; and

Whereas the benefits that will accrue through the development of the Garrison Diversion Project will extend to all sections of North Dakota as well as to areas throughout the Nation by providing: (1) A broadened tax base in the project area, (2) a nearby bountiful feed supply to nonirrigated sections of the State, (3) opportunities for industrial development throughout the area, and (4) a greater demand for products manufactured at far distant points; and

Whereas the North Dakota Bankers' Association is vitally interested in the economic stability of North Dakota and the development of the resources of the State for the greatest possible benefits to all the citizens of the State and Nation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the North Dakota Bankers' Association at its convention duly assembled in Minot, N. Dak., this 9th day of May 1959, That this association recognizes the value of the many benefits that will be derived from the Garrison Diversion Project, not only to the project area, but also to the entire State of North Dakota and the Nation, and therefore urges the Congress of the United States to approve the Garrison Diversion Project

and appropriate the necessary funds to bring about the construction of the project facilities at an early date.

Memorial Day, 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DON L. SHORT
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 28, 1959

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, all too often nowadays, Memorial Day comes and goes without our giving much consideration as to why we observe this holiday, what it means to our country and its people, and what it means to us as individuals. Memorial Day was first conceived to remember the heroes of the Civil War. Since that time it has become a day upon which remembrance is given to all loved ones who have passed on—but primarily it is a day devoted to the memory of members of our Armed Forces who have given their lives for their and our country. What is it that has brought us into war and what were these heroes fighting for—we have never fought a war to gain additional territory—we have never fought a war to gain economic advantages for this country—we have never fought a war to impose forcibly our system of government on another country. The basic premise that the United States of America was concerned with in all of its armed conflicts was freedom—a word that we have become so accustomed to that I fear many of us fail to appreciate its true significance.

When our Nation was founded in 1776, a new idea was introduced that was the first fundamental change that had been made since government was first formalized. It was a completely new idea.

What was this new idea? Was it the regular election of government leaders by the people? Was it the wide dispersal of the powers of government among Federal, State and local units? Was it the American method of checks and balances? No—these had been conceived by the Greeks, the French, or the English. Our new Government recognized the premise that in this new land the Government should be "of the people, by the people, and for the people." No other nation had ever gone so far to establish the right and duty of free citizens to manage their own governmental affairs.

This was a revolutionary concept of Government. Never before in history had the people said to the Government, "Thou shalt not." Always the Government had been able to say to the people, "You may," or "You must." Very specifically, the Bill of Rights comprising the first 10 amendments to our Constitution set out the powers of the Government and plainly stipulated that these were the only powers with which the Government was endowed, and that all others were reserved to the States or to the people.

It was this philosophy of individual freedom and individual responsibility that attracted to this country millions of persons from government-oppressed peoples all over the world. They represented every color, every race, and every creed. They were in search of personal freedom, not Government-guaranteed security. They earned and enjoyed here the greatest degree of security ever enjoyed by any people anywhere.

People who came to this new land wrote back to relatives praising the freedom they had found. They said here the Government guarantees you nothing except life, liberty, and the right to own whatever you have honestly acquired. Here you have the responsibility that goes with individual freedom. There is no law or custom that prevents you from rising as high as you are able. Here in America, you can do as you please so long as you do not violate the rights of others to do as they please.

Such comments would not be completely true today because that freedom for which our forefathers fought so hard and for which many of our young men have laid down their lives is slowly but surely being lost. It just seems to be seeping away slowly, and none of us seem inclined to abandon our pursuit of the almighty dollar long enough to repair the damage that has been done. The Bill of Rights still exists on paper, but the spirit that caused it to be written is surely fading away.

Under this plan of government, the people of this Nation have done well in a material way. Here we are—6 percent of the world's population on 7 percent of its land. A conglomeration of races and bloodlines with no more natural resources than many other areas of the globe—creating as much new industrial wealth as all the other 94 percent combined. One hundred and seventy some million of us own nearly six times as many automobiles as the other 2 billion people on earth combined. We produce and consume about as much steel as all the rest together, and own similarly fantastic proportions of bathtubs, telephones, refrigerators, and tractors and most of the other manifestations of prosperous living.

We produce enough foodstuffs on our farms and ranches to provide ourselves with the world's highest standard of living plus a surplus large enough to feed millions of people in foreign countries.

Our accomplishments are indeed fabulous and yet we know that men will not necessarily risk their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor for bathtubs or automobiles. America had no such luxuries in 1776, and it was a principle rather than a material gadget for which our forefathers were willing to lay down their lives.

We know that the spirit which makes and is America—the spirit which has inspired and made possible our amazing achievement—has been able to flourish only because of a system of government deliberately established to protect the right of the individual citizen to make his own decisions, to accept the responsibility for them and the consequences of them, and to establish his own personal pattern of life within the limits of trespass upon the rights of his neighbor.

No one person is to blame for sapping that spirit of individualism. No one political party is to blame. The people are as responsible as the elected and appointed leaders. It is we, the people, who seem to have forgotten that freedom and responsibility are inseparable. It is we, the people, who are discarding the concept of government that brought forth the Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

In short, few of us seem to want to keep government in its proper place which is out of our personal affairs and responsibilities. Many of us seem to favor various types of government-guaranteed and compulsory security—we say that we want personal freedom, but we demand government housing, government tax concessions to industry, to business, government price guarantees plus the controls that must go with them, government-guaranteed jobs and wages. We boast that we are responsible persons, but we vote for candidates who promise us special privileges, government subsidies, and so-called individual security.

Such schemes are directly contrary to the spirit of the Bill of Rights. Our heritage is being lost more through weakness than deliberate design. The Bill of Rights still shines in all its splendor but many of us are looking in another direction.

Many of us are drifting back to that old concept of government that our forefathers feared and rejected. Many of us are now looking to government for security. Many of us are no longer willing to accept individual responsibility for our own welfare. Yet personal freedom cannot exist without individual responsibility.

Thus the American people are on the verge of a final decision. We must choose between the destruction caused by government paternalism and the security insured by individual freedom with individual responsibility as expressed in the Bill of Rights. There is no other choice.

As it must, the choice rests with each of us as individual Americans. No one can tell us what to think or do; no one should. To do so would be a violation of both the spirit and the words of the Bill of Rights. As responsible persons, each of us has the privilege and the obligation to pursue what each considers to be the right course of action. But this above all—let us understand the meaning of these actions.

Without the possibility of failure, there is no meaning to achievement; without the possibility of sickness there is no meaning to health; without the possibility of hell there is no meaning to heaven. If a parent continues forever to make choices for a child, the child will never be mature and will never be free. If the State is given power and responsibility to make decisions for men, and thereby to save them from any re-

sult of making personal choices, the people never attain political freedom and moral responsibility.

It seems to me that we who are now enjoying the benefits of the supreme sacrifices made by our soldiers and sailors should not forget what this principle was that prompted them to be willing to fight to establish and in our later wars fight to preserve. They have passed on to us a responsibility that we must not fail in carrying out. Ours is not to take up arms in defense of freedom, but to exercise our duty now as responsible citizens. Responsibility and freedom are the reverse sides of the same coin. Neither can exist independently of the other.

The American patriots that we are remembering today have passed on to us a responsibility to carry on the defense of those principles upon which this Nation was founded. The words of Maj. John McCrae, the English army officer of World War I, who later give his life for his country, express the responsibility that is ours better than any I have been able to put together. In his immortal poem "In Flanders Fields" written on the battlefields of France, he said:

We are the dead
Short days ago we lived, felt dawn, saw sunsets glow
Loved and were loved but now we lie in Flanders Fields
Take up our quarrel with the foe
To you from failing hands we throw the torch
Be yours to hold it high
If ye break faith with us who die
We shall not sleep, though poppies blow in Flanders Fields.

Poison in Your Water—No. 87

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 28, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the Courier Times, New Castle, Ind., of October 9, 1958, entitled "What Industry Asks in Plant Locations."

The article follows:

WHAT INDUSTRY ASKS IN PLANT LOCATIONS
(By Frank A. White)

What industry wants when it seeks a new plant location was explained to Hoosiers in a coldly factual manner by John H. Chiles, Jr., vice president and manager of the Transformer Division of Westinghouse Electric Corporation.

He spoke at a planning conference set up at Purdue University by the State Department of Commerce, Industry and Publicity and the Indiana State Chamber of Commerce. Here are the highlights.

There are more than 4,000 communities of 2,500 population or more in the United States. They have 225,000 miles of railroads along which plants could be located, and 300,000 miles of regular truck lines. Each of the 4,000 communities considers itself best suited for new industry.

All of these are good customers of an industry. The pressure is so terrific that many industries turn to a plant locating service and work in closest secrecy in finding a new plant location.

There are literally hundreds of factors considered in plant location. Here is a sheet from an actual report on a city seeking a new plant. While it had many economic and social conditions needed, it flunked one vital necessity. The report showed the city had:

(1) Labor supply more than adequate, several times more than actually needed. (2) Labor rates fair, with low turnover. (3) Good sites on highways and railroad lines at very reasonable prices. (4) City was large enough to soften impact of change of supervisors' families who moved to new location. (5) Had parochial and public school systems, Christian and Jewish houses of worship.

CAREFUL STUDY OF ASSETS OF A TOWN

6. Shopping facilities good. 7. County free of debt—indicating stable tax rate. 8. Water, electricity, gas, sewerage, and railroad facilities available at property line under consideration. 9. Interstate trucking available. 10. Vocational schools willing to enter into training programs. 11. City has definite plan for attracting new industry which can fit community needs. 12. Hotel facilities adequate, as well as train and plane service. 13. Community genuinely wanted Westinghouse as an industrial neighbor. (There is a vast distinction between wanting the payroll and wanting the industry.)

All this looked favorable. The field team, after a long trip, saw this sign in the hotel lobby: "Water Shortage, Waste Not, Want Not." That sign, and the facts it revealed knocked out any further consideration of the town for a new plant.

Adequate labor supply is not a cold economic factor. In addition to skills, or those who can be trained, attitudes, character and ambitions of men and women available are studied. They must have a spirit of fairplay, cooperation and teamwork.

An industry wants to pay its way, a fair share of cost of government. Direct taxes on business are a factor in operational costs and competition. A company fears instability worse than anything else. Some towns change their tax rates to encourage industrial expansion, realizing a new business must walk before it can run, and it may make little, if any money for several years. Some communities exempt new industries from property taxes for 5 years, to give the manufacturer a chance to get his business on a paying basis.

There is no "right man" to pressure in a big industry in getting a new plant. The product department manager makes final decision on new site for the manufacture of his product line in Westinghouse.

Considered are availability of raw materials; distribution of product; climate; distance to other large plants of Westinghouse, or to competitors' plants in same area, and now dispersion of plants for security reasons among other factors.

If the industry makes a mistake in new plant location, the community shares the ill effects. Communities can be harmed by too rapid influx of new industry, where regular community services can't keep pace, or sometimes, by too many industries of the same kind.

On June 20 last, Westinghouse selected Muncie as location for a new transformer plant.

Other speakers on the annual conference at Purdue showed that Indiana is getting far more than its share of new plants, compared to other States.

Recognition of Irving Senzel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 28, 1959

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, Irving Senzel is a career civil service employee in the Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior, who is favorably known to many of us in the Congress. He is a student of public land matters and is highly experienced in the administration of the public land laws. He has always given freely of his unusual talent to assist Members of Congress in studying legislative proposals affecting public lands and to present testimony before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. Senzel has been stricken with a severe heart attack and he faces the prospect of a very long period of convalescence. I am sure that my colleagues join me in wishing him speedy return to health and a long period of continued outstanding public service.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following outline of Mr. Senzel's career:

PERSONAL HISTORY OF IRVING SENZEL

Mr. Senzel was born January 9, 1914, at Rochester, N.Y. He completed his elementary and high school education there, and graduated from the University of Rochester in 1935 with a B.A. degree in economics. He was elected to Phi Beta Kappa. He did graduate work as a research assistant in economics at the university of Rochester and also took additional credits at American University, Department of Agriculture Graduate School, and the Department of Commerce In-Service School.

Mr. Senzel's first employment was with the Civic Committee on Unemployment in Rochester where he did statistical work in connection with a social and economic study of the city's high school students and in connection with unemployment and relief. He entered the Federal civil service in August 1938 as a junior clerk at the Bureau of the Census, and in September 1939 transferred to the General Land Office as an assistant statistician. He rose through the various grades through demonstration of his outstanding capabilities, and in 1944 was made assistant chief of the research and analysis division of the General Land Office. He completed a program for the training of supervisors of the Department of the Interior in 1946, and in December 1947 he was promoted to the position of Chief, Economic and Statistical Research Division. He was promoted again in January 1951 as a principal staff officer of the Division of Land Planning, and in October 1957 he was elevated to his present position of lands officer in the Lands Staff Office of the Division of Technical Programs, Bureau of Land Management.

Mr. Senzel received two superior performance awards in 1949 and in 1956 and an outstanding performance rating. He was selected by the Secretary of the Interior to attend the economic mobilization course of the Industrial College of the Armed Forces, which he completed in June 1952. He was cited by the commandant for displaying during the course exceptional initiative, enthusiasm and energy in his studies and other activities of the college. The commandant stated, "He has brought to the college an

understanding and knowledge of the responsibilities and problems of the Bureau of Land Management which have helped to broaden the base of our studies. He is sound in his analysis of complex problems dealing with economic mobilization, and is practical in his approach. His work here has been outstanding in every way." As a result of his attendance at ICAF he was detailed by the Secretary of the Office of Defense Mobilization for 60 days to prepare estimates of the effects of an attack upon the United States for evaluation by the National Security Council and for mobilization planning by all agencies.

Statement of Hon. Robert W. Hemphill Before the Civil Rights Subcommittee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1959

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN ROBERT W. HEMPHILL BEFORE THE CIVIL RIGHTS SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE ON WEDNESDAY, MAY 27, 1959

Thank you for having more hearings on this question than you originally planned. It is in the best American spirit to allow all to be heard. I want to thank you, also, for letting me come this morning.

A month or so ago, on the 29th day of April, I appeared before a Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee of the U.S. House of Representatives. I asked the members of that subcommittee, including the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, to declare a moratorium on civil rights legislation. I told that committee that the continual prodding of the civil rights controversy by a Supreme Court in disrepute, and a Congress which neglects the consuming danger of inflation, was and is, detrimental to race relations all over this country. I lay at the feet of civil rights proponents and their fellow travelers, the "do-gooders," the blame for the violences which are erupting in increasing numbers all over this fair land. The decline in race relations since the great mistake incorporated in the Black Monday decision of May, 1954, a political philosophy, has been emphasized by sporadic outbursts of increasing frequency, and violence. If there be any statesmanship left, it should be exerted in the direction of quenching the fires of mistrust and race hatred instead of promoting such base purposes.

Let us see what has happened to the country and to its economy during these days of political wrestling between the parties to see who is going to get credit for the hyprocisy of passing a civil rights bill. Everybody wants to "get credit"—and tomorrow when the history of this shameful parade of insincerity is exposed, men will ask each other how such hypocrisy could have reached such proportions.

Last week we had before the House a housing bill. Previously, a housing bill had failed because a Congressman from New York inserted a civil rights provision. When the civil rights provision was offered in the housing bill this year, every Negro Representative voted against it. They knew it would wreck and beat the housing legislation. Is this not signal recognition that this question soils where it touches, that the injection of the civil rights question into or onto any other question ruins both. Civil rights is a cancer which has, since I have been in this Congress, sapped the legislative strength of the Congress, and mirrored the political dishonesty of an administration which used bayonets because it had no sufficient statesmanship or judgment to offer at Little Rock.

Yes, just last week we considered the housing legislation in the U.S. House of Representatives. I have cataloged what happened in that debate. I do not need to tell you that in many of the areas of this country, as long as the housing units contain either all white or all of some other race, little difficulty arises. Once someone of a different race moves in, immediately the rents go down, the desirability falters, and the value declines. If you do not believe that is true, take an honest look at the city of Washington. Ride along some of its beautiful streets and see what has happened since this city has been mongrelized in the manner that it has. This, the Capital City of the World, confused, scarred, and ruined by the byproducts of the race question.

If I thought there were any sincerity of hope that this question could be solved by legislation, I would hasten to try to forge that legislation. I know that it cannot be solved by legislation, and I think you men who are the Senators of this land, know that too. I hope the Supreme Court knows it. If we could just hope for some enlightenment in that Court, our hope for renewal of justice, and a return to the high position that that Court occupied, would be encouraged.

Let us look at what else has happened. Under the false hope that they will be bettered by moving into the metropolitan areas, thousands and thousands of our Negro population have moved into the great metropolitan centers. What has happened? There are not enough jobs for them. Their conditions are not improved by the fact that they can ride on a streetcar with somebody from another race. Their standards of living are not better. Their education is, in most instances, inferior to that which they received back home, and they are ripe for juvenile delinquency, crime, and corruption. It is not their fault, either. It is the fault of people who have been pushing this question, either for their own selfish interest, or to get votes, or to further the Communist cause. That is the situation from a racial standpoint, and those of this Congress who are from the cities know that to be true. I do not ask them to admit it. I feel sorry for those men in politics who have to give lip service to civil rights, knowing that in their hearts they have not the courage to run on real and patriotic issues. I thank the Almighty I do not have to deny my people the true beliefs of my heart in order to get elected.

When I was discussing this question sometime ago, someone asked me what I thought of the bombings. I told them that I thought bombing people in the night, or bombing temples or churches or societies is wrong, and it should be punished. In every State that I know of, such is punished. The hue and cry to put the FBI into the picture is a political hue and cry, so that those who propose all sorts of measures can go back and beat their chests, and tell Negro voters what they did for them. Someday somebody is going to tell the Negro what they did to him by making his vote a political pawn, and his race relations a mockery in the process.

I would vote for any legislation to stop bombings and to stop race violence. Violence has not been the answer to any of the world's problems. Time after time, we have fought wars, and in which we have resorted to violence to express our views or our purposes. More often than not, violence has been desultory and has not improved any situation.

Then there is the problem of race consciousness. The fact that the race question makes headlines every day, and the greatest parliamentary body in the world is constantly besieged by the question, incites a race consciousness which is not good. People who have been accustomed to going to segregated schools, satisfied, helped and guided in those schools, either become dissatisfied, or wonder why schools should be integrated, or if they should be integrated. Thus, dissatisfaction comes into the picture to replace satisfaction.

Again, I lay it at the feet of the Supreme Court, those Members of Congress, and the "do-gooders", who have incited these difficulties.

Nowhere in the United States does the Negro get as much consideration in the courts of justice as in those States where the schools are segregated. You see, I have lived with the Negro, and I know him. I know him better than you, because I have never been a hyprocrite with him and told him that I was going to put him in a school with white children or raise his social status. I have been honest with him, and he has come to trust and believe what I have had to say. Then, as prosecuting attorney, I used to lean over backward to make sure that a Negro had a little bit more mercy and a little bit more protection, because I recognized the fact that he might not have as much education and that he might need the protection of the courts. That was my record, but it was no exception either in South Carolina or throughout the Southland. We just did it that way because we knew that it was right, and it was our tradition.

At the hearing over in the House Judiciary Committee, when my distinguished Governor, Governor Hollings of South Carolina, came up and testified, on the same day he testified before this subcommittee, there came to the hearings an old Negro man from my district. He had come up to visit some of his people here in the Washington area and he came by my office and asked if could go to the hearings, that he wanted to see what our Governor looked like. We gave him directions as to how to get to the hearings and I saw him sitting up there and I went over and spoke to him. I asked him what he thought about the whole picture, and he said that the colored folks didn't want any integration—the white folks at home had treated them mighty good. After that hearing he came by the office and asked me for a little piece of money. It was no exception. I expected it, and he got a little piece of money. I had never seen him before and I did not know him and I am a southerner who believes in segregation. But I gave him a little piece of money. I am trying to illustrate something for you here, and I am trying to show what you are trying to destroy.

Recently, in one city, a Negro patrolman was the cause of a disturbance in the police force. I did not go into the details, and I shall not name the city. I am sorry they had that trouble. All it points out is that you cannot legislate social equality, and while I do not know the policeman involved, I do believe that if the Negro had shown himself to be worthy of the joint patrol the white policeman would have welcomed him. How so many who have been elevated to the high office of Congress could be so blind, I cannot fathom. We in the South know, and have long recognized, that the Negro must promote his own progress. We have made it possible for him to do so. Have others—or do they want his vote, and despise his progress?

I assume, and I hope, that every man sent to the Congress and to the Senate is sent because his people have confidence in him and want him to think and to work for the good of the Nation. I am thinking of the

talents possessed by the Members of Congress and the Members of the Senate that I know, and how well those talents could be channeled into good works, instead of wasted in this row over civil-rights legislation. I had hoped that we had learned the lesson from the farce of 1957, and the fact that the Civil Rights Commission is impotent, useless, and an unnecessary and expensive burden on the people of this country. The only thing good I can say of it is that it did not become the tool of communism that some wished and expected, which is more than I can say of some others.

What about inflation? Are you letting inflation take us over, or why are we fooling around with this civil-rights question?

What about our defense picture? Are you satisfied? I am not. I am worried, and badly worried. I am especially worried since I heard of a speech that Mr. Teller, a leading scientist, made out in the West, in which he said that by the year 2000 Russia would certainly be in the forefront. Are we today spending so much time on civil rights that we could be spending on something else? I challenge you, I challenge this Congress, and I challenge the courts of this great land to return its thoughts and its energies to preserving our freedom, marshaling our strength, preparing our people, and cataloging our resources to victory in cold war or hot, that these free people may live better and peacefully, and produce, in the future, generations equal to their time and their responsibilities of world leadership in good works and Christian purposes. I stand ready to do my part, and to that end I make this bold statement today.

What about defense? We all know that there is a lot of fat in the defense spending. I am not privileged to be on the Armed Services Committee. I wish I were, as I would start asking a lot of questions.

I could name many problems to which we could turn our talents so much more profitably than this civil rights question.

And so, Mr. Chairman, if you would give us a moratorium, and we turn our thoughts to other matters, I am sure that the Nation would be benefited, race relations would be improved, and the violence would gradually decrease. I urge you and this committee to use your statesmanship in this direction.

If we dare, let us face the realities of the existence of white and Negro as citizens of a United States. The white man wants innumerable necessities and an abundance of luxuries. He is no stranger to hardship or sacrifice, either by heredity or experience. Horatio Alger inspired a generation before mine. Today I find in the Halls of Congress many men who pride themselves in the fact that they delivered papers, stoked furnaces, took up laundry to get an education. Thank God they did not look to their Government for some fool legislation to protect themselves from discrimination, because they were poor, orphaned, or suffered hardship. I do not apologize for the fact they had to work for a living—I glory in their American spirit.

The Negro must earn his place or he cannot keep or expect it.

You cannot help him by hypocritical legislation, nor longer inspire him by obedience to a desire for his ballot. He has been misled, fooled, propagandized in the past, today his education and the fine communications of a great Nation bring him the truth, and that truth is that each major political party of this Nation has diverted from high purposes and soiled its shield of honor to get votes—God help us if we do not reform. Some think this world is waiting for a revolution in creative thinking on the race question. I tell you today the Negro is sick of his role as the football of every pink, liberal, or fool, who deceives him by false promises, lies to him about equality, and, underneath, fears him as an opponent in some city ward in a metropolitan area.

I speak as a partisan. I admit my emotion to segregation. I am happy that I owe no apologies to anyone. The fact that I emphasize a truth of our generation will, I am sure, be cauterized by some of the press, ignored by others. I am neither radical nor extreme. Yet, I am tempted since the departures of those who fail to understand our program inspire a position aggressive and positive.

This is our land—would you destroy it? One sure way is to bow your head down to the idol of civil rights, and glow in the acclaim of the foolish. Here in Washington are many, most of them desire our demise as an international leader, who will shout your name, put you in the paper, and get you called a statesman, if you will yield to their desires.

Give lipservice to this hypocrisy—every organization which is a Communist front will hail you. You will get honors, medals, certificates and honorariums. Every time I pick up the paper I see where some one is getting a special recognition for his "heroic part" in promoting civil rights legislation. The paper always omits the great hero's part in promoting racial tensions and racial hatreds.

Let us see what the races really want.

The white man, Negro, yellow man, red man—all want peace. Turn the efforts of this committee, its staff—turn the money spent on propaganda—into the channels for peace see how much good can be done.

All races want jobs, security. Are we as a nation letting productive power—which foundations security—falter, while we wrestle back and forth with a political civil rights question cheapened by hypocrisy? What are we to do if we have a depression? Will civil rights legislation prevent a depression—help us economically in any way? Of course not.

All races want justice. Today justice in this land gives even measure to white or black or any other race. Civil rights legislation does nothing to promote justice. How can you expect anything good from a civil rights statute which the average white man despises and the average Negro does not understand? How far will the leaders of this country depart from reason to do political homage to the NAACP and other Communist-inspired and Communist-infiltrated organizations?

I could name other desires. I will not. I invite your great brains to high purposes.

I have made some strong statements here. They are strong because they are true, and it is time somebody took the wrappings off of truth.

The Negro in my country is accepted as a citizen—he votes, worships, trades, rides, plays—as he pleases. His schools are as good as any in the Nation. We hope to preserve these freedoms for him, preserve and further the pleasant race relations that now exist. Help us by using your statesmanship now to turn our national thinking from this race question to questions more productive.

Loyalty Affidavit Required by the National Defense Education Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WINT SMITH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1959

Mr. SMITH of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago I put this item in my newsletter:

Here is another matter that disturbs many of us because it shows the methods of fellow travelers and their constant efforts to ridicule patriotic Americans who attempt to teach and preach our basic American doctrines of loyalty to our country.

Last week I received a petition supposedly signed by 50 faculty members of the University of Kansas City, Mo. This faculty petition asked that the students applying for Federal loans to continue their education be not compelled to sign a loyalty oath in order to get a loan. By this petition you have faculty members who indicate that they think it is wrong for anyone to be required to state he is not a Communist or affiliated with any subversive group. Anyone doubting the existence of this petition can get a photostat copy by writing me. It would be most interesting to know just who promoted this petition in the Kansas City University.

Mr. Speaker, as usual we received several letters that said I was doing a disservice to the cause of education—and were severely critical of anyone who would publicize the faculty for sending in this petition—because it was all done in trying to maintain the right of freedom to teach in the classroom.

I wonder at such a statement—to me such a statement is far from the truth—and it always raises grave doubts in my mind for anyone to make such a statement. There is no such thing as absolute freedom.

I did, however, receive one reply to my comment on this Kansas City University petition that is so different and so outstanding that I append it hereto. I do not know the writer, but I am sure that if we had more students with the ability to think and analyze today's problems as does the writer of the appended letter, America's future would be in much safer hands. The writer of this letter is a student at the University of Kansas. His comments are so to the point in issue, I commend it most highly and it is to be noted he states he is one of the recipients of the benefits of this exchange program. His letter follows:

LAWRENCE, KANS., *May 22, 1959.*

Representative WINT SMITH,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SMITH: I just want to take a few minutes out of final examination week to make a comment about something I read in the paper yesterday. I am referring to the letter or petition signed by the Kansas City University professors criticizing the loyalty affidavit required under the national defense education act. The article I read did not fully explain the situation, but if the professors were objecting to that loyalty oath signed by students who are granted the loans, then perhaps you might be interested in the views of a recipient of such a loan.

I am now enjoying the advantage of such a loan, and with great pride and willingness I signed the loyalty oath. I believe that such a requirement can be easily justified.

In the first grade I began giving the pledge of allegiance to the flag, and ever since then I have been willing and anxious to publically declare my loyalty to this country at any time to any body. I find it difficult to understand the reasoning of those who find it distasteful, or immoral, or unjust to pay verbal respect to what other men have died for—the United States. It seems to be the popular thing to do among certain groups to object to any display of patriotism. But I cannot believe that all people think this way. This letter is just to let you know that not all do.

I realize that such people as the professors at K.C.U. object to such an oath because it is compulsory. But to a degree compulsion is necessary to maintain the very freedom they claim to support. It is a well-known old saying that to maintain liberty, we must have restraints, or else the liberty descends to license, which is the loss of liberty for others. Of course this is not applicable to the current issue, but it does demonstrate that requirements, and rules, and compulsion are not inimical to freedom. What possible objection can a man have for being required to declare that he will not be unfaithful to the very institution which provides him with his freedom? Surely the government which protects him can expect this much in return. It is not demanded that he not try to change the government, but only that he follow the law in his attempts.

But of course there is even greater reason for requiring a loyalty oath for these loans. No one in the country is required to apply for the loan. This is simply a contract situation. When a party offers a loan subject to certain conditions, no one who accepts the offer has any right to object to the terms. The simple answer is to just not accept the offer. If a man wants to sell me his car at a very reasonable price, provided I give him a ride, I can't buy his car and then honestly complain about giving him his ride.

The requirement for the loan is such a simple one—just to not be disloyal to the nation. I wonder if these same professors would object to a man who would give them each a sum of money if they would promise not to shoot him in his sleep. I think that the situations are analagous.

Of course it is argued that such an oath is meaningless. It is said that any disloyal person would sign anyway, so that it is merely a burden on the conscientious citizens. I suppose the disloyal will sign, but this in no way affects the justification of requiring it for all who apply. It would allow prosecution for those who did falsely sign.

But there is even a greater reason for the faithful to sign. It makes us stop and think. That was the first time since I took my oath of allegiance for military service that I publicly declared my loyalty. It gave me a thrill. When I read that oath, and signed my name, I thought about what it meant. It was a reminder of my American citizenship, and though it may seem just childish sentimentality to some, to me there was real pride in signing.

Let me make it clear that I don't propose to speak for anyone but myself. But I did want to let you know that not everyone feels as the professors evidently do, and that I respectfully take issue with them. I regret that I did not have the time to work out my thoughts in a more coherent manner, but with the press of exams, I felt that I could spare only the time to sit down and type them out as they came to mind. But you no doubt can see my purpose, and that is all that is necessary.

Respectfully,

Dulles Eulogy

SPEECH
OF
HON. JEFFERY COHELAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 25, 1959

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to convey deepest sympathies to the family of John Foster Dulles—from my constituents in the Seventh District of California and for my family and myself.

We sense that people throughout the world, in a quiet moment, have paused to look toward Washington where John Foster Dulles has passed away. In that alone there is greater tribute than we can pay here.

Rev. Dr. Joseph J. Gavenda Honored on 25th Anniversary as Pastor of St. Joseph's Church in Hazleton, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 28, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news article from the Hazleton Plain Speaker, Monday, May 25, 1959:

DR. GAVENDA HONORED BY ST. JOSEPH'S PARISH FOR QUARTER CENTURY OF SERVICE AS PASTOR

Parishioners and friends of St. Joseph Roman Catholic Church honored the Reverend Doctor Joseph J. Gavenda on his 25th anniversary as parish priest with a testimonital dinner in the school gymnasium last night.

Five native sons of the parish were officers at a special silver jubilee mass held at 10:45 o'clock Sunday morning at which approximately 1,000 people were in attendance. The event marked the beginning of a spiritual bouquet for the pastor from members of the parish he has served for a quarter century.

Father Gavenda received three tributes in the form of a Papal Blessing, the parish spiritual bouquet and a purse from the parish groups and individuals.

Following a talk by Rev. Jerome Pavlik, O.F.M., Franciscan Friary, Easton, Father Gavenda expressed his gratitude to the parishioners, priests, honored guests, and other individuals for the honors bestowed upon him. He concluded his remarks by saying "Not unto us O Lord, but unto Thy name give glory."

Father Pavlik spoke on the power of a priest who for the past 25 years as pastor has held the immortal souls of St. Joseph parishioners in his hand. "Your presence is an undying tribute * * * that Dr. Gavenda has performed his most consecrated job well," he told those at the dinner. He reminded them that they should say thanks for a spiritual job done perfectly."

It should be the thought and wish of everyone here * * * that we beg almighty God to spare our beloved pastor Dr. Gavenda for many many more years * * * Congratulations Dr. Gavenda and God bless you," were the closing remarks of Reverend Pavlik.

The children of the parish presented three special musical selections during the testimonial dinner, entitled "Jubilee Tribute," "Jubilejni Pozdrav," and "Honor to Our Pastor." Accompanists were Miss Cecila Koval and Miss Anita Gabos.

Mayor S. Thomas Capparell presented the reverend doctor with the key to the city while DANIEL J. FLOOD, Congressman, and Judge Paul Selecky, juvenile court judge, spoke for the county and upon the good works the priest accomplished with youth of the community.

The parish tribute was given by Rev. Cyril M. Hudak, assistant pastor. Invocation was by Rev. Cyril J. Rable, and benediction by Rev. John S. Marinko, assistant pastors.

Charles Kapes presented the tribute from St. Ladislaus Mission parish.

George Gavenda, a brother of the guest of honor, made a presentation in behalf of the priest's family.

Numerous congratulatory messages were received from priests and friends, including Judge Bernard Brominski, Common Pleas Court, Rev. James Bolger, Rev. John Koval, Rev. John Bednarczyk, and the Thomas Fedor family of Harrisburg.

Honored guests were: the Doctor's brothers and sisters, Mr. and Mrs Frank Soltis and family, Pittston; Mr. and Mrs. John Skovira and family, Jessup; Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Pitoniak and family, Jessup; Mr. and Mrs. John Gavenda and family, Clifton, N.J. and George Gavenda and family, Trenton, N.J.; who made a presentation on behalf of the family.

Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Fenstemacher, Hon. and Mrs. Leo Kubitsky, Dr. and Mrs. Emil Martyak; Mr. and Mrs. Robert Walsh; Mr. and Mrs. Nick Bonomo; Mr. and Mrs. Andrew J. Hudak, parents of Father Hudak; Sheriff and Mrs. Joseph Mock; Mr. and Mrs. A. Sarosky.

Seated at the main table were: Father Drogowski, pastor of St. Stanislaus; Father Francis Vilha, pastor of Sts. Cyril and Methodius, Clifton, N.J.; Father Leo Gardzalla, assistant pastor, St. Mary's Allentown; Father Rable; Father Pavlik; Father Joseph Tomicek, pastor of St. John the Baptist, Throop; Father Hudak; Mayor and Troop; Father Hudak; Mayor and Mrs. Capparell.

The five sons of the parish; Father Marinko; Father Cassian Yuhas, C.P., Holy Family Monastery, West Hartford, Conn.; Father Andrew Rentko, S.V.D., Divine Word Seminary, Girard, Pa.; Father Michael Gaydos, assistant pastor, St. John's, Freeland; Father Andrew Chupela, assistant pastor, St. Mary's, Uniontown.

Additional priests present were: Father Stephen Gurcik, pastor of St. Stephen's, Plymouth; Father Andrew Diugos, pastor of St. Michael's, Jessup; Father Michael Frohman, pastor of St. John's Freeland; Father Louis Pilati, pastor of Holy Rosary; Father Michael Vetter, pastor of Holy Trinity; Father Henry Luchi, pastor, Our Lady of Mount Carmel; Father Joseph Pilny, pastor, Sts. Peter and Paul's Plains; Father Francis Zolcinski, pastor, St. Stanislaus, Wilkes-Barre; Father Anthony Kozlowski, pastor, St. Mary's, Nanticoke and Lt. Col. Father John Hlopko, chaplain U.S. Army.

An estimated 800 people attended the dinner.

The Silver Jubilee mass was celebrated by Rev. Dr. Gavenda, with Rev. Andrew Rentka, S.V.D., Sacred Heart Seminary, deacon; Rev. Andrew A. Chupela, St. Mary's Nativity Church, Uniontown and Rev. Marinko, master of ceremonies. Rev. Cassian Yuhas, C.P., Holy Family Monastery, West Hartford, delivered the sermon. Minor officers were altar boys of the St. Joseph parish with music by the girls choir, under the direction of the Sisters of Saints Cyril and Methodius. Organists were Miss Rosemary A. Yuhas and Miss Benedicta V. Marinko.

Keenotes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELIZABETH KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 19, 1959

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of

the RECORD, I include my newsletter which was released today:

KEENOTES

(By Representative ELIZABETH KEE)

The House this week approved legislation to extend the life of the Renegotiation Act. Newspapers paid very little attention to the debate. In fact, the business press alone seemed to recognize the significance of the legislation and to report the debate fully.

What is the Renegotiation Act? It provides the means whereby our Federal Government can recover excessive profits from firms awarded Government contracts. During the past 4 years an average of about $140 million per year has been recovered by means of this act.

As long as we as a Nation must continue to spend billions of dollars a year on defense, there will be a need for legislation to protect the taxpayer against unreasonable profits for firms which provide goods and services to the Government. Many contracts, particluarly for the development and production of missiles and other new weapons, cannot be awarded on a low bid basis. The work is too specialized. Negotiations offer the only sensible way for the Government to arrive at an agreement with the contracting firm.

But negotiated contracts can return tremendous profits to the contracting companies. That is why our Government must have some way of recovering any excess profits.

Records of the Renegotiation Board reveal that industry and business have voluntarily returned to the Government millions of dollars which they believed represented excess profits. In other cases, Government and business could not agree. The Renegotiation Board then stepped in to use the law passed by Congress to arrive at a settlement.

AREA REDEVELOPMENT BILL BEFORE RULES COMMITTEE

Thus far, the House Rules Committee has not cleared the area redevelopment bill (S. 722) for debate on the House floor. There is danger that this urgently needed legislation may be bottled up in the committee for the rest of the session.

In this connection, I was interested in a recent comment by Miss Sylvia Porter, one of the best known and most able financial writers in the country, in a recent newspaper column:

"It's obvious that most chronically depressed areas in such States as Massachusetts, West Virginia, Pennsylvania, Michigan, are not going to be able to rejuvenate themselves without Federal aid. The difference between the administration and the Democratic leadership is not over the need for area assistance and redevelopment legislation. The differences are over how to aid and how much to aid. Now—before we get into trouble again—is the time to rescue this legislation from the political bog, put it through, make it work."

The Senate has already passed this legislation, thanks in a large part to our two West Virginia Senators, Mr. RANDOLPH and Mr. BYRD. The House Banking and Currency Committee, after lengthy hearings, amended the Senate bill and recommended that it pass.

The recent improvement in the overall economic picture has led many people to the mistaken belief that the worst is over and area redevelopment legislation is no longer needed. Those of us who have introduced and strongly supported this legislation are doing everything within our power to convince members of the Rules Committee of the need for action in the immediate future on this legislation.

Panama Canal Society, Washington, D.C.: Historic Meeting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, one of the most widely discussed questions before the Nation and the Congress today is the control and jurisdiction of the Panama Canal, which since the Suez crisis of 1956, has been under sustained political attacks. Dramatized by such incidents as the 1958 Panamanian flag planting in the Canal Zone an the 1959 invasion of Panama by Cuban revolutionaries, these attacks have had one prime purpose—wresting control of the great interocean waterway from the United States.

This objective, it should be noted, has been part of a long-range program of the international Communist conspiracy since 1917. Current efforts to advance it have presented foreign policy problems of portentious import not only for the United States and Panama but also for all maritime nations that use the Canal.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, it is most significant that the 24th annual luncheon meeting of the Panama Canal Society of Washington, D.C., on May 16, 1959, at the Sheraton-Carlton Hotel in the Nation's Capital, to honor Gen. and Mrs. Robert E. Wood and the other old timers of the Canal construction era, was devoted to reminiscence of his Isthmian service, and the theme of "Communist and the Panama Canal."

This society, which I had the honor to address on May 12, 1956, when it honored former Chief Engineer John F. Stevens, consists of former Panama Canal officials, engineers, and others connected with its construction or its subsequent operation, maintenance, sanitation, and protection. Thus, the members include personnel of the Armed Forces, Public Health, and Foreign Services, who have been stationed on the Isthmus and, incidentally, know its problems and hazards at first hand.

The officials of the society, 1958 to 1959, were Stephen Latchford, president; Frank M. Hill, vice president; and Clarence L. Chapin, secretary-treasurer. The committee on arrangements consisted of Hon. Maurice H. Thatcher, chairman; Joseph A. Cheeseman, and Frank M. Hill.

Distinguished guests included: Congressman William K. Van Pelt, of Wisconsin, member of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries; Maj. Gen. Glen E. Edgerton, former Governor of the Panama Canal; Brig. Gen. Bonner Fellers, former strategic planner in the Southwest Pacific, World War II; Dr. Charles S. Collier, professor of law emeritus, George Washington University; John J. Daly, editor and author; Dr. Donald M. Dozer, historian, University of Maryland; Harry W. Frantz, Latin-American correspondent, United Press-International; Col. Wallace M. Hale, chaplain, U.S. Army; Dr. Louis M. Sears, professor of history emeritus, Purdue University; Vice Adm. John F. Shafroth, Naval Historical Foundation; Mrs. Gaillard Sherman Rogers, Trinity College, Washington, D.C.; Mrs. Ruth Shipley, former Chief of Passport Division, State Department; Dr. Louis L. Williams, secretary of the Gorgas Memorial Institute of Tropical and Preventive Medicine; and John M. Littlepage, well-known Washington attorney.

Other personages in the large assemblage were: Capt. Miles P. DuVal, well-known historian of the Panama Canal and author of the celebrated Terminal Lake-Third Locks plan for its modernization; Col. Pierre Gaillard, son of the late David D. Gaillard, the former member of the Isthmian Canal Commission after whom Culebra Cut was renamed; Mrs. Maurice H. Thatcher, a "first lady" and distinguished hostess on the Canal Zone during construction days; Mrs. Aileen Gorgas Wrightson, daughter of Gen. William Crawford Gorgas, the great sanitarian of the Isthmus; and Mrs. Ben Jenkins, president of the Ladies Auxiliary of the Panama Canal Society.

A very pleasing feature of the occasion was the program of Latin-American and other musical selections.

The occasion was indeed notable and appealing to students of both canal history and current problems. It is gratifying to note that General Wood mentioned key figures in Panama Canal construction: John F. Wallace, the pioneer engineer; John F. Stevens, its basic architect; and George W. Goethals, a principal builder.

Though the builders of the Panama Canal gained great fame and have been acclaimed many times, I quote these eloquent words on the printed program of the meeting from the gifted pen of Governor Thatcher:

Because of the vital and enduring monument they wrought the builders of the Panama Canal will long live in the history of the world and the memory of mankind.

I am very grateful to General Wood for his gracious reference to myself Representative WALTER, and others named by him, and thank him therefor.

The assemblage being called to order by the president, Stephen Latchford, who presided until the end of the luncheon, the invocation was delivered by Col. Wallace M. Hale, Chaplain, U.S. Army, as follows:

INVOCATION BY COL. WALLACE M. HALE

Our Father, we are grateful to Thee for the challenging and demanding tasks in life. We remember especially those here assembled who have had a part in literally moving mountains and spanning continents. May the remembrance of their sacrifice and accomplishment be a signal and a guide for the citizenry of our Nation, as, today we look into space and its challenge for us.

Today we meet in honor of a great cause—a benefit rendered to all mankind. May the spirit of these men who built the Panama Canal be ours as we look toward Berlin, Moscow, Geneva, and to the rest of

the world. May the spirit of this country who makes this work available to all men of good will be continued in us in all our dealings in the future. As we bring the world closer together, may we learn to live with each other and become brothers in the best sense of the term; learning to use all that Thou has given to us.

Bless our fellowship today.

Bless this food, and may this memorable occasion be both pleasing to Thee and pleasant to us.

In the name of Christ, we pray. Amen.

Next, there came singing of the first and last stanzas of "America," accompanied by the orchestra; then the pledge of allegiance, led by Col. George S. Brady, U.S. Army, retired. This was followed by "In Memoriam" and silent reverance to deceased members of the society and old timers, with their names given by Roger S. Erdman, life members of the society.

At the close of the luncheon, President Latchford presented Governor Thatcher as toastmaster. In his remarks of presentation, President Latchford spoke of Governor Thatcher's public service on the Isthmus, and afterwards in Congress; also of his various visits to the Isthmus including that of last November when, accompanied by his wife and many old timers, including President Latchford, they went to the Isthmus at the invitation of the Canal Zone Governor, General Potter, for a week's stay and participation in the centenary program of the anniversary of President Theodore Roosevelt's birth. He also spoke of Governor Thatcher's substantial aid to the Society through its existence, and of his beneficial services to old timers through the years.

Thereupon, as toastmaster, Governor Thatcher welcomed all in attendance at the luncheon meeting, and later introduced guests at the speakers' table, as well as distingiushed guests in the audience.

His introduction of Gen. Robert E. Wood as guest speaker follows:

REMARKS OF GOVERNOR THATCHER IN INTRODUCING GENERAL WOOD

We are most fortunate, indeed, to have with us today a man who has greatly distinguished himself in the business world, but who, for 10 years, or more, on the Isthmus, made an outstanding record in important official positions in the construction organization of the Panama Canal.

Born in Kansas City, Mo., he became a graduate of the U.S. Military Academy at West Point, and was in the 3d U.S. Cavalry in the Philippines from 1900 to 1902. In 1905 he went to the Canal Zone where he served the Isthmian Canal Commission in various capacities, rising to the important positions of Assistant Quartermaster and Chief Quartermaster, leaving the Isthmus in 1915, following the completion of the Panama Canal and its opening to navigation. His Isthmian labors made him the consummate master of organization and detail which enabled him later to become one of the ablest leaders in the business world.

He entered private business in 1915, but during World War I he served as Acting Quartermaster of the U.S. Army, 1918–19; and then returned to a business career, and was vice president of the great firm of Sears, Roebuck & Co., 1924–28, and then became its president, and thus served for the ensuing 11 years; and as its head helped to build it up and expand it to become the greatest merchandising institution in the world. On his retirement as president in 1939 he became the company's chairman of the board, and so continued until 1954. He yet continues as a company director.

His sturdy Americanism has brought him distinguished civic and patriotic activities and fame. In every task he has undertaken he has achieved success; and his life and his labors are inspirational and altogether worthy of emulation. Yet strong and active, he is devoting the later years to matters of public good.

We welcome him—a fellow Old Timer—as one of us, and as a friend in the construction era of the Canal, and as a friend now and always. He left London yesterday at 11 a.m. and flew by jet plane to New York, arriving there yesterday afternoon, and in Washington yesterday late afternoon.

He needs no introduction to this assemblage. It is with a sense of honor and privilege that I present Gen. Robert E. Wood.

General Wood was cordially greeted by the audience and spoke as follows:

ADDRESS OF GEN. ROBERT E. WOOD

I am happy to be here today with the members of the Panama Canal Society of Washington. The older I grow the more I dislike to make speeches, but this is an exception, as it gives me an opportunity to greet some of the comrades of my younger days.

I went to the isthmus in March 1905, just before the first (and only) yellow fever epidemic broke out. I have always been grateful to the fever, for there was a short period, where anybody who would stay on the job was promoted. I didn't get the fever, and I was promoted very rapidly and reached the upper echelons of the work at its very beginning.

I had the honor of serving under all three chief engineers: Wallace, Stevens, Goethals. Mr. Wallace, though a brilliant engineer, was not long enough in the canal to have much impression on the work. Mr. Stevens was a truly great engineer, great administrator, and great leader of men. He planned and started the execution of the work in the Culebra Cut, for which Col. Goethals gave him full credit. No ordinary man could have filled Stevens shoes, but Goethals, like Stevens, was no ordinary man. Suffice to say that no other man could have completed the job as rapidly and efficiently as the Colonel. It was one Government job that was the epitome of economy and efficiency, but it was Goethals' brilliant mind and dynamic energy that did it.

I felt that all of us, serving as we did as young men, must have felt the pride of working on a great job, and a job in which there was never even a whisper of graft or scandal.

I was first assigned to the then Department of Labor Quarters and Subsistence which had the duty of recruiting the labor, housing it, and feeding it.

The job had many complications as can be imagined. The feeding of the West Indian Negroes, of the Spanish and Italian labor, of the Americans, divided as they were, between the outdoor construction men, railroad and steam shovel workers, and the engineers, draughtsmen and clerical workers, presented many problems.

The first class of employees preferred quantity of food with less stress on the refinements of service and equipment; the second class of employees preferred less quantity and better service. We partially solved the problem by dividing the dining rooms in half, part being assigned to the men who wore coats, part to those in their shirt sleeves, all men making their own choice.

Furniture was assigned to all employees. Some bright genius, the precursor of our modern bureaucrat, devised a devilish system of assignment of furniture. The furniture was assigned in three classes: A—to employees getting from $100 to $200 per month; B—to employees getting from $200 to $300 per month; and C—to employees getting over $300 per month. There was one class for all bachelors. The complications can be imagined.

In 1908 the Department was abolished and the duties divided between the Commissary Department, which handled the feeding and the Commissary stores, and the Quartermaster Department which handled the housing. To the Quartermaster was transferred the Materials and Supply Department—in other words, the supply system of the canal. As the construction work progressed, the supply problem became the major problem. To supply a great work 2,000 miles from a market is a monumental task. I have often told my buyers in Sears that they had a relatively easy stock and supply problem, compared with that of the Panama Canal.

In 1911, I was assigned for a brief period to the operation of the water terminals of the Canal—Colon and Balboa, then returned to the Quartermaster, became Chief Quartermaster of the canal in early 1913, and for my last year from August 1914 to May 1915, had charge of the construction of the permanent buildings of the canal.

All in all I had a varied experience of different phases of the work. I did not then guess that in 1918 I was to become Quartermaster General of the Army, and later the head of a great merchandising business, but the training and experience I gained on the canal was to be invaluable to me in later years.

I served under Col. Goethals for 7 years. He never accepted an excuse for failure. For a young man to serve under such a chief was a wonderful experience. I have never ceased to be grateful to him in later years.

I think most of us remember with nostalgic fondness our life in the canal; most of us were very young. We were starting life together, many of us brought our brides there, had some of our children on the canal, started our families. By the standards of that day, we were well paid and well treated. We were associated with a great enterprise of which all of us felt proud. Altogether it was a rare experience. Those of us who went through the canal on the first boat on August 1, 1914, will never forget the emotions aroused by that first trip.

So much for our earlier experiences. Today a danger menaces our country—a danger connected with our Panama Canal. There is no question that the power of the Soviet Union is being exerted to encircle and absorb in the matter of influence the Panama Canal and the Caribbean nations—a series of proposals has been put forth, all of them tending to undermine the sovereignty of the United States over the Panama Canal. The latest of these proposals are the 12-mile limit extensions, that Panama has undertaken to establish by law. This proposal is in line with Soviet and Red China actions in their contiguous waters, and these actions have been seized on by radical leaders in America as a precedent for Panamanian action in the premises.

We have been fortunate in having ex-Governor Thatcher; and two of the most patriotic Americans in Congress—Representative FLOOD and Representative WALTER, both of Pennsylvania—as well as some engineers and others who have tried to combat the attacks on the jurisdiction of our Government over the Canal Zone. Congressman FLOOD in particular has made a series of splendid speeches covering the whole subject of the attempts to break down our sovereignty over the Canal Zone.

To treat these matters in this after-luncheon speech would take too much time,

but the speeches of Governor Thatcher and Mr. FLOOD, who is an able, fearless, and patriotic American Congressman, fully explain the whole subject far better than I can do. In this connection, I would also mention Capt. Miles P. DuVal (U.S. Navy, retired), a major historian of the Panama Canal, with service on the Canal Zone; he has also, by speeches and writings, made extensive and effective contributions in the same behalf.

While we have our defenders, we also have our opponents. Governor Thatcher sent me a clipping taken from the Washington Post of April 26 of this year. How an editorial writer could write such an editorial without apparently any knowledge of the history of Panama and of the functions of the canal, it is hard to see.

In 1902 Panama was a State or Province of Colombia. It could hardly be called a nation or a nationality. As the editorial states, it is entirely ruled by a small clique of families. There can be no nationalism when there is no nation. When the Americans started construction, the Canal Zone was practically a wilderness and was almost valueless. It is entirely due to the expenditure of some $400 million by the American Government and by the devotion and enterprise of the men who worked in the canal that it was completed and is today a great monument to mankind.

America constructed the Panama Railroad about 1850. We paid Colombia some $25 million as treaty compensation. We have raised the payments, which were originally $250,000 a year, to Panama by successive steps to nearly $2 million a year.

An article on the whole Panama question was recently published in the Saturday Evening Post, its author being Demaree Bess, one of the ablest of all American correspondents. I have a high respect for Mr. Bess. I don't agree with everything in the article; I think Mr. Bess has somewhat underrated the Communist menace, but I do believe that he has pointed a way to the solution of the problem.

Any further claims by the Panamanian Government regarding the canal payments, and above all, any question of the sovereignty of the canal, should be disregarded, and our State Department should inform the Panamanian Government in no uncertain terms that we have a treaty; that we will observe it; and that we shall not amend the treaty further. We should also request them to clean house of Communist agitators.

If Panama needs economic help and assistance, and if we continue our policy of foreign aid, it, as an undeveloped country, should be entitled to a proportionate amount of this economic aid. Personally, I prefer to see a greater proportion of this aid go to Latin America, rather than Europe.

The question of communism in Panama is a very difficult one. If Panama is well governed, if the standards of education go up, if the standard of living rises, communism will retreat and disappear, that is what is happening in Western Europe today.

Now our Panama Canal Society is a small one. Its members now are all elderly men. We must not fool ourselves that we have very much influence, but I do believe it is up to the members and the society, as a whole, to do what we can to register our opposition to communism, to the encroachments on the sovereignty of the canal, and individually to write our Congressmen and Senators expressing our views. I sometimes feel pessimistic when I contrast robust Americanism of the young people of 1905 with some of the pallid and pink internationalism of the young people of 1959. However, I still have faith in my country and our people and I believe we shall continue to advance.

At the conclusion of General Wood's address he was cordially thanked by Toastmaster Thatcher, who called for a rising vote of thanks to the speaker for his presence and his most interesting and inspiring remarks, which was enthusiastically accorded.

The toastmaster called on Hon. WILLIAM K. VAN PELT for a word of greeting, to which the Congressman responded expressing his pleasure at being invited as a guest and participant at the luncheon meeting. He spoke of his visit to the isthmus last fall during observance of the T. R. centennial and of his return by ship with the Thatchers and a contingent of oldtimers from the Washington, D.C. region.

Thereupon Governor Thatcher exhibited moving pictures in color, taken by Mrs. Thatcher and him last November on their visit to the isthmus.

The election of officers of the society for the ensuing year then took place, with the following results: Frank M. Hill, president; Clarence L. Chapin, vice president; and Matthew C. O'Hearn, secretary-treasurer. Also members of the executive committee were chosen for the ensuing year with Joseph A. Cheeseman, chairman.

Mr. Speaker, the Panama Canal Society of Washington, D.C., has, indeed, set a most worthy example to other similar societies, and to patriotic and civic organizations, in general, in dealing in a forthright and effective manner with the grave problems connected with the present and future of the Panama Canal.

Address by Hon. William Jennings Bryan Dorn, of South Carolina, at the Annual Jefferson-Jackson Day Dinner of Eighth Virginia Congressional District Democrats, Charlottesville, Va.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 28, 1959

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted me to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am pleased to include an address delivered by our colleague, the Honorable WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN DORN, of South Carolina, at the annual Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner of the Eighth Congressional District of Virginia, held at Charlottesville on May 23, 1959. The Eighth District of Virginia is represented in the House of Representatives by the distinguished dean of the Virginia delegation and chairman of the Rules Committee, the Honorable HOWARD WORTH SMITH.

The occasion attracted a very large assemblage of Democrats of the Eighth District. The Honorable Thomas H. Blanton of Caroline County, who is chairman of the Democratic State Central Committee for the State of Virginia, presided.

Congressman DORN is an able and effective speaker. He has cooperated with the Democrats of Virginia on a number of other occasions and rendered a similar service to the Democrats of the Fifth District of Virginia at a meeting held in that district, at Danville, in October 1958.

The able address of Congressman DORN was highly appropriate for the occasion and, in my opinion, will prove of interest to the Members of the Congress as well as to the public in general. The address is as follows:

Senator Blanton, Congressman SMITH, and my fellow Democrats, I am flattered and honored to be presented to you by one of the greatest Americans of our time—your own beloved Judge HOWARD SMITH, Chairman of the powerful Rules Committee of the U.S. House of Representatives. Your Congressman is an American who places the welfare of his country above political expediency. He is rendering to the entire Nation the same unselfish service so typical of the early patriots of your illustrious Virginia history. Judge SMITH is recognized in the House as the leader of those who of us who still believe in States rights, economy in Government, and individual liberty. Were it not for this great American, I shudder to think where our freedom and liberty might be at this very moment. We might well be under a Fascist type of complete national socialism. All of us in the Congress have been inspired by his logic and foresight, his calmness and patriotism. I congratulate you, the Democrats of the eighth district, for your selection of this great man many years ago and your continuing support of him through the years.

May I say thank you for sharing with the entire Nation the devoted service of that stalwart champion of economy and individual liberty, your senior Senator HARRY F. BYRD. Senator BYRD upholds with honor and distinction the traditions, heritages, and philosophy of your great Commonwealth—the Mother of American Presidents. You are rightly proud of your entire delegation to the Congress for their leadership, forthrightness, and allegiance to the faith of our fathers. Under this able leadership, you are carrying on in the tradition of the men who supported George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, and the other Founding Fathers.

Virginia soil is sacred soil to all freedom-loving Americans. You gave to the Nation George Washington, the Father of our Country; James Monroe, and the Monroe Doctrine; George Mason, and his Bill of Rights; James Madison, the Father of the Constitution; Robert E. Lee, the English-speaking people's greatest military genius; Thomas Jefferson, author of the Declaration of Independence, and founder of our great Democratic Party. These great Americans and countless others you have produced contributed immeasurably to the creation of this palladium of liberty.

It is always an inspiration to visit your beautiful, cultured, and historic city of Charlottesville and to see again your charming University of Virginia, your great institution of higher learning which has always imparted to the youth of America some of the patriotism, intellectual sagacity, and love of liberty so characteristic of its founder, "the Sage of Monticello." My wife and I again paid our respects this afternoon to the memory of Thomas Jefferson at that great American shrine we all love. My mind drifted back to the Declaration of Independence when he so ably wrote, "We pledge our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor." My friends, we can do no less today if our great Republic is to be preserved as the arsenal of democracy, the heart and core of the free world. We have always been victorious in the war over the forces of oppression, centralization, and totalitarianism. Now, we must fight in peace as we have fought in war to preserve our basic fundamental liberties. It is just as important to save America and preserve our form of gov-

ernment as it was to create America, the Constitution, and the Bill of Rights.

We can and must breathe the new life, vitality, and courage into the Democratic Party. Jefferson, as the founder of the great Democratic Party, was a liberal in that he believed that "the least governed are the best governed." He was a liberal when he said, "There is no danger I apprehend as much as the consolidation of our Government by the noiseless and, therefore, alarming instrumentality of the Supreme Court." He was a liberal when he expressed confidence in the people's ability to govern themselves at the local and State level. Judge Smith is a liberal in that he believes in the time-honored principles and ideals as exemplified by Thomas Jefferson. The rest of us in the South, who have maintained a nucleus around which the Democratic Party could rise again, are liberals. We are the true liberals because we still have, during these trying times, confidence in the individual citizen. We are fighting to preserve for him his liberty and freedom. We want to safeguard his home and family from unwarranted search and seizure. We want to protect him from a Federal gestapo. We wish to preserve for him trial by jury and save for him his time-honored rights to educate his children at the local level. We have never forsaken the principles of the Democratic Party as enunciated by Jefferson. We realize that fundamental principles never change. They are the same "yesterday, today, and forever." We will not now deviate from these principles. We stand today with Thomas Jefferson, William Jennings Bryan, and John W. Davis.

It is the liberal radicals who have left the Democratic Party. It is they who have usurped the title of "liberal." They are really national Socialists, parading in the cloak of liberalism under the banner of the Democratic Party. Their philosophy is close to that of the Fascist and the collectivist in that they advocate centralized Federal authority. They look to Washington for the rectification of any and every evil. They endorse every decision of the Supreme Court. They are conformists, making every effort to brainwash the American people to their conformity. They advocate an increase in the national debt and more domestic and foreign spending. They express no confidence in the people—no confidence in local or State government by their advocacy of Washington paternalism. These radicals have repudiated the time-honored principles and ideals of the Democratic Party, principles that served the Nation and the party so well. These pseudo-liberals desire to regulate the lives of the American people from "the cradle to the grave." Their strength is censorship, special interests, agitation, political bosses and bloc voters. These national Fascists believe that only they should do the thinking and planning for the American people. Their policies have brought America to the brink of ruin. The American citizen is the victim of their unworkable schemes. These radicals now dominate, to a great extent, the policy of both great American political parties. They intend to give the American people no political choice, but they have not reckoned with the American people who are becoming aware of this socialistic plot.

The greatest threat to the American people today is inflation, the prospect of a 10-cent dollar and paper money with little purchasing power; inflation as a result of excessive spending and extravagance in government; inflation spawned by a colossal Federal debt with its stupendous annual interest; exorbitant taxation and foreign spending beyond our means; yes, and from our failure to retire the national debt during a time of unprecedented prosperity. Frankly, I fear cheap money more than I fear the Russian military might. I fear runaway inflation more than I do the Communists' probe into space or their economic war.

The history of inflation is the history of the decline and fall of great civilizations. Imperial Rome and the British Empire faltered on the road of inflation. Following World War I, inflation contributed greatly to the collapse of the German Republic, thus paving the way for the raving Hitler, his national socialism and his infamous secret police. The German housewife in 1923 had to carry a basket of paper money to purchase one loaf of bread. The frugal French people are today in a state of despair and desperation, the victims of insanity in government, the victims of wild government spending and fiscal irresponsibility. French political leaders dished out borrowed government money lavishly to their constituents and promised more and more from the government till. The result—an unbalanced budget, deficit financing and paper money. It takes 37 francs today to buy the same as one franc in 1927. The French housewife is forced to pay the equivalent of $10 for carrots, ham, potatoes, or bread that cost $1 in 1949. The hard-earned savings of the French people in the form of bank accounts, social security, veterans' pensions, unemployment and old-age insurance are all but worthless.

America is on that same road today. We are running through the same red lights. We hear the same warning sirens but, so far, we have failed to listen. The one-worlders, international spenders and radical liberals in both of our political parties would have you to believe that the answer to inflation is more inflation and more paper money. They ridicule the national debt and say "we owe it to ourselves." They accuse the Jeffersonian Democrats of being reactionary. They charge us with slowing the wheels of progress and turning back the clock to horse and buggy days. In a feeble attempt to justify their fallacious spending sprees, they point to our rising national income. They point to our increase in population and they point to the new stars in our flag.

But, oh my friends, their story is misleading. They do not tell you this—they do not compare our increase in the national debt or the increase in our budget to our gain in individual income. Our population has increased only 27 percent in 20 years. Yes, our national income has increased 673 percent in 20 years, but our Federal budget has increased 1,239 percent. The Federal budget in 1938 was $6.15 billion and today it is a staggering total of $82.4 billion. May I remind you also that our national debt of $285 billion is more than the debt of the rest of the world combined. At this fantastic rate of increase, in the near future we will be paying to the Federal Government the greater portion of our income and, unless this trend is halted, your boys and girls here in Virginia will see the collectivist trend become a reality when they will all be working for the Federal Government or paying 80 percent of their income to that Government.

If there is any doubt about the seriousness of this hour, let me paraphrase my distinguished friend, Congressman SMITH, Chairman of the Rules Committee, when he said on the floor of the House this week, "Old Uncle Sam came up with his plug hat in his hand and his stars-and-stripes coattails waving out behind him, and he said to the moneylenders: 'Please renew my note for a year.'

"Did he ask them to do it at 1¼ percent? He asked them to do it at 4 percent, and many of them did not do it; 33⅓ percent of those bondholders refused to renew your Uncle Sam's note at over three times the rate of interest of 1¼ paid last year."

This to me is a shocking state of affairs. It simply means our people are losing faith in the solvency of our country, in the soundness of our paper money. At this very moment no outstanding Government bonds are selling for one hundred cents on the dollar. There is no doubt about it—we are in a crisis, a national crisis brought on by the fallacious policies of the self-styled liberals in both political parties. We, as Democrats, can no longer blame all of these evils on a faltering administration. As a national political party, we can no longer run against that old bogeyman, the 1932 depression. We can no longer, in good conscience, run against Herbert Hoover. We must abandon this negative party policy and launch an offense against the evils of our day.

Let me remind you here tonight, my fellow Democrats, that we control the House and Senate by overwhelming majorities. Yet, we are in a serious depression, one partly of our own creation—a depression of inflation, a depression of cheap money, a depression as serious and more far-reaching than the one of the early 1930's. We must, as a party, cease celebrating our sweeping November victory and examine the future. Already I can see the distant storm clouds of political disaster. Already the rumbling and grumbling can be heard at the grassroots. The gravy train is running off the track. Payday is at hand. We, as a national party, must attack these problems with the spirit and courage of Old Hickory. If William Jennings Bryan could speak to us today he would be saying, "Do not crucify mankind upon a cross of inflation. Do not bear down upon labor a crown of unbearable taxation."

The Democratic Party should offer to the country now and to the Congress a program of tax revision, a sound dollar, a balanced budget, reduction in government spending and government bureaucracy, a tapering off of foreign aid—foreign aid which largely goes into the coffers of special interests. We must offer some incentive through depreciation and a revision of the tax structure so that American business can remain in America and alleviate the unemployment threat. We must abandon this negative foreign policy and launch an imaginative, offensive world policy based upon the Bill of Rights and the self-determination of peoples. The dollar sign must be eliminated as the symbol of our foreign policy. Many foreign policy failures are covered up by censorship and that untouchable—the bipartisan foreign policy.

Billions can be saved in our national defense program. The Democratic Party can offer consolidation of our missile programs, our four Air Forces. We can advocate a uniform supply system and unification of our varied defense activities. We should also explore the possibility of a single service.

We must protect American labor from unfair imports and make our trade program truly reciprocal and mutually advantageous. We have a moral obligation to offer some hope to the youth of America by a start now, however small, toward retiring the national debt. Let me remind you again that the interest on the national debt is the second largest item in our budget and is greater annually than all the expenditures of the Federal Government in the year 1940. It disturbs me greatly to see our national party only offering the American people more spending, deficit financing, and fiscal irresponsibility as a remedy for this monetary crisis. A realistic program should be offered to the American people now and in the 1960 Democratic Party platform. With it we can win. With it we will restore the confidence of the American people in the party of Thomas Jefferson.

The Federal Government holds a powerful club over the head of every American taxpayer. Our people are no longer free. They spend sleepless nights and anxious days worrying about the rapid approach of the tax deadline. No sooner are taxes paid than the housewife, small farmer, and the worker

must begin keeping records, saving pennies, and looking to the next Federal demand on their income with fear and apprehension. The least we can do for the little taxpayer is to simplify tax forms and relieve him of this ceaseless anxiety.

The Government is actually losing revenue through our present tax policy. We have reached the bottom of the barrel. We are already at a point of no return. We are on a dead end street. There is no longer any incentive to expand business. There is no longer the pioneering spirit in business to take a chance and, as a result, unemployment will grow. There is no incentive for big business to expand, and little opportunity for small business to become big business. Our present tax policy, unless revised, will "kill the goose that lays the golden egg." This Congress and the Democratic Party, through a revised tax program, can encourage and bolster our economy and can thus go forward with full employment and with more revenue for the Federal Treasury.

It is past time that the Democratic Party advocate a return to the time-honored principles and ideals of our party—States rights, free local government, individual liberty, trial by jury, and local control of schools. The greatest Democratic platform ever written was the platform of 1932. It was a victorious platform. It was a sound platform. It was patriotic and appealed to the people. I commend to our national leadership a restudy and rereading of that great platform, a platform that called for a 25 percent reduction in Federal expenditures, a balanced budget, economy in Government, States rights, and individual liberty. I remind you tonight, this great platform closed with the philosophy of Thomas Jefferson—"equal rights to all, special privileges to none." Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson launched the Democratic Party as the "Party of the People." They championed the cause of the small farmers, the workers, the underprivileged, and those in remote places on the frontiers of our country. These men had confidence in the people's ability to govern themselves at the local level. They respected the individual, regardless of wealth or aristocratic heritage. These fearless leaders rejected a system of special privileges. The foundation stones of Jeffersonian democracy became a sound currency, a minimum of government, States rights, and only such taxation as absolutely necessary.

If we are to continue to perform our traditional role in America as a political party, we must return to the time-honored principles that made our party stand through the years as the champion of the people and one that served our country so well. We must continue to champion the cause of the average American. Our people are crying for leadership today. We must not disappoint them. Our people are aroused over the complacency and indifference of Washington to their basic problems. They are aroused as never before. They are on the march. A political revolution is brewing. When the aged, poor, and disabled find that hard-earned social security cannot pay the house rent, and old-age insurance cannot meet the grocery bill, when those in the middle income brackets find the purchasing power of their dollar has vanished, then political unrest will be abroad in the land. The American people are going to vote—they are going to protect themselves and their children from a 10 cent dollar. They are not going to accept the platforms of 1952 and 1956, high-sounding platforms forced on the platform committee by the eggheads and pseudo-liberals. May I remind you that these platforms were overwhelmingly rejected by the people at the polls. The rank and file Democrats are not going to permit racketeers and big city bosses to dominate the Los Angeles convention. The people are going to be there. They are going to demand the bread and butter platform of a sound dollar, a reduction in the bloated federal bureaucracy. They are going to demand job security and a fair deal for the American worker. It is going to take more than fancy jokes and five syllable words to unite the Democratic Party.

If we nominate a radical or a self-styled liberal with the same old phony platform, our presidential nominee will again be defeated. The heart and core of the Democratic Party has been the solid South, the land of Jefferson and Jackson. For generations the South almost alone kept alive the time-honored principles and ideals of our party. We did not vote against Cleveland because he was from New York. We did not vote against Bryan because he was from the Middle West. We did not vote against Jim Cox because he was from Ohio, or John W. Davis because he was from New York, or Adlai Stevenson because he was from Illinois. In the South we do not consider sectionalism a qualification for the presidency. We voted for these men because they were great Americans and good Democrats.

On the other hand, the eggheads and liberals discriminate against southern candidates solely on the basis of sectionalism. I quote President Harry S. Truman from volume 2, page 494, of his "Memoirs":

"DICK RUSSELL * * * had the ability, integrity and honesty. He was one of the best informed men in the Senate * * * Senator RUSSELL was always able to present any problem in a clear and straightforward manner * * * I believe that if RUSSELL had been from Indiana or Missouri or Kentucky, he may very well have been the President of the United States."

Let me remind you that in the last two elections, the only electoral support Adlai Stevenson received was in the solid South. The time has come today when the South should be recognized for its loyalty to the party throughout the years. This loyalty rewarded not with a vice presidential candidate who has little in common with the Jeffersonian and Jacksonian theories of Government, but with the presidential nominee.

The time has come for us to ask other sections of the country to cast aside prejudice and nominate as our standard bearer a man from the most democratic section of our country. With the platform of 1932 he could win. Not since 1848, when Zachary Taylor from Louisiana was nominated, has the Democratic Party nominated a man from the "land of Old Hickory" and "the Sage of Monticello." We must rescue the Democratic Party from the radicals, the fascists and from the trend toward collectivism.

The radical liberals and Nazi-type socialists in both national political parties are not only leading us into a socialist pit of no return with their extravagance and waste of Federal funds, but are destroying the power of the States, usurping the rights of our people and concentrating more power in the hands of the Federal Government, particularly the Attorney General. Again these pseudo-liberals are misleading the American people. They are setting up the machinery through which the people they claim to champion could eventually be liquidated or persecuted.

No racial persecution has ever taken place on a nationwide basis except under a powerful central government—autocratic power in the hands of one or a few men. This power is being created in America today. The rights of the States, the local communities and citizens are being taken over by this Federal autocracy. The greatest protection minority races have in America is not the Attorney General, the Supreme Court or Federal secret agents. These are instrumentalities of power that can be turned against minority races. The greatest protection minorities have, in fact their only real protection, is the States of our American Union, sovereign States with their own constitutions. It may be possible to have persecution because of race on the local level, but never on a nationwide basis as long as we maintain the sovereignty of States and free local government.

The same is true of religious persecution and trial by jury. The Spanish Inquisition was made possible by autocratic power in the hands of Philip II. The religious persecutions of Louis XIV and Adolph Hitler were perpetrated through the instrumentality of centralized power. Nikolai Lenin and Joe Stalin were able to destroy the churches of Russia and forbid religious worship only because they wielded absolute power in the Kremlin.

Thomas Jefferson said, in substance, that if there were no States at the time of the formation of the Republic, they must be created to guarantee the freedoms and liberties of our people. This continuous attack upon our States is an attack upon freedom. It is an insidious attempt to undermine individual liberty and create a totalitarian State. It is inconceivable that the American citizen will for long sit complacently and indifferently on the sidelines and watch the gradual liquidation of our Constitution, the destruction of State sovereignty and the usurpation of individual freedom by an all-powerful, ever-growing Federal plutocracy.

Congressman SMITH, your bill, H.R. 3, is a step toward preserving the constitutional power of our States from unwarranted usurpation and encroachment by the Congress and the Supreme Court. It will help preserve this Republic as we have known it. I hope it can become law at this session of Congress. I pledge you my cooperation, my every support and that of my people. We are taking our stand today beside the Founding Fathers of this Republic—George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, and the others. Our struggle today is greater, more far-reaching and even more important than that of these early patriots. If we lose America and the free world today, we will be plunged backward 1,000 years into medieval darkness. The road to chaos and ruin is centralization and consolidation of all government in the hands of a few in Washington. To preserve our basic freedoms, guaranteed in the Bill of Rights, we must save our Constitution as written. This great document can only be preserved and passed on to coming generations by first preserving the integrity and sovereignty of our American States. Freedom of speech, trial by jury; freedom of choice; yes, freedom of the press and religious liberty can only be preserved and guaranteed by defending the rights of our States.

The South must take the lead in this crusade to save America from totalitarianism and from bankruptcy. It can be done through the Democratic Party of Jefferson. Only the South can assume this leadership because we are still free. The people of Virginia and the South can truthfully say with Thomas Jefferson when he said: "I have sworn upon the altar of God eternal hostility against every form of tyranny over the mind of man."

Farmers Are Customers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial

from the Wilkes-Barre Record of Tuesday, May 26, 1959:

FARMERS ARE CUSTOMERS

Farmers and ranchers are among the biggest customers of American industry.

For example: There are 12 million tractors, cars, and trucks on the U.S. farms. Agriculture buys more petroleum than any other industry. Farmers provide a market for 6½ million tons of finished steel annually. Rubber used on the farms of America would put tires on nearly 6 million automobiles annually. Sixteen percent of the gross freight revenue is from agricultural products.

Agriculture consumes 50 million tons of chemicals each year.

Agriculture uses more electric power than Chicago, Detroit, Houston, Baltimore, and Boston combined.

Delinquency of Negro Youths Here Shows Sharp Drop During 1954–58

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1959

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Post and Times Herald of March 19, 1959:

DELINQUENCY OF NEGRO YOUTHS HERE SHOWS SHARP DROP DURING 1954–58

(By Milton Viorst)

Delinquency among Negro children declined sharply from 1954 to 1958, the Welfare Department reported yesterday.

The rate fell from 37.1 per 1,000 children, to 21.2 during this period. Delinquency among white children, meanwhile, remained stable. In 1954, it was 15.3 per 1,000. In 1958, it was 15.2.

The figures were compiled by Welfare Department statisticians for children 5 to 17 who were referred to the Juvenile Court for serious offenses. Statistics were presented to the Public Welfare Advisory Council yesterday.

The nonwhite delinquency ratio declined steadily over the 5-year period, the figures showed. In 1955 it was 32.6, in 1956 it was 27.5, in 1957 it was 22.4. The figures for white children fluctuated only slightly from year to year.

The figures showed that Negro population in the 5 to 17 age group grew from 69,000 to 93,500 during the period. Meanwhile, the number of delinquents dropped from 2,562 to 1,980.

The white population in the juvenile bracket dropped from 62,000 to 52,000. The number of delinquents fell correspondingly from 946 to 792.

The results were reflected in the general decline of juvenile delinquency in Washington, reported recently in the "State of the Nation's Capital" message to Congress. Total delinquency fell from 26.8 to 19.1 per 1,000 from 1954 to 1958.

District Welfare Director Gerard Shea attributed the progress to the work of the Youth Council, area boards, the youth division of the Police Department, and the increased length of commitment of juvenile offenders.

He told the council that the average delinquent now remains under supervision about 3 years, of which 12 to 18 months are in training schools. He said lengthened supervision and an enlarged staff have cut the number of repeaters.

In other action, the council recommended that schools in welfare institutions remain under the control of the Welfare Department. The Federal Bar Association recently urged their transfer to the Board of Education.

Overpopulation in the Ryukyu Islands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. BURNS
DELEGATE FROM HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1959

Mr. BURNS of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, the United States, under the Treaty of Peace with Japan, is responsible for the administrative, legislative, and jurisdictional control of the Ryukyu Islands, of which Okinawa is the biggest. As Mr. Sulzberger of the New York Times says in his recent book, "What's Wrong With U.S. Foreign Policy?" since the Security Treaty with Japan does not guarantee Japan's support in any future Pacific war, our generals and admirals calculate that we cannot relinquish Okinawa, a quintessentially important base. Since this retention of the Ryukyu Islands may continue for many years, the United States has certain specific responsibilities for the islands and has inherited certain problems which we must solve. One of them is overpopulation.

The population land resources ratio of the Ryukyu Islands is the most unfavorable of any area in the world. With a present population of 830,000 and growing at the rate of 20,000 per year, these "wards" of the United States find themselves crowded into an area of 850 square miles, only 25 percent of which is arable. Okinawa, the big island, contains some 600,000 people in addition to the vast military base to which Mr. Sulzberger refers. Okinawa had a population density in 1951 of 1,208 to the square mile, as compared with 580 in Japan. Using another comparison in 1951, the Ryukyus had a population of 6.36 per cultivated acre, as against 5.67 in Japan and 0.385 in the U.S.A. This population density is no doubt the biggest in the world, and while the official statistics are 8 years old, they have certainly not improved to any extent.

The use of some 40,000 acres on the big island of Okinawa by the U.S. Armed Forces further complicates the problem, which was further compounded after the war by the forced repatriation of approximately 190,000 Ryukyuans from Japan, Korea, Formosa, and the Pacific Islands. This decision by the Allied Powers has been proven unwise, but it does not help solve the present problem. Prior to the war, population stabilization was accomplished in the islands by an ambitious overseas emigration program sponsored by the Japanese Government. By 1938, about 74,000 Ryukyuans had emigrated to countries outside the Japanese Empire, in addition to those resettled within the Empire and forced to return home following the war's end. Of the some 74,000 emigrants, about 30,000 went to South America and have become welcome additions to the population in Argentina, Brazil, and Bolivia. Many have become extensive landowners while others entered business and the professions. They have intermarried and become well integrated into the community. Since the end of the war, an additional 8,170 had emigrated to South America by July 1, 1958, and about 250 additional emigrants went to the Okinawa colony in Bolivia since that time.

While resettlement to other less populous islands in the Ryukyus has had some success, the basic problem confronting the United States is to stabilize the population by various methods, including emigration to other areas. Areas considered have been, of course, South America, the Pacific Islands, New Guinea, and the United States. South America will be treated later, but suffice to say that emigration to the Pacific Islands is not feasible because the islands under U.S. administration are gradually developing an overpopulation problem of their own. The proposal for emigration to New Guinea was not acceptable to the Government of the Ryukyus Islands.

Insofar as emigration to the United States is concerned, it is perhaps surprising to know that Ryukyuans have no quota for entry into the United States, and must technically apply under the Japanese quota, which is always oversubscribed. No other area outside the Iron Curtain appears to be discriminated against in such a fashion. However, it is interesting to know that the State Department has recently issued instructions that effective from May 15, 1959, Ryukyuan applicants for emigration to the United States will be removed from the Japanese list and listed under the separate quota list for the Asian Pacific Triangle. This quota appears to offer some hope for a living adult Ryukyuan emigrating to the United States legally as a Ryukyuan.

The Okinawan colony in Bolivia was established in 1954, and now numbers in excess of 1,200 people. Following some initial reverses, caused by a poor location for the first site, a strange disease which still eludes identification, and land titles, these have been solved by moving the colony to a new and more favorable site where the strange disease has not appeared, and the official transfer of land titles by the Government of Bolivia in January of 1957. An additional area of some 49,000 acres is reported to be available for the expansion of the colony. The colony had a successful rice crop last year and sold 1,500 tons of rice on the market. An additional 244 emigrants are presently on the high seas en route to join the colony and to settle in the new grant of land. Of the 8,170 emigrants since the war's end, over 5,000 emigrated on their own resources, about 1,600 were aided by the Government of Japan, and 1,200 borrowed from the Ryukyuan Emigration Bank. GARIOA funds provided $160,000 for the transportation of the first group of 394 emigrants in 1954, and about $180,000 in Bolivian counterpart funds were used at the colony site for clearing the jungle, building roads, purchasing farm equipment and seeds, and other basic expenses.

The Ryukyuans who have emigrated to Hawaii now number a vigorous prosperous group which always appears as a challenge to Ryukyuans passing through Hawaii, exemplifying to the visitor from the native land the freedom and benefits that accrue to American citizens, of whatever nationality they may be. The Americans of Okinawan ancestry in Hawaii are a distinct and valuable addition to our citizenry, and I am proud of every one of them.

My colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota, WALTER JUDD, added a clause to the Mutual Security Act of 1954 providing that from funds available under the act, not to exceed $800,000 could be used to facilitate the migration to the other American Republic of persons resident in that portion of the Ryukyu Island Archipelago under United States control. Of this continuing authority, only $180,000 has been made available, and that was for the initial colony in Bolivia. The relocation of the original colony, the strange disease, and other internal problems prevented any further use of the funds under this authority until 1958 when the Department of the Army, acting as executive agency for the Ryukyu Islands, developed a plan for a further expansion of the emigration program to Bolivia, as well as adult agricultural emigrants to Brazil. Additional information is being sought in Bolivia to support this plan because that country offers the best opportunity for emigration of families and will afford assistance to Bolivia in its campaign to become more self-sufficient in providing the food it requires.

The prewar population problems of the Ryukyus were solved by emigration, and Japanese propaganda made much of the domestic need for living space. The population has been thoroughly indoctrinated with the idea that emigration was both a necessity and a right. Ironically, this Japanese policy may have been one of the contributing causes of the late war in the Pacific. While the policy has been discredited, the psychological residue remains and generates strong pressures for emigration. Unless minimum outlets for these pressures can be found, they could build up to an explosion point. With both Japan and the government of the Ryukyu Islands supporting migration, any serious inadequacies in the program will be attributed to the lack of U.S. support.

A comparison of emigration programs in overpopulated areas, which have been supported wholly or in part by U.S. funds, indicates quite clearly that the per capita cost for emigrants from the Ryukyus to South America compares most favorably with more expensive programs. The Ryukyuan government and the individual emigree are contributing almost 45 percent of the total cost from their own resources. Those programs, which took almost 7,000 Ryukyuans to South America, other than Bolivia, since the end of the war, have been financed almost entirely from local sources. Funds to the extent required are no longer available from local resources, and the operation must be partially supported by the United States if the overpopulation problem in the Ryukyu Islands is to be ameliorated.

It is my hope that the $620,000 for which authority exists in the Mutual Security Act will be promptly found and made available to the program, and I would hope that succeeding amendments to the Mutual Security Act would continue this support.

Big Ed Walsh, One of Baseball's Greatest Pitchers and Native of Plains, Pa., Near Wilkes-Barre, Dies at Age of 78

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 28, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I includes the following article from the New York Times of Wednesday, May 27, 1959, which reports the passing of Ed Walsh, truly one of baseball's alltime greats who starred for many years with the Chicago White Sox. Mr. Walsh was born in my congressional district and began his fabulous baseball career in Wilkes-Barre. Luzerne County was always justly proud of big Ed Walsh who performed feats in the national pastime that still stand as records in the game.

ED WALSH, PITCHER, DEAD AT 78; STAR OF WHITE SOX FOR 12 YEARS—MEMBER OF "HITLESS WONDERS" OF 1906 WON 40 GAMES ONE SEASON—IN HALL OF FAME

POMPANO BEACH, FLA., May 26.—Ed Walsh, one of baseball's greatest pitchers, who one season won 40 games for the Chicago White Sox, died today of cancer. He was 78 years old.

Since he came to Florida in retirement 3 years ago, Mr. Walsh has been in and out of hospitals. Until his death he opposed the ban of spitball pitching that was enacted after he left the scene. The spitter was his best pitch when he was in his prime in the early 1900's.

Surviving is a son, Robert E., of Meriden, Conn., where his father worked for many years at a water plant after he retired. Before he moved to Florida, Mr. Walsh lived in Cheshire, Conn., near Meriden. Another son, Ed Jr., who died in 1937, also pitched for the White Sox.

HALL OF FAME MEMBER

A coal miner in his youth, Edward Augustin Walsh went on to become one of the greatest spitball pitchers in the game and to win election to baseball's Hall of Fame in 1946. In his prime the big right-hander was also noted for his control and blazing speed.

Big Ed's feats were many, most of them coming in 1908, when he won 40 games and lost 15. He was an iron man that year, appearing in 66 games and setting a record for innings pitched—464, a mark that still stands.

During that season, when the White Sox finished third, only 9 percentage points out of first place, Walsh pitched seven times in the last nine games. In that stretch he won four times and lost once, 1–0, when Addie Joss of the Cleveland Indians pitched a perfect game against him. Among his four victories were complete games in a doubleheader on September 29, when he beat the Boston Red Sox, 5–1 and 1–0.

Walsh won a doubleheader on another occasion and in 1911 pitched a no-hit game against Boston.

He was born in Plains, Pa., on May 14, 1881. At the age of 20 he received a tryout with the Wilkes-Barre club of the Pennsylvania State League and was a sensation. Walkes-Barre refused to part with him, and he remaind there until the circuit disbanded because the coal miners, who constituted a major portion of its patrons, went on strike.

In 1902, Walsh was sold to the Meriden Club of the Connecticut League; 2 years later he went to Newark, then shortly thereafter joined the White Sox. He remained in Chicago through the 1910 season and ended his career the next year with the Boston Braves of the National League. In all, he won 195 games and lost 128.

STAR OF HITLESS WONDERS

During his heyday with Chicago, Big Ed was the big attraction on the team known as the hitless wonders. His teammates on the pitching staff were Doc White and Nick Altrock, left-handers, and Frank Owen and Frank Smith, right-handers.

This group pitched the White Sox to the American League pennant in 1906 and helped to defeat the Chicago Cubs in the world series in six games.

In the third game of the 1906 series, Walsh blanked the Cubs 3 to 0 and struck out 12 batters. This performance stood as the strikeout record for a world series game until 1929, when Howard Ehmke of the Philadelphia Athletics struck out 13 Cubs. Big Ed also defeated the Cubs, 8 to 6, in the fifth game of the 1906 series, although White had to be called to his rescue in the 7th inning.

By 1907 Walsh had become the ace of the staff. For the next 5 years he was one of the topnotch pitchers in the league. But his arm began to weaken in 1913. He spent part of the next three seasons with the White Sox as a pitcher and talent scout. Then in 1917 he tried a comeback with the Boston Braves. He appeared in four games, won none and lost one.

Walsh became manager of the Bridgeport club in the Eastern League in 1919 and served through the next season. He umpired for the American League in 1921. Shortly thereafter he returned to scouting for the White Sox and also served as a pitching coach at the University of Notre Dame.

Armenian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 28, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, Armenian independence was brought about by the Russian Revolution of 1917, and ironically, its disappearance was also caused by forces which gave rise to that revolution.

In the midst of the First World War Armenians faced total extermination in the Ottoman Empire, but Armenians under Czarist Russia's domination were spared such a sad fate. In 1917 when the Russian autocracy was overthrown, various nationality groups there felt free, and each seemed to be the master of its own destiny. It was then that the Armenian people asserted their freedom and proclaimed their independence on May 28, 1918.

Unfortunately the Armenian Republic thus established 41 years ago could not survive by itself under unstable and precarious conditions. Two years after

its birth it was attacked by the Turks and by the Red Army of Communist Russia. By early December of 1920 the country was overrun, its government overthrown and a puppet Soviet type of regime was set up under dictation from Moscow. Of course since then the country has been part of the Soviet Union, but the remembrance of the independence attained 41 years ago and lost 2 years later, still lingers on, and all Armenians celebrate the anniversary of that memorable day, the Armenian Independence Day.

We join them in the hope that their liberty may soon be restored.

The Delaware River Port Authority Reports That Waterborne Commerce and Affiliated Activities Produce a Combined Revenue in Excess of $5 Million a Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 28, 1959

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Harry G. Schad, the chairman of the mayors' committee on port promotion, composed of the mayors of Camden, Philadelphia, and Wilmington, reports in a recent letter that within the last 10 years, port commerce of these cities and surrounding areas has nearly doubled and is now in excess of 100 million tons annually.

Mr. Schad points out that—

Waterborne commerce is valuable commerce for the entire business community. A carefully documented analysis, prepared by the Delaware River Port Authority, reveals that waterborne commerce and affiliated activities produce a combined direct and indirect revenue in excess of $5 million per day.

When the present program of deepening the Delaware River is finally completed the entire Delaware River Valley will benefit from a large expansion in the dollar volume of waterborne commerce.

I include here an editorial from the Wilmington Morning News, Wilmington, Del., of May 18, 1959, commenting on Mr. Schad's letter:

FIVE MILLION DOLLARS A DAY

We have before us a copy of a letter sent this month to banks, commercial firms, and merchants by Harry G. Schad. In this case the indefatigable and multipurpose Mr. Schad is acting in his capacity as chairman of the mayors' committee on port promotion.

(It's composed, we note, of the mayors of Camden, Philadelphia, and Wilmington in that alphabetical order.)

Says Mr. Schad:

"Waterborne commerce is valuable commerce for the entire business community. A carefully documented analysis, prepared by the Delaware River Port Authority, reveals that waterborne commerce and affiliated activities produce a combined direct and indirect revenue in excess of $5 million per day.

"Thus in the Philadelphia port area we have a built-in economic asset which generates an amazing amount of dollar activity. * * * And each additional ton of general cargo moving through the port generates another direct and indirect expenditure of some $40."

Mr. Schad adds that within the last 10 years, port commerce of the areas "has nearly doubled and is now in excess of 100 million tons annually." What if most of this increase is in oil and oil products and iron ore. Wilmington is already favored for handling several kinds of imports, and if you ever look at the river traffic you'll notice that by no means all the big ships are tankers or bulk carriers. Ships with the maze of booms denoting general-cargo freighters are visible too, often.

More of 'em can be induced, we're sure, to use the Delaware River port facilities instead of New York and Baltimore. At least that's what hard-driving men like Harry Schad are determined to get them to do.

Cancer Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLEY O. STAGGERS
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 28, 1959

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, it is needless to point out how much our individual lives are affected by the current events of our Nation and the world.

In view of the tragedy which has occurred just this week in the death of our great Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, I would again like to call attention to the desperate need for the passage of legislation which would provide for a program for the study of that dreaded disease—cancer.

I have introduced H.R. 4139 which would authorize and request the President of the United States to undertake to mobilize an adequate number of the world's outstanding experts to coordinate and utilize their services in a supreme endeavor to discover means of curing and preventing cancer.

Looking around us today, I feel sure each of us is familiar with the heartache and sadness caused by the fact that a member of our immediate family or a friend is presently suffering from cancer, or has been the fatal victim of the horrible disease.

Various individuals and organizations are putting forth an allout effort to assist in alleviating the suffering and prevention of cancer. They are doing a fine job—but I believe the time has come when we must combine national and world forces in combating and conquering this terrible disease which is so destructive to health and happiness and snuffs out life itself.

Even if we were to expend only one-thousandth of the amount for this cancer research program that we spend on our national defense, cold wars or otherwise, it would be a great boon to civilization, and provide the very life to millions of human beings in the United States and the world.

The time for action is now. Cancer does not wait until tomorrow or next week or next year—it strikes young and old alike, men and women, regardless of race or creed, the rich and the poor. Cancer has no mercy. Let us take the necessary measures for action now toward the complete destruction of this mighty foe.

Monsignor Mahon's Diamond Jubilee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK J. BECKER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 6, 1959

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I insert herewith an editorial written in the great Diocesan newspaper, the Brooklyn Tablet. This editorial deals with the life and accomplishments of a priest whom I have known for a great many years, the Right Reverend Monsignor John J. Mahon.

I could add nothing further to this editorial except to say that the people of my district, from one end to the other, know that Monsignor Mahon has been not only a priest of the Catholic Church for 60 years, but a man who devoted a greater part of his life in helping all the people of the communities in which he was either a curate, assistant pastor or pastor. The life he has led in the community has caused him to be known as one of the best loved men of the Catholic Church.

The editorial follows:

The diocese of Rockville Centre and the diocese of Brooklyn rejoice as one on the occasion of Right Rev. Msgr. John J. Mahon's diamond jubilee in the holy priesthood. We join our prayers as he offers a solemn mass of thanksgiving Wednesday, May 27, the 60th anniversary of his ordination, in Our Holy Redeemer Church, Freeport, with Bishop Walter P. Kellenberg presiding. Forty-nine of his 60 years of fruitful priestly labors have been spent in Nassau and Suffolk Counties, and 24 of them as pastor of Our Holy Redeemer Church.

Few priests are blessed with the opportunity to serve God for so many years, and fewer jubilarians are to be found who can perform the arduous duties of the priest as Monsignor Mahon does every day. He has been through these many years and remains today, by the grace of God, a dedicated man. By his devotion to the care of souls he has earned the admiration and the abiding affection of his people. By his keen interest in public affairs he has merited the respect and gratitude of our public officials.

Surely our hearts are thrilled when we contemplate the innumerable graces conferred through his hands for the salvation of his fellow man. It has been in many instances a labor, trying and difficult, but always crowned with success.

People of all faiths have respected him and conscientiously obeyed his admonitions, seeing always in his kindly interest the intent to promote their eternal welfare.

Monsignor Mahon's 60 years of devotion to duty, but above all his sacred office itself, have made him venerable. He has brought distinction and added dignity to the priesthood. His has been a noble and useful career. He has been not only a witness, but

has made a vital contribution to the magnificent growth of the church on Long Island, from his early days in Sag Harbor to the present.

As a young pastor in Inwood, Long Island, he met the many burdensome duties of his charge with a singular fortitude. Here everything was to be raised, as it were, from its foundation; the organization of his people into a strong flock; the erection of a church and rectory; the assurance of means for the religious education of youth, that precious portion of pastoral solicitude. All of these achievements marked his apostolic work in this area as well as in Baldwin, where he built a beautiful rectory, and in Freeport, where he erected an eight-classroom addition to the parish school and made many extensive improvements on parish property.

Surely he has been all things to all men, but only that he might win all men to Christ.

The Tablet, in saluting Monsignor Mahon on his 60th anniversary, is particularly grateful to him for his consistent and loyal support of the Catholic Press. Ever since this paper started he has been one of its finest patrons, always promoting its circulation and willing to cooperate in providing reading material. It is due to such encouraging and helpful support as he has so generously provided that the Tablet has met with success.

The church is alive today because of the sacrificing zeal of her children through the ages—priests, religious and laity; and the stellar role played by this humble priest from this corner of God's vineyard is already written in the Book of Life. Ad multos annos.

Justin C. Morgan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 28, 1959

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, this week the city of Buffalo mourns the passing of one of its most outstanding jurists, Judge Justin Colfax Morgan. He was an indefatigable worker and a conscientious public servant. Before his appointment to the bench, Judge Morgan served Buffalo as an assemblyman in the New York State Legislature where he worked just as diligently.

I know that the sympathy of all of us is extended to his wife and family in their great loss.

I wish to include the following editorial which appeared in the Buffalo Evening News, Buffalo, N.Y., on May 26, 1959:

JUSTIN C. MORGAN

Western New York has lost a fine public servant in the death of Justin C. Morgan. His career in public life spanned 31 of his 58 years and comprised service at all three levels of government, culminating in his appointment in 1956 as a Federal judge. To all his posts he brought the same characteristic combination of great ability, deep dedication and uncommon strength of character.

His 16 years in the legislature were a model of diligence and integrity in the public interest. A top-ranking member of the Republican majority, he was regarded with warmth and affection by political friend and foe alike as both a lawmaker and a man. Serving in key committee posts, he left a constructive imprint upon countless legislative advances, particularly in governmental ethics, housing and the judiciary.

As a judge he showed the same skill that had marked his years at Albany. All who observed his work were impressed by his unusual capacity for hard work, his ability to get quickly to the heart of issues and his abiding sense of public responsibility. He made of his courtroom a symbol of dignity and decorum in the best traditions of the Federal bench.

Judge Morgan's public conduct flowed naturally from the wealth of his personal traits. Gentle in manner, unfailingly good humored, devoted in his friendships, he displayed a genuine love and respect for his fellow men. His untimely death will properly be mourned as a grievous loss on many counts—to the Federal judiciary, to the cause of public service generally and, not least, to the community in which he lived and worked.

Civil Airlift and MATS

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 28, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under a previous consent I insert hereafter an excellent article from the Taxpayer of May 1959, published by the Citizens Public Expenditure Survey, entitled "Costly MATS Flights Slug Taxpayers Twice."

Following that article, Mr. Speaker, I am inserting an article by Edgar Prinn in the Washington Evening Star of May 27, 1959, quoting General Tunner, the Commanding General of MATS. The views expressed by him, if carried out by the Defense Department, would be a refreshing change of attitude on the part of the Department of Defense and would lead to opportunities to build up civil airlift.

The articles follow:

[From the New York State Taxpayer, May 1959]

COSTLY MATS FLIGHTS SLUG TAXPAYERS TWICE

(By Ralph C. Morgan)

Every day at 10 a.m. (Pacific coast time) an Alaska Airlines DC–6 takes off from the State of Washington and flies to Fairbanks and Anchorage, Alaska. At exactly the same time a Military Air Transport Service (MATS) equivalent of a DC–6 leaves the State of Washington for its daily flight to Alaska.

Taxpayers are subsidizing the Alaska Airlines run because it is not producing enough revenue to pay its own way. Taxpayers, of course, pay the full cost of the MATS flights. And these MATS flights, carrying both military and civilian personnel, result in a revenue loss of nearly $3 million to the private airlines servicing the area and which are equipped and capable of handling the military traffic. The Greater Anchorage Chamber of Commerce notes that this loss of revenues would offset current subsidies paid these airlines.

TAXPAYERS CHARGED DOUBLE

"Here," says Congressman DANIEL FLOOD, of Pennsylvania, "is a clear case of the taxpayers being charged twice * * * Why can't we eliminate that double charging of the taxpayers by putting the MATS traffic on that commercial plane?"

One Air Force officer, Brig. Gen. Robert J. Friedman, has declared before a congressional committee that "MATS operation into the Alaskan area is no different from their transport operation throughout the globe."

"Consequently," notes Congressman CHARLES O. PORTER, of Oregon, "outside of the continental United States, government-owned and government-operated airlines, in the form of MATS and an equally large fleet of administrative aircraft fly parallel to the U.S.-flag airlines, and compete daily with them in the carriage of peacetime government traffic." The cost of MATS operations this year tops one-quarter of a billion dollars.

TOUGH COMPETITION

No wonder commercial airlines are asking Congress for subsidies of more than $7 million. It's tough competing with an airline that doesn't have to charge users enough to meet its own expenss, let alone show a profit.

Each year Congress has been telling the Defense Department that it "should to the greatest extent practicable, adjust its use of air transportation so as to use existing unutilized capacity of U.S. air carriers" * * * an order which, for the most part, has been generally ignored.

In fiscal 1955 MATS procurement of commercial aircraft amounted to only $14.1 million. Last year Congress really put the pressure on and the Air Force finally agreed to procure $84 million of civil aircraft during the current fiscal year. In the final appropriation action MATS was given $80 million to be used this year for commercial air transportation service only.

"EVASION, SUBTERFUGE"

But, in March, MATS admitted that it would only use $66.7 million for civil airlift procurement this year. "This," said Congressman FLOOD, "is a classical and traditional example of the attitude of the Air Force vis-a-vis MATS and the intent of Congress from the very inception of this problem, and they will continue to do so with or without reason at every possible moment. My opinion is that there has been evasion, subterfuge, and a determined spirit of resistance against what we meant."

It has been repeatedly demonstrated that civilian airlines can carry goods and passengers more efficiently and at less cost to the taxpayers than can MATS. For example, it was found that one commercial line could offer United States to Japan air service for military personnel at a cost of $184 per passenger. The MATS cost for the same service was $212 per passenger.

However, this year the Defense Department is proposing to make a one-third cut in the use of civil airlift and is seeking a sizable increase in funds to further expand MATS operations by 44,000 flying hours.

The Defense Department wants to cut civil airlift next year down to $54 million, less than 19 percent of the total amount spent for Government air traffic. MATS also wants to increase the amount spent on itself by $14 million over this year.

WHY JET TRANSPORTS?

On top of that, the military airline is anxious to get into the jet transport field. It is asking for $53 million to buy some jet transports despite the fact that the commercial airlines have invested some $3 billion in jet planes which could be utilized by the military.

Congressman PORTER told a House Defense Appropriations Subcommittee this month that "if the amounts devoted to civil airlift are up one year and down the next, we cannot realistically hope that civil airlift will consistently grow to a size sufficient to help meet national emergency needs in the event of all-out war, limited war or other emergency."

"MORE THAN ENOUGH"

The Oregon lawmaker has just taken a survey of all U.S. civil airlines (small,

medium and large) and found that these airlines expect to have over 1.2 billion ton-miles of capacity during fiscal 1960 available to carry military traffic. "This is more than enough airlift to carry all the passengers and cargo now transported by the Military Air Transport Service."

Chances are that MATS won't get congressional approval to expand its own operations and cut down on its use of taxpaying commercial airlines this year. But, judging from recent history, the mere lack of congressional approval won't stop this costly Government airlines from doing just as it pleases.

[From the Washington Evening Star, May 27, 1959]

TUNNER URGES MORE AIR USE BY PENTAGON

(By L. Edgar Prina)

The commanding general of the Military Air Transport Service says the Pentagon could save money and give more business to commercial carriers if it moved more men and material overseas by plane.

Lt. Gen. William H. Tunner, in reply to inquiries arising out of charges of Government competition with air transport companies, asserted last night:

"MATS would like to give more business to the airlines but at present there is no more business. The answer, as I see it, is to move more and more defense business overseas by air."

The general noted that 93 percent of Air Force personnel and their families going to and from overseas assignments rode by either military or commercial air, enabling the Air Force to save "substantial" sums of money.

"If the Defense Department as a whole were to adopt this policy, it would increase our movement of Government passengers by almost 50 percent," he contended. "It would result, of course, in increased commercial business."

General Tunner also pointed to the increased use of air delivery for highly complicated and very expensive items of military hardware as a way to save money. For example, he said, the Air Force found it could effect "a 22 percent reduction in an original engine procurement program" after it decided to move its replacement jet aircraft engines by plane.

"In this field of moving higher cost items, much more can be done and I estimate we could double the Defense Department's air movement of these items and save substantial procurement money by buying a fewer number and seeing to it that these high-cost items did not sit on docks and decks on long, tortuous pipelines," he said.

In the current year, MATS has contracted business amounting to $70 million to civilian air carriers and the Defense Department overall will purchase $200 million in airlift from commercial carriers during this fiscal year. The $70 million figure represents an increase of $13 million over the 1958 total.

General Tunner remarked that as MATS contracts have increased, more airlines organize "and spring up to ask for a share of this business." He added that in the last 8 months 17 new airlines have been added to the MATS bidder list.

Obscene Mail Matter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD G. WOLF

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1959

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include in the RECORD my testimony before the Post Office Subcommittee on Postal Operations, as follows:

TESTIMONY OF CONGRESSMAN LEONARD G. WOLF, DEMOCRAT OF IOWA, BEFORE THE POST OFFICE SUBCOMMITTEE ON POSTAL OPERATIONS, MAY 26, 1959

Thank you for this opportunity of appearing before you. My statement will be a short one, but I hope that it will aid this committee in considering in the proper context the problem of obscenity.

As you all are well aware, the modes, fashions and even the modes of all society differ from place to place and from historical period to historical period. The levels of sophistication vary across the country as to matters concerning sex, religion and, I suppose, even politics. Differences are, of course, even more striking timewise in the United States for we pass through stages and levels of considering certain ideas or objects as unacceptable or even obscene. Because of these obstacles it is indeed difficult to decide on the meaning of obscenity in a way which will be operationally applicable in all cases across the entire country for all periods. Consequently, we are forced to return to certain basic principles and interpret our present problem in the light of these principles. In the United States we are most fearful of trodding on the toes of the individual. Consequently, we fear intervention or restriction on freedom of the press or freedom of belief. For this reason many good and great citizens fear censorship over any part of the printed word in their belief that once censorship begins it is hard to stop and can result in controls and restrictions that would be antithetical to our way of life. Furthermore, drawing on the prohibition experience repressive censorship requirements will result in an even greater rash of obscene and pornographic literature.

However, there is another side of the story which I believe should be emphasized today. Philosophers have pointed out in the past that certain kinds of literature must not be allowed in the society because of its deleterious and corrupting effect. These philosophers have felt that because of the very nature of man certain kinds of literature lend excitement and stimulation to the baser and more brutish side of man's instincts.

Today this hypothesis has been shown in case after case where perverted and violent acts are performed by both our youth and adults because of stimulation and deviation gained in part from reading smut magazines. As I am sure the subcommittee is well aware, many of these magazines mingle sex and violence together in a way which construes sex with violence rather than with love. Sadism and masochism become the frame of reference in which life is considered by these people. There is no doubt that this leads to decay in the society.

We have not been without weapons against the forces of evil. On both a governmental and local level, great efforts have been made to combat the insidious influences of pornographic literature. Last year the Congress passed a law which substantially strengthened the hand of the Department of Justice in their battle against obscenity. As a result of that law, which I am told is quite effective, the Attorney General may bring an action in places where the material is both sent and received. Besides governmental action, local authorities are waging strong campaigns in conjunction with church groups, and educational authorities. These groups have helped the parents of this Nation in their efforts to improve the reading habits of their children and to protect their children from participating in crime and depravity. It behooves the Congress to aid the parents who, of course, have the primary responsibility for the moral upbringing of their children. The Federal Government, and more particularly, the Post Office Department, also has a strong responsibility in this matter. It must root out the purveyors of filth through quick and effective means without violating constitutional or reasonable guarantees to the defendant.

I strongly believe that Congress should give the Post Office Department the kind of necessary legal machinery consistent with the Constitution and the Bill of Rights to control the pornographers and smut peddlers.

This task is indeed a complex one, but it is one which must be dealt with now if we are going to be able to control a stream of pornography that, I believe, has done much to fan the flames of juvenile delinquency and adult crime in this country.

Housing—New Bill Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1959

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the Christian Science Monitor of May 23, 1959, entitled "Housing—New Bill Needed."

The article follows:

HOUSING—NEW BILL NEEDED

Out of a major trial of strength between President Eisenhower and his liberal Democratic opposition it now appears possible that the Nation may get a better housing bill than either side originally proposed.

We hope this is the course events will take. But we do so with more than a vague notion that compromise is a good thing. We had specific objections to the bill which the President backed and which was so roundly defeated. And we have specific objections to the catchall Rains and Sparkman bills, which passed handily in Congress, only to face a Presidential veto.

Generalized, our objections are these: 1. The legislation backed by the administration cut the urban renewal program back too far. 2. The House and Senate measures backed by liberal Democrats set the spending level for public housing too high.

As the situation now stands, it does not appear that the Democrats can muster the strength to override the expected Presidential veto of their housing bill. In all likelihood, this will give Mr. Eisenhower still another veto victory; the Democrats a 1960 campaign issue; and the average taxpayer a chance for a better measure hammered out as a necessary compromise between the two sides.

This paper firmly believes that such a compromise can be constructed so as to place greater emphasis on encouraging local initiative for needed growth and renewal, rather than simply pouring Federal funds into urban America to prime economic expansion through political public works spending.

We are convinced that the urban renewal program meets this test of encouraging the most useful type of economic growth and rebirth. It stimulates local self-help, civic enthusiasm, careful work from local planners, and the cooperation of businessmen and politicians. It also provides a powerful stimulus to local private enterprise. And, in restoring city land values it makes a return to the Nation's major Fed-

eral-taxpayer, the city dweller, by cutting his local taxes.

In their other features, however, the Rains and Sparkman bills do not always measure up to this standard for Federal spending. This is particularly so of the Rains bill's authorization for 140,000 new public housing units, which would cost about $3.7 billion.

Admittedly a certain amount of low-cost housing is necessary to provide for some of the thousands of persons displaced by urban renewal slum clearance. But not the amount stipulated by this bill. Basically, public housing has the opposite effect from urban renewal—in providing tax-free housing it cuts away the economic base of cities. To build the amount of Federal housing envisioned in the Rains bill is objectionable not only because it is heavy spending, but because it implies that even with economic prosperity, more liberal Federal mortgage policy, and more emphasis on restoration of low-cost housing in renewal projects there is going to be a vastly increasing number of Americans unable to afford anything else.

Housing and slum clearance are a half-trillion-dollar challenge to the most prosperous civilization the world has yet known. But that challenge cannot be met simply by pouring such an enormous sum into the cities in measures which ultimately will hurt local economic bases. We hope a compromise will be found this year that will put housing and renewal back to serving local needs rather than priming the national pump.

Prize-Winning Essay by Deborah Wilson of Clinton, Iowa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD G. WOLF
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 28, 1959

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I wish to have inserted into the Appendix of the RECORD this short essay by a young constituent of mine, Deborah Wilson. This essay is interesting because it points up the fact that our youth are being trained in our schools for leadership, responsibility to the community, and respect for human life. This type of good leadership training does much to counteract those elements in the community which tend to influence our children toward taking part in juvenile crime. Deborah Wilson is a sixth grader. I wish to congratulate her on winning her trip to Washington. We must encourage these leaders of tomorrow today. Her winning essay follows:

PATROL ESSAY

(By Deborah Wilson, Hawthorne School, Clinton, Iowa)

It is extremely important for school safety patrol members to be stationed at dangerous intersections near schools to help direct their classmates, even though traffic signal lights, stop signs, police, or adult crossing guards help protect pedestrians at such intersections.

School safety patrol members should be on duty even when there is a stop sign or traffic signal lights, because it is not always possible for cars to stop. In winter the streets are often icy and cars are not able to stop. Patrol members are better able to judge whether a car is going to stop than younger children are.

Patrol members should be on duty even when there is an adult crossing guard or a policeman there to protect pedestrians. The patrol members like to have an adult crossing guard or a policeman at dangerous intersections with them. This teaches the patrol members to be alert and learn more safety habits. The younger children will respect the patrol members, knowing that some day they will have the chance to become a patrol member too. By working with a policeman or an adult crossing guard, the patrol members will become safety conscious. Safety will become a habit and they will be more willing to observe safety rules and to realize their importance.

The Potentials of Solar Energy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEWART L. UDALL
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 28, 1959

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, Arizona is justifiably famous for many things, not the least of which are clear skies, an abundance of sunlight, and a vista of wide horizons. Of course, we have long appreciated Arizona's balmy winters—and lately, through the midwifery of science, we have focused our attention on the potential of sunlight as a new source of power.

Its use has been highlighted dramatically during the launching of our earth satellites by the use of radios powered by solar batteries; small units which produce power continuously and indefinitely when exposed to the sun's rays.

An interesting and informative discussion of the potentials of solar energy is contained in the May issue of the Agriculture and Livestock Monthly News Digest of the Valley National Bank, a publication compiled and edited by my friend, Charles W. Pine.

In a frank outburst of State pride I am inserting this article in the RECORD, as I believe the information it contains will be of value to our colleagues.

The article follows:

Solar energy applications no longer are confined to "science fiction"—as attested to by thousands of authoritative documents and photographs assembled and classified by the Association for Applied Solar Energy, whose headquarters are located here in Phoenix. Through the world, scores of firms are making and selling ingenious devices that trap sunlight and convert it in various ways to useful work. Examples include beacon lights, satellite transmitters, hearing aids, batteries, portable radios, electric clocks and picnic cookers.

Morgan Monroe, former science editor of the Arizona Republic, noted in a recent Reader's Digest article that enough solar energy pours down on 100 square miles of Arizona desert during a single day to operate all U.S. industries around the clock. "How to capture and employ this boundless energy," he pointed out, "is the challenge facing man's ingenuity." True, solar energy scientists haven't even come close to demonstrating how all the sun's power-packed energy can be feasibly employed—but they have proved that sunshine can be constructively used in literally dozens of fascinating ways.

Of interest to our readers will be the following "blueprint for the farm of the future" that we put together as a result of poring over no little AASE literature and interviewing some of its top officials. The farmhouse itself will be air-conditioned (both heated and cooled) by solar energy. Food will be stored in solar-powered refrigerators and cooked in solar ovens. Solar generators (power converters) will provide electricity for lights, appliances and numerous chores around the house and barn. Solar pumps will lift water from underground—and solar stills will purify it. If he wishes, the farmer-rancher can keep comfortably cool by wearing a lightweight solar helmet—which also will provide him with two-way solar-radio communication.

Assuming his wife succeeds in persuading him to build a swimming pool "like all those city folks have," he'll be able to supply it with solar-heated (or cooled) water. The very climate on his farm (or ranch) will be controlled, in part, by solar energy devices that prevent frost and lengthen the growing season. He might even wish to raise a solar "crop"—consisting of algae or some other form of plant life which can convert sun energy into palatable food. If so, he'll undoubtedly want to carry a solar broiler on picnics to cook the family's hot dogs (or "algae dogs," as they may be known then).

Calendarwise, how far in the future is such a farm? If the earth's supply of fossil fuels (coal, oil and natural gas) were to be suddenly exhausted tomorrow, the answer would be "Tomorrow"—for all the above equipment already has been successfully built and tested in various solar energy laboratories around the world. Many of these devices, of course, will never be put to wide- and tested in various solar energy laboratories around the world. Many of these devices, of course, will never be put to widespread use so long as other cheaper-to-utilize sources of energy are available. Viewed with such realism, the answer then could be "Centuries."

The point we want to make at this writing is that all of the aforesaid methods for putting the sun to work have been proved—in the laboratory, at least—and many of them actually are being utilized today. Just a sampling of AASE and other solar energy literature turns up these facts: The U.S. Office of Saline Water is testing a number of salt-water-to-fresh water conversion methods employing solar energy as the "actuator." Denver's Dr. George Lof has developed simple solar distillation units which can be used for small-scale installations, and the world's first commercial solar stills already are being produced by an Algerian firm and undergoing rigorous tests in the Sahara desert.

Two years ago, Michigan State University engineers developed a grain-drying shed using solarheated air. Four years ago, B. M. Bensin told a group of scientists assembled at Tucson that his solar energy-trapping devices had successfully lengthened the growing season in Alaska—enabling him to grow tomatoes out-of-doors just 130 miles from the Arctic Circle. A year before that, Dr. Maria Telkas, noted solar energy scientist, outlined techniques to capture solar heat during the day in chemical compounds—and release it at night, thus preventing frost and accelerating crop growth.

Solar hot water heaters today are in fairly wide use in several foreign countries and, to a small extent, in Florida, California, and Arizona. Here, in the United States, solar heated and cooled homes have been built in locations ranging from Arizona's Paradise Valley to Massachusetts. A small solar water pump, operating on saturated low-pressure steam generated by a solar boiler, has been perfected by University of Wisconsin scientists. In Tucson, Heidore Macou of the

University of Arizona's department of mechanical engineering is testing a large solar refrigeration unit that may lead to development of a compact solar icebox for desert dwellers. Detailed plans explaining how you can heat your swimming pool with sunshine were published last fall in the AASE newsletter, "The Sun At Work."

Purchasable in some U.S. department stores today are a variety of solar stoves and grills, ranging in price from $16.50 to $30. One advertises it can "cook four large hamburgers in 10 minutes on a clear day." Another promises: "Winter or summer, you can cook in less time than it takes to start a fire." (Incidentally, Indians on the Colorado River Reservation near Parker are now baking tortilla-like edibles on solar cookers provided them by University of Wisconsin anthropolgists testing the sociological effects on such cooking on Indian family life.)

Thus, it's evident that solar energy has been harnessed in many forms—or can be harnassed—for farmers of this generation. Nevertheless, it must be emphasized that most solar devices by necessity are custom made for pilot operation—and therefore quite expensive. E. Lee McLean, executive vice president and general administrator for the AASE, notes that one of the most likely solar applications for Arizona will be converters generating electricity for power in isolated areas. But, he stresses, a power converter would have to be custom-made today at substantial initial cost. Until mass production brings down the price, obviously there won't be many buyers. Conversely, manufacturers hesitate to plunge into mass production without a definite market.

Such impasses typify most solar energy development today. Although the scientific know-how is available, down-on-the-farm applications will have to await significant price breakthroughs on production and marketing fronts. (One major manufacturer has announced its intention to go ahead, regardless. Curtiss-Wright Corp. has invested $1 million in a Princeton, N.J., research laboratory where it will investigate commercial possibilities of various solar energy devices. Already it has announced plans for the ultimate marketing of a solar cooker developed by Dr. Telkas. And currently being tested in the San Joaquin Valley is a solar fruit drier which, it hints, is not too far away from market stage.)

Meanwhile, the AASE is strengthening Arizona's claim as the world's foremost information center on solar energy. Its library and encouragement have provided the impetus for a score of high level symposiums on the subject in recent years. This very month, for example, an AASE advisory council meeting in New York City brings together some 30 authorities on virtually every known aspect of solar energy utilization who will exchange information and ideas re: the present state of solar research. Arizona today ranks first among her sister States in many important economic indices. Thanks to her perennial sunshine and the AASE, a not-too-distant tomorrow's list may add one of the most significant of all: "Number of practical solar energy applications in actual use."

Thirty-five Thousand Dollar Loan Limit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. FLOYD BREEDING
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1959

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial, taken from the Hutchinson News, Hutchinson, Kans., of Monday, May 25, expresses the sentiments of many wheat growers in my area on the $35,000 loan limit on farm commodities. I trust my esteemed colleagues will read this article and realize this limitation will not solve the farm program:

LOAN LIMIT

The Senate has passed and sent to the House a bill which puts a limit on farm commodity loans of $35,000 to any single farmer.

Perhaps this should make us all feel better because a crack has been taken at the big guy in wheat production and other phases of supported agriculture. I suppose it is designed to silence critics of the farm program who point to the handouts to wealthy, large-scale operators as the worst of the sins.

Actually, this is just another phony gesture toward solving the farm problem.

The $35,000 loan limit means that no more than about 18,000 bushels of wheat can be put under loan by a single farmer. Figuring good yields, that means production from no more than 1,000 acres.

One thousand acres isn't a large wheat plot in western Kansas. It is scarcely a practical size with modern machinery.

It is the land, not the people, that produces wheat. It makes no difference whether one man owns 1,000 acres or 10 men own 100 hundred acres each, the surplus will be the same. If Government loans for wheat are legally, morally, and economically right, then they should apply to all wheatgrowers. If they are wrong they should be abolished.

If the Senate wants to limit the amount of wheatland a man can own and operate, it should say so. It should break up the big farms as Castro is doing.

This latest amendment is just another of the half measures which complicate the farm program beyond all solution.

Poison in Your Water—No. 89

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the San Francisco (Calif.) Tribune of August 19, 1958, entitled "Second Line Fails to Halt Overflow."

The article follows:

SECOND LINE FAILS TO HALT OVERFLOW

A city plan to stop sewage overflow near Mission Bay has failed, city officials said today.

New plans to solve the problem were proposed yesterday in an emergency meeting.

The raw sewage is supposed to flow through a trunkline from the rapidly growing northwest portion of the city. The trunkline crosses under the San Diego River bed and ends at the sewage plant near the naval station in South Bay.

FLOW CALLED TOO HEAVY

In recent weeks, the sewage flow has been too heavy for the line, which narrows in diameter as it crosses under the riverbed. The flow has backed up north of the riverbed and oozed out of manholes.

The city tried to correct the situation by building a second line across the riverbed.

Paul Beermann, director of water, engineering, and public works, said the new pipeline across the San Diego river was completed Saturday.

SITUATION IS WORSE

He said city officials had hoped it would solve the problem. But the situation today was worse instead of better, he said.

The bad-smelling sewage oozes out during peak use periods in an area near Pacific Highway and Grand Avenue. It fills a drainage ditch 40 feet wide and a quarter of a mile long.

Another area west of Mission Bay High School also is affected. Sewage has come out of manholes and run along the curb in a residential area.

MOTEL VACANCY TOLD

The stench is sickening, motorists and residents in the area have said.

Edward Lee, who owns a motel near the sewage sump, said he had no guests yesterday for the first time in 18 months.

"One of my guests was sick from the odor and left the motel," he said. "Others say—can't stand the stench. And those who leave won't be back."

The drainage ditch filled with sewage skirts the Mission Bay Park golf course. The mouth of the ditch has been plugged by city workers to keep raw sewage from flowing into Mission Bay.

Beermann said new plans call for rounding off the peak use periods.

TUESDAY WASH URGED

He urged residents of Pacific Beach, La Jolla, Clairemont, and Point Loma to wash on Tuesday instead of Monday.

He said the city will ask the Navy to agree to discontinue putting sewage from Miramar Naval Air Station into the city sewage disposal system. This would cut daily capacity as much as half a million gallons a day, Beermann said.

The water department today said the Navy formerly channeled sewage from Miramar through a primary treatment plant to a large lagoon about 1,000 feet west of the Miramar boundaries.

NAVY PERMISSION SOUGHT

The city is now asking Miramar for permission to reactivate the lagoon. The city would then channel the Miramar sewage to the lagoon.

Other action suggested by Beermann includes inspecting present lines for blockage, studying velocity flow, and checking the efficiency of present pumping plants.

Beermann also urged the study of creating an oxidation pond in Mission Bay.

A John Foster Dulles Diplomatic Academy for Peace Should Be Established as a Lasting Monument to One of America's Greatest Secretaries of State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 27, 1959

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today legislation to provide for the establishment of a U.S. Diplomatic Academy. This bill represents considerable study and thought and was ready for introduction just before the sad events of this week when death came to our great Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles.

Therefore, if a diplomatic academy is created by Congress, I now suggest that the name of this new institution should

be "The John Foster Dulles Diplomatic Academy for Peace."

Eulogies for Mr. Dulles were many but I think that our revered Chaplain, in well-chosen words during his prayer at the opening of the session on Wednesday, stated the purposes for which John Foster Dulles lived and died. I would like to repeat a portion of this prayer but not as a prayer. I repeat it as a guide for the conduct of our American people and our Nation. The Reverend Braskamp said:

Grant that through the discipline of hard experiences and trying circumstances we may learn the needed lessons of patience and perseverance.

May we never yield to moods of defeatism and despair and allow our energies and resources to be weakened and dissipated by fears and anxieties.

Give us the unfaltering confidence that there is a moral and spiritual power in the universe which is working for righteousness and justice, however seemingly frail and feeble our own human efforts and achievements.

Mr. Dulles knew, perhaps better than any living man, the ever present danger that we face from an alien scheme of life. He was worried that we were not devoting our full energy as we should have to fight back against the subversive weapons used by the Leninists of today.

Mr. Dulles commented in the very last two paragraphs of his book "War and Peace":

There may come a time in the life of a people when their work of creation ends. That hour has not struck for us. We are still vital and capable of great endeavor. Our youth are spirited, not soft or fearful. Our religious heritage and our national tradition are not forgotten.

If our efforts are still inadequate, it is because we have not seen clearly the challenge and its nature. As that is more clearly revealed, we shall surely respond. And as we act under the guidance of a righteous faith, that faith will grow until it brings us into the world-wide fellowship of all men everywhere who are embarked on the great adventure of building peacefully a world of human liberty and justice.

Many people in my State of Florida have been thinking very seriously about the effectiveness of the resistance we offer to the world-wide spread of Communism. Perhaps the first forward step was taken at a Kiwanis meeting in Orlando, Fla. This grew into a movement, in turn, for the establishment of a freedom academy and a freedom commission. Companion bills to create these new Government-sponsored movements were introduced by my Florida colleague Mr. HERLONG, and by my fellow Republican Congressman, Mr. JUDD, of Minnesota, whose advice on matters pertaining to foreign affairs is respected on both sides of the aisle in this House. Both Mr. HERLONG and Mr. JUDD, as well as the late Secretary of State, were familiar with a study published in January of 1952 by the Rand Corporation called "The Organizational Weapon," which reported as follows:

The Communists are winning because they have developed a new form of power struggle, a new dimension of political warfare, which makes it possible for them to get to the people in each target nation and to control or manipulate them in ever-increasing numbers in the interest of the Soviets. As long as the Communists can do this and we cannot counteract it, our own diplomacy and aid programs will be largely undercut, while those of the Soviet Union and Red China will achieve success all out of proportion for the money spent.

In principle, I subscribe wholeheartedly to the objective of the Freedom Commission and Academy legislation to counteract the Communist organizational weapons, but I am convinced that we must add the positive action of providing a general diplomatic training school in which our future diplomats can learn in a few years some of what John Foster Dulles learned and techniques in diplomacy he developed in a lifetime. He had no opportunity to go to one source, to one fountainhead of general diplomatic learning, to fit himself for his task. I think we learned our lesson in not providing such training in the great loss that this Nation sustained during the past week. We must move ahead and move ahead now without undue delay.

In my district of Florida, many people have been concerned with the problem of combating the organizational weapons of communism. John Foster Dulles has pointed the way with the accuracy of a bombsight. Without further delay the U.S. Department of State should be authorized to establish a diplomatic school modeled after our service academies. The school can be started at once to counteract the Communists and to train free-world diplomats to carry the message of peace aggressively to all peoples in all lands.

Consequently, I urge that Congress take fast action on this subject and authorize immediately the creation of the John Foster Dulles Diplomatic Academy for Peace.

In the Rand study on the organizational weapon, I find this statement—page 8:

"The proletariat has no other weapon in the fight for power except organization * * * the proletariat can become and inevitably will become a dominant force only because its intellectual unity created by the principles of Marxism is fortified by the material unity of organization which welds millions of toilers into an army of the working class." This stress on organization is the kernel of Lenin's entire viewpoint; it is an emphasis that provides a threat of consistency through the variations in Communist political warfare.

As to our present ineffectiveness, let me quote from an editorial in a recent issue of Life magazine:

The gap lies between our military preparedness at one end and our conventional diplomacy at the other. On this wide and surging front we presently deploy a few smidgens of propaganda, economic aid, and covert intelligence activities. To the Communists, on the other hand, this is the most important front of all. Throughout it, and in depth, they deploy all those techniques of political warfare, both overt and covert, which are the day-and-night work of the world's Communist parties and which were known to Lenin, their inventor, as "the organizational weapon."

This weapon, with and without the help of military threats, is chiefly responsible for all the gains the Communists have made since World War II.

My bill provides that the curriculum "shall include the education and training of students at the Academy concerning all aspects of the international Communist conspiracy, and the education and training of such students in the science of the counteraction to the international Communist conspiracy, to the end that such students can be more useful to their Government in defeating the international Communist conspiracy," but, primarily, it also "shall be designed to meet the present and anticipated needs of the United States for adequately trained officers and employees in the diplomatic service of the United States."

Therefore, my bill encompasses the type of studies to counteract communism that are suggested by the proponents of the freedom academy proposal but it further provides for training in the academy in the basic sciences of diplomacy and it insures that this Nation would have an adequate supply of trained diplomats and consular personnel to serve in one of the most noble and most important professions so far as the long-range future welfare of the United States as well as the free nations and the world is concerned. It has been my belief for some time that there is no excuse, for instance, for sending personnel to a foreign country who are not equipped to speak the language of the country and who do not have a full understanding of the history of the country and the thinking of the people to which they are assigned. The academy, in conjunction with the Department of State and other agencies of the Government, could see that this vacuum is filled through matriculation in the academy. The academy, of course, could also provide for graduate courses in the future for special training when such training is deemed necessary and special jobs have to be done.

The waging of the peace should be our paramount effort and, as such, certainly deserves at least the devotion of equal attention and resources as does the preparation for war. There are presently five service schools—Army, Navy, Air Corps, Merchant Marine, and Coast Guard—to make sure that our trained personnel are available should war be necessary. It is inexcusable to me that an equal effort is not being put forth to prepare for the waging of an equally aggressive battle on the peace front throughout the world.

Airlift and General Gavin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 28, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under consent heretofore granted, I insert a letter I have received from Lt. Gen. James M. Gavin, the wartime hero of the 82d Airborne Division, and until his recent resignation from active duty, the

Director of Research and Development for the U.S. Army. General Gavin's letter comments on my speech in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 20, pages 7816–7823, on the importance to the national defense of building up an air merchant marine. I am grateful for appreciation from a man like Jim Gavin.

The letter follows:

CAMBRIDGE, MASS., *May 26, 1959.*

Hon. CHARLES O. PORTER,
House of Representatives, Congress of the United States, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PORTER: May I congratulate you on your excellent presentation of the airlift problem in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Wednesday, May 20.

As you know, I have written and spoken on this subject extensively over the past 10 years. It takes little in the way of profound understanding of our national defense problems to realize that an ability to react promptly is the essence of survival in this dynamic age, and the key to our capacity to react is, of course, an adequate airlift.

As you know, too, I participated in prolonged discussions of the subject with the Joint Chiefs of Staff. I have testified before congressional committees on the adequacy of our airlift. It is a confusing problem for the public to understand since much comes out of the Department of Defense as a compromise position that ends up saying something usually in the vein, "in keeping with our present planning concept, our airlift is not inadequate." That point of view is usually arrived at by taking everything with wings, regardless of door size, floor strength, transoceanic navigational equipment, etc., and dividing the total of the lift by the probable cargo requirements. The probable cargo requirements may mean everything to everyone since the planning concept may contemplate, just for example, reacting to any situation with a massive thermonuclear exchange; thus, the cargo requirements would be at a minimum. Repeated assurances of the adequacy of airlift presented in such veiled language tends to have a soporific effect on the public attitude toward this very serious problem.

It is terribly important, therefore, that Members of Congress, such as yourself, have the courage and willingness to lay the facts before the people. It is for this reason, therefore, that I congratulate you for having done so. It was a fine presentation of a problem that is compelling in its need for solution.

Sincerely,

JAMES M. GAVIN.

Mr. Dulles: The Century's Greatest Diplomat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 27, 1959

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Star by Mr. Constantine Brown:

[From the Washington Evening Star, May 26, 1959]

THE CENTURY'S GREATEST DIPLOMAT—DULLES' RANK SEEN IN DETERMINATION, UNFLINCHINGNESS, AND SINCERITY

Flags all over the free world are at half staff as a last token of respect for John Foster Dulles. The chroniclers of the future will surely describe him as the greatest diplomat in his strife-torn century.

Mr. Dulles died with his boots on. Although he resigned as soon as he realized he would no longer be able to keep a firm hand on the tiller, he continued to give advice almost until his last breath.

Although in agonizing pain, Mr. Dulles refused until 10 days ago to take strong sedatives lest they interfere with his thinking. He wanted to serve his own country and the free world for as long as it was humanly possible. He accepted powerful pain killers, which kept him in torpor most of the time, only when he realized that his end was at hand and the will of the Almighty was to be accomplished.

People have wondered what made Mr. Dulles tick and why he remained so uncompromising in his fight against international communism. Some said that it was his ambition to run America's foreign relations the way he wanted. Others said that he was just stubborn and paid no attention to constructive criticism. The few intimates who had been at his side for many years knew that it was his strong religious conviction and his godliness which made him impervious to criticism and cajoling. A man who believes in God as deeply as Mr. Dulles did could have no truck with the enemies of religion, the Red atheists.

Mr. Dulles was a pillar of the Presbyterian Church in which he was born and one of the most prominent Protestant laymen in the country. Yet, while a devout Presbyterian, he was not parochial. When his son Avery wanted to join the Catholic Church, Mr. Dulles did not remonstrate. He told him that if he believed that he would thus best serve the Lord he had better follow his convictions. Avery was ordained a few years ago. The father was in the church and the first to congratulate and embrace the new pastor.

Mr. Dulles was able to carry on his man-killing task with devotion, energy, and relentlessness only because he was a devout man of God.

Mr. Dulles' greatness as a Secretary of State came not only from his determination to remain unflinching in the face of the danger from international communism but also from the fact that he was able to carry his sincerity to the rest of the administration and thus become the real policymaker of our foreign relations.

Despite President Eisenhower's affection for some of the White House advisers who did not agree with the Dulles brink policies, he trusted his Secretary of State so implicitly that he seldom went counter to his recommendation. This was in contrast with the position of another chief of the State Department, Cordell Hull. President Franklin D. Roosevelt insisted on being his own Secretary of State. There were occasions after Pearl Harbor when Mr. Hull was informed only much later about certain diplomatic moves made by the Chief Executive with the advice of Harry Hopkins. No such unpleasantness ever occurred during Mr. Dulles' tenure.

There is no doubt that Mr. Dulles made mistakes. Only the timid and innocuous can go through life without blundering. But considering the many facets of our foreign rlations, the credit side is far longer than the debit side of the ledger.

This country has had a number of able Secretaries of State in this century. One of the most outstanding was Charles Evans Hughes. But he ranks far behind as second best to Mr. Dulles. The problems which Mr. Hughes had to face from the turn of the century to the outbreak of World War I were paltry compared with the complexities we have had to face since, particularly in the last 6 years.

In Mr. Dulles term of office the United States not only had to resist the onslaughts of the Russians and Chinese Communist enemies but had to walk a tightrope in relations with our own allies. A person with less determination and real dedication to the cause of the free world than Mr. Dulles could never have succeeded in keeping the existing tenuous alliances together.

There was the great effort by a number of our allies and neutrals to give Communist China a seat in the United Nations. Mr. Dulles worked tirelessly and successfully to prevent this crime against the principles for which the free world is fighting.

In the past the chief adviser on foreign affairs to the White House had to be pretty well conversant with only one sector of the world. Mr. Dulles had to deal simultaneously with increasingly complex problems all over the globe.

And until his last days on earth Mr. Dulles handled his tasks with as much success as a human being was capable of, considering the violent tugs and pulls of the era in which we live. He was accused of being inflexible. He accepted this accusation as a compliment for he understood that under existing world conditions flexibility is synonymous with surrender.

Rigged Prices on Government Contracts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD G. WOLF
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1959

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks I wish to have inserted into the Appendix of the RECORD an article which appears in this week's issue of Labor, a national weekly newspaper.

This article states that over the years identical bids have been submitted for a wide range of items needed by the Federal Government. There seems to be more than a coincidence that this identical bidding of many of our big business firms are not the result of clairvoyance but the result of collusion.

It is significant that the closing sentence states so long as this price fixing continues, the talk about free competitive enterprise is bunk.

The article follows:

THEY TALK COMPETITION, BUT RIGIDLY FIX PRICES

If four men sat down to play poker, and each drew the highest possible hand—a royal flush—kibitzers would conclude that either the age of miracles is still here or the cards were stacked. That, however, would be a less remarkable occurrence than one revealed by a report in the Scripps-Howard newspapers.

The report said a study of the records of the Tennessee Valley Authority shows that, down through the years, manufacturers have submitted identical bids when they were asked to offer prices on products TVA wanted to buy. Each time, all the manufacturers, as many as eight of them at a time, offered exactly the same price.

The report gave numerous examples, including electrical equipment, pipe, cement, steel, copper, and aluminum products, industrial chemicals and many others. The names of the companies doing the identical bidding read like a "Blue Book" of American big business.

Why, in all these cases and over such a long period of time, didn't the prices differ by even as much as 1 cent? Such a situa-

tion can't be explained by any miracle. Obviously, the cards were stacked. In each case, the manufacturers must have agreed among themselves on the price each would offer to TVA. Thus there was no price competition.

Yet these same manufacturers and their propaganda organizations keep telling the American people that this is a land of free competitive enterprise.

TVA, the great public-owned power system, is not the only Government agency victimized by identical bidding. That was pointed out by Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, Democrat, of Tennessee, who heads the Senate Antitrust Subcommittee. He said "we have found that identical bids have been submitted for a wide range of items needed by defense agencies, inflating the prices the taxpayers must pay."

This is nothing new. During World War I, but before Uncle Sam got into that conflict, U.S. steel companies tried to hold up the Navy for high fixed prices on armorplate. Navy Secretary Josephus Daniels smashed that conspiracy by getting bids from British companies, which were able and willing to furnish armorplate at lower prices although they were hardpressed to meet Britain's needs in the war.

During the great depression, steel, cement, and some other kinds of companies invariably offered identical prices when they were asked to bid on materials needed for job-creating public works programs. This got so bad that Interior Secretary Harold L. Ickes delayed such programs in an unsuccessful attempt to save money for the taxpayers by forcing "competitive bidding."

The identical bidding has continued during and since World War II. Times of war, peace, prosperity and depression are all the same to big business price fixers. They never compete on prices, no matter how many unemployed workers may be competing for jobs. The antitrust laws seems to make no difference.

As KEFAUVER and others have pointed out, the administered price system which produces the identical prices is a main cause of inflation and constantly rising prices. Yet the big business fixers try to blame inflation on workers' wages.

So long as this price fixing continues, the talk about free competitive enterprise is the bunk.

The Honorable John Foster Dulles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. BARRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 26, 1959

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include in the RECORD Mr. George E. Sokolsky's column of today. Heretofore, I have attempted to express my belief in the inner force of Mr. Dulles. Mr. Sokolsky has done this in a far greater measure than my poor power:

THE RELIGIOUS MAN

(By George E. Sokolsky)

In the notices concerning John Foster Dulles, emphasis reasonably has been upon his patriotism, his limitless energy, his conspicuous services in the diplomacy of his country since he was a very young man, his enormous salesmanship for the Western alliance.

But there was another and a more fundamental side to John Foster Dulles. He was essentially a man of religion, one who labored because he believed, one who served his country because he served his God.

His father was a Presbyterian minister and the Dulleses were brought up within the moral disciplines of John Calvin and John Knox, believing that prayer is an aid to living and that the moral life is not for externals alone. It had been planned that he, too, should be a minister of the gospel. His grandfather, John W. Foster, had been Secretary of State; his uncle, Robert Lansing, was a lawyer and became Secretary of State in the Wilson Cabinet. Therefore, in the manse in Watertown, N.Y., and later, when his father was professor of theology at the Auburn Theological Seminary, Foster, as he was usually called, was steeped in Bible and in moral law.

However, at Princeton, he decided in favor of the law and devoted himself to that subject and to its international aspects until the emergence of the amoral dictatorship of the 1930's proved that the secular society, uncontrolled by moral idealism, could easily slip back into barbarism. He returned to religious activity and became one of the foremost lay churchmen in the United States.

In search of aggressive, hopeful Christianity, he attended a churchmen's meeting on church and state at Oxford in 1937 and found there the spiritual resurgence that was necessary for him. In 1939, he attended the World Council of Churches at Geneva and thenceforth devoted himself to the union of Protestant sects in the United States.

He traveled about the country preaching the doctrine of a moral order based upon the revelations in Jesus Christ and seeking an international society based upon this moral order. Out of this experience came his "Six Pillars of Peace," which premissed peace upon human rights which were not the product of human decision, to be granted or withdrawn, but which came from God and are therefore eternal and may never be withdrawn in a moral society.

John Foster Dulles' preoccupation with religion knew no bigotry. Within his own family, there were religious differences which he met with breadth and love. His son, Avery, joined the Roman Catholic Church and became a Jesuit priest. The relations between father and son were not impaired by the son's departure from the predestinationism of the Presbyterians to the Thomism of the Catholics.

As a man of God, John Foster Dulles abhorred Marxism. To him, its sociology even more than its economics, was a vulgarization of humanism, a total rejection of divine inspiration, revelation and consent. He could not conceive of a society without moral sanctions and therefore refused to believe that Soviet Russia could maintain the barbaric amorality which marked the earliest phases of communism. And, of course, he proved to be right. For more and more, the Russians themselves renounced their nihilism as hooliganism and now tend to adopt a regimented puritanism to save themselves from the decay which they see in Western libertarian absorption with gaiety and sex.

John Foster Dulles was a moral man. His home life was all that such a man could desire. In another 3 years, he and Mrs. Dulles would be celebrating the golden anniversary of their marriage. It was a warm, friendly household even in the days of his absorption with a private law practice which he cast aside to serve God and his country.

It was in this spirit that he served as Secretary of State. He brought into world diplomacy his concept of Christian ethics. Perhaps that is why, in Soviet Russia, he was abhorred. Christian ethics, the recognition of the inviolability of the contractual oath, are so alien to the Soviet rule of necessity that Mr. Dulles was regarded in that country as their prime enemy. He was. It was Mr. Dulles who arrested the Soviet march forward in the Mediterranean and the southeast Asia areas.

The Tactical Air Command

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS N. DOWNING

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1959

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I would like to pay a brief tribute to one of the services of our Armed Forces.

The U.S. Air Force's Tactical Air Command was recently the recipient of two American aviation's most coveted awards—the Mackay trophy in recognition of its swift deployment of the Composite Air Strike Force to the Far East during the Formosan crisis last year; and the Daedalian trophy for the most effective aircraft accident prevention program in the Air Force during the year 1958. I would like to place the story of these accomplishments in the RECORD with a distinct sense of pride since the headquarters of Tactical Air Command is located in the First Congressional District of Virginia, which I am privileged to represent in this House.

Langley Air Force Base, the Air Force's oldest active establishment and located on Virginia's historic lower peninsula, has played an outstanding role in the air age. Named after Samuel Pierpont Langley, the distinguished astronomer and head of the Smithsonian Institute who did important development work in the days of the infancy of aviation, Langley Air Force Base has seen the era of Billy Mitchell and his revolutionary experiments which proved the vulnerability of shipping to air power, and the establishment of the General Headquarters of the Air Force—the first inkling of the independent air arm. Langley has seen literally dozens of young men who are to be the Air Force's future general officers living upon its historic ground.

Tactical Air Command was awarded the Mackay trophy for Xray Tango, the code name for the command's deployment of the Composite Air Strike Force to the Far East during the Formosan crisis. The citation accompanying the Mackay trophy credits the outstanding airmanship of the strike force crews and the skill and effectiveness of support personnel for the success of the internationally significant operation.

The Mackay trophy, established by the late Charles E. Mackay, a member of the Aero Club of America, is presented annually by the National Aeronautics Association for the year's most meritorious flight. Selection of the recipient of the award is made by the Chief of Staff, U.S. Air Force.

The Daedalian trophy, was established by the Order of the Daedalians, an organization of World War I pilots, and

is awarded annually by the Chief of Staff of the U.S. Air Force to the major air command having the most effective accident prevention program.

Lt. Gen. Dean C. Strother, Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations, U. S. Air Force, presented the trophy at the annual meeting of the Order of the Daedalians at Kelly Air Force Base, Tex., on April 11.

Only major commands of the Air Force which flew more than an annual total of 100,000 hours are considered for the Daedalian trophy. In awarding the trophy, the types of aircraft flown and flying conditions are considered.

Tactical Air Command's flying safety record in the dispatch of many aircraft of various types to the troubled Middle East and Far East were undoubtedly factors which contributed to the award of the Daedalian trophy to Tactical Air Command.

The Composite Air Strike Force concept was developed in a large part at Langley Air Force Base. It was the brainchild of TAC's brilliant commander, Gen. Otto P. Weyland.

When the free world stood again on the brink of war in the Far East, Tactical Air Command had a balanced force of combat aircraft with support elements on the scene 16 hours after the many units had been alerted at various Air Force bases, including Langley.

Thus, in the space of less than 1 day, Tactical Air Command had its Composite Air Strike Force with nuclear striking power on combat patrol in the Far Pacific.

It is very appropriate that these two honors were bestowed on Gen. O. P. Weyland, before his retirement after a long career during which he distinguished himself during World War II and the Korean conflict.

Among my many other friends at Langley Air Force Base, I would like to mention Brig. Gen. Perry B. Griffith. General Griffith is the commander of the 836th Air Division, Langley's parent tactical organization, units of which so ably proved the validity of the Composite Air Strike Force concept twice last year. In the 9 months he has been commander of the air division at Langley he has abundantly demonstrated an outstanding degree of belongingness with the people of the local community.

I would like to mention just one example of the fine relationship which exists between Langley Air Force Base and community upon which it lives—not merely exists. Through the efforts of General Griffith and several members of his capable staff and the generosity of the Air Force Museum at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base in Ohio, a diarama showing the bombing of the Ostfriesland by Gen. Billy Mitchell's bombers was presented to the Virginia War Memorial Museum in Newport News. It was my privilege and pleasure to accept on behalf of the museum, this diarama and exhibit of two bombsights. Thus, this pictorial presentation of one of the most important milestones in the story of air power reposes most appropriately in the unique War Memorial Museum, but a few miles from the place where the event took place.

My True Security: The American Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 28, 1959

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to call attention to a prizewinning essay which was written by Miss Dianne Walljasper of Salem, Iowa, on "My True Security: the American Way."

The thoughts of this high school student, as so eloquently expressed in her essay, should inspire all of us.

MY TRUE SECURITY: THE AMERICAN WAY

How often have I said, "Oh, if only I had a million dollars." Suppose someone did give me a million dollars, tax free, to use at my own discretion. Would I be satisfied with this affluent security? Most likely not. A million dollars is not a sanctuary of security. No matter how many material protectives it might purchase, I would still lack true security.

My true security depends upon me for its existence. The whole concept of my true securty rests squarely upon my own initiative and ambition. I feel truly secure only when I can depend upon myself for my needs. Choosing my own calling, developing my talents, earning my own living, winning and keeping my home sacred from intrusion, accumulating other property that may give protection and surety to myself and my loved ones—these are indications of a true security.

Let me quote what a young African journalist, returning to Africa after his recent visit in America, wrote. "I do not think that the average American appreciates the fact that he is enjoying a standard of living which he and he alone in this world can enjoy. I never knew that the average American had so much. I am not saying that Americans do not deserve the things they have; they do, because they worked hard for them. I wish that there was something I could do to convince the Americans, young and old, that they should go down on their knees every day and thank God for what they have."[1] Looking about me, I see the abundance of material things to which the African journalist referred—automobiles, airplanes, skyscrapers, radio and television sets, fertile farms, and busy factories—all evidences of material securities. However, they in themselves do not make us safe or secure.

I am fortunate to live in a country founded by men who loved freedom and prized it above all earthly possessions. Americans usually accept these freedoms as a matter of existence, seldom realizing that these heroic men and women pledged their lives, their fortunes, and their honor for our present security. Obtaining freedom was their objective and has remained the objective of our Nation throughout its history. Each age must build on to the values of the past, must extend the road a little farther.

Our preoccupation with material successes has threatened to blind us to the value of self-initiative and self-reliance, both indispensable weapons in preserving true security. True security cannot be mine if I am indifferent, lethargic, and timid. I cannot be indifferent about Government affairs—I must get out and vote for the best men if I want to preserve my freedoms, necessary forerunners of security. I must get out and use my brain and brawn if I am to acquire and keep my material independence. Timidity must be pushed into the background and courage brought to the fore—courage to participate in religious, social, and political functions, so that I can learn from others and others can learn from me, so that I can help others and accept their help in return. In this way my own initiative will provide for my future and I can truthfully say, "Keep your million dollars, give me my true security."

[1] Swanstrom, Rev. E. E., letter, Catholic bishops' relief fund, Feb. 20, 1959.

Council of State Chambers of Commerce Rates Pennsylvanians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER M. MUMMA
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 28, 1959

Mr. MUMMA. Mr. Speaker, a chamber of commerce research group has just recently completed and released a study under which they have rated Pennsylvania's 30 U.S. Representatives on their attitude toward labor legislation. The results were carried in the Patriot, which is published at Harrisburg, Pa.

Mr. Speaker, you see many of these studies more and more these days, made by various and sundry groups or organizations.

The newspaper article which tells of their study follows:

[From the Patriot, Harrisburg, Pa., May 21, 1959]

CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION FROM STATE MOSTLY LIBERAL

A chamber of commerce research group has rated Pennsylvania's 30 U.S. Representatives on their attitude toward labor legislation.

Seventeen of them, 15 Democrats and 2 Republicans, are "liberal," says the Council of State Chambers of Commerce, which operates a Washington research-analysis office for various State chambers of commerce, including Pennsylvania's.

Eight, all Republicans, are called conservative.

MUMMA CONSERVATIVE

Greater Harrisburg's two congressmen are at opposite ends of the chamber of commerce scale. Republican Representative WALTER M. MUMMA, of Harrisburg (16th District), is labeled a "conservative," while Democratic Representative JAMES M. QUIGLEY, of Camp Hill (19th District), is classed as a "liberal."

The classifications are being circulated in advance of House debate and voting on opposing labor legislation, including the Senate-passed Kennedy-Ervin bill.

The ratings are reported to be based on a consensus of voting record tabulations and the expert opinions of Washington sources intimately associated with legislation in the labor-management field.

In addition to MUMMA, these Republicans are graded as conservative: Representatives PAUL B. DAGUE (9th District), IVOR D. FENTON (12th District), JOHN A. LAFORE, JR., (13th District), ALVIN R. BUSH (17th District), WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR., (5th District), LEON H. GAVIN (23d District), and CARROLL D. KERNS (24th District).

DEMOS LIBERAL

In addition to QUIGLEY, these Democrats are classed as "liberal": Representatives WILLIAM A. BARRETT (1st District), KATHRYN E. GRANAHAN (2d District), JAMES A. BYRNE (3d District), ROBERT N. C. NIX (4th District), WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR., (5th District), HERMAN TOLL (6th District), all of Philadelphia, and STANLEY A. PROKOP (10th District),

DANIEL J. FLOOD (11th District), GEORGE M. RHODES (14th District), JOHN H. DENT (21st District), FRANK M. CLARK (25th District), THOMAS E. MORGAN (26th District), WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD (28th District), and ELMER J. HOLLAND (30th District).

The two Republicans rated as "liberal": Representatives JAMES G. FULTON (27th District, and ROBERT J. CORBETT (29th District), both of Allegheny County.

WALTER NOT LIBERAL

The only Democrat not termed a "liberal" is Representative FRANCES E. WALTER (15th District), of Easton. He's classified as "middle of the road, tends to liberal."

Two Republicans are given this same chamber of commerce designation. They are Representatives WILLARD S. CURTIN (8th District), and JAMES E. VAN ZANDT (20th District).

Poison in Your Water—No. 90

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 28, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the RECORD an article appearing in the Omaha, Nebr., Evening World-Herald of August 28, 1958, entitled "Sewer Stink Makes Point With Doctors":

SEWER STINK MAKES POINT WITH DOCTORS—MEDICAL SOCIETY GETS REPORT ON SEPTEMBER 9

(By Hollis Limprecht)

A group of doctors and sanitation experts Thursday took a look—and smell—at "one of the city's most pressing health problems."

That was the description used by Dr. Maurice Grier, president of the Omaha-Douglas County Medical Society, to describe raw sewage in the Missouri River.

He headed the delegation which included members of the society's executive committee and the city-county health department.

The seven persons cruised on the Corps of Engineers launch, *Sioux City*, from the Minne Lusa to south Omaha sewers.

NINETEEN SEWER OUTLETS

They saw the river as a great potential recreation spot and smelled it as it is today, choked by sewage from 19 outlets.

Dr. Grier explained the reason for the tour:

"Unless a person can see for himself, he has no idea of the magnitude of the problem. I had no idea there were that many open sewers."

As the launch nosed into the Grace Street sewer (the smell on Abbott Drive), Dr. Matilda McIntire of the health department said:

"The only way to describe this is a stinking, filthy mess."

COVERED WITH OIL

The backwater was covered with a menacing, black oil slick.

Dr. Grier, speaking of treating sewage, said:

"It's going to cost a lot of money but we can hardly ask upstream and downstream cities to clean up without doing it too."

The doctors rode past the Council Bluffs water inlet, downstream from the Minne Lusa sewer.

As the launch passed another sewer, E. L. Edwards, Corps of Engineers host, asked:

"Smell it?"

There was a murmer of disgust.

POTENTIAL RUINED

Dr. McIntire said her family frequently goes boating on the river.

"But we never water ski or swim in it. The river has great potential which is ruined by the pollution."

Dr. Grier said the executive board will report its findings at its September 9 meeting.

Any recommendations on the coming sewer bond issue would be channeled through the health department, he said.

Others on the inspection trip were Drs. Paul Read, Richard Egan, John Grier and Edward K. Connors of the medical society and M. B. Crabill, health department sanitation engineer.

Geneva and Mutual Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 28, 1959

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in today's New York Times, entitled "Geneva and Mutual Security," presents such potent arguments relative to the mutual security bill that I insert it as part of my remarks, as follows:

GENEVA AND MUTUAL SECURITY

At a moment when East and West confront each other in Geneva in a diplomatic showdown of potentially momentous consequences Congress is likewise approaching a showdown on one of our principal weapons in this contest—the mutual security program. This program, for which President Eisenhower has asked $3,930 million for the coming fiscal year, is reaching the end of congressional committee action and will have to be voted upon by Senate and House next month. No doubt some kind of program will be approved, as the need for one is generally acknowledged and there is no real opposition to it. But just what kind of program it will be remains to be seen.

The fact is that after months of discussion the program is still caught in a squeeze play between those who find it too timid and would increase it by billions, and those who find it too large, at least in its present form. Thus Senators FULBRIGHT, KENNEDY, and HUMPHREY are fighting for inclusion in it of a 5-year commitment of $7.5 billion for the development loan fund to be raised by Treasury loans instead of appropriation, which goes far beyond anything requested by the President.

On the other hand, Senator MANSFIELD, while also favoring more emphasis on lending, calls for elimination of defense support and economic assistance grants over the next 3 years as a giveaway that could cause a popular revolt against the whole program.

In line with these arguments the House Foreign Affairs Committee has already slashed the program by $366,800,000, mainly in military aid, while voting an extra $100 million for development loans. And the appropriations committees ax it, as a rule, on principle.

The cut in military aid is particularly ill-advised. This money enables some of our exposed allies, especially in the Far East, to maintain military forces beyond their economic strength. If these forces are cut they may have to be replaced by American forces to check the Communist tide. Military aid may need reorganization, preferably by adopting President Eisenhower's suggestion that since such aid is part of our defense effort it should also be part of our own defense budget. But to cut it at this time could prove disastrous.

The urge for cutting military aid derives from the assumption, popular among Democrats, that in view of the atomic stalemate a hot war is unlikely and that the cold war is rapidly moving toward economic competition, including economic aid. That is true, but only in part and only so long as the military balance is adequate enough to deter Communist aggression. Destroy that balance to our disadvantage, even locally, and a new Korea would immediately loom on the horizon.

This does not mean that military aid should impinge on economic aid. On the contrary, economic aid may well have to be increased to counteract the billion dollars in aid extended by the Communist bloc to 18 selected underdeveloped countries last year. And there are potent arguments for extending such aid in long-term low-interest loans rather than grants. But the whole economic situation in the world is changing, as shown by both the economic prosperity of Western Europe and the replacement of the dollar shortage by a dollar surplus which is taking gold out of this country.

In view of this the administration is rightly skeptical of the proposed long-range commitments, however much it may favor long-range programs. It has, in fact, a most promising substitute in the proposed billion-dollar International Development Association, to which the United States would contribute one-third, with other now prospering free countries contributing the rest.

This project, first proposed by Senator MONRONEY, is due for approval in September. In the meanwhile Congress can do no better than pass the mutual security program as it stands.

Illinois General Assembly Calls for Antilynch Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 25, 1959

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as a result of the disgraceful episode which occurred recently in the State of Mississippi, the Illinois General Assembly unanimously adopted a resolution calling on the Congress to pass an effective antilynch law. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following:

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 44

Whereas the discovery of the body of Mack Charles Parker has confirmed the fears of the Nation that the Mississippi Negro was the victim of a lynch mob which forcibly and contrary to all tenets of law and decency took him from a jail cell where he was awaiting trial for rape; and

Whereas once a Negro is accused of rape in the South, such accusation places Negroes, whether guilty or innocent, in the gravest danger and invariably denies to them a free and impartial trial; and

Whereas the frequent and sordid miscarriages of justice and lynchings of Negroes damage our world prestige at a crucial time when our free society is fighting the critical battle against communism: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 71st General Assembly of the State of Illinois, the Senate concurring herein, That Congress be respectfully requested to enact

an effective antilynch law so that lynchings will be ended in the South, and that suitable copies of this resolution be forwarded by the Secretary of State to each Member of the U.S. Congress elected from Illinois.

Adopted by the House, May 5, 1959.

PAUL POWELL,
Speaker, House of Representatives.
CLARENCE BOYLE,
Clerk, House of Representatives.

Concurred in by the Senate, May 6, 1959.

JOHN WM. CHAPMAN,
President of the Senate.
EDWARD E. FERNANDES,
Secretary of the Senate.

Achieving World Understanding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 28, 1959

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I direct your attention to some significant remarks made recently by Sir Kenneth Coles, president, International Society for the Welfare of Cripples, Sydney, Australia, at the annual luncheon meeting of the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped.

As you know, our old colleague, Gen. Melvin J. Maas, is chairman of this committee and is doing a splendid job.

Here are Sir Kenneth's remarks:

If we are to achieve a wider degree of international goodwill, and those who are working for it would be unwise to ignore the fact that leaders of a number of nations are making no efforts to foster such goodwill in any real sense, then we must work in those fields where there is a common aim, and where worldwide cooperation is acceptable.

The fields most widely accepted are probably those of the arts and medicine, and of these, physical medicine is particularly so at this time. As healing and preventive medicines have prolonged and saved lives, physical medicine is becoming an economic necessity, if lives so saved are to be useful and not a burden on society.

In all fields of medicine, we have seen a revolution take place—a revolution of greater magnitude and having a greater impact on world economics than any previous upheaval in any time.

You, in this country, have been one of the ringleaders in this revolution—you have fostered its development, and have set up cells in foreign countries—you have infiltrated your experts in rehabilitation into their administration and you have invited their citizens to come to the United States of America to learn the most effective ways of continuing this revolution with greater success.

As a member of the International Society for the Welfare of Cripples, I am proud indeed to have had a small part in it. As the representative of a nation benefiting greatly, I am most grateful to the organizations and institutions who have made it possible for us to develop our rehabilitation services in the South Pacific to a point where we can now give assistance in our turn to countries around us, and who are less fortunate than we.

It must be recognized that so great is the desire for improved facilities in new countries, that any study which is conducted in the Western World will be watched with interest; and any conclusions that are reached will be accepted, and form the basis of action over a wide area.

This is particularly so in regard to placement in industry because, of course, the whole concept of rehabilitation falls down if the patient fails to be acceptable in employment of some kind.

The International Society for the Welfare of Cripples now has 36 countries who are members and others who are affiliated, so that its work is welcomed by voluntary societies in nearly 50 nations.

In many of these countries, rehabilitation is a relatively new concept, and they are desperately short of trained men and women to carry on what are really only skeleton programs.

When we can supply some trained people and then have their graduates come to Western countries for practical experience, then can real progress be made. This is the pattern of international affairs today—those with the greatest need have the least resources to cope with their problems.

During my term of office, I hope to visit many of our members, but one drawback of living in Australia is that one has to make an initial journey of about 5,000 miles before getting anywhere at all.

However, I have visited more than a dozen nations so far, and in every one of these have been impressed with the selfless devotion of the people who give their lives to the work of helping the handicapped and their determination to provide the best services, even if they have to beg, borrow, or appropriate by any means what they require.

We who are conquering polio and tuberculosis insofar as resultant crippling is concerned, and who have almost forgotten that leprosy is still a cruel scourge, are also apt to overlook the fact that in over half the world these diseases are not decreasing.

Shortly before I left home, the Department of Health of the State of New South Wales asked me if our Society for Crippled Children could take over three homes which they were closing for lack of patients; two previously used for tuberculosis patients, and one for children with heart ailments. My reply was that our society was looking for a user for one of our polio hospitals, as we had no fresh cases of residual paralysis from polio for nearly 12 months.

To go from this situation, as I did last year, and within 24 hours traveling northward from Sydney, I find myself being shown over the orthopedic wards of a hospital where not only the beds set as close as possible, and both sides of the corridors lined with beds from end to end, but in extreme cases two small patients were sharing a single hospital bed—I saw long queues of people waiting to share the wholly inadequate services, and doctors and therapists working long hours. I saw children numbering 40 to a room being given exercises by their mothers, as they knelt beside them on a mat, the physical therapist walking up and down the center of the room instructing them and spreading her skill 40 fold in an endeavor to cope with an impossible task.

These modern heroes and heroines of physical medicine look with hope to the International Society to use its influence to get them more equipment, and to train their helpers to become expert in our methods. Can we afford not to help them to the utmost?

In terms of time and travel, they are not far away. This time last week I was working at my own desk in Sydney, and I have stopped off for 3 days en route. If our generation acquires immunity to such cruel cripplers as polio and tuberculosis, dare we take the risk of allowing them to flourish in lands that are no longer remote corners of the earth, but close in time and in frequency of visits by your people and mine?

The program being steadily developed is best implemented by the visits of top-ranking men from the United States and Europe, who will advise on the setting up of clinics and centers, and there develop locally men and women who can be brought to see and be trained at the best centers.

Over a wide area, this has been, or is being done, but it needs an increasing awareness on the part of governments that handicapped people can be an asset and not a burden on the community.

In so many countries I have visited, I have found the same pattern. Centers have been established—men have been cured or their disease arrested, and then started on vocational training courses. Finally comes the attempt to get a job. In Hong Kong a vocational officer at a center for the blind said to me, "So far, I have not placed one blind man in a permanent job—only our own workshop with very limited scope gives some occupation; who wants a blind man with a million refugees seeking employment?"

In another city, I saw the beautiful craftsmanship of 450 lepers spread out for sale, and I said to the supervisor that such work must surely find a ready market. The answer was, "Who will buy the work of a leper?—we cannot sell it."

In an African city it was the same story—"Who will employ a disabled native when three fit men are waiting for every job?"

The problem of employment as you have been examining it here on a national plane, has some quite difficult aspects, some of which do not yield easily even to the most patient and understanding approach. On the other hand, where the handicapped person can acquire a high degree of skill, there is undoubtedly a sympathetic reception and an assured place for him in industry.

But the problem is so diverse, and so individual that we cannot simplify it even in this way. For every 100 unemployed handicapped persons, there are 100 problems, separate and individual, to be studied and worked on, if success is to be permanently achieved.

Looking at the figures presented to the Commonwealth Rehabilitation Committee of my own country up to December 31, 1958, I find of those placed in employment after rehabilitation, over 40 percent were in skilled and semiskilled trades; and over 30 percent in clerical and administrative positions. Only 25 percent went into unskilled and rural jobs. This was over a survey of 17,671 persons accepted for rehabilitation, out of which 11,087 were placed in work. But while this may be some cause for satisfaction, there is another figure—the balance of 5,141 whose rehabilitation was canceled. While, no doubt, some of these obtained jobs as lift drivers and watchmen, there still remains the specter of some 5,000 people, considered fit candidates for rehabilitation, whose only resource is the humiliating one of the invalid pension—and we are a country with relatively little unemployment—less than 2 percent of the total work force.

If we find this problem of employment of the handicapped in our countries difficult of solution, how much more so is it in those lands where there is a fast growing population, almost devoid of industry other than that related to food and clothing?

You can well understand how the reports, the results of careful surveys, and the recommendations made are sought for and studied with keen interest and hope in so many lands. Around the world, linked in a common desire to help their fellows, I have found men and women who think the same thoughts, have the same hopes, and desires, and work toward the same goal—that of providing adequate services for the handicapped.

We do not have to ask for their good will or understanding, nor they to seek ours, for we already have the closest ties, the ties of

service. Surely here is one path to the hearts of men and the brotherhood of nations—one clear way in which we may work toward world understanding.

John Foster Dulles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 25, 1959

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include editorials from the May 25, 1959, editions of the Flint Journal of Flint, Mich., and the State Journal of Lansing, Mich. They are not only astute evaluations of John Foster Dulles, but they typify the loss which free peoples everywhere feel at his death. The editorials follow:

[From the Flint (Mich.) Journal, May 25, 1959]

CHRISTIAN IDEALS GUIDED DULLES

John Foster Dulles, America's voice in world affairs for more than 6 years, has left behind for history to assess a record of devoted public service and unrelenting adherence to morality in relations between nations.

Only the passage of time will correctly determine whether Mr. Dulles was a great Secretary of State. His accomplishments and his failures must be weighed in relation to the effect they have and will have on world affairs.

There are those who already contend Mr. Dulles will be ranked in history as one of our great Secretaries. Former President Herbert Hoover is one. At the time of Mr. Dulles' resignation from the Cabinet, the former President had this comment:

"We have had many great Secretaries of State. History will rank Secretary Dulles among the greatest of them—and in my view the highest of them all."

President Eisenhower, whose personal affection for Mr. Dulles and faith in his judgment in foreign relations was well-known, contributed a glowing appraisal of his Cabinet officer the day he announced the late Secretary's resignation:

"I personally believe he has filled his office with greater distinction and greater ability than any other man our country has known—a man of tremendous character and courage, intelligence and wisdom."

His critics claimed the qualities which pleased his supporters detracted from his abilities and made more difficult attainment of peace in the world. They accused him of creating crises, of failing to develop imaginative new policies, of "brinkmanship."

The criticism which he endured clamly during his years in the Cabinet might well have been more political than real. That was evidenced when his last illness became known. Some of his severest critics here and abroad expressed sincere regret that America was losing his services in the international arena.

Senator WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, Arkansas Democrat, was a frequent critic of Mr. Dulles. Yet the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee once said he was "moved to admiration by the spectacle of (Mr. Dulles') courage" as well as his "unrelenting purpose of seeking peace."

Even the sharpest critics of Mr. Dulles conceded that America seldom had had a more hard-headed, resourceful representative in world negotiations. Soviet leaders knew those qualities and didn't like them. The Russians denounced him often and bitterly.

The Kremlin's denouncements of Mr. Dulles during the years they had to deal with him could be the greatest tribute to his success in frustrating the expansionistic objectives of world communism.

Mr. Dulles' record in blocking Russia and Red China is substantial. During his 6 years directing U.S. foreign policy, communism was checked in many places.

Once-skeptical Asians are glad today that Mr. Dulles held firm when Peiping threatened Quemoy and Matsu. Since Tibet, they see the face of communism as Mr. Dulles saw it.

Whether or not one agreed with the international policies Mr. Dulles followed, there was no question of his devotion to the ideal of world peace and his physical courage in unrelenting pursuit of that objective.

Earlier this year, when the cancer which caused his death was adding to his pain and reducing his stamina, he went to Europe to discuss with our allies the Western position in the Berlin crisis.

Before he left for home and a return to the hospital, he had whipped an agreement into preliminary form and obtained unanimous agreement on the program which was presented at the Foreign Ministers Conference at Geneva May 13.

Mr. Dulles was probably one of the world's most traveled men. He believed in personal diplomacy and was willing to go anywhere if his presence could advance the cause of peace. He kept up those travels even when illness undermined his strength. He traveled a fantastic 560,000 miles hunting a way to peace.

His great strength in foreign affairs and his world prestige was due in considerable part to his intellectual firmness and his dedication to the ideal that Christian principles should be adhered to in the international arena. He believed morality among nations would insure peace.

If all the nations some day accept and adhere to the principles which Mr. Dulles advocated so vigorously, this world will have benefited immeasurably from his extensive participation in international events.

[From the Lansing (Mich.) State Journal, May 25, 1959]

JOHN FOSTER DULLES

In the death of John Foster Dulles, America and the rest of the free world have lost a courageous and devoted leader in the search for an enduring peace with freedom and justice for all mankind.

A saddened Nation is paying tribute to the great American who died in its service and as it does so it is joined by all people who cherish liberty and peace.

In the six crisis-marked years he had served as Secretary of State, Mr. Dulles worked tirelessly and with great personal sacrifice for the causes represented by his country's basic foreign policy of peace with justice and honor.

When cancer forced his retirement from the high office in which he had served with selfless dedication to the vital tasks assigned him by President Eisenhower, Mr. Dulles continued to exhibit the courage and thoughtfulness for others which were characteristic of his long career of public service.

Commentators have said that only the events of the future can give the final answer to the question of whether the policy that he pursued was wise.

But no matter how historians of the future evaluate his policy in the light of unfolding events, Mr. Dulles already has won a secure and honored place in history as a valiant defender of freedom against the expansion of Communist tyranny.

While there were those who believed that Mr. Dulles was too rigid in his relations with the Communists, what some criticized as inflexibility was widely supported as the degree of firmness essential to the preservation of freedom in the face of the menace of Communist imperialism.

Many of Mr. Dulles' fellow Americans who had once commented humorously on his far-flung travels now see the thousands of miles he had traveled in the performance of his duties as one of the measures of his devotion to his country and to the principles for which it stands before the world.

Death has deprived free men of John Foster Dulles' active services but there is good reason to believe that his example as a champion of freedom will continue to serve as an inspiration as long as the struggle between freedom and tyranny continues.

During the 6 years John Foster Dulles served as President Eisenhower's strong right arm and as the spokesman for the American people in the councils of world diplomacy, the defenses of freedom have been strengthened, largely through his tireless leadership in behalf of the principles in support of which the nations of the free world stand united.

A few days before Mr. Dulles' death, the President bestowed upon him the medal of freedom—the Nation's highest civilian decoration. No American has been more deserving of that high award.

Mr. Dulles has earned the lasting gratitude of his fellow Americans and of all who love freedom and peace.

It is most fitting that the great American who served his country with such deep devotion both as Secretary of State and in his country's uniform in World War I is to be buried in Arlington National Cemetery, there to rest in honored glory among the Nation's heroic dead.

Armenian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 27, 1959

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, independence and freedom had been the national aspiration of the Armenian people suffering under alien conquerors in their homeland. For centuries they had cherished this dream; though well aware of the almost insuperable difficulties in attaining their national goal without effective aid from friends and sympathizers abroad, still they nursed the idea as part of their spiritual nourishment. The more they were oppressed by their overlords, and the more they suffered under unbearable conditions, the more fervently they clung to the idea, and only in its realization they sought their salvation. And toward the end of the First World War, at a terrible cost in human lives, they had their reward within their grasp.

During that war about 1 million Armenians had lost their lives in Turkish massacres, but many hundred thousands who survived that holocaust escaped to the Caucasus, joined their kinsmen in a northeast corner of historic Armenia there, and proclaimed their independence on May 28, 1918. That was 41 years ago, and since then the independence thus attained has vanished into the dreamland again. After enjoying the

sweetness and blessings of free and independent life, unhappy Armenians were to fight for their freedom in a hopeless, life-and-death struggle against both Turkish nationalist forces and Communist Russia's Red army. The unfortunate end came early in December of 1920, when the country was overrun by the enemy forces, part of it was retained by the Turks while in another part a Soviet type of government was instituted under the direct control of the Kremlin.

Today for more than 38 years the Soviet regime rules over Armenia as one of its 16 constituent republics. There all vestiges of freedom are banned, and collectivization as well as regimentation has been in full swing. The people have been enduring under this totalitarian dictatorship and at the same time hoping and praying for their freedom. On the anniversary celebration of Armenian Independence Day, we echo their genuine feelings and hope that they will be rewarded in their expectation.

Award Presented to C. O. Watts for Flood Control Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD DAVIS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 28, 1959

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, Mr. C. O. Watts of Rougon, La., was recently presented a Department of the Army Certificate of Appreciation by Maj. Gen. William A. Carter, president of the Mississippi River Commission.

Mr. Watts has been one of the most intelligent, faithful and effective leaders in the whole program of flood control in the lower Mississippi Valley. A man of unimpeachable integrity, motivated by unselfish patriotic impulses, he has been a tower of strength as the Corps of Engineers has approached this problem of controlling the waters of the Mississippi as they sweep to the gulf.

I am including in this statement a newspaper account which shows the language of the citation, signed by Hon. Wilber M. Brucker, Secretary of the Army, and Maj. Gen. Emerson C. Itschner, Army Chief of Engineers.

CERTIFICATE OF APPRECIATION, CITATION PRESENTED TO C. O. WATTS FOR WORK DONE IN INTEREST OF FLOOD CONTROL—MAJ. GEN. WILLIAM CARTER GIVES AWARD IN BEHALF OF DEPARTMENT OF ARMY

At a public hearing conducted aboard the steamer *Mississippi* in New Orleans, C. O. Watts, of Rougon, was presented a Department of the Army Certificate of Appreciation by Maj. Gen. William A. Carter, Vicksburg, Miss., president of the Mississippi River Commission.

The certificate was signed by Wilber M. Brucker, Secretary of the Army, and Maj. Gen. Emerson C. Itschner, Army Chief of Engineers. It was the first flood control award given in Louisiana.

CORPS CITATION

Written on the citation was:

"For distinguished service to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers from 1912 to 1959 as a member and president of the Atchafalaya Basin Levee Board, Mississippi Basin Levee Board, Mississippi Valley Flood Control Association, Louisiana Association of Levee Boards, and as a private citizen.

"His outstanding accomplishments in maintaining flood control structures and carrying out other obligations of local interests essential to the floodproofing of the lower Mississippi Valley, and his knowledge and judgment and unselfish cooperation were of benefit to the corps in its river and harbor and flood-control misison in the lower Mississippi Valley.

"Through such cooperation he has helped to gain for the Corps of Engineers and the Army great prestige and public support."

Watts has been with the Atchafalaya Levee Board since 1925, under eight State administrations. Under his guidance, the board was active in the flood of 1929, 1937, 1945, 1950, and, when he was not on the board, he assisted the Army corps in the 1949 flood.

What Do We Mean by Free Speech?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 28, 1959

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, the speech at the banquet celebrating the 50th anniversary of the school of journalism, University of Missouri, was given by the distinguished author of the best seller, "Only in America," who is also a widely syndicated columnist for the Scripps-Howard Newspaper Alliance, Mr. Harry Golden.

Mr. Golden, a southerner, spoke on the subject of free speech.

I include, for the information of my colleagues, the text of Mr. Golden's speech:

WHAT DO WE MEAN BY FREE SPEECH?

(Address delivered by Harry Golden, of Charlotte, N.C., at the banquet celebrating the 50th anniversary of the school of journalism, University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo., May 8, 1959)

What do we mean by free speech?

We know that if we can explain it we will at the same time explain the concept of democracy of freedom, the entire concept of our Western culture.

We also know that free speech is a license of some sort. It is not a complete license. The American courts have helped us in this determination. Free speech, said Oliver Wendell Holmes, does not give us the privilege of yelling fire in crowded theaters when there is no fire, nor does free speech give us the privilege to slander our neighbor, nor even our enemy. Free speech does not entitle us even to slander the enemy of society.

By free speech, I suppose, we mean the unimpeded dissemination of ideas: ideas unimpeded by fear of physical punishment. Speech without personal punishment. The right to express ideas that run contrary to popular opinion.

Ideas that run contrary to public opinion have always been expressed. Free speech aids such ideas; but these ideas are not necessarily the greatest ideas expressed by men. Indeed, the greatest ideas are usually those which only advance the ideas of the majority by slight modification. Free speech also means that the majority has the right to override and ignore certain ideas.

Contrary opinion has always been with us. Athens did not have such a thing as free speech, yet it produced great thinkers, most of whom at one time or another went against the grain of the majority. These thinkers were willing to pay the penalty, sometimes death, sometimes banishment, sometimes silence. Yet there were other thinkers who expressed equally great ideas with which the majority found immediate accord. The poet Heisod issued the first agricultural pamphlets. Aeschylus condemned the barbarity of the Persians and was applauded for it and wrote an undying drama. Aristophanes teased the state religion and audiences lionized him. But there were some who suffered. There were those who did not agree. There were traitors and doublecrossers and tax-dodgers, and, of course, honest men.

The Achilles heel of Athens was the fact that though she could produce great men, she could not tolerate them. This should not be a surprising fact: the Inquisition burnt the works of Dante and eminent Englishmen, thought William Blake was only a looney printer. Athens is the inventor of this Achilles heel.

Its great thinkers spoke out. Socrates did not fear punishment. He founded philosophy. "The unexamined life is not worth living," he told his listeners. And this was a profound concept and founded Western philosophy but it was also unpopular and Socrates insisted on paying the penalty. He drank the hemlock. Aristotle didn't worry about punishment either. But when Alexander began conquering the world—Alexander the young prince whom Aristotle had tutored—Aristotle fled Athens because of the Athenians. He was afraid they would make him drink the hemlock, too. And he did not want the Athenians to sin against philosophy.

The gamble worked for St. Thomas, but not for Galileo. When Galileo begged the bishop to look in the telescope and see for himself that the earth revolved about the sun, the bishop said he wouldn't dare. If he saw what Galileo said he'd see, he knew the devil would have put it there. When Galileo climbed to the top of the Tower of Pisa and dropped two objects of different weight to prove that they fell with equal speed, all he did was prove to himself that the physics of his day was wrong but he proved to his contemporaries only that he was wicked.

There was a problem. Free speech was not a concept. The dissemination of ideas was a struggle rather than a privilege. Plato did not talk about politically free speech—only the philosopher had political freedom, nor did Aristotle. Galileo did not beg for it. Men believed they had to speak truth. They did not believe there was any doubt in ascertaining truth. They did not suspect that different truths need different sanctions. Or that truths can cause war.

What changed this was the invention of the printing press. This became a severe problem. St. Thomas and Maimonides and Luther agreed on the truth of a monotheistic God, but now it was not a parochial audience which would hear them out—it was everybody. Monotheistic God or not, they disagreed. How can you sanction truth? And philosophers for the first time realized, you can't. You can only sanction speech.

Free speech in the beginning served the interests of the theologians and the philosophers. Martin Luther and Descartes. This does not mean that the rest of society was unaffected. Oh, indeed not. There was an aristocratic society with a new middle class growing, there were commercial ideas in direct conflict to the tenets of the Catholic Church and this battle was being fought in the higher realms of books and sermons. After a century of burning bodies at the stakes, of wars, of tortures, society began to realize the need for speech without punishment. Punishment or not, speech was not stopped. And so the philosophers began to dedicate themselves to a minute analysis of free speech as an abstract concept. And the

classic statement on free speech was finally developed at the beginning of the 19th century. John Stuart Mill in his pamphlet "On Liberty" offered three incontrovertible reasons for allowing free speech. They were: (1) You may be wrong: free speech will eventually let you hear the truth and set you right; (2) you may be only partially right: free speech will correct your errors; (3) you may be totally right: free speech will let you hear the contrary view and confirm your truth.

It is quite obvious that the modifications the U.S. courts have made in free speech since Mill have always been to enlarge and define speech—really to give a better shake to the minorities. But I think it is a mistake to imagine and involve in free speech the idea anti-Semitism or anti-Negro feeling, an antisubversion. Free speech should be at the service of the majority, too. We must emphasize the idea that free speech is a pro-American idea.

It has been the standard procedure of publicists and spokesmen for minority groups to proceed with a long recital of the accomplishments and contributions the minorities have made to free speech. But here, let me be the first to extend congratulations to what is known as "the majority" which usually sits back and listens to these recitals with good taste and with gallantry, and with not too much cynicism, I may add.

I have often thought that it is a pity that "the majority" which no longer needs to prove itself has denied us, "the minorities," a recital of its own accomplishments and contributions. It was precisely the Protestant majority in Virginia and the Carolinas after all, which sanctioned free speech and made it a cornerstone of the American democracy. And the accomplishments and contributions of the minorities are a reflection of the culture which surrounds them and it would serve as a fitting reminder and a greater awareness if we emphasized the part "the majority has played in establishing this great American free society. I hope therefore that you do not consider me presumptuous if I based my theme on the contributions of "the majority" to the American idea and to the principle of free speech.

I'll go back no further than the Reverend William Tennant of South Carolina who stood at the constitutional convention of South Carolina 3 years before our establishment of the Federal Constitution, for the most important principle of this American idea—the separation of church and state. Several of the delegates told the Reverend Tennant that he had nothing to worry about—that mid-18th century America was a child of the enlightenment and with men like Jefferson, Hamilton, Madison and Mason around there was little to worry about indeed. But the Presbyterian Reverend Tennant knew better. He said the air can change and so can the hearts of men. It would be a better idea to put it on the books: and so this wonderful man together with Mr. Pinckney and Mr. Rutledge and General Gadsden helped remove forever the civil and political disabilities that had been imposed in this society on those groups that did no adhere to the majority religious faith. It was the Protestant majority who established this principle of the American idea—that the differences of ideas is the greatest of all virtues and that it must not generate anger or division.

Is it not this very principle that we seek when we try to define free speech? The separation of church and state is the single greatest aid to free speech, which leads us to a definition of the civilized man, if I may make so bold, the man who respects new ideas, who respects the opposition, and who respects himself.

We often over-emphasize the equality of man in our society when the basic idea of America really means the acceptance of man. It is by accepting men and hearing him out, that we may finally achieve a wide and free dissemination of ideas—because we allow for such a thing as different men and different ideas.

The Dutch in Holland did not produce a Franklin D. Roosevelt; nor did the Irish in Ireland produce an Alfred E. Smith. Nor did the Germans in Germany produce such humanists as Wendell Wilkie and Bob Wagner. It was not the change in geography that paved the way for these men of genius. When they left the country of their origin they encountered here—this American idea—the meaning of Reverend Tennant of South Carolina and the early Virginians.

It is no coincidence that the Jewish people made their greatest contribution to civilization after the ghetto walls had been destroyed. They had built around themselves in the ghetto walls the fair ramparts of culture. In the dark ages when millions of people lived and died without ever having seen a written word, nearly every Jew could read and write. Yet it was not until the door was opened, opened upon the distractions of the world, but a world where some ideas could be disseminated, that the Jews produced a Spinoza, a Mendelssohn, a Disraeli, a Brandeis, and an Einstein.

The Parsis, who like the Jews have been contemporaneous with nearly all of recorded history had long centuries ago developed a culture of the highest order; yet in segregated isolation they sat in almost total darkness until the beginning of the 19th century when the door was opened to human relationships—to the free interchange of ideas with other men. They proceeded then to add immeasurably to the wealth and to the culture of Bombay and India.

With over two centuries of free speech behind us we have learned this: where there is resistance to the freedom of human relationships the resistors lose as much as the resisted, which is the great pity, and in the science of these human relationships, we must first discard the scare words. The interchangeability of ideas and the opportunity for all to burgeon out for themselves all that is within them has nothing whatever to do with what a man believes, but what he resists. Some men want to forward and advance their own ideas and impede no others: some men want to make rigid their own ideas and impede all others.

The greatest weapon we have in the fight to eliminate prejudice is free speech. The guarantee of free speech in the South has done more to aid the Negro in his cause than anything else. For it is the majority who speak now and question, just as it is the majority who will enforce integration.

Statement and Letter Re Admiral Strauss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1959

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for last Monday, May 25, 1959, there appeared the remarks of Representative WOLF, from the State of Iowa, in which he inserted a Drew Pearson article entitled "Textile Men Get Strauss 'Payoff'."

Normally I would not waste the time to take notice of a Drew Pearson article. Mr. Pearson's disregard for truth has been aptly characterized by Presidents of the United States in strong language. In this case I feel obligated to make reference to the introduction of the intemperate article by the gentleman from Iowa.

I doubt whether the gentleman from Iowa has even met Mr. Strauss; yet he blandly accuses Mr. Strauss of a lack of high principle and of being a dealer in falsehood, smear and chicanery. Apparently this characterization springs from what he recently has read or heard about the 1956 hearings and reports on the second supplemental appropriation bill, 1957.

I suggest to the gentleman from Iowa, that before he got too incensed he should have looked at the RECORD. In that connection, I ask that the statement issued by five minority members of the Public Works Subcommittee at the time the hearings were released in July 1956 be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

I also ask that a letter written to Senator MAGNUSON on May 23, 1959, by Mr. TABER, ranking minority member of the Appropriations Committee; Mr. JENSEN, ranking minority member of the Public Works Subcommittee, and three other members of the Appropriations Committee, including myself, be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

I hope the gentleman from Iowa will read these, as I am sure he will then realize there is no basis for his defamation of such a dedicated public servant as Admiral Strauss.

The statement and letter follow:

STATEMENT BY MESSRS. TABER, JENSEN, ANDERSEN, PHILIPS, AND HAND

The printed hearings of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Public Works, just released, included testimony on the fiscal 1957 budget requests of the Atomic Energy Commission. It offers a startling example of political "doctoring" of an official record.

As released to the press, the document misrepresents some portions, and distorts other portions, of the actual testimony.

For example, in the committee room, Chairman CANNON said to Chairman Strauss of the Atomic Energy Commission (as we recall the statement, which can easily be verified by the original transcript) something like this:

"Mr. Chairman, your testimony has been satisfactory. You have a difficult and complicated problem. You are serving one of the most important interests of our times and apparently you are doing it as efficiently and as expeditiously as we have reason to expect."

Mr. CANNON also complimented the Commission on the manner "in which it has handled its budget and on its dealings with the committee, and especially the economical way in which it approached the whole subject."

In the politically edited version of the hearings, the above statements by the committee chairman have been removed, along with Mr. Strauss' responses. Unwarranted remarks, derogatory to Admiral Strauss, Dr. Libby, or other AEC witnesses, were kept in the hearings. The minority members objected frequently to the arbitrary and often discourteous treatment of witnesses representing the majority views of the Commission.

The record has been juggled to give false weight to testimony appealing to the bias of the committee majority while other testimony has been omitted from the printed record. In at least one instance, the remarks

of a minority member of the subcommittee were stricken without his permission.

During a colloquy between the committee chairman and Mr. Strauss (pp. 63–71 of part II of the printed record) the committee chairman asked Mr. Strauss to give the clerk a statement, representing the view of a majority of the Atomic Energy Commission on the subject of the Gore-Holifield atomic power acceleration bills which Mr. Strauss wanted to place in the record. This statement is omitted from the printed record. A long statement representing the one-member minority view on the Commission is included in full. It is interesting to note that this one member, who now advocates a crash program, which testimony shows to be inimical to the best interest of the Nation, was himself opposed to the extended Federal financing program idea in January. Through the entire hearings he was given space and recognition, as opposed to the three members of the Commission present who did not support this crash program and the absent member who was reported to agree with these three. In this Nation, a vote of four to one is presumed to represent a decision. In the committee, the politically inspired opinion of one Commissioner seems to influence the committee majority.

Readers of part 2 of the hearings will be interested to observe the headings of various paragraphs and to compare them with the indexed hearings. Reference from the index to the pages indicated will fail to disclose the listed headings in many instances; in turn, a great many of the actual headings will not be in the index. Many of the nonindexed headings are both political and inaccurate.

These hasty examples are sufficient to show that the printed record is not a true account of what transpired in the hearings of the Atomic Energy Commission before the Appropriations Subcommittee.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., May 23, 1959.

The Honorable WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: You are in receipt of a letter from Chairman CLARENCE CANNON, of the House Appropriations Committee, in which he states: "In denying the truth and accuracy of the printed hearing record of the House Appropriations Subcommittee, Mr. Strauss is implicitly impugning the integrity of the subcommittee and the full committee of which the subcommittee is a part." We are members of that committee. We emphatically disagree with Mr. CANNON.

It was not Secretary Strauss who at the recent Senate hearings on his confirmation initiated criticism of the 1956 printed record of the hearings. It was 15 members of the Appropriations Committee, including us, who signed a critical minority report back in 1956. Secretary Strauss at the recent hearings before the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, in response to questions by Senators, and in defending himself, quoted from our report. Secretary Strauss had every right in the world to refer to this public document as evidence in support of his defense against unjust attacks and conclusions in respect to his public service.

The following is what was uncovered in 1956 in connection with this matter.

The events in question occurred as a result of hearings before a Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee of the House in the 84th Congress during June and July 1956 and the charges made by Mr. CANNON and the defense by Mr. Strauss center around the accuracy of the printed report of the hearings at that time.

Fifteen members of the Appropriations Committee signed a minority report which began as follows:

"We find ourselves unable to support a report, the conclusions of which are not in accord with the testimony. We cannot approve printed hearings from which pertinent testimony has been omitted, or which has been molded to meet the desire to make a case, irrespective of the evidence (the words "irrespective of the evidence" are italicized) in favor of public power from atomic resources."

The fact is that the printed hearings did omit material testimony and did include material which on its face proves the charge of the 15-member report that the printed hearings are not a factual account of the testimony.

For example, pages 41, 42, and 43 of part I of the printed hearings indicate that Chairman CANNON introduced on June 13, 1956, a letter into the record at that point which in part reads as follows:

"I direct your attention to pages 9181 through 9188 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Wednesday, June 13, wherein this advertisement is severely criticized and pointedly ridiculed by Senator CLINTON ANDERSON, of New Mexico, chairman of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy."

As the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for June 13, 1956, was not available until the next day, June 14, the letter in question could not have been written on June 13, 1956, nor placed in the hearing record by Chairman CANNON on June 13, 1956, as the printed hearings indicate. If this is not conclusive evidence that the printed record was, to use the softly worded assertion of the minority, "molded"—any other description of what was done with it might require a less tactful word.

Those who were present at the hearings recall that Chairman CANNON opened with encomiums and compliments to the Commission to which the Chairman of the Commission responded in kind. These were edited out before the transcript was printed, but not very skillfully edited, because on page 71 of part I of the printed hearings one of the members of the committee is quoted as follows:

"Mr. Strauss, I certainly respect you as a very able gentleman, and as the chairman of a very important Commission, a very great Commission. I wish I could share the applause of our chairman for your Commission."

This remark is altogether meaningless in the context since the chairman's complimentary statements to which the member referred were edited out.

Pages 41, 42, and 43 of part I of the printed hearings contain the major portion of a letter to the editor published in a local newspaper on June 25, 1956, yet this letter is baldly made a part of the testimony of June 13, 12 days before the letter appeared. This is certainly a molding of the printed record. The minority report took note of this. The minority noted that the inclusion of a letter written long after the hearing and imbedded in the record as a part of the testimony without explanation and without an opportunity for the committee to agree to its inclusion or question statements contained in it was irregular. The minority report noted furthermore that in order to prevent divulging the date, the first sentence of the letter was deliberately cut. This was unprecedented procedure and deeply disturbing to many members of the committee.

Chairman CANNON'S current attack on Mr. Strauss is not generated by the current incident to which he ascribes his letter. It is of much older date. To support this assertion, let us quote again from the minority report signed by 15 members of the Appropriations Committee, including us.

"Chairman Strauss, and the two other Commissioners present, were treated with unwarranted disrespect, and at times with abuse when they attempted to present facts. The three Commissioners were hindered in the presentation of their testimony, or were prevented from giving complete answers, or were denied the privilege of inserting pertinent information in the record."

Let us quote to you one further portion from the minority report:

"The original issue of the committee report, furnished the full committee at its meeting this morning, July 20, was so full of inaccurate, and at times almost libelous attacks on the chairman of the Commission that several of the majority members themselves could not stomach it. We hope it will be cleaned up before it is filed with the Congress. The bitterness of the personal and untrue attacks on Commissioner Strauss, Mr. Cisler, and other men who happened to disagree with the committee chairman's predecided opinions, or with the suggestions of the lone minority member of the Commission, is unequalled in the memory of minority members of this committee.

"The readers of the report, at some future date, when the heat of the argument has cooled, but the report regrettably still stands as an official record, must understand that the slanderous assertions, if allowed to remain, are untrue, unfair, and unworthy of a committee whose past actions have demonstrated greatness, not pettiness, and that we not only disagree, but say to Chairman Strauss, and the other under attack, that we rank them among the great and the patriotic citizens of this Republic, willing to suffer these indignities in the service of the United States."

We have in our possession a copy of the press release put out by the minority members of the subcommittee the night the hearings were released, July 20, 1956.

We also have in our possession photostatic copies of each page of the original transcript referred to in this letter and all of these are available for your examination.

If the minority report is not already in the record of your committee's hearing, we ask that it be placed in the printed hearings.

We respectfully request that this letter be placed in the printed hearings of your committee on Mr. Strauss' confirmation.

Respectfully,
JOHN TABER,
BEN F. JENSEN,
IVOR D. FENTON,
GERALD R. FORD, JR.,
FRANK T. BOW,
Members, Committee on Appropriations.

Minority Report on Public Power From Atomic Sources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 12, 1959

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, so that the Members may have a more complete understanding of the issues raised by the gentleman from Iowa and others concerning the testimony of Secretary of Commerce Strauss during consideration of the second supplemental appropriation bill, 1957, and in support of the letter and statement I have previously presented to the House on this subject,

I include with my remarks the minority report on this bill:

MINORITY REPORT, 84TH CONGRESS, 2D SESSION, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, REPORT NO. 2849, SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1957

We find ourselves unable to support a report, the conclusions in which are not in accord with the testimony. We cannot approve printed hearings, from which pertinent testimony has been omitted, or which has been molded to meet a desire to make a case, irrespective of the evidence, in favor of public power from atomic sources. We oppose committing the Government to spend large amounts of money which would otherwise be spent by private industry; and to building reactors in various parts of the world before we have established the relative merits of these reactors by continued research in the United States. We are unwilling to jeopardize the security of our own Nation by spreading our scientists, our industrial know-how, and our own recognized advances in a critical field, prematurely and thinly over so great an area as the report contemplates. Evidence submitted before this committee, as well as at Geneva, indicates this Nation is ahead of all other nations in the development of atomic energy for peaceful uses, as it is for the demands of atomic powered war. We want to keep the United States in this position.

We believe the proposed crash program, supported by only one member of the Atomic Energy Commission (in opposition to the considered judgment of the other four members, and of skilled scientists and technicians on the Commission's staff) is intended deliberately to open the door for Federal domination and control of atomic power. This would be a long step toward the complete socialization of the electric utility industry, at a tremendous cost to the taxpayers.

Senator GORE, of Tennessee, who is one of the sponsors of the legislation which would authorize this "crash" program is quoted by the Evening Star of Washington, D.C., in the issue of Wednesday, July 18, 1956, as saying, regarding the bill, that "he regards its provisions for Government construction of atomic power plants as one of the keystones of a four-point public power program he expects the Democrats to spell out in their platform at the party's Chicago convention." This same article called attention to a statement, in the Senate, that President Eisenhower would veto the bill if it were passed by the House.

The Atomic Energy Act of 1954 is the law. The use of atomic energy and power, for the benefit of all the people, must be developed under the act. The declared purpose of that act was that (a) the development, use, and control of atomic energy shall be so directed so as to make the maximum contribution to the general welfare, subject at all times to the paramount objective of making the maximum contribution to the common defense and security; and (b) the development, use, and control of atomic energy shall be directed so as to promote world peace, improve the general welfare, increase the standard of living, and strengthen free competition in private enterprise.

This act became law less than 2 years ago, on August 30, 1954.

There can be little doubt that S. 4146 (H.R. 12061) upon which this "crash" program is based, represents an amendment to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, contrary to and inconsistent with the declared policy of that act, shown in (b) above.

By no stretch of the imagination can the the proposed "crash" program strengthen free competition in private enterprise.

The Atomic Energy Commission is charged with carrying out of the policy prescribed by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954. Four of the five Commissioners, accompanied by staff members, appeared before the Public Works Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, from June 13 through July 3, 1956.

The record is filled with specious reasoning, and the preconceived conclusions of some members of the majority.

The objective was to justify a crash program for Federal construction of admittedly uneconomic, large and small scale atomic power plants. The facts brought out in the hearings disclose that such a crash program would hurt rather than help national program of developing the technical knowledge needed to construct and operate nuclear reactors for the production of economic electric power. More serious, however, is the detrimental effect such a crash program would have on the defense activities of the Commission, other defense activities, and of American industry.

Admiral Radford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, testifying on April 18, 1956 before a subcommittee of the House Appropriations committee, pointed up this shortage of competent scientific personnel for research and development work. He said:

"I have come to the conclusion that we are spending probably all the money in research and development that we can spend to advantage. We have reached a stage where the limitation in that field is probably, a matter of competent scientific personnel available for that work.

"We can give a contract to a company for research and usually they will take it. Then we see ads in the paper where they try to hire trained men away from some other company that is producing on some other other defense research program. There is a shortage. If we were to materially increase our efforts in this line I think we would cause trouble."

UNFAIR HEARINGS

One member of the Atomic Energy Commission (apparently the instigator of the crash program idea for the Federal construction of uneconomic atomic powerplants) was given almost unlimited opportunity to present his views and to insert quotations and material in the record. The present position on the part of Mr. Murray appears, from the testimony, to date only from February 23, 1956.

By contrast, Chairman Strauss, and the two other Commissioners present, were treated with unwarranted disrespect, and at times with abuse when they attempted to present facts. The three Commissioners were hindered in the presentation of their testimony, or were prevented from giving complete answers, or were denied the privilege of inserting pertinent information in the record.

An example of favoritism is shown on pages 74–78 of the hearings, where a lengthy statement by Mr. Murray was included without questions. Then, when Chairman Strauss asked permission to include a statement, representing the views of the majority of the commission members, he was told to hand it to the clerk, and that it would be taken up in regular order. That was the last of it. (See pp. 63 and 64 of the hearings, pt. 2.)

Pages 41, 42, and 43 of the hearings, contain the major portion of a "Letter to the Editor," published in the Washington Post and Times Herald on June 25, 1956. These pages are part of the testimony of June 13, 1956. The inclusion of a letter written 10 days later, without explanation and without an opportunity for committee members to agree to its inclusion, or to question statements contained in it, is irregular. The first sentence of the letter was deliberately cut, to prevent divulging the date irregularity.

At one place (on pp. 8 and 9 of the reporter's transcript, No. 79769) there was deleted, from the published hearings, a statement and the questions of a minority member of the subcommittee, and the answers of the witness, without the knowledge and consent of that member.

There appears to us to be little question that the desire to put the Federal Government into the construction and operation of large- and small-scale atomic powerplants is part of an attempt to create a public power versus private power issue for the coming political campaign. Those concerned with this continuing movement towards the nationalization of the electric utility industry know that this poorly disguised basic intent would be futile. It would invite a veto by the President.

Curiously, ample evidence in opposition to a crash program, for the construction and operation by the Federal Government of a large number of atomic powerplants, here and abroad, can be found in an analysis of the statements of the chief proponent of this proposal, as well as in the testimony of the other AEC Commissioners, and of expert witnesses.

In the hearings (p. 362, of pt. 2) Dr. Libby testified frankly that the crash program would, in his opinion, result in drawing scientists from the work on which they were now engaged, in the Commission's carefully planned program, and spreading them thinly over the larger area contemplated in the Murray crash program, to the obvious handicap of an orderly development of such power for both civilian and military uses.

The testimony indicates repeatedly that the Commission's greatest problem is the shortage of technical manpower. With Mr. Murray's own admission (p. 339 of pt. 2) that the AEC staff now has its hands full, it is difficult to see where the additional trained engineers and scientists will come from to take on the proposed crash program. He suggests a new and additional staff in spite of constant testimony on the shortage of scientists.

We call attention to the waste of both money and manpower if we were to start building these reactors all over the world, before we have concluded the necessary research and development in this country. We would have to send technicians to the points of installation, no matter how far away these might be, every time a bug developed in one of the reactors.

Industry itself, cooperating with the Government, is engaged in research and development, leading to the exportation of reactors for foreign markets. The testimony shows a number already contemplated from these sources. As practical know-how increases, there is no reason to doubt that industry will enter this market and expand it.

The implications of the majority report are that the crash program would entail the construction of both large and small scale reactors, which have not yet been proven, and for which there is not yet assurance of successful or safe operation. It must be remembered that we are now appropriating money for continued research on five different types of reactors, only two of which are presently in operation on a practical scale.

The committee members who apparently wish to create a new Federal power monopoly are attempting to use the fact that private industry has not completed an atomic powerplant, and put it in operation, in the less than 2 years which have elapsed since the act was passed, to insist that the Federal Government must now step in. They know that neither industry nor Government can design and build large-size atomic reactors overnight, and that many new and technical problems must first be solved. This is a new industry in itself.

They know that industry is today spending $30 million a year to develop this new industry, and plans an expenditure of almost a half-billion dollars.

Most important, these propagandists for public power monopolies know that, from the very start of the atomic age, when the Manhattan project was the most secret of all war secrets, we have depended on the manpower and the know-how of private industry, just as we should admit we must do today. Without Westinghouse, Du Pont, Dow, General Electric, and the rest of this distinguished list, there would be no bomb, and no "atoms for peace."

MISLEADING AND NONFACTUAL HEADINGS

We deplore the wide use, throughout part 2 of the AEC hearings, of headings that are not in accord with the testimony. This use of misleading and erroneous headings appears to be an effort to influence the reader to accept the interpretations and the preconceived opinions of the majority in charge of the hearings. To us, this indicates a fear, and justifiably so, that the reader would not reach the same conclusions by reading the hearings for himself.

An example will be found on page 375 of part 2. The heading reads: "President Eisenhower's Views Ratify the Approach of the Joint Committee." A few inches below, on the same page, Chairman Strauss points out that the President did not appoint the "McKinney Panel," to which reference is being made. It was appointed by the Joint Committee. The President had not expressed himself.

We call attention to specific inaccuracies in the accompanying committee report: On page 4, the statement is made that "the committee insisted that its hearings * * * be unclassified, etc." Frankly, the committee did no such thing, nor was there any need for it. We have been hearing this subject for more than 10 years, with a constant effort on the part of the Commission to provide "accurate and understandable information," and to declassify it.

On page 7, the report misinterprets the attitude of Chairman Strauss of AEC. Nothing in the testimony confirms this statement, nor does the AEC Chairman hold the opinions charged to him. The unreliability of Russian statistics is a matter of common knowledge, admitted by all AEC Commissioners, including Commissioner Murray, but the conclusion to be reached is an emphasis on the need for constant checking and observation, in addition to our own continued research.

Again, on page 7, the report states that we are 3 years behind Russia and Great Britain. The testimony before the committee, as in the conference at Geneva, is the opposite of this statement.

What the report neglects to state is that an atomic reactor does not produce electric power. The reactor is a substitute for the heat under a boiler. It may be used, among other things, to produce the steam which then operates equipment which in turn produces electric power or light. When the United States operates a reactor continuously for the length of time we have operated one in the *Nautilus*, we have in fact proven not only the design of the reactor, but our lead in this important field. To apply it to the production of electric power, to light a city for example, requires only the necessary designs and construction, and these follow in rapid and proper order, under the program submitted by the AEC.

On page 8, the report states flatly that the United States has nothing comparable to the Russian 5,000-kilowatt plant. In simple language, this is not so. The *Nautilus* and *Sea Wolf* are visible evidences of its inaccuracy. The report omits the known fact that the Russian reactor may or may not have been operating "continuously." The testimony shows it to be supported by a steam-plant tied to the same grid.

On page 9, the report states that "this Nation is bogged down in inexcusable stagnation." This statement is not correct. We have more developments, than at any time in our atomic civilian history. The big reactor and power setup at Shippingport is almost ready for operation. Planned for 60,000 kilowatts, it is now estimated to produce up to 100,000 kilowatts.

Referring to the report, on page 10, we point out that the majority members might at least try to be consistent. The report states that no nation in the world knows which type of reactor is best or safest, and then asks Congress to insist that the AEC build innumerable plants and "tie them into communities for the supply of electricity." In other words, we don't know yet just what to do, so let's go into full (and expensive) production, even if we have to spread our scientific knowledge so thin the safety of the United States may suffer. On page 13 the report states definitely that no industry "dares to take a chance." This is an untrue statement, in the face of the "chances" already being taken by industry to cooperate in the program, and the millions now being spent by industry. Contracts are concluded, or under negotiation, for atomic reactor developments with Commonwealth Edison Co., 180,000 kilowatts; Yankee Atomic Electric Co., 134,000 kilowatts; Consolidated Edison Co., 140,000 kilowatts; Detroit Edison and its associates, fast breeder reactor over 100,000 kilowatts; Pennsylvania Power & Light Co., 150,000 kilowatts; Duquesne Light Co. and Westinghouse Electric Co. (Shippingport plant), 60,000 kilowatts or more; and numerous smaller companies and cooperatives.

On page 16 the report calls attention to the expenditure of $15 billion by the Government. We accept the figure but think the report would have been more honest if it had added that most of this was spent for weapon development, and that we spent the greater part through contractual relations with such industries as we now propose to draw into the picture in the partnership program of the AEC.

On page 16 this astonishing statement is made: "The United States * * * is not coping with these problems." How far can you get from the truth, and print such a statement in a report and still maintain the integrity of a congressional committee?

The original issue of the committee report, furnished the full committee at its meeting this morning, July 20, was so full of inaccurate, and at times almost libelous attacks of the Chairman of the Commission that several of the majority members themselves could not stomach it. We hope it will be cleaned up before it is filed with the Congress. The bitterness of the personal and untrue attacks on Commissioner Strauss, Mr. Visler, and other men who happened to disagree with the committee chairman's predecided opinions, or with the suggestions of the lone minority member of the Commission, is unequaled in the memory of minority members of this committee.

The readers of the report, at some future date, when the heat of the argument has cooled, but the report regrettably still stands as an official record, must understand that the slanderous assertions, if allowed to remain, are untrue, unfair, and unworthy of a committee whose past actions have demonstrated greatness, not pettiness, and that we not only disagree, but say to Chairman Strauss, and the other under attack, that we rank them among the great and the patriotic citizens of this Republic, willing to suffer these indignities in the service of the United States.

On page 20, the report characterizes a full-page advertisement, inserted as one part of an educational campaign, directed to the paper's readers by a group of private power companies, as misleading and ill-advised. We submit that the advertisement was not misleading, but clear and accurate, and we will not join any statement which labels, as "ill-advised," the constitutional right of any citizen or group of citizens to present their side of a controversial issue through either the editorial columns or the advertising pages of any newspaper.

We submit in conclusion, that—

There is no present lack of power in the United States.

We do not underestimate the advances in atomic knowledge made in other countries, and we are aware of them, but the United States still leads in practical research and the development of reactors. To maintain this lead, we must not waste either money or the scientists who have put us in the lead and can keep us there.

The proposed expenditure of $400 million, above the budget request, and against the majority opinion of the AEC Commissioners, is unnecessary, wasteful, and inimical to the best interest of the Nation.

The AEC is carrying on a well-considered and well-planned program, drawing in the best brains and abilities of American industry. We should not insist that these assets be spread as thin, as the bill and the appropriation proposes to spread them.

Nothing in the testimony, nor in the bill, specifies the number of reactors to be built by the United States, nor where they are to be built. We are just to start off in full flight—building them. Nor does any testimony indicate even approximately the probable cost of this "crash" program, nor the length of time it would delay the considered program now underway. Estimates have been made which place the total cost in the billions.

We oppose the inclusion of this initial $400 million, to put the Government in the public power business with atomic energy. We support the original budget request for $1,898,700,000, and are willing to accept the additional $40 million added by the committee.

JOHN TABER; BEN F. JENSEN; H. CARL ANDERSEN; IVOR D. FENTON; JOHN PHILLIPS; ERRETT P. SCRIVNER; CLIFF CLEVENGER; EARL WILSON; BENJAMIN F. JAMES; GERALD R. FORD, Jr.; EDWARD T. MILLER; CHARLES W. VURSELL; T. MILLET HAND; HAROLD C. OSTERTAG; and FRANK T. BOW.

The Challenge to American Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEWART L. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1959

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, many of us who favor Federal aid to education programs are increasingly concerned about the complacency—both in Congress and out—over the challenge confronting American education. This week, for example, the President's Science Advisory Committee, headed by Dr. James R. Killian, Jr., issued a report boldly pointing out some of our educational shortcomings. Yet there are ample reasons for misgivings that the recommendations of this distinguished committee will be quickly shelved to gather dust along with earlier reports filed by the White House Conference on Education, the National Citizens Commission for the Public Schools, and the

Rockefeller Brothers Fund Report on Education.

The word "crisis" may not be apt to describe our educational predicament. Instruction is not a spectacular feat with climaxes and places for appropriate applause. The intellectual fiber and character of a country are forged both in and out of classrooms by a slow process of accretion. But nevertheless, the capacity of our people to do great things next generation, and the next after that, is for better or worse being determined today and tomorrow.

It is this fact which underscores the concern many of us feel over the recommendation of the Killian and Rockefeller reports that our current annual investment in education should be doubled—as a "minimal rather than an extravagant goal" to quote the Killian group. Who will say that our failure to launch a vigorous three-pronged effort—local, State, and Federal—to reach this goal is not an urgent national task?

Evidence of the challenge we face confronts us almost every time we open a newspaper. I present herewith two illustrative news items—a dispatch filed a few days ago by the Moscow correspondent of the New York Times; and an Associated Press account of a speech delivered last week in Milwaukee by Dr. Edward Teller:

[From the New York Times, May 12, 1959]

STALIN ERA PAST, AMERICANS STRESS

(By Harrison E. Salisbury)

Moscow, May 11.—President Harlan H. Hatcher of the University of Michigan said today it was time that Americans realized the Stalin era was dead and that Russians recognized that the age of the robber nations was past.

President Hatcher made his comment in summing up his favorable impressions of the Soviet educational system from a month's inspection of Soviet universities.

Dr. Hatcher is the leader of one of several American educational groups that have been surveying the Soviet educational field. Other ranking educators who have just completed a study tour include President Henry T. Heald of the Ford Foundation, and Shepherd Stone of the Ford Foundation, Prof. Philip E. Mosely, director of studies of the Council of Foreign Relations; F. Cyril James, vice chancellor of McGill University, Montreal; Norman P. Auburn, president of Akron University, and William Pine, head of the scholarship program of the Ford Motor Co. Fund.

SOVIET GETS HIGH MARKS

Dr. Hatcher spoke only for himself. However, the educators generally gave Soviet higher education very high marks.

"Soviet society is moving at a much faster rate than is generally realized either here or abroad," Dr. Hatcher declared. "Education is the motivating and guiding force in this evolution. I think that the direction of this movement is going to surprise everyone."

Dr. Hatcher said it was time that "my countrymen begin to understand that changes can take place in the Soviet system and that these changes are actually occurring before our eyes."

He said he felt that too many persons in the United States, particularly at the policy-making level, tended to overlook the evolution that has occurred in the last 6 years.

"Stalin is dead and it is time that Washington began to realize this," Dr. Hatcher said. "And in the same connection it is high time that Moscow understands that the era of the robber barons, the era of primitive 19th century capitalism, has ended in the United States and given way to a completely new way of life."

UNIVERSITIES VISITED

The group of educators headed by Dr. Hatcher has visited seven of the principal Soviet universities—Moscow, Leningrad, Kiev, Tiflis, Tashkent, Samarkand, and Irkutsk. Their principal impression in Soviet higher education was one of drive, energy, pioneering spirit and high competence. They devoted chief attention to the humanities and were surprised to find that contrary to the reports of some observers Soviet humanities were not being skimped for the sake of science.

"On the contrary, we have found that the humanities here have benefited from the impact of new scientific attitudes," Dr. Hatcher said. He gave much credit to the excellent foundation laid in the Soviet 10-year schools in languages and in literature; not only of Russia but of foreign countries.

"Students arrive at the university wonderfully well prepared," he said. "They have excellent study habits. Their extracurricular activities are tied into serrious subjects. Reading habits are widespread and good. The use of libraries is exceptional."

It was his opinion that Soviet scientists, engineers, and technicianss had a broader basis of the humanities than many in the United States.

He helped conduct a seminar for graduate students at Moscow University in contemporary literature and was surprised at how widely read and conversant the students were with English and American literature.

"There is a spirit of competition all the way through the Soviet education system and indeed Soviet life which I did not expect to find," he said.

As far as ideology is concerned, Dr. Hatcher said, he examined the content of many ideological courses and found their general nature not so different in concept from American courses in civics and government as he had expected.

He was particularly struck by the driving energy and pioneering spirit east of the Urals. Irkutsk University with 3,500 students soon will double in size while Moscow and Leningrad will remain relatively stable.

TELLER SAYS RUSS LED IN SCIENCE

MILWAUKEE, MAY 20.—Noted physicist Dr. Edward Teller, said Wednesday night that "10 years from now Russia will become the unquestioned world leader in the field of science."

"All we can hope to do is to regain our lost leadership at some later date," said Teller, professor of physics at the University of California at Berkeley. He is generally credited with the major portion of the research which led to the development of the hydrogen bomb.

Dr. Teller said he had no doubt that the world will be modeled after Russian ideas and not after our own by the end of the century.

He spoke at the opening meeting of a 3-day conference at Marquette University on "The Education of the Scientist in a Free Democracy."

In recent years Teller has been an outspoken opponent of nuclear test bans, a proponent of faster missile production, and an advocate of a wide variety of fission and fusion weapons. The 51-year-old Teller often has disclaimed sole responsibility for the hydrogen bomb, but has testified that he was one of only a half dozen or so who worked on it in the period immediately after World War II.

He suggested a few emergency measures in the field of scientific education.

He asked that scientifically inclined children be started early and that talent, which he defined as only a strong interest in what is an endless game with surprises around every corner, be developed. He also pleaded for more and better teachers and teaching methods.

H.R. 2729

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1959

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I would like to insert a letter and a memorandum that I have recently sent to the members of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with regard to my bill, H.R. 2729. As I feel this legislation is of great interest to small business, I felt that it should be brought to the attention of this body.

The letter and memorandum follow:

MAY 26, 1959.

The Honorable OREN HARRIS,
Chairman, Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, New House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing this letter on the equal pricing bill, H.R. 2729, to all members of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in response to a request that they be informed about the measure, its mechanics, and its purposes.

There are two bases for this bill:

1. Complaints in growing numbers from independent businessmen that their manufacturer-suppliers are increasingly entering direct competition with them, either straight to consumer from factory or through factory-owned stores, at prices which the independents cannot meet, on any profitable basis.

2. Research which indicates that our present antitrust laws do not in any way afford any protections for these independent businessmen against this particular type of price discrimination.

There is ample evidence that this manufacturer direct-to-consumer or factory-owned store unfair price competition is injuring independent business people, which is set forth at length in the accompanying memorandum.

As to the second point made in the memorandum, I believe we are all in agreement with the need for such legislation as the Robinson-Patman law now on the books. This law prohibits unfair price discriminations which promote monopoly. But the fact is that while it covers relationships between manufacturers and their various classes of retailers and wholesalers, it does not cover the relationship between a manufacturer selling direct and his own independent retailers.

Mr. George J. Burger, vice president, National Federation of Independent Business had a more than 2-hour conference with the five Federal Trade Commissioners on this problem, last fall. He was told that in the Agency's opinion, the Robinson-Patman law, which aims to promote fair pricing competition, does not extend to price discriminations between manufacturers selling direct and through factory-owned stores on the one hand, and their independent dealers on the other. The plain fact is that as matters stand, so far as the independent who is being unfairly squeezed by his own manu-

facturer-supplier is concerned, he has no protection, and he has no hope of protection.

My own investigations confirmed this fact, and that is why I am sponsor of H.R. 2729. The one and only purpose of this bill is to afford the independent businessman the same assurances of fair, nonmonopolistic competition in his relationship with directly competing manufacturer suppliers as he already has in other respects.

I do think this bill is urgently needed, and I urge your favorable action on it so that it may become law.

Sincerely,

ALVIN M. BENTLEY,
Member of Congress.

MEMORANDUM REGARDING H.R. 2729

On March 25, 1959, Mr. James W. Cassedy, general counsel, National Auto and Flat Glass Dealers Association, spoke before this committee in support of H.R. 2729. He quoted reports from many of his group's members indicating injury from this type of factory direct competition. Here are a few of those quotes:

"Ed's Glass Shop, 739 Southwest 29th, Oklahoma City, Okla.: 'In 1956 our account with Pittsburgh Plate Glass was in excess of $17,000, but they did not think enough of my account, so in turn they solicit my accounts, selling some of them at the same price they sell auto glass shops.'

"Allentown Glass & Paint Co., 501 North Seventh, Allentown, Pa.: 'They (Pittsburgh Plate Glass) sell glass to our insurance and garage customers at the same price they sell to us who are dealers or retailers.'

"Bridgewood Auto Glass Co., 1422 Stiles, Philadelphia, Pa.: 'Pittsburgh Plate has gone into dealers and sold them bent glass at the price I buy it.' "

On March 23, Mr. Frank T. Underhill, executive director, Independent Shoeman, speaking in favor of H.R. 2729, told the committee: "My association naturally is in favor of H.R. 2729 inasmuch as (maintaining free enterprise in the shoe industry) is the very reason for Independent Shoeman's existence. It has frequently come to our attention that factory-owned or factory controlled retail outlets quite often enjoy a competitive advantage over the independent operator due to special prices, extra discounts or advertising allowances or some volume incentives. These reflect in the selling prices * * *. Testimony given in the Brown-Kinney trial (civil action No. 10,527) indicates that the practice of lower prices to factory owned or controlled stores is very much a reality by those companies engaged in dual selling."

On March 23, 1959, in my own testimony before this committee I quoted from one of my own constituents, Mr. Ron Bushey, Bushey Radiator & Auto Glass Co. of Saginaw, Mich.:

"I have been told by the manager of Pittsburgh Plate that they expect me to purchase from them between $35,000 and $40,000 of their glass, which represents about one-third of my yearly purchases, and if I didn't, they would find another outlet. Please remember that Pittsburgh is in the retail business as my competitor. As such they have cut prices to my customers. Where I have sold to accounts for years, Pittsburgh has cut my price by 15 percent. * * * After cutting prices, Pittsburgh raised their price to me by 10 percent * * *. This is a tragic situation for us little fellows trying to survive. This great company that manufactures, wholesales, and is my supplier—is now openly trying to get all my customers for their own retail shop."

This is about the same situation as one independent tire dealer recently mentioned to Mr. George J. Burger, vice president, National Federation of Independent Business. In part, this dealer declared (I will supply his name on request):

"Since 1922 I have been a tire distributor for * * *. My business represents an investment of $365,000 in the physical plant alone, and a half a million dollars including equipment, plus my 49 years of experience in the tire business. I built this business up to a volume of $1 million a year. In recent years the unfair and discriminatory practices of the tire companies have reduced my business to where it is running at about $250,000 a year. Five years ago I had 27 employees. Today I have 12. Until 5 years ago my business was profitable. Today I am supporting my business out of my savings and investments. Last year I lost $26,000 in cash in my business, without taking out a penny for myself. In the past 8 months I have had to put $100,000 into the business. If present conditions continue I will soon be out of business. * * *

"The very tire manufacturers whose business we independent dealers helped build are now destroying our business by sending company salesmen into * * * to sell tires to our customers cheaper than our buying prices. As a volume distributor I buy tires from the manufacturer at a discount of 6 tens off the manufacturer's list price plus an additional discount of 8 percent. I know of many instances where the tire companies in recent years have sold tires to my former customers at discounts of 7 tens and even 8 tens off list price. No one of such customers buys half as many tires as I do. I am not talking about sales to national companies, which are bad enough. I am talking about local truckers and transportation companies. The tire companies will sell direct, at prices equal to and often below my cost, to anyone who has two trucks or more * * *. The situation cannot continue much longer without ruining me and other independent tire dealers."

The foregoing ties right in with an editorial which appeared recently in Super Service Station, a publication of the Irving-Cloud Publishing Co., for many years a recognized authority on the automotive aftermarket. In part, this editorial read:

"Regulation of pricing under dual marketing practices may be one bit of legislation that most independent petroleum marketers and tire dealers will agree would help their businesses by removing two of their worst griefs.

"Relief is promised in a bill (H.R. 2729) introduced in the Congress by Representative ALVIN M. BENTLEY, Republican, Michigan. It might stop one practice of which oil jobbers have been complaining for years, and equalize retail competition between gasoline and tire dealers, and their suppliers' stores.

"The Bentley bill might not affect gasoline at service stations as much as tires which, it is the belief of antitrust bill sponsors in Washington, are billed to company stores at lower prices than the prices charged other retailers. * * * The Bentley bill may not be the solution of all manufacturer-distributor-dealer price troubles, but its passage could bring considerable relief in some areas."

But getting back to the tire field, actually the conditions noted above are nothing more than a worsening of conditions found by Burger Tire Consultant Service in a survey of 4,000 independent tire dealers nationally. In signed statements (which are available to the committee for inspection), the following allegations were made, based on the operating experience of these independent businessmen:

Some 77 percent of the Goodyear dealers who replied said that prices set by manufacturers selling direct or through their own stores were so low as to deny them a chance to remain competitive and make a profit.

Some 90 percent of the Firestone dealers who replied said that prices set by manufacturers selling direct or through their own stores were so low as to deny them a chance to remain competitive and make a profit.

Some 100 percent of the Goodrich dealers who replied said that the prices set by manufacturers selling direct or through stores were so low as to deny them a chance to remain competitive and make a profit.

An average 75 percent of the foregoing dealers of all three manufacturers charged that tire manufacturers operating their own stores do not give independent dealers the same buying prices and services they offer their own outlets * * * and consequently, an average 84 percent said they knew of cases wherein tire manufacturers operating their own stores undersold their own dealers through these stores.

That is why one prominent midwestern dealer, Mr. Charles Raney, Jr., told Senate Judiciary Committee on May 21, 1954: "If I thought that the past and present trends in the (factory direct) distribution of tires were to continue without correction, I would sell my business without further consideration and attempt to obtain employment with one of the major rubber companies, because surely as time passes, there is where we dealers would eventually be if we wished to remain in the tire industry. How can I, as an independent tire dealer, hope to compete with my own suppliers, when they are attempting to make deals direct with the consumer at prices very near those that I pay and in some instances considerably below?"

With reference to the survey conducted by Burger Tire Consultant Service, you will note there is no reference in it to the U.S. Rubber Co. That was because at the time it was the policy of that firm not to operate through company stores. Actually, immediately before World War II, this firm did operate company stores. Alleged price discriminations between these stores and its own independent dealers were part of charges of unfair competition brought against it by the Federal Trade Comimssion. But FTC dropped these charges when informed that U.S. Rubber had closed its factory stores. You may be interested to know that several years later, U.S. Rubber told a congressional committee it was happy over this decision, because it found operating conditions better through independent dealers only. However, only recently, the firm reversed its policy on these things, and it now plans to open factory-owned retail stores once more.

Now I have mentioned testimony of the injurious nature of this type of factory direct competition with retailers in the glass, shoe, and tire industries. I have touched on evidence of its existence in the oil industry. I can assure you that it exists in other industries, such as paints and plumbing. In other words, there is ample evidence that this type of direct competition is not the problem solely of one independent in one industry, or of the independents in any single industry. It covers independents in a broad and important segment of industries, and as evidenced by reference to the United States Rubber Co. (above), and in the following testimony by George J. Burger, vice president, National Federation of Independent Business, before this committee, on March 18, 1959:

"Is the retail shoe industry—as to the actual number of stores owned and operated by major shoe producers, at this moment I do not have the estimated number but we have noted in a recent announcement in the Wall Street Journal February 6, 1959, that the General Shoe Co. proposes to open about 50 retail stores in the low-price women's shoe field, and of course it goes without saying that what this company does, others will follow."

It is a growing problem.

Furthermore, as Mr. George H. Frates, National Association of Retail Druggists, told the Senate Judiciary Committee, on May 21, 1954, while testifying in favor of S. 175, a

bill to divorce tire manufacturers from retailing:

"We are in favor of passage of S. 175, which is now pending before your committee. It might seem at first blush that there is a wide variance between the retailing of automobile tires and the retailing of drugs and drug sundries, therefore, we respectfully wish to call to the committee's attention the fact that the invasion of one field, if financially successful, presupposes the entry into another area."

But suppose this problem did not exist on such a broad basis. Suppose it were limited to, say, part of only one industry. I contend this would not make it any the less deserving of our attention, or any the less actionable on our part. As Mr. George Burger, vice president, National Federation of Independent Business has said, time and again, the basic question is whether it is right for a manufacturer to be able to go into markets and, either through factory-owned stores or direct from factory, undersell his own established independent dealers, on a basis that has no necessary direct relationship to their efficiency of operations. Or, as Mr. George H. Frates, National Association of Retail Druggists, put it in his 1954 testimony:

"If a company is permitted to manufacture, distribute, and retail a given product, under our free enterprises system that act is their privilege. Our concern, however, stems from the utter unfairness of a manufacturer selling his own wares at retail for a price substantially lower than other retailers handling this same item—this applies to services as well as merchandise. We believe this manipulation is accomplished by rigged discounts and is a violation of fair dealing in the marketplace. A manufacturer who competes with his retailing distributors and engages in predatory price cutting uses the tools of a monopolist."

That Phony Economic War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. DAVIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1959

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I have never believed that the way to fight communism is to throw our taxpayers' money around the world indiscriminately to friends and foes alike. The administration's $3.93 billion foreign aid request for economic as well as military aid is for some 70 countries, including Communist Poland and Yugoslavia and pro-Communist India and Indonesia, is far out of line. The criterion for any sort of aid, it seems to me, should be the demonstrable need on the part of a proven friend and ally to shore up its defenses against the threat of Communist takeover.

I think it is clear that the front which we must defend is the military, not the economic or any other. To do otherwise, as I fear the administration contemplates doing with new foreign aid appropriations, is to engage in a type of suicidal shadowboxing. We would be committed to a policy of operating an international soup kitchen—with no strings attached—while the Russians advance in their program with limited loans for specific purposes at high interest rates

Very much to the point on this subject of economic aid is the editorial entitled "That Phony Economic War" which appeared in the Indianapolis Star of April 12, 1959. Pursuant to the unanimous consent of the House, I insert that editorial herewith:

THAT PHONY ECONOMIC WAR

We have received from the U.S. State Department a booklet titled, "The Communist Economic Threat." It seeks to prove that the Communists are using a new weapon, economic pentration. And it can be the most dangerous of all weapons in the Communists' varied arsenal.

Now let's just analyze the facts about this economic threat. The booklet states, "Since 1954 the Soviet bloc countries have concluded agreements with 18 of the less developed countries outside the Soviet orbit which provide for the extension of an estimated $2,400 million in intermediate and long term credits and grants for goods and services from the bloc."

Sounds dangerous, doesn't it? But listen to what the booklet does not say: For instance, the United States has given away approximately $24 billion to foreign countries since 1954. That is 10 times the estimated Soviet program.

But even more was left out of the booklet. The $2,400 million Soviet credit program (and it is chiefly credits loaned at 2 to 2.5 percent interest) is figured at the Soviet rate of exchange of 4 rubles to a dollar. The dollar, however, according to the Perrera Co. in New York, which deals daily in foreign exchange, is actually worth between 25 and 50 rubles. In other words the actual buying power of the ruble is from 6 to 12 times less than the Soviets say it is.

For the sake of simplicity let us use the figure of 24 rubles to the dollar as a most generous figure to the Soviets, being less than the world money market would demand yet more accurately reflecting the true value of the ruble. Our figures below are all based on a ratio of 24 rubles to a dollar.

At 24 rubles to a dollar, instead of the 4 used by the State Department in arriving at the $2,400 million figure, we find that the Soviet program suddenly shrinks to $400 million or one-sixth as much as claimed. This means the Soviets are, in truth, lending $100 million or less a year while the United States is giving away around $6 billion a year, a ratio of 60 to 1 for the United States.

Don't go away, there's more. The State Department booklet itself states that only about 38 percent of the credits (from the Soviets to those 18 countries) have been drawn. So the $2,400 million program which became $400 million at the most in real dollars, suddenly turns out to be $152 million actually spent by the Soviets since 1954, a measly $38 million a year and a tiny six one-thousandths of the U.S. foreign aid program.

And here is something else. U.S. private industry and business, according to our own State Department officials, invests about $2 billion a year in foreign countries. At the same time private charities and foundations send a huge total of $500 million every year to backward and forward countries. So it turns out that private industry and private charity in the United States are sending more dollars every year to foreign lands than the Soviet Union says it is sending in 4 years. With no foreign aid spending at all, the United States invests 66 times as much money abroad as the Soviet Union every year.

But of course, the real truth is that foreign aid spending or Soviet "economic penetration" has nothing whatsoever to do with fighting communism or advancing communism.

For an actual case history of how foreign aid has nothing to do with pro or anti-communism take Egypt and Iraq. The Soviets have advanced credits, according to their own figures and the State Department's booklet, of $782 million to Egypt since 1954. Of course the true dollar value of these credits is about one-sixth as much or about $130 million which is still the most loaned by the Soviets to any non-Communist country. Iraq on the other hand got all of its economic and military aid from the United States and Great Britain. The Soviet Union gave Iraq nothing whatsoever. But it is Iraq that is now virtually Communist and it is Egypt's President Nasser who is leading the Arab anti-Communist cause. Anybody who can contend that foreign aid fights or advances communism from this example has an upside down mind.

Now let's look at some facts on foreign trade. According to the Soviet Affairs Analysis Service, prepared from Soviet statistics by the "Institute for the Study of the U.S.S.R." in Munich, Germany, the total foreign trade done by the Soviet Union in 1957 was 33,300 million rubles. Translated into real dollars the highest possible figure would be $1,387 million in Soviet trade a year. But 24,500 million rubles' worth of this trade is entirely inside the Soviet bloc. Trade with non-Communist nations is only 7 billion rubles or around $290 million a year. Why the free world's trade in Asia and Africa alone is $23 million a year, or 92 times the total Soviet trade with the entire free world.

The entire Soviet foreign trade, inside and outside the Communist bloc, amounts to only 3.6 percent of the world's exports and 3.3 percent of the world's imports. Each of the Big Four nations, the United States, Great Britain, France and West Germany, does more foreign trade than the Soviet Union. How can a nation with such a comparatively small trade potential pose a dangerous "economic threat" to the free world? How can Soviet trade-aid programs be considered "the most dangerous of all weapons in the Communists' varied arsenal?"

The truth is that the Soviet threat to the free world is not economic at all, it is political and military. Of course they do use whatever economic power they have for political advantage. They make a big show of what little they have. When they send automobiles to Argentina to sell for 2,500 rubles each and they sell the same cars in the Soviet Union for more than 10,000 rubles, they are simply using automobiles for political dramatics.

In this field of political exploitation of every Soviet resource from trade to guns to diplomacy, intrigue and mass murder the Soviets are indeed winning the cold war, not because they have big resources, but because they have the skill to use what little they have effectively. With the free world's total resources, or just U.S. resources alone, we could easily defeat the Soviets in this drive for world domination. It is our policies that are at fault, not our resources. Until we rid ourselves of the absurd and demonstrably false idea that we can defeat Communists with foreign aid, we will keep on wasting $6 billion a year for nothing while they make a modest profit on the interest they get from their little credit program.

When Lincoln said, "You can fool some of the people all of the time, and all of the people some of the time, but you can't fool all of the people all of the time," perhaps he was right. But how much time is it going to take "all the people" of this country to stop being fooled by this phony State Department policy of fighting Soviet economic penetration with foreign aid dollars?